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ABSTRACT
This research study compared the effects of the intrusive form of developmental academic advising (IDAA) and the influence of additional academic support services on the mean cumulative Grade Point Averages (GPAs) of 4 randomly assembled groups of academically at-risk college students during 2 separate semesters. Academically at-risk students are defined as those students whose cumulative GPAs are below academic good standing at a university. The mean cumulative GPA of each student group was averaged prior to the beginning and at the end of the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters, respectively. All of these students were enrolled in a private university in the Mid-Atlantic region of the United States. The results of this study imply that using IDAA with a comprehensive offering of additional academic support services could provide greater academic improvement assistance to academically at-risk students than a less intrusive process.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Student retention remains a significant issue at most colleges and universities (Tinto, 2004). Earl (1988) believed that 33% of enrolling freshman would not be able to continue enrollment during their sophomore year. This issue becomes more complicated when the institution has to address the needs of students who fall into academic jeopardy requiring them to be deemed academically at-risk students. Academically at-risk student status can be defined as those students placed on academic probation or suspension by the institution because they achieved a Grade Point Average (GPA) below a 2.0 relative to a 4.0 academic grading scale. Similar evaluations of academic jeopardy exist on campuses that have different grading scales. However, each campus sets an acceptable limit that it defines as academic good standing. Any student whose GPA falls below that standard is considered a member of the institution’s academically at-risk student population.

Each university has to decide if it’s academically at-risk student population requires a more intentionally designed academic advising and support program (Earl, 1988). These programs must address the needs of at-risk students as they try to achieve on a higher academic level. These advising and support programs can also help the institution to retain more students who are in this population.

Most universities are divided into academic disciplines and levels within one campus. These universities also enroll students who fall into the academically at-risk student category. Universities need to make a comprehensive effort in the form of a
campus academic advising initiative in order to adequately address the specific needs of their academically at-risk student population. The academic departments need to work together and coordinate this intentional advising effort designed to meet the academic needs of this population (Tinto, 2004). Universities could potentially improve retention rates related to the academically at-risk population by providing these students with additional academic support.

This type of academic support program could assist the academically at-risk students in their effort toward achieving their personal, academic, and career goals. The university would also benefit by retaining more of its enrolled student population (Garnett, 1990). The academic advising program employed in this comprehensive effort should be based upon the tenets of the developmental academic advising model, with some additional mandatory requirements related to attending all scheduled meetings between academic support personnel and academically at-risk students (Earl, 1988; King, 2000). Those additional requirements could also require the academically at-risk student to engage the university’s other available academic support service offerings, such as learning strategies instruction and career exploration education.

Academic advising programs based on college student development theories are called developmental academic advising programs. These advising programs appear to be the most effective means that universities can employ to help their students achieve their academic, personal, and career goals (Cuseo, 2003; Fox, 1986; Miller & Murray, 2005). Academic advisors apply those college student development theories during their
individual and group encounters with their assigned students (Hagen & Jordan, 2008). Campuses have employed the developmental advising model as a response to the general retention concerns that they face (Garnett, 1990). Tinto (2004) discussed the negative financial impact that universities experience when they do not make intentional efforts to retain their academically at-risk student populations. Universities that design comprehensive academic support programs that will address the specific needs of their academically at-risk student population have found that they are most effective when they add a mandatory meeting component to the developmental academic advising sessions (Abelman & Molina, 2001; Kirk-Kuwaye & Nishida, 2001).

Considering the issues that universities face regarding the retention of academically at-risk students and the financial impact that the lack of an effective and comprehensive retention strategy can have on the successful overall operation of a university, further research relative to the Intrusive Developmental Academic Advising (IDAA) model is warranted. The IDAA model continues to be employed as a means of making the developmental academic advising encounter into a mandatory advising meeting. Earl (1988) used a study to show that implementing an intrusive component to the academic advising model can be a very effective means of providing this academically at-risk student population with the assistance that they require in order to make progress toward academic good standing. IDAA allows the advisor to force an advising encounter, provide assistance to the student in academic jeopardy, and offer
other relevant academic support services, in an attempt to aid and retain a greater number of these students.

A university’s ability to improve retention levels will help to diminish the negative financial impact on the university’s budget caused by high rates of student attrition (Tinto, 2004). The implementation of the IDAA format employed along with a comprehensive offering of additional academic support services is an excellent means of assisting the academically at-risk student population. This combination addresses the student’s need to acquire an improved academic skill set. Improving that academic skill set is essential in their effort to make sufficient progress toward good standing and graduation.

**Background of the Study**

Studies show that many universities have attempted to address the academic needs of their academically at-risk student population over the past 20 or 30 years (Abelman & Molina, 2001; Austin, Cherney, Crowner, & Hill, 1997; Earl, 1988; Garnett, 1990; Hoyt & Lundell, 2003; Kirk-Kuwaye & Nishida, 2001; Lipsky & Ender, 1990; Mann, Hunt, & Alford 2003/2004; Molina & Abelman, 2000; Thomas & Minton, 2004). The mandatory academic advising format was employed by Earl (1988) with a group of academically at-risk, second-semester freshmen. This was one of the first and most significant studies conducted. It attempted to address the needs of this specific student population. It involved the employment of prescriptive academic advising, which allowed the academic advisor to help the student with course selection for upcoming semesters.
The prescriptive academic advising model was one of the early forms of academic advising. The field progressed toward the use of the developmental academic advising model (Heisserer & Parette, 2002).

