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Raising the Compulsory School Attendance Age: The Case for Reform
Since the publication of *The Silent Epidemic: Perspectives of High School Dropouts*, governors and state legislators have requested more information about one of our policy recommendations – to consider raising the compulsory school attendance age under state law from 16 or 17 to the age of 18, coupled with support for struggling students. In recent years, more and more states have been passing or introducing legislation to raise the compulsory school age. Many states have recognized that the original laws were passed 100 years ago or more when we had a very different economy. Today’s globally competitive economy requires at least a high school diploma and often additional education and training to provide the knowledge and skills needed for the 21st century. Good research also supports the view that increasing the compulsory school age can help decrease the dropout rate in schools. Notwithstanding the evidence, a majority of states still permit students to drop out before the age of 18.

We have published this report to provide to state and local leaders more information about the merits of raising the compulsory school age – including the latest research, compelling arguments, and examples of how other states are making progress – in order to strengthen the arsenal of tools states and communities have to combat the dropout epidemic.

**The Dropout Problem**

The United States has a dropout epidemic. Almost one-third of all public high school students – and one-half of African Americans, Hispanics, and Native Americans – fail to graduate from high school with their class. Most students drop out within just a few years of finishing school and often enter a life of poverty, crime, prison, and broken homes. Society also suffers from the loss of productivity and the higher costs of increased incarceration, health care and social services.

In our 2006 report, *The Silent Epidemic*, we shared the results of focus groups and a national survey of former students who had dropped out of high school. We also recommended concrete steps at the local, state and federal levels to address the dropout problem. While we face an epidemic in which the number of dropouts is unacceptably high, we also face an opportunity. Namely, the problem is not insurmountable, and we can make positive progress against it. One of the top reasons students gave for dropping out was that they had “too much freedom,” and many wished that their schools and parents had had higher expectations for them and had done more to keep them in classes each day. Another top reason was that they spent too much time with others who were not interested in school. Too much freedom combined with apathy about

> “Every student in America should graduate from high school ready for college, career and life. Every child. No exceptions. Whether they are going off to college or into the work force or a combination of the two, it is the responsibility of public education to give our young people the skills, knowledge and preparation for life they need and deserve.”


> “Raising the minimum age for school attendance, if accompanied by real support for the wavering students, would do a lot to end ‘the silent epidemic.’”

school creates a potent mixture, increasing the chances that students will drop out. Nearly all of the dropouts we surveyed regretted the decision.

Our report recommended that states could help reduce the dropout rate by raising the compulsory school age under state law, coupled with more supports for struggling students. While this step alone will not solve the dropout epidemic, we believe based on best evidence that it can help.

### Top Five Reasons Dropouts Identify as Major Factors For Leaving School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classes were not interesting</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missed too many days and could not catch up</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spent time with people who were not interested in school</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had too much freedom and not enough rules in my life</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was failing in school</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A Policy for a Bygone Era

The majority of states allow students to drop out of high school when they are 16 or 17, before they have reached graduation age (see Appendix B). Most states enacted these compulsory school attendance laws between 1870-1910, a time when fewer than 10 percent of 17 year olds graduated from high school. In fact, fewer than 15 percent of 14-17 year olds were even enrolled in high school in any given year before 1910. In an economy that was still significantly agrarian, a high school education was not a prerequisite to participating in the mainstream workforce. Fifty-two percent more Americans lived in rural than in urban areas in 1900. One hundred years later, the situation had changed entirely, and nearly four times more Americans live in urban than in rural areas. And non-farm employment has increasingly required education over the past one hundred years as we have shifted from an economy in which the largest share of jobs has moved from the manufacturing to the services sector.

Clearly, times have changed, though state laws have not always kept up. It is common knowledge that the U.S. economy needs college graduates. At a time when two-thirds of high-growth, high-wage jobs require a college degree and only one-third of Americans have college degrees, it makes little sense to us that...
state laws would continue to make it easy for students to avoid the prerequisite to college: a high school diploma.

**The Unhappy Consequences of the Status Quo**

Detractors might argue that students prone to dropping out of school will not go to college anyway, and therefore raising the compulsory school age will have little effect. Research indicates, however, that approximately one-quarter of potential dropouts remain in school because of compulsory school laws. In addition, overall enrollment rates among 16 year olds are lower in states that allow them to drop out when they turn 16. While it may be difficult to ascertain how many of those would choose to pursue a college education, it is more difficult to argue that they should be allowed to give up on school so easily before they are faced with that choice, especially in light of the fact that the vast majority of students who exercise the freedom to drop out of school later regret the decision and wish that their states and schools had had higher expectations of them. Faced with the reality of trying to get a job and raise a family, most students who dropped out wished they had remained in school.

Their concerns are merited – the economic consequences of dropping out are dramatic. In the United States, high school graduates earn 43 percent more than individuals without a high school diploma, and college graduates earn more than 150 percent – one and a half times – more. Median earnings for people who have not graduated from high school are currently a mere $415 per week. Research has shown a 10 percent rise in earnings for people who simply stay in school one year longer. Over their lifetimes, female high school dropouts earn between $120,000 and $244,000 less than female graduates, and males $117,000 to $322,000 less than male graduates. College graduates earn between $800,000 and $1,387,000 more over their lifetimes than high school dropouts.

Not only are earnings prospects bleak for dropouts who have jobs, but the prospect of having a job at all is not guaranteed: dropouts are much more likely to be unemployed. The unemployment rate among individuals who have not graduated from high school is 65 percent higher than it is for graduates and 3 times higher than it is for college graduates. Clearly, dropping out of high school is often equivalent to choosing a life of financial hardship. It also places a burden upon society as a whole. Annual public health costs for dropouts have been estimated at $58 billion, and approximately $10 billion could be saved each year in public assistance if all our students graduated from high school. A
10 percent increase in the high school completion rate would reduce the cost of crime by $14 billion. One recent study has shown that cutting the current cohort of 20 year old dropouts in half would result in $45 billion in added tax revenues and reduced public health, crime and welfare costs over the life of the cohort.

