

Teacher and Staff Perspectives on the Needs of High School Students who are At Risk of  
Academic Failure and Truancy

Allison Parry-Gurak

The College at Brockport, State University of New York

### Acknowledgements

The writer would like to express her sincerest gratitude and appreciate to the following people who have assisted in the completion of this graduate capstone research project. This research could not have been possible without the guidance and expertise of the faculty advisors, Summer M. Reiner, PhD, LMHC, NCC and Claudette Browne-Smythe, PhD in addition to the support and direction of the site supervisor Colleen Albee, MEd., School Counselor. Furthermore, the writer would like to thank her fellow classmates for countless hours of brainstorming, guidance, and encouragement. Last, but never least, the writer would like to thank her family and friends for the love and support as she completed her Master's degree, the sacrifices made have not gone unnoticed.

### Abstract

Students, who are at risk of academic failure and truancy, are at an increased risk of school dropout. Understanding why academic failure and truancy occurs, may lead to the development of comprehensive prevention and intervention programs in order to best support these students. Teachers and staff have unique insights as to the needs of students and their barriers to success. Results of this research found, family support is vital in student success and often is an area lacking for students who are at risk of academic failure and/or truancy. Furthermore, providing comprehensive support, school resources, family engagement, and student engagement were identified by participants as possible areas of potential implications for school counselors.

*Keywords:* academic failure, truancy, at risk, youth, school counseling, family support

Teacher and Staff Perspectives on the Needs of High School Students Who are At Risk of  
Academic Failure and Truancy

Poor grades and failing courses, also known as *academic failure*, in addition to *truancy* are considered as strong predictors for students, who are at risk of dropping out and not graduating from high school (Casillas et al., 2012; Dembo & Gullledge, 2009; Hernandez Jozefowicz-Simbeni, 2008). Gaining an understanding of why some students are at risk of not graduating from high school can help one better understand the needs of all students. Telfer, Jennings, McNinch, and Mottley (1992) suggested that interventions for at risk youth needed to examine more than academic performance. Therefore, by exploring various risk factors, such as student attitudes, parent involvement, school engagement, and peer interactions, one can better understand why certain students become at risk (Casillas et al., 2012). Once an understanding of these risk factors have been developed, one can then begin to develop and implement various interventions with hopes to provide support for students, who are currently at-risk, as well as, create preventative measures to ensure all students are supported for optimal success.

Critically examining teacher and faculty perspectives pertaining to high school students, who are considered at risk of academic failure and truancy, may help educators better understand predictors of academic failure and truancy, as well as, possible interventions to support these students. Exploring this topic from a teacher/faculty perspective will introduce new information to this body of research, as often, this research is examined from the student and/or parent perspective. Furthermore, teachers/faculty will be able to share their unique perspectives regarding the students with whom they have direct relationships and daily interactions. Teachers/faculty may be able to better identify students, who would be considered at risk, due to various

factors. The purpose of this research is to explore teacher and staff perspectives of at-risk youths' struggles and needs.

### **Review of the Literature**

Both academic failure and truancy are major concerns for today's youth, as these are leading behaviors associated with at risk youth, and conversely correlate with graduation rates. The importance of a high school diploma, in today's society, is vital to the future success and well-being of youth; therefore, gaining a comprehensive understanding of which students may be most likely to fall into the category of *at-risk* is necessary to the development and implementation of prevention and invention programs for school. The following literature review will discuss, in detail, demographic information regarding students who are considered at-risk and will identify possible barriers to success.

#### **At-Risk Youth**

In order to understand who are at risk of not graduating from high school, one must explore the factors, including demographics and barriers, associated with school dropout. Demographic characteristics such as, being poor, homeless, male, African American or Hispanic, being a sexual minority, coming from single family homes, and being in foster care were contributing factors which were associated with higher risk of school dropout (Hernandez Jozefowicz-Simbeni, 2008). Research identified these aforementioned demographics as associated with additional academic risk factors, such as, academic failure and truancy (Hernandez Jozefowicz-Simbeni, 2008; Johnson & Perkin, 2009; Scheel, Madabhushi, & Backhaus, 2009).