Prescriptive advising in the Earl (1988) study was combined with a mandatory advising meeting as an attempt to address the fact that students in the academically at-risk population were less likely to seek out assistance on their own. Students in this mandatory or intrusive meeting discussed additional concerns related to their academic challenges. This discussion progressed beyond prescriptive advising because the advisor had to employ some elements of college student development theory in order to provide the best assistance for the at-risk student (Hagen & Jordan, 2008). The developmental academic advising model became the most appropriate response for the members of this student group. Developmental academic advising improved on the prescriptive academic advising model. It included prescriptive academic advising, but also focused on helping the student to develop holistically. This approach would help the student to develop the life skills, as well as the academic skills, required to become successful (King, 2005; Kramer, 2000). The process of mandating an academic advising meeting was deemed intrusive advising in the Earl (1988) study.

Thus, IDAA mandates that a developmental academic advising meeting occur between student and advisor in order to help the academically at-risk student to explore relevant concerns, discover appropriate strategies, and achieve greater levels of success. The Earl (1988) study suggested that at-risk students who do not encounter a mandatory
meeting may be less inclined to attend an advising session with an advisor. That study and others suggested that the intrusive meeting provides the advisor with the opportunity to offer assistance and recommendations to engage other campus academic support services (Abelman & Molina, 2001; Lipsky & Ender, 1990; Thomas & Minton, 2004).

Academic advising in the college setting has always been available to students. It was originally conducted in a very informal manner. The field of advising did not always have a true theoretical framework that was designed to support the activity (Hagen & Jordan, 2008). Thus the IDAA model could not have been implemented until the process of academic advising became an organized and formalized activity that could be designed to respond to the needs of a changing student population (Frost, 2000).

During the post-colonial era, faculty members served as academic advisors. There was no formal structure related to advising. Academic advising became a more defined activity in the early 20th century due to increased enrollment on college campuses. Faculty members began to pay more attention to the process. Some institutions used those faculty members who had a background in psychology to facilitate the process. Overall, academic advising remained an uncoordinated effort (Frost, 2000).

Student populations began to diversify after World War II. A more formalized academic advising system was required in order to respond to the academic needs of those populations. Also, faculty members began to engage in more research activities, which created a need for the utilization of professional advisors (Frost, 2000). As advising became more formalized, those who were involved in the field began to employ
multiple college student development theories as well as psychology therapy models as ways to further refine the process of academic advising (Hagen & Jordan, 2008).

The progression of academic advising toward a developmental advisement model, where students are included in the advising process, evolved away from the concept of using the academic advising encounter to merely prescribe that students enroll in certain classes without soliciting their feedback. Developmental academic advising based on college student development theories and other psychology-based models became a process of aiding the holistic development of the student’s decision-making skill set (King, 2005). Advising students using this developmental model has helped them to better understand the connection between education, future career goals, and lifestyle desires (Kramer, 2000).

The need for the academic advisor continues because students do not typically enter college with the decision-making skill sets required to plot their academic path. The developmental academic advising encounter has become a joint effort between student and advisor, as opposed to being advisor-centered and prescriptive in nature (Kramer, 2000). Student and advisor participate in and learn from each aspect of the advising process. The academic advisor plays a critical and joint role with students during their development and progression toward academic, career, and personal success.

The college student development theories that are used to create the developmental academic advising model include developmental psychology, cognitive psychology, personality typology, psychosocial behavior, and person-environment
interaction theory. They are all specifically focused on college student populations (King, 2005). With the inclusion of college student developmental theory, the process of mandating a developmental academic advising meeting for academically at-risk students can be deemed the *intrusive developmental academic advising (IDAA)* model. The advisor using an IDAA meeting format should be trained in the area of college student development in order to have a more positive effect during that encounter.

They should also be knowledgeable about available academic support services in order to recommend the most appropriate academic assistance available to the student. These recommendations can ultimately lead the student to a more successful integration into the institution, hopefully resulting in higher levels of academic achievement (Steingass & Sykes, 2006). Universities have used the Earl (1988) study as a template as they make every effort to retain greater numbers of their academically at-risk student populations (Hoyt & Lundell, 2003; Thomas & Minton, 2004; Tinto, 2004).

According to Tinto (2004) universities can be in serious jeopardy of not being able to successfully fulfill their academic mission by allowing this academically at-risk student population to become academically suspended or dismissed from the institution. Some universities have made a commitment to retain more members of this student population. Studies show that it can also benefit the U.S. economy by supplying increased numbers of well-trained and educated leaders into their desired career fields upon graduation (McCabe, 2000).
Problem Statement

The commitment on the part of the university to offer a comprehensively designed group of academic support services to its academically at-risk student populations, including the IDAA model, will help the university fulfill its academic mission. It will have the opportunity to retain and educate more of its students who are in academic jeopardy. Also, the negative financial impacts on college budgets could be reduced by decreasing the total number of academically at-risk students who leave the university via academic suspension or attrition (Tinto, 2004).

