

**NAPSEC EXIT SURVEY
1999 – 2000 Academic Year**

Report Number 1

**January 15, 2001
Captiva Island, Florida**

Outcomes Committee

**Jack Breen
Julia Dyckman Andrus Memorial, NY**

**Robert Fitzgerald
Stetson School, MA**

**Joseph Gorga
Lord Stirling Schools, Inc., NJ**

**Dr. Millicent H. Kellner - Project Director
CPC – High Point Schools, NJ**

**Richard MacMullen
Harmony Hill School, RI**

**Dr. Carl Mores
Cotting School, MA**

**Richard Robinson
Stetson School, MA**

**Barbara A. Strickarz -Chair
CPC – High Point Schools, NJ**

**Dr. David L. Williams
Phillips Program, VA**

**Dr. David Winikur
High Road Schools, NJ**

Introduction

Outcome research in the area of special education is in its infancy. In the last decade, important first steps have been taken to learn the outcome of special education conducted within the public school setting. The National Longitudinal Transition Study – NLTS (1993), for example, which focused on children whose special needs could be met within their districts, called attention to the disproportionately high dropout and lower postsecondary school enrollment rates for special education students when compared to youth in the general population. However, with its emphasis on secondary school in-district special education the NLTS did not focus on students in out-of-district educational settings.

Outcome in the area of out-of-district special education remains largely unexplored. Little is known about the degree to which these out-of-district students benefit from the private special education programs they attend and which students among them are able to return to educational settings within the public school. There is also much to learn about the post-secondary school careers of these special education students.

Because of concern regarding this relatively underdeveloped knowledge base, the National Association of Private Special Education Centers (NAPSEC) undertook a survey of the educational settings to which transfer students moved upon leaving a NAPSEC-member school and of the plans made by graduating students. The following report, Report Number One, will set forth the results of this survey.

METHODS

Sixty-eight (68) NAPSEC member schools (25.2% of the 270 eligible member schools) participated in the study. Each member school was asked to report on its exiting students by classifying itself according to the disabilities of the types of students it served. Although the students attending NAPSEC members' out-of-district private special education schools have multiple and complex disabilities that cannot be easily categorized, for the purposes of this study participants were asked to select only one of three classifications to describe the primary disability of the exiting student.

In short, schools were asked to sort exiting students by the dominant category that best described why the student was placed in their school. If a school served more than one type of student, the school was instructed to file a separate report for each student type. To help guide the classification efforts, the following definitions were provided:

1. Medical Disorders– includes cerebral palsy, muscular dystrophy, blindness, brain injuries, birth defects and spina bifida.
2. Pervasive Development Disorders and Communication Handicaps – includes autism, retardation and learning disabilities
3. Emotional and Behavioral Disorders – includes anxiety, depression, thought disorders, mood disorders, severe disruptive behavior, juvenile offenders

The majority of schools reported serving students with one primary disorder. Seventeen (17) of the participating schools, however, reported serving more than one student population. Four (4) schools reported serving children with Medical Disorders and Pervasive Developmental Disorders/Communication Handicaps; six (6) schools reported children with Pervasive Developmental Disorders/Communication Handicaps and Emotional/Behavioral Disorders; and seven (7) schools reported serving students with Medical Disorders and Pervasive Developmental Disorders/Communication Handicaps and Emotional/Behavioral Disorders. This added 24 distinct educational programs to the overall count.

For the purpose of analysis, all schools were labeled according to the type of student served. Schools who reported multiple student populations were entered for each distinct classification category and the overall school enrollment was also separated by the classification category. This permitted us to separate all exiting students by relevant classification category. Thus, due to multiple counts, our sixty-eight (68) schools reported serving students in ninety-two (92) distinct educational programs.

RESULTS

The sixty-eight (68) schools (Table 1-A) and ninety-two (92) programs (Table 1-B) were located in fifteen (15) states.

Table 1-A

NAPSEC Schools by State

STATE	# of Schools	PERCENT
CT	2	2.9
IL	5	7.4
KS	1	1.5
MA	4	5.9
MD	8	11.7
MN	1	1.5
MS	1	1.5
NH	2	2.9
NJ	25	36.7
NY	6	8.8
PA	1	1.5
RI	1	1.5
TN	2	2.9
TX	1	1.5
VA	8	11.8
TOTAL	68	100.00

Table 1-B

NAPSEC Programs by State

STATE	# of Programs	PERCENT
CT	2	2.2
IL	7	7.5
KS	1	1.1
MA	6	6.5
MD	11	12.0
MN	1	1.1
MS	3	3.3
NH	4	4.3
NJ	33	35.8
NY	8	8.7
PA	2	2.2
RI	1	1.1
TN	2	2.2
TX	1	1.1
VA	10	10.9
TOTAL	92	100.00

Table 2 shows the 2179 students by the location of the sending state.

