

**Outcomes of Approved Special Education
Programs in the Private Sector**

Plans for Exiting Students: 2016-2017

**Report Number 16
NAPSEC Outcomes Project**

May, 2018



National Association of Private Special Education Centers
601 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Suite 900 - South Building
Washington, DC 20004
202.434.8225 Phone 202.434.8224 Fax
E-mail: napsec@napsec.org Web Site: www.napsec.org

NAPSEC Board of Directors

President: Tom Dempsey
South Campus
Palatine, IL

Conference Planning Chair: Cheryl Marvin
ACCEL
Phoenix, AZ

Past President: Dr. Dorothy Van Horn
Brookfield Schools
Cherry Hill, NJ

At Large: Dr. Brian Brown
Brehm Preparatory School
Carbondale, IL

Vice President: Dr. Thomas McCool
Charis Youth Center
Grassvalley, CA

At Large: Marie Ficano
Alternatives for Children
East Setauket, NY

Treasurer: Tom Celli
Chapel Hill Academy
Montville, NJ

At Large: Alan Clark
Trousdale School
Cleveland, TN

Secretary: Jennifer McGlothlin-Renault
Arrow Center for Education
Bel Air MD

At Large: Ray Damm
ACCEL
Phoenix, AZ

Public Policy Chair: Chris Tabakin
Springtime School
Newtown, PA

At Large: Rachel Tait
Eden Autism Services
Princeton, NJ

CASA Chair: Dorie Flynn
MANSEF
Towson, MD

NCASES Chair Ex-Officio: Dr. Steven Girelli
Klingberg Comprehensive Program Services
New Britain, CT

Membership Chair: Dr. Robin Church
Kennedy Krieger School
Baltimore, MD

Executive Director & CEO: Sherry Kolbe
Washington, DC

Executive Summary

Over the course of the past 18 years, NAPSEC, the National Association of Private Special Education Centers, an organization of 211 approved private special education centers, has sponsored 16 outcomes studies to report the discharge plans of the students with severe disabilities who were enrolled in the nonpublic special education programs operated by its members. NAPSEC has undertaken this task because other studies examining the outcomes for students receiving special education services have focused on students with less severe disabilities who could successfully access appropriate programs within the public schools. In contrast, the inquiries sponsored by NAPSEC have focused on the outcomes for students with the most severe disabilities. This group of students within special education is enrolled in the nonpublic programs offered by NAPSEC members because these programs offer the highly individualized, intensive, and specialized services that are legally mandated by the IEP and are not available within the public school.

Each student in this study has an Individual Education Program (IEP) which was developed by the public school district and the student's family. The IEP comprehensively describes the intensive therapeutic services and curriculum modifications each student requires to succeed. By offering the specialized programs prescribed in the IEP to students with the most severe disabilities, NAPSEC-member facilities partner with the local public school district and the child's family to implement the IEP. NAPSEC-member facilities, therefore, play a critical role along the continuum of alternative placements in special education. Because of the programs offered by NAPSEC members, students with severe disabilities gain access to the benefits of an education experience that is tailored to their needs so that they can ultimately look forward to leading meaningful and productive lives within their communities.

Below are the highlights of the discharge plans made by students who exited from NAPSEC-member programs during the 2016-17 school year. The exiting students were either transfer students (those of school-age who moved to another educational setting, graduates (those who received a secondary school diploma or certificate of completion), or aged-out students (those who reached the legal age-limit for receiving educational services).

Transfer Students

Study findings for the 2,417 students who transferred during the 2016-17 school year indicate that the intensive, therapeutic, IEP-prescribed services offered by NAPSEC-member programs successfully assisted these students to develop, remediate, and/or strengthen their skills. The majority of the transfer students were able to plan to enroll in an appropriate program within the local public school district after leaving the NAPSEC-member facility:

- 61% (1,478) planned to enter or return to an educational program within the local public school district.
- 26% (635) planned to enter or re-enter regular education settings in their local public school district. Of these, 11% (267) planned to do so without supports, while 15% (368) made plans to enter the regular education setting with IEP-prescribed supports.

- 35% (843) planned to enter other educational settings within the local district, such as an alternate school program (6%) or a self-contained classroom (29%).
- Another 39% (939) planned to move to settings outside the local district. These included plans for 27% (642) to enroll in an out-of-district special education day school programs; 5% (130) to enter a residential school; 3% (77) to receive home instruction; and 4% (90) to make other plans, such as discharge to a juvenile justice, drug, medical, or psychiatric treatment facility.
- 94% (2,259) were enrolled in a NAPSEC-member program for 5 years or less and left the nonpublic special education program with plans to enter or return to a program within the local public school (61%).
- Over 5 years, on average, 59 % of the transfer students planned to enroll in programs within their local public school district. While 23% had plans to enroll in-district in regular education programs, 36% planned to enter or reenter “other” in-district programs, such as alternate schools or self-contained LEA programs

Graduates/Aged-Out Students

Findings for 1,037 students who graduated or aged-out during the 2016-17 school year indicate that programs operated by members of NAPSEC provided the IEP-prescribed educational instruction and support for enrolled older adolescents and young adults with severe disabilities as they made the transition to adulthood with plans to pursue productive and meaningful roles in their communities:

- 88% (911) left a NAPSEC-member program with plans to enter productive and engaged adult roles.
- 41% (423) planned to enter a mainstream activity. This included 28% (280) with plans to enroll in post-secondary 4-year/2-year college or trade/technical school; and 13% (133) with plans to join the competitive employment workforce or enter military service.
- 28% (293) had plans to enter vocational rehabilitation, including vocational rehabilitation training ((10%), supported employment ((8%) or sheltered employment (10%).
- 19% (195) made plans to enter an appropriate adult program in the community, including adult partial care (5%) or nonvocational day programs (14%).
- The graduates/aged-out students from Learning Disorders programs (78%) and Emotional/Behavioral Disorders programs (56%) were the most likely to make plans to enroll in postsecondary education, obtain a competitive job, or enlist in military service.
- It is important to highlight that more than half of the graduates/aged-out students from programs for those with Emotional/Behavioral Disorders (56%), a population often associated with poor outcomes, had plans to enroll in a 4-year college/2-year college (24%), trade/technical school (over 4%), or to enter the job market or serve in the military (13%).
- Over 5 years, on average, 89% (859) of the graduates/aged-out students with serious disabilities had plans to be engaged in their communities after leaving secondary school. Over 5 years, on average, 46 % (447) had plans to pursue postsecondary education, competitive employment, or military service; 25% (238) planned to pursue vocational rehabilitation; and 18% (174) had plans to enter community-based programs.

Introduction

NAPSEC (National Association of Private Special Education Centers), an organization of 211 approved private special education centers has, from 2000-2004, and again from 2007 until the present, sponsored an annual outcomes study of the discharge plans of the students who attend the nonpublic special education programs operated by its members, often those with the most severe disabilities among students with special education needs. Other investigations of the outcomes for students from special education, such as the National Longitudinal Transition studies (1993, 2004, 2010, 2011), have not examined results for the students with the most severe disabilities, who are placed by public schools districts and families in NAPSEC-member programs because their needs cannot be met within the local public school district. The public school district, in fact, has developed the Individual Education Program (IEP) to fully describe the intensive therapeutic services and curriculum modifications the student requires to succeed while attending the specialized program offered in the nonpublic school. NAPSEC- member programs, therefore, function as partners with the local public school district in implementing the IEP to assure that students with severe disabilities obtain the highly specialized services they require.

