

Running Head: NPSEF POST SECONDARY OUTCOME STUDY

Collaborative Postschool Outcome Study for Maryland and New Jersey:
Tracking Outcomes for Students with Severe Emotional/Behavioral Disabilities
Enrolled in Nonpublic Special Education Facilities

Deborah T. Carran
Johns Hopkins University

Millicent H. Kellner
ASAH

Sue Murray
Maryland Association of Nonpublic Special Education Facilities

Christine Ramsey
Johns Hopkins University

Abstract

The outcomes for 294 students with severe emotional and behavioral disabilities (EBD) were examined 2 years after they exited from nonpublic special education facilities (NPSEFs) in Maryland and New Jersey. The outcomes of the students from NPSEFs were compared to those of their public school peers with EBD who were followed in the National Longitudinal Transitional Study 2 (NLTS2), a national study funded by the U.S. Department of Education of the outcomes for students with disabilities attending public schools. The NPSEF students were recruited for this study during AY 2005-2006 and 2006-2007. Participants and their parents were contacted annually and interviewed by phone.

Results and comparisons for students with EBD two years after leaving high school are presented for the areas of post-secondary education, emerging independence, and engagement. Findings demonstrate that the NPSEF youth had higher reported rates of engagement, employment, enrollment in post-secondary education, and independent living as well as lower rates of involvement with the criminal justice system.

Introduction

More than any other group of students with disabilities, students with emotional and behavioral disabilities (EBD) continue to present many challenges to educators as they struggle to achieve academic success (Kauffman, Mock, & Simpson, 2007; Wagner, Friend, Bursuck, Kutash, Duchnowski, Sumi, & Epstein, 2006). Their transition from secondary school to adulthood often presents challenges similar to those faced by these students during the school years and places them, as young adults, at a disadvantage to achieve the overarching goals of equal opportunity, full engagement, and independence that are integral to IDEA (Turnbull, Turnbull, Wehmeyer, & Park, 2003). The *Report from the National Longitudinal Transitional Study-2 (NLTS2)* (Wagner, Newman, Cameto, Garza, & Levine, 2005) documents the myriad of challenges that youth with EBD who attended educational programs offered in their public schools face in comparison to youth with other disabilities attending public school. As the NLTS2 study makes clear, 2 years after leaving public school, youth with EBD had the highest dropout rate as well as the highest rates of involvement with the criminal justice system, mental health facilities, legal guardianship, homelessness. These youth were also the most likely of all students with disabilities to have had or fathered a child.

Not all youth with EBD are able to receive their education in public facilities like the students that participated in the NLTS2 study. Sometimes, emotional and behavioral symptoms are so severe that educational programs to meet their needs are not available in the public sector. Rather, these students must be served in nonpublic special education facilities (NPSEFs) where the educational program is further supported by a range of individualized services usually associated with therapeutic day treatment programs. The youth with EBD who attend NPSEFs present with complex symptoms which require a constellation of services so

that their unique, complicated, and multifaceted instructional needs can be addressed; their transition from school to adulthood requires close management. (Lane & Carter, 2006). While it is clear that the transition outcomes of NLTS2 youth with EBD attending public school programs was “troubling” at two years (Wagner, et al 2005), we wondered how population of young adults with more severe and complex symptoms of EBD than these NLTS2 students, namely those who attending NPSEFs, would compare.

Nonpublic Special Education Facilities (NPSEFs): Background

Private schools have existed in the United States since the 1800s. While private facilities specializing in the education of students with disabilities (NPSEFs) have existed nearly as long, it was not until PL 94-142 (Education for All Handicapped Children Act, 1975) was passed that the growth in private special education facilities took hold. This law mandated that students with disabilities be educated in the appropriate least restrictive environment (LRE). In addition, it also mandated a continuum of alternative settings, a requirement that local school systems (LSS) could not always meet within public schools. Consequently, the number of approved nonpublic special education facilities (NPSEFs) grew accordingly.

Nationwide, individuals in NPSEF placements represent about one percent (1%) of all special education students. These students are frequently those with the most severe and complex disorders, who require intensive, individualized interventions not available in their local public school district (National Association of Private Special Education Centers [NAPSEC], 2005a). Among all special education students, those with EBD are most likely to be placed in NPSEF settings (U.S. Department of Education, 2002).

Outcomes for Students with Disabilities

There have been several national studies to examine the outcomes of students with disabilities (SRI International, 1993; U.S. Department of Education, 1999; U.S. Department of Education, 2000; U.S. Department of Education, 2001; U.S. Department of Education, 2002). Blackorby and Wagner (1996) found that special education students who attend public school programs are at high risk during their school years for poor performance and dropping out, and, after completing school, of not pursuing postsecondary education, lagging behind in employment opportunities and wages, not living independently, and not being socially integrated in their communities when compared to their general education peers. Such studies have focused on students with disabilities attending public schools, with little attention to students who attend NPSEFs. There has been limited outcome literature published on the students whose needs require enrollment in highly specialized settings (Lane & Carter, 2006; Lange & Sletten, 2002), or to determine differences in outcomes as they relate to severity of disability. These very critical considerations must be included to fairly evaluate student outcomes.