Table 2

Students by Sending State

State	# of Students	Percent
AL	1	.05
AZ	1	.05
CA	3	.15
CT	69	3.10
DC	52	2.32
GA	2	.10
IA	1	.05
IN	2	.10
IL	136	6.24
KS	7	.35
LA	1	.05
MA	113	5.09
MD	316	14.45
ME	5	.25
MS	162	7.43
PA	8	.40
NH	43	1.97
NJ	807	37.03
NY	166	7.61
RI	17	.85
SC	1	.05
TN	16	.80
TX	9	.40
VA	228	10.46
WA	1	.05
W.VA	5	.25
Other*	6	.30
Total	2179	100.00

* NAPSEC schools reported that students attending their programs came from Canada, Haiti and Hong Kong.

According to Table 3, of the sixty-eight (68) participating schools, fifty (50) schools had exiting students who were residents of the same state in which the school is located; one (1) school exited students who were sent by a different state; seventeen (17) schools had exiting students who resided both in the same state as well as in a different state from that in which the school is located.

Table 3 Sending State Compared to State of NAPSEC School

	# of Schools	Percent
Same State	50	73.5
Different State	1	1.5
Combination Same and Different State	17	25.0
TOTAL	68	100.0

As has been previously mentioned, our sixty-eight (68) schools offered ninety-two (92) distinct educational programs. When the ninety-two (92) programs are examined by the youngest age at which they accept students, 39.1% of the programs (36 programs) accept students between the ages of three and four years, the preschool years, while fifty-six (56) programs (60.9%) accept students between the ages of five and fourteen, the approximate age span for the elementary school years.

Table 4 Lower Limits of Age Range for Entering NAPSEC Programs

AGE	# of programs	Percent
<3 – 4	36	39.1
5-14	56	60.9
TOTAL	92	100.0

When the factor of the oldest age for which a student is accepted for services is examined, the age range of 16-22 years (80 programs or nearly 87%), the high school years, emerges as the most common.

Table 5 Upper Limits of Age Range for NAPSEC Programs

AGE	# of programs	Percent
<6-9	4	5
12-15	8	10
16-22	68	85
TOTAL	80	100

According to Table 6, the ninety-two (92) programs and the students they serve were classified in the following way.

Table 6 NAPSEC Schools by Primary Classification

Classification	# of Programs	Percentage
Medical	15	16.3
PDD/CH	32	34.8
ED/BD	45	48.9
TOTAL	92	100.0

Thus, NAPSEC programs were most likely to be composed of children with Emotional and Behavioral Disorders (48.9%), followed by students with Pervasive Developmental Disorders/Communication Handicap (34.8%) and Medical Disorders (16.3%).

Planned or Unplanned, Positive or Negative Exits

When asked if the exits were planned or unplanned, positive or negative¹, the schools reported that 1528 of the 2179 exits were planned (70.1%), while 651 were unplanned. The schools also reported that 1525 exits were positive (almost 70%), while 654 were negative. Thus, approximately 70% of the students who exited from a NAPSEC program experienced a planned and positive exit.

The Students

Demographics

7339 students were enrolled in the ninety-two (92) programs and 2179 of these students exited in the 1999-2000 school year (29.7% of enrolled students).

Table 7 describes the exiting students by type of program they attended. 1606 students, (73.7% of all students exiting from NAPSEC programs) attended forty-five (45) programs for assistance with Emotional and Behavioral Disorders; 396 students (18.2% of total exiters) attended thirty-two (32) programs for students with Pervasive Developmental Disorders/Communication Handicaps; and 177 students (8.1% of total exiters) attended fifteen (15) programs for youth with Medical Disorders.

¹ The following definitions were used: a) Positive – School staff felt student had completed the program or, if change was unplanned, it was still positive for student; b) Negative – Student was asked to leave because he/she was disruptive to program, was not benefiting from program or was removed prematurely by the sending district.

Table 7

Primary Classification by Number of NAPSEC Programs
and Number of Exiting Students

Primary Classification	# of Programs	# of Total Exiters	% of Total Exiters
Medical	15	177	8.1
PDD/CH	32	396	18.2
ED/BD	45	1606	73.7
TOTAL	92	2179	100.0

Table 8 exhibits the exiting students by age at the time of their exit. Nearly 60% of the students exited between the ages of 16 and 22+ years of age and nearly 20% between the ages of 12 -15 years. More than 17% left a NAPSEC program between the ages of 5-11 years, and less than 6% between the ages of 3-4 years.

Table 8

Age of Students at Exit

Age	# of Students	Percent
<3-4	129	5.9
5-11	375	17.2
12-15	434	19.9
16-22+	1241	57.0
TOTAL	2179	100.0

Gender of Exiting Students

When the exiters are examined by gender, we learn that 1576 are males and 603 are females. The students who exited from NAPSEC programs were more than two and a half times more likely to be male than female.

Race/Ethnicity of Exiting Students

Table 9 describes the exiting students by Race/Ethnicity.

Table 9

Race/Ethnicity of Exiting Students

Race/Ethnicity	# of Students	Percent
Caucasian	1197	54.9
African American	733	33.7
Hispanic	188	8.6
Asian	29	1.3
Other	32	1.5
TOTAL	2179	100.0

54.9 of the students were Caucasian, 33.7 were African American, 8.6% were Hispanic, 1.3% were Asian and the final 1.5% came from other racial/ethnic backgrounds.

