

spotlight

No. 371 – March 24, 2009

DROPOUT PREVENTION GRANTS

Legislators need to rethink their approach to the dropout problem

KEY FACTS: • Only 14 of the 100 schools that received services from dropout prevention grant recipients had substantially lower dropout rates and higher graduation rates from the 2006-07 to the 2007-08 school year.

• Of the five types of recipients awarded grants, grants to non-profit organizations appeared to have the most success.

• Further empirical research is required to get a complete picture of the relationship, if any, between dropout prevention grants and dropout rates.

.....

d id dropout prevention grants work?

Because of research limitations, the politicians and advocates who claim that dropout prevention grants have worked cannot substantiate that claim. The problem is that they cannot establish a causal connection between the grant program and changes in the dropout rate.¹ While a number of grant recipient schools had lower dropout rates, there is no evidence that the grants themselves were the primary cause for the decline. Similarly, there is no evidence that the grants generated any increases in school dropout rates.

Indeed, correlation does not suggest causation. As one well-regarded research textbook points out, “Due to lack of randomization, manipulation, and other types of control characteristics of experimental studies, it is difficult to establish cause-effect relationships with any great degree of confidence.”² A number of other factors – existing districtwide initiatives, school policy changes, higher quality teachers and administrators, etc. – may have accounted for lower dropout rates among grant recipient schools. The burden of proof falls on the defenders of the dropout grant initiative, particularly the Democratic leadership of the North Carolina state legislature who claim that the millions of dollars spent on the programs have directly lowered dropout rates.

Rather than make an earnest attempt to evaluate the programs, defenders of the initiative complain that independent evaluations of the grant programs are invalid because “schools didn’t receive the money until halfway through the school year.”³ First, a number of these programs were already in existence

200 W. Morgan, #200
Raleigh, NC 27601
phone: 919-828-3876
fax: 919-821-5117
www.johnlocke.org

The John Locke Foundation is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit, nonpartisan research institute dedicated to improving public policy debate in North Carolina. Viewpoints expressed by authors do not necessarily reflect those of the staff or board of the Locke Foundation.

when they were awarded a grant, so there was no “up and running” period. More importantly, the fact remains that legislators expected grant recipients to demonstrate the effectiveness of their programs by the end of the 2008 calendar year (when their grant funding expires or is renewed).⁴ The legislation reestablishing the committee on dropout prevention says,

“SECTION 7.14.(e) Evaluation. – The Committee shall evaluate the impact of the dropout prevention grants awarded under S.L. 2007-323 and under this section. In evaluating the impact of the grants, the Committee shall consider ... the extent to which the program or initiative has improved students’ attendance, test scores, persistence, and graduation rates...”⁵

The mandatory progress report instructed grant recipients to provide a

[l]ist of names of schools where students are enrolled. Include the four-year cohort graduation rate for each school and LEA. If program/initiative is serving middle school students, include the four-year cohort graduation rate of their recipient high schools.”⁶

Indeed, one of the only ways that grantees could have demonstrated the effectiveness of their programs would have been to show that they raised graduation rates for the 2007-08 school year.

Furthermore, in my previous study of the dropout prevention grants, I discussed the pitfalls of funding a program for a year or two if one cannot adequately measure its effectiveness. In the conclusion of the report, I pointed out,

The results outlined in Tables 1–3 should not suggest that the grant programs directly lowered or raised graduation rates, but they do suggest a troublesome downward slide in district rates that the dropout grants were designed to stop. Further research will be required to get a complete picture of the relationship, if any, between dropout prevention grants and graduation rates.

There are two obstacles to that research effort. First, many of the dropout prevention grants will not register an immediate, quantifiable effect on a district or school graduation rate because the programs were designed to reach at-risk elementary and middle school students. More importantly, it will be difficult for grant recipients to establish direct, causal connections between the dropout prevention programs and district or school graduation rates. Programs should not receive additional funding and/or replication based on anecdotal evidence. Instead, grant recipients should be able to quantify their program’s ability to retain students and significantly increase the district or school graduation rate.⁷

One of the purposes of my previous study was to point out how unreasonable legislative expectations and claims were. In that study, I acknowledged how foolish it was for state legislators to expect grantees to demonstrate immediate results. Nevertheless, this and previous evaluations of the grants are simply compiling data required under state law and further mandated by the Department of Public Instruction and The Committee on Dropout Prevention.

