New England Secondary Schools Consortium

Technical Report with Baseline Data

April 27, 2010

New England Secondary Schools Consortium

Technical Report with Baseline Data

April 2010

Project Staff

Lonnie Kaufman, *Project Manager*
John Tapper*, Research Manager*

Report Information

This report is conducted under contract with the Nellie Mae Education Foundation (NMEF) in Quincy, Massachusetts. This work would not be possible without considerable cooperation and assistance from the data coordinators and their staffs in the five participating states comprising the New England Secondary School Consortium.

The University of Massachusetts Donahue Institute is the public service, outreach, and economic development unit of the University of Massachusetts President's Office. Established in 1971, UMDI strives to connect the Commonwealth with the resources of the University through services that combine theory and innovation with public and private sector applications.

UMDI's Research and Evaluation group specializes in applied social science research, including program evaluation, survey research, policy research, and needs assessment. The Research and Evaluation group has designed and implemented numerous innovative research and evaluation projects for a variety of programs and clients in the areas of education, human services, economic development, and organizational development.

University of Massachusetts Donahue Institute
Research and Evaluation Group
100 Venture Way, Suite 5
Hadley, MA 01035-9462
(413) 587-2400
(413) 587-2410 to send a fax
www.donahue.umassp.edu

Contents

Executive Summary

Encompassing Connecticut, Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont, the New England Secondary School Consortium (NESSC, or the Consortium) is a pioneering educational partnership committed to fostering forward-thinking innovations in the design and delivery of secondary education across the New England region. The Consortium's bold goal is to ensure that by 2016 every public high school student in the five partner states will receive an education that will prepare them for college, career, and civic responsibility in the interconnected global community of the 21st century.

The NESSC grant identifies five long-term measures of success:

1. Increase graduation rates across the five states to 90 percent.
2. Decrease annual dropout rates to less than 1 percent.
3. Increase the percentage of students enrolling in two- or four-year college degree programs to 80 percent.
4. Reduce the number of students required to take remedial courses during their first year of college to 5 percent or less.
5. Engage post-secondary institutions, organizations, and colleagues in a collaborative effort to ensure that more students earn a college degree.

As part of their contract to serve as evaluators of NESSC, the UMass Donahue Institute (UMDI) has actively participated in a collaborative process of identifying common indicators and documenting cross-state agreements related to these data. The role of UMDI has been to document, organize, help to clarify, and to report on both the common and dissimilar data sources and methodologies utilized by each state.

The process for establishing baseline data engaged data representatives from the NESSC states (Data Group) in five day-long meetings that took place over nine months beginning in June 2009 (Connecticut participated in the January and March 2010 meetings). The Data Group made recommendations to UMDI and the Consortium on data reporting and availability. The measures to be reported include:

- Graduation Rates
- Dropout Rates
- Post-Secondary Matriculation
- College Readiness
- Post-Secondary Success

Graduation Rate

Graduation rates have been computed using the formula recommended by the National Governors Association (NGA). This is a rate that relies on the identification and tracking of a four-year graduation cohort. All states in the Consortium currently report graduation rates based on this recommendation. The Data Group recommendations provide greater uniformity in calculation of this measure by, for example, developing a common approach for students on Individual Education Plans (IEPs) and for students with limited English proficiency (LEP).

Dropout Rate

The Consortium dropout rate is closely linked to the graduation rate. Data Group members recognized the confusion that sometimes results when the graduation rate and dropout rate are reported using different methods. The group felt that a clear relationship between these measures would be helpful. The NGA has offered guidance

on dropout rates and recommend that dropouts be counted as those students who have not completed high school and are no longer enrolled. This rate is calculated as a cohort rate, using the same freshman cohort as was used for the graduation rate. Using this approach will be helpful, since as the graduation rate increases the dropout rate should decrease.

Post-Secondary Matriculation

Getting accurate data on post-secondary matriculation requires states to become members of the National Student Clearinghouse (NSC). At this time, NSC is the only agency that provides detailed information on post-secondary attendance and completion. All of the Consortium states are members or in the process of joining NSC.

Consortium Council members expressed their desire for post-secondary matriculation data to capture student attendance at one-year certificate programs that may not be part of matriculation for a college degree. These data are not currently available but will be added to the technical report tables as they become available in the future.

College Readiness

The original measure of college readiness in the NESSC grant relied on the number of students participating in remedial classes in their first year of college. In the opinion of the Data Group, inconsistencies in the definition of remedial classes across states, and between colleges within states, made participation in remedial education an impractical and unreliable measure of college readiness.

To allow for better reporting of "college readiness," future data will make use of multiple measures, including:

- Remedial class participation rates
- Placement tests (Accuplacer or other)
- SAT scores
- Advanced Placement course participation and scores
- Participation in the State Scholar program
- Early enrollment in college

Except for Connecticut, data on these measures was not made available by NESSC states during this baseline year.

Post-Secondary Success

In the original NESSC grant, post-secondary success was referred to as "college success" and identified high school graduates who attended two- or four-year higher education institutions. At the request of the Consortium Council, this measure was renamed "post-secondary success." This measure will eventually include matriculation and completion data for students who attend one-year post-secondary professional certificate programs (like LPN or HVAC programs).

The measures reported here also acknowledge that not all students start and/or finish their post-secondary education "on time." For that reason, the post-secondary success rate will be computed over a six-year period.

At this time, only New Hampshire has provided post-secondary matriculation data on their high school graduates. Other Consortium states report they are working on acquiring these data in the future.

NESSC Key Indicators Data Table			
Goal to be Reported	**Key Decision Points**	**Method for Reporting**	**Comments**
High School Graduation Rate	The calculation is done with a variation on the National Governors Association (NGA) formula. States will report four-, five-, and six-year rates, freezing the adjusted cohort in Year 4. No exemptions will be included for SpEd or LEP.	(# of graduating seniors) ÷ (# of first-time freshman ± transfers in or out)	▪ Data is disaggregated by NCLB categories, including a category for "multi-racial." Students are referenced in the IEP or LEP statistics if they have been in these groups at any point in their high school career.
High School Dropout Rate	The rate recommended by the Data Group is conceptually similar to the Graduation Rate (see above) supported by the NGA. The rate reflects a count of students who have not graduated from a program aligned with state standards, or are not enrolled.	(# of students in adjusted freshman cohort) – (Graduates + students still enrolled + other completers of standards-aligned programs) = Dropouts Dropout rate = dropouts ÷ adjusted freshman cohort	▪ In this formula GED completers are listed as dropouts. Dropout rates will be computed and reported with and without including GED completers. ▪ GED completers and those students who enroll in college without finishing high school will be reported in this section with a separate table.
Post-Secondary Matriculation Rate	This will include matriculation rates at two- and four-year colleges and one-year certificate programs.[1] The rates will be calculated for the first two years after high school completion.	(# of students matriculating) ÷ (# of high school graduates)	▪ Data is disaggregated by matriculation in college or certificate program[1], and by background as a high school graduate, GED completer, or early enrollment student. ▪ The National Student Clearinghouse (NSC) will provide data to the Consortium on post-secondary matriculation and completion.
College Readiness	The Data Group recommended using a variety of measures to provide a composite representation of college readiness.	Composite Measures on College Readiness: 1. Attendance in remedial classes during the freshman year 2. Scores on placement tests (Accuplacer) 3. SAT scores in high school 4. AP course participation and scores 5. Participation in State Scholars program 6. Early enrollment in college	▪ This is a difficult construct to capture as no one measure is consistent across the Consortium. ▪ All the measures listed have some bias and must be interpreted as a group. ▪ The measure is an adaptation of the original grant measure that called for reporting only attendance in remedial classes.
Post-Secondary Success	Students are counted as beginning college when they first matriculate. They have six years in which to be counted as completers.	(# of students completing their program within six years) ÷ (# of students beginning post-secondary education in target year)	▪ Completion is disaggregated by college degree and certificate programs. ▪ No data source for one-year programs exists at present.