Exiting Students and Subsidized School Lunches

Eight hundred and forty-five (845) exiting students (38.8% of all exiting students) qualified for subsidized school lunches.

The Transfer Students

Overall, 1623 students were transfer students who left a NAPSEC program and went on to another educational setting. Table 10 indicates the type of school these transfer students attended.

Table 10 All Transfer Students by School Type

School Type	# of Transfer Students	Percent
Preschool	129	8.0
Elementary School	375	23.0
Middle School	434	27.0
High School	685	42.0
TOTAL	1623	100.0

Forty-two percent (685 students) of the transfer students left a NAPSEC program for another educational setting during high school. 27% (434 students) of the transfer students were in middle school, 23% (375 students) were in elementary school, and 8% (129 students) in preschool programs.

Table 11 Planned Education Outcomes for Transfer Students

New Educational Setting	# of Students	Percent
Regular Education, Not Special Education	73	5.9
Regular Education, Private/Parochial	40	3.3
Regular Education, Vocational	8	.6
Regular Education, Supported Inclusion	127	10.3
Resource Room	23	1.9
Alternative School	38	3.1
Special Education-Self-Contained LEA	253	20.5
Out of District Special Education	339	27.5
Residential	182	14.8
Other	109	8.9
Home Instruction	40	3.2
TOTAL	1232	100.0

If we combine all of the known students who were able to return to their districts or move on to a private or parochial school (Regular Education – not special education, private/parochial, vocational, supported inclusion; Resource Room; Alternate School; Special Education, Self-Contained LEA), almost 46% (562 students) were involved in such transfers. 27.5% (339 students) transferred to another out-of-district placement and 14.8% (182 students) transferred to a residential school. 3.2% (40 students) went on to home instruction. Finally, 8.9 (109 students) went on to “other” situations, such as moving away, drug rehabilitation program, psychiatric hospital, juvenile corrections, subacute hospital, medical leave, or death.

Table 12 NAPSEC Transfer Students with Plans to Return to In-District Placements or to Regular Education in a Private or Parochial School

Placement	# of Students	Percent
Regular Education, Not Special Education	73	13.0
Regular Education, Private/Parochial	40	7.1
Regular Education, Vocational	8	1.4
Regular Education, Supported Inclusion	127	22.6
Resource Room	23	4.1
Alternative School	38	6.8
Special Education, Self-Contained LEA	253	45.0
TOTAL	562	100.0

Of the 562 transfer students who returned to district, or who moved on to a private or parochial school, 13% entered nonclassified regular education, 7.1% entered private/parochial regular education and 1.4% entered regular vocational school. Thus, 21.5% were able to enter a nonclassified, regular education setting. Moreover, 22.6% returned to regular education with supported inclusion, while 45% of these students returned to special education classes in a self-contained LEA setting. In short, 67.6% returned either to regular education with supports or to the LEA for self-contained instruction.

At the point of transfer, 1232 transfer students with a known outcome for living arrangements were in the following situations. (See Table 13)

Table 13 Planned Living Arrangements of Transfer Students

Living Situation	# of Students	Percent
Independent Living	5	.4
Semi-Independent Living	13	1.0
Living with Parents or Other Relative	900	73.1
Group Home	45	3.7
Skill/Foster Home	63	5.1
Developmental Center	0	0
Residential Treatment Center	121	9.8
Other	85	6.9
TOTAL	1232	100.0

The majority of the transfer students, 73.1% (900students) live with their parents or a relative, while 19.8 (121 students) live in a residential treatment facility. 1.4% (18 students) live independently (.4% or 5 students) or semi-independently (1% or 13 students). 108 students (8.8%) live in a group home or skill/foster home. Another 6.9% of the transfer students were living in “other” settings, such as subacute hospital, juvenile correctional facility, drug rehabilitation program or psychiatric hospital.

Table 14 indicates the educational outcomes for known students with Medical Disorders who transferred out of a NAPSEC program to another educational setting.

Table 14 Planned Outcomes for Transfer Students with Medical Disorders

New Educational Setting	# of Students	Percent
Regular Education, Not Special Education	12	11.6
Regular Education, Private/Parochial	4	3.9
Regular Education, Vocational	0	0
Regular Education, Supported Inclusion	8	7.8
Resource Room	10	9.7
Alternate School	0	0
Special Education-Self-Contained LEA	43	41.7
Out of District Special Education	25	24.3
Residential	1	1.0
Other	0	0
Home Instruction	0	0
TOTAL	103	100.00

Almost 75% of these students were able to return to in-district placement or to regular education in a private or parochial school, while 24.3% went on to another out-of-district placement. Only 1% went on to residential treatment.

Table 15 indicates the educational outcomes for known students with Emotional and Behavioral Disorders who transferred from a NAPSEC school to another educational setting.