**Lifetime Earnings by Education Level**


**Important Research and Reports Related to Compulsory School Attendance**

In addition to what the data tell us about the social and economic prospects for dropouts, important research suggests that raising the compulsory school age curtails dropout rates and produces other positive outcomes. The following studies are useful resources:

- Joshua Angrist and Alan Krueger find in their study, “Does Compulsory School Attendance Affect Schooling and Earnings?” that approximately one out of every four potential dropouts remains in school because of compulsory schooling laws. In addition, the study shows that states allowing students to drop out of school at 16 also have lower enrollment rates among 16 year olds. The authors also find support in their research for the view that students who attend school longer because of compulsory laws earn higher wages in
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Philip Oreopoulos finds in his study, “Do Dropouts Drop Out Too Soon?” that students required to attend an extra year of schooling experience a 12 percent increase in earnings. In addition to increased earnings, the students are less likely to report being unemployed, having health problems, being depressed, and working in lower-skilled jobs. Oreopoulos shows that people with more schooling report higher levels of satisfaction with their lives overall, even when he controls for factors such as income. This study can be found at: Philip Oreopoulos. “Do Dropouts Drop Out Too Soon?” NBER Working Paper W10155 (December 2003). An updated working draft of the paper is available at http://www.economics.utoronto.ca/oreo/research/dropouts/details.htm.

In their overview and survey of research on the importance of compulsory school ages, Hoor Bhanpuri and Ginger Reynolds find that raising the age is an important component of confronting the dropout problem. In their study, “Understanding and Addressing the Issue of the High School Dropout Age,” the authors find evidence that raising the compulsory school age is gaining support across the United States in part because doing so helps reduce dropout numbers. The paper also provides a sampling of evidence-based interventions that help reduce the dropout rate. This study can be found at: Hoor Bhanpuri and Ginger Reynolds. “Understanding and Addressing the Issue of the High School Dropout Age.” Learning Point Associates (2003).

Our 21st century realities cannot be sustained by 19th century policies, and for this reason, governors and state legislators across the United States are beginning to call for more rigorous standards and supports for students in an effort to graduate more young people from high school. Since the publication of The Silent Epidemic report, Civic Enterprises has been contacted by numerous state leaders seeking to do something about the dropout problem in their states. While they all understand that raising graduation rates requires a multi-pronged approach, they also understand that it is more difficult to address the problem if state law permits students to drop out of school before they reach graduation age and sends the message that they can do so.

“I am also introducing, once again, a bill so that a student may not leave school until they graduate or reach the age of 18. Students need to graduate in order to get better jobs and have a better quality of life for the rest of their lives. This change will also motivate the state and schools to provide better alternative schools and more educational opportunities for those young people who are now dropping out of school.”

– South Dakota Governor Mike Rounds, State of the State Address, January 9, 2007

“Education is the single most important factor in the future prosperity of our state…Since 2003, we have seen vast improvements in education. Some of the most important gains have been in our students’ graduation rate – which has increased seven and a half percent over the last four years…But today I make the same challenge as before: While we’ve seen terrific progress, we must do better.”

– Georgia Governor Sonny Perdue, State of the State Address, January 10, 2007
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A Growing Trend

As much as the nation should be alarmed by the scope and gravity of America’s dropout problem, we should also be encouraged by the leadership that states across the country are demonstrating to address it. Only 17 states and the District of Columbia require students to be in school until they are 18. We are witnessing a movement, however, among states to raise their compulsory school attendance ages and provide more supports to struggling students.

Governors and state policymakers understand that their states’ economic future and the dropout problem are related, and they are taking action. Many current state efforts to keep young people in school are dealing with the compulsory school age, because there is a growing, shared understanding that raising the age requirement is also a way to raise expectations among students, their parents, school authorities, and the general public. These efforts also demonstrate an understanding that raising the school age must be supplemented by additional measures and supports.

Today, in addition to the 17 states and the District of Columbia that require students to remain in school until they graduate or are 18, 14 states have either introduced or passed legislation in the current session raising their compulsory school age to 18 (See Appendix C). Another 7 states have introduced legislation raising the age from 16 to 17. We are witnessing a moral seriousness about enriching school attendance requirements that is unprecedented perhaps since the movement to establish a compulsory school attendance age more than 100 years ago. Not all legislative efforts emerge victorious, but our hope is that state leaders will act upon their shared obligation to make sure that no student fails to graduate who otherwise could have succeeded.

Each state’s legislative initiative moves according to its unique needs, interests, and history. Some of the states’ bills under consideration merely raise the age to 18, while others provide additional provisions. Elements of more comprehensive legislative approaches include:

- An increase in the compulsory school age to 18
- Exceptions “with teeth,” namely express permission from school authorities and parents to be exempted from the legal age requirement
- Alternative schooling options for students needing extra help
- Sanctions or penalties for failing to attend classes

“When one in four Hoosier kids drops out…we are not getting the job done. Formal education begins in kindergarten, but for successful lives today and tomorrow, it never ends. Family supporting jobs from now on will almost always require not merely a quality high school learning experience but continuing education beyond.”

— Indiana Governor Mitch Daniels, State of the State Address, January 11, 2007

“The best economic development tool is an educated workforce. But too many of our kids are dropping out of high school. Our achievement gap is too wide, and we aren’t doing enough to partner with teachers to help them improve student learning. My goal: to start us down a 10-year path of progress. Right now, about 30 percent of Colorado high school students don’t graduate. Less than half of the black, Latino and American Indian students who start high school in Colorado actually finish. Less than half. Our goal: cut the drop-out rate in half within 10 years.”

— Colorado Governor Bill Ritter, State of the State Address, January 11, 2007
Not everyone, of course, supports raising the compulsory school age. Some have argued that students inclined to drop out will do so anyway, regardless of what the legal age is. In addition, some say, forcing likely dropouts to stay in school will lead to greater classroom disruptions and an overall negative influence on the remaining students. Others have opposed raising the legal age because it interferes with parents’ rights to make educational choices for their children, while still others argue that it raises the burden on taxpayers and gives more control to an already intrusive government.

While each of the arguments against raising the compulsory age merits consideration, many of the current state efforts can be regarded as efforts to respond to and accommodate them. There appears to be a growing consensus among governors and state officials that the long-term costs associated with the dropout problem warrant additional measures to help students stay in school and receive the support they need to graduate. Seen within the context of state economic development, earlier investments in young people are more likely to result in future economic benefit and lower social costs. Since there is a high probability that the government will be assuming responsibility for some aspect of a dropout’s life through welfare, healthcare, and the criminal justice system, increased attention by the public school system in an early effort to help students graduate seems a preferable and preemptive intervention. And because there is evidence that an increase in the legal age increases graduation rates, it does not seem like sound policy to assume that all potential dropouts will in fact drop out. For these reasons, states such as Arizona, Georgia, Indiana, and New Hampshire – to name only a representative sample – are providing supplemental supports, alternative education, and additional instruction to help students stay in school until they graduate.

