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ABOUT THE COMMON DATA PROJECT

Beginning in 2009, the five state education agencies (SEAs) participating in the New England Secondary School Consortium have been collecting, calculating, and reporting graduation rates, dropout rates, and postsecondary-enrollment and persistence rates using consistent procedures and methodologies developed by a regional team of data specialists from the departments and agencies of education in Connecticut, Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont. To our knowledge, the New England Secondary School Consortium’s Common Data Project is the first initiative of its kind in the United States.

Recognizing the critical importance of high-quality data to effective school improvement, our five participating states decided to proactively address data quality, reliability, and comparability, rather than waiting for an outside entity to establish new guidance and regulations.

To promote more accurate and reliable data comparability across the five Consortium member states, the Common Data Project develops and implements standardized procedures designed to eliminate unwanted variance that may result from divergent data systems, the misinterpretation of agreed-upon rules, or computational errors. The Data Project has also created a series of quality-control mechanisms that further improve the reliability and comparability of state-reported data.

How the Project Works

- Data specialists from the participating SEAs, along with representatives from higher education and other data experts, meet several times throughout the year to discuss best practices, refine agreements, and coordinate the collection and reporting of data. Each participating SEA shares and discusses its data practices with other SEAs, and several refinements of in-state data procedures have resulted from lessons learned from other states.
- All five states use common metrics, procedures, and rules when compiling, calculating, and reporting data. A full description of these procedures can be found in the Common Data Project 2015 Procedural Guidebook. The goal is continual improvement of data reliability and comparability across the region.
- The common procedures and rules are published under a Creative Commons license, which allows for the free use of all content, and other SEAs and educational organizations are encouraged to use and adapt our work.
- Each year, the Consortium produces a comprehensive report on graduation rates, dropout rates, and postsecondary enrollments and persistence rates for each of the five states. The Consortium, and its participating SEAs and partners, use these annual reports to help evaluate the impact of state policies and initiatives designed to improve secondary schools and student performance.
- Each year, the five SEAs publish the Consortium metrics on their websites, making the data available to the educators, policy makers, and the public.
- The common data procedures and metrics are compliant with all state and federal rules, regulations, and guidance related to data quality and reporting.
- The common-data reporting is used to track statewide and regional improvements in school and student-subgroup performance within and across states. The comparable data
set—in place since the baseline year of 2009—allows for more reliable cross-state comparisons.

- A comprehensive “college-readiness index” that takes into account academic, socioeconomic, and behavioral data is currently under development. The Annenberg Institute for School Reform at Brown University and the Center for Education Policy, Applied Research, and Evaluation at the University of Southern Maine have been collaborating on the development of the index. Any further development is contingent on securing funding.

Project Innovations

- **Common Metrics:** The Common Data Project has produced a set of common formulas that are used to calculate secondary graduation rates, secondary dropout rates, and postsecondary-enrollment, -persistence, and -completion rates.

- **Common Rules:** All five departments of education follow the same “business rules” and procedures when collecting, calculating, and reporting common data to improve consistency, comparability, and quality.

- **Common Definitions:** Each variable in the common regional data set is determined using consistently applied definitions. For example, all five departments of education follow the same definitions for economically disadvantaged students, English-language learners, students with disabilities, and other student subgroups.

- **Common Reporting Windows:** All five departments of education follow common data-collection and data-reporting timelines. Since most large-scale databases are continually updated, common reporting windows improve the consistency and comparability of multistate data sets.

- **Common Quality-Control Procedures:** The Common Data Project uses both internal (state-by-state controls) and external (third-party coordination and auditing) as part of its common quality-control framework. The redundant, multistage protocol is designed to improve data quality throughout the collection, calculation, and reporting cycle.

Selected Indicators

The New England Secondary School Consortium has established four performance goals to be achieved in each of the five states:

1. Increase high school graduation rates.
2. Decrease dropout rates.
3. Increase the percentage of students enrolling in two- and four-year postsecondary programs or pursuing industry-certified and accredited postsecondary certificates.
4. Increase the percentage of students who graduate from high school college ready.