This quantitative research study attempts to explore the effects that IDAA could have on the mean cumulative GPAs of academically at-risk students. These possible effects were observed during two separate semesters when IDAA advising meetings were coupled with additional academic encounters. The GPAs were measured at the beginning and at the end of the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters, for the academically at-risk students enrolled in two independent courses. The Spring 2012 groups were measured both at the end of the Spring 2012 semester and at the end of the Fall 2012 semester, respectively. This measured the possibility of the lasting effect of the Spring 2012 treatment. The Fall 2012 groups were measured at the beginning and end of Fall 2012 only.

The study was conceived during the Spring 2012 semester. Liberty University (LU) offers many academic support courses designed to help their students improve in the area of their study skills and college adjustment. Those include CLST 101, 102, 103,
104, 105, and an advanced reading and vocabulary development course, 301. Two courses are used from that group to specifically aid their Academic Warning (AW) students and were used for this study. There are two separate courses taught at a university during each semester.

One course, CLST 103 is offered in a lab-style format, to academically at-risk students as well as other university students who choose to enroll. Any student at the university is eligible to enroll in this course; however academically at-risk students must be intrusively enrolled by university personnel in one of four academic-assistance-based courses. The students in this lab-style CLST 103 course are required to self-assess their area of greatest need for academic skill set augmentation. Learning strategies modules are provided by the Intrusive Developmental Academic Advising Advisor/Instructor (IDAAI), who serves as the professor and IDAA advisor in this course, in order to help the student improve in this specific area. Students enrolled in this course must have at least one individual IDAA meeting with the IDAAI in order to discuss the academic skill that they were working to improve, as well as future curriculum and personal decisions.

The academically at-risk students at this university must enroll in the CLST 103 course or in another course that combines the IDAA format of academic advising with a more comprehensive set of learning strategies instruction modules. This university, like many institutions, has made an intentional effort to address concerns related to the retention of its academically at-risk student population (Abelman & Molina, 2001; Austin et al., 1997; Earl, 1988; Garnett, 1990; Hoyt & Lundell, 2003; Kirk-Kuwaye & Nishida,
2001; Lipsky & Ender, 1990; Mann et al., 2003/2004; Molina & Abelman, 2000; Thomas & Minton, 2004). After researching and deriving a theoretical foundation for the CLST courses, the university offers these courses in order to better prepare its academic warning (AW) academically at-risk student population for future academic success at this institution.

The other course at this university offers a more intrusive form of advising as well as more intensive learning and career strategies instruction modules. The CLST 105 course attempts to assess the overall strengths and weaknesses in the AW student’s reading and study skills strategies by having them complete weekly topical reflection assignments. The IDAAI professors of the CLST 105 course design a personalized study plan for the student, which is implemented during the semester by that student. Application based assignments are required of each student that measure the improvement of the academic skill sets of the AW academically at-risk students. The AW students also meet weekly in a one-on-one IDAA advising format with the IDAAI professor. The instructors/advisors in this course attempt to help the students to develop an understanding of the relationship between their ability to achieve academic good standing and meeting their overall academic and career goals.

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this research study was to explore the effects that the IDAA encounter and additional academic support services had on the mean group cumulative grade point averages (GPAs) of randomly assigned groups of academically at-risk
students. The GPAs of the groups of randomly assigned academically at-risk students were measured per group, based on their mean cumulative GPA at the beginning and at the end of the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters. The Spring 2012 groups were measured both at the end of the Spring 2012 semester and at the end of the Fall 2012 semester, respectively. This measured the possibility of the lasting effect of the Spring 2012 treatment. The Fall 2012 groups were measured at the beginning and end of Fall 2012, only. The IDAA meetings occurred for each student in all of the groups as an individual meeting between course instructor/advisor and at-risk student.

One group per semester of academically at-risk students was enrolled in the CLST 103 course. These students encountered only one mandatory IDAA advising meeting between advisor and student during the semester. This group also engaged a set of assignments intended to assist the students toward achieving academic improvement, after the students completed a self-assessment of their personal academic skill set area of perceived need. This course was offered in a lab-style format where the AW academically at-risk student worked on one self-perceived area of academic need and the IDAAI instructor met with the student in an IDAA format for one mandatory advising meeting per semester.

The other group of academically at-risk students enrolled in the CLST 105 course at this university engaged weekly one-on-one IDAA meetings with the IDAAI instructor/advisor of this course. Additionally the students in this course completed weekly topical reflection assignments that helped them to assess their academic
performance and improve their overall personal strengths and weaknesses in the areas of reading and other academic study skills. The CLST 105 course offered weekly classroom delivery of instruction. It offered a comprehensively apportioned group of academic and career exploration skill set augmentation instruction in addition to the weekly IDAA meetings between the IDAAI and the AW academically at-risk student.

The mean cumulative GPAs of these four independent groups of academically at-risk students were calculated, based on their beginning of the semester cumulative GPA and on their end of the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters cumulative GPAs. Those GPAs were compared to the GPAs of the other groups. These academic support services, as well as the IDAA meetings, were transacted on the same campus of a private university, located in the Mid-Atlantic region of the United States.