Dropout Prevention Grants: Preliminary Results

Out of the 100 schools examined, 45 improved their dropout rates at a higher rate than their respective school districts. On the other hand, 55 schools failed to improve dropout rates relative to their districts. Of the 45 schools that improved their dropout rates relative to changes in their school district, only 14 also had higher graduation rates. Put simply, only 14 of the 100 schools that received services from dropout prevention grants had substantially lower dropout rates and higher graduation rates from the 2006-07 to the 2007-08 school year (see **Appendix**).

As a whole, the schools that received dropout prevention grant funds did not appear substantially to raise graduation rates or lower dropout rates compared with district and state averages. From the 2006-07 to the 2007-08 school year, the average graduation rate at grant recipient schools dropped from 73.1 percent to 71.5 percent, while the

statewide graduation rate increased 0.8 percent during the same period. The average dropout rate for grant recipient schools declined from 7.2 percent to 6.7 percent, consistent with the average district decline of 0.5 percent. At the same time, there was a 0.3 percent decrease in statewide dropout rate.

Dropout Prevention Grants by Type

Among the five types of recipients awarded grants, grants to non-profit organizations appeared to have the most success. There are two caveats to this observation. First, there were few dropout prevention grants awarded to schools, faith-based organizations, or colleges in the first round of grants, so the sample is too small to determine if these kinds of entities could have been successful in lowering the dropout rate. Second, as mentioned above, there is no evidence that the grants or the type of grants actually caused the dropout rate to change.

Table 1. Performance of Non-Profit Grant Recipients (minimum three schools)

<i>Grant Recipient</i>	<i>Schools</i>	<i>Avg. Dropout Rate Change (Schools)</i>	<i>Avg. Dropout Rate Change (Districts)</i>	<i>Schools Outperform Districts?</i>	<i>Non-Profit Grant Recipient Rank</i>
Futures for Kids	19	-1.1	-0.5	Yes	1
Cross Country for Youth	3	-1.0	-0.5	Yes	2
YWCA of Asheville & Western Carolina	7	-0.5	-0.4	Yes	3
Communities in Schools	5	0.0	0.4	Yes	4
Harriet Webster Task Force For Student Success	8	0.2	-0.4	No	5
Operation Homework	3	0.4	-0.1	No	6

Among the non-profit grantees, schools where Futures for Kids, Cross Country for Youth, and the YWCA of Asheville and Western Carolina had the highest improvement (decline) in their dropout rates (see Table 1). Communities in Schools did not lower schools' dropout rates, but unlike the districts where the school implemented the program, it did not raise the dropout rates either. Dropout prevention projects operated by the Harriet Webster Task Force For Student Success and Operation Homework may have allowed dropout rates to increase.

Table 2. Performance of School District Grant Recipients (minimum three schools)

<i>Grant Recipient</i>	<i>Schools</i>	<i>Avg. Dropout Rate Change (Schools)</i>	<i>Avg. Dropout Rate Change (Districts)</i>	<i>Schools Outperform Districts?</i>	<i>Non-Profit Grant Recipient Rank</i>
Harnett County Schools	4	-1.7	-1.4	Yes	1
Randolph County Schools	3	-0.7	-0.5	Yes	2
Cleveland County Schools	4	0.0	0.5	Yes	3
McDowell County Schools	3	-0.7	-1.0	No	4
Buncombe County Schools	3	-0.6	-0.9	No	5
Chatham County Schools	3	-0.4	-0.7	No	6
Pitt County Schools	5	-0.1	-0.5	No	7
Beaufort County Schools	3	0.0	-0.4	No	8
Burke County Public Schools	3	0.2	-1.4	No	9

Among schools and school districts, Harnett and Randolph counties had the greatest improvement in dropout

rates (see Table 2). Grant recipient schools in Cleveland County did not lower their dropout rates, but unlike the school district, they did not raise their dropout rates either. Grant recipient schools in McDowell, Buncombe, Chatham, and Pitt counties lowered their dropout rates, but the declines did not exceed the district rate decreases. Finally, grant recipient schools in Beaufort and Burke counties did not improve their dropout rates, even though dropout rates in both school districts declined.