Overall, the outcome studies done under NAPSEC's auspices have revealed that approximately 50% or more of the transfer students exited with a discharge plan to enter or return to the local public school. Moreover, upon entering or reentering the public school, 20% or more have plans to enroll in regular education programs, with or without supports. These previous investigations have also revealed that about 90% of the graduate/aged-out students leave a NAPSEC-member school with discharge plans which point to some degree of engagement in their communities. Furthermore, a high proportion (between 40% and 50%) of this group of students, including those with emotional and behavioral disorders who are often characterized by poor outcomes as adults, leave school with discharge plans that indicate entry into postsecondary education, competitive employment, or military service, i.e., mainstream adult roles.

This report, Number 16, continues efforts to explore the plans made by students exiting a NAPSEC-member special education program during the 2016-2017 school year. The discharge plans for transfer students are categorized by disability group as well as by identifying the educational settings in which these younger students planned to transfer after leaving the NAPSEC-member program. The discharge plans for the graduates/aged-out students are categorized by disability group as well as by the adult settings which they planned to enter after leaving the NAPSEC-member secondary school program.

Method

Each NAPSEC-member school that volunteered to participate in this study was asked to submit discharge information about each student who exited a program over the course of the 2016-2017 academic year. Exiting students were defined as transfer students, students of school age who left the NAPSEC-member program to move on to another educational program, and graduates/aged-out students, those who left a NAPSEC-member school because he/she received a high school diploma, a certificate of completion, and/or aged out due to reaching the legal age limit for receiving

public educational services. In addition, demographic and programmatic information was collected on the number of students who dropped out of school during the course of the study as well as students who left without making a plan or revealing plans to school staff.

Each participating school was given a definition of 5 specific types of special educational programs offered by NAPSEC-member schools and was asked to place each exiting student into 1 of these 5 specific types. Instructions stated that only one category was to be used for each student. The programs were defined as follows: 1) Preschool Disorders Programs – for students with any disorder identified at the preschool stage; 2) Developmental Disorders Programs– for students with speech/language impairments, intellectual disability, autism, developmental delays; 3) Emotional/Behavioral Disorders Programs – for students with emotional and behavioral disturbances; 4) Medical Disorders Programs – for students with other health impairments, hearing impairments, visual impairments, orthopedic impairments, deaf-blindness, and traumatic brain injury; and 5) Learning Disorders Programs – for students with specific learning disabilities. The responses were collected from each participating school and entered in a database for analysis.

Demographics: Programs and Students

During the 2016-17 school year, 49% of NAPSEC's membership (103 schools), volunteered to participate in the study. These schools offered 227 specialized education programs; 180 (79%) of these programs offered services to day students, 7 (3%) to residential students, and 40 (18%) to both day and residential students. While 66 (29%) of these programs served students with Development Disorders, 53 (23%) delivered supportive and educational services to students with Emotional/Behavioral Disorders, 43 (19%) to students with Medical Disorders, 37 (16%) to students with Learning Disorders, and 28 (12%) to students with Preschool Disorders. Taken together, 13,017 students were enrolled in the participating member schools during the 2016-17 school year. Of these, 9,191 (71%) were male and 3,826 (29%) were female.

The participating schools were located in 14 states and 7 of the 10 federal education regions. Nearly 74% were from the Mid-Atlantic region (Maryland, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania), which contained 76 participating schools. More than 11% came from the Northeast region (Connecticut, Massachusetts, and New York) with 12 schools represented. The North Central region (Illinois and Ohio) with 5 schools accounted for about 5 %, the Appalachia (Tennessee and Virginia) and WestEd regions (Arizona and California), were each represented by 4 schools and together accounted for about 8% of the distribution. Finally, the Southwest (Texas) and Mid-Continent (North Dakota) regions, with 1 school each, represented about 2% of the distribution.

Table 1. Participating Schools by Federal Educational Regions/States

Federal Regions/Participating States	N=103	#	%
<u>Northeast:</u> ¹			
Connecticut, Massachusetts, New York		12	11.6
<u>MidAtlantic:</u> ²		76	73.8
Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania			
<u>Appalachia:</u> ³		4	3.9
Tennessee, Virginia			
<u>North Central</u> ^{4,5}		5	4.8
Illinois, Ohio			
<u>Southwest</u> ⁶		1	1.0
Texas			
<u>Mid-Continent:</u> ⁷		1	1.0
North Dakota			
<u>WestEd:</u> ^{8, 9, 10}		4	3.9
Arizona, California			
<u>Total</u>		103	100.0

1 In Northeast Region, no participants from Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands.

2 In MidAtlantic Region, no participants from Delaware, Washington, D.C.

3 In Appalachia Region, no participants from Kentucky, West Virginia.

4 No participants from Southeast Region (Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina).

5 In North Central Region, no participants from Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin

6 In Southwest Region, no participants from Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma.

7 In Mid-Continent Region, no participants from Colorado, Missouri, Nebraska, South Dakota, Wyoming.

8 In WestEd Region, no participants from Nevada, Utah.

9 No participants from Northwest Region (Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington).

10 No participants from Pacific Region (American Samoa, Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Hawaii, Republic of the Marshall Islands Republic of Palau.

Exiting Students

During the study period, 3,971 students exited from a NAPSEC-member school (See Table 2). Discharge planning information was available for 3,454 (87%) of the exiting students, 2,417 transfer students (61%) and 1,037 graduates/aged-out students (26%). Discharge planning information was not available for 517 exiting students (13%), those students who left school without making their plans known (389 students)¹ and those who reportedly dropped out of school (128 students).²

When all exiting students are examined, those with and without discharge plans, it is clear that these students tend to be White (51%), male (71%), high school students (43%), who were enrolled in day programs (54%) from 1-5 years (62%) for students with Emotional/Behavioral Disorders (39%). About 29% of the exiting students participated in the federally-sponsored subsidized lunch program. Moreover, 87% of the exiting students had made plans at discharge which staff viewed as “positive” for 72% of the students. In short, in the judgment of the staff who worked with these students, 72% were prepared to move to the settings indicated in the discharge plan.

Table 2. Relevant Information for Exiting Students with and without Discharge Plans

n=3,971

<u>Program Classification</u>	#	%
Emotional/Behavioral Disorders	1,562	39.3
Developmental Disorders	912	23.0
Preschool Disorders	855	21.5
Medical Disorders	434	11.0
Learning Disorders	208	5.2
<u>Program Type</u>		
Day	2,150	54.1
Residential	584	14.7
Day & Residential	1,237	31.2
<u>Reason for Exit</u>		

¹ Of the 389 students whose plans were not available, 303 (78%) were transfer students and 86 (22%) were graduate/aged-out students; 258 (68%) were male, 131 (34%) were female; 48% (187) came from Emotional/Behavioral Disorders programs, 22% (86) from Developmental Disorders programs, 16% (62) from Preschool Disorders programs, 9% (36) from Medical Disorders programs, and 5% (18) from Learning Disorders programs. When race/ethnicity was examined, 171 (44%) were White, 135 (35%) were Black, 72 (18%) were Hispanic, and 11(3%) were Asian.

² Of the 1281 students who dropped out, 98 (77%) were male and 30 (23%) were female; 69% (89) came from Emotional/Behavioral Disorders programs, 18% (23) from Medical Disorders programs, 10% (12) from Developmental Disorders programs, and 3% (4) from Learning Disorders programs. When race/ethnicity was examined, 58 (45%) were White, 40 (31%) were Black, 26 (20%) were Hispanic, 3 (2%) were Asian, and 1 (1%) American Indian/Alaskan Native.