**Significance of the Study**

Academic advising is a valued academic support service. The service is made available on most college campuses. It has developed, over time, into a necessary and distinctive service offering for students. It became necessary for the format of developmental academic advising to focus on serving the needs of very specific student populations as it progressed into its own separate advising entity. Advising became an entity that, in many instances, required professional academic advisors to perform the functions (Kramer, 2000). Working with students who find themselves in academic jeopardy has become a distinctive genre of developmental academic advising (Heisserer & Parette, 2002).
There are some academic advisors who primarily work with the academically at-risk student population. Campuses offer services to these students designed to address their specific needs (Lipsky & Ender, 1990). Academic advisors who work with these students have conducted studies designed to help the students progress toward achieving academic good standing on their campus. The studies have also aided those who advise the at-risk student population (Earl, 1988; Heisserer & Parette, 2002; King, 2005; Kirk-Kuwaye & Nishida, 2001; Molina & Abelman, 2000). The advisors who work with these students appreciate all efforts that can help to make their work more effective. This includes the employment of IDAA encounters and other relevant academic support services designed to address the needs of those students in academic difficulty (Lipsky & Ender, 1990; Steingass & Sykes, 2006).

Most campuses continue to focus on meeting the student retention goals of their college and the university (Lipsky & Ender, 1990). The ability to meet these goals depends largely on the work of advisors who employ developmental advising and additional academic support services to help the campus retain more students, including those in the academically at-risk category. The IDAA model has demonstrated its effectiveness relative to the work that academic advisors engage in with their university’s academically at-risk student population (Earl, 1988; Molina & Abelman, 2000).

This study can assist those who work primarily in the field of IDAA advising and employ other academic support services in their attempt to help academically at-risk students (Earl, 1988; Hagen & Jordan, 2008). It can provide additional information about
academic support services that could help this population of students. This study can also assist the university toward achieving their retention goals by helping their academically at-risk students to reach academic good standing (Tinto, 2004).

Research Questions

**Research Question 1.** Will one group of academically at-risk students mandated to receive only one IDAA encounter, and perform academic skills assignments associated with their self-assessed academic improvement need area, demonstrate academic improvement at the end of the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters, when their potential improvement is measured and compared to the potential improvement demonstrated by the other 5 cohort groups, 6 total including this group, referenced in this study (Table 1)? The six cohort groups include; group 1 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=141 students, group 2 who registered for CLST 105 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=86 students, group 3 who registered for CLST 103 during the Fall 2012 semester, n=107, group 4 who registered for CLST 105 during the Fall 2012 semester, n=114, group 5 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall 2012 semester, n=57, and finally group 5 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall 2012 semester, n=39.

**Research Question 2.** Will one group of academically at-risk students mandated to receive only one IDAA encounter and perform academic skills assignments
associated with their self-assessed academic improvement need area, demonstrate academic improvement when their potential improvement is measured at the end of the Fall 2012 semester and compared to the potential improvement demonstrated by the other 5 cohort groups, 6 total including this group, referenced in this study (Table 1)? The six cohort groups include; group 1 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=141 students, group 2 who registered for CLST 105 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=86 students, group 3 who registered for CLST 103 during the Fall 2012 semester, n=107, group 4 who registered for CLST 105 during the Fall 2012 semester, n=114, group 5 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall 2012 semester, n=57, and finally group 5 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall 2012 semester, n=39.

**Research Question 3.** Will one group of academically at-risk students, mandated to receive weekly IDAA encounters and required to engage weekly academic skill set augmentation assignments, demonstrate academic improvement when their potential improvement is measured at the end of the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters and compared to the potential improvement demonstrated by the other 5 cohort groups, 6 total including this group, referenced in this study (Table 1)? The six cohort groups include; group 1 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=141 students, group 2 who registered for CLST 105
Research Question 4. Will one group of academically at-risk students, mandated to receive weekly IDAA encounters and required to engage weekly academic skill set augmentation assignments, demonstrate academic improvement when their potential improvement is measured at the end of the Fall 2012 semester and compared to the potential improvement demonstrated by the other 5 cohort groups, 6 total including this group, referenced in this study (Table 1)? The six cohort groups include: group 1 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=141 students, group 2 who registered for CLST 105 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=86 students, group 3 who registered for CLST 103 during the Fall 2012 semester, n=107, group 4 who registered for CLST 105 during the Fall 2012 semester, n=114, group 5 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall 2012 semester, n=57, and finally group 5 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall 2012 semester, n=39.
Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall 2012 semester, n=39.

**Research Hypotheses in Null Form**

**Null Hypothesis 1 HO.** The mean level of academic improvement of an academically at-risk group of students, enrolled in a course during the Spring 2012 semester, who received only one IDAA encounter and completed academic skills assignments associated with their self-assessed academic improvement need area, will show no statistically significant improvement when their mean cumulative GPAs are measured at the end of the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters and compared to the mean cumulative GPAs achieved by the other 5 cohort groups, 6 total including this group, referenced in this study (Table 1). The six cohort groups include: group 1 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=141 students, group 2 who registered for CLST 105 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=86 students, group 3 who registered for CLST 103 during the Fall 2012 semester, n=107, group 4 who registered for CLST 105 during the Fall 2012 semester, n=114, group 5 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall 2012 semester, n=57, and finally group 5 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall 2012 semester, n=39.
Null Hypothesis 2 HO. The mean level of academic improvement of an academically at-risk group of students, enrolled in a course during the Fall 2012 semester, who received only one IDAA encounter and completed academic skills assignments associated with their self-assessed academic improvement need area, will show no statistically significant improvement when their mean cumulative GPA is measured at the end of the Fall 2012 semester and compared to the mean cumulative GPAs achieved by the other 5 cohort groups, 6 total including this group, referenced in this study (Table 1). The six cohort groups include; group 1 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=141 students, group 2 who registered for CLST 105 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=86 students, group 3 who registered for CLST 103 during the Fall 2012 semester, n=107, group 4 who registered for CLST 105 during the Fall 2012 semester, n=114, group 5 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall 2012 semester, n=57, and finally group 5 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall 2012 semester, n=39.