In contrast to their public school special education peers tracked in national studies, NPSEF students present with more severe disabilities, are more likely to have multiple and complex disorders, and to have manifested these disorders for longer periods of time. Students with these characteristics present a different population in the outcome literature. Given the risks of poor outcomes shown for students with EBD attending public school programs, the outcomes for these students enrolled in NPSEFs are unclear.

Outcomes: A Post-Secondary Framework

Two state associations of NPSEFs, the Maryland Association of Nonpublic Special Education Facilities (MANSEF) and ASAH (formerly the Association of Schools and Agencies for the Handicapped) in New Jersey, formed a collaborative partnership to longitudinally track

their students and address issues of accountability. The design for this collaborative tracking effort paralleled the data collection foci of NLTS2, including the domains associated with the transition from high school to adulthood as well as a specific population of exiting students with disabilities. A two cohort longitudinal panel study was implemented to collect data on students with EBD who exited NPSEF facilities in Maryland and New Jersey. Previous studies focusing on students with EBD have consistently indicated poor outcomes (Blackorby & Wagner, 1996; Carson, Sitlington & Frank, 1995; Greenbaum, Dedrick, Friedman, Kutash, Brown, Laredi, et al., 1998; Wagner, 1995, Wagner et al., 2005) in the domains of education, employment, engagement, independence, and social/community involvement. Because access to a control group of students was not available, published outcomes from Wagner, et al. (2005??) were used for comparison.

The transition period after high school as youth are expected to take on new roles can be a challenge to many young adults. The early post-secondary years, which can be characterized by uncertainty, may be the most unsettling and especially difficult for youth with disabilities. Since this is a time when young adults in general are at increased risk for injury, homicide, and substance abuse (Park, Mulye, Adams, Brindis, & Irwin, 2006), it is no surprise that the vulnerable population of young adults with EBD are at increased risk for mental health-related crises-(Gralinski-Bakker, Hauser, Billings, Allen, Lyons, Jr., & Melton, 2005). Clearly, one benefit of attending school is the structure and support this institution provides to facilitate relationships, emerging independence, and engagement. Leaving high school, therefore, can be especially challenging for youth with EBD who have difficulty managing the responsibilities of adulthood: planning, implementing, following through, and completing tasks in a range of life domains.

NLTS2 has framed their findings in several publications to include the key domains young adults need to be successful, such as, receiving training, education or skills sets that lead to employment. The end result of such activities is a productive citizen who has a positive involvement in society. If youth do not become positively engaged, their opportunity for success will diminish with time. Getting engaged is the first step toward emerging independence, since being employed and having an income will enable youth to live independently. With independence, the other indicators of adulthood become relevant. This includes the joining with other young adults in social groups, voting, driving, and living civilly and lawfully. This framework should support the successful transition of youth from secondary school. Each domain has a key position in the framework

This study was initiated by a consortium of NPSEFs to respond to issues of accountability to determine whether youth with the diagnosis of severe EBD who attended NPSEF programs were successfully transitioning into adulthood. More specifically, were EBD youth served in NPSEFs as successful as EBD youth served in public school settings?

Method

Participants

Eighteen Maryland member schools of the Maryland Association of Nonpublic Special Education Facility (MANSEF) and 20 New Jersey member schools of what is ASAH (formerly the Association of Schools and Agencies for the Handicapped) chose to participate in this study. A total of 294 students were recruited for this study who had been discharged from MANSEF ($N = 154$) and ASAH ($N = 140$) secondary schools during the 2005-06 (Cohort 1: MANSEF $n = 80$, ASAH $n = 76$) and 2006-07 (Cohort 2: MANSEF $n = 74$, ASAH $n = 64$) school years consented to participate in this study. The sample pool of 294 EBD participants included Federal diagnostic codes of EBD ($n = 233$) and

Multiple Disabilities ($n = 61$) with one of the multiple disabilities being identified by the sending district as EBD; all participants had an IQ greater than 70. All participants were enrolled in one of the participating schools for a minimum of one semester (five months) and did not re-enroll in a different participating high school program after discharge.

Settings

Both MANSEF and ASAH are not-for-profit organizations of NPSEFs whose member schools and facilities are approved by the Maryland and New Jersey State Departments of Education respectively. These schools and facilities, located throughout Maryland and New Jersey, provide intense therapeutic services for children and youth who have at least one of the following disabilities mental retardation, hearing impairment, deafness, speech/language impairment, visual impairment, emotional and behavioral disturbance, orthopedic impairment, other health impairment, specific learning disability, multiple disabilities, deaf/blindness, traumatic brain injury, autism, and developmental delay.

Students attending MANSEF and ASAH schools are referred by their local education agency (LEA) through the Individual Education Plan (IEP) process. Students are placed in a MANSEF or ASAH facility when the public school system cannot adequately implement the student's IEP. These students have been unsuccessful at functioning in public school settings and have been identified as requiring more intense services. The NPSEFs are more restrictive than public school placements. Students receive approximately 30 hours of academic educational services in a segregated special education facility in combination with individualized therapeutic programs.

Funding for a NPSEF special education placement for MANSEF-member schools is provided by the Maryland State Department of Education (75%) and the student's LEA (25%). The Maryland State Department of Education requests funding from the State of Maryland's General Fund specifically for

non-public tuitions. A similar system is in place for funding of ASAH-member schools in the state of New Jersey.

