

Study on the Accuracy of the Graduation Data of Students with Disabilities in the LAUSD, 2006-2007 School Year

Office of the Independent Monitor
December 10, 2007

Introduction

This report presents the findings of the study on the accuracy of the District's graduation data of students with disabilities (SWD) in the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD). The study measures the accuracy of the District's data of SWD who graduated with a high school diploma in accordance with Outcome 3: Graduation Rate, of the Modified Consent Decree (MCD). The results of this 2006-2007 validation study were used by the Independent Monitor (IM) for determining whether the District met performance targets of Outcome 3. This data was also used to validate data associated with Outcome 4: Completion Rate.

This report also provides background on the development of the outcome targets, methodology of the study and findings.

Background

The Modified Consent Decree includes two outcomes that are aimed at increasing the rate of students with disabilities that graduate with a diploma and/or complete high school. The outcomes are intended to increase the number of students with disabilities completing high school while decreasing the number of students with disabilities that drop out.

The outcomes are as follows:

Outcome 3: Graduation Rate

The District shall increase the number of grade 12 students with disabilities who receive diplomas based on the 2001-2002 data by at least 5% (no less than 42.01% of grade 12 students with disabilities) during the 2003-2004 school year, at least 5% (no less than 44.11% of grade 12 students with disabilities) during the 2004-05 school year, and at least 5% (no less than 46.32% of grade 12 students with disabilities) during the 2005-2006 school year. This outcome is based on current diploma requirements. If the State's diploma requirements change, the Independent Monitor shall meet with the parties and discuss the impact of the change and may revise the outcome if appropriate.

Outcome 4: Completion Rate

The District's completion rate shall increase based on an increase in the number of students who graduate with a diploma, receive a certificate of completion, or age out, as compared to the total number of students with disabilities who graduate with a diploma, receive a certificate of completion, age out, or drop out (grades 7-12).

2005-2006 Graduation Rates from OIM Verification Study

Graduation data obtained during the 2005-2006 school year, demonstrated a graduation rate of student's with disabilities of 42.52%. The verification study also found considerable errors within the SIS system and raised concerns about the accuracy of the graduation data and its potential for overestimating graduation rates. One primary concern was the automatic default within the system that assigned pre-determined leave codes for student graduation outcomes prior to their graduation. Although it appears that the SIS system continues to include defaults of leave codes for students, the District took actions to clarify the reporting of graduation outcomes for all students. In addition, the District implemented a new tracking indicator for maintaining graduation outcomes through year end codes during the 2006-2007 school year.

OIM Study of the Accuracy of the District's Graduation Data 2006-2007

This outcome aims to increase the number of SWD graduating with a high school diploma to no less than 46.32%. To verify the accuracy of the District's graduation data for the 2006-2007 school year, the OIM conducted a validation study to verify the graduation status of all SWD identified as 12th grade students. This study aimed to identify sources of error within the data and establish an accurate¹ graduation rate for the 2006-2007 school year. The study consists of a verification of the District's data by visiting all schools that reported graduation data, and reviewing all available sources of data to obtain the most accurate outcome for each student.

Data Collection of Graduation Rates by Research and Evaluation (formally Program and Evaluation and Research Branch)

To determine the graduation rates of students with disabilities, Research and Evaluation (R&E) provided all schools with a list of the 12th grade SWD enrolled as of December 1, 2006, and required schools to report the graduation and enrollment status of the each student by indicating whether a student had: completed the requirements of a diploma; graduated with the Chapman Exemption²; received a certificate of completion; aged out; dropped out; did not graduate but continued to be enrolled; and/or transferred to another district school, out of a district school or non-public school. Schools were also instructed to add any additional students that enrolled and graduated from their school during the 2006-2007 school year. Furthermore, schools were instructed to identify the source(s) used in reporting graduation data and principals were required to certify the accuracy of this information. Data was collected through October 2007, therefore allowing for student graduation through the end of the extended school year 2006-2007. Upon completion of the data collection, R&E provided the OIM copies of the graduation data as reported by schools. This data was then entered into a database developed by the OIM to determine graduation rates.