[1] These data are not currently available. The National Student Clearinghouse is engaged in efforts to capture these data and make them available in the future.

NESSC Context

Encompassing Connecticut, Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont, the New England Secondary School Consortium (the Consortium) is a pioneering educational partnership committed to fostering forward-thinking innovations in the design and delivery of secondary education across the New England region. The Consortium's bold goal is to ensure that by 2016 every public high school student in the five partner states will receive an education that will prepare them for college, career, and civic responsibility in the interconnected global community of the 21st century. To achieve this outcome, the Consortium will:

1. Increase graduation rates across the four states to 90 percent.
2. Decrease annual dropout rates to less than 1 percent.
3. Increase the percentage of students enrolling in two- or four-year college degree programs to 80 percent.
4. Reduce the number of students required to take remedial courses during their first year of college to 5 percent or less.
5. Engage post-secondary institutions, organizations, and colleagues in a collaborative effort to ensure that more students earn a college degree.

In addition to the goals above, the NESSC grant proposal specified that states would come to agreement on common methods for measuring stated goals. The NESSC suggested that success in Phase I could be recognized by the Consortium's progress toward:

- Implementing a cross-state agreement on methods to measure a four-year cohort graduation rate.
- Developing a process to measure student enrollment in two- and four-year college degree programs.
- Establishing common criteria to determine how students will be identified as dropouts.
- Establishing a process to measure and gather data on enrollment in college developmental/remedial courses.

Decisions related to the goals above apply strictly to measuring progress for grant purposes, not for state policy.

Work of NESSC Data Group

Members of the NESSC grant's facilitator, the Great School Partnership (GSP), convened a series of meetings to accomplish the tasks listed above. This work – involving data analysts from the NESSC states (the "Data Group"), the GSP, and others as appropriate – commenced in June 2009. The Data Group shared the ways their states currently report data and discussed potential approaches to reporting these data for grant-related purposes. However, meeting discussions became richer, and potentially more helpful to the Consortium mission, than simply providing data for a technical report. Data Group members deliberated on the quality and intent of proposed metrics and made recommendations that have the potential to inform cross-state agreements on common data collection and reporting methods. These agreements await action by authorizing bodies from Consortium states.

Role of UMDI

As part of their contract to serve as evaluators of NESSC, UMDI has actively participated in a collaborative process of identifying common indicators and documenting cross-state agreements related to these data. The role of UMDI has been to document, organize, help to clarify, and to report on both the common and dissimilar data sources and methodologies utilized by each state.

In addition, UMDI was charged with producing this baseline data technical report. The report summarizes the work of the Data Group: key decisions reached, the formulas that have been utilized to report on measures related to progress on grant goals, and a proposed timeline and procedure for future data gathering and analysis.

Timing and Completeness of Data Collection and Reporting

Data Group members indicated that they would provide data for this report before March 1, 2010. Due to a variety of constraints faced by Data Group members, the deadline for data collection was moved to April 7, 2010. While much of the data was provided to UMDI, some is still missing. Four states provided complete, or nearly complete, data on graduation and dropout rates; Maine provided only partial data. Just one state (New Hampshire) provided data on post-secondary matriculation. Data Group members reported difficulties in gathering NSC data in a timely manner. In addition, Connecticut only recently finalized their data agreement with NSC. Only one state (Connecticut) provided data on college readiness.

The data that were gathered has been made available in this report. In order to adequately evaluate Consortium progress on key goals, more complete data will be needed in the future.

Process for Determining Baseline Data Measures

Establishing methods for reporting the baseline data in this report engaged data representatives from each Consortium state for nine months. Data analysts (the Data Group) were involved in several meetings whose objective was to advise UMDI on how to report data for the NESSC grant. The meetings were facilitated by GSP with technical assistance from UMDI. Meetings were held in Concord, New Hampshire and took place in June, July, and October 2009, and January 2010.

June 10th Meeting

The first meeting of the Data Group occurred on June 10. The purpose of this meeting was to introduce Data Group members to the Consortium and to begin the process of providing information and advice to UMDI on how to report common measures on target data. In addition to sharing information on state data, representatives also engaged in a rich discussion about how to accurately capture the measures represented in the Consortium goals. These included:

- Graduation Rates
- Dropout Rates
- College Enrollment
- College Preparation
- College Success

Following the June meeting, UMDI created an online survey as a tool for states to share current practices for reporting baseline data required in the NESSC grant. These data were collected, summarized, and used to inform the next meeting of the Data Group about differences and similarities between states in reporting key grant measures.

July 11th Meeting

The second meeting of the Data Group occurred on July 11 and focused on how states might come together for reporting baseline data. A variety of data-gathering strategies were explored, including the use of the National Student Clearinghouse (NSC), state databases, and U.S. census data. The result of this meeting was tentative recommendations on baseline data that were sent to Working Group members in August. Representatives to the Data Group were asked to share these recommendations with their commissioners.

A presentation on the process used by the Data Group to create reporting recommendations was made at the October 16th Consortium Council meeting. At that meeting, the facilitator from GSP was directed to include information on one-year post-secondary program matriculation in order to capture post-secondary education data for programs that resulted in certifications but not necessarily in college degrees.

October 28th Meeting

The Data Group met a third time on October 28. At this meeting, members recommended changes in the names and descriptions of some of the measures in the technical report. In doing this, the Data Group attempted to more accurately represent the Council's direction to include one-year certificate programs in the post-secondary measures. The new measures included:

- Graduation Rates
- Dropout Rates

- Post-Secondary Matriculation
- College Readiness
- Post-Secondary Success

Discussions continued to focus on ensuring that the technical report captured Consortium measures accurately. Representatives made recommendations regarding GED completers, students who attend college early, and college readiness.

Data representatives expressed a desire to use measures for Consortium reporting that were identical to those used for federal reporting. Following the October meeting, contact with a federal data consultant was made to follow up on potential discrepancies between measures reported for Consortium progress and those necessary for federal reporting. The discussion on aligning federal and Consortium reporting is ongoing within the Data Group and with Working Group members.

A concern was expressed that information about the Data Group's work had not been fully communicated to commissioners and other key members of the participating states' departments of education. The Data Group considered the communication of recommendations regarding baseline data for the NESSC grant to be a priority. The GSP facilitator, Duke Albanese, assisted the effort to communicate recommendations by helping to set up meetings between state leads and commissioners and Data Group members.

January 27th Meeting

At the January meeting, representatives reviewed the draft technical report from UMDI. Edits and revisions were suggested, including the desire from some commissioners to report dropout rates that did not count GED students as dropouts (they receive this designation because they do not complete a program aligned with state standards). Doing so could make the dropout rate lower. The group decided to report the dropout rate both as originally suggested and including GED completers. Maine does not currently have the data to report both rates so they will only report using the agreed-upon method that counts GED completers as dropouts.

The group also received guidance on the practice of freezing the four-year cohort in order to report five- and six-year graduation rates. A consultant for the Maine DOE, who also sits on the federal peer review panel that approves state reporting plans, suggested that future reports of the five- and six-year rates may need to account for transfers in the fifth and sixth years. The group agreed to revisit the five- and six-year graduation rate method next year when federal guidance is clearer.