MANSEF and ASAH schools serving students with severe EBD offer academic supports delivered in small, highly structured, therapeutic environments with clinical and behavioral intervention programs. Psychiatric treatment, including medication management and individual, family and group therapies, is available as needed. Speech, occupational and physical therapy may also be provided if the student has concomitant disorders. The student may be enrolled in a day program or a residential program, depending on the IEP team's recommendation. All students participating in this study were day students.

Instrument

The authors and staff representing participating schools developed the MANSEF-ASAH Postschool Survey. Survey questions corresponded with domains and items established for the National Longitudinal Transition Study – 2 (NLTS2, Office of Special Education Programs). The MANSEF-ASAH Postschool Survey consisted of 105 forced-choice items related to employment, post high school education, living situation and community involvement. Items in both the NLTS2 and the MANSEF-ASAH Postschool Survey derived their structure from existing research in several fields concerning the transition process from secondary schools for students with disabilities. This framework directed the content of the data collected. Face validity was determined through a panel of academic and practitioner experts. The items selected for this study were confirmed to reflect the domains previously identified from the NLTS2.

Study Design

The sample for this analysis utilized a longitudinal panel design (Menard, 1991). This methodology tracks participants longitudinally, utilizing the same pool of cases (i.e., total participants recruited) at

each time period surveyed. Panel designs align respondent interviews within a time period, as opposed to strict subject alignment across time. Panel designs also facilitate participant recall of recent events and help to clarify relationships between recent and historic events (Bullis, Yovanoff, Mueller, & Havel, 2002). Attempts were made to contact the same pool of total participants annually, one and two years following discharge from MANSEF or ASAH facilities. This study presents data across wave 1 (W1) and wave 2 (W2) of the longitudinal panel study for MANSEF and ASAH students. The two-year follow-up for this analysis was utilized in order to have a comparable sample to the NLST2 study which collected data on students ten years post high school, 2001 to 2009. For comparison purposes only, the published two year outcomes (Wagner et al., 2005) for students with emotional disabilities were used to determine whether MANSEF/ASAH students were making similar progress as the nationally representative sample.

Procedure

Each participating school obtained signed consent forms from participating students and/or their guardians. One MANSEF and one ASAH trained representative reviewed student records and entered relevant data into a database developed by one of the authors. This database served as a repository for demographic, academic, and diagnostic information available on the student prior to discharge.

Training. Each organization designated one person to collect and enter demographic data. The designee attended a four-hour training session on the use of the software that also included a full description of the data fields. Each designee was given a paper copy of the database template along with a data key manual that described in detail the data to be entered. Drop-down lists with forced-choice answers were employed whenever possible. Each designee was given as much on site and/or phone support from one of the authors as requested. Data sets from each participating school were imported into one database by one of the authors at the end of each of the two school years.

Discharged students or parents/guardians were contacted by phone annually for two years after their date of discharge by a trained interviewer. Interviewers were employees of Potsdam Institute of Applied Research, from State University of New York Potsdam. Each interviewer was given two hours of interview training along with a script to follow for each interview. At the end of training, each interviewer was able to successfully follow this script, completing a mock survey form to a criterion level. Each completed survey was entered in a database. At the end of the study, data fields were translated to a Microsoft® Excel format and downloaded into SPSS for data analysis.

Data Reporting

There was no public education setting comparison group available for this study, so the authors were limited to nationally published results from similar populations. This study compared responses of youth who had exited from NPSEF in Maryland and New Jersey to published responses from the NLTS2 report (Wagner et al., 2005). The details of NLTS2 design, procedures, and data collection have been widely reviewed (Wagner, Kutash, Duchnowski, & Epstein, 2005) and may be found on the study's website (www.nlts2.org).

NLTS2 used a sampling strategy with weighting to be generalizable to US students with disabilities in all federal reporting categories. In NLTS2 reporting, frequencies and means were weighted and reported as population estimates of percent of students nationally with related standard errors.

For this collaborative study the values reported are the numbers and percents of the sample members. Data values for the sample parallel NLTS2 reporting categories for W1, W2, or for all participants at W1 or W2.

Results

Participant Characteristics

Participants were primarily Caucasian with slightly more males than females. The youth's family economic characteristics could not be addressed due to problems with missing data from Maryland sites. Significant differences were found for some school indicators. Student cohorts from the MANSEF- and ASAH-member schools were compared on demographic characteristics to determine sampling differences (race, gender, free and reduced meals) (see Table 1). MANSEF- and ASAH-member schools did not differ in gender distribution of students. MANSEF schools had a higher proportion of African American and minority students ($n = 52, 34\%$) compared to ASAH schools ($n = 17, 12\%$); there were no other significant differences. To account for these differences results from MANSEF- and ASAH-member schools will be reported separately as well as combined into one pool for comparison to the nationally representative sample of students with EBD in public school settings from NLTS2. Table 1 also presents the number of youth contacted at each wave.

The following sections focus on the post secondary transitional outcomes framework domains that were identified in the NLTS2 reports. Survey item results will be presented for MANSEF and ASAH groups separately and combined and then compared to the NLTS2 published two year outcomes.