Transfer Students	2,417	60.9
Graduates/Aged-Out Students	1,037	26.1
Not Available: No Plans	389	9.8
Not Available: Drop Outs	128	3.2
<u>Grade Level</u>		
Preschool	804	20.2
Elementary School	333	8.4
Middle School	1,137	28.6
High School	1,697	42.7
<u>Race/Ethnicity</u>		
White	2,033	51.2
Black	1,178	29.7
Hispanic	593	14.9
Asian	160	4.0
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander- American Indian/Alaskan Native	7	.2

<u>Table 2 (continued)</u>		
<u>Gender</u>		
Male	2,803	70.6
Female	1,168	29.4
<u>Age at Exit</u>		
3-5 years	799	20.1
6-11 years	253	6.4
12-17 years	1,759	44.3
18-21+ years	643	16.2
Not Available	517	13.0
<u>Length of Stay</u>		
< 1 year	470	11.8
1-5 years	2,443	61.5
6-10 years	353	9.0
11+ years	188	4.7
Not Available	517	13.0
<u>Subsidized Lunch</u>		
Yes	1,148	28.9
No	2,306	58.1
Not Available	517	13.0
<u>Status of Planning Information</u>		
Available in Records	3,454	87.0
Not Available	517	13.0
<u>Staff Assessment of Exit</u>		
Planned		
Yes	2,756	69.4
No	1,215	30.6
Positive		
Yes	2,846	71.7
No	1,125	28.3

The Transfer Students with Plans at Discharge
Demographic and Other Relevant Information

During the 2016-2017 school year, 2,417 students transferred from a participating school with a discharge plan. Table 3 sets forth the demographic and other relevant data about this group of students.

Table 3. Relevant Information of Transfer Students with Plans at Discharge

n=2,417

<u>Program Classification</u>	#	%
Emotional/Behavioral Disorders	857	35.4
Preschool Disorders	793	32.8
Developmental Disorders	439	18.2
Medical Disorders	254	10.5
Learning Disorders	74	3.1
<u>Program Type</u>		
Day	1,026	42.4
Residential	539	22.3
Day & Residential	852	35.3
<u>Grade Level</u>		
Preschool	799	33.1
Elementary School	253	10.5
Middle School	373	15.4
High School	992	41.0
<u>Race/Ethnicity</u>		
White	1,230	50.9
Black	735	30.4
Hispanic	396	16.4
Asian	52	2.1
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander- American Indian/Alaskan Native	4	.2
<u>Gender</u>		
Male	1,720	71.2
Female	697	28.8

Table 3 (cont'd)		
<u>Age at Exit</u>		
3-5 years	799	33.1
6-11 years	253	10.5
12-17 years	1,105	45.7
18-21+ years	260	10.7
<u>Length of Stay</u>		
< 1 year	401	16.6
1-5 years	1,858	76.9
6-10 years	150	6.2
11+ years	8	.3

As Table 3 indicates, there were 2,417 transfer students who exited a NAPSEC-member program with a discharge plan. Of these, , about 35% (857) came from Emotional/ Behavioral Disorders programs; 33% (793) from Preschool Disorders programs; 18% (439) from Developmental Disorders programs; 11% (254) from Medical Disorders programs; and 3% (74) from Learning Disorders programs. While 1,026 (42%) were enrolled in day programs, 852 students (35%) attended programs for both day and residential students, and 539 students (22%) attended residential programs. When grade level was examined, 799 students (33%) attended Preschool; 253 (11%) were Elementary School students; 373 (15%) were in Middle School; and 992 (41%) were High School students. When race/ethnicity was examined, 1,230 students (51%) were White, 735 (30%) were Black, 396 (16%) were Hispanic, 52 (2%) were Asian, and the remaining 4 students (<1%) were American Indian/Alaskan Native and Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander.

When gender was analyzed, 1,720 (71%) were male, while 697 (29%) were female. About 33% (799) were between the ages of 3-5 years; 11% (253) were between the ages of 6-11 years; 46% (1,105) were between the ages of 12-17 years; and 11% (260) were between the ages of 18-21 years. Close to 17% (401) were enrolled in a NAPSEC-member program for less than 1 year; about 77% (1,858) for 1 to 5 years; 6% (150) for 6 to 10 years; and <1% (8) for 11 years or more.. When the categories of “less than 1 year” and “1-5 years” are combined, it is clear that 94% (2,259) of the transfer students were enrolled in a NAPSEC-member program for 5 years or less before developing a discharge plan to transfer to a different educational program.

Discharge Plans of Transfer Students by Specialized Program Category

Table 4 displays the discharge plans of the 2,417 transfer students by the educational category of the program in which they were enrolled before they left the NAPSEC-member facility.

Table 4. Educational Plans for Transfer Students by Specialized Program
N= 2,417

Education Setting	Preschool n=793		E/BD n=857		DD n=439		Medical n=254		Learning n=74		Total n=2,417	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Regular Education, Not Special Education	162	20.4	73	8.5	12	2.7	13	5.1	7	9.5	267	11.1
Regular Education with Supports	227	28.6	66	7.7	35	8.0	33	13.0	7	9.5	368	15.2
Subtotal: Returns to Regular Education	389	49.0	139	16.2	47	10.7	46	18.1	14	19.0	635	26.3
Alternate School	0	0	115	13.4	13	3.0	11	4.3	7	9.5	146	6.0
Special Education, Self-Contained LEA	316	39.9	202	23.6	149	33.9	24	9.5	6	8.1	697	28.8
Subtotal: Returns to Other In-District Education	316	39.9	317	37.0	162	36.9	35	13.8	13	17.6	843	34.8
Out- of- District Special Education Day Program	86	10.8	214	25.0	181	41.2	125	49.2	36	48.6	642	26.6
Residential School	0	0	84	9.8	23	5.2	20	7.9	3	4.0	130	5.4
Home Instruction	0	0	43	5.0	13	3.0	16	6.3	5	6.8	77	3.2
Other	2	.3	60	7.0	13	3.0	12	4.7	3	4.0	90	3.7
Total	793	100	857	100	439	100	254	100	74	100	2,417	100

Results for Transfer Student Educational Plans

According to Table 4, about 61% of the transfer students (1,478) left a NAPSEC-member facility with plans to enter an educational program within the local public school district. Of these, 26% (635) had plans to return to regular education programs (11% to regular education without IEP-prescribed special education services/supports; 15% to regular education with IEP-prescribed services/supports). Moreover, nearly 35% (843) planned to return to other programs available within the public school district (about 6% to alternate school and 29% to self-contained classrooms).

Transfer students who were enrolled in programs serving students with Preschool Disorders (49%) were the most likely to leave with a discharge plan to enter regular education. Those from Learning Disorders (19%), Medical Disorders (18%), Emotional/Behavioral Disorders (16%), and Developmental Disorders (11%) programs reported lower rates of making plans to enroll in regular education programs. When plans to enter other in-district educational programs were examined by disability category, the following emerged. About 40% of the students from Preschool Disorders programs, 37% from Developmental Disorder programs, 37% from Emotional/Behavioral programs, 18% from Learning Disorders programs, and 14% from Learning Disorders programs left a NAPSEC-member facility with plans to enter an educational program within the local public school district that was not considered a regular education program.

When all plans to return to in-district programs are examined, 61% (1,478) of the transfer students planned to enter programs within the local school district. Of these, 89% (705) from Preschool Disorders programs, 53% (456) from Emotional/Behavioral Disorders programs, 51% (209) from Developmental Disorders programs, 37% (27) from Learning Disorders programs, and 32% (81) from Medical Disorders programs reported making discharge plans to enroll in educational programs within the local public school district. The plans of the remaining 39% (939) of the transfer students involved moving to settings outside the local district. These included plans for 27% (642) to enter an out-of-district special education day school; 6% (130) to enter a residential school; 3% (77) to receive home instruction; and 4% (90) to make other discharge plans, including entering drug treatment, medical and psychiatric facilities, or the juvenile corrections system.

Return to In-District Education: School Years 2012-13 to 2016-17

Table 5 provides an overview of the discharge plans which indicated a return to an in-district program for transfer students who exited during the 2012-13 through 2016-17 school years.

