Article

Promoting Successful School Completion Among Learners

Ana Lourdes S. Boyles
Vicky Sue D. Tolentino
Estrella P. Valmoria
Jonalyn T. Alvarado
Jerome E. Camacho
Joseph M. Barmuel
Merlyn T. Jumawid
Reymon D. Guzman
Jenalou P. Pacaňa
Remcil B. Neri

Corresponding Author: analourdes@gmail.com

Abstract: The data analysis highlights the importance of several crucial factors in the educational context. Firstly, it underscores the significance of fostering strong student-teacher relationships and recognizing the influence of economic status on academic performance, as perceived by both parents and teachers. Moreover, it reveals that school policies and practices are perceived to have a role in shaping student-teacher relationships, albeit to a somewhat lesser degree. These findings collectively emphasize the multifaceted nature of educational dynamics and the critical need for institutions to prioritize strategies that enhance teacher-student bonds and address economic disparities. Effective communication and collaboration between educators, parents, and students emerge as key drivers for improving the overall educational experience and academic outcomes. This abstract provides a succinct overview of the valuable insights gained from the data analysis, offering guidance to educators, policymakers, and stakeholders seeking to enhance the quality of education in their institutions.

Introduction

Many educational institutions consistently encounter the challenge of students who are at risk of discontinuing their education. Educational institutions that cater to students who are at danger of discontinuing their education are linked to a variety of negative outcomes. In the context of the Philippines, it has been observed that a significant number of elementary and high school pupils, totaling over

five million individuals, did not enroll for the academic year 2020-2021, resulting in high dropout rates. The Department of Education (DepEd) should implement exceptional strategies to locate and reintegrate these children and young adults into the educational system, in order to mitigate any potential disruptions to the nation's future social and economic fabric. The epidemic has contributed to a significant increase in the number of dropouts, further compounding the already elevated population of out-of-school youths, previously estimated at 3.5 million in 2017. When considering the challenge at hand, reintegrating early grade dropouts into the education system may present a comparatively simpler effort, but the reengagement of adolescents who have discontinued their education poses greater difficulty. According to a publication by the Manila Bulletin in 2021,

Prior to the onset of the epidemic, the issue of school delinquency has been a significant concern. A significant proportion of children who do not re-enroll in primary education frequently face financial constraints within their families, despite the fact that public education is provided at no cost. The implementation of the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) by the government has contributed to a reduction in the rate of early school dropouts. This program provides financial incentives to impoverished parents, encouraging them to ensure their children's continued enrollment in educational institutions. The phenomenon of dropout has been acknowledged as a matter that extends beyond the individual, as it exerts an impact on the broader community and society. Research has indicated that individuals who discontinue their education constitute a significant proportion, approximately 75%, of criminal offenders within the United States. Moreover, these individuals have a higher propensity to rely on public assistance programs. According to a study conducted by Dropout Prevention (2003), it is estimated that the general population will bear a financial burden of over 200 billion dollars per year in relation to crime and welfare payments. This finding is supported by Levin and Belfield, as stated in Chapman et al (2011, p. 1). When examining individuals who do not complete high school in contrast to those who successfully graduate, it is observed that the average high school dropout imposes an economic burden of approximately $240,000 on the economy throughout their lifetime. This burden is primarily attributed to reduced tax contributions, increased dependence on Medicaid and Medicare, elevated rates of criminal activity, and heightened reliance on welfare programs. The user's text is too short to be rewritten in an academic manner. According to Christenson, Sinclair, Lehr, and Godber (2001), there is evidence to show that those who fail to complete high school are at a higher risk of experiencing negative outcomes such as unemployment, underemployment, incarceration, or reliance on social services (p. 474). Based on the provided information, it is evident that the rate of students

dropping out has emerged as a pressing societal issue that necessitates attention and intervention from governmental and educational institutions.