Representatives from NSC also attended the January meeting. They brought information for the Data Group on how to increase matches between state data and NSC data. They also provided information on ongoing efforts to capture and report non-degree data from professional certificate programs. Some of these data are currently being gathered, and NSC reported they are in the process of categorizing and organizing it. The expectation is that data on these types of educational programs will be available in the next year or two.

Baseline Measures

The following sections provide a review of progress and a description of decisions reached based on recommendations from the Data Group for each of the five long-terms measures of the Consortium. This work represents the best thinking of Data Group members *at this time*. In future years, as more data become available and/or reporting requirements change, the measures and contexts in this report may be adjusted accordingly.

The Data Group concluded that data from 2008–09 offered the best baseline from which to report progress because 2008–09 represents the beginning of the Consortium; that is, the class of 2009 is the first class to graduate since the beginning of the grant.

Graduation Rate

Formula

<div align="center">

(# of graduating seniors) ÷ (# of first-time freshman +/- transfers in or out)

</div>

Background

The graduation rate is, arguably, the most important metric for measuring Consortium progress. Over the years, various graduation rates have been used in different states, and by the federal government, with little consensus. As a consequence, comparing graduation rates between states has been difficult or impossible.

Most states now use a form of the National Governors Association (NGA) recommendation for reporting the graduation rate. This is a rate that relies on the identification and tracking of a four-year graduation cohort. When data representatives gathered in July, three of four states reported that they use a version of this rate.

Key Decisions

The group felt that in addition to the common four-year rate, the Consortium should report five- and six-year graduation rates. Analysts felt that reporting the extended rate gave the best representation of high school completion. The Data Group decided to "freeze" the number of students in a graduating cohort (the denominator in the equation). This means that as graduates are added in the fifth and sixth years of the cohort, graduation rates will rise. At this time, federal guidance on reporting extended graduation rates with a "frozen" freshman cohort value is unclear. **For the purpose of baseline data, this distinction between "frozen" and adjusted cohorts in the fifth and sixth years is unimportant as there is only one freshman cohort for the first year of data. This is an issue that may need to be revisited once federal reporting guidelines have been clarified and state practices adopted**.

Considerations

New Hampshire (NH) does not have sufficient data at present to calculate a freshman cohort for the graduating class of 2009, the baseline year. The NH data collected to inform the cohort graduation rate only goes back to the class that began high school in 2006. In 2006–07 the graduating class of 2009 was in their sophomore year. To compensate for this missing freshman count the decision was made to model the data to get the closest possible estimate for the NH first-time-freshman cohort.

In order to accomplish this, NH data representatives averaged transfers in and out at the school level for the last three years. These are adjustments made to the cohort count on an annual basis. The freshman cohort count for NH was the count from the sophomore year, adjusted with an average for transfers in or out. If the average over

three years was positive, the sophomore cohort has been adjusted up by that amount. Negative averages adjust the cohort down. Since the graduation rate for NH has been modeled this way, NH baseline data was entered with an asterisk to indicate that the data are based on projections rather than on actual counts.

There was significant discussion within the Data Group about distinctions between high school graduates, GED completers, and alternative-program completers. Based on current practices in several Consortium states, the committee decided that it was important to recognize students who completed a program *that met state standards* outside the traditional high school setting. If the program students finished was aligned with state standards, the students were counted as graduates. This excluded most GED completers.

While GED programs generally do not meet state standards, the committee felt that their numbers should be reported to get a more detailed picture of high school completion. Though GED students might not meet state standards for graduation, it seemed inaccurate to classify them as non-completers. As a result, these students are not counted as graduates (they haven't met state standards), but they are reported in a separate table within the dropout data.

Data on graduation rates (and other NESSC measures) have been reported using the most recent disaggregations from federal reporting requirements. These groupings are disaggregated by ethnic group (e.g., Hispanic/non-Hispanic) and by gender, race, socioeconomic status, English proficiency status, and disability status. In recognition of future federal reporting requirements, a "multi-racial" category has been added. No states currently report multi-racial data, but, as this will be a federal requirement for 2011, the category has been added to accommodate future data gathering. To qualify for inclusion under the categories on socioeconomic status, English proficiency status, or disability status, a student must have qualified for one of these designations for at least one year in high school.

Dropout Rate

Formula

> **(# in adjusted freshman cohort) - (graduates + students still enrolled + other completers) = Dropouts**
>
> **Dropout rate = Dropouts ÷ adjusted freshman cohort**

Background

Calculating a common dropout rate presented the Data Group with significantly greater challenge than the graduation rate. Dropout rates were calculated differently in five of the Consortium states. The issue of conceptual misunderstandings of the relationship between the graduation rate and dropout rate was also a consideration.

Key Decisions

The Consortium dropout rate will be closely linked to the graduation rate. Data Group 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 data director for NGA has offered guidance on the dropout rate. She recommends that dropouts be counted as those students who have not completed high school and are not still in high school. This rate is calculated as a cohort rate, using the same adjusted freshman cohort as was used for the graduation rate. This is conceptually helpful because as the graduation rate increases the dropout rate should decrease.

A clear distinction was made between students who complete a high school program that requires students to meet state standards and those who receive a GED. Since a variety of alternative high school options exist in the region, the Data Group decided that only programs that required students to meet standards would be allowed to count for the graduation and dropout rates (See Graduation Rate, above). **GED completers are counted as dropouts, since**

they do not complete a program that requires students to meet state standards. However, representatives reported that commissioners would like the dropout rate to be calculated with and without GED completers. This is not possible in every state, but dropout rates with and without GED completers will be computed wherever possible.

The Data Group grappled with identifying GED completers as "dropouts." The intention of GED students to complete their education is arguably greater than those students who simply leave school. The Data Group decided to add a table (Table 2c) for GED students and for those who enrolled in college without graduating high school – another group that will be represented as "dropouts" using the dropout formula. The number of students in each of these categories, as well as the percentage of dropouts they represent, have been reported.

Considerations

As with the graduation rate, the Consortium will report both five- and six-year rates using a "frozen" freshman cohort. **Future federal guidance may require re-examining whether to adjust five- and six-year rates for transfers. For this baseline year there is no difference between methods**.

The modeled freshman cohort will be used for baseline dropout data with New Hampshire. These data will be identified with an asterisk to alert readers that the rate is modeled and not based on an actual count of freshman.

Post-Secondary Matriculation

Formula

<div align="center">

(# of students matriculating) ÷ (# of high school graduates)

</div>

Background

The intention in capturing post-secondary matriculation is to determine the percentage of students who go on to further education after high school. In some states this rate was previously captured using surveys given to high school seniors. Members of the Data Group reported that survey results were not always indicative of students' actions. Some local research suggested that there was a discrepancy between the numbers of students who were reported as accepted to college and those who actually attended. For this reason, the committee chose to base the post-secondary rate on students who were matriculated, that is, who registered for classes in a degree-granting program.

Getting accurate data on post-secondary matriculation required states to become members of the NSC. At this time, NSC is the only agency that provides detailed information on post-secondary attendance and completion. All of the Consortium states have data agreements with NSC.

Key Decisions

The Data Group considered whether the denominator for the matriculation rate should be the number of high school graduates or the number in the freshman (high school) cohort, since the measure seeks to report the effect of high school transformation over the course of a student's high school career. However, the group felt that using the freshman cohort would be confusing to the general public and so opted for the more familiar measure.

At a fall Council meeting, the desire was expressed that baseline data on post-secondary matriculation capture students who attend one-year certificate programs that may not be part of matriculation for a college degree. As these data are not currently available they are not yet included in the data tables. Negotiations with the NSC to address this particular concern are ongoing.