As state leaders consider the best approach to boost graduation rates and cut dropout rates, they are also faced with the question of how effective their anti-truancy laws and programs are. For students who do slip through the cracks, it is imperative to have an effective system in place that helps reunite students with school and, ultimately, a path to graduation. There is evidence that anti-truancy programs work best when students receive strong personal attention from an adult, their parents are involved early, and schools provide intensive interventions. State laws can build upon what research tells us works. Some states define truancy too broadly and without enough clarity such that officials are not compelled to intervene early and effectively. There are good anti-truancy statutes, however, that recognize what students need to be reengaged in school. For example, Virginia’s anti-truancy law requires an intervention
after five unexcused absences in which parents are notified and the situation is discussed. If a sixth unexcused absence follows, a conference between parents, school officials, and additional community service providers is held to develop the appropriate ongoing intervention to help the student. One additional unexcused absence is grounds for referral to the courts. The Virginia statute is designed to promote an early school-based intervention that is both compassionate and compulsory that involves parents and provides necessary community supports outside of school to help keep the student engaged in school.

**SPOTLIGHT – Indiana & New Hampshire**

**INDIANA**

In an effort to address lagging graduation rates, the State of Indiana passed legislation in 2005 and 2006 that raises the compulsory school age to 18 and allows limited exceptions only after a formal withdrawal process involving the parents and principal that explicitly makes clear to the student the likely consequences of dropping out. The Indiana law recognizes that raising the age will keep some but not all potential dropouts in school. Because many students at risk of dropping out start exhibiting “dropout-like behavior” before they actually leave school, Indiana’s law places early warning requirements on the state’s high schools. Report cards must show suspensions, absences, whether work or drivers licenses have been revoked on account of unexcused absences, and whether the student is earning enough credits to move to the next grade level. Counseling for students who fall behind on their career plans is required by law so that credit recovery options are available soon enough to make a difference in a student’s life.

In addition, Indiana law has provided for alternate education for 11th and 12th grade students who need a different learning environment to graduate. The alternate program allows students to enroll in a vocational education program or to seek employment, provided they maintain a 95 percent attendance rate in a school program requiring at least 3 hours of classes per day leading to a timely graduation with the appropriate credits.

Taken as a whole, the Indiana law addresses many of the key reasons students have cited for dropping out of high school that we highlighted in *The Silent Epidemic*. A copy of the Indiana legislation is provided in Appendix D.

“I’d also like you to fix another absurd law by requiring all students to attend school until they are 18. A law enacted in 1895 says it’s okay to drop out when you turn 16. Maybe it was okay then, but it is not okay now, and we all know it. We need to keep at-risk kids in school, but we also need to do more to help them succeed. This fall, we will open the first of a series of revolutionary new high schools. They will allow students to earn in five years both a high school diploma and a community college degree that will prepare them to fill job vacancies in our health care industry…Even with the best of schools, some of our children lack the kind of personal attention they need to get on track or to reach for a big goal like college. Mentor Michigan continues to help fill that void. Between September of 2004 and 2006, we increased the number of youth being mentored by nearly 12,000.”

Indiana State Representative Luke Messer

Luke Messer, a former state representative in Indiana, successfully sponsored the Indiana school age legislation. His innovative work has received national recognition and was featured in TIME magazine’s cover story “Dropout Nation” and on the Oprah Winfrey Show.

Mr. Messer has said, “I sincerely believe that this is one of the most important civil rights issues of our generation. In a society that promises an inalienable right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, one can’t meaningfully pursue happiness without an education that provides an opportunity at a living wage. For too long, we have sent too many young people into schools where they don’t have a very good shot at success.”

The following are excerpts from an interview with Mr. Messer.

How did you first get interested in the dropout issue?

A few years ago, Stan Jones, the Commissioner of the Indiana Higher Education Commission brought it to my attention that following the federal model and the model of nearly every state in the Union, Indiana computed high school completion rates in a way that did not track individual students and did not account for those who simply didn’t show up for school the next year or other students who “disappeared” from the school system’s enrollment. As a result, Indiana’s more accurate statewide graduation rate was closer to 70%, not the 90+% that had been reported for years. Some urban schools had graduation rates below 30%.

What prompted you to introduce legislation?

First, I began to learn more about the devastating economic consequences of dropping out of school — both for an individual and society as a whole. Unfortunately, in our society it is remarkably hard to recover from the decision to drop out of school. Second, given those consequences, it simply does not seem just that we are sending our young people into schools where they have a 1/3rd chance of failure, and in many urban and remote rural schools the likelihood of failure is as high at 50% to 80%. That is just not good enough. We have to do better.

What were the greatest challenges to moving the bill?

Overcoming the myths surrounding this issue. The first myth was that we actually had a 90% graduation rate. The old way of counting led to a result where almost every school in the state had a better than 85% graduation rate. . . .

The second large myth was the “bad apple or bad egg” myth. Early on in this debate, I would have well meaning educators tell me, you just don’t understand, if you keep these bad kids in class, you are just going to ruin school for the rest of the good kids. When you believe the true graduation rate is 90+%, you might believe that 10% of the kids are bad apples or bad eggs. However, when you begin to understand that true dropout rates are as high as 30, 50 to 80 percent in some schools, no one believes that 30, 50, 80 percent of kids are bad apples or bad eggs that can’t make it. When folks see the real data, they begin to understand that something has to be done.

The third major myth was the “some kids move” myth. Again, well meaning educators would tell me that some of these kids just move. But, when you see the real data, you realize that no school has a 110% graduation rate graduating more seniors than they had as freshmen. The best schools in our state are in the 90+% graduation range. These kids are simply not moving to the suburbs, they are falling through the cracks of our system . . .

What do you think the impact of the legislation will be?

My biggest hope is that we started the process toward reform. Surely, there are better ideas out there for reform than the ones we came up with, but we did get started. And, I hope public policy leaders all across the country begin to address this crisis. We just cannot continue to allow a third to a half to in some places 80% of our young people be set up for failure.
NEW HAMPSHIRE

Current research suggests that one in five students in New Hampshire drops out of high school. The New Hampshire legislature is currently considering a bill strongly backed by Governor John Lynch that aims to confront the problem. The bill raises the compulsory school age from 16 to 18 and provides alternative education for students at risk of dropping out.