The Data Team, in conjunction with external third parties, created five performance indicators using agreed-upon metrics. The common metrics, in conjunction with a standardized set of business procedures and rules, significantly increase the comparability of reported data on each indicator across the five Consortium states. To our knowledge, only the federal government, via the National
Center for Educational Statistics (NCES), has attempted to provide the public with comparable metrics on key educational initiatives.

**High School Graduation Rate** [Status: Operational] [Baseline Year: 2009]
High School graduation rates have been computed using the formula articulated in federal regulations, specifically 34 C.F.R. §200.19 (b)(1). The rate relies on the identification and tracking of a four-year graduation cohort. All states in the Consortium currently report the federal graduation rate. The following formula is used for calculating the graduation rate:

\[
\frac{\text{(# of Graduating Seniors)}}{\text{( # of First-time Freshman +/- Transfers In or Out)}}
\]

**Dropout Rate** [Status: Operational] [Baseline Year: 2009]
The Consortium dropout data is closely linked to the data used in calculating the adjusted cohort graduation rate. Data Team members recognize that, as the graduation rate and dropout rate have often been reported using disparate methods, a clearer relationship between these measures would be helpful. The National Governors Association recommended that dropouts be counted as those students who have not completed high school and are no longer enrolled in high school. This rate is calculated using the same adjusted freshman cohort used for the graduation rate. The following formula is used for calculating dropout rate:

\[
\frac{\text{(# in Adjusted Freshman Cohort)}}{\text{-(Graduates + Students Still Enrolled + Other Completers)}}}{\text{Adjusted Freshman Cohort}}
\]

**College Enrollment** [Status: Operational] [Baseline Year: 2009]
The rationale for collecting college-enrollment data is to determine the percentage of students who go on to further education after completing high school. All five Consortium states use data collected by the National Student Clearinghouse (NSC), and NSC reports are run during a common reporting window to reduce variance associated with ongoing updating of the national NSC database. The following formula is used for calculating college enrollment:

\[
\frac{\text{(# of Students Enrolled in College)}}}{\text{( # of High School Graduates)}}
\]

**College Persistence** [Status: Operational] [Baseline Year: 2011]
The business rule states: “The number of college freshman (by cohort) that remain continually enrolled in a postsecondary-education program who enroll for a third semester after initial enrollment.” This business rule is similar to that used by the NCES in reporting the number of first-time, full-time students who are retained (i.e., return to college) the following fall (see National Center for Education Statistics, 2015-144, *The Condition of Education 2015*).

\[
\frac{\text{(# of Students Enrolled in 3rd Semester)}}}{\text{( # of Freshman College Cohort)}}
\]

**College Success** [Status: Operational] [Baseline Year: 2011]
College success is determined by the number of high school graduates who attend two- or four-year institutions of higher education (IHEs) and graduate. This indicator will eventually include enrollment and completion data for students who attend one-year post-secondary professional
certificate programs (e.g., LPN). The data reported by this indicator does not currently reflect all students starting and completing their postsecondary education “on time” for that reason, the postsecondary-success rate will be computed over a six-year period. The national standard for measuring college completion allows for 150% of the length of the program – six years for baccalaureate degrees, three years for two-year degrees. All Consortium states use data collected by the National Student Clearinghouse (NSC). The following formula is used for calculating postsecondary success in four-year programs (the same formula is modified for two-year programs):

\[
\frac{\text{(\# of Students Completing Postsecondary within 4 Years)}}{\text{(Freshman College Cohort)}}
\]

**College-Readiness Index (CRI) [Status: Pending] [Baseline Year: TBD]**
The Data Team recommended that the Consortium use multiple measures to create a “college-readiness index.” The Consortium’s college-readiness index is currently under development, and the Data Team is collaborating with the Annenberg Institute for School Reform at Brown University and the Center for Education Policy, Applied Research, and Evaluation at the University of Southern Maine. The college readiness index is waiting for targeted funding in order to proceed with further development. The following formula is a working definition of college readiness:

**Completion of 24 credit hours of college coursework and a GPA of 2.5 or enrollment in a third semester of college (two-year or four-year programs)**
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY


Key Findings

1. High School Graduation Rates
   - No state rate reached the long-term goal of 90 percent, but all states have made progress toward that goal. All member states demonstrated improvements in graduation rates since the baseline year (2009). The graduation rates of economically disadvantaged students, English-language learners, and students with disabilities lag behind all other student subgroups.