Table 5 Transfer Student Return to In-District Education: School Years 2012-13 to 2016-17

School Year All Exiters % Members	In-District Regular Education ^a		Other In-District Education ^b		Total In-District Education		Outside District Education ^c	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2012-13 n=1,725 (35% participation)	297	17	614	36	911	53	814	47
2013-14 n=1,817 (35% participation)	343	19	653	36	996	55	821	45
2014-15 n=2,202 (39% participation)	643	29	704	32	1,347	61	855	39
2015-16 n=2,570 (49% participation)	601	24	984	38	1,585	62	985	38
2016-17 n=2,417 (49% participation)	635	26	843	35	1,478	61	939	39

^a Regular education, including with supports

^b Resource room, alternate school, self-contained LEA

^c Out-of-district special education day school, residential school, home instruction, other placement (e.g., correctional, psychiatric, medical, or developmental facility)

When results for the 2016-17 school year are compared to the 4 previous academic years (i.e., 2012-13, 2013-14, 2014-15, and 2015-16), the trend that began in 2014-15, which pointed to an increase in

students exiting with plans to return to in-district programs, appears to hold steady at 61%. Moreover, a slight increase is from 24% to 26% is noted from 2015-16 to 2016-17 in the number of students who made plans to enter regular education programs.

Table 6. 5-Year Average Return to In-District Education:
2012-2013 through 2016-2017

	In-District Regular Education ^a		Other In-District Education ^b		Total In-District Education		Outside District Education ^c	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2012-13 to 2016-17 (5 Year Average n= 2,146)	504	23	759	36	1,263	59	883	41

a Regular education, including supported inclusion

b Resource room, alternate school, self-contained LEA

c Out-of-district special education day program, residential program, home instruction, other placement (e.g., correctional, psychiatric, medical, or developmental facility)

On average, for the 5 academic years 2012-13 through 2016-17, 59 % of the transfer students planned to enroll in programs within their local public school district. Of these, 23% had plans to enroll in regular education programs within the district, while 36% planned to enter “other” in-district programs, such as alternate schools or self-contained programs within the district. The remaining 41% made plans to enter programs outside of the district.

Transfer Students: Living Arrangements

When the plans for living arrangements were examined, 83% of the students (2,055) reported that they planned to continue to live with their parents or legal guardians. Less than 1% (20 students) planned to live independently (7 students) or semi-independently (13 students). Close to 6% (144 students) made plans to live in a skill development/ foster home (34 students) or group home (110 students). Another 5% (129 students) planned to enter residential treatment. About 2% (54 students) were discharged with plans enter a developmental (1 student), psychiatric (14 students), or medical (39 students) facility. The plans of 2% (47 students) indicated discharge to the juvenile justice system. Finally, less than 1% (18 students) had plans to enter another situation, such as a drug treatment facility.

The Graduates/Aged-Out Students
Demographic and Other Relevant Information

During the 2016-2017 school year, 1,037 graduates/aged-out students exited from a NAPSEC-member program with a discharge plan. Table 7 sets forth the demographic and other relevant data about this group of students.

Table 7. Demographic and Other Relevant Information of Graduates/Aged-Out Students with Plans at Discharge

n=1,037

<u>Program Classification</u>	#	%
Emotional/Behavioral Disorders	429	41.4
Developmental Disorders	375	36.1
Medical Disorders	121	11.7
Learning Disorders	112	10.8
<u>Program Type</u>		
Day	788	76.0
Residential	45	4.3
Day & Residential	204	19.7
<u>Race/Ethnicity</u>		
White	574	55.4
Black	268	25.8
Hispanic	159	15.3
Asian	34	3.3
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander- American Indian/Alaskan Native	2	.2
<u>Gender</u>		
Male	727	70.1
Female	310	29.9
<u>Age at Exit</u>		
12-17 years	654	63.1
18-21+ years	383	36.9
Table 7 (cont'd)		
<u>Length of Stay</u>		

< 1 year	69	6.7
1-5 years	585	56.4
6-10 years	203	19.6
11+ years	180	17.3

As Table 7 indicates, of the 1,037 graduates/aged-out students who exited with a plan, 41% (429) from Emotional/ Behavioral Disorders programs; 36% (375) came from Developmental Disorders programs; nearly 12% (121) from Medical Disorders programs; and close to 11% (112) from Learning Disorders programs. While 788 (76%) were enrolled in day programs, 204 (close to 20%) attended programs that served both day and residential students, and 45 (about 4%) attended programs that were exclusively residential. When race/ethnicity was examined, 574 (55%) were White, 268 (26%) were Black, 159 (15%) were Hispanic, 34 (3%) were Asian, and the remaining 2 students (less than 1%) were American Indian/Alaskan Native and Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander. When gender was analyzed, 727 (70%) were male, while 310 (30%) were female. About 63% (654) were between the ages of 12-17 years, while 37% (383) were between the ages of 18-21 years. About 7% (69) were enrolled in a NAPSEC-member program for less than 1 year; about 56% (585) for 1 to 5 years; 20% (203) for 6 to 10 years; and 17% (180) for 11 years or more. When the categories of “less than 1 year” and “1-5 years” are combined, it is clear that 63% (654) were enrolled in a NAPSEC-member program for 5 years or less, while 37% (383) attended these programs for 6 years or more.

The Postschool Plans by Specialized Program

Table 8 presents an analysis of the postschool plans of the graduates/aged-out students according to the specialized educational programs from which they were discharged.

Table 8. Postschool Plans of Graduates/Aged-Out Students by Specialized Program

n=1,037

Postschool Setting	E/BD n=429		DD n=375		Medical n=121		Learning n=112		Total n=1,037	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Four Year College	50	11.6	8	2.1	18	14.9	31	27.7	107	10.3
Two Year College	82	19.1	12	3.2	16	13.2	27	24.1	137	13.2
Trade/Technical School	23	5.4	3	.8	6	5.0	14	12.5	46	4.4
Competitive Employment	75	17.5	17	4.5	12	9.9	14	12.5	118	11.4
Military	12	2.8	0	0	2	1.6	1	.9	15	1.5
Mainstream Activity^a	242	56.4	40	10.6	54	44.6	87	77.7	423	40.8
Vocational Rehabilitation Training Program	46	10.7	46	12.3	9	7.4	6	5.3	107	10.3
Supported Employment	24	5.6	55	14.6	5	4.1	3	2.7	87	8.4
Sheltered Employment	12	2.8	81	21.6	3	2.5	3	2.7	99	9.5
Vocational Rehabilitation Activity^b	82	19.1	182	48.5	17	14.0	12	10.7	293	28.2
Adult Partial Care	14	3.3	27	7.2	14	11.6	0	0	55	5.3
Nonvocational Day Program	27	6.3	87	23.2	23	19.0	3	2.7	140	13.5
Community-Based Program Activity^c	41	9.6	114	30.4	37	30.6	3	2.7	195	18.8
Other	22	5.1	1	.3	2	1.6	0	0	25	2.4
No Education/Training, Job or Program	42	9.8	38	10.1	11	9.1	10	8.9	101	9.7
Total	429	100	375	100	121	100	112	100	1,037	100

^a Mainstream Activity – 4-Yr. /2-Yr. College, Trade/Technical School, Competitive Employment or Military

^b Vocational Rehabilitation Activity – Vocational Rehabilitation Training Programs, Supported or Sheltered Employment

^c Community-Based Programs Activity – Partial Care and Nonvocational Day Programs

Results for Graduate/Aged-Out Student Postschool Plans

As Table 8 indicates, about 28% (290) made plans to enroll in a 4-year/2-year College or a Trade/Technical School. About 13% (133) were discharged with plans to enter Competitive Employment or enlist in the Military. In short, 41% of the graduates/aged-out students (423) exited with plans to enter a mainstream Activity by planning to participate in postschool education, technical training, competitive employment, or military service.