Post-Secondary Education

Categories of post-secondary education for this survey and NLTS2 were vocational/business/technical trainings, 2-year and 4-year colleges. Results of post-secondary survey items are presented in Table 2 and indicate that 58% of NPSEF graduates were continuing their education compared to 21% of the NLTS2 EBD sample. MANSEF and ASAH results, both separately and combined, had greater percentages of students enrolled in 2- and 4-year colleges two years out of secondary school compared to the NLTS2 reports. The proportion of students reported enrolled in

Vocational/Business/Technical training programs was similar for the NPSEF programs (8%) and NLTS2 (7%).

The authors were also able to track student progress between post-secondary educational settings. Nearly 10% ($n = 11$) of ASAH students and 2% ($n = 3$) of MANSEF students started their educations in 2-year colleges and then transitioned into 4-year colleges. A small number of students (3% each for MANSEF and ASAH) began their educations in the Vocational/Business/Technical training programs and then transitioned into 2-year and 4-year colleges by W2.

Emerging Independence

The variables examined under emerging independence reflected a youth's transition to independence and social responsibilities. Independence was reflected in employment, living arrangement, marital status, number of children, and transportation (Table 3). At W1 and W2, 56% of NPSEF youth were working part time or full time, a much larger proportion than the national estimate of 27% at W1 and 36% at W2.

One year out of high school, the majority of NPSEF youth (88%) reported residing with their parents, guardian, or another family member; this is only slightly higher than NLTS2 (84%). The proportion dropped slightly by W2 for NPSEF (79%) but remained higher than NLTS2 (65%). In contrast, at W1 9% of NPSEF reported to be living alone, with a spouse, roommate, or in a college dorm compared to 0% for NLTS2. Groups were more similar by two years out (Wave 2), but slightly more NPSEF (19%) youth were living independently compared to NLTS2 estimates (16%). Finally, at W1, NPSEF youth (4%) were living in other settings which included supervised group homes, residential treatment centers, and correctional facilities than NLTS2 (less than 1%). By Wave 2, more NLTS2 (6%) youth were reported to be in these settings compared to NPSEF (2%).

The social aspects of independence examined a youth's relationships and family network. At W2, more NPSEF youth reported being single (96%) compared to NLTS2 (84%). Fewer NPSEF youth two years out reported having children (4%) compared to NLTS2 youth (11%). For transportation, 50% of NPSEF youth had a driver's license/permit by Wave 1 compared with 34% of NLTS2 ED youth; within our sample fewer MANSEF youth (36%) had licenses/permits compared to ASAH (65%). At Wave 2, all groups had increased the number of licenses/permits so that NPSEF combined were similar to NLTS2 (63%), but the MANSEF sample remained lower than the ASAH sample. This may be due to the greater availability of public transportation in the Baltimore Washington Metro area.

Engagement

Civic involvement was examined modeling the NLTS2 indicators of social group membership, voting, arrest, and engagement (Table 4). General engagement was defined by NLTS2 as a composite variable of employment and postsecondary education.

Civic involvement appeared stronger for NLTS2 youth than for NPSEF. At W1 more NLTS2 youth (47%) reported to be involved in social groups compared to 22% of NPSEF youth, with a decline in participation by W2 for both NLTS2 and NPSEF. Two years out of high school, nearly 10% more of the NLTS2 youth were registered to vote (52%) compared to NPSEF youth (43%). However, fewer youth who had exited from NPSEF facilities (17%) had been arrested by Wave 2 compared to NLTS2 (57%).

Engagement plays through the busy lives most young adults lead two years out of high school; mostly employment, education/training, or withdrawal (non-engagement). Table 4 presents the composite indicator of engagement for NPSEF youth used by NLTS2. Clearly, more NLTS2 youth reported employment only (44%) up to two years out of high school compared to NPSEF (32%). However, compared to NLTS2 a greater proportion of NPSEF youth were reported to be engaged in the

other categories including post-secondary education only (9% for NPSEF, 1% for NLTS2), and some form of education plus employment (43% for NPSEF, 18% for NLTS2). Finally, only 8% ($n = 19$) of NPSEF youth were identified as not engaged in employment and/or postsecondary education at some time during these two years compared with 34% of NLTS2 youth.

Discussion

This section of the paper will begin with a discussion of each of the transitional outcome framework areas, comparing results of the NPSEF youth to the NLTS2 published findings. This will be followed by a discussion of the accountability of NPSEF and this study's limitations.

Post Secondary Education

Youth exiting from NPSEF programs attended post secondary education (vocational, 2-, and 4-year) at higher rates compared with NLTS2 youth; nearly three times higher. Transition planning was evident in the NPSEF samples when individual youth were tracked across programs. There was a sizeable group ($n = 14$) of NPSEF youth who began 2-year colleges and then switched to 4-year colleges. There was also a small number of youth who had begun their post secondary education in training programs and then moved into 2- and 4-year colleges. This was not comparable with NLTS2, since the level of detail was not available in the public domain publications. However, despite the small samples in this study, it was still possible to examine the paths taken by some of the youth.