Conclusion

To repeat the John Locke Foundation's September 2008 evaluation of the dropout prevention grants, the results outlined in this study above should not suggest that the grant programs directly lowered or raised dropout rates. Further empirical research will be required to get a complete picture of the relationship, if any, between dropout prevention grants and dropout rates.

There are two obstacles to that research effort. First, many of the dropout prevention grants will not register an immediate, quantifiable effect on a district or school dropout rate because the programs were designed to reach at-risk elementary and middle school students. More importantly, it will be difficult for grant recipients to establish direct, causal connections between the dropout prevention programs and district or school dropout rates. Programs should not receive additional funding and/or replication based on anecdotal evidence. Instead, grant recipients should be able to quantify their program's ability to retain students and significantly increase the district or school dropout rate.

Terry Stoops is the education policy analyst for the John Locke Foundation.

End Notes

1. This is a particular limitation of the Mandatory Progress Report for 2007 Dropout Prevention Grant Recipients, which simply asks grant recipients 1) to include the four-year cohort graduation rate for each school and LEA and 2) to complete a summary of goals and objectives, description of target audience of the program, and budget. None of this information will allow an evaluator to determine if the grant program actually caused or persuaded students served by the program to stay in school. See North Carolina General Assembly Committee on Dropout Prevention, "2008 Dropout Prevention Grant Requests for Additional Funds and MANDATORY Progress Report for 2007 Dropout Prevention Grant Recipients," September 15, 2008.
2. L.R. Gay, *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application*, 5th ed., New Jersey: Prentice Hall, p. 328.
3. For example, see Chris Fitzsimon, "Invest in families to keep kids in school," February 17, 2009, at www.ncpolicywatch.com/cms/2009/02/17/invest-in-families-to-keep-kids-in-school.
4. See North Carolina General Assembly Committee on Dropout Prevention, "2008 Dropout Prevention Grant Requests for Additional Funds and MANDATORY Progress Report for 2007 Dropout Prevention Grant Recipients," pp. 6, 8, and 10; see also page 17, which lists Session Law 2008-0107.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 17.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 8.
7. Terry Stoops, "Dropout Prevention Grants: An Update," John Locke Foundation *Spotlight* No. 358, September 16, 2008, p. 7, www.johnlocke.org/spotlights/display_story.html?id=209.
8. **Notes:** North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NC DPI), Program Monitoring and Support, "Dropout Report 2007-2008," February 2009; NC DPI, Program Monitoring and Support, "NC Schools 2007-2008 Dropout Events, Grades 1-12," February 2009; NC DPI, "Report to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee: Annual Report on Dropout Events and Rates, G.S. 115C-12(27)," February 2008; NC DPI, Raising Achievement and Closing Gaps, "2007 Funded in 2008," Excel spreadsheet, February 2009; NC DPI, Raising Achievement and Closing Gaps, "2007 Nonfunded Comprehensive Spreadsheet," Excel spreadsheet, February 2009; NC DPI, "Cohort Graduation Rate," ayp.ncpublicschools.org, accessed February 11, 2009; NC DPI, Financial and Business Services, Student Accounting, "Average Daily Membership and Membership," www.ncpublicschools.org/fbs/accounting/data, accessed February 11, 2009.

Limitations: This table does not include all schools serviced by the dropout prevention grants that were awarded in 2007 because the staff of the Raising Achievement and Closing Gaps program did not maintain a comprehensive list of them. The table includes schools served by 2007 applicants funded in 2008 and a handful of schools served by 2007 applicants that did not receive continuation funding. Omitted grant recipients include: Avery County Schools, Clay County Schools, Columbus County Schools, Communities in Schools of Cleveland County, The Housing Authority of the City of Winston-Salem, Gaston County Schools, The New Light at Risk Intergenerational Outreach, S.O.A.R. Academy, Communities in Schools of Charlotte-Mecklenburg, The Youth Resource Center of Moore County, Building Hope Community Life Center, The Link Crew, Polk County Schools, Futures for Kids of Wake County, and Centra de Accion Latino of Guilford County, and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Some of the omitted grant recipients did not serve a particular cohort of schools. In addition, the table does not include 38 elementary, middle, high, alternative, charter, and early college schools that did not record dropout events for two consecutive years (2006-07 and 2007-08).