Current New Hampshire law allows for standard exceptions to compulsory school attendance, such as physical or mental inability, and requires the agreement of parents and school authorities. The proposed legislation would allow a superintendent to waive attendance requirements in favor of an alternative learning plan for a student over the age of 16, so long as the plan is sufficiently rigorous and approved by the student’s principal and parent or guardian. The law defines alternative learning plans broadly to include internships, technical education, community service, and online courses. The goal is to keep students engaged in learning so that they are sufficiently equipped to take the next steps in life after high school and participate fully in the economy.

A copy of the New Hampshire legislation is provided in Appendix E.

New Hampshire Governor John Lynch

John Lynch began a second term as New Hampshire’s Governor in January 2007. Governor Lynch has made improving education and increasing the state’s graduation rate a major priority of his second term and highlighted the issues in his recent inaugural address.

The following are excerpts from an interview with Governor Lynch.

How did you first get interested in the dropout issue?
Right now, 20 percent of our students are dropping out of high school. That is simply unacceptable.

What prompted you to feature this in your State of the State and to introduce legislation?
If our broad goal for education is opportunity, we should ensure we give our children the opportunity to get better jobs and live better lives. That opportunity begins with more New Hampshire young people graduating from high school. As a state we cannot continue to send a mixed message to New Hampshire’s children that they will have the opportunities they deserve if they leave school at 16. As a state, we established a compulsory attendance age in 1903 because lawmakers realized students needed a certain level of education to get good jobs. But what made sense in 1903, doesn’t make sense in 2007. In 1903, students could leave school at 16 and get good jobs at mills or farms. That’s just not true any longer. Half a high school education is no longer enough.

What are the greatest challenges to moving the bill?
Some believe that additional resources are needed to support alternative education programs for at-risk youth. In order to support and expand these types of programs in New Hampshire, I included an additional $4 million in state funds. For example, my budget will double the dropout prevention program and, as a result, serve an additional 1,350 students. The funding increases the capacity of adult high schools to serve nearly 8,800 students at 53 locations; it allows the state apprenticeship program to serve 880 students across the State of New Hampshire; and will allow nearly 500 more students, for a total of 3,000, to attend the career and technical educational centers. In total, we will spend $54 million in state and federal funds this biennium to help young people graduate from high school. And in the capital budget, I have included nearly $14 million to begin renovations to two regional career and technical education centers in Exeter and Manchester. We are providing significant resources to help our young people stay in school.
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What are the arguments that opponents summoned against it?

Aside from a claim of a lack of funding for alternative education programs, critics claim the legislation would cause the “warehousing” of students who do not want to be in school, which would lead to significant disruptions in the classroom. This bill does not force students to stay in classroom environments that are not working for them. Instead, it gives school districts and students the flexibility to create alternative learning plans, including vocational education, night school or internships that will engage students and make them want to complete their education. The funding for expanding these existing alternative programs has been included in my budget.

Expense has been cited as another concern. However letting these young people drop out of school has proven to be a great expense. Nationally, 80 percent of prison inmates are high school dropouts. Dropouts are twice as likely to be on welfare. Rates of teen pregnancy, substance abuse and crime are significantly higher among dropouts. A recent study by Polecon Research of Dover concluded that the cost to the state's Medicaid program alone of high school dropouts, who have fewer opportunities to get jobs that offer health insurance, is nearly $45 million a year. And students who drop out of high school will earn significantly less than their peers throughout their lives.

Also, a report by the Alliance for Excellent Education recently found if all households in New Hampshire were headed by high school graduates, the state would increase household wealth by more than $216 million; New Hampshire could save more than $13 million a year in remedial education costs at the state's community technical colleges if high schools eliminate the need for remediation; New Hampshire could save almost $64 million in health care costs over the respective lifetimes of each class of dropouts; if New Hampshire's male high school graduation rate increases by 5 percent, it could lead to combined savings and revenue of more than $15 million per year; and the lost lifetime earnings for each class of dropouts in New Hampshire are more than $1 billion.

There is also the claim those wishing to leave school no longer have the desire or ability to learn. The majority of dropouts nationwide had grades of C or better when they left school and were confident they could have met graduation requirements. In fact, according to Civic Enterprises' report commissioned by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, two-thirds of those surveyed said they would have stayed in school if more were demanded of them.

How does the public, and particularly students, in the state feel about this legislation? Any grassroots opposition to it?

I spend a lot of time in schools and I have spoken to many of these young people who either dropped out and are back in alternative programs, or were at-risk of dropping out. They all tell me the same thing - raising the compulsory attendance age to 18 and expanding alternative programs is the right thing to do. When I speak to these kids, they said if they had dropped out they would just be hanging around street corners. Now, most of them I talk to want to go on to college, and all of them said they will get their diploma.

Parents of home-schooled children have opposed the legislation, however the bill does not apply to their children.

What about parents, business leaders, others?

Many parents I have spoken with feel that this legislation sends a positive message to our students - that education is vitally important, and that we care enough about New Hampshire's youth that we are not going to give up on them and we are going to require them to work toward a high school diploma. Talking to business leaders across New Hampshire, they tell me they have the products, they have the customers, but they need the skilled workers to allow their companies to grow. These jobs are not open to those without a high school diploma.

What do you think the impact of the legislation will be?

This legislation is about making it clear to New Hampshire young people that we are not going to give up on them or let them give up on themselves. It will further our goal of making sure every New Hampshire child receives a high school diploma. It will provide the skilled workers our companies need and help strengthen our economy.
Conclusion

The dropout epidemic in the United States requires the ongoing vigilance of our educators, policymakers, business and civic leaders, parents, students and the public. As states address the problem by raising the compulsory school attendance age, providing alternative learning opportunities, and making other reforms, we believe graduation rates will improve. Our hope is that the current momentum at the local, state and federal levels to do more to provide accurate information, improve accountability, raise expectations, and provide needed supports for students will go a long way toward addressing the silent epidemic of high school dropout.

Acknowledgement and note

The authors would like to give special thanks to Tiffany Happel and Lynn Klaiman of Civic Enterprises for the creative and cooperative effort that led to this report. Civic Enterprises is a public policy development firm dedicated to informing discussions on issues of importance to the nation. The authors also would like to thank Chaves Design for designing this report.