The most remarkable finding related to post secondary education was the proportion of NPSEF youth who had enrolled in any post secondary training/school; this percentage was more than twice that reported for NLTS2. This finding supports the NPSEF model in which youth with severe disabilities (in this case severe EBD) receive appropriate academic supports delivered in small, highly structured therapeutic environments with highly individualized clinical and behavioral intervention programs. The

therapeutic environment of NPSEFs fosters successful transition to post-secondary educational settings where youth can enhance their chances for obtaining jobs.

Emerging Independence

A greater proportion of NPSEF youth were employed part- time or full- time compared to NLTS2 youth at both W1 and W2. As was shown in the educational domain, the NPSEF youth were better prepared to enter the workforce when they exited these facilities compared to NLTS2 EBD youth. In this framework domain, there were a small number of NPSEF youth who did choose to live independently at W1, while none (0%) of the NLTS2 youth reported doing this at W1. Reasons behind the choice were not reported by respondents. By W2, the number of youth living independently had increased in both groups although the NPSEF had a greater proportion at W2 than NLTS2; this may be due to the larger number of NPSEF youth at post secondary schools who may be living in dormitories.

The number of youth who did actually live independently was small. We saw that the overwhelming majority of the NPSEF youth with EBD were living at home with parents or guardians across both waves of data collection. While it would be encouraging to see this indicator declining by W2 for NPSEF as it did decline for NLTS2, the NLTS2 reported a concomitant increase in ‘Other Living Situations.’ This finding indicates that approximately 20% of NLTS2 youth left their parental homes by W2; of the 20%, approximately three quarters of NLTS2 youth went into an independent living arrangement, while the remaining one quarter of them fell in the ‘other’ category of residence which included supervised home, residential facility, correctional facility, or homelessness. NPSEF, in contrast, reported very few youth in the ‘other’ category of residence at both W1 and W2 and with even less at W2.

Slightly more NLTS2 youth were in permanent personal relationships compared to NPSEF youth. While, the proportion of NPSEF youth who were and remained single across waves was very

high; very few of NPSEF youth had children by W2 (4%). Slightly more than 10% of the NLTS2 youth reported having children. The difference between samples may be a reflection of the difference in severity of the EBD disability between samples. Youth with severe EBD served by NPSEF have been shown to have more difficulty in connecting, making friends, and maintaining friendships with peers, which surely impacts establishing and sustaining interpersonal relationships (Simpson, Peterson, & Smith, 2011). Another interpretation of the difference for NPSEF youth may be the result of the therapeutic work that takes place in the schools. NPSEFs work closely with students and families to prepare youth by developing skill-building strategies to evaluate situations and make good choices. Examining the parenthood finding through this lens, NPSEF youth may have made the choice not to have children at this young age and to focus on school and employment.

Engagement

NLTS2 youth reported higher levels of social groups and civic involvement (i.e. voting) across both waves. Previous findings from this study demonstrated a lack of established personal relationships for NPSEF youth, so it is not surprising that they would also be more likely to report being involved in fewer social group relationships and civic activities. Youth with disabilities served in public school settings, especially those with EBD (i.e., those in NLTS2) have been shown to lack involvement in social groups (Carter, Swedeen, Moss, & Pesko, 2010), and youth with severe EBD reported even lower rates of these indicator items.

While the NPSEF youth may not have reported being involved with their community, they were arrested at lower rates. NPSEF had lower rates of ever being arrested across the two waves compared to NLTS2 youth. It has been well established that EBD youth have the highest arrest risk for any category of disability (Zhang, Barrett, Katsiyannis, & Yoon, 2011). Arrest and incarceration at an early age becomes an additional risk indicator for long term incarceration (Huesmann, Eron, & Dubow, 2002).

The low percent of arrests ever across the two waves for NPSEF youth in this study was very encouraging. One possible explanation for the lower arrest rate may be the therapeutic milieu of the NPSEFs. A stable and supportive high school environment was comfortable for these severely EBD students. As a result, they stayed in high school, graduated, and remained engaged as young adults.

Engagement was very strong for NPSEF youth. While more NLTS2 youth were only employed, more NPSEF youth were employed and attending post-secondary education. The NPSEF youth were very engaged in activities that would strengthen their skills and enhance their chances of becoming successful adults. The small percentage (8%) of youth reported as 'Not Engaged' among the NPSEF young adults lends support to the premise that NPSEF programs are effective. NPSEF staff are highly trained to help these students with multiple and complex needs develop skills that support their engagement.

Accountability of NPSEF Programs

Findings from this study clearly support the positive benefits of the intense support that youth with EBD receive in NPSEF programs. It is interesting to note the similarity of the findings across all domains for the young adults with EBD who left school in both Maryland and New Jersey. The individualized attention, therapeutic program design, and program supports for youth with severe EBD that are available in NPSEFs resulted in many more young adults who are engaged, educated, employed, and who are able to avoid the criminal justice system.

In summary, NPSEF youth are productively engaged in their communities at much higher rates and are leading productive lives. The young adults who have transitioned from from these programs enroll at higher rates in 2 and 4 year colleges and are also employed at higher rates than their generally less disabled EBD peers.

Limitations

Several limitations must be considered in this study.