To capture attendance by GED students and by students who attend college without finishing high school, the

committee decided to disaggregate matriculation data by graduates/non-graduates. Data will also be compiled on non-graduates (as available) for attendance in one-year certificate programs as well as two- or four-year colleges when those data become available.

Considerations

Data on matriculation could be gathered by states through a common query to the NSC. State matriculation rates should be disaggregated using the same format as that used for graduation rates.

NSC representatives educated the Data Group on ways to improve matches with their college matriculation data when their states make data requests. These include the addition of high school codes to student data or the use of social security numbers (as is done in Maine). Concern was raised about state differences in match rates between state records of high school graduates and NSC records of college matriculation. Since some states are likely to have higher match rates, the group decided that the match rate should be considered when reporting matriculation data. A concern was raised about the potential for unmatched students to be unrepresentative of the general population. This is an issue of bias that the group will explore in the future.

College Readiness

Formula

The Data Group recommended that, since college readiness was such a difficult and important measurement to capture, the Consortium used multiple measures to create a report on college readiness. This report would include descriptive data on:

- Remedial class participation rates
- Accuplacer (or other) test
- SAT scores
- Advanced Placement course participation and scores
- Participation in the State Scholar program
- Early enrollment in college

Future analysis of these data (for 2009–10) will follow two steps:

1. These data will be reported descriptively.
2. The Data Group will meet to discuss trends in the data and to offer analysis.

Background

The goal in the NESSC grant originally addressed the issue of college readiness by reporting numbers of students in remedial classes. The reasoning was that, if students were properly prepared in high school, the number of students in remedial (or developmental) classes in college should decrease. The difficulty with this seemingly straightforward measure was the variety of requirements for placement in remedial classes and/or the availability of these classes. Colleges differ, for example, between and within states on the standard for remediation in writing, mathematics, and reading. In addition, many private colleges and universities (and several state universities) do not offer remedial classes. These conditions make the reporting of remedial course attendance rates difficult to interpret.

Key Decisions

Some of the college readiness measures will be assessed during students' first year in college. Placement tests, remedial class rates, and early enrollment are examples of these. Others, however, assess college readiness while

students are still in high school. The SAT is an example of this type of measure. Other education organizations have tackled metrics for identifying college readiness, most notably the American College Testing program (ACT). ACT has published College Readiness Benchmarks that provide predictive success measures based on scores on the ACT exam. By predictive, ACT means,

> *"Students who meet a Benchmark on the ACT … have approximately a 50 percent chance of earning a B or better and approximately a 75 percent chance or better of earning a C or better in the corresponding college course or courses."*

Several researchers have tested the reliability of ACT scores for predicting college readiness[1]. While Consortium states do not report high levels of ACT participation, all Consortium states report high levels of SAT use. Using ACT-comparable SAT scores offers the Consortium an opportunity to assess college readiness with less-biased data and a high level of validity and reliability.

The College Board, creator of the SAT, has worked with ACT to create concordance tables for establishing comparable scores between the two tests. These comparisons have been tested by both organizations to ensure reliability. The table below shows comparable scores between tests.

Content Area	ACT Readiness Benchmark	SAT Equivalent Score
Writing	18	430
Reading	21	500
Mathematics	22	520

An SAT writing score below 430, for example, predicts that a student is unlikely to be successful in a college writing course.

The SAT does not definitively answer the question, "How many of our high school graduates are college ready?" It does, however, add a reasonable measure of college readiness in Consortium states. Widespread use of the SAT and the availability of college readiness benchmarks translated from the ACT offer the Consortium an additional reliable metric for assessing levels of college readiness in each state. The SAT is the only measure that is used in all Consortium states.

Considerations

While using SAT scores as a measure of college readiness is helpful, it still presents difficulties. Research on SATs in Vermont showed that there is significant bias in who takes the test. The schools with higher percentages taking the test tended to have higher scores. There was also a significant gap in test taking between students identified as having low socioeconomic status (SES) and other students. The result is that an SAT measure is unlikely to reflect a true measure of college readiness, since low SES students (who may be college ready) are unlikely to take it.

The exception to this situation is Maine, where all students must take the SAT. If all Consortium states had such a policy, the SAT might be a strong measure of college readiness. In the absence of this policy, the New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP) might function as a predictor of college success. This would require a study of test results and college matriculation to establish scores associated with probable college success.

---

[1] Allen, J., & Sconing, J. (2005). *Using ACT Assessment scores to set benchmarks for college readiness*. ACT research report series, 2005-3. Iowa City, Iowa: ACT.

Barton, P. E. (2006). *Reading between the lines: What the ACT reveals about college readiness in reading*. Iowa City, Iowa: ACT.

Greene, J. P., & Forster, G. (2003). *Public high school graduation and college readiness rates in the United States*. [New York]: CCI Center for Civic Innovation at the Manhattan Institute. http://www.manhattan-institute.org/ewp03.pdf.

Connecticut has already completed such a study of their CMT/CAPT tests. With funding, perhaps such a study of NECAP could create an unbiased college readiness measure for New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont, such as that available to Maine and Connecticut.

As there is no region-wide, reliable measure of college readiness, the Consortium will have to use the proposed suite of measures to create yearly interpretations of progress on college readiness. As policies and practices related to college readiness become more common across the region, it may be more easily and equitably measured.

During this baseline year only Connecticut has provided college readiness data to UMDI. Baseline data on the suite of proposed measures can begin in future years as these data become available from other Consortium states.

Post-Secondary Success

Formula

(# of students completing post-secondary programs within six years) ÷ (freshman college cohort)

Note: Post-secondary success for students who enroll in one-year programs will be calculated similarly when data becomes available.

Background

In the original NESSC grant, success after high school was referred to as "college success." After the October 16th Council meeting the Data Group reconsidered this term and chose to rename the measure, "post-secondary success" to capture matriculation and completion of one-year professional certificate programs (like RN or HVAC programs).

Key Decisions

The Data Group was concerned about accurately representing two groups in the post-secondary success rate. One was the group of students who delayed (or deferred) entering college. If the calculation for post-secondary success was predicated on students going directly from high school to college, this population would be misrepresented as "unmatriculated" rather than simply starting school later. For this reason the decision was made to create a new freshman (college) cohort each fall. Students would belong in the cohort in which they started their post-secondary education. A student who graduated in 2009, for example, but didn't start college until fall of 2011, would belong to the 2011 college cohort.

The Data Group also acknowledged that not all students finish their post-secondary education "on time." For that reason they recommended that the post-secondary success rate be computed over a six-year period.

Considerations

The six-year period for reporting post-secondary completion is appropriate for four-year college programs. However, one-year certificate programs, two-year associate degrees, and other non-baccalaureate programs may be misrepresented by such a long period for completion. The Data Group will work with the NSC to explore national benchmarks for program completion and the potential availability of data on non-baccalaureate programs.

Recommended Timelines and Procedures for Data Collection

The purpose of this section is to suggest a protocol for consistent gathering and reporting of NESSC data. As the Consortium has not agreed to particular practices regarding data collection and reporting, the procedures below should be considered as suggestions for the future. At future meetings, the Data Group may wish to consider formally adopting procedures for data gathering that will ensure the consistency and integrity of data over time.

The Data Group might also wish to revisit the timeline for submission of data. The conditions that necessitated current deadlines might be different in the future. The Working Group has indicated that they could make use of data on key measures as soon as it is available.