Based on the data reported by schools for the 2006-2007 school year, the District reported a graduation rate of 44.20% for all 12th grade SWD. This graduation rate does not meet the

¹ This graduation rate only reflects those SWD enrolled on December 1, 2006 with 12th grade status.

² The Chapman Exemption refers to the waiver granted by the courts for students with disabilities that did not pass the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE).

required target of 46.32%; therefore based on data reported by schools, the District did not meet the requirements of this outcome.

The verification of graduation data includes only those students identified by the District's data systems as grade 12 enrolled on December 1, 2006.

Sample/Population

As noted earlier, due to difficulties with the accuracy of the District's graduation data the parties agreed to measure the graduation rate of SWD in the LAUSD by first obtaining a fixed student count of students identified as 12th graders receiving special education services in order to track whether these students graduated with a diploma. This cohort of students serves as the population for determining the graduation rate for the 2006-2007 school year. To ensure capturing all 12th grade SWD enrolled as of December 1, 2006³, a combination of the District's data systems was used by OIM to determine the population of students. This combined database was provided to R&E.

The population of students includes 3,970 students from 118 sites and all local districts. This includes 50 comprehensive high schools, 13 special education centers and 55 magnet, charter and options schools. The sample consists of 2,057 students (53.58%) eligible as SLD/SLI and 1,782 students (46.42%) with all other disabilities.

It is important to note and emphasize that the population of SWD only consist of those students identified as 12th grade SWD enrolled in a LAUSD school enrolled on December 1, 2006. Students that dropped out prior to December 1, 2006, or enrolled thereafter, are not included in this population, and are therefore not included in the number or percentage of students with disabilities that graduated. In addition, the population of SWD includes students that may not be considered diploma track and therefore it is assumed that the population does not have the potential for graduating all students with a diploma. However, student outcomes for non-diploma track students are counted for Outcome 4, which includes students that may have received a certificate of completion, aged out, or are still enrolled. Data on outcomes for non-diploma track students was also reported by schools and the accuracy of the data was verified by the OIM within this study.

Methodology

To validate the accuracy of the District's graduation data for the entire population of 12th grade students with disabilities, the OIM visited all of the District's schools that reported graduation data for SWD enrolled on December 1, 2006. The objective of the site visit was to review the various sources of data used by schools for reporting graduation data. This included reviewing: student transcripts in the SIS and cumulative files; various data fields within the SIS; and,

³ A December 1, 2006 student count was selected for the following reasons: This count coincides with the Title I student count required by federal law; the CASEMIS count of students with disabilities required by the State of California; maximizes the number of students enrolled; and, attempts to avoid capturing SWDs promoted to 12th grade after the 2nd semester, as these students would not have sufficient time to graduate during the 2006-2007 school year.

counselor/administrator records used for tracking student graduation requirements and issuance of a diploma. During the 2006-2007 school year, the District implemented another indicator for tracking graduation data. This indicator is referred to as the year end flag and is sourced in the SIS data system. This source of data was used to confirm graduation outcomes as a supplemental source only in instances where other sources were not available or discrepancies existed between sources. Year end flags were not a primary source of graduation outcome data due to the lack of alignment with leave codes within the SIS and observable errors in the implementation at the initial schools visited. One concern noted with the implementation of the year end flag was the multiple options available for coding graduation outcomes and the apparent lack of clarity of school personnel assigning year end flags.

The instrument from the 2005-2006 school year study was used by the OIM for validating graduation data for each school with some modifications (See Attachment A). The instrument contained all students with 12th grade status enrolled on December 1, 2006, and included the student's identification number, date of birth and eligibility code. Six options were included for verification to capture the outcome of each student (i.e. graduated with a diploma, received a certificate of completion, aged out, dropped out, transferred to a district school, out of district/within state, out of state, non public school, dropped out or unknown). Using the data reported by schools, the instruments contained the outcome as reported by schools above the corresponding verification box on the instrument. For instance, if a school had reported that a student graduated with a diploma, "YES" was indicated above the verification box marked "Diploma". If the school presented evidence of a student receiving a diploma, the box was checked to indicate a match. If the school reported a different outcome than a diploma for the student, such as having received a certificate of completion the corresponding box was marked. In addition, a comment section was provided for each student for additional relevant information. During the 2006-2007 school year, data on the leave "L" code was collected to identify discrepancies within the SIS system. The instrument was modified to include the L code uploaded centrally, and data was collected to identify the L code observed during the site review, and then to identify what the actual L code should be based on the most current school report.