Additional predictive factors, of poor academic outcomes and school dropout, were students having low grade point averages, suspensions, low future expectations of school,

negative perceptions of teachers, experiencing violence or threat of harm, and other environmental risks (Johnson & Perkin, 2009). Students' mental and emotional well-being and support systems were identified as strong predictors for school completion, as students who have experienced trauma, abuse, neglect, and had less involved parents, had a greater likelihood to dropout of school (Hernandez Jozefowicz-Simbeni, 2008).

In addition to numerous demographic variables and predictive factors, parent and family, teacher and instructional, parent-teacher interaction, student, school or educational system, resource, and teacher-student interaction barriers influenced school success (Griffin & Galassi, 2010).

**Barriers to school success.** *Parent and family barriers* included factors, such as, single parent concerns, lack or inability to discipline, lack of family support, lack of knowledge of resources, uncertainty in how to help one's child (Griffin & Galassi, 2010). *Teacher and instructional barriers* were: high student to teacher ratios, teachers comparing students to other students and siblings, and previous teacher experiences with the student (Griffin & Galassi, 2010). *Parent-teacher interaction barriers* were identified as a lack of communication between teachers and parents, while *student barriers* included a lack of students: understanding the subject matter being taught, inability to ask for help, behavioral concerns, and not fitting in with his/her peers (Griffin & Galassi, 2010). *School or educational system barriers* were factors, such as, a lack of mentoring, limited enriched programming, poor student preparation for school in elementary school, limited transportation, high pressure associated with high-stakes testing, and bullying (Griffin & Galassi, 2010). Perceived available *resources* for school success were the perceived support the school offers such as the school counselor, school principal, sports, before and after school programs, and opportunities for parent involvement. The last barrier, which

Griffin & Galassi (2010) identified, was *teacher-student interaction barrier*; this barrier included classroom management and the teacher's ability or inability to discipline and handle disruptive behaviors. These various barriers perpetuated academic failure and truancy, which in turn, increased student likelihood of not completing high school and experiencing numerous negative personal and societal consequences (Hernandez Jozefowicz-Simbeni, 2008; Lapan, Wells, Petersen, & McCann, 2014).

### **Academic Failure**

Academic failure is a significant concern for today's high school students, as poor grades and course failure, are strong predictors for high school dropout (Casillas et al., 2012; Scheel et al., 2009). "Students who drop out typically first fall behind in measures of academic achievement" (Scheel et al., 2009, p. 1149). By examining various risk factors, one can hope to gain a better understanding of how students are at risk of academic failure and thus, strive to reduce high school dropout rates (Casillas et al., 2012). These factors included, but were not limited to, student behaviors, attitudes, family structure, motivation, school characteristics, and student demographics (Casillas et al., 2012; Scheel et al., 2009). Academic motivation and parent involvement, or family influence, were two themes, which continued throughout much of the literature. According to Scheel et al. (2009), academic motivation was directly related to academic success; they identified numerous themes as to why students lost motivation in school. Themes, such as, self-efficacy, purpose of school, family influences, relationships at school, counselor influence, and school structures and activities were discussed. Additional themes related to academic success, according to Johnson and Perkin (2009), included a lack of school engagement and low student confidence levels. These themes significantly impacted students' academic success and school dropout rates. Another theme was parent involvement and family

influence. Researchers found that parent involvement declined in middle and high school settings, for numerous reasons, which led to increased academic failure (Griffin & Galassi, 2010).

### **Truancy**

Truancy, or chronic absences, are not only a strong indicator of school dropout, but students, who are chronically absent from school, often lack the opportunities to develop important foundational skills associated with academic, social, and economic success (Casillas et al., 2012; Dahl, 2016; Dembo & Gullede, 2009; Telfer et al., 1992). Furthermore, truancy correlated with negative behaviors in school, psychosocial difficulties, and an increased entry in the juvenile justice system (Dembo & Gullede, 2009). Truancy related issues continued for individuals well into adulthood, as evident through difficulty with employment, marital stability, poor social skills and interpersonal difficulties and increased violence and criminal activities (Dahl, 2016; Hernandez Jozefowicz-Simbeni, 2008).