Appendix. Performance of Schools Served by Dropout Prevention Grants⁸

<i>School</i>	<i>District</i>	<i>Grant Recipient</i>	<i>2006-07 Grad. Rate</i>	<i>2007-08 Grad. Rate</i>	<i>Grad. Rate Change</i>	<i>2006-07 Dropout Rate</i>	<i>2007-08 Dropout Rate</i>	<i>School Rate Change</i>	<i>District Rate Change</i>	<i>School Outperforms District?</i>	<i>Grant Renewed for 2008?</i>
Farmville Central HS	Pitt	Pitt County Schools	68	54.7	-13.3	5.6	10.8	5.2	-0.5	No	Yes
East Alps Academy	Burke	Burke County Public Schools	N/A	N/A	N/A	28.6	32.5	4	-1.4	No	Yes
Randolph Learning Center	Asheville City	YWCA of Asheville & Western Carolina	N/A	N/A	N/A	7.4	11.1	3.7	0.7	No	Yes
Phillips HS	Wake	Harriet B. Webster Task Force For Student Success	45	65.6	20.6	41.4	44.1	2.7	-0.4	No	Yes
North Edgecombe HS	Edgecombe	Futures for Kids	59.8	67	7.2	6.1	7.9	1.8	0.6	No	Yes
Central Wilkes HS	Wilkes	Communities in Schools of Wilkes	74	74.2	0.2	7.2	9	1.8	0.7	No	Yes
Southwest Edgecombe HS	Edgecombe	Futures for Kids	70.8	N/A	N/A	6.8	8.3	1.5	0.6	No	Yes
Orange County HS	Orange	Communities in Schools of Orange County	71.9	76.7	4.8	4.6	6.1	1.5	0.3	No	Yes
Dalton McMichael HS	Rockingham	Operation Homework	72.9	64.1	-8.8	4.7	6.2	1.5	0.4	No	Yes
Grimsley HS	Guilford	N.C. A&T State University	85.6	81.2	-4.4	2.3	3.7	1.4	0.3	No	Yes
Mitchell HS	Mitchell	Mitchell High School	70.9	61	-9.9	6.5	7.9	1.4	1.2	No	No
Hayesville HS	Clay	Clay County Schools	84.3	76.5	-7.8	2.6	3.9	1.3	1.3	No	No
Dudley HS	Guilford	N.C. A&T State University	83.7	74.9	-8.8	4.3	5.5	1.2	0.3	No	Yes
Asheville HS	Asheville City	YWCA of Asheville & Western Carolina	80	72.1	-7.9	4.5	5.6	1.1	0.7	No	Yes
Burns HS	Cleveland	Cleveland County Schools	75.8	68.1	-7.7	7.5	8.7	1.1	0.5	No	Yes
West Charlotte HS	Mecklenburg	Urban Restoration & First Baptist Church-WCS Assoc.	63.7	59.8	-3.9	12	13.1	1.1	-0.5	No	Yes
Anson HS	Anson	Anson County Schools	67.2	71.1	3.9	3.9	4.9	1	-0.6	No	Yes
Northside HS	Beaufort	Beaufort County Schools	71.5	76.9	5.4	4.5	5.4	0.9	-0.4	No	Yes
Jordan Matthews HS	Chatham	Chatham County Schools	75	77.8	2.8	5	5.8	0.9	-0.7	No	Yes
Athens Drive HS	Wake	Harriet B. Webster Task Force & Athens Drive HS	82.7	79	-3.7	5	5.9	0.9	-0.4	No	Yes
Trinity HS	Randolph	Randolph County Schools	82	78.8	-3.2	4.4	5.2	0.8	-0.5	No	Yes
Croatan HS	Carteret	Carteret County Public Schools	84.8	80.7	-4.1	3.3	4	0.7	-1.1	No	Yes
Middle Creek HS	Wake	Harriet B. Webster Task Force For Student Success	90.9	84.8	-6.1	4.9	5.6	0.7	-0.4	No	Yes
East Wake HS	Wake	Harriet B. Webster Task Force For Student Success	69.4	89.7	20.3	7.6	8.3	0.7	-0.4	No	Yes