The views reflected in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, The Case Foundation or The MCJ Foundation.
ENDNOTES


5Ibid.


11Levin, Belfied et. al., 1.

12It is worth noting that not all analysts agree that compulsory schooling laws are the main reason for the higher earnings that Angrist and Krueger describe. For example, John Bound and David Jaeger have argued that additional variables besides compulsory schooling laws also explain the earnings outcomes Angrist and Krueger attribute to compulsory schooling laws only. Bound and Jaeger’s analysis, however, does not directly call into question Angrist and Krueger’s finding that compulsory schooling laws play a significant role in preventing dropout from occurring. See Bound, John & David Jaeger (1996). On the validity of season of birth as an instrument in wage equations: A comment on Angrist &Krueger’s “Does Compulsory School Attendance Affect Schooling and Earnings?” NBER Working Paper No. W5835. Available at SSRN: http://ssrn.com/abstract=225621


Raising the Compulsory School Attendance Age: The Case for Reform

Appendix A

The Dropout Challenge
By David S. Broder
Sunday, February 26, 2006; B07

They number in the millions — 3.5 million Americans between the ages of 16 and 25 who have dropped out of high school and were not enrolled in school in 2003, the most recent year for which an estimate is available. Of every three young men and women entering high school, only two will emerge with a diploma. For minority students, the odds are worse. And the losers pay a price all their lives.

They are the subject of “The Silent Epidemic,” a study that will be released Thursday. It was conducted for the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation by a private research firm called Civic Enterprises. I was given a preview of the report by John Bridgeland, a former Bush administration domestic policy adviser who is one of its authors.

The dropout problem has been researched extensively. But this study is unusual in two respects. Peter Hart’s polling firm was commissioned to do focus groups and surveys of people between 16 and 25 who had quit school without diplomas. They were interviewed in 25 locations ranging from big cities and suburbs to small towns, all with unusually high dropout rates.

And these young people offered solid reasons to believe this is a solvable problem.

For one thing, they recognize that they made a mistake in quitting school. Eight out of 10 said they now know that having a diploma is important to success in life. And national data back them up. Dropouts earn an average $9,200 a year less than high school graduates and have far greater likelihood of winding up on welfare, in prison or on drugs.

Three out of four of those interviewed said that, if they could do it over, they would choose to stay in school. Even more said they would re-enroll now to get their degrees, if they could do it with people their own age.

And most are confident they could make it. The big news out of the study — a surprise to many, I expect — is that most of these dropouts are not “hopeless losers.”

One-third of the 467 surveyed said they were failing in school. But more than six out of 10 were maintaining averages of C or better when they quit.

As many complained that classes were not challenging or interesting as found the academic requirements daunting. I believe it. A year ago, I visited — and wrote about — the Gateway to College program run by Portland (Ore.) Community College (and also funded by the Gates Foundation). There, I saw 14 teenage dropouts discussing the writings of Plato and Malcolm X — college-level work.

I quoted the leaders of the voluntary program, in which students accepted strict discipline barring absences or blown assignments, as believing it demonstrates that “even for the hardest cases — teenagers with few credits, low grade-point averages and a host of personal problems — the challenge of a tough curriculum, backed by skillful teaching in small classes and plenty of personal counseling, can be a path to success.”

That is also the essence of what the dropouts in this report suggest would rescue and reward them — and their millions of counterparts.

The authors of the study make a couple of other important points. They note that dropouts typically show many signs of disaffection before they quit school. One of the most common is frequent absences — skipping school entirely, cutting classes or leaving early in the afternoon. Better monitoring of attendance — and follow-ups with students and families when the pattern first appears — could do a lot to avert the ultimate act of dropping out.

And, the authors note, almost no one drops out of school before the 10th grade — or age 16. The fact that 16 is the last year of compulsory school attendance in most states is not irrelevant. Only one state — New Mexico — makes enrollment mandatory for most students until they obtain high school diplomas.

Raising the minimum age for school attendance, if accompanied by real support for the wavering students, would do a lot to end “the silent epidemic.”

davidbroder@washpost.com

## Appendix B – Compulsory School Attendance Laws by State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Age of Required School Attendance</th>
<th>Exemptions / Employed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from</td>
<td>to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Age of Required School Attendance</td>
<td>Exemptions / Employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from</td>
<td>to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18 or 17 with parental consent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16 or completion of 8th grade, whichever is later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>5, or 8 if parents and school board agree</td>
<td>high school graduate or 17 if excused by school board and employed in a gainful trade or occupation or child is in alternative schooling with parental consent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17 in cities with 4,500 or more population and union-free school districts, otherwise 16 if approved by local school board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Raising the Compulsory School Attendance Age: The Case for Reform

The table below provides information on the age of required school attendance and exemptions from required school attendance across various states, along with the completion of grade levels for certain states.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Age of Required School Attendance</th>
<th>Exemptions 1/ Employed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18 or 16 if excused by written joint agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18 or excused by district school board; 16 with consent of school administration and parent; 21 for a child with a disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16 if regularly engaged in employment with a certificate. 15 in farm work or domestic service in private home with permit. Or, 14 employed as above if completed elementary school with permit recommended by district superintendents of schools or principal of private school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18 with written parental consent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16 further attendance is determined by court to be disruptive, unproductive or not in best interest of child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16 or completion of 8th grade if member of certain religious organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18th birthday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16 and 8th grade completed. Home schooled minors has exempt from attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16 and 8th grade completed. 8th for employment purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15 and completed 6th grade and services needed for support of family.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Raising the Compulsory School Attendance Age: The Case for Reform

**State** | Age of Required School Attendance | Exemptions ¹/ Employed | Completion of Grade
--- | --- | --- | ---
Virginia | 5 to 18 | exempt any pupil with parent’s consent along with that of principal or superintendent or a court which believes the minor cannot benefit from education at school. | ---
Washington | 8 to 18 or 16 and parent agrees that child should not be required to attend, or child is emancipated, or child has received certificate of competence. | 16 | ---
West Virginia | 6 to 16 | --- | ---
Wisconsin | 6 to 18 | --- | ---
Wyoming | 7 to 16 | --- | ---

¹Nearly all States exempt those whose physical or mental condition precludes attendance. Other exemptions not directly related to employment include those because of distance from school or school transportation; expulsion, suspension or determined to be disruptive; marriage; excused by court or judge; and receiving religious education.