- Not all participants were contacted at all waves which may have resulted in a loss of information. Only 58% ($n = 170$) both at W1 and W2.
- Not all NPSEF schools in both states participated. All schools were eligible but there may have been selective reasons for participation.
- All interviews were done by phone and not face to face which may have increased participation, but precluded more in depth responding from participants.
- Parents/Guardians were surveyed when youth were not available and the information could have been wrong or not correctly reported for all indicator items.
- Results apply only to NPSEF facilities in Maryland and New Jersey, not a nationally weighted representative sample as per NLTS2.
- Results were limited due to characteristics of samples; 50% of economic indicators were missing from Maryland and the New Jersey was overwhelming non FaRMs. The majority of participants were white.

References

- Beales, R.R. (1996). *Meeting the challenge: How the private sector served difficult-to-educate students*. Retrieved November 7, 2005 from <http://www.rppi.org/ps212.html>
- Blackorby, J., & Wagner, M. (1996). Longitudinal postschool outcomes of youth with disabilities: Findings from the National Longitudinal Transition Study. *Exceptional Children*, 62, 399-413.
- Bullis, M., Yovanoff, P., Mueller, G., & Havel, E. (2002). Life on the “outs”- Examination of the faculty to community transition of incarcerated youth. *Exceptional Children*, 69(1), 7-22.
- Carran, D.T., Nemerovsky, A.G., Rock, E.E., & Kerins, M.R. (1996). Risk of unsuccessful program completion for students with emotional/behavioral disorders: An epidemiological risk analysis. *Behavioral Disorders*, 21(2), 172-189.
- Carran, D.T., Kerins, M., & Murray, S. (2005). Three year outcomes for positively and negatively discharged students with EBD from non-public special education facilities. *Behavioral Disorders*, 30(2), 119-134.
- Carson, R., Sitlington, P., & Frank, A. (1995). Young adulthood for individuals with Behavioral disorders: What does it hold? *Behavioral Disorders*, 20, 127–135.
- Carter, E.W., Swedeen, B., Moss, C. K., & Pesko, M. (2010). “What are you doing after school?”: Promoting extracurricular involvement for transition-age youth with disabilities. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 45, 275-283.
- Chambers, J.G., Parrish, T.B., & Harr, J.J. (2002). *What are we spending on Special Education Services in the United States, 1999-2000?* (Contract No. ED99CO 0091). Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs.

- Chambers, J.G., Shkolnik, J., & Perez, M. (2003). *Total expenditures for students with disabilities, 1999-2000: Spending variation by disability*. (Special Education Expenditure Project Report No. R-5). U.S. Office of Special Education Programs.
- Education of All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, Pub. L. No. 94-142.
- Gaganon, J.C., & McLaughlin, M.J. (2004). Curriculum, assessment, and accountability in day treatment and residential schools. *Exceptional Children*, 70(3), 263-283.
- Gralinski-Bakker, J.H., Hauser, S., Billings, R., Allen, J., Lyons, Jr., P., & Melton, G. (2005). *Policy Brief: Network on Transitions to Adulthood for Young Adults with Mental Health Issues*. 21, 1-3.
- Greenbaum, P. E., Dedrick, R. F., Freidman, R.M., Kutash, K., Brown, E. G., Lardieri, S. P., & Pugh, A. M. (1998). National Adolescent and Child Treatment Study (NACTS): Outcomes for children with serious emotional and behavioral disturbance. In M. H. Epstein, K. Kutach, & A. Duchnowski (Eds.), *Outcomes for children and youth with behavioral and emotional disorders and their families: Programs and /evaluation best practices* (pp. 21–54) Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.
- Huesmann, L.R., Eron, L.D., & Dubow, E.F. (2002). Childhood predictors of adult criminality: Are all risk factors reflected in childhood aggressiveness? *Criminal Behavior and Mental Health*, 12, 185-208.
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004, P.L. 108-446, 20 U.S.C. §1400 *et seq.*
- Kauffman, J., Mock, D., & Simpson, R. (2007). Problems related to underservice of students with emotional or behavioral disorders. *Behavioral Disorders*, 33(1), 43-57.
- In press New Horizons for Learning <http://education.jhu.edu/PD/newhorizons/Journals/>

- Kellner, M.H., & Strickarz, B. (2003). Exit plans for students with disabilities attending separate approved special education programs in the private sector. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals*, 26, 85-97.
- 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.
- Malmgren, K., Edgar, E., & Neel, R.S. (1998). Post school status of youths with behavioral disorders. *Behavioral Disorders*, 23(4), 257-263.
- Menard, S. (1991). *Longitudinal research*. (Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences No. 76). Newberry Park, CA: Sage.
- 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.
- National Association of Private Special Education Centers. (2005a). *NAPSEC outcomes report: Our programs produce positive results*. Retrieved March 29, 2006, from <http://www.napsec.org/outcomes.html>
- National Association of Private Special Education Centers. (2005b, August). *Outcomes of approved special education programs in the private sector: Results of a statewide survey. Outcomes for students from class of 2000: Year 5 follow-up analysis of findings: 2002-2005*. (Report Number 5 of the NAPSEC Outcomes project). Washington, DC: Author.
- In press New Horizons for Learning <http://education.jhu.edu/PD/newhorizons/Journals/>

National Center for Educational Statistics (1993a). *National education longitudinal study of 1988: NELS: 88 questionnaires, base year through second follow-up.*

(Volume I, Base year 1988). Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

National Center for Educational Statistics (1993b). *National education longitudinal study of 1988: NELS: 88 questionnaires, base year through second follow-up.* (Volume II, First Follow-up 1990). Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

National Center for Educational Statistics (1993c). *National education longitudinal study of 1988: NELS: 88 questionnaires, base year through second follow-up.* (Volume III, Follow-Up 1992). Washington D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Parrish, T., Harr, J., Wolman, J., Anthony, J., Merickel, A., & Esra, P. (2004). *State special education finance systems, 1999-2000. Part II: Special education revenues and expenditures.* Center for Special Education Finance, American Institutes for Research, Publisher.