<i>School</i>	<i>District</i>	<i>Grant Recipient</i>	<i>2006-07 Grad. Rate</i>	<i>2007-08 Grad. Rate</i>	<i>Grad. Rate Change</i>	<i>2006-07 Dropout Rate</i>	<i>2007-08 Dropout Rate</i>	<i>School Rate Change</i>	<i>District Rate Change</i>	<i>School Outperforms District?</i>	<i>Grant Renewed for 2008?</i>
Crest HS	Cleveland	Cleveland County Schools	70.4	72.3	1.9	5.4	6	0.6	0.5	No	Yes
Garner HS	Wake	Harriet B. Webster Task Force For Student Success	71.8	74.7	2.9	6.8	7.4	0.6	-0.4	No	Yes
Graham HS	Alamance	Alamance-Burlington School System	73	63.7	-9.3	10.4	10.9	0.5	0.3	No	Yes
New Hanover HS	New Hanover	DREAMS of Wilmington, & Futures for Kids	60.9	64.1	3.2	6.8	7.2	0.4	-0.5	No	Yes
South Stokes HS	Stokes	South Stokes High School	77.6	79.7	2.1	5.6	6.1	0.4	1	Yes	Yes
Anson MS	Anson	Anson County Schools	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.1	0.5	0.3	-0.6	No	Yes
Northeast HS	Guilford	Centro de Accion Latino	78.9	77.7	-1.2	4.9	4.4	-0.5	0.3	No	No
Northwest HS	Guilford	Operation Homework	96.1	92.7	-3.4	0.8	1	0.3	0.3	Yes	Yes
Tarboro HS	Edgecombe	Futures for Kids	62.4	60.8	-1.6	6.8	7	0.2	0.6	Yes	Yes
East Randolph HS	Randolph	Randolph County Schools	74.9	74.2	-0.7	6.7	6.9	0.2	-0.5	No	Yes
Buncombe Early College	Buncombe	Buncombe County Schools	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.6	3.7	0.1	-0.9	No	Yes
North Buncombe HS	Buncombe	YWCA of Asheville & Western Carolina	76.7	84.2	7.5	3.5	3.4	0	-0.9	No	Yes
Swain County HS	Swain	Swain County Schools	66.9	69.7	2.8	10.5	10.5	0	-0.8	No	Yes
Southside HS	Beaufort	Beaufort County Schools	69.7	68.1	-1.6	6.3	6.2	-0.1	-0.4	No	Yes
Kings Mountain HS	Cleveland	Cleveland County Schools	74	72	-2	7.3	7.2	-0.1	0.5	Yes	Yes
Durham School of the Arts	Durham	Futures for Kids	82.2	90.8	8.6	0.5	0.4	-0.1	-0.7	No	Yes
Northern Moore HS	Moore	Northern Moore Family Resource Center	81.8	81.1	-0.7	4.4	4.3	-0.1	0	Yes	Yes
East Chapel Hill HS	Chapel Hill	Communities in Schools of Orange County	91.7	89	-2.7	1.1	0.9	-0.2	0.4	Yes	Yes
Northwood HS	Chatham	Chatham County Schools	78.3	85.8	7.5	3.5	3.3	-0.2	-0.7	No	Yes
Hertford HS	Hertford	Futures for Kids	68.9	62.1	-6.8	3.3	3.1	-0.2	-0.2	Yes	Yes
West McDowell JH	McDowell	McDowell County Schools	N/A	N/A	N/A	1.2	1	-0.2	-1	No	Yes
West Mecklenburg HS	Mecklenburg	Urban Restoration & First Baptist Church-WCS Assoc.	62.6	58.8	-3.8	11.3	11.1	-0.2	-0.5	No	Yes
J.H. Rose HS	Pitt	Pitt County Schools	72.9	58.3	-14.6	7.7	7.5	-0.2	-0.5	No	Yes
Erwin MS	Buncombe	Buncombe County Schools	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.5	0.3	-0.3	-0.9	No	Yes
John A. Holmes HS	Chowan	Edenton-Chowan Schools	73.6	64.4	-9.2	4.8	4.4	-0.3	-0.5	No	Yes
Overhills HS	Harnett	Harnett County Schools	74.1	73.7	-0.4	7.2	6.8	-0.3	-1.4	No	Yes
Eugene Ashley HS	New Hanover	Futures for Kids	77.3	62.3	-15	6.4	6.1	-0.3	-0.5	No	Yes
Northeast HS	Pasquotank	Education Foundation for Elizabeth City-Pasquotank	70.3	71.2	0.9	2.9	2.6	-0.3	-0.9	No	Yes