Table 15 **Planned Outcomes for Transfer Students With Emotional and Behavioral Disorders**

New Educational Setting	# of Students	Percent
Regular Education, Not Special Education	60	6.7
Regular Education, Private/Parochial	18	2.0
Regular Education, Vocational	7	.8
Regular Education, Supported Inclusion	111	12.3
Resource Room	13	1.5
Alternate School	35	3.9
Special Education-Self-Contained LEA	126	14.0
Out of District Special Education	252	28.0
Residential	147	16.3
Other	95	10.6
Home Instruction	35	3.9
TOTAL	899	100.0

About 41% of these students were able to return to an in-district placement or to regular education in a private or parochial school. More than 28% went on to another out-of-district placement. About 16% went to residential placement, while more than 10% went on to another placement, such as a correctional facility or a drug rehabilitation program.

Table 16 shows the educational outcomes for known students with Pervasive Developmental Disorders and Communication Handicaps who transferred out of NAPSEC schools to another educational setting.

Table 16 **Planned Outcomes for Transfer Students With Pervasive Developmental Disorders and Communication Handicaps**

New Educational Setting	# of Students	Percent
Regular Education, Not Special Education	1	.4
Regular Education, Private/Parochial	18	7.8
Regular Education, Vocational	1	.4
Regular Education, Supported Inclusion	8	3.5
Resource Room	0	0
Alternate School	3	1.3
Special Education-Self-Contained LEA	84	36.5
Out of District Special Education	62	27.0
Residential	34	15.0
Other	14	6.0
Home Instruction	5	2.1
TOTAL	230	100.0

Almost 50% of these students were able to return to in-district programs or to regular education in a private or parochial school; 27% were transferred to another out-of-district placement; 15% went to residential placement. More than 6% (6.7%)went on to other settings, such as psychiatric hospitals or subacute hospitals.

Table 17 compares outcomes for all transfer students according to their primary program classification. Overall, when transfer students who were able to return to in-district education are examined, almost 75% were from programs for Medical Disorders, about 41% from programs for Emotional/Behavioral Disorders and 50% from programs for Pervasive Development Disorders/Communication Handicaps. 24.4% of the transfer students from Medical Disorder programs went on to another out-of-district placement, while this was the case for 28% of the students from Emotional/Behavioral Disorders programs and 27% for students from Pervasive Development Disorders/Communication Handicap programs. Only 1% of the students from Medical Disorder programs went on to residential treatment, while 16.3% of the students from Emotional/Behavioral Disorders programs and 15% from Pervasive Development Disorders/Communication Handicap programs did so.

Table 17 Comparison: Planned Outcomes for Transfer Students By Program

New Educational Setting	From Medical Program		From ED/BD Program		From PDD/CH Program	
	# of Students	Percent	# of Students	Percent	# of Students	Percent
Regular Education, Not Special Education	12	11.6	60	6.7	1	.4
Regular Education, Private/Parochial	4	3.9	18	2.0	18	7.8
Regular Education, Vocational	0	0	7	.8	1	.4
Regular Education, Supported Inclusion	8	7.8	111	12.3	8	3.5
Resource Room	10	9.7	13	1.5	0	0
Alternate School	0	0	35	3.9	3	1.3
Special Education-Self-Contained LEA	43	41.7	126	14.0	84	36.5
Out of District Special Education	25	24.3	252	28.0	62	27.0
Residential	1	1.0	147	16.3	34	15.0
Other	0	0	95	10.6	14	6.0
Home Instruction	0	0	35	3.9	5	2.1
TOTAL	103	100.0	899	100.0	230	100.0

The Graduates/Aging Out Students

Post-School Setting

The NAPSEC schools reported that 451 students (20.7% of all exiting students) graduated/ or aged out from their schools during the 1999-2000 school year. Known outcomes were available for 413 of these graduates/aging out students.

Table 18 indicates the planned post-school setting for these students.

Table 18 Planned Post-School Setting for Graduates/Aged Out Students

Post-School Setting	# of Students	Percent
4 Year College	25	6.0
2 Year College	64	15.5
Trade School	12	2.9
Other School	1	.2
Competitive Employment	84	20.3
Armed Forces	9	2.2
Vocational Rehabilitation	44	10.9
Supported Employment	80	19.4
Sheltered Employment	37	9.0
Partial Care Program	3	.7
Nonvocational Day Program	26	6.3
Other	11	2.7
No School/No Program	17	4.1
TOTAL	413	100.0

24.6% of the graduates/aged out students (102 students) went on to a 2 or 4 year college or to a trade or other school. 22.5% went on to a job or entered the Armed Forces. Thus, 47.1% of the graduates/aged out students were able to pursue some form of further education (college, trade or other schooling), employment or enrollment in the Armed Forces. 39.3% (161 students) went on to a vocational rehabilitation program, supported employment or sheltered employment. 7% (29 students) went on to partial care or a nonvocational day program. 2.7% (11 students) went on to another setting such as a correctional facility. 4.1% (17 students) were involved in no school or program after leaving a NAPSEC program.

Table 19 describes the living arrangements.