Existing research has demonstrated that the identification of an exact predictor for dropout remains elusive. Nevertheless, numerous variables have been identified as influential factors that contribute to the likelihood of dropout and academic underachievement. According to Hosp (2008), some circumstances in the life of kids, such as familial issues, broken families, numerous relocations, drug use, and inadequate instruction, can diminish the likelihood of these children acquiring knowledge and developing positive relationships with their peers. These elements are sometimes referred to as risk factors (p. 365). Students that are considered at risk are mostly associated with having inadequate academic and social abilities, which consequently leads to a general disconnection from the school environment (McDonald, 2002). Within an educational context, risk variables can be classified into two distinct categories: unmodifiable and modifiable.

Unmodifiable variables can present significant challenges due to their inherent nature as factors that lie outside the purview of educational institutions. Although there are certain unalterable characteristics that influence the likelihood of learning taking place, they do not exert direct and immediate effects on the quality of instructional sessions (Howell & Nolet, 2000). Certain variables, such as hearing or vision impairment, possess inherent characteristics that have instructional implications. However, the majority of variables do not exhibit such characteristics (Hosp, 2008). Invariable factors may encompass financial level, familial circumstances, intelligence quotient (IQ), racial background, and other additional elements. According to Ysseldyke and Elliott (2008), the predominant focus of activities in schools is centered on the student, namely on identifying what is wrong, lacking, weak, or flawed.

The primary factors contributing to failure can be attributed to the inadequacies, deficiencies, dysfunctions, and disabilities of the learner. In recent times, there has been an increased emphasis among school psychologists on exploring additional elements that contribute to academic challenges, such as instructional methods, school structure, and classroom dynamics. According to the literature (p. 500), it is common for educational institutions to focus on identifying shortcomings in students who are experiencing difficulties. Typically, their attention is directed towards the immutable factors, a tendency that can have significant adverse consequences. Although unalterable characteristics can provide an indication of students who may be more vulnerable compared to their peers, they are insufficient in addressing the complex academic and school-related issues that contribute to dropout rates. Attempting to manipulate immutable variables in order to mitigate student dropout would disregard the fundamental elements of prevention and jeopardize the student's academic trajectory. The

ongoing pursuit of identifying impairments is an endeavor to categorize and assess students in order to determine their eligibility for special education and related services. Regrettably, the pursuit of identifying deficiencies is impacted by these immutable characteristics and neglects the modifiable variables that can be altered inside the educational institution. The attribution of student failure is commonly ascribed to immutable factors, although it is more appropriate to assign responsibility to educational institutions. However, it is often the case that students who are at risk do not meet the criteria for special education services. Consequently, these students receive minimal or no additional help, leading to a persistent academic lag as the school perceives them as not requiring supplementary assistance. Furthermore, Ysseldyke and Elliot (2008) asserted that it is crucial to include the student's level of engagement inside the educational institution, in addition to the aforementioned criteria. A student who demonstrates active involvement and a strong sense of affiliation with the educational institution reduces the likelihood of dropout. Given that the decision to drop out is not made hastily, the absence of active involvement can be a reliable indicator and facilitate the implementation of proactive interventions. According to Appleton, Christenson, and Furlong (2008), the act of leaving school prematurely is not an immediate occurrence, but rather a gradual process that unfolds over time. They argue that by promoting student engagement, educators can intervene at the earliest indications of students becoming disconnected from the educational system.

Methodology

The descriptive method of research was used in this study, which described data and the characteristics of the population under study. The research methodology employed in this study appears to be a comprehensive approach to understanding the factors contributing to student dropout rates in a specific public elementary school in President Carlos P. Garcia, Bohol. Utilizing a descriptive-correlational and comparative design, the researchers aim to establish a clear picture of the factors influencing students' decisions to drop out of school. The incorporation of the INPUT-PROCESS-OUTPUT approach suggests a structured framework for data collection, analysis, and interpretation. Additionally, adopting a questionnaire developed by Gustafson, Kelsey, A. as the primary data gathering instrument enhances the validity of the study. Focusing on the students themselves as respondents is logical, as they are the central figures in this dropout phenomenon. Overall, this research methodology exhibits a systematic and data-driven approach to identifying the underlying causes of dropout rates, which can subsequently inform the development of preventive measures and interventions to address this critical issue in education.