The gathering and reporting of data require an organization to take responsibility for the task. In this first (baseline) year, UMDI had this responsibility. To ensure continuity and consistency in upcoming years, the Consortium may wish to designate a specific organization to gather and report data. For the purpose of suggesting a protocol for the future, the organization in the timeline below will be referred to as the "Evaluator."

November/December of the reporting year

Consortium facilitators convene a meeting of data representatives.
In the current process, the Data Group found discussions on specific details of data gathering and reporting to be fruitful. Prior to gathering and reporting data, future reports might also benefit from such meetings. Data meetings could be organized to review data guidelines and procedures. Changes in measures or procedures might be necessary due to changes in federal guidance, Consortium focus, or data availability. Decisions made at this meeting should probably be submitted for approval to authorizing bodies.

February 1 of the reporting year

Data representatives make a request for post-secondary data to the National Student Clearinghouse.
Future reporting will require requests for post-secondary matriculation data on the previous year's graduates. These requests will be sent by each state to NSC. Received data would need to be converted to the reported post-secondary matriculation rates by data representatives at state departments of education.

Requests will also need to be made to NSC for post-secondary completion data, including:

- Semester of matriculation
- Date of graduation
- Degree or certificate obtained

February 15 of the reporting year

Evaluators send unpopulated data tables to state data representatives.
Unpopulated data tables (in Microsoft Excel) for all Consortium measures should be sent to Data Group members in early February. Any revisions made during the December meeting of the data representatives should be approved by the Consortium before changes are made to the data tables. In the future – consistent with current practices – the Evaluators should make sure that agreements reached on revisions are reflected in the tables *before* they go to departments of education for population.

March 1 of the reporting year

All populated data tables are returned to the Evaluators.
Data representatives should return populated data tables to the Evaluators by March 1.

March/April of the reporting year

Consortium facilitators convene a meeting of the data representatives to analyze college readiness data.
The college readiness metric uses multiple measures. Since there are currently no specified analyses with which to model these data, an ad hoc approach will be used. Data representatives may wish to simply report descriptive statistics on the data or, with the guidance of the Evaluator, they may wish to identify trends or patterns in the data of interest to Consortium members.

May 1 of the reporting year

A final report on yearly data is submitted to state departments of education and to Consortium facilitators.
Data tables are updated annually using the baseline data template included in this report. Evaluators are one option for being responsible to organize, analyze, and summarize findings for such a report.

Proposed Procedures and Timeline

Task	Group Responsible	Completion Date	Notes
Convene Data Group	Consortium Facilitators	November/December	Consortium facilitators convene a meeting of data representatives.
Request for Post-secondary Data	State DOE data representatives	February 1	Data representatives make a request for post-secondary data to NSC.
Data Tables sent to DOEs	Evaluators	February 15	Evaluators send unpopulated data tables to state data representatives.
Data Tables Completed and Returned	State DOE representatives	March 1	All populated data tables are returned to the Evaluators.
Convene Data Group	Consortium Facilitators	March/April	Consortium facilitators convene a meeting of the data representatives to analyze college readiness data.
Data Report is Completed	Evaluators	May 1	The final report on NESSC progress is completed.

Data Group Members

Connecticut	
Sarah Ellsworth, Bureau Chief for Data Collection, Research and Evaluation 860-713-6888 – sarah.ellsworth@ct.gov	Barbara Beaudin, Associate Commissioner for Assessment, Research, and Technology 860-713-6897 – Barbara.beaudin@po.state.ct.us
Maine	
Bill Hurwitch, MEDMS Project Director 207-624-6816 – bill.hurwitch@maine.gov	Brian Snow, Data Manager 207-624-6840 – brian.snow@maine.gov
New Hampshire	
Sallie Fellows, Systems Development Specialist VI in Bureau of Information Services 603-271-0073 – sfellows@ed.state.nh.us	Irene Koffink, Administrator in Bureau of Data Management 603-271-3865 – Irene.koffink@ed.state.nh.us
Michael Schwartz, Education Consultant 603-271-7455 – mschwartz@ed.state.nh.us	
Rhode Island	
Elliot Krieger, Executive Assistant for Communications 401-222-8471 – Elliot.krieger@ride.ri.gov	Margaret Votta, Progressive Support & Intervention 401-222-8412 – Margaret.votta@ride.ri.gov
Vermont	
Lisa Gauvin, Director of Information & Technology 802-828-3719 – lisa.gauvin@state.vt.us	Stacey Murdock, Director of Data Administration 802-828-0473 – Stacey.murdock@state.vt.us
Stephen Magill, Data Analysis Director 802-828-6565 – Stephen.magill@state.vt.us	Glenn Bailey, Data Analyst 802 828 2141 – Glenn.Bailey@state.vt.us
Great Schools Partnership	
Duke Albanese, Co-Executive Director 207-773-0505 – dalbanese@greatschoolspartnership.org	David Ruff, Co-Executive Director 207-773-0505 – druff@greatschoolspartnership.org
Donahue Institute	
John Tapper, Research Manager 413-587-2421 – jtapper@donahue.umassp.edu	Lonnie Kaufman, Research Manager 413-587-2419 – lkaufman@donahue.umassp.edu

Data Tables

The tables included in this report represent data disaggregated by federal reporting categories. Data Group members note that upcoming changes in the reporting requirements will introduce a category called, "multi-racial." This category is intended to clarify the confusion that occurs when student results are reported in more than one racial category.

Table 1								
High School Graduation Rate								
Freshman cohort year: 2005	**# of 1st year freshman in cohort**	**# Graduating seniors**	**Transfer adjustment (+/-)^a**	**4-year graduation rate**	**# 5th year graduates**	**5-year graduation rate**	**# 6th year graduates**	**6-year graduation rate**
All								
Connecticut	44307	34626	-659	79.3%	-	-	-	-
Maine	15714	12323	256	77.2%	-	-	-	-
New Hampshire*	18614	14497	539	75.7%	-	-	-	-
Rhode Island	13327	9576	-641	75.5%	-	-	-	-
Vermont	7993	6902		86.4%	-	-	-	-
Ethnicity								
Hispanic								
Connecticut	6682	3880	6	58.1%	-	-	-	-
Maine					-	-	-	-
New Hampshire*	532	319	24	57.4%	-	-	-	-
Rhode Island	2346	1403	-153	64.0%	-	-	-	-
Vermont	107	87		81.3%	-	-	-	-
Non Hispanic					-	-	-	-
Connecticut	37625	30746	-665	83.2%	-	-	-	-
Maine					-	-	-	-
New Hampshire*	18082	14178	515	76.2%	-	-	-	-
Rhode Island	10981	8173	-488	77.9%	-	-	-	-
Vermont	7886	6815		86.4%	-	-	-	-

* Modeled freshman cohort

Table 1								
High School Graduation Rate (continued)								
Freshman cohort year: 2005	# of 1st year freshman in cohort	# Graduating seniors	Transfer adjustment (+/-)[a]	4-year graduation rate	# 5th year graduates	5-year graduation rate	# 6th year graduates	6-year graduation rate
Race								
African - American								N/A
Connecticut	6101	4086	73	66.2%	-	-	-	-
Maine	285	219	41	67.2%	-	-	-	-
New Hampshire*	305	182	71	48.4%	-	-	-	-
Rhode Island	1233	764	-87	66.7%	-	-	-	-
Vermont		124		78.0%	-	-	-	-
Native American					-	-	-	-
Connecticut	115	79	-8	73.8%	-	-	-	-
Maine	115	74	3	62.7%	-	-	-	-
New Hampshire*	55	32	9	50.0%	-	-	-	-
Rhode Island	89	58	-7	70.7%	-	-	-	-
Vermont	159	65		74.7%	-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander					-	-	-	-
Connecticut	1407	1257	119	82.4%	-	-	-	-
Maine	206	188	27	80.7%	-	-	-	-
New Hampshire*	282	252	59	73.9%	-	-	-	-
Rhode Island	373	275	2	73.3%	-	-	-	-
Vermont	203	184		90.4%	-	-	-	-
White/Caucasian					-	-	-	-
Connecticut	30002	25324	-849	86.8%	-	-	-	-
Maine	14844	11768	-5	79.3%	-	-	-	-
New Hampshire*	17418	13698	1992	70.6%	-	-	-	-
Rhode Island	9286	7076	-396	79.6%	-	-	-	-
Vermont	7689	6651		86.5%	-	-	-	-
Multi-racial	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	-	-	-