Table 19 Planned Living Arrangements for Graduates/Aging Out Students

Living Situation	# of Students	Percent
Independent Living	38	9.5
Semi-Independent Living	7	1.8
Living with Parents or Other Relative	289	72.2
Skill/Foster Home	5	1.3
Group Home	37	9.2
Residential Treatment Center	10	2.5
Developmental Center	2	.5
Psychiatric Hospital	0	0
Correctional Facility	2	.5
Other	10	2.5
TOTAL	400	100.0

11.3% of graduates/aged out students (45 students) were able to live independently or semi-independently, while 72.3% (293 students) lived with their families in the community. 1.3 % went on to a skill/softer home, 9.2% to a group home, 2.5% to a residential treatment center and .5% to a developmental center. Only .5% (2 students) went on to a correctional facility. 2.4% of the graduates (10 students) went on to other settings, such as a medical facility.

Post-school Outcomes for Graduates/Aged Out Student by Program Classification

Tables 20 through 22 display the known post-school outcomes for 400 of the graduates/aging out students according to the classification of their program.

Table 20 shows the post-school outcomes for Graduates/Aging Out students with Medical Disorders

Table 20 Planned Post-School Outcomes for Graduates/Aging Out Students with Medical Disorders

Post-School Setting Moved To	NAPSEC #	NAPSEC %
Four Year College	11	20.0
Two Year College	13	23.6
Trade School	0	0
Competitive Employment*	9	16.4
Supported Employment	3	5.5
Sheltered Employment	2	3.6
Vocational Rehabilitation Program	3	5.5
Day Program, non-vocational	8	14.5
No Job or Day Program	0	0
Other	6	10.9
TOTAL	55	100.0

*This includes students who entered the Armed Forces.

Fifty-five of the graduates came from Medical Disorder programs.

60% of these students were able to enter college, competitive employment or the Armed Forces. 9.1% were able to enter supported or sheltered employment, while 20% were able to enter a vocational rehabilitation or non-vocational day program. No student was left without a job, schooling or a program.

Table 21 shows the post-school outcomes for Known Graduates/Aging Out Students with Emotional and Behavioral disorders.

Table 21 **Planned Post-School Outcomes for Graduates/Aging Out Students with Emotional and Behavioral Disorders**

Post-School Setting Moved To	NAPSEC #	NAPSEC %
Four Year College	12	4.7
Two Year College	46	18.2
Trade School	11	4.4
Competitive Employment*	82	32.4
Supported Employment	37	14.6
Sheltered Employment	11	4.4
Partial Care Program	1	.4
Vocational Rehabilitation Program	33	13.0
Day Program, non-vocational	2	.8
No Job or Day Program	15	5.9
Other	3	1.2
TOTAL	253	100.0

*This includes students who entered the Armed Forces.

Two hundred and fifty-three graduates came from Emotional and Behavioral Disorder Programs. Almost 60% of the graduates entered college, trade school, competitive employment or the Armed forces. 19% entered supported or sheltered employment, while 13% entered vocational rehabilitation. 1.2% entered partial care or non-vocational day programs. 5.9% were not engaged in school, job or program. Only 1.2% were involved in another setting, such as corrections, drug rehabilitation or a psychiatric hospital.

National Study Comparison: Post-School Outcomes for Graduates from Programs for Pervasive Developmental Delays and Communications Handicaps

Of the few published studies of the outcomes of special education, the National Transitional Study of Students with Severe Disabilities (1997), examined the post-school outcomes for students with mild to moderate mental retardation and functional limitations. NAPSEC exit data for known students from a similar population, those from programs with Pervasive Developmental Disorders and Communication Handicaps, were compared to the results of this study. NAPSEC data was recategorized to permit comparison to this national study.

Table 22 National Study Comparison: Post-School Outcomes for Graduates with Pervasive Development Disorders and Communication Handicaps

Post-School Setting Moved To	NAPSEC #	NAPSEC %	NTSSD #	NTSSD %
Competitive Employment*	2	2.2	90	23.0
Supported Employment	40	43.4	45	1.0
Sheltered Employment	24	26.1	91	23.0
Vocational Rehabilitation Program	8	8.7	14	3.0
Day Program, non-vocational	16	17.4	23	6.0
No Job or Day Program	2	2.2	135	34.0
TOTAL	92	100.0	398	100.0

* This includes students who entered the Armed Forces.

Known NAPSEC students from programs for Pervasive Development Disorders/Communication Handicaps were less likely to be involved in competitive employment than the NTSSD students, but more likely to be in supported employment, sheltered employment, vocational rehabilitation and non-vocational day programs. In general, NAPSEC students were much more likely to be engaged in supported adult programs in the community (95.6%) --- supported employment, sheltered employment, vocational rehabilitation program and, non-vocational day programs---than the NTSSD students (33%). Moreover, NAPSEC students were also less likely to be without a job or day program than the NTSSD students (2.2% NAPSEC students without a job or program as compared to 34% of the NTSSD students).

Dropouts

One hundred and five (105) students dropped out of NAPSEC schools. They represent 9.2% of all enrolled High School students, both transfer students and graduates (105 of 1136 students). When the dropouts are compared to the total of all graduates in the study, the rate becomes 23.2% (105 of 451 students). One hundred and three of the dropouts (98.1%) came from ED/BD programs.