Results and Discussion

Table 1. School Policies and Practices

Indicators	Learners		Teachers	
	Mean	VD	Mean	VD
Attendance policy	3.53	A	4.01	A
Student code of conduct	3.48	A	4.25	SA
Student discipline	4.16	A	4.16	A
School uniform policy	4.21	SA	4.11	AA
Disciplinary probation	3.64	A	4.12	A
Appropriate consequences for student misbehavior	3.80	A	4.15	A
School guidelines	3.53	A	4.21	SA
Grand Mean	3.76	A	4.14	A

The results presented in Table 1 reveal important insights into the perceptions of both learners and teachers regarding various school policies and practices at the identified public elementary school. On average, the respondents generally agree with most of the school policies and practices, as indicated by the Mean ratings for both learners and teachers. Notably, both groups agree on the attendance policy and student discipline, with Mean ratings above 4.00, suggesting a shared understanding and support for these policies. However, significant differences in perceptions emerge for certain policies. For instance, while teachers strongly support the student code of conduct, learners have a slightly lower level of agreement. Similarly, the school uniform policy, disciplinary probation, and school guidelines show varying degrees of agreement between the two groups. These differences highlight areas where communication and alignment of expectations between learners and teachers may be necessary to ensure a more cohesive school environment. Overall, the Grand Mean ratings indicate a generally positive stance towards the school policies and practices, but the variations in perception warrant further attention and dialogue to foster a more harmonious educational setting.

The summary results of the students-teacher relationship survey reveal several key insights. On average, both learners and teachers rated the importance of creating classroom environments conducive to learning and addressing students' developmental, emotional, and academic needs very highly, with mean scores of 4.21 and 4.32, respectively, indicating strong agreement. Similarly, both groups emphasized the significance of showing respect, valuing individuality, and demonstrating kindness and politeness, with mean scores of 4.13 for learners and 4.25 for teachers.

Additionally, the importance of providing opportunities for students to express ideas and receive feedback was highlighted, although teachers rated this slightly higher (4.22) than learners (4.02).

Table 2. Students-teacher Relationship

Indicators	Learners		Teachers	
	Mean	VD	Mean	VD
Create classroom environments more conducive to learning and meet students' developmental, emotional, and academic needs	4.21	SA	4.32	SA
Show respect, value the individuality of each student, and are kind and polite.	4.13	A	4.25	SA
Students have opportunities to express ideas and get feedback from teachers.	4.02	A	4.22	SA
Teachers recognizing that students have needs outside of the classroom goes a long way in developing relationships.	4.11	A	4.29	SA
Develop communication skills	4.16	A	4.30	SA
Relationship-building skills are essential for contributing to a team and building an understanding between yourself and others.	4.15	A	4.23	SA
Teachers being willing to let their guard down with students shows that this trust can work both ways.	4.13	A	4.26	SA
Grand Mean	4.13	A	4.25	SA

Moreover, recognizing students' needs outside the classroom was seen as essential by both groups, though teachers rated it slightly higher (4.29) than learners (4.11). Interestingly, the development of communication skills received a high mean score of 4.16 from learners, but there appears to be a data discrepancy with a VD of 0.30 for teachers, which may require further investigation. Lastly, both learners and teachers emphasized the significance of relationship-building skills, with mean scores of 4.15 and 4.23, respectively. Overall, these results underscore the importance of fostering a positive and supportive teacher-student relationship to enhance the learning experience and promote student well-being.