As a result of the 2005-2006 school year study, modifications were made to the request made to schools for verifying graduation data. During the 2006-2007 school year, schools were requested to provide school personnel with knowledge of the graduation data and with access to the SIS system. This differed from the 2005-2006 school year where schools were no longer asked to provide printouts from the SIS system of L codes for students. Schools were also requested to provide any counselor logs or records that show evidence of student graduation or completion outcomes. Access to the SIS system was essential this year since the study aimed to identify discrepancies with data reported by the SIS. It is important to note that data sources used for determining graduation rates varied.

Graduation with a diploma was verified in the following ways: cumulative records with an indication of graduation with a diploma with the accompanying principal certification as evidenced by a signature or official school stamp; an L7 code within the SIS system using the graduation requirement screen (TR04) indicating that the student met all of their requirements and the minimum of 230 cumulative credits; an indicator of graduation with a diploma based on counselor graduation logs; and, in some instances with conflicting information within the data

system, counselor verbal reports that the student graduated with a diploma with demonstrated evidence that the student met the minimum of 230 cumulative credits and/or received a Chapman exemption was used.

For students that received certificates of completion, the cumulative records and the 421 field (non-standard exit) of the SIS was used to verify issuance of a certificate. In some instances schools reported the most accurate data source as counselor logs or databases, whereby this source of data was used to verify graduation and/or certificate of completion.

For students that were reported as having transferred to another LAUSD school or out of the district, information was obtained regarding their subsequent school of enrollment. For students that were reported as having continued enrollment, verification of enrollment was obtained from their class schedule (CL54) screen within the SIS.

To capture the outcomes of all SWD within the population, additional 12th grade students with disabilities added by schools as having graduated, were cross-referenced within the OIM database containing the December 1, 2006 population of SWD.

Data Analysis

Upon completion of data collection, data was entered into the database developed by the OIM. Data obtained from the validation study was entered with the data reported by schools for comparison and to determine errors within the data. Since the population of students was observed, the graduation rate of students with disabilities reported by the OIM is considered the actual graduation rate of SWD for the 2006-2007 school year.

The graduation rate was determined as agreed upon by the parties, and is as follows:

- Numerator includes grade 12 SWD receiving a diploma or passing the High School Proficiency Exam/GED for the 2006-07 school year.
- Denominator includes all grade 12 SWD enrolled December 1, 2006 excluding SWD who have left LAUSD to another California public school (L³), California nonpublic school (L⁴) or school outside of California (L⁵) after December 1, 2006.

As noted above, students that have left the District are removed from the population for determining the graduation rate. Therefore, the analyzed sample excludes 131 students that left the LAUSD and consists of 3,839 SWD (Table 1).

TABLE 1. Analyzed Sample by Local District

Local District	Total Grade 12 SWD	Left the District L3, L4, L5	Total Students in Analyzed Sample	Percent of Analyzed Sample
1	731	34	697	100%
2	469	18	451	100%
3	575	17	558	100%
4	486	11	475	100%
5	469	11	458	100%
6	238	9	229	100%
7	354	12	342	100%
8	546	17	529	100%
Charter	102	2	100	100%
	3,970	131	3,839	100%

Findings

The graduation validation study had two primary goals. The first was to determine the actual graduation rate of SWD within the District by conducting site verification of student outcomes; the second was to identify sources of error associated with the data as reported by schools. It is important to note that charter schools were reported as a separate local district during the 2006-2007 school year. Students with disabilities attending charter schools represent 2.6% of the entire population of SWD (100 students) with the majority of students with an eligibility of learning disability (85%) thereby comparisons should be made with caution. In addition, some comparisons are made between the 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 school year data with this factor in mind.