Simpson, R.L., Peterson, R.L., & Smith, C.R. (2011). Critical educational program components for students with emotional and behavioral disorders: Science, policy, and practice. *Remedial and Special Education, 32, 3, 230-242.*

State University of New York, Potsdam Institute. (2004). *New York State Post-School Indicators Longitudinal Study.* Author.

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.
- Turnbull, H.R, Turnbull, A.P, Wehmeyer, M.L., & Park, J (2003). A quality of life framework for special education outcomes. *Remedial and Special Education, 24*(2) 67-74.
- 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 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 (2002). *President's Commission of Excellence in Special Education Report. A new era: Revitalizing special education for children and their families*. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2005). The condition of education 2005. (Report Number 2005-094). Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- U. S. Department of Health & Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration, Maternal and Child Health Bureau. (2008). *The national survey of children with special health care needs chartbook. 2005-2006*. Rockville, Maryland: US Department of Health and Human Services.
- Wagner, M., Blackorby, J., Cameto, R., & Newman, L. (1993). *What makes a difference? Influences on postschool outcomes of youth with disabilities. The third comprehensive report from the National Longitudinal Transition Study of Special Education Students*. Menlo Park, CA: SRI International.
- Wagner, M., & Cameto, R. (2004). The characteristics, experiences, and outcomes of youth with emotional disturbances. Reports from the National Longitudinal Transitional Study-2.
- Wagner, M., Friend, M., Bursuck, W.D., Kutash, K., Duchnowski, W., Sumi, C., & Epstein, M.H. (2006). Educating students with emotional disturbances: A national perspective on school programs and services. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 14, 12-30.
- Wagner, M., Kutash, K., Duchnowski, A., & Epstein, M. (2005). The Special Education Elementary Longitudinal Study and the National Longitudinal Transition Study-2: Study
- In press New Horizons for Learning <http://education.jhu.edu/PD/newhorizons/Journals/>

designs and implications for children and students with emotional disturbance. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 13, 25-41.

Wagner, M., Newman, L., D'Aico, R., Jay, E.D., Butler-Nalin, P., & Cox, R. (1991). *Youth with disabilities: How are they doing? The first comprehensive study of special education students*. SRI International, Menlo Park, CA.

Zhang, D., Barrett, d., Katsiyannis, A., & Yoon, M. (2011). Juvenile offenders with and without disabilities: Risks and patterns of recidivism, *Learning and Individual Differences*, 21, 12-18.

Author Note

Deborah T. Carran, School of Education, Johns Hopkins University; Millicent H. Kellner, Center for Applied Psychology, Rutgers University; Sue Murray, Transition Specialist, MANSEF; Christine Ramsey, Department of Mental Health, School of Hygiene and Public Health, Johns Hopkins University.

This research was supported by grants from the Maryland Association of Nonpublic Special Education Facilities and ASAH of New Jersey (formerly the Association of Schools and Agencies for the Handicapped).

Correspondence concerning this article may be directed to Deborah T Carran, School of Education, 6740 Alexander Bell Drive, Columbia, MD 21046-2100. E-mail: dtcarran@jhu.edu

Table 1

Demographic Comparison of ASAH and MANSEF Cohorts EBD Youth

		ASAH			MANSEF			ASAH + MANSEF
		Cohort		Combined	Cohort		Combined	Total
		I (2005-06)	II (2006-07)	I + II	I (2005-06)	II (2006-07)	I + II	
		N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Total N Recruited		76 (100%)	64 (100%)	140 (100%)	80 (100%)	74 (100%)	154 (100%)	294 (100%)
Race	Caucasian	61 (80%)	39 (61%)	100 (71%)	41 (51%)	50 (68%)	91 (59%)	191 (65%)
	Af-American ^{1,3}	4 (5%)	13 (20%)	17 (12%)	32 (40%)	20 (27%)	52 (34%)	69 (23%)
	Other Minority	11 (14%)	12 (19%)	23 (16%)	7 (9%)	4 (5%)	11 (7%)	34 (12%)
F/R Lunch	Yes ²	14 (18%)	16 (25%)	30 (21%)	15 (19%)	15 (20%)	30 (20%)	60 (20%)
	No	62 (82%)	41 (64%)	103 (74%)	29 (36%)	18 (24%)	47 (30%)	150 (51%)
	Missing	0	7 (11%)	7 (5%)	36 (45%)	41 (55%)	77 (50%)	84 (29%)
Sex	Male	38 (50%)	39 (61%)	77 (55%)	52 (65%)	51 (69%)	103 (67%)	180 (61%)
	Female	38 (50%)	25 (39%)	63 (45%)	28 (35%)	23 (31%)	51 (33%)	114 (39%)
Contact Wave 1		49 (64%)	51 (80%)	100 (71%)	53 (66%)	56 (76%)	109 (71%)	209 (71%)
Contact Wave 2		57 (75%)	44 (69%)	101 (72%)	54 (68%)	52 (70%)	106 (69%)	207 (70%)
Contact Wave 1 & 2		45 (59%)	40 (62%)	85 (61%)	41 (51%)	44 (59%)	85 (55%)	170 (58%)
Contact Wave 1 or 2		61 (80%)	55 (86%)	116 (83%)	66 (82%)	64 (86%)	130 (84%)	246 (84%)