Null Hypothesis 3 HO. The mean level of academic improvement of an academically at-risk group of students enrolled in a course during the Spring 2012 semester, who received weekly IDAA encounters and were required to engage weekly academic skill set augmentation assignments, will show no statistically significant improvement when their mean cumulative GPAs are measured at the
end of the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters and compared to the mean cumulative GPAs achieved by the other 5 cohort groups, 6 total including this group, referenced in this study (Table 1). The six cohort groups include; group 1 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=141 students, group 2 who registered for CLST 105 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=86 students, group 3 who registered for CLST 103 during the Fall 2012 semester, n=107, group 4 who registered for CLST 105 during the Fall 2012 semester, n=114, group 5 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall 2012 semester, n=57, and finally group 5 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall 2012 semester, n=39.

**Null Hypothesis 4 HO.** The mean level of academic improvement of an academically at-risk group of students enrolled in a course during the Fall 2012 semester, who received weekly IDAA encounters and were required to engage weekly academic skill set augmentation assignments, will show no statistically significant improvement when their mean cumulative GPA is measured at the end of the Fall 2012 semester and compared to the mean cumulative GPAs achieved by the other 5 cohort groups, 6 total including this group, referenced in this study (Table 1). The six cohort groups include; group 1 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=141 students, group 2 who registered for CLST 105 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=86 students, group 3 who
registered for CLST 103 during the Fall 2012 semester, n=107, group 4 who registered for CLST 105 during the Fall 2012 semester, n=114, group 5 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall 2012 semester, n=57, and finally group 5 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall 2012 semester, n=39.

**Identification of Variables**

The beginning of semester cumulative GPAs served as the covariate for each group of academically at-risk students. The courses CLST 103 and CLST 105 taken by the four cohorts of students during the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters, respectively, served as independent variables. The dependent variables for each group of academically at-risk students were the post-semester cumulative GPAs.

**Definitions**

*Academically At-Risk Student*—students whose cumulative GPA placed them below academic good standing at their university.

*Academic Good Standing*—a cumulative GPA at or above a specific level based on a specific number of earned credit hours. Students with fewer than 24 earned GPA credit hours are required to have a 1.50 minimum cumulative GPA. Students who have from 25 to 47 credit hours are required to have a 1.65 minimum cumulative GPA. Students who have from 48 to 71 credit hours are required to
have a 1.85 minimum cumulative GPA. Students who have 72 or more credit hours toward graduation are required to have a 2.0 minimum cumulative GPA (Liberty University, 2011/2012).

**Academic IDAA Advising Meetings (AM)**--mandatory IDAA advising sessions that occurs with the instructor of this course. This class’s professor serves as the IDAA instructor and academic advisor for the academically at-risk students enrolled in the specific course (Kirk-Kuwaye & Nishida, 2001; Lipsky & Ender, 1990).

**Academic Probation (AP)**--at the end of the Academic Warning semester, students who fail to raise their GPA to the required academic level are placed on Academic Probation. These students are required to sign an academic plan from the Center for Academic Support and Academic Services (CASAS) indicating the grades necessary to remove probation status. Students are limited to 13 semester credit hours; are required to take CLST 101, 102, 103, or 105; and may not drop or withdraw from a course without permission from CASAS (LU, 2011/2012).

**Academic Suspension (AS)**--at the end of the Academic Probation semester, students who fail to raise their GPA to the required academic level are placed on Academic Suspension. Students who desire to return to Liberty University (LU) in the future must appeal to the Registrar’s Office in writing. If approved to return, the Registrar/CASAS will determine a plan that will prepare students for a successful re-entry into LU. These students are required to sign an academic plan
from CASAS indicating the grades necessary to remove probation status. Students are limited to 13 semester credit hours; are required to take CLST 101, 102, 103, or 105; and may not drop or withdraw from a course without permission from CASAS (LU, 2011/2012).

*Academic Warning (AW)*--students failing to attain and maintain the minimum GPA required based on their academic level at the university are placed on Academic Warning. During the following semester, students are limited to 13 semester credit hours; are required to take CLST 101, 102, 103, or 105; and may not drop or withdraw from a course without permission from CASAS (LU, 2011/2012).

*Center for Academic Support and Academic Services (CASAS)*--the academic support and advising services center at this university. This learning center houses the academic advisors and the course instructors for CLST 103 and 105 and offers academic support services to the entire university (LU, 2011/2012).

*CLST 103, Individualized Lab in Reading and Study Strategies*--this one-credit-hour course is an individualized program in reading and study strategies based on students’ goals and assessed needs. The varied curriculum focuses on academic, personal, and/or spiritual domains. It is delivered in a lab format with faculty/student interaction. (LU, 2011/2012).

*CLST 105, Strategies for the Application of College Learning Skills* --this one-credit-hour course provides strategies that will enable students to apply college
learning skills to their current courses. It incorporates one-on-one mentoring, as well as weekly accountability. It is designed to foster an awareness of current academic progress and to encourage the motivation and responsibility necessary for academic success. (LU, 2011/2012).