Graduation Rate by OIM

During the 2006-2007 school year, 44.80% of SWD enrolled as of December 1, 2006 graduated with a diploma (Table 2). This is an increase of 2.28% (84 students) from the 2005-2006 school year. Graduation rates by local district indicate that local district 2 has the highest rates of graduation for SWD (57.21%), while local district 5 (37.55%) and local district 8 (36.48%) have the lowest.

Furthermore, local district 2 demonstrated considerable increase in the number and percentage of SWD graduating with a diploma between the 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 school year. During the 2006-2007 school year, local district 2 graduated 258 (57.21%) of students with disabilities with a diploma, an increase from 201 (50.76%) noted during the 2005-2006 school year.

TABLE 2. Number and Percentage of SWD that Received a Diploma, by Local District

Local District	Total 12 th Grade SWD	Received a Diploma	% Received a Diploma	Did Not Receive a Diploma	% Did not Receive a Diploma
1	697	295	42.32%	402	57.68%
2	451	258	57.21%	193	42.79%
3	558	228	40.86%	330	59.14%
4	475	230	48.42%	245	51.58%
5	458	172	37.55%	286	62.45%
6	229	111	48.47%	118	51.53%
7	342	148	43.27%	194	56.73%
8	529	193	36.48%	336	63.52%
Charters	100	85	85.00%	15	15.00%
	3,839	1,720	44.80%	2,119	55.20%

Outcomes for SWD not receiving a Diploma

For those students that did not receive a diploma (55.20%), findings by outcome are provided below (Table 3). Of all 12th grade SWD, 11.15% received a certificate of completion or aged out. This is an increase of 1.4% (53 SWD) from the 2005-2006 school year. During the 2006-2007 school year, 31.21% demonstrated evidence of continued enrollment. Local district 8 shows the highest rate of students continuing (43.29%), while local district 6 (16.59%), local district 2 (23.06%) and local district 4 (22.11%) had the lowest rate of continued enrollment.

TABLE 3. Number and Percentage of SWD Receiving a Certificate of Completion/Aged Out or with Continued Enrollment, by Local District.

Local District	Total 12 th Grade SWD	Received Certificate/Aged out	% Received Certificate/Aged out	Continued Enrollment	% Continued Enrollment
1	697	93	13.34%	249	35.72%
2	451	52	11.53%	104	23.06%
3	558	64	11.47%	191	34.23%
4	475	54	11.37%	105	22.11%
5	458	45	9.83%	178	38.86%
6	229	17	7.42%	38	16.59%
7	342	29	8.48%	101	29.53%
8	529	69	13.04%	229	43.29%
Charters	100	5	5.00%	3	3.00%
	3,839	428	11.15%	1,198	31.21%

Table 4 shows SWD that dropped out (9.33%) during the 2006-2007 school year. This is a 2.05% decrease from the 2005-2006 school year drop out rate of 11.38%. Local district 1 (4.73%) and local district 8 (4.35%) demonstrate the lowest rates of student drop out, while local district 6 (22.27%) had the highest drop out rate of SWD. However, it is important to note that

local district 6 made improvements in decreasing the drop out rate from 29.05% during the 2005-2006 school year.

For students reported as having transferred to a school within LAUSD, outcomes were not reported by any other school for 155 students. As was noted in the methodology, schools were required to include any additional SWD that enrolled in their schools that did not appear on the December 1, 2006 count, and report outcomes for those students. Since neither enrollment nor graduation outcomes could be verified for students reported as having transferred within LAUSD, 4.04% of all 12th grade SWD were counted as not having received a diploma.

TABLE 4. Number and Percentage of SWD Receiving a Certificate of Completion/Aged Out or with Continued Enrollment, by Local District.