SUMMARY

The Programs

The sixty-eight participating schools, which generated 92 academic programs, were located in 15 states. In 73.5% of the cases, the sending state was the same state as that in which the NAPSEC school was located. Fifty-six programs (almost 61%) accepted students between the ages of 5-14 years as the youngest age of entry. Thirty-six programs (almost 40%), identified the ages of 3-4 years as the youngest age of entry. When the oldest age for which a student is accepted for services was examined, 85% of the schools identified the range of 16-22 years, 10% identified the range of 12-15 years and 5% stated the range of 6-9 years.

Demographics

Almost fifty percent (48.9%) of the schools in this study (45 out of 92 programs) served children with emotional and behavioral difficulties. In fact, such children (1606) made up 73.8% of all the exiting students in this study. Moreover, the students were two and a half times more likely to be male than female. Caucasian students (54.9%) and African American students (33.7%) were the most represented racial/ethnic groups in the study. Almost forty percent (38.8%) of the students qualified for subsidized lunch. The schools reported that 1528 exits (70.1%) were planned and 1525 exits (almost 70%) were positive.

Transfer Students

Forty-two percent (42%) of the 1,232 transfer students were high school students. Elementary school students made up 23% of the sample and middle school students were 27%.

Almost forty-six percent (45.6%) of the transfer students planned to leave a NAPSEC program and enter an in-district educational setting or enter regular education in private/parochial school. 5.9% returned to regular education – not special education, 3.3% went on to regular private or parochial school education and .6% went on to regular vocational school. Almost thirty-one percent (30.8%) returned either to regular education with supports (10.3%) or LEA for self-contained instruction (20.5%). According to governmental education definitions, this would indicate that almost 46% of the known transfer students were able to return to a less restrictive education environment. 27.5% of the students transferred to another out-of district setting and almost 15% transferred to a residential setting.

The majority of these known transfer students (73.1%) are able to live in the community with their parents or another relative. 1.4% plan to live independently or semi-independently. Sixteen percent (16%) reside in a residential treatment center. Only 3.7% live in a group home and only 5.1% live in a skill or foster home. Slightly more than six percent (6.9%) live in “other” settings, such as a subacute hospital, juvenile correctional facility, drug rehabilitation program or psychiatric hospital.

Known Transfer Students by Primary Classification of Program: Findings and Comparison

When the transfer students are examined by the primary classification of their program, the following emerges. Almost 75% of students from Medical Disorders programs are able to enter an in-district educational setting upon transfer. Almost 42% are able to return to self-contained LEA's;

11.6% to regular education that is not affiliated with special education; almost 8% return to supported inclusion; almost 10% to resource room. 24.3% go on to another out-of-district experience. 1% go on to residential facilities.

41.2% of students from programs for Emotional/Behavioral Disorder students were able to return to in-district educational programs. 14% returned to self-contained LEA's; 12.3% to supported inclusion; 6.7% to regular education-not special education; 3.9% to alternate schools; 2% to private or parochial schools; 1.5% to resource rooms; and .8% to regular education-vocational. 28% transferred to other out-of-district programs. 16.3% went on to other residential programs.

49.9% of students from programs for Pervasive Development Disorders/Communication Handicap are able to enter an in-district educational setting after transfer. 36.5% return to self-contained LEA's; 8% to regular education private or parochial; 3.5% to supported inclusion; 1.3% to an alternate school. These students go on to participate in regular education-not special education as well as regular education-vocational education at the same rate (.4%). 27% go on to other out-of-district placement, while 15% go on to residential treatment centers.

When the outcomes for all transfer students are compared by primary program classification, the following emerges. Almost 75% of the students from programs for Medical Disorders were able to enter in-district educational programs; about 41% of the students from programs for Emotional /Behavioral Disorders and 50% of the students from programs for Pervasive Development Delays/Communication Handicaps did the same. 24.4% of the students from Medical Disorder programs went on to another out-of-district placement, while this was the case for 28% of the students from Emotional /Behavioral Disorders programs and 27% for students from for Pervasive Development Delays/Communication Handicaps programs. Only 1% of the students from Medical Disorder programs went on to residential treatment, while 16.3% of the students from Emotional/Behavioral Disorders programs and 15% from Pervasive Development Delays/Communication Handicaps programs did so.

Graduates/Aging Out Students

More than forty-seven percent (47.1%) of the graduates/aging out students were planning to pursue some form of postsecondary training (college or trade school), employment, or enrollment in the armed forces. More than thirty-nine percent (39.3%) were able to enter vocational rehabilitation or supported and sheltered employment. Thus, 86.4% of these students were able to engage in productive pursuits in the mainstream. Seven percent (7%) were able to enter productive programs, such as partial care and nonvocational day programs. Only 4.1% were not engaged in any further training or program. Only 2.7% were involved in other pursuits, such as volunteerism.