Table 3. Learners Performance

Subjects	GWA	Description
Mathematics	89.25	Very Satisfactory
Science	89.49	Very Satisfactory
English	89.48	Very Satisfactory

Table 3 presents the learners' performance in three key subjects: Mathematics, Science, and English, along with their corresponding

Grade Weighted Averages (GWA) and performance descriptions. The data indicates that the learners have achieved consistently high scores in all three subjects, with GWAs of 89.25 for Mathematics, 89.49 for science, and 89.48 for English, all falling within the "Very Satisfactory" range. These results suggest that the learners have demonstrated a strong level of proficiency and understanding in these subjects, reflecting their dedication to academic excellence and the effectiveness of the teaching methods employed. The uniformity of their performance across these subjects implies a well-rounded academic foundation, which is crucial for their overall educational development. Overall, these impressive scores reflect a commendable level of academic achievement among the students in these specific subjects.

Table 4. Economic Status

Economic Status	Students		Teachers	
	WM	VD	WM	VD
Financially secure	3.84	A	3.84	A
Low-income but not poor	4.16	A	4.4	SA
Low socio-economic status	4.48	A	4.48	A
Grand Mean	4.16	A	4.24	SA

Table 4 provides insights into the economic status of both students and teachers, reflecting their perceptions of financial security. The results reveal that both groups, students and teachers, rated themselves as financially secure with a weighted mean (WM) score of 3.84, indicating agreement. Interestingly, when it comes to the category of "Low-income but not poor," students rated themselves relatively high with a WM of 4.16, suggesting that they perceive themselves as having some economic challenges but not falling into the "poor" category. In contrast, teachers rated this category slightly higher at 4.4, indicating that they may perceive the economic challenges of students as more pronounced. Furthermore, both students and teachers rated the "Low socio-economic status" category with a high WM score of 4.48, showing that both groups are aware of the presence of students facing significant economic difficulties. Overall, the grand mean scores of 4.16 for students and 4.24 for teachers indicate a general awareness and recognition of the economic diversity within the school community, with both groups acknowledging the importance of understanding and addressing the economic realities that students may be facing.

Table 5 provides valuable insights into the level of support that both teachers and learners perceive they receive from parents in various aspects of education. Teachers reported an average mean score of 4.40, indicating a high level of agreement with the overall parental support they receive. Among the specific aspects, teachers noted that parents are particularly helpful in developing good study habits (4.02) and encouraging them to get good grades (4.16). On the other hand, learners

generally reported a mean score of 3.93, suggesting that they also perceive a reasonable level of support from their parents. They particularly appreciate their parents' help with developing good study habits (4.21) and assistance with difficult tasks (4.06). However, learners indicated slightly lower levels of motivation and encouragement from their parents (3.64) and a somewhat lower agreement that parental encouragement helps them stay focused on their education (3.93).

Table 5. Parent's Support

Parent's Supports	Teachers		Learners	
	Mean	VD	Mean	VD
Helped me develop a good study habit	4.02	A	4.21	SA
My parents motivate me to strive hard and continue to learn independently	3.48	A	3.64	A
My parents encouraged me to get good grades.	4.16	A	4.07	A
My parents were strict when it came to completing the learner's materials	4.21	SA	4.24	SA
My parents always check to see if I had completed the task and activities in the school	3.64	AA	3.18	A
parents always checked if I had my breakfast, lunch, and dinner.	4.07	A	4.10	A
My parents help me on my difficult task	4.01	A	4.06	A
Overall, I believe my parents' encouragement helped me stay focused on my education.	3.54	A	3.93	A
Total	4.40	A	3.93	A

Notably, in the aspect of parents checking if learners completed school tasks and meals, there is a discrepancy, with teachers rating it higher (3.64) compared to learners (3.18). Overall, these results reflect the important role that parental support plays in the educational journey of both teachers and learners, with room for improvement in some areas, such as learner motivation and parental involvement in monitoring tasks and meals.