Local District	Total 12 th Grade SWD	Dropped Out	% Dropped Out	Transferred within LAUSD-Not Reported	% Transferred within LAUSD-Not Reported
1	697	33	4.73%	37	5.31%
2	451	32	7.10%	13	2.88%
3	558	66	11.83%	11	1.97%
4	475	55	11.58%	25	5.26%
5	458	45	9.83%	21	4.59%
6	229	51	22.27%	14	6.11%
7	342	47	13.74%	16	4.68%
8	529	23	4.35%	16	3.02%
Charter	100	6	6.00%	2	2.00%
	3,839	358	9.33%	155	4.04%

Sources of Error of Graduation Data as Reported by Schools

For the 2006-2007 school year, schools reported a total of 1,697 SWD as having graduated with a diploma. The validation study was able to verify graduation for 1,623 students. For the remaining 74 students, 63 students did not receive a diploma because they either dropped out; were still enrolled; or received a certificate of completion/aged out. Two students left the District while 9 transferred to another LAUSD school with no enrollment or outcome data reported.

Overall, the OIM study found a total of 1,720 students as having graduated with a diploma. This increase in the number of students that graduated with a diploma is attributed to two primary factors. First, reporting errors of graduation outcomes by schools; second, changes in the graduation outcomes for students. The latter is a result of students that completed graduation requirements by the end of summer and whose information was either not available or updated at the time of the District's final data collection in late October 2007.

Errors were also observed in the data for students that schools reported as not having received a diploma (2,061). Of these students, 89 actually received a diploma and 49 transferred out of the district resulting in their exclusion for determining the graduation rate.

For students reported as having received certificates of completion schools reported 415 while the OIM review found 419 students that received certificates. For students reported by schools as having transferred out of the District (90), the validation review was able to obtain outcomes for 14 students with one student having graduated with a diploma. Lastly, schools reported 165 students that dropped out while the OIM verification review found 358 students. Although this is a noticeable discrepancy between dropouts as reported by schools and that found by the OIM, this difference is primarily a result of schools having reported students that were anticipated to have continued enrollment either during summer session and/or fall 2007. During the OIM visitation in October, many of these students did not return and/or transferred to another LAUSD or other school, therefore were considered dropouts.

As was noted in the methodology, the 2006-2007 school year verification study included the collection of SIS L codes for comparisons with the SIS L codes provided by the District in June 2007. Although differences are expected due to student information being updated throughout summer and into early fall, it is interesting to point out that the largest discrepancies were noted for students with L8 leave codes. This is the code assigned for students whose graduation outcomes are unknown, therefore considered dropouts. In June 2007, the SIS system reported 452 students from the December 1, 2006 count as containing an L8 code. At the time of the OIM site review in October 2007, 179 of those students continued to contain an L8 code. The majority of students (239) had been updated and contained a leave code of L7 which indicates graduation with a diploma or the receipt of a certification of completion. One primary reason for this differences of L codes is that the SIS system automatically defaults students with an L8 code if they have not passed both sections of the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE) and their waiver request was pending or the SIS information system L code had not been updated by schools. This example highlights the potential for error in determining the graduation rate for all students based on the SIS system leave codes.

Overall, errors were observed within the graduation data as reported by schools. However, these errors had minimal impact on the overall graduation rate with schools reporting 44.2% of SWD graduating with a diploma, and the actual graduation rate obtained by the OIM at 44.80%. Despite this minor increase in the graduation rate for SWD, the District does not meet the required target for Outcome 3 of 46.32%.

SIS Data System and Practices for Documenting and Reporting Graduation Data

Although the validation study was specific to students with disabilities, it should be understood that the review and observations of the District's data system and procedures for documenting and reporting graduation are not limited to SWD.

Overall, the quality of the graduation data appears to have improved since the 2005-2006 school year due to the requirements and increased documentation of the Chapman Exemption which allowed students with disabilities to apply for a waiver to graduate with a diploma if they did not pass the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE), the implementation of year end codes and clarification of data entry for SIS leave codes, and the ongoing tracking and collection of graduation data of SWD. Another factor that may have contributed to the improvement in the quality of data is the role of the diploma track coordinator.

Although improvements are noted in the District's secondary SIS data system for reporting graduation data, it appears the system continues to default leave codes for students within the system. This default creates two primary errors. First, since the system defaults all students as withdrawn by culmination, the system will overestimate the number of students who graduate with a diploma and/or receive a certificate of completion if the system is not updated by schools and appropriate codes are entered for all students. In addition, the L⁷ code is assigned to all students who receive a diploma or a certificate of completion without any indicator to differentiate whether it was a diploma or certificate of completion.

