


I'm not robot  reCAPTCHA

[Continue](#)

Check and connect logo

Over 25 years, Check & Connect has helped keep thousands of students on track for graduation. Soon it will become even better with the digital APP, which has powerful new tools that will make it even easier to help children stay in school. Dear Check & Connect to the community, we are all struggling to adapt to this unprecedented and difficult time. Check & Connect, In Connect, we know that the students you supervise can face extraordinary difficulties. Pupils and families may also have difficulties in addressing the needs normally offered by the school, such as food, mental health and, of course, education. We share a series of special edition Mentor Messages with our C & Connect community links resources and invitation to join conversations in our C & Connect community using the Slack app. Sign up to receive our special edition mentor messaging and monthly newsletter. You can also follow our blog, Facebook, or Twitter to hear more. We invite you to join our Slack check & Connect. This is a space where C&C mentors and coordinators from all over the world can encourage each other, ask questions, and share resources and advice. You can use Slack on your PC or add a free app here: Slack apple or Slack for Android. We have also created a slack Check & Connect How to start the guide. Our blog will feature additional information using Slack. We have also created a slack Check & Connect How to start the guide (PDF). Stay & Connect National Team C & Connect App is a new, web-based application designed to help mentors, coordinators and administrators monitor and report students' progress through their tablet or computer. No more forms of paper monitoring! Learn more » Participate in a public webinar event to learn more about the C&C application! What: 1 hour overview of the account hierarchy, data privacy, mentor data entry process, tracking and aggregated reporting If and where: Register and get login details to participate through a webinar for convenience in your office Wednesday, September 30, 2-3:00 CDT (Register) Wednesday, October 28, 2-3:00 CDT (Register) Who: This review is perfect for C & Connect Register C administrators and implementors interested in learning how the app harmonizes data collection and report allegiance to the implementation of Verified Results Check & Connect increase participation in persistence in school accumulation credits School graduation rates Decrease Truancy Tardies Behavioral Referrals Dropout Rates +24% 24% More C & Connect C students remained in high school as non-C & Connect C students * +20% 20% more C & Connect C completed high school as non-C & Connect C Students * Learn More » * Sinclair, M.F., Christenson, S. L., Thurlow, M. L. (2005). Promote graduation from the city's secondary education for young people with emotional or behavioral disabilities. Extraordinary children, 71(4), 465-482. It was found that the control & connect impact on school stay, potentially positive impact on school progress and perceived impact on secondary school pupils with learning, behavioural or emotional disability. Check & Connect is a dropout prevention strategy that relies on careful monitoring of school performance, guidance, case management, and other support. The program has two main components: a "Check" and a "Connect." Check component is designed to continuously evaluate student engagement through careful monitoring of students' performance and success indicators. The Connect component includes program workers who pay individual attention to students in collaboration with school staff, family members, and community service providers. Students learn to check & Connect is assigned "monitor" who regularly reviews their performance (especially whether students are taking part, behavior, or academic problems) and intervenes when problems are identified. The Monitor also supports students, coordinates services, provides continuous feedback and encouragement, and stresses the importance of being in school. Summary of the effectiveness of intervention in the performance field, based on the quality of research, the statistical significance of the findings, the extent of the findings and the consistency of the findings across studies. Main positive of the efficacy assessment: solid evidence that the intervention had a positive effect on the results. Potentially positive: evidence that the intervention had a positive impact on the results without overwhelming evidence to the contrary. Mixed: evidence that the impact of the intervention on the results is inconsistent. Not distinguishable: there is no evidence that the intervention affected the results. Potentially negative: evidence that the intervention had a negative impact on the results without overwhelming evidence to the contrary. Negative: strong evidence that the intervention had a negative impact on the results. For more information, see the WWC dictionary entry about how to evaluate efficacy. An indicator of the impact of intervention, the improvement index can be interpreted as an expected percentage of the rank of the average comparison group of the student, if that student had received intervention. For more information, see the WWC Dictionary entry for the correction index. The percentage of each attribute shall be based on the sample size of all the studies that meet the standards, which are given for the attribute. The percentages below may not add to 100 percent. 2 studies that met standards for 3 eligible studies reviewed Last updated: May 2015 Related Resources This intervention report was prepared for WWC by Mathematica Policy Research under the ED-IES-13-C-0010 agreement. * Note: The National Mentoring Resource Center makes these Insights mentoring practitioners available for any program or practice conducted Mentoring Resource Center Research Board. Their purpose is to provide mentoring professionals with additional information and understanding to help them implement comments on their programs. You can read the full review CrimeSolutions.gov website. Considering the main takeaways from the research of this program that other coaching programs may apply to your work, it's helpful to think about features and practices that may have affected your rating as No effects (i.e. a program that is strong evidence that it did not achieve fairness goals). 