Table 6. Teacher Support

Indicators	Teachers		Learners	
	Mean	VD	Mean	VD
Helped me develop a good study habit.	4.22	SA	3.12	MA
Teachers communicate with my parents on weekly basis to follow up my studies.	4.44	SA	3.06	MA
Teachers motivate me to strive hard and continue to learn independently	4.16	A	3.20	MA
Teachers encouraged me to get good grades.	4.14	A	2.84	MA
Teachers were strict when it came to completing the module.	4.38	SA	4.14	SA

Teachers always check to see if I had completed the task and activities in the module	4.44	SA	4.54	SA
Total	4.29	SA	3.48	A

Table 6 provides valuable insights into the level of support that both teachers and learners perceive from teachers in various aspects of their educational journey. Teachers reported an average mean score of 4.29, indicating a high level of agreement with the overall support they receive from their teachers. Among the specific aspects, teachers noted that their educators have been particularly effective in helping them develop good study habits (4.22) and maintaining strictness in completing modules (4.38). They also appreciated the frequent communication between teachers and parents to follow up on their studies (4.44) and the motivation to strive for independent learning (4.16). On the other hand, learners reported a lower mean score of 3.48, suggesting that they perceive a moderate level of support from their teachers. They particularly noted a lack of communication between teachers and parents (3.06) and a lower level of motivation from teachers to strive for independent learning (3.20) and to get good grades (2.84). However, learners did indicate that teachers were strict in completing modules (4.14) and were diligent in checking task completion (4.54). Overall, these results highlight the importance of teacher support in both learners' and teachers' experiences. While teachers generally perceive a high level of support from their educators, learners indicate room for improvement, especially in terms of communication with parents and motivation. Enhancing these areas of support can contribute to a more positive and effective educational environment for learners.

Table 7. Significant Relationship

Factors	Learners	Teachers
School policies and practices	0.10	0.52
Student-teacher relationship	0.47	0.61
Academic performance	0.64	0.58
Economic status	0.51	0.62

Table 7 presents the correlation coefficients indicating the strength and direction of the relationships between various factors as perceived by both learners and teachers. For learners, the data suggests that they perceive a weak positive relationship between school policies and practices and student-teacher relationships (0.10), indicating that they believe that these factors are somewhat related. Furthermore, there is a moderate positive relationship between student-teacher relationships and academic performance (0.47), suggesting that learners believe that a strong relationship between students and teachers positively impacts academic outcomes. Additionally, parents' learners perceive a strong positive relationship between economic status and academic

performance (0.64), indicating their belief that economic status significantly influences academic success. Teachers, on the other hand, see a moderate positive relationship between school policies and practices and student-teacher relationships (0.52), suggesting that they perceive that school policies and practices have a somewhat stronger influence on the quality of student-teacher relationships. Similarly, teachers see a moderate positive relationship between student-teacher relationships and academic performance (0.61), indicating their belief that a strong relationship between students and teachers plays a relatively significant role in academic success. They also perceive a strong positive relationship between economic status and academic performance (0.62), aligning with parents' views on the influence of economic status on academic outcomes. In summary, both learners and teachers recognize the importance of student-teacher relationships and economic status in influencing academic performance, with teachers attributing a slightly greater significance to school policies and practices in shaping these relationships. These findings underscore the multifaceted nature of educational dynamics, with various factors interplaying to impact student success.

Conclusion

In conclusion, it highlights the complex web of factors that influence the educational experience within this context. It is evident that fostering strong student-teacher relationships and acknowledging the impact of economic status are paramount in promoting academic success, as perceived by both parents and teachers. Additionally, the role of school policies and practices, while recognized, is seen as somewhat less influential. This underscores the need for educational institutions to prioritize strategies that strengthen teacher-student bonds and address economic disparities to create a conducive environment for learning and improved academic performance. Furthermore, it emphasizes the importance of communication and collaboration between educators, parents, and students to enhance these critical aspects of the educational journey. These findings provide valuable insights for educators and policymakers as they work towards creating a more effective and equitable educational system.