Numerous factors were identified, which contributed to truancy issues for students, including: family influence, mental health, physical health, community and school engagement, academic failure, and other individual factors (Dahl, 2016; Dembo & Gullede, 2009). Furthermore, truancy had a strong correlation with factors related to low self-esteem, social isolation, and academic failure. According to Dahl (2016):

truants may avoid school because of peer pressure, bullying, lack of monitoring from parents, pregnancy, employment, caring for family members at home, involvement in drugs or alcohol, relationship problems, abuse on the home front, learning or developmental issues, [and] boredom with classes. (p. 120)

Due to the strong social relationships, often associated with truant students (Dahl, 2016; Hernandez Jozefowicz-Simbeni, 2008), drug and alcohol use amongst truant students and their peers were increased (Dahl, 2016). In fact, smoking marijuana was considered to be an “ordinary, typical, expected, and socially accepted form of leisure time during truancy” (Dahl, 2016, p. 127). Although marijuana use occurred while students were truant, drug use was not the primary reason students missed class; furthermore, marijuana use often occurred in a group setting as opposed to in solitude. Additionally, Dahl (2016) found lunch-time to be the most likely time when students would engage in truancy, as students strived to spend time with their peers. Additionally, the necessity to contribute to family responsibilities in single-parent homes, and student employment, were reasons for truancy.

The research questions, which were asked, are as follows: What are the needs of all students according to teachers’ perspectives? What are the factors that contribute to students being at risk of academic failure and truancy? According to teachers, what services do students need to succeed?

## **Method**

### **Participants**

Participants were recruited and then self-selected through a mass emailing provided by the participating high school titled “HS Core Dept”. This mailing included all high school staff, including by not limited to, general education teachers, special education teachers, counselors, administration, and other faculty members. Full time and part time employment status was included. Exclusion criteria included anyone under the age of 18, anyone considered not employed by the participating school district, and anyone who has no direct contact with students. Out of a possible 46 participants, there were a total of 13 participants (n=13) yielding a

response rate of 28.3%. Participants had the option to omit various questions throughout the survey; therefore, the response rate to specific questions varied. As reflected in Table 1, the majority of the participants were teachers (83.3%); furthermore, 83.3% were considered full-time and tenured employees. More than half, 58.3%, of the participants disclosed they have been at their role for 10 to 20 years and 66.7% identified having between four and six direct contact hours with students daily.

### **Instrument**

The testing instrument was developed by the researcher and was informed by the literature. The survey contained 10 questions, with some questions having multiple items within the question. There were a total of 49 items, which were addressed within the survey. The survey was primarily quantitative with questions being in the form of a Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree.); the final two questions, however, were qualitative in nature and allowed for free text responses. Participants selected if they confirmed or denied informed consent on the first page of the survey. If participants confirmed informed consent, they were allowed to continue to the survey. If participants denied informed consent, they were taken directly to a thank you page, which concluded their participation. The survey was estimated to take no longer than ten minutes to complete and remained open for participation for a duration of three weeks. Once the three-week deadline was completed, the survey closed and participants no longer had access to the survey.

### **Procedures**

Participants were recruited through a mass emailing which is used for communication in the participating high school. The mass e-mail was delivered by the researcher with the approval by, but not sponsored by, the participating high school and was sent to the participant's

professional email address. Recipients included all high school staff, including by not limited to, general education teachers, special education teachers, counselors, administration, and other faculty members. The email provided possible participants with the following information: an explanation of the purpose and nature of the study, informed consent, the amount of time needed, and a hyperlink to the survey. Participants were also informed during the recruitment process via the email that participation was voluntary and all surveys would be completed anonymously. Contact information for the researcher was also provided. Data was collected over a three week period. A reminder email was sent to all possible recruits after two weeks from the initial recruitment email. While data was collected, the researcher was available to answer any questions about the research and any general questions about the survey. Once the three week deadline for completion of the survey past, data collection was considered complete and data analysis began.

### **Data Analysis**

Results were reported using the online website SurveyMonkey (SurveyMonkey, 2017). The data were transferred to an excel spreadsheet for further analysis. Results were reported using inferential and basic statistics, including aggregate means and standard deviations. Furthermore, qualitative responses were thematically coded.