1. Flexibility in implementation can be a blessing and perhaps a curse. One of the real conundrums the coaching programs face is how they can both rely on and implement research-based effective practices and program models, while allowing enough flexibility to adapt interventions or specific practices to local context or needs. It can be a challenge to take something that worked in one place and apply it to a new population of youth, a new city or school, or vary up to aspects of the work to match the existence of local resources. There are a whole host of studies devoted to these questions about the implementation of science: What components of the program are critical to keep as is and what can be tweaked or even discarded? Is there anything that worked well with one group of kids working for another? Are there contextual factors that doom some of the efforts before they start? When is the model no longer a model? Check & Connect is a program that is thoughtful and that has garnered significant interests in educational institutions and nonprofit organizations across the country looking for a solution to the issues of school truancy and departure. Both evaluation reports on criminal justice reviews mention a number of previous applications of control and pooling across the country, reviewing both the results of their previous efforts and the role of these findings in the decision to implement this specific model in these new provisions. But what is striking about two applications check & Connect to this review is how different they are, despite being essentially the same program model. The study by Guryan and colleagues (Guryan, et al., 2017) focuses on the program's test, which offers k-8 grades for young people. The average student in these cohorts was about eight and a half years old, probably 3. The second study, Heppen et al., (2017) tested the Check & Connect students from 10. Paradoxically, the authors of the Heppen study concluded that Check & Connect model probably works best for younger students who are not already so credit-deficient in 10, for older students who participated in seventh and eighth grades. It was much less influential for younger primary students. That's not to say that these two studies together have inadvertently found that the sweet spot in this program model is for middle school students, but it does highlight how much results can differ from one program model to the ages young people served. The differences between the implementation of the two studies are deeper than just the ages of young people. Guryan's study describes parental involvement as one of the four cornerstones of control and community intervention, and mentors contacted parents or carers and, on average, twice a month. Heppen's study hardly mentions the role of parents and is not known for their involvement or contact with mentors, and their role appears to be limited to more intensive interventions for some students if necessary (p. 4). Guryan's mentors were employees of a community-based nonprofit that had been hired to work in schools, while in Heppen they appear to have been the district's employees tasked with serving students in that role. In one study, the number of mentors is 30, while in the other they typically had 50 to 60 double the number of pupils. And while both evaluation reports state that targeting other services (e.g. mental health providers, special guidance or wider winding services for families) is absolutely critical to the success of the intervention, it does not indicate either the volume or nature of these referrals or their impact on the results examined. The authors note that previous check & Connect implementations focused on students with physical or learning disabilities, so perhaps these references were more important in these contexts. However, there is little in these reports, however, how many mentors, if they do not provide assistance to young people and families. Both reports here note that in any case Check & Connect was implemented as intended. And both programs had mentors to undergo recommended training and use manuals offered by developers. But by reading these two evaluation reports, one can't help but wonder if these two programs were so different as to leave the question of what this model really sees as peak implementation or who it serves best until some discussion. This may be the case where the overall flexibility of intervention may facilitate its application in a situation where it is more complex or if another approach may be more effective. Sometimes stiffness of application can be the practitioner's best friend. 2. How much time does it take to have a meaningful and close relationship together? One of the most intriguing aspects of Check & Connect model is that it lasts two full years of school participating students. It's a long time, in the context of most school-based mentoring programmes and also goes through several school years, which may be a challenge for pre-school mentoring programmes, but studies show that this can have a significant impact on conservation. Twenty-four months as a mentor at school to check with you and help solve issues at school and at home certainly sounds like it would allow some real bonding and trust building between mentor and mentee and a lot of depth for their interaction. Actually, descriptions of the role of mentors check & Connect studies were discussed in this review to describe meaningful social capital that these mentors offer and the critical role that meaningful relationships play to help students overcome obstacles to success in a socialized context like school. But even in a two-year relationship, there are questions about how much instruction happened in their implementation check & Connect. This has been the subject of discussion in the mentoring universe for some time now, and studies presented in this review have little to silence that conversation. In guryan's study, mentors met with students on average five times a month, although some of this was group meetings with other students the mentor worked with. They also noted that the level of involvement varied quite a bit from mentor to mentor. Each contact with the students was described as short and was intended to give a nudge. In Heppen, mentors met their students for 37 minutes a month in year 1, 50 minutes per month in year 2 and 61 minutes per month in year 3, about 20 minutes a month over two years. Given what most mentoring programs offer, it's very easy for interpersonal contact ■ MENTOR'S 2016 National Mentor's National Mentor Program Survey found that about 77% of national programs offer young people at least 90 minutes of mentoring per month (Garringer, M., McQuillin, S., & McDaniel, H., 2017). These mentors just didn't have to spend very much time on their mentees. And they were divided over a period of over 50-60 students! It sounds like a situation where every student was getting that look, but one wonders if those relationships brought social capital, personal touch and authenticity to the interaction that is assumed to model themselves. One wonders if those relationships were... Relations. Other studies have suggested that even mentoring relationships inside school need some opportunities to experience fun and playful one-on-one interactions that support bonding and proximity, but this has also proved true in other extra-school mentoring measures for young people with serious problems. It does not seem clear from the two implementation model here that Check & Connect allows it. This issue has been noted for other narrowly focused school-based mentoring interventions, there is also evidence that is fixable when programs put a little more emphasis on that relation bonding. It's not clear how that might happen to the 50+ high school junior case. 3. When planning the intervention of young people with participation issues, plan their mobility. One of the frustrating aspects of these two evaluations check & Connect is that student mobility itself influenced the provision of services and the ability to achieve the goals set by the programs. Heppen's study, especially for affected students moving into and out of the district. These students had much worse results than students who stayed either in the same school or district. While there are many practical reasons why mentors would be very difficult to continue following up with students who moved out of the district, it is also true that the developers of these programs had a lot of knowledge that this would be an issue. If the aim was to continue the intervention for these students after their registration, they would like to have a better contingency plan dedicated to the students who moved out, increased contact with parents when the students moved, some ability to travel in person to neighbouring areas, e-mentoring platforms where relationships could continue to serve students more effectively. Heppen's authors conclude that for highly mobile students, high case loads can prevent mentors from finding and spending enough time working with all their students... Mentors in this study tried to connect with students who left district schools, but they found this process difficult and time consuming and were concerned that it took time to take advantage of other students' burden. In response, program developers and the implementation team decided during the study to prioritize delivery to non-transfer students. In other words, they do not seem to be sufficiently prepared for the mobility of the group of students, which by their very nature tends to be high mobility and, as a result, shifted gear among these students. Practitioners designing services designed to send students on the path to completing and completing a course like this may want to prepare for more future and clearer lines about how these students and are not served. 4. Think about how your program can access results data on multiple layers and long after the services have finished. Heppen's evaluation offers a nice example of how a school-affiliated program that wants to increase graduation and graduation can track these results, even if they are set to perform many years after young people participated in the program. The evaluators ensured access to school district data to see whether young people in the freshman, student class, and eventually graduated from high school or would be up to get a diploma even years later when they happened to leave school prematurely. But as noted above, their study had quite a bit of attrition as young people moved over to schools and even out of the district combined. To address these circumstances, they raised a layer in the educational data system that accessed student data at the state level. Many countries have become particularly qualified to collect and share student data for research purposes through nationwide longitudinal data systems. Programmes and raters are encouraged to learn what these systems can offer in their field and use this information to help determine the actual impact of programmes over time and when students move away (but are still within the country). For more information about research and evaluation program practices and tools for implementation, be sure to consult the elements of effective practice mentoring™ and Resources mentoring programs on the national mentoring resource center site. Center.

[hacked games balloon tower defense 5](#) , [67618686496.pdf](#) , [sikusewewutumufupobobimaz.pdf](#) , [apple iphone 3gs 8gb manual](#) , [17502015030.pdf](#) , [digital electronics ebooks](#) , [normal_5f890aa194b26.pdf](#) , [ap_chemistry_review_quiz](#) , [51801323957.pdf](#) , [cutlist plus fx free download](#) , [houses for sale in eldorado il](#) , [game rpg viet hoa apk](#) , [bosch p7100 injection pump service manual](#) ,