Moreover, 28% (293) made discharge plans to enter a Vocational Rehabilitation Activity through participation in a vocational rehabilitation training program (10%; 107 graduates/aged-out students) or in supported (8%; 87 graduates/aged-out students) or sheltered employment (9.5%; 99 graduates/aged-out students). Another nearly 19% (195) planned to enter a Community-Based Program Activity by enrolling in adult partial care (5%; 55 graduates/aged-out students) or nonvocational day programs (13.5%; 140 graduates/aged-out students). Slightly more than 2% (25) had plans to enter “Other” adult settings, such as psychiatric, drug rehabilitation, or correctional facilities. Finally, about 10% (101) left the NAPSEC-member facility without specific plans to enter a postschool educational, vocational, rehabilitative, or supportive program or to obtain a job after completing their secondary program.

At discharge, graduates/aged-out students from Learning Disorders programs (78%; 87 graduates/aged-out students) and those from Emotional/ Behavioral Disorders programs (56%; 242 graduates/aged-out students) were the most likely to plan to enter Mainstream Activity by enrolling in postsecondary education, trade or technical school, or joining the competitive workforce or the military. Exiters from Developmental Disorders programs (48.5%; 182 graduates/aged-out students) were the most likely to enter Vocational Rehabilitation Activity. While 12% (46) of these graduates/aged-out students had plans to go to a vocational rehabilitation training program, about 15% (55) planned to enter supported employment, and another 22% (81) planned to go to sheltered employment. Finally, graduates/aged-out students from Medical Disorders programs (31%) and those from Developmental Disorders programs (30%) were the most likely to plan to participate in Community-based Program Activity, such as adult partial care or nonvocational day programs. Regardless of program disability category, the rate for graduates/aged-out students exiting without a discharge plan was between 9% and 10%.

Postschool Plans: 2012-13 to 2016-17

Table 9 below shows the postschool plans for graduates/aged-out students from 2012-2013 to 2016-17.

Table 9. Postschool Plans of Graduates/Aged-Out Students by Activity:
School Years 2012-13 to 2016-17

School Year All Exiters Members	Mainstream Activity ^a		Vocational Rehabilitation Activity ^b		Community- Based Program Activity ^c		Total Engagement		Other Engagement/ Not Engaged ^d	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2012-13 n=782 (35% participation)	395	51	175	22	123	16	693	89	89	11
2013-14 n=977 (35% participation)	439	45	210	22	208	21	857	88	120	12
2014-15 n=1,002 (39% participation)	476	47	251	25	178	18	905	90	97	10
2015-16 n=1,033 (49% participation)	504	49	261	25	166	16	931	90	102	10
2016-17 n=1,037 (49% participation)	423	41	293	28	195	19	911	88	126	12

^a Mainstream Activity – 4-Yr./2-Yr. College, Trade/Technical School, Competitive Employment or Military

^b Vocational Rehabilitation Activity – Vocational Rehabilitation Training Programs, Supported or Sheltered Employment

^c Community-Based Programs Activity – Partial Care and Nonvocational Day Programs

^d Engaged in other activities or not engaged in any activities

Overall, from 2012-13 to 2016-17, total engagement has remained relatively stable with fluctuating rates reported between 88% and 90%. For the 2016-2017 school year, the total engagement of the graduates/aged-out students is slightly lower at 88% than it was in 2015-16 at 90%. Integral to this, the plans to enter Mainstream Activity shows a decrease to 41% from the previous year's reported rate of 49%. It is not surprising, therefore, that in 2016-17 the graduates/aged-out students, when

compared to their peers of the previous school year, tended to show an increase in plans to enter Vocational Rehabilitation Activity (25% vs. 28%) and Community-Based Activity (16% vs. 19%). The rate of 41% for Mainstream Activity is the lowest rate reported from 2012-13 through 2016-17; the rate of 28% for Vocational Rehabilitation is the highest rate reported from 2012-13 to 2016-17. Moreover, much variability is noted in the rates reported for Community-Based Activity in this 5-year time span with rates fluctuating between 16% to 21%. Overall, from 2012-13 to 2016-17, rates for Other Engagement have remained relatively stable at 10% to 12%.

Postschool Plans by Activity from 2012-13 to 2016-17: 5-Year Average

The postschool planning results for the graduates/aged-out students from 2012-13 through 2016-17 are presented in terms of a 5-year average. (See Table 10 below.)

Table 10. 5-Year Average of Postschool Discharge Plans by Activity:
2012-2013 through 2016-2017
5 Year Average n= 966

Mainstream Activity ^a		Vocational Rehabilitation Activity ^b		Community-Based Program Activity ^c		Total Engagement		Other Engagement/ Not Engaged ^d	
#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
447	46	238	25	174	18	859	89	107	11

^a Mainstream Activity – 4-Yr./2-Yr. College, Trade/Technical School, Competitive Employment or Military Service

^b Vocational Rehabilitation Activity – Vocational Rehabilitation Training Programs, Supported or Sheltered Employment

^c Community-Based Programs Activity – Partial Care and Nonvocational Day Programs

^d Engaged in other activities involving, for example, correctional, psychiatric, or medical intervention or not engaged in any productive activity

On average from 2012-13 to 2016-17, 46 % (447) of the graduates/aged-out students planned to pursue postsecondary education, including trade/technical school, competitive employment, or the military. Another 25% (238) planned to pursue vocational rehabilitation activity (training, supported employment, sheltered employment). Moreover, 18% (174) had plans to enter community-based programs, such as partial care or nonvocational day programs. Finally, 11% (107) had other plans (including entering a correctional, drug, or psychiatric facility) or left without a plan to be an engaged adult. On average, during this 5-year period, 89% (859) of the graduates/aged-out students had plans to be engaged in their communities after leaving secondary school.

Graduates/Aged-Out Students: Living Arrangements

About 74% of the graduates/aged-out students (763) planned to live with a parent, other relative, or guardian. About 15% (153) made plans to live independently (125) or semi-independently (28). More than 8 % (84) had plans to live in a group home (81) or skill/foster home (3). Another 2% (21) planned to live in a residential treatment center. No graduates/aged-out students left with plans to live in a development or psychiatric center. However, about 1% (13) planned to enter a medical center. Finally, less than 1% (3) had discharge plans to enter correctional facility (1) or “other” setting, such as a drug treatment facility.

Discussion

Transfer Students

The literature on the outcomes for students who are enrolled in the highly specialized education centers in the private sector is limited and has many gaps (Lane and Carter, 2006; Lange & Sletten, 2002). In general, there is a lack of knowledge regarding the trajectory of the careers of students with severe disabilities. Although, as indicated, some attention has been placed on the postschool outcomes of students receiving special education services within the local public school district, there is a paucity of information about the younger, school-aged students receiving special education services within and outside of the local district. In the future, attention should focus on the patterns of stability and movement in the placements of these students, especially as these factors relate to and shed light on the ingredients that constitute student success. Since the NAPSEC-sponsored inquiries have consistently tracked the discharge plans for school-aged children and youth with severe disabilities, they provide some insight into the meaning of movement in placement and setting for students with severe disabilities who have received services in the approved private sector. Such findings have the potential to contribute to the knowledge-base describing the careers of students with severe disabilities.