### **Results**

Four variables were identified by the teachers and staff perceived to affect all students' success. The mean of these variables are represented in Table 2 and are as follows: Family Support (M= 4.18), School Engagement (M= 4.30), Social Supports (M= 4.03), and Student Attitudes (M= 4.15). Contributing factors of these variables include: Parental involvement (M= 4.82), Parental involvement level (M=3.0), Implications of student's home life (M= 4.73),

Student engagement in school (M= 4.55), Opportunities for engagement (M=4.09), Positive school community results from school engagement (M=4.27), Social supports importance (M= 4.55), Positive relationships with peers (M= 3.73), Positive relationships with school adults (M= 3.82), Importance of student attitudes (M= 4.91), Attitude effects experience (M= 4.45), and Positive attitude toward learning (M= 3.09).

The survey then asked participants how the aforementioned variables affect students who are considered at risk of academic failure and truancy as represented in Table 3. Participants identified the following variables for academic failure and truancy respectively, Family Support (M= 4.51, M= 4.45), School Engagement (M= 3.73, M= 3.97), Social Supports (M= 2.52, M= 3.00), and Student Attitudes (M= 3.42, M= 3.24). Contributing factors for each of the aforementioned variables effecting academic failure and truancy are as follows respectively: Parental involvement (M= 4.27, M= 4.45), Parental attitude (M= 4.45, M= 4.45), Implications of student's home life (M= 4.82, M= 4.45), Student disengaged from school (M= 3.82, M= 4.00), Student participation in engagement opportunities (M= 3.45, M= 3.82), Inactive role in school community (M= 3.91, M= 4.09), Lacking social supports with peers (M= 2.55, M= 2.91), Negative relationships with peers (M= 2.64, M= 2.64), Difficulty for school adults to develop a positive relationship (M= 2.36, M= 3.45), Student has negative attitude towards life (M= 3.18, M= 3.09), Negative attitude towards learning (M=3.73, M= 3.64), and Discipline struggles (M= 3.36, M= 3.00).

The survey concluded with two qualitative questions. As reflected in Table 4, participants were asked to identify current interventions, which were used with the special populations of this study. The researcher coded these responses and was able to identify three main categories of interventions: school resources, family engagement, and student engagement. Lastly, participants

were asked if there were any additional considerations, which they believed would be helpful for the research to know. The researcher coded the responses and was able to identify one overarching category throughout the responses, which the researcher titled *comprehensive support*. These findings are reflected in Table 5.

### **Discussion**

As supported through the literature, the researcher was able to identify four variables, which contributed to student success. These variables were family support, school engagement, social supports, and student attitudes. Within these main variables, the researcher identified three possible contributing factors to each variable. Participants were asked to identify, on a Likert scale, if they believed each variable and aforementioned contributing factor affected student success as related to all students. Across all four variables, participants agreed that family support, school engagement, social supports, and student attitudes effected student success. While all four variables were close in regards to their mean, participants identified school engagement as the top variable with, family support as the second most prevalent variable. The contributing factors with the highest mean were: importance of student attitudes, parental involvement, and implications of student's home life. One should note, two of the three contributing factors, parental involvement and implications of student's home life, were reflective of the family support variable; stressing the important role families play in overall student success.

Participants were then asked how the aforementioned variables affect students, who are considered at risk of academic failure and truancy. Academic failure and truancy were viewed as independent factors effecting student success. Using the same Likert scale, as previously mentioned, participants identified if they believed each variable affected student success as related to the special populations identified. Participants aligned with the responses of each

population in regards to what variable effects these populations. For example, family support was identified as the number one variable effecting success for students at risk of academic failure or truancy. Participants strongly agreed, 4.51, and agreed, 4.45, that students, who were at risk of academic failure and truancy, respectfully, lacked family support. For truancy, all three contributing factors, parental involvement, parent attitude, and implications of student's home life, scored a 4.45. In regards to students, who are at risk of academic failure, scores for the contributing factors were 4.27, 4.45, and 4.82 respectfully. These findings support the previous findings that family support, or lack thereof, affect student success, thus playing a vital role in personal development. Furthermore, one should note the importance outside factors play in regards to who a student performance at school therefore, supporting Epstein and Van Voorhis (2010), spheres of influence theory.