*Cumulative Grade Point Average (GPA)*--calculated by dividing the total number of attempted credit hours by the total quality points earned relative to each credit hour. This average is based on the specific university’s assigned number of quality points and credit hours per attempted course.

*Developmental Academic Advising*--a form of academic advising where the academic advisor, who possesses a background in college student development theory, engages in a cooperative learning relationship with the student in order to transact the advising encounter (Kramer, 2000).

*High-Risk Students*--students who are conditionally admitted to an institution in spite of their demonstrated level of less than adequate academic preparation prior to enrolling in the current institution (Garnett, 1990).

*Intrusive Developmental Academic Advising (IDAA)*--an academic advising model that employs the elements of the developmental academic advising while including mandatory contact with the student. It is an advising method used with students who are considered academically at-risk (Earl, 1988; Kramer, 2000).
Intrusive Hold--an electronic registration and campus computer network suspension of services restriction. It is used as a means of mandating an IDAA encounter.

IDAA Academic Advisor/Instructor (IDAAI)--the IDAA Academic Advisors/Instructor served as the course facilitator for each of the CLST 103 and 105 classes. They were assigned as course instructors and academic advisors by CASAS at this university. They conducted the one-on-one IDAA advising meetings, as well as serving as course instructors for all of the academically at-risk student groups.

Learning Center (LC)--the learning center functions as a unit within CASAS and specifically houses the academic advisors and the course instructors for CLST 103 and 105 and offers academic support services to the entire university (LU, 2011/2012).

Prescriptive Academic Advising--an advising method used by academic advisors or other department representatives to stipulate the required courses for the student to enroll in during upcoming semesters (Heisserer & Parette, 2002).
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

College Student Development Theory and Developmental Academic Advising

Universities and the academic departments that they house can use academic advising as an academic support services program that is designed to address the needs of their academically at-risk students (Heisserer & Parette, 2002). The prescriptive format of academic advising was the first general system used by advisors. Academic advising has progressed past the prescriptive format. In that prescriptive format, students received a list of courses, typically from their faculty academic advisor or an academic departmental administrative assistant who was designated to provide the information related to selecting courses during their next registration period (Frost, 2000). Those courses would allow them to continue to progress toward the fulfillment of their degree requirements (Heisserer & Parette, 2002). The practice of academic advising has changed toward a more interactive format called developmental academic advising.

Developmental academic advising, along with the relationship that this form of interaction helps the advisor engage with the student, has a basis in college student development theory. The concept differs from prescriptive advising, where students merely receive answers to their course registration and course sequencing questions. Developmental advising focuses on the holistic learning experience of the student. This form of advising is grounded in college student development (CSD) theory, which serves as the theoretical framework for developmental advising.
CSD theory includes cognitive-structural development theory, typology theories, psychosocial theory, and person-environment interaction theories (Forney et al., 1998). All of these theories specifically relate to the age ranges of college student populations (King, 2005). A sound advising practitioner would be able to use this background in order to identify specific issues relative to the academic performance of the student (King, 2005). The advisor should be capable of forming a long-term exchange advising relationship with the advisee, thus enabling the advisor to assist students toward reaching their personal, academic, and professional goals (Hagen & Jordan, 2008; Kramer, 2000).

**Developmental Advising in the Intrusive Form**

When the advising relationship is formed with an academically at-risk student, the IDAA model has proven to be the most effective means of assisting that student population to make steady progress toward achieving academic good standing (Heisserer & Parette, 2002; King, 2005). IDAA can be transacted by mandating at least one required advising encounter with a developmentally trained academic advisor during a specific semester (Earl, 1988). The visit becomes mandatory through the use of an electronic registration and campus computer network suspension of services hold placed on the academically at-risk student’s interactive computing and online registration abilities. The intrusive hold itself ensures that students must remain restricted in their ability to interact with the campus computer network until they successfully accomplish the tasks set forth by the advisor who initiated the hold.
An advisor using IDAA with an academically at-risk student would place the intrusive hold on the student’s interactive ability with the campus computing network and leave that intrusive hold in place until the student responded to the initial form of contact. The advisor would send an email, inform via the internet based registration system, call the student on the telephone, or mail a letter to the student informing the student of the hold. In this correspondence, the advisor would inform the student of the steps that the student can take to have the hold lifted. The process of removing the intrusive hold would restore the student’s interactive computer and related abilities at the institution. This method has been extensively employed in multiple studies (Abelman & Molina, 2001; Earl, 1988; Kirk-Kuwaye & Nishida, 2001; Molina & Abelman, 2000).

The typical mandatory requirement associated with the IDAA process occurs where the student must contact the advisor who initiated the placement of the intrusive hold, schedule at least one developmental advising appointment, and attend that advising encounter as well as any follow-up assignments required by the advisor. These requirements can occur after the initial assessment of the student’s needs is conducted by the advisor during the meeting. After all requirements are satisfied, the intrusive hold can be released by the advisor.