This study found that the majority of the graduates/aged out students (72.2%) were able to live in the community with their parents or a relative. More than 11% (11.3%) were able to live either independently or semi-independently.

When we examined the graduates/aged out students by specific program, we discovered that 60% of the known students from programs for Medical Disorders and almost 60% of the known students from programs for Emotional/Behavioral Disorders planned to enter college, trade school, competitive employment or the Armed Forces. When we compared the known students from programs for Pervasive Developmental Disorders/Communication Handicaps to a similar population

of students examined in a national study, we found that NAPSEC students, though less likely to plan to enter competitive employment, were more likely to be engaged in a wide variety of adult programs (supported and sheltered employment, vocational rehabilitation and non-vocational day programs) than NTSSD students. Moreover, in general, NAPSEC students were much more likely to be involved in community-based adult programs than the NTSSD students.

Dropouts

In contrast to the data from the National Longitudinal Transition Study (1993), students from the NAPSEC programs in this study had a dropout rate of 9.2% when compared to all enrolled High School students, both transfer students and graduates/aging out students, and that of 23.2% when compared to all NAPSEC graduates/aging out students. In discussing the issue of dropout rates for special education, the NLTS report indicates that 38% of special education students who remained in-district dropped out of school and that 30% who entered high school never finished. In fact, 8% dropped out before they even entered high school. The special education dropout rate for students who remained within their districts compares with a rate of 25% for students in the general population. More recently, in the Twenty-First Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (1999), it was pointed out that the dropout rate for all students with disabilities is approximately 33%. Moreover, for certain groups, such as students with emotional disorders, this rate can approach 50%. As the NLTS pointed out, some of the elements of school programs that make a difference in preventing dropouts include promoting social bonds with teachers and peers as well as providing appropriate course work and individual support services. These elements are integral to private special education.

APPENDIX A

The Participating Schools

NAPSEC Exit Survey 1999-2000

Total N= 270

Preliminary Study N=58

1. Alpine Learning Group, NJ
2. American School for the Deaf - CT
3. Anderson School – NY
4. Andrus/Orchard School –NY
5. Arrow Center – MD
6. Briarwood - TX
7. Boys' Village - CT
8. Brookfield - NJ
9. Catholic Children's Home, IL
10. CCS-Mt.Carmel
11. Child Development Center, NJ
12. Children's Center for Therapy and Learning, NJ
13. Community School of Family Connections, NJ
14. Cotting – MA
15. CP of Mon/Ocean-Schroth – NJ
16. CPC-High Point , NJ
17. Crotched Mountain - NH
18. Devereaux-Deer Haven, NJ
19. Dominion – VA
20. Dorothy B. Hersh, ARC of Monmouth - NJ
21. Dr. Gertrude Barber, PA
22. Durand Academy – NJ
23. East Mountain School – NJ
24. ECLC, NJ
25. Eden Institute – NJ
26. Elim Christian - IL
27. Frost – MD
28. Githens Center, NJ
29. Grafton – VA
30. Hannah More, MD
31. Harmony Hill School – RI
32. Heartspring – KS
33. High Road - NJ
34. Holden – MA
35. Illinois School for Autism, IL
36. JFK- You and Me, NJ
37. Jefferson School – MD
38. Joseph Academy - IL
39. Kellar School, VA
40. King's Daughters', TN
41. Kingsway Learning Center, NJ
42. Kohler – NJ
43. Lakeview, NJ
44. Laura Baker, MN
45. Lawrence Hall – IL
46. Leary – VA
47. Lighthouse , MA
48. Little Keswick, VA
49. Lord Stirling - NJ
50. Maplebrook, NY
51. Maryland School for the Blind – MD
52. Millcreek - MS
53. New York Institute for Special Education - NY
54. Oakmont, MD
55. Pathways, MD
56. Phillips, VA
57. Rivermont, VA
58. Rock Brook – NJ
59. Rugby – NJ
60. Siskin - TN
61. Spaulding-NH
62. St.Charles-NY
63. Stetson School
64. St. Elizabeth – MD
65. Timber Ridge - VA
66. West. Exceptional Children, NY
67. Willowglen, NJ
68. YCS, NJ

APPENDIX B

NAPSEC School Summary Form

NAPSEC SCHOOL SUMMARY FORM FOR JULY 1, _____ TO JUNE 30,
 (YEAR) (YEAR)

DIRECTIONS: Please complete a separate summary form to report totals for each dominant student classification category. Check **ONE DOMINANT** category below:

___ **Medical** – includes cerebral palsy, muscular dystrophy, visual impairments, hearing impairments, brain injuries, birth defects, spina bifida, etc.

___ **Pervasive Development Delays and Communication Handicaps** – includes autism and mental.

___ **Emotional and Behavioral Disorders** – includes anxiety, depression, thought disorders, mood disorders, severe disruptive behavior,, juvenile offenders.