Participants answered between *disagree* and *neutral* when asked how social supports may impact these students. For students at risk of academic failure, participants responded with lacking social supports with peers ( $m = 2.55$ ), negative relationships with peers, ( $m = 2.64$ ) and difficulty for school adults to develop a positive relationship ( $m = 2.36$ ). Regarding students at risk of truancy, participants responded lacking social supports with peers ( $m = 2.91$ ), negative relationships with peers ( $m = 2.64$ ), and difficulty for school adults to develop a positive relationship ( $m = 3.45$ ). This data suggests participants believe students in these two populations overall have the social supports they need to be successful. One can conclude these findings further support the need to increase family support, as students are able to maintain social relationships and support regardless of at risk status unlike family support.

### **Implications and Recommendations for Counselors**

Student demographics, predictor factors, and barriers to learning impact academic success, individual experiences, also contributed to academic outcomes. Early interventions were found to be the best prevention for school dropout (Casillas et al., 2012; Johnson & Perkin, 2009; Scheel et al., 2009). Early intervention requires early identification; risk factors for academic failure can be identified as early as middle school. Moreover, “the transition to high school in 9<sup>th</sup> grade is a ‘critical yet neglected time’ for at-risk students” (Scheel et al., 2009, p. 1149). Early interventions for students, who are considered to be at risk of academic failure and/or truancy, should begin at the first sign of a concern (Dembo & Gullledge, 2009; Hernandez Jozefowicz-Simbeni, 2008). According to Dembo and Gullledge (2009), attention is often given to the underlying cause of truancy only after the student has incurred chronic absences; this is often too late as the student has already developed issues regarding academic performance and psychosocial functioning. Programming for students at risk of school dropout should include afterschool programs, intervention programs, remedial academic and social skills groups, family environment, parent involvement, and parent workshops which are all crucial to fostering each students’ ability to learn and success in school (Dodd & Bowen, 2011; Hernandez Jozefowicz-Simbeni, 2008; Lapan et al., 2014; Scheel et al., 2009).

When developing effective programs to address academic failure and truancy, research stated the following elements were vital to long-term success of the program: “leadership, teamwork, action plans, implementation of plans, funding, collegial support, evaluation, and networking” (Epstein & Van Voorhis, 2010, p. 3). Furthermore, the development and evaluation of programs to support at risk youth should include student involvement and consultation and must focus on more than solely the academic performance of the student (Telfer et al., 1992; Dembo & Gullledge, 2009). Additionally, according to Dembo and Gullledge (2009), “most

communities lack screening or assessment and intervention services for truant youth, and large percentages do not connect with needed programs” (p. 438); one can assume this too applies for students at risk due to academic failure. When addressing truancy, schools may choose to address different levels of truancy as any unexcused absence maybe considered truant (Dahl, 2016). Therefore, when developing an intervention program one should consider different reasons for truancy to determine which intervention program will be most appropriate for each student’s needs.

Providing comprehensive support, school resources, family engagement, and student engagement were identified by participants as possible areas of potential implications for school counselors. Comprehensive support included providing support for students in all areas of their lives, including family and community supports. Response number seven in Table 5 summarizes this theme by stating “we need so much more to support our students in 2017. It is not only about the academics anymore. So many of our struggling students need to learn how to be successful through life, not just school”. School resources included additional academic support, administrative interventions, and after school support. Family engagement included examples such as calling home and working with the parents. Student engagement interventions were identified as the most used intervention by participants when working with students who are at risk of academic failure or truancy. The theme of student engagement was evident throughout the data in responses such as response number three in Table 4, which identified the importance of “ask[ing] questions and show concern, rather than judgment”. Response number nine in Table 4, summarizes the importance of student engagement but also discussion the additional barriers students face as “building a relationship with the student helps sometimes, but if there are issues outside of school, often a relationship is not enough”.

**Recommendations for school counselors.** School counselors play an important role in early intervention and prevention when working with students who struggle with academic failure and/or truancy. School counselors are often able to provide interventions for the student, family, and school system in hopes to address any concerns pertaining to student success. It is important interventions be unique to the needs to each student and there should be less emphasis on disciplinary and management problems thus enhancing the chance of success (Casillas et al., 2012; Dembo & Gullledge, 2009; Telfer et al., 1992). By exploring the root cause of the academic failure and truancy one can better understand the behaviors associated with the problems and better address the needs of each student (Dembo & Gullledge, 2009). Furthermore, it is important for school counselors to provide intervention for students who are considered to be at a moderate risk but may not yet be exhibiting behavioral signs of being at risk. Casillas et al. (2012), states students who are at a moderate risk “are often missed by school personnel [who are] trying to identify students who need additional support or interventions” (p. 416). Casillas et al. (2012) continue on to state “these students actually may be among the most responsive to intervention and prevention strategies” (p. 416-417).

According to Dembo and Gullledge (2009), the following elements should be considered when developing an effective intervention programs for school counselors:

- (a) Parent or guardian involvement;
- (b) a continuum of services, to include meaningful incentives, consequences, and support;
- (c) collaboration with community resources, including law enforcement, mental health services, mentoring, and social services;
- (d) school administrative support and commitment to keeping youth in the educational mainstream; and
- (e) ongoing evaluation. (p. 439)

Epstein and Van Voorhis (2010) stated, “school, family, and community partnerships must be understood as an official component of school organization to promote student learning” (p. 1). Furthermore, Epstein and Van Voorhis (2010) identified the involvement of schools, families, and community partnerships as the theory of overlapping spheres of influence and state there are “shared goals and responsibilities for student learning” (p. 1). The authors continue on to suggest the three spheres which are created, school, family, and community, overlap and within this overlap lies “the framework for the six types of involvement: *parenting, communication, volunteering, learning at home, decision making, and collaborating with the community*” (Epstein & Van Voorhis, 2010, p.2).

School counselors are in a unique position within their school to provide students with more comprehensive care. Extra considerations should be made to not only address concerns of academic failure and/or truancy, but special attention must be made to family engagement and support. As reflected in the data, the role families play in the education is crucial to individual student success and one must use interventions which engage the family. Currently, teachers and staff utilize numerous interventions to engage the individual student but family interventions are limited and are often restricted to calling home once a problem is evident. One should work to implement prevention interventions prior to a student demonstrating concerns of academic failure and/or truancy and must incorporate a family approach throughout all students’ education.

It is important that school counselors maintain communication and an open, respectful, and collaborative relationship with the families with whom they are working (Griffin & Galassi, 2010; Hernandez Jozefowicz-Simbeni, 2008; Johnson & Perkin, 2009; Scheel et al., 2009). Epstein and Van Voorhis (2010) stated, “practices that informed and involved families to help students attend school every day and on time measurably increased schools’ average daily

attendance and reduced chronic absenteeism” (p. 3-4). Furthermore, Johnson and Perkin (2009) state “counselors can serve as a cultural bridge between families and teachers” (p. 126) further supporting the vital role counselors play in family engagement and communication.

In addition to the development of positive relationships between school and families, school counselors must focus on the relationship with each student. Research suggested when students have a positive relationship with at least one adult in the school students feel safer, engaged, and supported (Lapan et al., 2014; Scheel et al., 2009). According to Scheel et al. (2009), “positive relationships with teachers, in which academic progress is gauged through individual improvement (rather than comparison to other students), promoted school belongingness and academic self-efficacy” (p. 1148-1149). This further supports the importance of positive relationship building. Due to the correlation between marijuana use and the social setting, which accompany truancy (Dahl, 2016; Dembo & Gullledge, 2009), group counseling may be one intervention school counselors can implement when working with this population. Moreover, the high prevalence of alcohol and substance use stresses the importance of alcohol and substance use prevention and intervention strategies as a necessity for counselors working with youth who are often truant.

### **Limitations**

The primary limitation was in regards to sample size. While the study yielded a response rate of 28.3%, this was only a total of 13 participants. One must take this into consideration when interpreting these findings and use caution as to not generalize these findings to a larger population. Furthermore, the study was conducted at a small rural high school with limited diversity amongst the community. The majority of students, staff, teachers, community members, and even the researcher are Caucasian; therefore, one could question possible cultural bias in

the responses and interpretations. Furthermore, these findings may be lacking in reliability and may even be considered inaccurate when dealing with a diverse multicultural population. An additional limitation to this study was the survey distribution and design. The study was conducted at a high school level and not at the district level. This limitation confines the findings and interpretations of the data to the high school only; therefore, it does not take into consideration the other grade levels and age of the students which could change the findings. Furthermore, the survey questions were general and non-specific. One should consider further exploring each of the identified variables by utilizing more comprehensive and well-developed questions throughout the survey.

### **Future Research**

Due to the aforementioned limitations, one must use care when assuming these findings are representative of a larger population, as further study is needed. Areas of future research could include a district wide study to engage a larger number of participants and take student age and maturity into consideration. Additionally, research should be conducted in a more diverse setting to examine these issues at a larger scale with hopes to address cultural considerations.

## References

- Casillas, A., Robbins, S., Allen, J. K.-L., Hanson, M. A., & Schmeiser, C. (2012). Predicting early academic failure in high school from prior academic achievement, psychosocial characteristics, and behavior. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 104*(2), 407-420.  
doi:10.1037/a0027180
- Dahl, P. (2016). Factors associated with truancy: emerging adults' recollections of skipping school. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 31*(1), 119-138. doi:10.1177/0743558415587324
- Dembo, R., & Gullledge, L. M. (2009). Truancy intervention programs: challenges and innovations to implementation. *Criminal Justice Policy Review, 20*(4), 437-456.  
doi:10.1177/0887403408327923
- Dodd, A. T., & Bowen, L. M. (2011). 21st century community learning centers - improving the academic performance of at risk students: a Bronx tale. *Journal of Health and Human Services Administration, 34*(1), 10-41.
- Epstein, J. L., & Van Voorhis, F. L. (2010). School counselors' roles in developing partnerships with families and communities for student success. *Professional School Counseling, 14*(1), 1-14.
- Griffin, D., & Galassi, J. P. (2010). Parent perceptions of barriers to academic success in a rural middle school. *Professional School Counseling, 14*(1), 87-100.
- Hernandez Jozefowicz-Simbeni, D. (2008). An ecological and developmental perspective on dropout risk factors in early adolescence: role of school social workers in dropout prevention efforts. *Children & Schools, 30*(1), 49-62.

- Johnson, A. F., & Perkin, G. W. (2009). What we know about at-risk students: important considerations for principal and counselor leadership. *National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin*, 93(2), 122-134. doi:10.1177/0192636509340692
- Lapan, R. T., Wells, R., Petersen, J., & McCann, L. A. (2014). Stand tall to protect students: school counselors strengthening school connectedness. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 92(3), 304-315. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6676.2014.00158.x
- Scheel, M. J., Madabhushi, S., & Backhaus, A. (2009). The academic motivation of at-risk students in a counseling prevention program. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 37(8), 1147-1178. doi:10.1177/0011000009338495
- SurveyMonkey. (2017). Retrieved from SurveyMonkey: [www.surveymonkey.com](http://www.surveymonkey.com)
- Telfer, R. J., Jennings, R. E., McNinch, G., & Mottley, R. (1992). A comparison of student and teacher perceptions of students at risk. *Yearbook of the American Reading Forum*, 41-53.

Table 1

*Demographics of Participants (n=12)*

Category	N	%
Role within the school		
Administration	0	0.0%
Teacher	10	83.3%
Student Support	2	16.7%
Other	0	0.0%
Years worked in said role		
Fewer than 10 years	2	16.7%
10-20 years	7	58.3%
20-30 years	3	25.0%
More than 30 year	0	0.0%
Employment status		
Full-time, tenured	10	83.3%
Full-time, non-tenured	2	16.7%
Part-time	0	0.0%
Other	0	0.0%
Direct daily contact hours with students		
Fewer than 2 hours	0	0.0%
2-4 hours	2	16.7%
4-6 hours	8	66.7%
More than 6 hours	2	16.7%

Table 2

*Variables Effecting Student Success (n=11)*

Variable	All Students	
	M	SD
Family Support	4.18	0.84
Parental involvement	4.82	0.39
Parental involvement level	3.0	0.74
Implications of student's home life	4.73	0.45
School Engagement	4.30	0.19
Student engagement in school	4.55	0.66
Opportunities for engagement	4.09	1.00
Positive school community results from school engagement	4.27	0.62
Social Supports	4.03	0.37
Social supports importance	4.55	0.50
Positive relationships with peers	3.73	0.45
Positive relationships with school adults	3.82	0.39
Student Attitudes	4.15	0.77
Importance of student attitudes	4.91	0.29
Attitude effects experience	4.45	0.66
Positive attitude towards learning	3.09	0.67

*Note.* 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 =Neutral, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree.

Table 3

*Variables Effecting Students Who are Considered at Risk of Academic Failure and Truancy**(n=11)*

Variable	Academic Failure		Truancy	
	M	SD	M	SD
Family Support	4.51	0.23	4.45	0.00
Parental involvement	4.27	0.45	4.45	0.50
Parental attitude	4.45	0.66	4.45	0.50
Implications of student's home life	4.82	0.39	4.45	0.50
School Engagement	3.73	0.20	3.97	0.11
Student disengaged from school	3.82	0.72	4.00	0.74
Student participation in engagement opportunities	3.45	0.66	3.82	0.94
Inactive role in school community	3.91	0.51	4.09	0.67
Social Supports	2.52	0.12	3.00	0.34
Lacking social supports with peers	2.55	0.66	2.91	0.67
Negative relationships with peers	2.64	0.64	2.64	0.48
Difficulty for school adults to develop a positive relationship	2.36	0.98	3.45	1.08
Student Attitudes	3.42	0.23	3.24	0.28
Student has negative attitude towards life	3.18	0.57	3.09	0.51
Negative attitude towards learning	3.73	0.62	3.64	0.77
Discipline struggles	3.36	0.64	3.00	0.43

*Note.* 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree.

Table 4

*Current Interventions Used When Working with Students who are At Risk of Academic Failure or Truancy (n=9)*

Response No.	Response Text	Categories
1	Administrative intervention, castle learning to reinforce skills/learning, availability after school	School resources
2	10th Period Help Calling home to Parents Meeting with student to devise a plan to succeed	School resources, family engagement, student engagement
3	Ask questions and show concern, rather than judgment.	Student engagement
4	Re: students that are not specifically assigned to me or identified as SWD - seek them out to offer individual/small group - touch base when they've been absent to offer academic support - offer academic support when I see they don't grasp a particular concept	Student engagement
5	talking with them to try and find out what is going on at home that may be behind the issue	Student engagement
6	1:1 help after school or during a study hall/planning period; peer tutoring; constant contact with school support services	School resources
7	---	N/A
8	try and make connections to school and real world- jobs/ work with teachers and parents/try and find out what is going on so that I can help-Reasons for truancy	Student engagement, family engagement
9	Building a relationship with the student helps sometimes, but if there are issues outside of school, often a relationship is not enough to help the student stay in school.	Student engagement

*Note.* N/A implies an answer was not given or is not applicable to the research/results.

Table 5

*Additional Research Considerations (n=7)*

Response No.	Response Text	Categories
1	Some of our students are very intelligent, pleasant in school, and complete work when asked to the best of their ability, but home life has a massive effect on attendance and engagement within the classroom. Teachers must be positive role models for these individuals.	Comprehensive support
2	N/A	N/A
3	n/a	N/A
4	For answers of Neutral, allow comments to further elaborate. Some of the statements about high risk students overgeneralize and stereotype the "typical" at-risk student.	N/A
5	---	N/A
6	At Risk Truancy issues addressed via home visits -contact with local police, more support in place for students and families	Comprehensive support
7	We need so much more to support our students in 2017. It is not only about the academics anymore. So many of our struggling students need to learn how to be successful through life, not just school.	Comprehensive support

*Note.* N/A implies an answer was not given or is not applicable to the research/results.