¹MANSEF significantly more African-American students than ASAH

²MANSEF significantly more Free and Reduced Meal students than ASAH

³ASAH Cohort II significantly more African-American students than ASAH Cohort I

Table 2

Post-Secondary Education among EBD Youth in MANSEF and ASAH Schools and NLTS-2, Two Years Out of High School

	MANSEF % (N)	ASAH % (N)	NPSEF % (N)	NLTS-2 % (SE)
Any Post-Secondary School*	55.4 (72)	62.1 (72)	58.5 (144)	20.8 (4.7)
2 Year Community College*	37.7 (49)	50.0 (58)	43.5 (107)	12.5 (3.9)
Vocational, Business, Technical School*	10.0 (13)	6.0 (7)	8.1 (20)	7.4 (3.1)
4 Year College*	10.8 (14)	18.1 (21)	14.2 (35)	4.0 (2.3)

*Participants contacted at Wave 1 and/or Wave 2

Table 3

Emerging Independence among EBD Youth in MANSEF and ASAH Schools and NLTS-2, Two Years Out of High School

	MANSEF % (N)	ASAH % (N)	NPSEF % (N)	NLTS-2 % (SE)
Percentage of Youth Employed Full or Part time at Interview				
Wave 1	53.2 (58)	58.6 (58)	55.5 (116)	27.2 (4.9)
wave 2	53.7 (57)	52.4 (53)	53.1 (110)	36.2 (5.4)
Living with Parents				
Wave 1	88.1 (96)	88.0 (88)	88.0 (184)	84.5 (3.9)
wave 2	76.4 (81)	82.2 (83)	79.2 (164)	65.3 (5.2)
Living Alone, with a Spouse, Roommate, or College Dorm				
Wave 1	9.1 (10)	7.0 (7)	8.1 (17)	0
wave 2	21.7 (23)	17.8 (18)	19.8 (41)	16.5 (4.0)
Other Living Situation*				
Wave 1	4.5 (5)	3.0 (3)	3.8 (8)	0.2 (0.5)
Wave 2	2.8 (3)	2.0 (2)	2.4 (5)	5.6 (2.5)
Marital Status**				
Single	94.0 (109)	97.6 (127)	96.0 (236)	83.5 (4.3)
Married	2.6 (3)	2.4 (3)	2.4 (6)	3.6 (2.2)
Marriage-Like Relationship	3.4 (4)	0	1.6 (4)	4.3 (2.4)
Have or Fathered a Child				
Wave 1	1.8 (2)	4.0 (4)	2.9 (6)	1.5 (1.3)
Wave 2	2.8 (3)	5.0 (5)	3.9 (8)	11.0 (3.7)
Driver's license/permit				
Wave 1	35.8 (39)	65.0 (65)	49.7 (104)	33.7 (5.3)
Wave 2	49.0 (52)	78.2 (79)	63.3 (131)	62.9 (5.7)

*Supervised Group Home, Residential Facility, Jail/Correctional Facility; **participants contacted at W1 and/or W2

Table 4

Civic and Community Engagement among EBD Youth in MANSEF and ASAH Schools and NLTS2, Two Years Out of High School

	MANSEF % (N)	ASAH % (N)	NPSEF % (N)	NLTS2 % (SE)
Involved in Community Group, Hobby, Club, Religious Group, etc				
Wave 1	24.8 (27)	20.0 (20)	22.4 (47)	46.7 (3.9)
wave 2	16.0 (17)	19.8 (20)	18.8 (39)	28.0 (3.8)

Registered to Vote, Up to Two Years*	40.8 (53)	44.8 (52)	42.7 (105)	51.5 (6.6)
Arrested, Ever Up to Two Years*	16.2 (21)	17.2 (20)	16.7 (41)	57.6 (5.5)
Engagement *				
Employment Only	4.6 (45)	29.3 (34)	32.1 (79)	43.8 (5.3)
Post-Secondary Only	10.0 (13)	8.6 (10)	9.3 (23)	0.9 (1.0)
Job Training Alone or w/Other Engagement	8.4 (11)	3.4 (4)	6.1 (15)	3.4 (2.0)
Employment and Post-Secondary Education	35.4 (46)	51.7 (60)	43.1 (106)	17.9 (4.1)
Not Engaged	9.2 (12)	6.0 (7)	7.7 (19)	34 **

* Participants contacted at W1 and/or W2

**Estimated Percentage in NLTS2, SE not available