Prepared By:
Office of External Affairs
Wage and Hour Division, Employment Standards Administration
U.S. Department of Labor

This document was last revised in December 2006; unless otherwise stated, the information reflects requirements that were in effect, or would take effect, as of January 1, 2007.
### Appendix C – Current Legislation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Legislation Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>“An Act raising the compulsory school attendance age; relating to the crime of contributing to the delinquency of a minor; relating to duties of the Department of Education and Early Development; relating to truancy; and relating to employment of a minor.” (<a href="http://akesenate.org/index.php?bill=SB14">http://akesenate.org/index.php?bill=SB14</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>“This bill raises the compulsory school attendance age from 16 to 18 years of age for students other than those receiving competent private instruction. The bill includes technical amendments to eliminate a reference to the compulsory attendance age for purposes of dual enrollment and to exempt children who meet conditions existing in Code section 299.2. The bill also directs the department of education to convene a compulsory attendance working group. The working group is to review supports for affected students and to consider the necessity of expanding support programs and services, online at-risk academy courses, career academies, current at-risk allowable growth provisions, and full funding of the instructional support levy. The working group must submit a report to the general assembly and the department of education by January 15, 2008. The bill may include a state mandate as defined in Code section 25B.3. The bill requires that the state cost of any state mandate included in the bill be paid by a school district from state school foundation aid received by the school district under Code section 257.16. The specification is deemed to constitute state compliance with any state mandate funding-related requirements of Code section 25B.2. The inclusion of this specification is intended to reinstate the requirement of political subdivisions to comply with any state mandates included in the bill. The provision relating to the working group takes effect July 1, 2007, while the remainder of the bill takes effect July 1, 2008.” (<a href="http://coolice.legis.state.ia.us/Cool-ICE/default.asp?Category=billinfo&amp;Service=Billbook&amp;menu=true&amp;ga=82&amp;hbill=HSB13">http://coolice.legis.state.ia.us/Cool-ICE/default.asp?Category=billinfo&amp;Service=Billbook&amp;menu=true&amp;ga=82&amp;hbill=HSB13</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>“Amend KRS 159.010 to provide that, beginning with the 2007-2008 school year, and every year thereafter, compulsory school attendance shall be required for all children between the ages of six and eighteen who have not graduated from high school; make technical changes; amend KRS 159.020 to conform; amend KRS 159.051 to allow a student’s driver’s license to be revoked due to unexcused absences; amend KRS 186.560 to conform.” (<a href="http://www.lrc.ky.gov/record/07rs/HB221.htm">http://www.lrc.ky.gov/record/07rs/HB221.htm</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>“Section 1B of chapter 69 of the General Laws, as appearing in the 2002 Official Edition, is hereby amended by inserting after the word “attendance” in line 102 its [sic] following: provided, however, all children under the age of 18 shall be required to attend school if they have not graduated.” (<a href="http://www.mass.gov/legis/bills/house/185/h00pdf/h00394.pdf">http://www.mass.gov/legis/bills/house/185/h00pdf/h00394.pdf</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>“AN ACT relating to education; requiring the boards of trustees of school districts to prescribe a policy for the development of 4-year academic plans for pupils enrolled in high school; requiring the principals of certain larger high schools to provide for a program of a ninth grade school within a school; requiring the State Board of Education to prescribe a uniform grading scale for high schools; requiring each school district to adopt a policy setting forth the duties of school counselors; expanding the age for compulsory school attendance from 17 years to 18 years; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.” (<a href="http://www.leg.state.nv.us/74th/Bills/AB/AB212.PDF#xml=http://search.leg.state.nv.us/issysquery/irf80cb/1/hilite">http://www.leg.state.nv.us/74th/Bills/AB/AB212.PDF#xml=http://search.leg.state.nv.us/issysquery/irf80cb/1/hilite</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>“This bill raises from 16 to 18 the age for compulsory school attendance and provides a procedure for a pupil who is at least 16 years of age to obtain an attendance waiver from school.” (<a href="http://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/legislation/2007/SB0018.html">http://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/legislation/2007/SB0018.html</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Law Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>“Every parent, guardian or other person having custody and control of a child between the ages of six and 18 years, if the child has not graduated from high school, shall cause such child regularly to attend the public schools of the district or a day school in which there is given instruction equivalent to that provided in the public schools for children of similar grades and attainments or to receive equivalent instruction elsewhere than at school.” (<a href="http://www.njleg.state.nj.us/2006/Bills/A2000/1801_I1.HTM">http://www.njleg.state.nj.us/2006/Bills/A2000/1801_I1.HTM</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>PASSED “A school-age person shall attend public school, private school, home school or a state institution until the school-age person is at least eighteen years of age unless that person has graduated from high school or received a general educational development certificate.” (<a href="http://legis.state">http://legis.state</a> nm.us/lcs/_session.asp?chamber=S&amp;type=++&amp;number=561&amp;Submit=Search&amp;year=07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>“Any person having responsibility for a child between the ages of seven and eighteen years shall ensure that the child is in attendance at a public school for the duration of each school year.” (<a href="http://www.legis.nd.gov/assembly/60-2007/bill-index/bi2184.html">http://www.legis.nd.gov/assembly/60-2007/bill-index/bi2184.html</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>PASSED “Every person having control of a child, who is six years old by the first day of September and who has not exceeded the age of eighteen, shall cause the child to regularly and annually attend some public or nonpublic school for the entire term during which the public school in the district in which the person resides, or the school to which the child is assigned to attend, is in session, until the child reaches the age of eighteen years, unless the child has graduated or is excused as provided in this chapter.” (<a href="http://legis.state.sd.us/sessions/2007/199.htm">http://legis.state.sd.us/sessions/2007/199.htm</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>“A BILL to amend and reenact §18-8-1 of the Code of West Virginia, 1931, as amended, relating to changing the compulsory school attendance for children in the state from sixteen to eighteen years of age.” (<a href="http://www.legis.state.wv.us/Bill_Text_HTML/2007_SESSIONS/RS/BILLS/hb2088%20intr.htm">http://www.legis.state.wv.us/Bill_Text_HTML/2007_SESSIONS/RS/BILLS/hb2088%20intr.htm</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>“AN ACT relating to compulsory school attendance; modifying requirements for compulsory attendance; imposing requirements on exemptions from required attendance; requiring school districts to report use of foundation funds directed at student drop-outs; and providing for an effective date.” (<a href="http://legisweb.state.wy.us/2007/Introduced/HB0129.pdf">http://legisweb.state.wy.us/2007/Introduced/HB0129.pdf</a>)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Indiana

Select Provisions from Indiana House Enrolled Act No. 1347, which was signed into law in March 2006

A complete copy of the act can be accessed at http://www.in.gov/legislative/bills/2006/HE/HE1347.1.html

SECTION 12. IC 20-33-2-9, AS ADDED BY P.L.1-2005, SECTION 17, IS AMENDED TO READ AS FOLLOWS [JULY 1, 2006]: Sec. 9.