The system of IDAA advising has its foundation in the developmental academic advising arena, where the advisor and student proceed toward the formation of a teaching and learning relationship (Earl, 1988; Heisserer & Parette, 2002; Molina & Abelman, 2000). Many studies have demonstrated that academically at-risk students will likely
require the intrusive form of academic advising in order to initiate the first contact with their academic advisor (Austin et al., 1997; Kirk-Kuwaye & Nishida, 2001; Mann et al., 2003/2004). The initial meeting and subsequent advising sessions provide the academic advisor with the opportunity to form the cooperative learning relationship with the student where academic, career, and personal assistance can be provided (Higgins, 2003).

**Linking Intrusive Advising with Academic Support Services**

Universities employ additional academic support service offerings and make them available to the student body on most campuses. These academic support service offerings can help the institution in its specific effort to improve its ability to retain its academically at-risk college student population (Tinto, 2004). Students can be admitted to an institution with the knowledge that their prior academic performance in high school or at a community college may initially result in their placement in a generally at-risk student category; here, their cumulative GPA could be in greater jeopardy, based on their level of preparation, of dropping below the level of academic good standing at the institution (Abrams & Jernigan, 1984; Metzner, 1989). If the cumulative GPA achieved at the university places the student below academic good standing, the student is considered academically at-risk by the university.

Academic advising offices work with other academic support services at some institutions in order to assist the academically at-risk student in the process of selecting a major, defining and setting future career goals, and managing the student’s daily integration into the university community (Garnett, 1990). Those universities use these
academic support services in an effort to offer a comprehensive support experience for the student. An academically at-risk student’s needs are usually discovered after an initial meeting with an IDAA advisor. The advisor, after that meeting, would be able to recommend other academic support services offerings to the student.

Studies have shown that linking intrusive advising with other academic support services after the initial advising encounter demonstrates a particularly positive impact on the retention rates of academically at-risk students (Garnett, 1990). Further research may be required to discover the potential impact of mandating the random assignment of academically at-risk students to engage IDAA and other academic support services, offered comprehensively, as well as those support services being offered as a result of a student’s self-assessment of perceived academic needs. Those additional academic support services could include career exploration workshops, learning strategies instruction workshops, or other academic follow-up meetings with the advisor.

A research study was conducted on the importance of a university’s ability to offer the appropriate amount of academic support services to the student population that they would deem high-risk students (Abrams & Jernigan, 1984). The results of the study demonstrated that a university should not rely on the traditional entrance criteria alone, such as high school GPA, standardized test scores, or other demographic related characteristics, when they are attempting to predict the academic success rate of their academically underprepared student group. The research also reinforced the concept that this generally high-risk student population’s academic performance, based in part on
previous academic preparation, may result in their being placed in an academically at-risk student category at the university. Again, this student group does not typically seek out the assistance of advising, tutoring, and other intervention services without the intrusive academic advising model being applied to motivate assistance encounters (Earl, 1988).

Abrams and Jernigan (1984) employed a program called “Promote Academic Survival and Success” (PASS) in order to address the retention and matriculation issues associated with their generally high-risk student population. The results of this study demonstrated that this type of PASS program helped the high-risk students at that institution. This high-risk population included some members of the university’s academically at-risk students. Their ability to succeed at the university level was also impacted by the academic support services offerings in this study.

The PASS study showed that additional academic support programs, which included intrusive academic advising, tutoring, career exploration, and other university services offerings, provided some of the best academic support services assistance for the high-risk students (Abrams & Jernigan, 1984). These offerings can be designed to improve the high-risk as well as the academically at-risk students’ ability to succeed at an institution. This program further supported the necessity of ensuring that universities offer a comprehensively apportioned academic support services program that can be designed to meet the retention needs of the university and the academic needs of its at-risk students.
Advisors who primarily worked with academically at-risk students began to apply research on the impact that developmental academic advising and additional academic support service offerings can have on this population when the services are coupled with the intrusive advising format. One research article discussed a program that was designed to address the needs of high-risk students who were admitted to the university with academic skill set deficiencies (Garnett, 1990). These high-risk students may or may not have fallen into the academically at-risk student category while enrolled at this university. If their minimum cumulative GPA obtained during enrollment had fallen below the minimum university requirement to maintain academic good standing, the students could have been considered academically at risk, in addition to being admitted as high-risk students. This study considered only high-risk students who were conditionally admitted to the institution in spite of their demonstrated level of less than adequate academic preparation.

The program was called “Students in Retention” (SIR). SIR intrusively mandated that this high-risk student population maintained regular meetings with their faculty academic advisors (Garnett, 1990). The program also ensured that the academically at-risk SIR students met with representatives of the university’s counseling department. The students were also required to prepare weekly journal-type performance reviews, which were evaluated with SIR program advisors.

Garnett’s (1990) work with high-risk students was developed based on a model of intrusive advising initiated by Earl (1988). The Earl (1988) study differed from the SIR
program because it employed a developmental advising model that also used intrusive advising to require the at-risk student to attend the advising meetings. The results of the SIR study demonstrated that the high-risk students who fully participated in this SIR program showed greater than 10% higher cumulative GPAs than those of a control comparative group, who did not participate in the SIR program (Garnett, 1990).