School Name: _____ School Location by State: _____

Contact Person: _____ Phone Number _____

For exiting students, total number of students exiting by home state: _____

Total School Enrollment for Relevant Year: _____

Total Number of Students Who Exited: _____

Age range of students in our school is: _____

Age of students at time of exit (please indicate the total number of students for each age):

Younger than	6 years _____	11 years _____	16 years _____	21 years _____
3 years _____	7 years _____	12 years _____	17 years _____	22 years _____
3 years _____	8 years _____	13 years _____	18 years _____	Older than
4 years _____	9 years _____	14 years _____	19 years _____	22 years _____
5 years _____	10 years _____	15 years _____	20 years _____	

Total number of exiting: Males _____ Females _____

Race/Ethnicity (indicate total number): White _____ Black _____ Hispanic _____ Asian _____ Other _____

Total number eligible for Subsidized School Lunch Program (whether or not provided by your school): _____

Number of exits that were: Planned _____ Unplanned _____ Number of exits that were: **Positive*** _____ **Negative**** _____

***Positive** – School staff felt student had completed program or change was unplanned but still positive for student.

****Negative** – Student was asked to leave because he/she was disruptive to program, was not benefiting from program, or was removed prematurely by sending district.

For High School Graduates

A. Students went on to:

1. Postgraduate training. (**Identify type**):
 - _____ a) Four year college
 - _____ b) Two year college
 - _____ c) Trade or technical
 - _____ d) Other (specify) _____
- _____ 2. Competitive employment
- _____ 3. Armed forces
- _____ 4. Vocational rehabilitation program
- _____ 5. Supported employment
- _____ 6. Sheltered employment
- _____ 7. Adult partial care program
- _____ 8. Nonvocational day program
- _____ 9. Other (specify) _____
- _____ 10. No school, program, or employment
- _____ 11. Unknown

B. Graduates' Living Arrangements are:

- _____ 1. Independent living (living alone or with roommate)
- _____ 2. Semi-independent/supported living
- _____ 3. Living at home with parent(s)/other relatives/guardian
- _____ 4. Skill/foster home
- _____ 5. Group home
- _____ 6. Residential treatment center
- _____ 7. Development center
- _____ 8. Psychiatric hospital
- _____ 9. Correctional facility
- _____ 10. Other (specify) _____
- _____ 11. Unknown

C. _____ Total Number of Students who Dropped Out

For Transfer Students

D. The Students' Living Arrangements are:

- 1. Independent living (living alone or with roommate)
- 2. Semi-independent/supported living
- 3. Living at home with parent(s)/other relatives/guardian
- 4. Skill/foster home
- 5. Group home
- 6. Residential treatment center
- 7. Development center
- 8. Psychiatric hospital
- 9. Correctional facility
- 10. Other (specify) _____
- 11. Unknown

E. Students attended:

1. ___ Preschool

The new settings are:

- A. Regular education, not special education
- B. Regular placement in private or parochial school
- C. Regular education, vocational school
- D. Regular education, supported inclusion
- E. Resource room
- F. Alternate school
- G. Special education, self- contained placement in LEA
- H. Out-of-district special education
- I. Residential school
- J. Other (specify)
- K. Home instruction
- L. Unknown

2. ___ Elementary School

The new settings are:

- A. Regular education, not special education
- B. Regular placement in private or parochial school
- C. Regular education, vocational school
- D. Regular education, supported inclusion
- E. Resource room
- F. Alternate school
- G. Special education, self- contained placement in LEA
- H. Out-of-district special education
- I. Residential school
- J. Other (specify)
- K. Home instruction
- L. Unknown

3. ___ Middle/Junior High School

The new settings are:

- A. Regular education, not special education
- B. Regular placement in private or parochial school
- C. Regular education, vocational school
- D. Regular education, supported inclusion
- E. Resource room
- F. Alternate school
- G. Special education, self- contained placement in LEA
- H. Out-of-district special education
- I. Residential school
- J. Other (specify)
- K. Home instruction
- L. Unknown

4. ___ High School

The new settings are:

- A. Regular education, not special education
- B. Regular placement in private or parochial school
- C. Regular education, vocational school
- D. Regular education, supported inclusion
- E. Resource room
- F. Alternate school
- G. Special education, self- contained placement in LEA
- H. Out-of-district special education
- I. Residential school
- J. Other (specify)
- K. Home instruction
- L. Unknown

REFERENCES

- Johnson , D.R., McGrew, K. S., Bloomberg, L., Bruininks, R.H. , & Lin, H. C. (1997). Results of a national follow-up study of young adults with severe disabilities. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*. (8), 119-133.
- Laad, H. (1996). *Holding Schools Accountable: Performance-Based Reform in Education*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.
- U.S. Department of Education (1999). *Twenty-First Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office
- Price-Ellingstad, D. & Berry, H.B. (2000). Postsecondary Education, Vocational Rehabilitation and Students with Disabilities. *American Rehabilitation*, 25, 2-9.
- SRI International (1993). *The National Longitudinal Transition Study: A Summary of Findings*. Contract No. 300-87-0054. Washington, D.C.: Office of Special Education Programs, U.S. Department of Education.
- Wagner, M.M.; & Blackorby, J. (1996). Transition from High School to Work or College: How Special Education Students Fare. *Future of Children*, (6), 103-120.