(a) The governing body of each school corporation shall designate the appropriate employees of the school corporation to conduct the exit interviews for students described in section 6(a)(3) of this chapter. Each exit interview must be personally attended by:

(1) the student’s parent;

(2) the student;

(3) each designated appropriate school employee; and

(4) the student’s principal.

(b) A student who is at least sixteen (16) years of age but less than eighteen (18) years of age is bound by the requirements of compulsory school attendance and may not withdraw from school before graduation unless:

(1) the student, the student’s parent, and the principal agree to the withdrawal; and

(2) at the exit interview, the student provides written acknowledgment of the withdrawal that meets the requirements of subsection (c) and the:

(A) student’s parent; and

(B) school principal;

each provide written consent for the student to withdraw from school; and

(3) the withdrawal is due to:

(A) financial hardship and the individual must be employed to support the individual’s family or a dependent;

(B) illness; or

(C) an order by a court that has jurisdiction over the student.

(c) A written acknowledgment of withdrawal under subsection (b) must include a statement that the student and the student’s parent understand that withdrawing from school is likely to:

(1) reduce the student’s future earnings; and

(2) increase the student’s likelihood of being unemployed in the future.

(a) This section and sections 15 through 17.5 of this chapter apply to a student who attends either a public school or a nonpublic school.

(b) Service as a page for or as an honoree of the general assembly is a lawful excuse for a student to be absent from school, when verified by a certificate of the secretary of the senate or the chief clerk of the house of representatives. A student excused from school attendance under this section may not be recorded as being absent on any date for which the excuse is operative and may not be penalized by the school in any manner.

SECTION 14. IC 20-33-2-17.5 IS ADDED TO THE INDIANA CODE AS A NEW SECTION TO READ AS FOLLOWS [EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2006]: Sec. 17.5. The governing body of a school corporation may authorize the absence and excuse of a student who attends any educationally related nonclassroom activity. Any educationally related nonclassroom activity and nonclassroom activity must meet all the following conditions:

1. Is consistent with and promotes the educational philosophy and goals of the school corporation and the state board.

2. Facilitates the attainment of specific educational objectives.

3. Is a part of the goals and objectives of an approved course or curriculum.

4. Represents a unique educational opportunity.

5. Cannot reasonably occur without interrupting the school day.

6. Is approved in writing by the school principal.

SECTION 15. IC 20-33-2-28.5, AS ADDED BY P.L.242-2005, SECTION 19, IS AMENDED TO READ AS FOLLOWS [EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2006]: Sec. 28.5.

(a) This section applies to an individual:

1. who:
   
   (A) attends or last attended a public school;
   
   (B) is at least sixteen (16) years of age but less than eighteen (18) years of age; and
   
   (C) has not completed the requirements for graduation;

2. who:

   (A) wishes to withdraw from school before graduation;
   
   (B) fails to return at the beginning of a semester; or
   
   (C) stops attending school during a semester; and

3. who has no record of transfer to another school.

(b) An individual to whom this section applies may withdraw from school only if all of the following conditions are met:

1. An exit interview is conducted.

2. The individual’s parent consents to the withdrawal.

3. The school principal approves of the withdrawal.
(4) The withdrawal is due to:

(A) financial hardship and the individual must be employed to support the individual’s family or a dependent;

(B) illness; or

(C) an order by a court that has jurisdiction over the child.

During the exit interview, the school principal shall provide to the student and the student’s parent a copy of statistics compiled by the department concerning the likely consequences of life without a high school diploma. The school principal shall advise the student and the student's parent that the student's withdrawal from school may prevent the student from receiving or result in the revocation of the student's employment certificate and driver's license or learner's permit.

(c) For purposes of this section, the following must be in written form:

(1) An individual's request to withdraw from school.

(2) A parent's consent to a withdrawal.

(3) A principal's consent to a withdrawal.

(d) If the individual's principal does not consent to the individual’s withdrawal under this section, the individual’s parent may appeal the denial of consent to the governing body of the public school that the individual last attended.

(e) Each public school, including each school corporation and each charter school (as defined in IC 20-24-1-4), shall provide an annual report to the department setting forth the following information:

(1) The total number of individuals:

(A) who withdrew from school under this section; and

(B) who either:

(i) failed to return to school at the beginning of a semester; or

(ii) stopped attending school during a semester;

and for whom there is no record of transfer to another school.

(2) The number of individuals who withdrew from school following an exit interview.

(f) If an individual to which this section applies:

(1) has not received consent to withdraw from school under this section; and

(2) fails to return to school at the beginning of a semester or during the semester;

the principal of the school that the individual last attended shall deliver by certified mail or personal delivery to the bureau of child labor a record of the individual's failure to return to school so that the bureau of child labor revokes any employment certificates issued to the individual and does not issue any additional employment certificates to the individual. For purposes of IC 20-33-3-13, the individual shall be considered a dropout.

(g) At the same time that a school principal delivers the record under subsection (f), the principal shall deliver by certified mail or personal delivery to the bureau of motor vehicles a record of the individual's failure to return to school so that the bureau of motor vehicles revokes any driver's license or learner's permit issued to the individual.
and does not issue any additional driver’s licenses or learner’s permits to the individual before the individual is at least eighteen (18) years of age. For purposes of IC 9-24-2-1, the individual shall be considered a dropout.

(h) If:

(1) a principal has delivered the record required under subsection (f) or (g), or both; and

(2) the school subsequently gives consent to the individual to withdraw from school under this section;

the principal of the school shall send a notice of withdrawal to the bureau of child labor and the bureau of motor vehicles by certified mail or personal delivery and, for purposes of IC 20-33-3-13 and IC 9-24-2-1, the individual shall no longer be considered a dropout.
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Appendix E

New Hampshire

SB 18-FN – AS AMENDED BY THE SENATE

03/15/07 0486s

2007 SESSION

07-1184

04/10

SENATE BILL 18-FN

AN ACT raising the age of required attendance of children in school.