References

Alliance for excellent education. (2007, October). Retrieved from:
http://www.all4ed.org/files/archive/publications/HighCost.pdf
Alliance for Excellent Education. (2010, September). High school dropouts in America. Google
Scholar. Retrieved from
http://www.all4ed.org/files/GraduationRates_FactSheet.pdf
Alliance for Excellent Education (2011). The high cost of high school dropouts: What the nation pays for inadequate high schools. Retrieved 2012, from:

http://www.all4ed.org/files/archive/publications/HighCost.pdf

American Psychological Association. (2011). Facing the dropout dilemma. Retrieved from:
http://www.apa.org/pi/families/resources/school-dropout-prevention.aspx?item=1

Appleton, J. J., Christenson, S. L., & Furlong, M. J. (2008). Student engagement with school: critical conceptual and methodological issues of the construct. Psychology in the Schools, 45(5), 369-386.

Alexander, K. L., Entwisle, D. R., & Horsey, C. S. (1997, April). From first grade forward: early foundations of high school dropout. Sociology of Education, 70, 87-107.

Aud, S., Hussar, W., Kena, G., Bianco, K., Frohlich, L., Kemp, J., Tahan, K. (2011). The Condition of Education 2011 (NCES 2011-033). U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Bonny, A. E., Britto, M. T., Klostermann, B. K., Hornung, R. W., & Slap , G. B. (2000). School disconnectedness: Identifying adolescents at risk. Pediatrics, 106(5), 1017-1021.

Bowman, L. (2004). Dropout prevention: How do we keep students from falling through the proverbial crack?. Informally published manuscript, Juniper Gardens Children's Project, University of Kansas, Kansas City, Kansa, , Available from Google Scholar.40 Burns, M. K., & Gibbons, K. (2008). Implementing response-to-intervention in elementary and secondary schools. (pp. 1-233). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis Group, LLC. Chapman, C., Laird, J., Ifill, N., & KewalRamani, A. (2011). Trends in high school dropout and completion rates in the united states: 1972-2009. Compendium report, Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2012/2012006.pdf

Christenson, S. L., Sinclair, M. F., Lehr, C. A., & Godber, Y. (2001). Promoting successful school completion: Critical conceptual and methodological guideline. School Psychology Quarterly, 16(4), 468-485. Retrieved March 13, 2012, from:
http://ezproxy-.gvsu-.edu/login-?url=http://proquest-.umi-.com-.ezproxy-.gvsu-.edu/pqdw eb-?did=107734675-&Fmt=3-&clientId=17833-&RQT=309-&VName=PQD Cho, H., Halfors, D. D., & Sanchez, V. (2005, June). Evaluation of high school peer group intervention for at-risk youth. Abnormal Child Psychology, 33(3), 363-374. Cooksen, J. (2011, November 3). How u.s. graduation rates compare to rest of the world. CNN, Retrieved from http://globalpublicsquare.blogs.cnn.com/2011/11/03/how-u-s-graduation rates-compare-with-the-rest-of-the-world/

Dropout prevention. (2003). Dropout prevention. Retrieved April 18, 2012, from:
http://www.solutionsforamerica.org/healthyfam/dropout_prevention.htm

Engelmann, Z. (Narrator). (2011). Theory of instruction [Online video]. Association for Direct Instruction. Retrieved April 23, 2012, from:
http://www.adihome.org/freeresources/videos

Garry, E. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention , (1996). Truancy: First step to a lifetime of problems. Retrieved from website:
https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles/truncy.pdf 41

Hale, L., & Canter, A. (1998). School dropout prevention: Information and strategies for educators. Retrieved from
http://www.naspcenter.org/adol_sdpe.html

Hammond, C., Linton, D., Smink, J., & Drew, S. (2007). Dropout risk factors and exemplary programs. In A technical report Retrieved from http://www.doe.virginia.gov/support/prevention/dropout_truancy/resources/dropout_risk _factors.pdf

Heppen, J. B., & Therriault, S. B. (2008). Developing early warning systems to identify potential high school dropouts. National High School Center. Retrieved from http://www.betterhighschools.org/pubs/documents/IssueBrief_EarlyWarning SystemsGuide.pdf

Hosp, J. I. (2008, November 28). Best practices in aligning academic assessment with instruction. Best Practice, 2, 363-376. [Need to get editors from Dr. Barnes book]

Howell, K. W., & Nolet, V. (2000). Curriculum based evaluation (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cenage Learning.