<i>School</i>	<i>District</i>	<i>Grant Recipient</i>	<i>2006-07 Grad. Rate</i>	<i>2007-08 Grad. Rate</i>	<i>Grad. Rate Change</i>	<i>2006-07 Dropout Rate</i>	<i>2007-08 Dropout Rate</i>	<i>School Rate Change</i>	<i>District Rate Change</i>	<i>School Outperforms District?</i>	<i>Grant Renewed for 2008?</i>
Enloe HS	Wake	Harriet B. Webster Task Force For Student Success	88.1	86.3	-1.8	4	3.7	-0.3	-0.4	No	Yes
South Caldwell HS	Caldwell	Sovereign Alliance for Youth	74.7	72.4	-2.3	5.7	5.3	-0.4	0.3	Yes	No
Riverside HS	Durham	Futures for Kids	71.9	68.8	-3.1	4.4	4.1	-0.4	-0.7	No	Yes
East Forsyth HS	Forsyth	Operation Homework	80.3	78.6	-1.7	5.1	4.6	-0.4	-0.9	No	Yes
Ayden-Grifton HS	Pitt	Pitt County Schools	57.1	53.8	-3.3	5.2	8	2.8	-0.5	Yes	No
Lee County HS	Lee	Futures for Kids	64.5	73	8.5	6.4	5.9	-0.5	-0.9	No	Yes
C.E. Jordan HS	Durham	Futures for Kids	76.4	68.7	-7.7	3.1	2.5	-0.6	-0.7	No	Yes
Hillside HS	Durham	Futures for Kids	68.2	62.5	-5.7	6.5	6	-0.6	-0.7	No	Yes
Pender HS	Pender	Futures for Kids	63.7	65	1.3	3.9	3.3	-0.6	-0.9	No	Yes
Bishop Spaugh MS	Mecklenburg	Cross Country For Youth	N/A	N/A	N/A	1.3	0.6	-0.7	-0.5	Yes	Yes
John Hoggard HS	New Hanover	John Hoggard HS & Futures for Kids	86.7	80.9	-5.8	4.2	3.5	-0.7	-0.5	Yes	Yes
East McDowell JH	McDowell	McDowell County Schools	N/A	N/A	N/A	1.5	0.7	-0.8	-1	No	Yes
Emsley Laney HS	New Hanover	Futures for Kids	67.7	76.4	8.7	5.6	4.8	-0.8	-0.5	Yes	Yes
Cedar Ridge HS	Orange	Communities in Schools of Orange County	80.3	77.6	-2.7	4.7	3.9	-0.8	0.3	Yes	Yes
Washington HS	Beaufort	Beaufort County Schools	67	58.6	-8.4	6.7	5.8	-0.9	-0.4	Yes	Yes
Western Harnett HS	Harnett	Harnett County Schools	78.1	81.8	3.7	5	4.1	-0.9	-1.4	No	Yes
D.H. Conley HS	Pitt	Pitt County Schools	66.1	58.6	-7.5	6.4	5.6	-0.9	-0.5	Yes	Yes
Harnett Central HS	Harnett	Harnett County Schools	76.2	76.2	0	6.5	5.5	-1	-1.4	No	Yes
McDowell HS	McDowell	McDowell County Schools	72.3	74.9	2.6	9.6	8.5	-1	-1	Yes	Yes
Sedgefield MS	Mecklenburg	Cross Country For Youth	N/A	N/A	N/A	1.7	0.7	-1	-0.5	Yes	Yes
Northern HS	Durham	Futures for Kids	71.8	71.7	-0.1	6.5	5.4	-1.1	-0.7	Yes	Yes
Ranson MS	Mecklenburg	Cross Country For Youth	N/A	N/A	N/A	1.5	0.3	-1.1	-0.5	Yes	Yes
Topsail HS	Pender	Futures for Kids	90.1	81.5	-8.6	4.4	3.3	-1.2	-0.9	Yes	Yes
Shelby HS	Cleveland	Cleveland County Schools	74.4	71.4	-3	6.8	5.4	-1.4	0.5	Yes	Yes
East Burke HS	Burke	Burke County Public Schools	75.1	72	-3.1	4.4	2.8	-1.5	-1.4	Yes	Yes
Pasquotank City HS	Pasquotank	Education Foundation for Elizabeth City-Pasquotank	65.5	66.7	1.2	7.1	5.6	-1.5	-0.9	Yes	Yes
Clyde Erwin HS	Buncombe	YWCA of Asheville & Western Carolina	66.8	64.7	-2.1	9.5	7.9	-1.6	-0.9	Yes	Yes
Erwin HS	Buncombe	Buncombe County Schools	74.8	75.2	0.4	9.5	7.9	-1.6	-0.9	Yes	Yes
Charles Owen HS	Buncombe	YWCA of Asheville & Western Carolina	73.2	77.4	4.2	6.1	4.5	-1.7	-0.9	Yes	Yes
Carver HS	Forsyth	YWCA of Winston-Salem & Operation Homework	73.2	67.9	-5.3	9.9	8.2	-1.7	-0.9	Yes	Yes