2. Dropout Rates
   - No state rate reached the long-term goal of less than 1 percent. All member states demonstrated improvements in reducing dropout rates since the baseline year (2009). The dropout rates of economically disadvantaged students, English-language learners, and students with disabilities are higher than all other student subgroups.

3. College-Enrollment Rates
   - No state rate reached the long-term goal of 80 percent. Most member states demonstrated relatively stable college-enrollment rates since the baseline year (2011). The college-enrollment rates of economically disadvantaged students, English-language learners, and students with disabilities lag behind all other student subgroups.

4. College-Persistence Rates
   - All state rates (except Connecticut) have demonstrated decreases in college persistence from the baseline year (2011). The 2013 New Hampshire persistence rate is significantly lower than the prior two years. The college-persistence rates of economically disadvantaged students, English-language learners, and students with disabilities lag behind all other student subgroups.
SECTION I
Graduation Rates

1.0 Graduation Rates: Cross-State Comparison

Guiding Question

How did the graduation rates in 2014 compare across the member states?

2014 Graduation Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Graduation Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>80.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESSC</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Findings

- The state rates had a range of approximately 8 percentage points.
- The Consortium rate was 87.0 percent and the highest reported rate was 88.7 percent (New Hampshire).
- No state rate reached the long-term goal of 90.0 percent.
- National graduation rates in 2011–2012 were 81 percent. (NOTE: The NCES method used to calculate this statistic is less precise than that used by the Consortium)

*NOTE: Throughout this report, the “NESSC” value represents the median rate among the five Consortium member states.
1.1 Graduation Rates: Six-Year Trend

Guiding Question

To what degree did graduation rates change over the past six years?

**Major Findings**

- All member states demonstrated graduation rate improvements since the baseline year (2009).
- The NESSC change rate was approximately 7 percentage points and the largest change rate was 7.7 percentage points (New Hampshire and Connecticut).
- Most states are on a trajectory to reach or exceed the 90 percent goal within the next five years.
- National trends in graduation have been trending upward since 2009.

*NOTE:* The 2009 New Hampshire data were estimated and the 2009 Connecticut data may not be comparable with previous years.
1.2 Graduation Rates: Economically Disadvantaged Students

Guiding Question

How did the 2014 graduation rates for economically disadvantaged (ED) students compare across the member states?

Major Findings

- The state rates had a range of approximately 6.7 percentage points.
- The NESSC rate was 77.6 percent and the highest reported rate was 77.8 percent (Maine).
- No state rate reached the long-term goal of 90 percent; however, all states had non-ED rates at or beyond the long-term goal of 90 percent.
- The performance gap for ED students was approximately 16.3 percentage points, with Rhode Island (21.7 percentage points) having the largest gap among member states.
1.3 **Graduation Rates: English-Language Learners**

**Guiding Question**

How did the 2014 graduation rates for English-language learners (ELLs) compare across the member states?

### 2014 Graduation Rates: English-Language Learners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>ELL</th>
<th>Non-ELL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
<td>86.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td>89.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
<td>88.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESSC</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Major Findings

- The state rates had a range of approximately 12.6 percentage points.
- The NESSC rate was 72.1 percent and the highest reported graduation rate for ELLs was 75.6 percent (New Hampshire).
- No state rate reached the long-term goal of 90 percent.
- The performance gap for ELLs is approximately 15.8 percentage points, with Connecticut (24.9 percentage points) having the largest gap among member states.
### 1.4 Graduation Rates: Students with Disabilities

**Guiding Question**

How did the 2014 graduation rates for students with disabilities (SWDs) compare across the member states?