* Modeled freshman cohort

Table 1 **High School Graduation Rate (continued)**								
Freshman cohort year: 2005	# of 1st year freshman in cohort	# Graduating seniors	Transfer adjustment (+/-)[a]	4-year graduation rate	# 5th year graduates	5-year graduation rate	# 6th year graduates	6-year graduation rate
Gender								
Male								
Connecticut	22658	16998	-253	75.9%	-	-	-	-
Maine	7922	6063	38	76.2%	-	-	-	-
New Hampshire*	9596	7228	338	72.8%	-	-	-	-
Rhode Island	6795	4573	-366	71.1%	-	-	-	-
Vermont	4133	3488		84.4%	-	-	-	-
Female					-	-	-	-
Connecticut	21649	17628	-406	82.9%	-	-	-	-
Maine	7555	6165	11	81.5%	-	-	-	-
New Hampshire*	9018	7269	201	78.8%	-	-	-	-
Rhode Island	6532	5003	-275	80.0%	-	-	-	-
Vermont	3860	3414		88.4%	-	-	-	-
Income					-	-	-	-
Eligible for free/reduced lunch					-	-	-	-
Connecticut	11417	6635	-343	59.9%	-	-	-	-
Maine					-	-	-	-
New Hampshire*	4018	2498	56	61.3%	-	-	-	-
Rhode Island	5815	3484	-318	63.4%	-	-	-	-
Vermont	2759	2042		74.0%	-	-	-	-
Not eligible for free/reduced lunch					-	-	-	-
Connecticut	32890	27991	-316	85.6%	-	-	-	-
Maine					-	-	-	-
New Hampshire*	14596	11999	483	79.6%	-	-	-	-
Rhode Island	7512	6092	-323	84.7%	-	-	-	-
Vermont	5234	4860	N/A	92.9%	-	-	-	-

* Modeled freshman cohort

Table 1								
High School Graduation Rate (continued)								
Freshman cohort year: 2005	**# of 1st year freshman in cohort**	**# Graduating seniors**	**Transfer adjustment (+/-)[a]**	**4-year graduation rate**	**# 5th year graduates**	**5-year graduation rate**	**# 6th year graduates**	**6-year graduation rate**
English Proficiency								
LEP[b]								
Connecticut	1750	1133	372	53.4%	-	-	-	-
Maine					-	-	-	-
New Hampshire*	275	190	38	60.7%	-	-	-	-
Rhode Island	740	467	-2	63.3%	-	-	-	-
Vermont	137	111		81.0%	-	-	-	-
Non-LEP					-	-	-	-
Connecticut	42557	33493	-1031	80.6%	-	-	-	-
Maine					-	-	-	-
New Hampshire*	18339	14307	501	75.9%	-	-	-	-
Rhode Island	12587	9109	-639	76.2%	-	-	-	-
Vermont	7856	6791		86.4%	-	-	-	-
Special Education Status					-	-	-	-
IEP[c]					-	-	-	-
Connecticut	5474	3110	-403	61.3%	-	-	-	-
Maine	2327	1511	93	62.4%	-	-	-	-
New Hampshire*	3098	2068	198	62.7%	-	-	-	-
Rhode Island	2828	1528	-224	58.7%	-	-	-	-
Vermont	1249	804		64.4%	-	-	-	-
Non-IEP					-	-	-	-
Connecticut	38833	31516	-256	81.7%	-	-	-	-
Maine	13385	10887	152	80.4%	-	-	-	-
New Hampshire*	15516	12429	341	78.4%	-	-	-	-
Rhode Island	10499	8048	-417	79.8%	-	-	-	-
Vermont	6744	6098		90.4%	-	-	-	-

* Modeled freshman cohort

[a] Transfers in – transfers out

[b] Limited English Proficiency

[c] Students who are on Individual Education Plans as a result of an identified disability.

Table 2a						
High School Dropout Rate						
Freshman cohort year: 2005	**# Adjusted freshman cohort[a]**	**# Graduating seniors**	**# Cohort members still enrolled**	**# Alternative completers (not including GED)**	**4-year rate** (And rate counting GED completers as graduates)	**5-year rate**	**6-year rate**
All							
Connecticut	43648	34626	2890	128	13.7%	-	-
Maine						-	-
New Hampshire*	19153	14497	2261	150	12.5% (10.4%)	-	-
Rhode Island	12686	9576	723	0	18.8%	-	-
Vermont	7993	6902	302		9.9%	-	-
Ethnicity							
Hispanic							
Connecticut	6688	3880	627	36	32.0%	-	-
Maine						-	-
New Hampshire*	556	319	122	9	20.7% (17.4%)	-	-
Rhode Island	2193	1403	182	0	27.7%	-	-
Vermont	107	87	5		14.0%	-	-
Non Hispanic						-	-
Connecticut	36960	30746	2263	92	10.4%	-	-
Maine						-	-
New Hampshire*	18597	14178	2139	141	12.3% (10.2%)	-	-
Rhode Island	10,493	8,173	541	0	17.0%	-	-
Vermont	7886	6815	297		9.8%	-	-

* Modeled freshman cohort

Table 2a							
High School Dropout Rate (continued)							
Freshman cohort year: 2005	**# Adjusted freshman cohort[a]**	**# Graduating seniors**	**# Cohort members still enrolled**	**# Alternative completers (not including GED)**	**4-year rate** (And rate counting GED completers as graduates)	**5-year rate**	**6-year rate**
Race							
African - American						-	-
Connecticut	6174	4086	631	55	22.7%	-	-
Maine						-	-
New Hampshire*	322	182	71	<5	21.4% (18.9%)	-	-
Rhode Island	1146	764	108	0	23.9%	-	-
Vermont	159	124	17		11.3%	-	-
Native American						-	-
Connecticut	107	79	8	0	18.6%	-	-
Maine						-	-
New Hampshire*	63	32	9	0	34.9% (31.8%)	-	-
Rhode Island	82	58	11	0	15.9%	-	-
Vermont	87	65	<5		20.7%	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander						-	-
Connecticut	1526	1257	64	0	13.4%	-	-
Maine						-	-
New Hampshire*	332	252	59	0	6.3% (5.7%)	-	-
Rhode Island	375	275	22	0	20.8%	-	-
Vermont	203	184	9		4.9%	-	-
White/Caucasian						-	-
Connecticut	1526	1257	64	0	13.4%	-	-
Maine						-	-
New Hampshire*	17853	13698	1992	140	12.1% (10.1%)	-	-
Rhode Island	8890	7076	400	0	15.9%	-	-
Vermont	7689	6651	283		9.8%	-	-
Multi-racial	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	-