<i>School</i>	<i>District</i>	<i>Grant Recipient</i>	<i>2006-07 Grad. Rate</i>	<i>2007-08 Grad. Rate</i>	<i>Grad. Rate Change</i>	<i>2006-07 Dropout Rate</i>	<i>2007-08 Dropout Rate</i>	<i>School Rate Change</i>	<i>District Rate Change</i>	<i>School Outperforms District?</i>	<i>Grant Renewed for 2008?</i>
Broughton HS	Wake	Harriet B. Webster Task Force For Student Success	85.8	77.7	-8.1	5	3.3	-1.7	-0.4	Yes	Yes
Enka HS	Buncombe	YWCA of Asheville & Western Carolina	74.8	75.2	0.4	6.5	4.8	-1.8	-0.9	Yes	Yes
Freedom HS	Burke	Burke County Public Schools	72.8	77.3	4.5	6.1	4.4	-1.8	-1.4	Yes	Yes
Heide Trask HS	Pender	Futures for Kids	68.5	59.8	-8.7	8.2	6.4	-1.8	-0.9	Yes	Yes
Chatham Central HS	Chatham	Chatham County Schools	78.3	80.2	1.9	4.5	2.7	-1.9	-0.7	Yes	Yes
Sanderson HS	Wake	Harriet B. Webster Task Force For Student Success	76.1	77.5	1.4	7.4	5.5	-1.9	-0.4	Yes	Yes
West Carteret HS	Carteret	Carteret County Public Schools	76.7	73	-3.7	6.4	4.4	-2	-1.1	Yes	Yes
North Pitt HS	Pitt	Pitt County Schools	55.1	43.5	-11.6	11.7	9.6	-2	-0.5	Yes	Yes
Central HS	Guilford	Communities in Schools of High Point	77.6	77.3	-0.3	66	63.8	-2.1	0.3	Yes	Yes
Southern HS	Durham	Durham Public Schools & Futures for Kids	58.8	61.5	2.7	8.6	6.3	-2.3	-0.7	Yes	Yes
South Central HS	Pitt	Pitt County Schools	61.4	51.3	-10.1	8.1	5.5	-2.6	-0.5	Yes	Yes
Hoke County HS	Hoke	Hoke County Schools	66.2	70.7	4.5	8.3	5.6	-2.7	-2.5	Yes	Yes
Buncombe Comm. East	Buncombe	YWCA of Asheville & Western Carolina	N/A	N/A	N/A	36.7	33.8	-2.9	-0.9	Yes	Yes
Randleman HS	Randolph	Randolph County Schools	62.8	64.7	1.9	12.5	9.4	-3.1	-0.5	Yes	Yes
Richmond Senior HS	Richmond	Futures for Kids	76	72.6	-3.4	10.2	6.6	-3.6	-2.3	Yes	Yes
Triton HS	Harnett	Harnett County Schools	78.7	71.2	-7.5	8.8	4.3	-4.6	-1.4	Yes	Yes
Robbinsville HS	Graham	Graham County Schools	71.3	62.4	-8.9	9.2	4	-5.1	-4.3	Yes	Yes
Edgecombe Early College	Edgecombe	Futures for Kids	46.2	46.7	0.5	9.6	0.8	-8.8	0.6	Yes	Yes
AVERAGES			73.1	71.5	-1.7	7.2	6.7	-0.4	-0.5		