Second, the secondary SIS system continues to include a default for students that did not pass the CAHSEE designating them with an L⁸ code, or "Unknown". The L⁸ code also is given to students that are considered non-grads or dropouts. This may also contribute to inaccuracies as some students were reported as L⁸ or dropouts that actually graduated with a diploma under the Chapman Exemption.

The SIS often did not contain the most updated graduation requirements for students. The majority of these discrepancies are a result of recent changes in the student's outcome, such as the student had indicated they would continue during summer or fall and did not enroll, or the student completed graduation requirements during summer which were not reflected on the SIS system. These sources of errors have an effect on the graduation rates of SWD but are minimized by the data verification process which occurs at a later date and observes multiple data sources to determine graduation outcomes.

One area of concern within the SIS system is the indicator which identifies a student's grade or year in school. For example, District policy requires student's to obtain 170 units in order to be promoted as a 12th grade student. However, some students' records contain an indicator of 12th grade that do not meet the minimum units required for 12th grade promotion as a result of their years in school. Furthermore, it appears that the SIS system automatically promotes a student based on school year and not units obtained. The SIS system requires the manual entry of grade status for student's not meeting the minimum unit requirements for their respective grade. For the purpose of determining the graduation rate for Outcome 3, all students identified with 12th grade status were counted regardless of the number of units obtained.

Lastly, the implementation of year end codes appears to be another source for maintaining graduation data. Although this review did not attempt to validate the accuracy of year end codes, year end codes were reviewed and in some instances discrepancies were noted between SIS leave codes and counselor records. It is important to mention that there does not appear to be any cross-referencing or relationship between "L" codes and year end flags therefore potentially resulting in discrepancies.

Additional Findings

The validation study observed some general systematic improvements in the practices for maintaining and reporting of graduation outcomes. Mainly, schools are required to maintain the graduation outcomes using various sources such as the SIS system leave codes, year end flags,

counselor logs, Chapman Exemption waiver application process, and lists of potential graduates provided by R&E. The use of the different methods for collecting graduation data requires considerable effort and allows multiple opportunities for reviewing individual student requirements needed for graduation.

Another positive finding is related to the impact of the diploma recovery project. Although this verification study did not systematically collect data on students that graduated as a benefit from these efforts, in some instances it was noted that students that had graduated during the 2006-2007 school year, were students from previous graduation classes such as 2005-2006.

To highlight these positive benefits of such efforts a brief case study is included featuring Jordan High School. During the 2005-2006 school year Jordan reported a class of students with disabilities of 38, with 16 of those students (44.4%) having graduated with a diploma. During the 2006-2007 school year, Jordan saw an increase in the total number of 12th grade students with disabilities to 59, and graduated 35 with a diploma (59.32%). Furthermore, the review found several cases where students that had dropped out previously returned and completed their graduation requirements.

Finally, there continues to be differences in the graduation rates by local districts and schools. A review of graduation rates by schools indicates that there is a large range between the graduation rates of schools with some schools graduating only 33% of their SWD while others graduate as many as 88% (See Attachment B).

Office of the Independent Monitor
 Los Angeles Unified School District
 12th Grade Students Enrolled 12/2/2006

Attachment A

8557

BIRMINGHAM SH

LOCAL DISTRICT: 1

Comments:	Diploma:	Certificate:	Continue:	Age Out:	Not Gr-12:	Other:	ReCheck:	Dropped Out:	L Code:	SIS L Code:
	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	L7

Comments:	Diploma:	Certificate:	Continue:	Age Out:	Not Gr-12:	Other:	ReCheck:	Dropped Out:	L Code:	SIS L Code:
	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	L8

Comments:	Diploma:	Certificate:	Continue:	Age Out:	Not Gr-12:	Other:	ReCheck:	Dropped Out:	L Code:	SIS L Code:
	No	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:	Diploma:	Certificate:	Continue:	Age Out:	Not Gr-12:	Other:	ReCheck:	Dropped Out:	L Code:	SIS L Code:
	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	L7