* Modeled freshman cohort

Table 2a						
High School Dropout Rate (continued)						
Freshman cohort year: 2005	**# Adjusted freshman cohort**[a]	**# Graduating seniors**	**# Cohort members still enrolled**	**# Alternative completers (not including GED)**	**4-year rate** (And rate counting GED completers as graduates)	**5-year rate**	**6-year rate**
Gender							
Male							
Connecticut	22405	16998	1862	116	15.4%		
Maine						-	-
New Hampshire*	9934	7228	1307	89	14.0% (11.7%)	-	-
Rhode Island	6429	4573	473	0	21.5%	-	-
Vermont	4133	3488	192		11.0%	-	-
Female						-	-
Connecticut	21243	17628	1028	12	12.1%	-	-
Maine						-	-
New Hampshire*	9219	7269	954	61	10.8% (9.0%)	-	-
Rhode Island	6257	5003	250	0	16.0%	-	-
Vermont	3860	3414	110		8.7%	-	-
Income							
Eligible for free/reduced lunch							
Connecticut	11074	6635	1220	100	28.1%	-	-
Maine						-	-
New Hampshire*	4074	2498	697	53	21.6% (18.6%)	-	-
Rhode Island	5497	3484	497	0	27.6%	-	-
Vermont	2759	2042	183		19.4%	-	-
Not eligible for free/reduced lunch						-	-
Connecticut	32574	27991	1670	28	8.8%	-	-
Maine						-	-
New Hampshire*	15079	11999	1564	97	10.0% (8.2%)	-	-
Rhode Island	7189	6092	226	0	12.1%	-	-
Vermont	5234	4860	119		4.9%	-	-

* Modeled freshman cohort

Table 2a

High School Dropout Rate (continued)							
Freshman cohort year: 2005	**# Adjusted freshman cohort**[a]	**# Graduating seniors**	**# Cohort members still enrolled**	**# Alternative completers (not including GED)**	**4-year rate** (And rate counting GED completers as graduates)	**5-year rate**	**6-year rate**
English Proficiency							
LEP							
Connecticut	2122	1133	158	<5	39.1%		
Maine						-	-
New Hampshire*	313	190	72	<5	16.3% (15.7%)	-	-
Rhode Island	738	467	71	0	27.1%	-	-
Vermont	137	111	13		9.5%	-	-
Non-LEP						-	-
Connecticut	41526	33493	2732	127	12.4%	-	-
Maine						-	-
New Hampshire*	18840	14307	2189	147	12.4% (10.3%)	-	-
Rhode Island	11948	9109	652	0	18.3%	-	-
Vermont	7856	6791	289		9.9%	-	-
Special Education Status							
IEP							
Connecticut	5071	3110	992	27	18.5%	-	-
Maine						-	-
New Hampshire*	3296	2068	646	37	17.7% (14.8%)	-	-
Rhode Island	2604	1528	335	0	28.5%	-	-
Vermont	1249	804	171		21.9%	-	-
Non-IEP						-	-
Connecticut	38577	31516	1898	101	13.1%	-	-
Maine						-	-
New Hampshire*	15857	12429	1615	113	11.4% (9.5%)	-	-
Rhode Island	10082	8048	388	0	16.3%	-	-
Vermont	6744	6098	131		7.6%	-	-

* Modeled freshman cohort

[a] Freshman cohort adjusted for transfers

Table 2c					
GED/Early College Enrollment within the Dropout Rate					
Freshman cohort year: 2005	**Reported dropouts**	**GED completers**	**% GED in dropouts**	**Early college enrollment**	**% Early college enrollment in dropouts**
Total					
Connecticut					
Maine					
New Hampshire	2395	405	16.91%	205	8.56%
Rhode Island	2387	625	26.2	0	0.0
Vermont	789			<5	

Table 3a						
Post-Secondary Matriculation Rates – High School Graduates						
Freshman cohort year: 2009	**# Graduates**	**# Matriculating in 2-year colleges**	**# Matriculating in 4-year colleges**	**4-year rate**[a]	**5-year rate**[b]	**6-year rate**[c]
All						
Connecticut					-	-
Maine					-	-
New Hampshire	14492	2231	6688	61.5%	-	-
Rhode Island					-	-
Vermont					-	-
Ethnicity						
Hispanic						
Connecticut					-	-
Maine					-	-
New Hampshire	318	59	95	48.4%	-	-
Rhode Island					-	-
Vermont					-	-
Non Hispanic					-	-
Connecticut					-	-
Maine					-	-
New Hampshire	14174	2172	6593	61.8%	-	-
Rhode Island					-	-
Vermont					-	-

Table 3a						
Post-Secondary Matriculation Rates – High School Graduates (continued)						
Freshman cohort year: 2009	**# Graduates**	**# Matriculating in 2-year colleges**	**# Matriculating in 4-year colleges**	**4-year rate**[a]	**5-year rate**[b]	**6-year rate**[c]
Race						
African - American						
Connecticut					-	-
Maine					-	-
New Hampshire	182	29	73	56.0%	-	-
Rhode Island					-	-
Vermont					-	-
Native American					-	-
Connecticut					-	-
Maine					-	-
New Hampshire	32	<5	6	31.3%	-	-
Rhode Island					-	-
Vermont					-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander					-	-
Connecticut					-	-
Maine					-	-
New Hampshire	252	35	134	67.1%	-	-
Rhode Island					-	-
Vermont					-	-
White/Caucasian					-	-
Connecticut					-	-
Maine					-	-
New Hampshire	13694	2108	6372	61.9%	-	-
Rhode Island					-	-
Vermont					-	-
Multi-racial	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	-

Table 3a **Post-Secondary Matriculation Rates – High School Graduates (continued)**						
Freshman cohort year: 2009	**# Graduates**	**# Matriculating in 2-year colleges**	**# Matriculating in 4-year colleges**	**4-year rate**[a]	**5-year rate**[b]	**6-year rate**[c]
Gender						
Male						
Connecticut					-	-
Maine					-	-
New Hampshire	7225	1120	2926	56.0%	-	-
Rhode Island					-	-
Vermont					-	-
Female					-	-
Connecticut					-	-
Maine					-	-
New Hampshire	7267	1111	3762	67.1%	-	-
Rhode Island					-	-
Vermont					-	-
Income						
Eligible for free/reduced lunch						
Connecticut					-	-
Maine					-	-
New Hampshire	2496	402	585	39.5%	-	-
Rhode Island					-	-
Vermont					-	-
Not eligible for free/reduced lunch					-	-
Connecticut					-	-
Maine					-	-
New Hampshire	11996	1829	6103	66.1%	-	-
Rhode Island					-	-
Vermont					-	-

[a] Students who attend in the year immediately following graduation.

[b] Student who have a year between high school graduation and college matriculation.

[c] Students who have two years between high school graduation and college matriculation.

Note: Data for one-year post-secondary programs (e.g., certificate, trade school, etc.) are not currently collected but will be added as they become available.