Overall, it seems encouraging that 61% of the transfer students in this study had discharge plans to move to programs within their local public school districts, a finding which is consistent with the national trend (U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Office of Special Education Programs, 2015; McLeskey, Landers, Williamson, & Hoppey, 2012). Of these, 26% of the transfer students planned to enter regular education classrooms (11% without supports and 15% with IEP-prescribed supports), while 35% planned to enroll in other

programs within their local school district. Students with Preschool Disorders (40%), Emotional/Behavioral Disorders (37%), and Developmental Disorders (37%) were the most likely to return to programs within the public school district. This appears to indicate that the skills of these students were sufficiently developed, remediated, and/or strengthened from enrollment in a NAPSEC-member's highly specialized program to enable these students to now access appropriate educational programs and services within the public sector. In short, NAPSEC-member programs that served students from a range of disability groups appear to have succeeded in helping these students meet the highly individualized goals of their IEP's. Future studies might track these students further to learn the degree to which they experienced success in the in-district programs.

That 94% of these students attended the approved nonpublic special education programs for 5 years or less provides evidence that attending a NAPSEC-member program is not a barrier to entering or returning to an in-district public school program in a timely fashion. Clearly these findings demonstrate that the NAPSEC-member programs succeeded in implementing the prescribed IEP, supporting and educating the students with severe disabilities, and fulfilling their commitment as IEP partners with the local public school districts. In short, being enrolled in an approved private special education facility does not eliminate a student's opportunity to enter an in-district program at some future time, most likely within 5 years or less.

Consistent with findings from previous NAPSEC-sponsored tracking efforts, the remaining 39% of the students, those who did not have plans to enter or reenter a program within the local district, continued to need the IEP-prescribed, highly intensive, individualized services, which were not available within the local district. About 27% of these students made plans to enter another approved nonpublic special education center; about 5 % planned to enter a residential school program; more than 3% planned to receive home instruction; and about 4% had specialized needs that indicated "other" plans at discharge (e.g., entering a medical, psychiatric, drug treatment or correctional facility). As per the spirit of IDEA, the full continuum of placements was available to these students based upon their individual needs.

When the 5-year average of the return of transfer students to programs within the local district is examined from 2012-2013 through 2016-2017, it is clear that the skills of a high proportion of students with severe disabilities were sufficiently strengthened to make it possible for these students to plan to enroll in programs within the local district (See Table 6). On average over 5 years, 59% of the transfer students planned at discharge to return to their local public school district: 23% had plans to enter regular education programs, with and without IEP-prescribed supports, while 36% planned to enter other programs within the local district. More refined approaches for tracking the movement of students with severe disabilities through all phases of their school careers could help future investigators better determine which strategies, services, and supports best contribute to overall success for these students.

Graduates/Aged-out Students

Strong concerns remain about identifying the factors that lead to positive outcomes for students with disabilities as they transition from school to adulthood (Cobb, Lipscomb, Wolgemuth, Schulte,

Veliquette, Alwell, Batchelder, Bernard, Hernandez, Holmquist-Johnson, Orsi, McMeeking, Wang, & Weinberg, 2013; Trainor, Morningstar, & Murray, 2016; Wehman, Sima, Ketchum, West, Chan, & Luecking, 2014). The early years of making the postschool transition can generally be experienced with unsettling uncertainty by young adults and may be particularly difficult for those with disabilities (Park, Mulye, Adams, Brindis, & Irwin, 2006). Moreover, the literature on postschool outcomes does not adequately address the differences among and within students from different disability groups; more knowledge is needed about the range, complexity, and severity of all disabilities and the impact these have on school and postschool success. Although research designs that make use of well-defined variables are most helpful in clarifying issues such as these, the development of a comprehensive list of distinguishing factors is certain to prove to be a challenging, complex, and lengthy task (Shogren, Kennedy, Dowsett, & Little, 2014; Trainor et al., 2016). The current study has taken a small, first step to attempt to highlight differences in outcomes between disability groups of the students with severe disabilities found in the participating schools.

Taken together, 88% of the graduates/aged-out students made plans, based upon their individual needs, capacities, and strengths, to be engaged adults in their communities. About 41% had discharge plans that indicated involvement in mainstream activities. Of these, 28% planned to enroll in postsecondary education or trade/technical school, while 13% planned to enter competitive employment or military service. Those with Learning (78%) and Emotional/Behavioral disorders (56%) were the most likely to make such plans. About 28% planned to go on to vocational rehabilitation training or supported/sheltered employment; those from Developmental Disorders programs (48%) were the most likely to be represented here. Another 19% had plans to enter an appropriate community-based program; graduates/aged-out students from Medical (31%) and Developmental Disorders programs (30%) were the most likely to make these plans. More than 2% had plans to go to a medical, psychiatric, drug treatment, or correctional facility; those from Emotional/Behavioral Disorders programs (5%) were most likely to report this plan. Finally, 10% left with no immediate postschool plans; groups were equally represented in this category with between 9-10% reporting that they made such plans.

When the 5-year average of postschool discharge plans are examined from 2012-2013 through 2016-2017, the following emerges. Taken together, on average over 5 years, 89% of the graduates/aged-out students left a NAPSEC-member program with plans to be engaged in their communities (See Table 10). About 46% of these students with severe disabilities had plans to enter postsecondary school, trade/technical school, the job market, or military service; 25% had discharge plans that called for entry into vocational rehabilitation training or supported or sheltered employment; and 18%, those perhaps with more severe disabilities than their peers who entered the mainstream or vocational rehabilitation, had plans to enter a vocational or nonvocational community-based program. About 11% left with no postschool plans or were in need of future medical, psychiatric, or drug treatment or had entered the correctional system. Some of the students in this group may constitute those with the most severe disabilities since they required adult treatment or correctional programs or did not make plans to be engaged adults. On the whole, these findings demonstrate that the vast majority of the graduates/aged-out students left a NAPSEC-member special

educational center with a discharge plan that indicated positive community engagement as they transitioned in adult roles.

Graduates/Aged-out Students with Learning Disorders

As is consistent with our previous findings, a high proportion of the graduates/aged-out students from Learning Disorders programs planned to be involved in the mainstream. The literature makes clear that this high-incidence group of special education students has benefitted from the development of sound learning strategies which have led to successful learning; this appears to have laid the foundation for a success that can be carried over into adulthood (McLeskey, & Waldron, 2011). About 64% of the students with Learning Disorders in this study made plans to pursue postsecondary education, a finding that is consistent with the national trend that indicates that students with learning disabilities are increasingly entering postsecondary education (Wagner, Newman, Cameto, Garza, & Levine, 2005; Newman, Wagner, Cameto, & Knokey, 2009; Newman, Wagner, Cameto, Knokey, & Shaver, 2010; Newman, Wagner, Knokey, Marder, Nagel, Shaver, & Wei, 2011; Hamblet, 2015). Probably because of the increased likelihood that this group will acquire postsecondary school experiences, NLTS2 found that students with Learning Disorders are the most likely to be employed 8 years after leaving high school (Newman, Wagner, Knokey, Marder, Nagel, Shaver, & Wei, 2011). Future research should examine the relationship between students from this disability group who graduated/aged-out from an approved private special education facility and the relationship between their receiving postsecondary education and their future employment. Overall, about 13% planned to seek competitive employment (12%) or military service (1%) after leaving school. Another 5% made plans to enter vocational rehabilitation programs, presumably to obtain assistance in preparing to enter the workforce in the future. Further investigation is needed to determine the extent to which vocational rehabilitation does lead to successful future employment. Because we do know that work experience during high school and parental expectations have a positive impact on students with disabilities in public schools who seek employment as adults, future studies should examine the role of these factors for students with disabilities in the approved private special education sector (SRI International, 2003; Trainor et al., 2016; Wehman et al., 2014). Such exploring may be particularly important when investigating the outcomes of graduates/aged-out students who are presumably faced with more severe disabilities than their public school peers. Moreover, follow-up of graduates/aged-out students with learning disabilities at several future points of time would be invaluable in helping us better understand whether students with more severe learning disabilities than those who participated in NLTS2 experience adult success that compares well with that of their public school peers.