#### Major Findings

- The state rates had a range of approximately 13.6 percentage points.
- The NESSC rate for SWDs was 70.3 percent and the highest reported rate was 73.6 percent (New Hampshire).
- No state rate reached the long-term goal of 90 percent; however, four states had non-SWD rates at or beyond the long-term goal of 90 percent.
- The performance gap for SWDs was approximately 20 percentage points, with Rhode Island (26.6 percentage points) having the largest gap among member states.

#### 2014 Graduation Rates: Students with Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>SWD</th>
<th>Non-SWD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>91.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td>91.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESSC</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Bar chart showing graduation rates for SWDs and Non-SWDs across different states.)
SECTION II
Dropout Rates

2.0 Dropout Rates: Cross-State Comparison

Guiding Question

How did the dropout rates in 2014 compare across the member states?

**Major Findings**

- The state rates had a range of approximately 4.4 percentage points.
- The NESSC rate was 7.3 percent and the lowest reported rate was 4.8 percent (New Hampshire).
- No state rate reached the long-term goal of a less than 1 percent dropout rate.
- Last year, the national dropout rate was 7 percent; however, the method used to produce the national statistic was slightly different than the method used by the NESSC states.
2.1 Dropout Rates: Six-Year Trend

Guiding Question

To what degree did dropout rates change over the past six years?

![Dropout Rates: Six-Year Trend](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESSC</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Findings**

- All member states have demonstrated decreased dropout rates since the baseline year (2009). This downward trend reflects those observed at the national level.
- The NESSC change rate was 4.3 percentage points and the largest change rate was 6.8 percentage points (New Hampshire).
- Most states will need more than five years to reach the long-term goal of less than 1 percent.

*NOTE: The 2009 New Hampshire data were estimated.*
2.2 Dropout Rates: Economically Disadvantaged Students

Guiding Question

How did the 2014 dropout rates for economically disadvantaged (ED) students compare across the member states?

Major Findings

- The state rates had a range of approximately 5.9 percentage points.
- The NESSC rate for ED students was 14.9 percent and the lowest reported rate was 9.9 percent (New Hampshire).
- No state rate reached the long-term goal of less than 1 percent.
- The performance gap for ED students was approximately 12.3 percentage points, with Vermont (13.2 percentage points) having the largest gap among member states.
2.3 Dropout Rates: English-Language Learners

Guiding Question

How did the 2014 dropout rates for English-language learners (ELLs) compare across the member states?

Major Findings

- The state rates had a range of approximately 17.7 percentage points.
- The NESSC dropout rate for ELLs was 14.3 percent and the lowest reported rate was 7.2 percent (New Hampshire).
- No state rate reached the long-term goal of less than 1 percent.
- The performance gap for ELLs was approximately 7.6 percentage points, with Connecticut (18.2 percentage points) having the largest gap among member states.
2.4 Dropout Rates: Students with Disabilities

Guiding Question

How did the 2014 dropout rates for students with disabilities (SWDs) compare across the member states?

Major Findings

- The state rates had a range of approximately 8.8 percentage points.
- The NESSC dropout rate for SWDs was 12.6 percent and the lowest rate was 8.6 percent (New Hampshire).
- No state rate reached the long-term goal of less than 1 percent.
- The performance gap for SWD was approximately 6 percentage points, with Maine (9.9 percentage points) having the largest gap among member states.
SECTION III
College-Enrollment Rates

3.0 College-Enrollment Rates: Cross-State Comparison

Guiding Question

How did college-enrollment rates in 2014 compare across the member states?