UMass Donahue Institute
Research and Evaluation Group

Table 3b **Post-Secondary Matriculation Rates – GED and non Graduates**								
Freshman cohort year: 2009	**# non Graduates**	**GED Completers**	**# Matriculating in certificate programs**	**# Matriculating in 2-year colleges**	**# Matriculating in 4-year colleges**	**4-year rate**[a]	**5-year rate**[b]	**6-year rate**[b]
All								
							-	-
Ethnicity								
Hispanic							-	-
Non Hispanic							-	-
Race								
African - American							-	-
Native American							-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander							-	-
White/Caucasian							-	-
Multi-racial							-	-
Gender								
Male							-	-
Female							-	-
Income								
Eligible for free/reduced lunch							-	-
Not eligible for free/reduced lunch							-	-
English Proficiency								
LEP							-	-
Non LEP								
Special Education Status								
IEP							-	-
Non IEP							-	-

Table 4 Post-Secondary Completion Rates										
Freshman cohort year: 2009	**Freshman cohort 2-year programs**	**2-year graduates**	**2-year graduation rate**	**Freshman cohort 4-year programs**	**4th year graduates**	**4-year graduation rate**	**5th year graduates**	**5-year graduation rate**	**6th year graduates**	**6-year graduation rate**
All										
							-	-	-	-
Ethnicity										
Hispanic							-	-	-	-
Non Hispanic							-	-	-	-
Race										
African - American							-	-	-	-
Native American							-	-	-	-
Asian/Pacific Islander							-	-	-	-
White/Caucasian							-	-	-	-
Multi-racial							-	-	-	-
Gender										
Male							-	-	-	-
Female							-	-	-	-
Income										
Eligible for free/reduced lunch							-	-	-	-
Not eligible for free/reduced lunch							-	-	-	-
English Proficiency										
LEP							-	-	-	-
Non-LEP							-	-	-	-
Special Education Status										
IEP							-	-	-	-
Non-IEP							-	-	-	-

Note: Data for one-year post-secondary programs (e.g., certificate, trade school, etc.) are not currently available but will be added as they become available.

Table 5a **College Readiness Data**						
Freshman cohort year: 2009	**Remedial enrollment: Writing**	**Remedial enrollment: Math**	**Remedial enrollment: English**	**% Below SAT readiness: Writing**	**% Below SAT readiness: Math**	**% Below SAT readiness: English**
All						
Connecticut				24.1%	52.7%	47.9%
Maine						
New Hampshire						
Rhode Island						
Vermont						
Ethnicity						
Hispanic						
Connecticut				46.3%	78.5%	73.1%
Maine						
New Hampshire						
Rhode Island						
Vermont						
Non Hispanic						
Connecticut				20.9%	49.2%	44.7%
Maine						
New Hampshire						
Rhode Island						
Vermont						

Table 5a						
College Readiness Data (continued)						
Freshman cohort year: 2009	**Remedial enrollment: Writing**	**Remedial enrollment: Math**	**Remedial enrollment: English**	**% Below SAT readiness: Writing**	**% Below SAT readiness: Math**	**% Below SAT readiness: English**
Race						
African - American						
Connecticut				58.0%	88.5%	82.8%
Maine						
New Hampshire						
Rhode Island						
Vermont						
Native American						
Connecticut				23.4%	59.6%	53.2%
Maine						
New Hampshire						
Rhode Island						
Vermont						
Asian/Pacific Islander						
Connecticut				21.0%	35.8%	42.2%
Maine						
New Hampshire						
Rhode Island						
Vermont						
White/Caucasian						
Connecticut				15.4%	44.1%	39.1%
Maine						
New Hampshire						
Rhode Island						
Vermont						
Multi-racial	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Table 5a College Readiness Data (continued)						
Freshman cohort year: 2009	**Remedial enrollment: Writing**	**Remedial enrollment: Math**	**Remedial enrollment: English**	**% Below SAT readiness: Writing**	**% Below SAT readiness: Math**	**% Below SAT readiness: English**
Gender						
Male						
Connecticut				26.5%	47.1%	47.4%
Maine						
New Hampshire						
Rhode Island						
Vermont						
Female						
Connecticut				22.1%	57.6%	48.5%
Maine						
New Hampshire						
Rhode Island						
Vermont						
Income						
Eligible for free/reduced lunch						
Connecticut						
Maine						
New Hampshire						
Rhode Island						
Vermont						
Not eligible for free/reduced lunch						
Connecticut						
Maine						
New Hampshire						
Rhode Island						
Vermont						

Table 5a						
College Readiness Data (continued)						
Freshman cohort year: 2009	**Remedial enrollment: Writing**	**Remedial enrollment: Math**	**Remedial enrollment: English**	**% Below SAT readiness: Writing**	**% Below SAT readiness: Math**	**% Below SAT readiness: English**
English Proficiency						
LEP						
Connecticut				40.7%	63.9%	65.9%
Maine						
New Hampshire						
Rhode Island						
Vermont						
Non-LEP						
Connecticut				22.7%	51.8%	46.6%
Maine						
New Hampshire						
Rhode Island						
Vermont						
Special Education Status						
IEP						
Connecticut						
Maine						
New Hampshire						
Rhode Island						
Vermont						
Non-IEP						
Connecticut						
Maine						
New Hampshire						
Rhode Island						
Vermont						

UMass Donahue Institute
Research and Evaluation Group

Table 5b					
College Readiness Data (continued)					
Freshman cohort year: 2009	**% of students requiring remediation based on college placement exam**	**# of students taking AP classes**	**% of students scoring 3 or high on AP exams**	**% of students participating in State Scholars Program**	**% of students dual enrolled/early college enrollment**
All					
Connecticut		40735	72.9%		
Maine					
New Hampshire					
Rhode Island					
Vermont					
Ethnicity					
Hispanic					
Connecticut		2242	57.4%		
Maine					
New Hampshire					
Rhode Island					
Vermont					
Non Hispanic					
Connecticut		36245	74.2%		
Maine					
New Hampshire					
Rhode Island					
Vermont					

Table 5b					
College Readiness Data (continued)					
Freshman cohort year: 2009	**% of students requiring remediation based on college placement exam**	**# of students taking AP classes**	**% of students scoring 3 or high on AP exams**	**% of students participating in State Scholars Program**	**% of students dual enrolled/early college enrollment**
Race					
African - American					
Connecticut		1568	30.4%		
Maine					
New Hampshire					
Rhode Island					
Vermont					
Native American					
Connecticut		87	73.6%		
Maine					
New Hampshire					
Rhode Island					
Vermont					
Asian/Pacific Islander					
Connecticut		3864	77.9%		
Maine					
New Hampshire					
Rhode Island					
Vermont					
White/Caucasian					
Connecticut		30726	76.0%		
Maine					
New Hampshire					
Rhode Island					
Vermont					
Multi-racial	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Table 5b **College Readiness Data (continued)**					
Freshman cohort year: 2009	% of students requiring remediation based on college placement exam	# of students taking AP classes	% of students scoring 3 or high on AP exams	% of students participating in State Scholars Program	% of students dual enrolled/early college enrollment
Gender					
Male					
Connecticut		17589	76.1%		
Maine					
New Hampshire					
Rhode Island					
Vermont					
Female					
Connecticut		23146	70.5%		
Maine					
New Hampshire					
Rhode Island					
Vermont					
Income					
Eligible for free/reduced lunch					
Connecticut					
Maine					
New Hampshire					
Rhode Island					
Vermont					
Not eligible for free/reduced lunch					
Connecticut					
Maine					
New Hampshire					
Rhode Island					
Vermont					

Table 5b					
College Readiness Data (continued)					
Freshman cohort year: 2009	**% of students requiring remediation based on college placement exam**	**# of students taking AP classes**	**% of students scoring 3 or high on AP exams**	**% of students participating in State Scholars Program**	**% of students dual enrolled/early college enrollment**
English Proficiency					
LEP					
Connecticut		424	65.1%		
Maine					
New Hampshire					
Rhode Island					
Vermont					
Non-LEP					
Connecticut		39305	73.1%		
Maine					
New Hampshire					
Rhode Island					
Vermont					
Special Education Status					
IEP					
Connecticut					
Maine					
New Hampshire					
Rhode Island					
Vermont					
Non-IEP					
Connecticut					
Maine					
New Hampshire					
Rhode Island					
Vermont					