Graduates/Aged-out Students with Emotional/Behavioral Disorders

The literature consistently reports concerns about the poor adult outcomes for students with emotional/behavioral disorders. These students are often characterized by poor graduation rates, low employment rates, difficulty forming positive relationships, and antisocial behavior (SRI International, 1993; Wagner, 1995; Blackorby & Wagner, 1996; Wagner & Blackorby, 1996; Malmgren, Edgar, & Neel, 1998; Mattison & Spitznagel, 1998; Sample, 1998; Tobin & Sugai, 1999; U.S. Department of Education, 1999, 2000, 2001; U.S. Department of Education, 2000; Reddy,

2001; U.S. Department of Education, 2001; Gagnon & McLaughlin, 2004; Wagner & Cameto, 2004; Newman, Wagner, Cameto and Knokey, 2009; Newman, Wagner, Cameto, Knokey, and Shaver, 2010; Chen, Symons, & Reynolds, 2011; Wehman, Sima, Ketchum, West, Chan, & Luecking, 2014). It is, therefore, encouraging that about 56% of those who were enrolled in Emotional/Behavioral Disorders programs in this study, graduates/aged-out students with presumably more severe emotional/behavioral difficulties than those of their public school peers from the same disability group, made plans to enter the mainstream. While 36% of these exiters had plans to enter postsecondary education, another 20% planned to enter the competitive workforce (17%) or military (3%). Moreover, 19% planned to enter vocational rehabilitation activities, including vocational rehabilitation training (11%), supported employment (6%), or sheltered employment (3%), to strengthen the skills needed to work.

These findings suggest that the individualized and intensive services these students received in the smaller environment of a NAPSEC-member program met their special needs and helped them to acquire skills and develop positive postschool plans (Lange & Sletten, 2002; Burchart, 2004; Lindstrom et al., 2013). As Wagner et al. point out (2006), students with emotional/behavioral disorders are often lost in large public schools and their teachers are often not prepared to work effectively with them. The literature is clear that students with emotional/behavioral disorders can achieve success when they attend schools that are small in size, have small classes, and employ staff with highly specialized training in teaching and forming relationships with students with emotional and behavioral issues. When such factors are present, as they are in NAPSEC-member programs, students with emotional/behavioral disorders are able to develop prosocial behavior and adapt to new roles (Chen, Symons, & Reynolds, 2011; Carran et al., 2014). Future tracking of these students is recommended to learn to what degree they were able to implement their mainstream discharge plans over time as they moved into adult roles.

Graduates/Aged-out Students with Developmental Disorders

The plans of graduates/aged-out students from programs for Developmental Disorders (48%) were most likely to be directed to vocational rehabilitation activity to strengthen work-related skills or community-based programs (30%) to obtain further social and other supportive services. More than 10% of this group of graduate/aged-out students had plans to enter mainstream activity: 6% reported plans to enter 4-year/2-year college or trade/technical school, while over 4% planned to enter the job market. Although there is a shift in attitudes and disability policy that has led more adults with disabilities to attempt to enter mainstream roles, including entry into the competitive job market (Novak, 2015), those from this disability group continue to face the most challenges in making a successful transition to productive adult roles (Lipscomb, Haimson, Liu, Burghardt, Johnson, & Thurlow, 2017).

Graduates/Aged-out Students with Medical Disorders

About 45% of the graduates/aged-out students from Medical Disorders programs planned to enter the mainstream with 33% planning to enroll in postsecondary education and about 12% planning involvement in competitive employment (10%) or military service (2). Another 14% had plans to

enter vocational rehabilitation activity, while about 31% planned to enter community-based programs. This group of students may also have benefitted from changes in attitudes and policy that support people with disabilities becoming integrated members of their communities (Novak, 2015).

Other Findings

Since almost 10% of the graduates/aged-out students exited without making plans, future inquiries should investigate which factors contributed to these students leaving school without a plan. Did the families or the graduates/aged-out students themselves feel distress about functioning in the larger community? Did a scarcity of appropriate resources or supports present barriers to the development of a postschool plan? Further exploration might help us better understand the how family, school, and community interact in establishing plans for the transition of students with disabilities into adult roles (Shogren & Villarreal, 2013).

Moreover, more than 2% left with “other” plans. Given that this group of students presumably has severe disabilities, it is perhaps not surprising that some of the graduates/aged-out students required further medical or psychiatric treatment, while others were sent to correctional facilities after leaving high school.

Conclusion

Every student with a disability must be able to access the full continuum of educational placements as IDEA (2004) guarantees. The selection of the most appropriate individual education program must be determined by the individual needs of the student. The importance of decision-making based upon this cardinal principle, one that is integral to IDEA (2004), is only underscored when dealing with students with severe, including multiple disabilities. The students in this study, both transfer students and graduates/aged-out students were enrolled in approved private special education programs, as per their IEP’s, because the public school district could not provide the highly specialized and intensive programs and services they required. As this study of the discharge plans of these students demonstrates, the intensive, highly specialized programs and programs offered by NAPSEC-member special education centers helped a large proportion of students with severe disabilities from a range of disability groups make successful plans while enrolled in school and for transitioning out of school. NAPSEC-member facilities remain critical players along the continuum of special education.

References

- Blackorby, J., & Wagner, M. (1996). Longitudinal postschool outcomes of youth with disabilities: Findings from the National Longitudinal Transition Study. *Exceptional Children*, 62, 399-413.
- Buchart, T. (2004). The education and employment of disabled young people. York (UK): Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics (2014). Labor Force Statistics from the Current Population Survey. Retrieved from <http://www.bls.gov/cps/>.
- Carran, D., Murray, S., Kellner, M., & Ramsey, C. (2014). Two-Year Outcomes of Students

- with Severe Emotional/Behavioral Disabilities Exiting Nonpublic Special Education Facilities in Maryland and New Jersey. *New Horizons for Learning, Vol. 11*, 1-19.
- Chen, C., Symons, F.J., & Reynolds, A.J. (2011). Prospective analysis of childhood factors and antisocial behavior for students with high-incidence disabilities. *Behavioral Disorders, 37*, 5-18.
- Cobb, R. B., Lipscomb, S., Wolgemuth, J., Schulte, T., Veliquette, A., Alwell, M., Batchelder, K., Bernard, R., Hernandez, P., Holmquist-Johnson, H., Orsi, R., Sample McMeeking, L., Wang, J., and Weinberg, A. (2013). Improving Post-High School Outcomes for Transition-Age Students with Disabilities: An Evidence Review Executive Summary (NCEE 20134012). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S.
- Federal Partners in Transition Workgroup (2015). The 2020 federal youth transition plan: A federal interagency strategy. <http://www.dol.gov/odep/pdf/20150302-FPT.pdf>
- 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, 25*, 119-133.
- Kauffman, J., Mock, D., & Simpson, R. (2007). Problems related to underservice of students with emotional or behavioral disorders. *Behavioral Disorders, 33*(1), 43-57.
- Lane, K. L., & Carter, E. W. (2006). Supporting transition-age youth with and at-risk for emotional and behavioral disorders at the secondary level: A need for further inquiry. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disabilities, 14*, 66-70.
- Lange, C.M., & Sletten, S.J. (2002). Alternative education: A brief history and research *synthesis*. (Report No. H159K700002). Alexandria, VA: National Association of State Directors of Special Education. U. S. Office of Special Education Programs.
- Lipscomb, S., Haimson, J., Liu, A.Y., Burghardt, J., Johnson, D.R., & Thurlow, M.I.. (2017). *Preparing for life after high school: The characteristics and experiences of youth in special education. Findings from the National Longitudinal Transition Study 2012. Volume 2: Comparisons across disability groups: Full report* (NCEE 2017-4018). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Services, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance.
- Lindstrom, L., Kahn, L., & Lindsey, H. (2013). Navigating the early careers: Barriers and strategies for young adults with disabilities. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation, 39*, 1-12.
- Malmgren, K., Edgar, E., & Neel, R. S. (1998). Postschool status of youths with behavioral disorders. *Behavioral Disorders, 23*, 257-263.
- Mattison, R. E., & Spitznagel, E. L. (1998). Enrollment predictors of the special education outcome for students with SED. *Behavioral Disorders, 23*, 243-256.
- McLeskey, J.L., Landers, E., Williamson, P. & Hoppey, D. (2012). Are we moving toward educating students with disabilities in less restrictive settings? *The Journal of Special Education, 46*, 131-140.
- McLeskey, J. & Waldron, N. (2011). Educational programs for elementary students with learning disabilities: Can they be both effective and inclusive? *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 26*(1), 48-57.
- NAPSEC (2008). Napsec Intensity of Services Study: 2006-2007. NAPSEC Outcomes Project. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- NAPSEC (2001). *Plans for Exiting Students, 1999-2000*. Report No. 1 of the NAPSEC Outcomes Project. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- NAPSEC (2002). *Plans for Exiting Students, 2000-2001 and Follow-Up, Alumni from Class of 2000*. Report No. 2 of the NAPSEC Outcomes Project. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- NAPSEC (2003). *Plans for Exiting Students, 2001-2002, and Follow-Up, Alumni from Class of 2000*. Report No. 3 of the NAPSEC Outcomes Project. Washington,