Jerald, C. (2006). Identifying potential dropouts: Key lessons for building an early warning data system. Washington, DC: Achieve, Inc.

Klem, A. M., & Connell, J. P. (2005). Relationships matter: Linking teacher support to student engagement and achievement. Journal of school health, 74(7), 262-273. Retrieved from http://www.fifeschools.com/fhs/documents/RelationshipsMatterLinkingTeac herSupportto StudentEngagementandAchievement.pdf

Kennelly, L., & Monrad, M. (2007). Approaches to dropout prevention: Heeding early warning signs with appropriate interventions. National high school center, Retrieved from http://www.betterhighschools.org/docs/nhsc_approachestodropoutprevention.pdf 42

Mahoney, J. L., & Cairns, R. B. (1997). Do extracurricular activities protect against early school dropout? Developmental Psychology, 33(2), 241-253. Retrieved April 15, 2012, from: http://ft.csa.com.ezproxy.gvsu.edu/ids70/resolver.php?sessid=v7nn7rvmogsg rmql5encjempa6&server=csaweb109v.csa.com&check=09fc9e4c828f1fd6bff6e 4669c3d63c3&db=psycarticles-set-c&key=DEV%2F33%2Fdev_33_2_2

McDonald, A. (2002). Best practices for at risk children. Retrieved April 23, 2012, from: http://www.sanmarcos.net/ana/bestpractices.html

Mellard, D., & Johnson, E. (2008). Rti: A practitioner's guide to implementing response to intervention. Corwin Press.

Pinkus, L. (2008, August). Using early warning data to improve graduation rates: Closing cracks in the education system. Alliance for Education. Retrieved from http://www.all4ed.org/files/EWI.pdf

Qualified teachers for at risk schools: National imperative. (2005, February 9). In National Partnerships for teaching in at risk schools. Retrieved April 15, 2012, from http://www.ecs.org/clearinghouse/57/96/5796.pdf

American Psychological Association. (2011). Facing the dropout dilemma. Retrieved from: http://www.apa.org/pi/families/resources/school-dropout-prevention.aspx?item=1

Samuels, C. A. (2009). High schools try out rti: Using framework with older students poses challenges, but shows promise, educators say. 28(19), 1-4. Retrieved from 43

http://www.cde.state.co.us/rti/downloads/PDF/HighSchoolsTryOutRtI_EDW eek_2009Jan29.pdf

Shannon, S., & Bylsma, P. (2005, December). Promising programs and practices for dropout prevention. Retrieved September 8, 2012, from Google Scholar.

http://www.solutionsforamerica.org/healthyfam/dropout_prevention.html

Tyler, J. H. & Lofstrom, M.(2009). Finishing High School: Alternative Pathways and Dropout Recovery. The Future of Children 19(1), 77-103. Princeton University. Retrieved December 3, 2012, from Project MUSE database.

Walker, H. M., & Shinn, M. R. (n.d.). Interventions for academic and behavior problems II: Preventative and remedial approaches. Washington, DC: NASP

Waxman, H. C., & Padron, Y. N. (1995). Improving the quality of classroom instruction for students at risk of failure in urban schools. Journal of Education, 70(2), 44-65.

Willms, J. (2000). Student engagement at school: A sense of belonging and participatoin.

Retrieved from http://www.unb.ca/crisp/pdf/0306.pdf

Yazzi-Mintz, E. (2008). Engaging the voices of students: A report on the 2007 & 2008 high school survey. Retrieved from

http://www.indiana.edu/~ceep/hssse/images/HSSSE_2009_Report.pdf 44

Ysseldyke, J.E., & Elliot, J (2008). Effective instructional practices: Implications for assessing educational environments. In J. Grimes & A. Thomas (Eds). Best Practices in School Psychology V. Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists