

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 325 735

CG 022 608

AUTHOR Mei, Dolores M.; And Others
 TITLE High School Attendance Improvement Dropout Prevention (A.I.D.P.) Program, 1988-89: End of Year Report. OREA Report.
 INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, NY. Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment.
 PUB DATE 3 Jul 90
 NOTE 48p.; For the 1986-1987 report, see ED 299 368.
 PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS Attendance; *Dropout Prevention; *Dropout Programs; *High Schools; *Public Schools; Urban Education
 IDENTIFIERS *New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

This report examines the 1988-1989 Attendance Improvement Dropout Prevention (AIDP) program as it operated in 30 New York City public high schools under new guidelines and broadened student eligibility criteria. Part I introduces the dropout prevention program, lists program guidelines and objectives, and describes the evaluation methodology. Part II focuses on program implementation, noting that all participating schools implemented attendance incentives and parent outreach, individual and group counseling, and P.M. schools; and that 70 to 80% implemented 9th and 10th grade houses, block programming, part-time jobs, work-study, vocational training, and independent study. Part III presents student outcomes and part IV gives conclusions and recommendations. A review of the data revealed that all five of the identified program objectives were met in more than 50% of participating schools: (1) 63% of schools met the average daily attendance objective in 9th grades and 53% met that objective in 10th grades; (2) 94% met semester attendance objective in 9th grades and 100% met that objective in 10th grades; (3) 50% reduced their percentage of long-term absentees in 9th grades and 63% met this objective in 10th grades; (4) the 9th graders in 23% of the schools and 10th graders in 97% of schools met the credit accumulation objective; and (5) 67% of schools reduced their dropout rates by the requisite amount. A list of variables used to measure each objective and a list of participating AIDP schools are appended. (NB)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *



OREA Report

HIGH SCHOOL
ATTENDANCE IMPROVEMENT
PROJECT PREVENTION
A.I.P.P. PROGRAM
1988-89
END OF YEAR REPORT

STAFF MEMBERS

Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment
Robert Tobias, Director
John E. Schoener, Chief Administrator

July 1990

HIGH SCHOOL
ATTENDANCE IMPROVEMENT
DROPOUT PREVENTION
(A.I.D.P.) PROGRAM
1988-89
END OF YEAR REPORT

Prepared by the OREA
High School Evaluation Unit

Dolores M. Mei
Evaluation Manager

Jan Rosenblum
Evaluation Associate

Rosalind Eichenstein
Senior Evaluation Consultant

Barbara Dworkowitz
Evaluation Consultant

New York City Public Schools

Division of Strategic Planning, Research and Development
Robin Willner, Executive Director



NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

Gwendolyn C. Baker
President

Irene H. Impellizzeri
Vice President

Carol A. Gresser
Westina L. Matthews
Michael J. Petrides
Luis O. Reyes
Ninfa Segarra
Members

Joseph A. Fernandez
Chancellor

It is the policy of the New York City Board of Education not to discriminate on the basis of race, color, creed, religion, national origin, age, handicapping condition, marital status, sexual orientation, or sex in its educational programs, activities, and employment policies, as required by law. Any person who believes he or she has been discriminated against should contact his or her Local Equal Opportunity Coordinator. Inquiries regarding compliance with appropriate laws may also be directed to Mercedes A. Nesfield, Director, Office of Equal Opportunity, 110 Livingston Street, Room 601, Brooklyn, New York 11201; or to the Director, Office for Civil Rights, United States Department of Education, 26 Federal Plaza, Room 33-130, New York, New York 10278.

7/3/90

SUMMARY

This report examines the 1988-89 Attendance Improvement Dropout Prevention (A.I.D.P.) program as it operated in 30 New York City public high schools under new guidelines and broadened student eligibility criteria. Qualitative data were obtained from interviews with program administrators, staff members, and students. Quantitative data were obtained from central data files.

PROGRAM STRUCTURE AND IMPLEMENTATION

1988-89 guidelines expanded student eligibility to include the entire ninth and tenth grades instead of limiting services to a core group of 150 students. In addition, the new guidelines provided a menu of program features from which schools could choose strategies best suited to their student population and environment.

All participating A.I.D.P. schools provided attendance outreach, individual and group counseling, P.M. schools, and independent study programs. Seventy to 80 percent of the schools implemented ninth and tenth grade houses, block programming, part-time jobs programs, work-study, and vocational training.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

Objectives for the 1988-89 A.I.D.P. program were revised to align them with the Chancellor's minimum standards for high schools. Five objectives for each participating school were measured: average daily attendance, semester attendance, long-term absentees (L.T.A.s), dropout rates, and course credit accumulation.

Sixty-three percent of A.I.D.P. schools met the average daily attendance objective in their ninth grade and 53 percent met the same objective in the tenth grades. Ninety-four percent of A.I.D.P. schools met the semester attendance objective in their ninth grades, and 100 percent met that objective in their tenth grades. Fifty percent of A.I.D.P. schools reduced their percentage of L.T.A.s to meet the objective in their ninth grade; and 63 percent met this objective in their tenth grade. The ninth graders in only 23 percent of the schools, but the tenth graders in 97 percent of the schools met the credit accumulation objective while 67 percent of the schools reduced their dropout rates by the requisite amount.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A review of the data reveals that overall, all five of the objectives were met in more than 50 percent of participating schools. Since this is the first year A.I.D.P. schools operated

under new guidelines and the objectives were set for a three-year period, it remains premature to draw long-term conclusions based on the first year of data. It is possible that the increment of success will increase sufficiently over the next two years to meet the stated objectives.

A.I.D.P. staff strongly supported school-based planning, but their participation in the crucial planning stages varied widely among schools. Input from all A.I.D.P. staff should be encouraged.

The broadening of student eligibility for A.I.D.P. services brought with it major coordination problems with other school programs. Attention must be given to establishing a process to facilitate coordination among programs. In addition, a full-time facilitator should head each A.I.D.P. program if funds permit.

A.I.D.P. staff and students agreed that counseling was essential to keeping at-risk students in school. However, 50 percent of guidance counselors spent a considerable amount of time on academic programming and administrative chores. Schools that had clinically-trained staff provided more counseling and much needed crisis intervention to students.

Facilitators reported problems attracting qualified teachers for block-programmed classes for at-risk students. A preparation period and supportive consultation in pedagogical strategies might be helpful for teachers.

Students and staff reported that students preferred classes relevant to career goals, and flexible ways of earning credits. Therefore, these program elements should be strengthened and expanded to help students connect classwork to their future.

Based on the findings of the evaluation, the following specific recommendations are made:

- Encourage the input of all A.I.D.P. staff, particularly during the crucial planning stages of each year's program.
- Establish a system to facilitate coordination between the A.I.D.P. program and other services for at-risk students.
- Provide a full-time facilitator to head each A.I.D.P. program.
- Include a clinically-trained staff person in the guidance department of all A.I.D.P. schools.
- Strengthen supportive services for teachers of block-programmed classes.

- Continue to expand and strengthen program elements that connect classwork with career opportunities, and allow for alternative ways to earn credits.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction	1
Program Guidelines	1
Program Objectives	2
Evaluation Methodology	3
Scope of this Report	4
II. Program Implementation	5
Program Design and Implementation	5
Program Elements	7
Effectiveness of Strategies	13
Staffing	14
Students Served	19
Student Attitudes	20
Support to A.I.D.P. Staff	22
Funding	23
III. Student Outcomes	26
IV. Conclusions and Recommendations	34
APPENDICES	
A. List of Variables Used to Measure Each Objective	37
B. List of Participating A.I.D.P. Schools	38

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Percentage of A.I.D.P. Schools Implementing Each Strategy/Feature	6
2	Summary of Staff in Selected A.I.D.P. Schools	15
3	Summary of A.I.D.P. Student Responses Describing the Way They Would Change School	21
4	Percentage of Funding Sources Used for A.I.D.P. Strategies and Features	24
5	Summary of Average Daily Attendance Baseline, Objectives, and Outcomes for 1988-89	27
6	Summary of Semester Attendance, Baseline, Objectives, and Outcomes, 1988-89	28
7	Summary of Long-Term Absentees (L.T.A.s) Baseline, Objectives, and Outcomes for 1988-89	29
8	Summary of Credit Accumulation Baseline, Objectives and Outcomes for 1988-89	30
9	Summary of Dropout Rates, Baseline, Objectives and Outcomes for 1988-89	32

I. INTRODUCTION

The Attendance Improvement Dropout Prevention (A.I.D.P.) program is a state-funded program of instruction, guidance, attendance, and health services for those students in New York City's public schools most at risk of dropping out of school. The program, begun as a pilot program in 1984-85, has operated in selected schools with large numbers of students with excessive absences. This report describes the 1988-89 A.I.D.P. program in 30 participating high schools and examines the extent to which program objectives were met during the school year.

PROGRAM GUIDELINES

During the three-year funding cycle of 1985-86, 1986-87, and 1987-88*, the A.I.D.P. program had six components which could be implemented according to one of three models**. Each participating school chose one model which served a core group of 150 students.

In response to earlier evaluations citing restrictions in program design and student eligibility, the Division of High Schools made key changes in the guidelines for the 1988-89 A.I.D.P. program. School-based planning teams were asked to utilize a full menu of strategies and features to customize a program to the needs of their student population and school environment.

*Evaluation reports on the 1985-86, 1986-87, and 1987-88 A.I.D.P. programs are available from the Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment.

**A description of these models, Operation Success, Project SOAR, and strategies, can be found in the "1987-88 High School Attendance Improvement Dropout Prevention (A.I.D.P.) Program End-of-Year Report" available from the Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment.

In past years, A.I.D.P. program guidelines stipulated that only students absent 20 or more days during the previous spring term, or 40 days during the previous school year, and long-term absentees (L.T.A.s) were eligible for program services. In all, only 150 students could be served at each participating school. The guidelines for the 1988-89 program extended eligibility to all students in the ninth and tenth grades of participating schools.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

The 1988-89 A.I.D.P. guidelines directed schools to develop a plan that would improve attendance and credits earned, and decrease rates of L.T.A.s and school dropouts. Similar to the targets specified in the Chancellor's minimum standards for the high schools, A.I.D.P. schools were expected to reduce the discrepancy between specific standards and their current performance by one-half over a three-year period. Schools that exceed their year's objectives in three or more areas will receive additional resources for the following year. The five objectives for the 1988-89 A.I.D.P. program assumed a shortfall between a school's current performance and the minimum standard. They relate to average daily attendance, semester attendance, long-term absentees, dropout rates, and credit accumulation. Progress will be evaluated yearly using a figure representing one-third of the total objectives*. Thus, 1989-90 and 1990-91 performance

*Information about the variables used to measure each objective is presented in an appendix.

objectives and outcomes will be considered in their respective evaluations.

The objectives are as follows:

- Using the 1987-88 school year as a baseline, the difference between the minimum standard of 85 percent excluding L.T.A.s and the school's average daily attendance rate of ninth and tenth graders should be reduced by one-half over a three-year period.
- Using the 1987-88 school year as a baseline, the difference between the minimum standard that no more than 20 percent of the students should be absent for 16 or more days per semester and the percentage of ninth and tenth grade students absent for 16 or more days per semester in each high school will be reduced by one-half over a three-year period.
- Using the 1987-88 school year as a baseline, the difference between the Chancellor's minimum standard that L.T.A.s should comprise no more than five percent of a school's register and the percentage of ninth and tenth graders in each high school who are L.T.A.s will be reduced by one-half over a three-year period.
- Using the 1986-87 school year as a baseline, the difference between the Chancellor's minimum standard of a 7.5 percent dropout rate and each school's dropout rate will be reduced one-half over a three-year period.
- Using the 1987-88 school year as a baseline, the number of credits required to be promoted to the next grade and the difference between the average number of credits earned by ninth and tenth grade students will be reduced by one-half over a three-year period.

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

Evaluators from the Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment (OREA) examined the 1988-89 A.I.D.P. program in the 30 participating high schools. OREA collected quantitative and qualitative data from all participating schools and from central data files. In addition, evaluators visited 33 percent of the schools to interview staff and students, and to observe program

activities.

Quantitative data were collected for both the 1987-88 (baseline) and the 1988-89 (program) school years. Data included aggregate average attendance rates, individual student attendance rates, aggregate data on long-term absentees, school-wide dropout rates, and credits earned. Qualitative data included interviews and surveys administered to program staff regarding program design and implementation.

SCOPE OF THIS REPORT

This report describes the range of programs implemented in participating A.I.D.P. high schools during the 1988-89 school year. Program implementation and components are described in Chapter II; student outcomes are presented in Chapter III; and conclusions and recommendations are discussed in Chapter IV.

II. PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

PROGRAM DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION

Guidelines for the 1988-89 A.I.D.P. program included an extensive menu of strategies and features from which schools could customize programs to the needs of students. As shown in Table 1, the menu offered alternative ways for students to earn credits toward a diploma. This included P.M. schools, independent study programs, re-entry classes for returning long-term absentees, as well as career assessment and job-placement services provided by community-based organizations (C.B.O.s).

Both A.I.D.P. facilitators and guidance counselors responded positively to planning their own program, noting that "an on-site counselor is in a better position to tailor a program to the social environment of each student body." In addition, this approach coincided with other school-based planning initiatives such as the Comprehensive School Improvement and Planning (CSIP)* program.

However, facilitators and guidance counselors also agreed that specific mechanisms were needed to strengthen this initiative. Sixty percent of the guidance counselors and 40 percent of the facilitators mentioned that they had not been

*The Comprehensive School Improvement and Planning (CSIP) program was designed by the Office of Comprehensive School Improvement and Planning (OCSIP) to meet the guidelines for school improvement established in the Chancellor's Implementation Plan for Schools in Need of Assistance. The program supports school-based planning teams working to improve the level of students' reading, writing, and mathematics abilities.

Table 1

Percentage of A.I.D.P. Schools Implementing
Each Strategy/Feature

Strategy/Feature	Percentage of Schools Implementing
Attendance Incentives	100
Individual Counseling	100
Group Counseling	100
P.M. School	100
Parent Outreach	100
Ninth and Tenth Grade Houses	80
Part-time jobs, Work-Study	80
Vocational Training	80
Independent Study	80
Block Programming	70
SOAR program	50
Mentoring/Tutorial	50
Health Counseling	50
Comprehensive Remediation	50
Shared Instruction	40
Off-site Programs	40
Re-Entry Classes	30
Leadership Training	30
Conflict Resolution	30
School/Community internships	20
Multi-Cultural Programming	20
G.E.D. program	0

- o All A.I.D.P. schools implemented attendance incentives, individual and group counseling, P.M. school, and parent outreach.
- o Seventy to 80 percent implemented ninth and tenth grade houses, block programming, part-time jobs, work-study, vocational training, and independent study.

involved in designing the 1988-89 A.I.D.P program. The input of all program staff during the crucial planning stages would be useful in sorting out some of the inevitable snags.

Including the entire ninth and tenth grades in A.I.D.P. caused coordination difficulties with other school programs and involved many more administrators. Of the facilitators who had been in A.I.D.P. for at least one year, 30 percent reported an increase in administrative responsibilities, including more liaison meetings and contact with school and C.B.O. staff. Forty percent of A.I.D.P. facilitators reported more meetings among program staff this year than last year, while 67 percent reported more meetings between A.I.D.P. staff and other staff in the school. Attention must be given to establishing a process that would ease coordination between programs.

PROGRAM ELEMENTS

Strategies and Features

Evaluators asked participating schools to indicate which of the strategies and features they used. The percentage of schools implementing each strategy is shown in Table 1. All A.I.D.P. schools implemented attendance incentives and parent outreach, individual and group counseling, and P.M. schools. Seventy to 80 percent implemented ninth and tenth grade houses, block programming, part-time jobs, work-study, vocational training, and independent study. There were no on-site General Equivalency Diploma (G.E.D.) programs, but schools referred appropriate students to G.E.D. programs at C.B.O. offices.

Attendance Follow-Up

All participating A.I.D.P. schools offered an attendance follow-up program that included tracking cutters, sending letters and making calls, and visits to absent students' homes. Many schools also designed parent outreach strategies. For example, some schools provided services to small groups of parents after school and or during evening hours. Services could include individual and family counseling, English as a Second Language (E.S.L.), and/or citizenship classes. Many schools also invited parents to school events and maintained a resource room for them.

All schools offered attendance incentives. Students who showed improvement in attendance were rewarded with such items as certificates, school trips, T-shirts, and school supplies.

Guidance and Counseling

All A.I.D.P. schools provided individual and group counseling to students. Facilitators and guidance counselors agreed that guidance is the most important component in a program for at-risk students because "nothing can be done if students can't get themselves into the building."

Some schools used interns from social work and psychology training programs to augment their A.I.D.P. counseling staff. These schools were able to provide enriched programs in career exploration and on health issues. Schools with high student-staff ratios focused on problem solving.

Sixty percent of schools surveyed offered health counseling. Programs included as few as 150 students and as many as the entire

school population. Classes on health topics were given by Health Resource Counselors or by invited speakers. Vision and hearing tests were provided to individual students as needed. Morris High School had a hospital clinic in the school that provided health counseling, physical examinations, and medical referrals for students.

Fifty percent of the A.I.D.P. schools offered a program of conflict resolution as part of guidance and counseling services. A guidance counselor at Seward Park held small group discussions in ways to solve interpersonal conflicts between two or more parties. Students involved in a conflict might be referred by a teacher or another student, or seek help for themselves. Programs at other schools included large group introductions to various methods of solving conflicts.

Educational Alternatives

All participating schools offered students alternative ways to earn credits toward a diploma. These students included those who had difficulty attending regular classes or who had multiple failures. By Spring 1989, all participating schools had implemented a P.M. school. P.M. schools provide classes for credit and hands-on learning experiences after regular school hours for students who also attend regular classes. This strategy targets students with course failures. For example, Curtis High School held P.M. classes in science and computers, Monday through Thursdays, for 50 at-risk students. Students used computer software such as the "Bank Street Writer" to write reports and

"Appleworks" and "Graphworks" to tabulate data compiled in the science laboratory.

Eighty percent of the schools also offered an independent study program. The independent study program was aimed toward older, working students, or those with family problems who were unable to attend regular classes. A contract for credit was agreed upon by an individual student and teacher. Typically, student and teacher designed a contract that defined the unit of work and the credits offered. Subject areas included technical drawing, music, as well as academic subjects. Supervisors included the A.I.D.P. facilitator, library coordinator, and technical drawing teacher. For example, Automotive High School offered approximately 75 students the opportunity to make up credits by working independently on academic assignments under the supervision of a staff person. The services and hours of the school library were extended to help students obtain materials to fulfill assignments.

Fifty percent of the A.I.D.P. schools provided a mentoring/tutorial program for students in need of extra help. A variety of methods were used. Some schools enlisted college students as tutors while others gave English and mathematics teachers a free period to work with students. In some cases, small groups of students with similar needs were organized and met weekly in a supervised homework room.

Sixty percent of the schools offered a comprehensive remediation program. The number of students served varied widely,

from nine to 500. For example, Morris High School targeted a large number of students for peer tutoring but provided a resource room for learning basic skills, and computer-assisted instruction.

Forty percent of the schools provided special transition classes for students returning to school after long-term absences. Some schools offered re-entry classes focusing on subject review, others simply provided a staffed room for students to catch up on work. Christopher Columbus High School used a mini-school to provide a supportive environment for returning L.T.A.s. Each student received individualized programming and supplementary academic classes.

Fifty percent of A.I.D.P. schools made use of block programming in which a group of students took classes together and received supplementary academic counseling.

Seventy percent of A.I.D.P. schools extended block programming to a "Houses" concept in which a group of students with similar interests were assigned the same counselor, grade advisor and facilitator, and encouraged to develop group identification*.

Schools also used high-interest classes to attract at-risk students. Fifty percent of non-vocational A.I.D.P. schools offered vocational classes to 24 to 175 students. Twenty percent of these classes were on-site, offering subjects such as cooking, word-processing, and cosmetology. Thirty percent were held off-

*A full description of the Houses program can be found in "Ninth Grade Houses, 1987-88 End-Of-Year Report," available from the Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment.

site by arrangement with vocational schools. Students were bused to vocational or technical classes on building construction, air conditioning repair, computer maintenance, office skills, precision metal technology and auto mechanics.

Work-Study

A.I.D.P. schools used part-time jobs, work-study, internships, and externships to motivate students to attend school. Eighty percent of A.I.D.P. schools had a part-time jobs and/or work-study program for 15 to 150 students. These programs often used community based organizations such as Federation Employment and Guidance Services (FEGS) to provide job-readiness training and job placements for students. Sometimes job programs were run by staff in the schools. Evander Childs High School had an in-house job developer at their school. Students got jobs in city agencies (for example, the Parks Department) and in private enterprise. Job monitoring and follow-up was done by either C.B.O. staff or school paraprofessionals.

Twenty percent of A.I.D.P. schools offered internships in law offices and police precincts, and externships in community agencies serving the blind and the aged. Students were supervised by paraprofessionals or by C.B.O. staff.

Educational Enrichment

Forty percent of A.I.D.P. schools reported that they had a program of multi-cultural education. The number of students served ranged from 120 to the entire school population. The wide divergence in numbers was a result of different interpretations of

the term "multi-cultural education." Those facilitators who thought the term referred to a specific class prepared for students reported not offering it. Those who construed it as an attitude and a way of presenting subject areas, or as extracurricular activities, said that all their students took part in multi-cultural education. These school activities included ethnic food festivals, bilingual programs, and the use of foreign publications. In order to broaden the students' understanding of international and cultural events, foreign students attending New York City colleges were invited into the schools to speak on ethnic and political issues."

EFFECTIVENESS OF STRATEGIES

Facilitators were asked to name the program elements most effective in keeping at-risk students in school. The five most effective elements were counseling, job training and employment, P.M. school, independent study, and block programming.

Eighty percent of facilitators endorsed counseling, noting that individual counseling was the most effective in keeping at-risk students in school. This perception was echoed by a large percentage of students who credited one-to-one contact with keeping them in school.

P.M. schools and independent study, endorsed by 50 percent of facilitators, "gave students more latitude in how credits can be accumulated while allowing them to develop closer ties with

*The Global Classroom Program was coordinated by the Office of High School Support Services (O.H.S.S.S.)

teachers."

Thirty percent of the respondents believed that block programming helped to reduce student isolation and provided a valuable network of support. However, another 30 percent cited major problems attracting effective teachers. This latter group considered mainstreaming at-risk students preferable noting also that special classes tend to segregate students.

Thirty-three percent of respondents believed that students didn't identify with their "houses" to the extent that attendance and achievement were positively affected. Thirty percent viewed health counseling as an ineffective strategy because "It hasn't got enough to do with why students aren't coming to school." Mentoring and tutoring were thought to be ineffective by 20 percent because "students don't want to stay after school."

STAFFING

The number of A.I.D.P. staff members and their responsibilities varied from school to school. As shown in Table 2, each school had a facilitator, but only 50 percent also had a co-facilitator. Ninety percent of the A.I.D.P. programs had a guidance counselor, 40 percent had a social worker, and 30 percent had both a social worker and guidance counselor. Programs with the latter configuration were able to provide enriched counseling services to students. Teachers were listed as part of the A.I.D.P. staff in 50 percent of the schools, and all A.I.D.P. programs had a least one paraprofessional.

Facilitators and co-facilitators had an array of

Table 2
Summary of Staff in Selected A.I.D.P. Schools

Title	Percentage of schools with one or more staff in title
Facilitator	100
Guidance Counselor	90
Family Assistant(s)	70
Co-Facilitator	50
Supervisor	50
Teachers	50
Social Worker	40
Neighborhood Worker(s)	40
School Aides	40
Educational Paraprofessional(s)	20
Family Paraprofessional(s)	20
Job Developer	20
Secretary	10
Telsol Operator	10
CBO Staff	10
Health Counselor	10

- o All of the A.I.D.P. Schools surveyed had a facilitator (part-time or full-time), while only 50 percent had a co-facilitator. All had either a guidance counselor or a social worker; 30 percent had both. All of the programs reported at least one category of paraprofessional; Family Assistant, Family Paraprofessional, Neighborhood Worker, Educational Paraprofessional, or School Aide. Fifty percent of the schools surveyed listed teachers as members of the A.I.D.P. staff.

responsibilities which included monitoring student attendance and achievement, planning and coordinating program activities, record keeping, and budgeting. Facilitators reported that their duties were more varied than in previous years, but less clearly defined. In the words of one facilitator, "In a sense we're responsible for everything." The majority of facilitators devoted only part of the day to these responsibilities. In fact, only 20 percent worked as full-time facilitators, while 55 percent also taught 10 periods a week. Indeed, turnover for the job was high: 40 percent were new to the position in 1988-89; 40 percent had been an A.I.D.P. facilitator two to three years; and only 20 percent stayed four or more years. Further, broadened student eligibility meant a significant increase in the amount of coordination needed between A.I.D.P. services and other school services. The time and energy of a full-time A.I.D.P. facilitator seems essential to the program.

All A.I.D.P. programs had at least one paraprofessional working as either a family assistant, neighborhood worker, family paraprofessional, educational paraprofessional, or school aide. Paraprofessional was the single staff category whose job descriptions showed considerable overlap across titles. School neighborhood workers, family assistants, and family paraprofessionals were involved with a wide variety of tasks, including writing or telephoning absentees' homes, and making home visits. In some schools, neighborhood workers also prepared daily reports on attendance and lateness; in other schools, they acted

as liaison with parents and truant officers in crisis situations. In addition to attendance outreach, family assistants visited employed students on the job or operated the TELSOL* machine.

The duties of school aides also varied considerably from school to school. While some delivered messages and accompanied students from classes to the A.I.D.P. office, others maintained attendance records. Some aides were responsible for calls to parents of absentees, or spoke directly to students about attendance and academic problems. Only one school aide was reported as working in the classroom. Educational paraprofessionals assisted teachers in the classroom, although some also maintained student records. A.I.D.P. programs utilized their paraprofessionals where they were most needed.

Forty percent of facilitators had problems finding effective teachers for block-programmed classes for at-risk students. Some saw the decision to assign effective teachers to mainstream classes as the reason A.I.D.P. was left with teachers who felt burdened and overwhelmed. Loss of a preparation period for A.I.D.P. teachers also contributed to their negative attitude. Consequently, facilitators in those schools recommended mainstreaming for their at-risk students, but noted their support of effective block-programming.

*TELSOL is an automated telephone dialer which is programmed to carry a message. Each New York City public high school has at least one TELSOL machine. In addition to messages about absences, typical messages include information about an upcoming school night, notification of the student's required attendance at a Regents Competency Test (R.C.T.), or notice that report cards are about to be issued.

The majority (60 percent) of A.I.D.P. guidance counselors had only one year of experience in the program; 10 percent had two or three years; and 30 percent were in their fourth year. Fifty percent held a provisional or regular license as a guidance counselor; 30 percent held a license in social work; and 20 percent were licensed in secondary education.

All guidance counselors provided three categories of direct service to students, i.e., programming classes, making referrals (for example, transfers to alternative schools), and individual and group counseling. Two distinct patterns emerged.

More than 50 percent of guidance counselors were primarily involved in student and family counseling, peer counseling classes, crisis intervention, and referrals to other programs. These counselors described themselves as student advocates; "the 'ear' students don't otherwise have," or as "surrogate family, helping to smooth out problems with teachers and deans."

The other 50 percent of guidance counselors focused on academic programming, administrative tasks such as program liaison, and meetings with other staff members.

Fifty percent of the schools provided weekly individual counseling to 10 or fewer students; approximately 40 percent saw between 11 and 15 students weekly; and 10 percent of schools saw more than 15 students weekly. The A.I.D.P. programs that had clinical staff available often utilized interns from graduate schools and were therefore able to serve more students. The interns were supervised by social workers (if on staff) or

guidance counselors.

All guidance counselors surveyed reported that they provided group counseling; 30 percent on a daily basis, 40 percent two to three times per week, and 30 percent once a week. Forty percent of schools providing group counseling more than once a week had interns.

Many guidance counselors observed that the number of students with serious emotional and family problems was increasing. Many felt that either a social worker or school psychologist should be an essential ingredient in a good A.I.D.P. program. One guidance counselor noted that "a trained clinical person in school may be what stands between the student and hospitalization, because there are no intermediate alternatives at present."

STUDENTS SERVED

Half of all facilitators focused on students in need of services, while the other half concentrated on students most likely to improve. Students receiving the most program services included cutters, students with a history of poor attendance, those failing one or more subjects, and students overage for their grade.

Facilitators track cutters in a variety of ways, including checking attendance sheets daily, using the University Applications Processing Center's (U.A.P.C.) reverse attendance program, and consulting bubble sheets which are duplicated for English and mathematics classes. Some facilitators

check the lateness list for chronically late students; others have a staff person watch out for cutters in or near the school building. One school compared home room absentees to class attendance lists, and generated a computer printout of students who cut classes. Many facilitators expressed dissatisfaction with the methods used to track cutters because they were too slow.

Once a cutter list was generated, some schools chose specific cutters to track intensively, while others tracked all cutters with telephone calls and letters to the students' homes.

STUDENT ATTITUDES

Seventy-eight percent of students reported attending school more often this year than last year; 14 percent reported attending more often last year; and eight percent reported no change.

Students with no improvement in attendance thought it was due to feelings of alienation (27 percent), either because classes seemed irrelevant or they had a problem with a teacher; illness (18 percent); or over-sleeping and influence of friends (13 percent).

Although students complained about classes and teachers, 84 percent reported that they had classes they especially liked and 65 percent thought they were doing better this year. Students reported having interesting classes but wanting more relevant classes. As shown in Table 3, 44 percent of students wanted relevant classes with active participation and teachers who cared.

Table 3

Summary of A.I.D.P. Student Responses Describing
the Ways They Would Change School

Item	Percentage of Endorsement
Courses relevant to life, involving active participation	44
Teachers and administrators who care, fire the others	25
Improve environment; paint building, improve lunches, move school away from drugs	11
Shorten school day/week	9
Enlarge specific program elements (guidance, tutoring)	7
More strictness, get rid of disruptive students	6
Start school day later	5
Get rid of security guards, metal detectors	5
More security guards, metal detectors	5
Learn computer use, instead of writing/computers	3
No grades, less homework, more credits	3
Less strictness	3
Bring in well-known speakers, athletes, graduates	2
More female students	2
Clarify credits	1

o Forty-four percent of students endorsed active courses relevant to life, while 25 percent of students endorsed hiring more teachers who care, and firing those who do not.

Expansion of program elements such as vocational classes, work-study, internships, and externships could connect classwork to realistic career goals.

It is interesting to note that it is the caring aspect of teachers, not their abilities in the classroom, that students wanted most. However, "teachers who care" are sometimes difficult to supply. Rather than block program students in programs where effective teachers cannot participate, individual contact between teacher and student can be promoted by increasing alternative ways of earning credits towards a diploma.

SUPPORT TO A.I.D.P. STAFF

The Office of High School Support Services (O.H.S.S.S.) provided a variety of workshops and professional development activities for A.I.D.P. staff. Workshops for facilitators and guidance counselors included presentations on innovative programs for at-risk students (for example, peer mediation programs). In addition, workshops also provided a forum for special enrichment programs, such as theatre groups making presentations. Facilitators were then able to pick and choose programs of interest to their students. Guidance counselors also participated in workshops on group counseling.

Workshops for teachers focused on pedagogical strategies for at-risk students (for example, computer-assisted instruction and peer mentoring). Workshops for paraprofessionals included training in parent contact and utilizing community resources.

O.H.S.S.S. published a variety of materials aimed

at helping staff, students, and their families. For example, the newsletter "In Sites" reported on effective dropout prevention strategies in A.I.D.P. schools, and a bilingual guide titled "Improving Attendance: a Parents' Guide" answered questions on procedures followed by schools when a child is absent. The bilingual guide also listed guidance and referral services. A guide for students, "For Freshmen Only", contained chapters titled "A Student Guide: Where to Go and Whom to See" and "Everything a Student Should Know About Attendance."

FUNDING

The 1988-89 A.I.D.P. guidelines based funding on each school's needs and allowed integration of funding across programs. Fifty percent of facilitators responded positively to the change, citing that integration of funding promotes schoolwide approaches to programming and encourages creativity and flexibility. Two specific increases were recognized as particularly helpful. These were the extra increment provided for P.M. schools in the Spring 1989 term, and the increase in the "Other Than Personnel Services" (O.T.P.S.) category. Only 10 percent of the respondents reacted negatively to funding for 1988-89, arguing that too much financial flexibility threatened accountability.

As shown in Table 4, schools used a mix of sources to fund each strategy and feature. Fifty percent of the facilitators reported problems with disbursement of funds. Some facilitators had to use their own money for supplies because of late

Table 4

Percentage of Funding Sources Used for A.I.D.P. Strategies and Features

Strategy/Feature ^a	A.I.D.P. 94601	A.I.D.P. P.C.E.N 94136	A.I.D.P./ Part-Time Options	A.I.D.P./ Concurrent 94607	A.I.D.P./ Guidance	P.C.E.N. Chap. I	Tax-Levy	Other	Sources	
P.M. School	30.8	23.1	0	7.7	3.8	3.8	0	15.4	0	
Shared Instruction	0	0	0	15.4	0	0	0	3.8	23.1	H.S. Division, grants
School/Community Internships	15.4	0	0	3.8	0	0	0	15.4	15.4	C.B.O.s
Re-Entry Classes	19.2	15.4	0	0	3.8	7.7	0	30.8	3.8	Grants, C.B.O.s
Off-Site Programs	3.8	3.8	0	7.7	0	0	0	19.2	19.2	Supt.'s fund, C.B.O.s, Spec.Ed.
G.E.D. Program	0	7.7	0	0	0	0	0	26.9	0	
SOAR Program	38.5	46.2	3.8	0	7.7	3.8	3.8	23.1	0	
Mentoring/Tutorial	15.4	11.5	0	0	3.8	3.8	11.5	23.1	11.5	N.Y.State, Spec. Grant 91611
Ninth and Tenth Grade Houses	19.2	0	0	0	15.4	11.5	7.7	65.4	11.5	Title VII Bilingual, Spec.Ed.
Part-Time Jobs, Work-Study	3.8	7.7	34.6	0	0	0	0	23.1	34.6	C.B.O.s, VEA 91702, N.Y. State
Vocational Training	3.8	3.8	0	7.7	0	0	0	23.1	15.4	C.B.O.s
Attendance Incentives	84.6	26.9	0	0	3.8	0	0	53.8	19.2	C.B.O.s, external sponsors
Individual Counseling	73.1	7.7	0	7.7	26.9	3.8	23.1	50.0	19.2	C.B.O.s
Group Counseling	61.5	3.8	0	0	23.1	3.8	23.1	30.8	30.8	C.B.O.s
Health Counseling	3.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	30.8	30.8	H.R.C.s, C.B.O.s, N.Y. State
Parent Outreach	80.8	15.4	0	0	15.4	11.5	19.2	46.2	23.1	Spec. grant, C.B.O.s
Block Programming	38.5	34.6	0	0	0	0	3.8	30.8	3.8	Spec. Ed.
Multi-Cultural Programming	7.7	3.8	0	0	0	0	3.8	11.5	7.7	Boro. Pres. Grant, Jr. Achiev.
Leadership Training	3.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	42.3	15.4	SPARK, COSA, External grant
Conflict Resolution	3.8	0	0	0	0	0	3.8	11.5	19.2	C.B.O.s, Victim Serv., Proj. Smart
Independent Study	42.3	7.7	0	30.8	7.7	0	0	11.5	0	
Comprehensive Remediation	19.2	19.2	3.8	0	0	30.8	15.4	23.1	0	
Others (cumulative percents)	20.7 ^b	19.2 ^c	0	0	0	7.7 ^d	3.8 ^e	15.4 ^f	11.5 ^g	

^a All schools used more than one funding source for each Strategy/Feature

^b Aspira, student activities, articulation, reduced class size, staff development attendance outreach, facilitation

^c Transitional program, staff development literacy, reduced class size

^d Four subschools, articulation

^e PALS

^f Four subschools

^g Operation Success, four subschools, substance abuse (funded by N.Y. State)

31

reimbursement for expenditures. One facilitator noted that A.I.D.P. funds were now used to pay for classes previously funded by tax levy. As a result, late disbursement caused staffing problems. Forty percent of facilitators reported problems because of a lack of sufficient funds for such things as a full-time social worker or high-interest classes.

III. STUDENT OUTCOMES

OREA examined student data for the five stated objectives of the 1988-89 A.I.D.P. program. As shown in Table 5, 63 percent of A.I.D.P. schools met the average daily attendance objective in their ninth grade, and 57 percent met the same objective in their tenth grades. Table 6 shows that 94 percent of A.I.D.P. schools met the semester attendance objective in their ninth grades, and 100 percent met that objective in their tenth grades. As Table 7 indicates, 50 percent of A.I.D.P. schools met the long-term absentee objective in their ninth grades, and 63 percent met the same objective in their tenth grades as well.

The credit accumulation objective is complex and bears some explanation. This objective stipulates that the number of credits required to be promoted to the next grade and the difference between the average number of credits earned (in 1987-88) by ninth and tenth grade students will be reduced by one-half over a three-year period. Table 8 presents credit data for ninth and tenth grade students in A.I.D.P. schools. As indicated in this table, the number of credits needed to be promoted varies from six to 11 among ninth graders and from eight to 14 among tenth graders at various high schools.

The objective states that the difference between the number of credits needed to be promoted in a particular school and the average number of credits earned by ninth or tenth grade students in that school will be reduced by one-half over three years. As

Table 5

Summary of Average Daily Attendance
Baseline, Objectives, and Outcomes for 1988-89

	Ninth Grade			Tenth Grade		
	Baseline 1987-88	Objective 1988-89	Sept 1988- June 1989	Baseline 1987-88	Objective 1988-89	Sept 1988- June 1989
Jane Addams	78.3	79.4	74.1	79.5	80.4	80.3
Automotive Trades	82.6	83.0	81.5	75.4	77.0	81.8*
Boys and Girls	71.8	74.0	75.3*	78.5	79.6	76.4
Bryant	84.0	84.2	84.2*	84.5	84.6	87.9*
Chelsea	80.4	81.2	81.1	76.3	77.8	73.8
Evander Childs	77.9	79.1	79.5*	81.9	82.4	84.5*
DeWitt Clinton	76.1	77.3	76.8	77.4	78.7	73.0
Chris. Columbus	81.0	81.7	87.0*	76.9	78.2	85.9*
Curtis	75.8	77.6	78.7*	81.1	81.8	82.2*
S. Gompers	79.8	80.7	81.2*	79.7	80.6	80.5
Graphic Comm. Arts	77.4	78.7	83.9*	78.6	79.7	75.0
S.J. Hale	71.4	73.7	78.6*	77.0	78.3	78.4*
Ft. Hamilton	70.3	72.8	79.5*	81.0	81.7	80.9
Erasmus Hall	77.7	79.9	80.7*	80.6	81.3	81.7*
Washington Irving	77.5	78.8	79.6*	82.9	83.2	84.8*
Andrew Jackson	80.5	81.2	78.0	81.1	81.8	79.3
J.F. Kennedy	77.5	78.8	82.8*	79.9	80.8	83.5*
Lafayette	76.8	78.2	77.9	78.8	79.8	79.0*
F.K. Lane	76.5	77.9	76.0	80.9	81.6	80.0
L. East Side Prep.	84.9	84.9	86.8*	81.5	82.1	82.0
J. Monroe	70.6	73.0	73.7*	79.4	80.3	79.8
Morris	71.1	73.4	78.1*	77.2	78.5	74.9
Park West	75.4	77.0	86.1*	80.5	81.2	76.3
Julia Richman	73.5	75.4	73.0	73.9	75.8	76.3*
Seward Park	84.1	84.2	88.1*	**	**	88.6*
Springfield Gardens	**	**	88.9*	83.6	83.8	88.3*
A. Stevenson	81.5	82.1	81.3	83.9	84.1	86.6*
Walton	79.9	80.8	76.6	82.8	83.2	83.1
G. Washington	77.9	79.1	75.4	76.3	77.8	81.7*
G. Wingate	80.1	80.9	82.3*	83.6	83.8	86.9*

* Met school A.I.D.P. objective.

** Met Chancellor's minimum standard of 85 percent average attendance. This objective excludes long-term-absentees (L.T.A.s).

o Sixty-three percent of the schools met the average daily attendance objective in the ninth grade and 57 percent met the same objective in the tenth grade.

Table 6

Summary of Semester Attendance
Baseline, Objective, and Outcomes 1988-89

School	Ninth Grade			Tenth Grade		
	Baseline 1987-88	Objective 1988-89	Sept.88 June 89	Baseline 1987-88	Objective 1988-89	Sept. 88 June 1989
Jane Addams	31.2	29.3	31.4	28.7	27.3	21.1*
Automotive Trades	14.3	15.2	18.0**	47.0	42.5	20.1*
Boys & Girls	46.8	42.4	31.0*	48.5	43.7	26.0*
Bryant	32.5	30.4	19.9**	33.1	30.9	11.6**
Chelsea	20.7	20.6	24.3	32.2	30.2	20.6*
Evander Childs	40.9	37.4	22.7*	34.6	32.2	16.8**
DeWitt Clinton	42.4	38.7	30.3	53.1	47.6	33.9*
Christopher Columbus	37.9	34.9	21.3*	48.0	43.4	18.0**
Curtis	42.0	38.3	27.4*	34.7	32.3	20.2**
S. Gompers	35.5	32.9	24.1*	35.2	32.7	20.4*
Graphic Comm. Arts	41.2	37.7	24.7*	39.3	36.1	33.4*
S.J. Hale	52.8	47.4	29.2*	41.3	37.8	28.7*
Ft. Hamilton	51.1	45.9	23.4*	32.0	30.0	18.6**
Erasmus Hall	45.6	41.3	18.0**	37.1	34.2	17.3**
Washington Irving	42.9	39.0	35.3*	29.4	27.8	22.8*
Andrew Jackson	35.4	32.9	25.3*	28.6	27.2	21.4*
J.F. Kennedy	44.7	40.6	20.6*	40.5	37.1	21.1*
Lafayette	40.2	36.8	24.2*	35.9	33.2	21.9*
F.K. Lane	46.9	42.4	32.8*	35.8	33.1	26.3*
L. East Side Prep	32.0	30.0	19.7**	42.1	38.4	17.1*
J. Monroe	52.6	47.1	32.2	37.5	34.6	26.0*
Morris	56.6	47.1	32.2*	37.5	34.6	26.0*
Park West	56.7	50.6	27.5*	46.3	41.9	30.0*
Julia Richman	55.6	49.6	33.9*	45.9	41.6	23.6*
Seward Park	25.2	24.3	15.1**	24.3	23.6	14.0**
Springfield Gardens	51.0	45.8	16.2**	41.4	37.9	22.4*
A. Stevenson	38.8	35.6	22.2*	33.7	31.4	15.0**
Walton	42.0	38.4	28.0*	35.0	32.5	15.1**
G. Washington	42.1	38.4	25.1*	44.1	40.1	18.4**
G. Wingate	35.0	32.5	19.8**	30.4	28.7	13.6**

*Met school A.I.D.P. objective.

**Met Chancellor's minimum standard that no more than 20 percent of the students should be absent for 16 or more days per semester.

o Ninety percent of the schools met the semester attendance objective in the ninth grade and 100 percent met the same objective in the tenth grade.

Table 7

Summary of Long-term Absentees (L.T.A.s)
Baseline, Objectives and Outcomes for 1988-89

	<u>Ninth grade</u>			<u>Tenth grade</u>		
	Baseline 1987-88	Objective 1988-89	Sept.1988- June 1989	Baseline 1987-88	Objective 1988-89	Sept.1988- June 1989
Jane Addams	11.5	10.4	9.1*	7.7	7.2	5.2*
Automotive Trades	1.4	**	1.0*	7.7	7.3	1.7**
Boys and Girls	8.6	8.0	11.7	28.7	24.7	15.8*
Bryant	8.1	7.6	9.3	4.8	**	6.1
Chelsea	4.9	**	2.3*	3.3	**	4.4**
Evander Childs	15.2	13.5	12.7	8.5	7.9	6.7*
DeWitt Clinton	7.4	7.0	3.8*	12.9	11.6	15.8
Chris. Columbus	10.4	9.5	9.3*	10.3	9.4	7.8*
Curtis	3.6	**	3.3*	1.0	**	1.8**
Gompers	3.3	**	2.5*	2.5	**	2.0**
Graphic Comm. Arts	5.8	5.6	3.6*	5.0	**	6.3
S.J. Hale	8.6	8.0	12.8	3.4	**	6.8
Ft. Hamilton	12.1	10.9	9.5*	6.5	6.3	4.6**
Erasmus Hall	14.7	13.1	8.0*	7.8	7.3	6.3*
Washington Irving	6.8	6.5	7.8	3.6	**	3.5**
Andrew Jackson	9.9	9.1	7.1*	7.9	7.4	5.8*
J.F. Kennedy	5.6	5.5	6.5	5.7	5.5	4.8**
Lafayette	10.1	9.2	10.7	6.4	6.0	5.5*
F.K. Lane	7.9	7.4	14.6	4.0	**	7.9
L.E.S. Prep	8.2	7.7	6.1*	7.7	7.3	6.5*
Monroe	12.9	11.6	13.5	5.8	5.7	5.8
Morris	20.4	17.8	10.2*	7.1	6.8	21.4
Park West	8.7	8.1	5.0**	7.0	6.6	11.4
Julia Richman	9.2	8.5	11.3	3.6	**	4.5**
Seward Park	9.6	8.8	10.3	5.7	5.6	6.8
Springfield Gardens	4.2	**	5.0**	3.8	**	5.4
A. Stevenson	18.8	16.5	10.0*	7.1	6.7	3.5**
Walton	9.18	8.5	10.0	6.6	6.4	7.3
G. Washington	7.80	7.3	11.7	5.1	5.1	5.1*
G. Wingate	8.14	7.6	8.8	5.4	5.3	5.3*

* Met school A.I.D.P. objective.

** Met Chancellor's minimum standard that no more than 5 percent of a school's register are L.T.A.s.

o Fifty percent of the schools met the L.T.A. objective in the ninth grade and 63 percent met the same objective in the tenth grade.

Table 8

Summary of Credit Accumulation
Baseline, Objective, and Outcomes for 1988-89

School	Ninth Grade				Tenth Grade			
	Baseline 1987-88	Credits Needed		Objective Sept. 88 June 89	Baseline 1987-88	Credits Needed		Objective 1988-89 June 89
		To Be Promoted	1988-89			To Be Promoted	1988-89	
Jane Addams	8.6	10	8.8	7.7	6.1	10	6.8	9.7*
Automotive Trades	10.5	a	8.8	10.2*	8.0	a	6.7	8.2*
Boys & Girls	7.1	10	7.6	6.5	6.0	10	6.7	7.2*
Bryant	9.8	10	9.8	8.6*	6.0	10	6.7	9.9*
Chelsea	a	10	a	7.6	a	10	a	9.0*
Evander Childs	6.2	8	6.5	6.0	5.1	12	6.2	8.0*
DeWitt Clinton	6.7	9	7.1	6.1	2.1	9	3.2	5.3*
Christopher Columbus	7.9	6	7.6	6.8	3.6	11	4.8	7.4*
Curtis	8.3	10	8.6	7.5	5.6	10	6.3	8.9*
S. Gompers	7.9	10	8.2	7.7	4.4	10	5.3	8.8*
Graphic Comm. Arts	7.7	14	8.8	8.7	6.3	14	7.6	8.0*
S.J. Hale	6.7	10	7.2	7.4*	3.9	10	4.9	8.2*
Ft. Hamilton	6.1	9	6.6	7.1*	4.4	10	5.3	8.2*
Erasmus Hall	6.3	8	6.6	7.3*	5.7	12	6.8	8.0*
Washington Irving	7.5	10	7.9	6.1	5.4	10	6.2	8.2*
Andrew Jackson	7.3	9	7.6	6.3	5.1	10	5.9	7.3*
J.F. Kennedy	6.5	9	6.9	6.2	3.1	9	4.1	7.0*
Lafayette	7.7	6	7.4	8.1	5.1	10	5.9	8.3*
F.K. Lane	7.3	9	7.6	6.1	5.0	10	5.8	8.3*
L. East Side Prep	8.6	11	9.0	7.8	14.2	10	13.5	11.1
J. Monroe	5.8	10	6.5	5.6	5.0	10	5.8	7.4*
Morris	6.6	7	6.7	6.0	4.3	10	5.2	5.6*
Park West	7.1	9	7.4	7.3	5.9	10	6.6	7.2
Julia Richman	6.5	10	7.1	5.2	4.7	10	5.6	7.1*
Seward Park	7.8	10	8.2	8.8*	5.5	10	6.2	8.6*
Springfield Gardens	4.1	8	4.8	8.4*	8.3	8	8.3	8.3*
A. Stevenson	6.1	9	6.6	5.5	4.5	10	5.4	7.0*
Walton	6.2	10	6.8	5.7	4.5	10	5.4	7.6*
G. Washington	6.1	10	6.8	4.8	5.6	10	6.3	7.1*
G. Wingate	6.6	6	6.5	6.4	4.4	12	5.7	7.7*
M.L. King	6.9	10	7.4	5.9	6.0	10	6.7	7.9*

*These data were unavailable from this school.

*Met the school A.I.D.P. objective.

o Twenty-three percent of the ninth graders and 97 percent of the tenth graders met the credit accumulation objective.

shown in Table 8, the ninth graders in only 23 percent of the schools, but the tenth graders in 97 percent of the schools, met the credit accumulation objective.

The disparity between the percentage of schools meeting the credit objective in the ninth and tenth grades is striking--one explanation relates to the average number of credits earned in 1987-88 which was used as a baseline. This number was higher (i.e., closer to the number needed to be promoted) for ninth graders than for tenth graders. As a result, it was more difficult for ninth graders to improve their performance than it was for tenth graders. Students entering ninth grade have not yet been exposed to high school level work or high school standards. Students who have made it into the tenth grade, on the other hand, have shown that they can achieve the level necessary to earn credits in high school.

The dropout objective stipulated that schools should reduce the difference between their own dropout rates and the Chancellor's minimum standard of a 7.5 percent dropout rate. Dropout data are presented in Table 9. As shown in this table, 67 percent of the schools met their objective by reducing their schoolwide dropout rates by the requisite amounts.

The measured objectives were met in more than half of the schools participating in the 1988-89 A.I.D.P. program. It must be noted that the objectives were set for a three-year period, and 1988-89 was the first year A.I.D.P. schools operated under the new guidelines. It is possible that the increment of improvement will

Table 9

Summary of Dropout Rates
Baseline, Objective, and Outcomes 1988-89

School	Baseline ^a 1986-87	Objective 1988-89	Sept.88 June 89
Jane Addams	4.8	*	7.4
Automotive Trades	8.9	8.7	8.4*
Boys & Girls	12.9	12.0	9.1*
Bryant	5.6	*	4.3*
Chelsea	8.2	8.1	7.5*
Evander Childs	12.0	11.3	7.1*
DeWitt Clinton	13.9	12.8	10.6*
Christopher Columbus	8.3	8.2	9.4
Curtis	5.8	*	4.7*
S. Gompers	7.6	7.5	7.2*
Graphic Comm. Arts	9.5	9.2	9.1*
S.J. Hale	13.1	12.2	8.7*
Ft. Hamilton	3.6	*	9.7
Erasmus Hall	6.6	*	9.6
Washington Irving	10.1	9.7	8.7*
Andrew Jackson	8.2	8.1	7.5*
J.F. Kennedy	8.0	7.9	7.5*
Lafayette	8.4	8.3	7.0*
F.K. Lane	10.7	10.2	9.9*
L. East Side Prep	5.6	*	11.8
J. Monroe	12.5	11.7	8.7*
Morris	9.4	9.1	11.6
Park West	8.2	8.1	11.7
Julia Richman	12.8	11.9	9.7*
Seward Park	7.4	*	9.8
Springfield Gardens	6.6	*	4.6*
A. Stevenson	10.6	10.1	7.0*
Walton	9.5	9.2	7.6*
G. Washington	10.1	9.7	10.3
G. Wingate	5.3	*	6.2

^aBaseline for dropout rates is 1986-87 reported by school. Baseline for all other objectives in 1987-88.

*Met the Chancellor's minimum standard of a 7.5 percent dropout rate.

o Sixty-seven percent of the schools met the dropout objective.

increase sufficiently in more schools over the next two years to meet or come closer to the total three-year objective.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The 1988-89 Attendance Improvement Dropout Prevention (A.I.D.P.) program operated in 30 high schools under new guidelines and broadened student eligibility.

A review of the data for which complete information was available indicates that the objectives were met in more than half of the participating schools. Since the five stated objectives were set for a three-year period, it remains premature to draw long-term conclusions based on the first year of data. It is possible, however, that improvement will increase sufficiently in more schools over the next two years to meet or come close to the three-year objectives.

A.I.D.P. staff strongly supported school-based planning, but their participation in the planning process varied widely among schools. More input by staff during the crucial planning stages would be useful in avoiding many inevitable program snags.

The inclusion of entire ninth and tenth grades in A.I.D.P., caused coordination difficulties with other school programs. A greater number of administrators had to be consulted, and more coordination meetings held. Attention must be given to establishing a process that would ease proceedings between programs. For optimum efficiency, the services of a full-time facilitator heading each A.I.D.P. program are needed.

Guidance staff noted that the addition of a clinically-trained staff person significantly increased guidance and counseling

services to students. Also, those programs with a social worker or psychologist were able to attract interns from graduate schools to further augment guidance services. Counselors observed that the number of students with serious emotional and family problems had increased. Yet, 50 percent of guidance counselors spent much of their time on academic programming and administrative chores. Clinically-trained staff are essential in providing often needed crisis intervention, and emotional support.

Many facilitators thought block-programming was an effective strategy, but needed ways to make such classes attractive to qualified teachers. Teachers in the program were often overwhelmed by the problems of at-risk students, and the extra work needed to keep students interested. Strategies such as preparation periods and supportive consultation should be used to attract teachers. If effective teachers could not be found, administrators felt it made more sense to mainstream these students.

Both students and staff reported that students preferred classes and activities relevant to career goals. Students also wanted individual contact with a caring teacher or staff person. To encourage students, a program of relevant classes and alternative ways of earning credits toward a diploma should be strengthened and expanded.

Based on the findings in the evaluation, the following specific recommendations are made:

- Encourage the input of all A.I.D.P. staff, particularly during the crucial planning stages of each year's program.

- Establish a system to ease coordination between the A.I.D.P. program and other services for at-risk students.
- Provide a full-time facilitator to head each A.I.D.P. program.
- Include a clinically-trained staff person in the guidance department of all A.I.D.P. schools.
- Strengthen supportive services for teachers of block-programmed classes.
- Continue to expand and strengthen program elements that connect classwork with career opportunities, and allow for educational alternative.

Appendix A

List of Variables Used to Measure Each Objective

Objective	Sample	Data Source
Average daily attendance rates for 1987-88 as a baseline and for the 1988-89 school year	Ninth and tenth graders in participating schools	Periodic Attendance Reports (PARs)
Individual student attendance by semester for 1987-88 as a baseline and for the 1988-89 school year	Ninth and tenth graders in participating schools	Student Information Services
Aggregate information on the number of L.T.A.s on register for 1987-88 as a baseline and for the 1988-89 school year	Ninth and tenth graders in participating schools	Office of DATA
Dropout rates for 1986-87 as a baseline and for the 1988-89 school year	Students in participating schools	Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment Dropout Report
Credit information for 1987-88 as a baseline and for the 1988-89 school year	Ninth and tenth graders in participating schools	CREA database

Appendix B

List of Participating A.I.D.P. Schools

School

Jane Addams
Automotive Trades
Boys and Girls
Bryant
Chelsea
Evander Childs
DeWitt Clinton
Columbus
Curtis
Gompers
Graphic Comm. Arts
S.J. Hale
Ft. Hamilton
Erasmus Hall
Washington Irving
Andrew Jackson
J.F. Kennedy
Lafayette
F.K. Lane
L.E.S. Prep
Monroe
Morris
Park West
Julia Richman
Seward Park
Springfield Gardens
A. Stevenson
Walton
G. Washington
G. Wingate