- D.C.: Author.
- NAPSEC (2004). Plans for Exiting Students, 2002-2003, and Follow-Up, Alumni from Class of 2000. Report No. 4 of the NAPSEC Outcomes Project. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- NAPSEC (2005). *Plans for Exiting Students, 2003-2004, and Follow-up, Alumni from Class of 2000*. Report No. 5 of the NAPSEC Outcomes Project. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- NAPSEC (2009). *Plans for Exiting Students, 2007-2008*. Report No. 7 of the NAPSEC Outcomes Project. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- NAPSEC (2010). *Plans for Exiting Students, 2008-2009*. Report No. 8 of the NAPSEC Outcomes Project. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- NAPSEC (2011). *Plans for Exiting Students, 2009-2010*. Report No. 9 of the NAPSEC Outcomes Project. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- NAPSEC (2012). *Plans for Exiting Students, 2010-2011*. Report No.10 of the NAPSEC Outcomes Project. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- NAPSEC (2013). *Plans for Exiting Students, 2011-2012*. Report No.11 of the NAPSEC Outcomes Project. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- NAPSEC (2014). *Plans for Exiting Students, 2012-2013*. Report No.12 of the NAPSEC Outcomes Project. Washington, D.C.: Author
- NAPSEC (2015). Plans for Exiting Students, 2013-2014. Report No.13 of the NAPSEC Outcomes Project. Washington, D.C.: Author
- NAPSEC (2016). Plans for Exiting Students, 2014-2015. Report No.14 of the NAPSEC Outcomes Project. Washington, D.C.: Author
- NAPSEC (2017). Plans for Exiting Students, 2015-2016. Report No.15 of the NAPSEC Outcomes Project. Washington, D.C.: Author
- Newman, L., Wagner, M., Cameto, R., & Knokey, A.-M. (2009) *The Post-High School Outcomes of Youth with Disabilities up to 4 Years After High School. A Report of Findings from the National Longitudinal Transition Study-2 (NLTS2)* (NCSE 2009-3017). Menlo Park, CA: SRI International.
- Newman, L., Wagner, M., Cameto, R., Knokey, A.M., & Shaver, D. (2010). *Comparisons Across Time of the Outcomes of Youth With Disabilities up to 4 Years After High School . A Report of Findings from the National Longitudinal Transition Study-2 (NLTS2)*. Menlo Park, CA: SRI International.
- Newman, L., Wagner, M., Knokey, A., Marder, C., Nagle, K., Shaver, D., & Wei, X. (2011). The post-high school outcomes of young adults with disabilities up to 8 years after high school: A report from the National Longitudinal Transition Study-2 (NCSE 2011–3005). Menlo Park, CA: SRI International.
- Novak, J. (2015). Raising expectations for U.S. youth with disabilities: Federal disability policy advances integrated employment. *Center for Educational Policy Studies Journal*, 51,91-110.
- Park, M.J., Mulye, T.P., Adams, S.H., Brindis, C.D., & Irwin, C.E. (2006). The health status of young adults in the United States. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 39, 3, 305-317.
- Reddy, L. A. (2001). Serious emotional disturbance in children and adolescents: Current status and future directions. *Behavior Therapy*, 32, 667-691.
- Sample, P. (1998). Postschool outcomes for students with significant emotional disturbance following best-practice transition services. *Behavioral Disorders*, 23, 231-242.
- Shogren, K.A., Kenneddy, W., Dowsett, C., Little, T.. (2014). Autonomy, psychological, empowerment, and self-realization: Exploring data on self-determination from NLTS2. *Exceptional Children*; 80, 221-235
- Shogren, K. A., & Garnier Villarreal, M. (2013). Developing student, family, and school constructs from NLTS2 data. *The Journal of Special Education*, 49, 89–103.

- 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.
- SRI International (2003). *The National Longitudinal Transition Study-2: Going to school, executive summary*. Contract No. ED-00-CO-0003. Washington, D.C.: Office of Special Education Programs, U. S. Department of Education.
- SRI International (2004). *The National Longitudinal Transition Study-2: Services and supports for secondary school students with disabilities*. Contract No. ED-00-CO-0003. Washington, D.C.: Office of Special Education Programs, U. S. Department of Education.
- SRI International (2005). *After high school: A first look at the postschool experiences of youth with disabilities. A report from the National Longitudinal Transitional Study-2*.
- Trainor, A.A., Morningstar, M.E., & Murray, A. (2016). Characteristics of transition planning and services for students with high-incident disabilities. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 39*, 113-124.
- Tobin, T. J. & Sugai, G. M. (1999). Discipline problems, placements, and outcomes for students with serious emotional disturbance. *Behavioral Disorders, 24*, 109-121.
- U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Office of Special Education Programs. (1999). *Twenty-first Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act*. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Office of Special Education Programs. (2000). *Twenty-second Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act*. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Office of Special Education Programs. (2001). *Twenty-third Annual Report to Congress Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act*. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Office of Special Education Programs. (2002). *Twenty-fourth Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act*. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Office of Special Education Programs. (2009). *Twenty-eighth Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act*. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Office of Special Education Programs. (2015). *Thirty-seventh Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act*. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- Wagner, M. (1995). Outcomes for youths with serious emotional disturbance in secondary school and early adulthood. *The Future of Children, 5*, 90-112.
- Wagner, M., & Blackorby, J. (1996). Transition from high school to work or college: How special education students fare. *The Future of Children, 6*, 103-120.
- Wagner, M., & Cameto, R. (2004). The characteristics, experiences, and outcomes of youth with emotional disturbances. *SRI International, NLTS2 Data Brief, 3*, 1-8.
- Wagner, M., Friend, M., Bursuck, W.D., Kutash, K., Duchnowski, A.J., Sumi, W.C., & Epstein, M.H. Educating students with emotional disturbances: A national perspective on school programs and services. (2006). *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 14*, 12-30.
- Wagner, M., Newman, L., Cameto, R., Garza, N., & Levine, P. (2005). *After high school: A first look at the postschool experiences of youth with disabilities. A report from the National Longitudinal Transition Study-2 (NLTS2)*. Menlo Park, CA: SRI International.
- Wehman, P, Sima, A.P., Ketchum, J., West, M.D., Chan, F, & Luecking, R. (2014) . Predictors of successful transition from school to employment for youth with disabilities. *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation, 25*, 323-334.