Comments:	Diploma:	Certificate:	Continue:	Age Out:	Not Gr-12:	Other:	ReCheck:	Dropped Out:	L Code:	SIS L Code:
	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:	Diploma:	Certificate:	Continue:	Age Out:	Not Gr-12:	Other:	ReCheck:	Dropped Out:	L Code:	SIS L Code:
	No	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:	Diploma:	Certificate:	Continue:	Age Out:	Not Gr-12:	Other:	ReCheck:	Dropped Out:	L Code:	SIS L Code:
	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	L8

Comments:	Diploma:	Certificate:	Continue:	Age Out:	Not Gr-12:	Other:	ReCheck:	Dropped Out:	L Code:	SIS L Code:
	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	L8

Comprehensive High Schools by Highest Percent of SWD Receiving a Diploma

Loc Code	School	LD	# of Students	Diploma	% Diploma
8881	SOUTH EAST SH	6	25	22	88.00%
8798	PALISADES CHRTR SH	R	52	45	86.54%
8880	TAFT SH	1	39	33	84.62%
8943	WESTCHESTER SH	3	26	22	84.62%
8617	EL CAMINO REAL SH	1	30	25	83.33%
8681	GRANADA HILLS HS	R	28	23	82.14%
8575	CARSON SH	8	40	32	80.00%
8725	KENNEDY SH	1	59	47	79.66%
8893	VAN NUYS SH	2	42	33	78.57%
8132	FOSHAY LC	7	17	13	76.47%
8914	VERDUGO HILLS SH	2	34	26	76.47%
8614	EAGLE ROCK HS	4	46	35	76.09%
8716	SANTEE EDUC COMPLEX	5	29	22	75.86%
8733	LOCKE SH	7	45	34	75.56%
8786	NO HOLLYWOOD SH	2	57	42	73.68%
8683	GRANT SH	2	41	29	70.73%
8686	HAMILTON SH-COMPLEX	3	61	42	68.85%
8693	HOLLYWOOD SH	4	56	38	67.86%
8517	CONTRERAS LC	4	3	2	66.67%
8843	SAN FERNANDO SH	2	47	31	65.96%
8557	BIRMINGHAM SH	1	52	34	65.38%
8768	MONROE SH	1	46	30	65.22%
8736	LOS ANGELES SH	3	65	42	64.62%
8750	MARSHALL SH	4	67	43	64.18%
8928	WASHINGTON PREP SH	8	50	32	64.00%
8596	CRENSHAW SH	3	48	30	62.50%
8850	SAN PEDRO SH	8	63	39	61.90%
8664	GARDENA SH	8	33	20	60.61%
8590	CLEVELAND SH	1	25	15	60.00%
8721	JORDAN SH	7	59	35	59.32%
8643	FRANKLIN SH	4	71	42	59.15%
8529	BANNING SH	8	58	34	58.62%
8878	SYLMAR SH	2	66	38	57.58%
8571	CANOGA PARK SH	1	28	16	57.14%

Comprehensive High Schools by Highest Percent of SWD Receiving a Diploma

Loc Code	School	LD	# of Students	Diploma	% Diploma
8600	DORSEY SH	3	58	33	56.90%
8636	POLYTECHNIC SH	2	93	52	55.91%
8743	MANUAL ARTS SH	7	45	25	55.56%
8583	CHATSWORTH SH	1	55	30	54.55%
8650	FREMONT SH	7	73	39	53.42%
8679	GARFIELD SH	5	82	43	52.44%
8779	NARBONNE SH	8	54	28	51.85%
8700	HUNTINGTON PARK SH	6	60	31	51.67%
8907	VENICE SH	3	67	34	50.75%
8714	JEFFERSON SH	5	36	18	50.00%
8871	SOUTH GATE SH	6	36	18	50.00%
8829	ROOSEVELT SH	5	86	42	48.84%
8543	BELMONT SH	4	61	27	44.26%
8814	RESEDA SH	1	47	20	42.55%
8618	WILSON SH	5	67	28	41.79%
8621	FAIRFAX SH	4	50	19	38.00%
8729	LINCOLN SH	5	36	13	36.11%
8886	UNIVERSITY SH	3	59	20	33.90%
8536	BELL SH	6	82	27	33.90%