COMMITTEE: Education

ANALYSIS

This bill raises from 16 to 18 the age for compulsory school attendance and provides a procedure for a pupil who is at least 16 years of age to obtain an attendance waiver from school.

Explanation: Matter added to current law appears in bold italics.

Matter removed from current law appears [in brackets and struckthrough.]

Matter which is either (a) all new or (b) repealed and reenacted appears in regular type.

03/15/07 0486s

07-1184

04/10

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

In the Year of Our Lord Two Thousand Seven

AN ACT raising the age of required attendance of children in school.

Be it Enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Court convened:

1 School Attendance; Compulsory Attendance by Pupil. Amend RSA 193:1, I to read as follows:
I. A parent of any child at least 6 years of age and under [16] 18 years of age shall cause such child to attend the public school to which the child is assigned in the child’s resident district. Such child shall attend full time when such school is in session unless:

(a) The child is attending a public school outside the district to which the child is assigned or an approved private school for the same time;

(b) The child is receiving home education and is therefore exempt from this requirement; [or]

(c) The relevant school district superintendent has excused a child from attendance because the child is physically or mentally unable to attend school, or has been temporarily excused upon the request of the parent for purposes agreed upon by the school authorities and the parent. Such excused absences shall not be permitted if they cause a serious adverse effect upon the student’s educational progress. Students excused for such temporary absences may be claimed as full-time pupils for purposes of calculating state aid under RSA 186-C:18 and equitable education grants under RSA 198:41;

(d) The pupil has been exempted from attendance pursuant to RSA 193:5;

(e) The pupil has successfully completed all requirements for graduation and the school district is prepared to issue a diploma or the pupil has successfully achieved the equivalent of a high school diploma by either:

(1) Obtaining a GED certificate; or

(2) Documenting the completion of a home school program at the high school level by submitting a certificate or letter to the department of education.

(f) The pupil has been accepted into an accredited postsecondary education program; or

(g) The pupil obtains a waiver from the superintendent, which shall only be granted upon proof that the pupil is 16 years of age or older and has an alternative learning plan for obtaining either a high school diploma or its equivalent.

(1) Alternative learning plans shall include age-appropriate academic rigor and the flexibility to incorporate the pupil’s interests and manner of learning. These plans may include, but are not limited to, such components or combination of components of extended learning opportunities as independent study, private instruction, performing groups, internships, community service, apprenticeships, and on-line courses.

(2) Alternative learning plans shall be developed, and amended if necessary, in consultation with the pupil, a school guidance counselor, the school principal and at least one parent or guardian of the pupil, and submitted to the school district superintendent for approval.

(3) If the superintendent does not approve the alternative learning plan, the parent or guardian of the pupil may appeal such decision to the local school board. A parent or guardian may appeal the decision of the local school board to the state board of education consistent with the provisions of RSA 21-N:11, III.

2 School Attendance; Bylaws as to Nonattendance. Amend RSA 193:16 to read as follows:
193:16 Bylaws as to Nonattendance. Districts may make bylaws, not repugnant to law, concerning habitual truants and children between the ages of 6 and 18 years not attending school [and not having a regular and lawful occupation; or who are not participating in an alternative learning plan under RSA 193:1, I(g)], and to compel the attendance of such children at school; failure to comply with such bylaws shall constitute a violation for each offense.

3 Truant Officers; Duties. Amend RSA 189:36 to read as follows:

189:36 Duties. Truant officers shall, when directed by the school board, enforce the laws and regulations relating to truants and children between the ages of 8 and 18 years not attending school [and without any regular and lawful occupation; or who are not participating in an alternative learning plan under RSA 193:1, I(g); and the laws relating to the attendance at school of children between the ages of 8 and 18 years; and shall have authority without a warrant to take and place in school any children found employed contrary to the laws relating to the employment of children, or violating the laws relating to the compulsory attendance at school of children under the age of 18 years, and the laws relating to child labor. No home school pupil nor any person between the ages of 6 and 18 who meets any of the requirements of RSA 193:1, I(c)–(g) shall be deemed a truant.

4 Home Education; Definitions. Amend RSA 193-A:1, I to read as follows:

I. “Child” means a child or children at least 6 years of age and under 18 years of age who is a resident of New Hampshire.

5 Repeal. RSA 193:1, IV, relative to withdrawal from school for children who are at least 16 years of age but under 18 years of age, is repealed.

6 Effective Date. This act shall take effect July 1, 2009.

LBAO
07-1184
01/23/07

SB 18-FN - FISCAL NOTE

AN ACT raising the age of required attendance of children in school.

FISCAL IMPACT:

The Department of Education states this bill may increase local expenditures by an indeterminable amount in FY 2010 and each fiscal year thereafter. There will be no fiscal impact on state and county expenditures or state, county, and local revenue.

METHODOLOGY:

The Department indicated that raising the compulsory age of attendance to 18 years of age would increase the high school population by less than 1,100 students in FY 2010 and each fiscal year thereafter. Based on dropout data from the 2005-2006 school year, approximately 1,300 students who dropped out of school were under the age of
had these students stayed in school until age 18, average daily membership (ADM) would have been higher by approximately 1,200. The Department further indicated that based on anticipated declines in the dropout rate and student enrollment, increased ADM in FY 2010 will be approximately 1,100, and such an increase should not require additional facilities or teachers. The Department assumes students covered by catastrophic aid do not drop out of school before the age of 18. With an effective date of July 1, 2009, the first year in which enrollment will be impacted is FY 2010; enrollment from FY 2011 will be used to calculate FY 2014 equitable education aid. Only the limited English proficient and transportation portions of the targeted aid component will be impacted by an increased ADM. In FY 2005, 28 dropouts received three or more hours per week of limited English proficiency services, 20 of which were under the age of 18. It is assumed this number will remain constant. Total impact on targeted aid beginning in FY 2014 would be $229,000 [(1,100 x $190 transportation aid) + (20 limited English proficient x $1,000)].

The Department states this bill may increase local school district expenditures in FY 2010 and each fiscal year thereafter to provide appropriate programs for potential dropouts between the ages of 16 and 18.