2014 College Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Enrollment Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESSC</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Findings

- The state rates had a range of approximately 12.9 percentage points.
- The NESSC college-enrollment rate was 58.9 percent and the highest reported rate was 65.2 percent (Connecticut).
- No state rate reached the long-term goal of 80.0 percent or the national rate of 66 percent (NCES 2015-144, The Condition of Education 2015, p. 184).
- The data suggests that more than 25 percent of all high school graduates do not immediately enroll in postsecondary education.

*NOTE: Only data from students who enroll in college immediately after graduating from high school are included in this section. All college-enrollment data come from the National Student Clearinghouse (StudentTracker for High Schools), which collects enrollment data from approximately 93 percent of the postsecondary institutions that participate in Title IV student loans. While this captures the majority of postsecondary enrollments in the United States, it may not include many trace, vocational, military, and international institutions or apprenticeship programs.

**NOTE: New Hampshire uses the National Student Clearinghouse (NSC) as a data source for college-enrollment and -persistence information. New Hampshire’s match percentage is approximately 47 percent of all student records submitted. The data reported to the NSC is directly submitted by both the public and private institutions in the State of New Hampshire.
3.1 College-Enrollment Rates: Four-Year Trend

Guiding Question

To what degree did college-enrollment rates change over the past four years?

![2014 College Enrollment: Four-Year Trend](chart.png)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESSC</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Findings

- College-enrollment rates among some states (exceptions being New Hampshire and Connecticut) have slowly increased since the baseline year (2011).
- The NESSC change in college enrollment was .3 percentage points and the largest change was a 2.2 percentage point decrease (New Hampshire).
- All states will need more than five years to reach the long-term goal of 80 percent.
- The enrollment data does not reflect an upward trend in the percent of students who enroll in postsecondary education immediately after graduation. By comparison, the national enrollment rates have decreased by 4 percentage points since 2009 (NCES 2015-144, *The Condition of Education 2015*, p. 184).
3.2 College-Enrollment Rates: Economically Disadvantaged Students

Guiding Question

How did the 2014 college-enrollment rates for economically disadvantaged (ED) students compare across member states?

2014 College Enrollment: Economically Disadvantaged Students

Major Findings

- The state rates had a range of approximately 12.2 percentage points.
- The NESSC rate for ED students was 44.6 percent and the highest reported rate was 47.8 percent (Maine); by national comparison, students from ED families had enrollment rates of 49 percent.
- No state economically disadvantaged rate reached the long-term goal of 80 percent.
- The performance gap for ED students was approximately 28 percentage points, slightly lower than the national trend of 31 percentage points (NCES 2015-144, The Condition of Education 2015, p. 186).
3.3 College-Enrollment Rates: English-Language Learners

Guiding Question

How did the 2014 college-enrollment rates for English-language learners (ELLs) compare across the member states?

Major Findings

- The state rates had a range of approximately 20.8 percentage points.
- The NESSC rate for ELLs was 42.2 percent and the highest reported rate was 59.5 percent (Maine).
- No state ELL rate reached the long-term goal of 80 percent.
- The performance gap for ELLs was approximately 19 percentage points; the largest performance gap was in Connecticut where ELLs underperformed their peers by 24.6 percentage points.
3.4 College-Enrollment Rates: Students with Disabilities

Guiding Question

How did the 2014 college-enrollment rates for students with disabilities (SWDs) compare across the member states?

Major Findings

- The state rates had a range of approximately 18.1 percentage points.
- The NESSC rate for SWDs was 31.7 percent and the highest reported rate was 35.6 percent (Rhode Island).
- No state SWD rate reached the long-term goal of 80 percent.
- The performance gap for SWDs was approximately 32.5 percentage points; the performance gap was largest in Vermont where SWD underperformed their peers by 38.3 percentage points.
SECTION IV
College-Persistence Rates

4.0 College-Persistence Rates: Cross-State Comparison

Guiding Question

How did the college-persistence rates in 2013 compare across the member states?

2013 College Persistence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Persistence Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESSC</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Findings

- State rates had a range of approximately 12 percentage points.
- The NESSC rate was 78.4 percent and the highest reported rate was 86.9 percent (Connecticut).
- Two states rates (Connecticut and New Hampshire) were above 80 percent.
- As a general reference nationally, four-year institutions had overall retention rates of 80 percent in 2013, while two-year institutions had retention rates of 60 percent (NCES 2015-144, The Condition of Education 2015, p. 234).

*NOTE: The data in this section are lagged to allow sufficient time for first-time freshman to attend college for three semesters. Further, this indicator combined information from two-year and four-year institutions.*
4.1 College-Persistence Rates: Three-Year Trend

Guiding Question

To what degree did college-persistence rates change over the past three years?

Major Findings

- All state rates (except Connecticut) have demonstrated decreases in college persistence from the baseline year (2011).
- The NESSC change in college persistence was approximately 6.2 percentage points and the largest change in college persistence was a 6.2 percentage point decrease (Vermont).
- All states will likely need additional time to reach 90 percent.
4.2 College-Persistence Rates: Economically Disadvantaged Students

Guiding Question

How did the 2013 college-persistence rates for economically disadvantaged (ED) students compare across member states?

Major Findings

- The state rates had a range of approximately 11.6 percentage points.
- The NESSC rate for ED students was 67 percent and the highest reported rate was 75 percent (Connecticut).
- No state’s ED rate has reached 80 percent; however, the non-ED rates in five states reached or exceeded the goal.
- The performance gap between ED students is approximately 15 percentage points, with Rhode Island (18.7 percentage points) having the largest gap among member states.
4.3 College-Persistence Rates: English-Language Learners

Guiding Question

How did the 2013 college-persistence rates for English-language learners (ELLs) compare across the member states?

Major Findings

- The state rates had a range of approximately 25.1 percentage points.
- The NESSC rate for ELLs was 68.6 percent and the highest reported rate was 75.5 percent (New Hampshire).
- No state’s ELL rate reached 80 percent; however, the non-ELL rate in two states (Connecticut and New Hampshire) exceeded the goal of 80 percent.
- The performance gap between ELLs is approximately 10.7 percentage points, with Vermont (28.9 percentage points) having the largest gap among member states.
### 4.4 College-Persistence Rates: Students with Disabilities

#### Guiding Question

How did the 2013 college-persistence rates for students with disabilities (SWDs) compare across the member states?

#### Major Findings

- The state rates had a range of approximately 16.7 percentage points.
- The NESSC rate was 61.5 percent and the highest reported rate was 69.6 percent (Connecticut).
- No state’s SWD rate reached 80 percent; however, the non-SWD rate in two states (Connecticut and New Hampshire) exceeded the goal of 80 percent.
- The performance gap between SWDs is 17.8 percentage points, with Maine (24 percentage points) having the largest gap among members.
SECTION V
College-Completion Rates

This section will be completed next year (2016) when the four-year completion rate is finalized.

*Note: According to National Center for Education Statistics data (NCES 2015-144, The Condition of Education 2015), four-year institutions had a graduation rate (within six years of starting program) of 59.4 percent, which was 0.2 percentage points higher than prior year (2012). For two-year institutions, the graduation rate (within three years of starting program) was 29 percent, which was 2 percentage points lower than the prior year.
About the Common Data Project

Recognizing the critical importance of high-quality data to effective school improvement, the five state education agencies from Connecticut, Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont have been collecting, calculating, and reporting graduation rates, dropout rates, and postsecondary enrollment, persistence, and success rates using consistent procedures and methodologies developed by a regional team of data specialists from the five departments of education. To our knowledge, the New England Secondary School Consortium’s Data Project is the first initiative of its kind in the United States.

To promote more accurate and reliable data comparability across the member states, the Data Project develops and implements standardized procedures designed to eliminate unwanted variance that may result from divergent data systems, the misinterpretation of agreed-upon rules, or computational errors. The Data Project has also created a series of quality-control mechanisms that further improve the reliability and comparability of state-reported data.

FMI: newenglandssc.org/resources/common-data-project