The Garnett (1990) article demonstrated the importance of using intrusive though not necessarily developmental advising with students placed on academic probation and suspension. The Earl (1988) model employed developmental academic advising, used in conjunction with the intrusive hold that required the academically at-risk students to meet with their academic advisor. The Garnett (1990) study demonstrated the importance of mandating that this student population interact with some forms of campus student support services. Other studies demonstrated that using the developmental advising model as the foundation for the comprehensive academic support program offered to aid the academically at-risk students was the most effective means of providing them with assistance (Abelman & Molina, 2001; Earl, 1988; Kirk-Kuwaye & Nishida, 2001; Lipsky & Ender, 1990; Molina & Abelman, 2000; Steingass & Sykes, 2006). These studies employed intrusive advising as one portion of the academic support offered to these students.

The services offered to the SIR students were mandated by the university as a condition for admission for each high-risk student. This study did demonstrate that the most intrusive form of academic advising had a significant effect on retention and
progress toward academic good standing (Garnett, 1990). All SIR students were intrusively mandated to engage all activities associated with the program. There was no evidence, however, that college student development theory and the developmental academic advising model served as the foundation for the SIR program (Earl, 1998; Hagen & Jordan, 2008; Kramer, 2000).

One concern associated with this study was that the advising format did not include the developmental advising or the IDAA component as a part of the encounter. It was simply an intrusively mandated advising session that was a part of the admission requirements for these high-risk students (Garnett, 1990). High-risk students in this study were not necessarily academically at-risk students. The SIR students were simply assigned an advisor and required, in a prescriptive advising format, to engage all academic support services.

When the developmental component is incorporated into the intrusive advising meeting and coupled with recommendations to attend other relevant academic service offerings, the process has demonstrated the ability to have a positive impact on academically at-risk students as they attempt to attain academic good standing (Abelman & Molina, 2001; Hagen & Jordan, 2008). The most effective relationship formed between the IDAA advisor and student can occur when the encounter is conducted by an advisor skilled in the use of CSD theory. Overall, IDAA and other relevant academic support services can have a positive effect on academically at-risk student success (Abelman & Molina, 2001; Hagen & Jordan, 2008).
Intrusive Advising and Learning Strategies Instruction

Academically at-risk students can require academic skill set augmentation in addition to the IDAA encounter, in order to improve their ability to return to academic good standing and progress at their institution (Garnett, 1990; Hart & Speece, 1998; Lipsky & Ender, 1990; Steingass & Sykes, 2006). During the IDAA meeting, the student can communicate possible problem areas and receive recommendations from the advisor to attend academic skill set assistance encounters. Some of those services could include scheduling meetings with learning center counselors, attending academic-based workshops, or enrolling in a learning strategies course. Advisors would likely recommend these support services if they considered them to be part of the best plan of action for the students, based on their initial discussion. IDAA advising can yield positive effects on the cumulative GPAs of students placed on academic probation or suspension when they also interact with academic support services like study skills courses (Lipsky & Ender, 1990).

Textbooks and research articles also recommend the use of learning resources that are available on college campuses as a means of augmenting the academic skill sets of students, particularly among those students who fall into the academically at-risk category (Garnett, 1990; Hart & Speece, 1998; Kanar, 2008; Lipsky & Ender, 1990; Nilson, 2003; Steingass & Sykes, 2006). Some universities offer remedial coursework, which is designed to supplement these academic skill sets (Hart & Speece, 1998). Research related to the academically at-risk student population recommends courses in
remedial writing, in basic English, and in elementary math, as well as in college and life skills preparation (Hart & Speece, 1998; Kanar, 2008). All of these courses are designed to help academically underprepared and academically at-risk students achieve at a higher level (Kanar, 2008; Steingass & Sykes, 2006). These courses have demonstrated an ability to improve academically at-risk students’ academic success and retention rates (Hart & Speece, 1998). At-risk students have demonstrated the ability to improve their cumulative GPAs if a university provides IDAA as well as additional academic support services such as academic study skill set instruction (Lee, 1999; Lipsky & Ender, 1990).

One specific study demonstrated that academic skill set instruction sessions, when used in conjunction with IDAA, have a positive effect on academically at-risk university students (Lipsky & Ender, 1990). One group of students in this study attended a learning strategies course after the advisor assessed the needs of the students during their individual IDAA encounters. The comparison group also consisted of academically at-risk probationary students; however, these students were not required to enroll in this course, which was offered during consecutive spring semesters for the duration of the period of measurement, but enrollment was optional (Lipsky & Ender, 1990). The results yielded significantly higher cumulative GPA levels among the students who enrolled in the academic skill development course than among those in the comparison group who chose not to enroll in the course.

After a need assessment has occurred during the IDAA meeting, a student can be assigned by the IDAA advisor to attend an academic skill set augmentation workshop,
course, or individual session conducted by learning strategies instructors. Academically at-risk students can also be intrusively and randomly assigned to attend an academic skill set augmentation session, lab, or semester-long course as a part of an offering of additional academic instructional assistance. The IDAA encounter is usually transacted through one meeting and a post-session recommendation to attend other relevant support services. Additional meetings with the IDAAI instructor/advisor can also function as an additional academic support services offering for academically at-risk students.

**Intrusive Advising and Follow-up Advising Meetings**

The concept of using IDAA follow-up advising meetings in a mentoring format can be positively linked to the same principles that guide developmental academic advising. The follow-up meetings connect an IDAA advisor with an academically at-risk student. However, the nature of IDAA forces the encounter; therefore, a mutually desired mentoring relationship may or may not result once all follow-up meetings are completed.

Advisors who have an understanding of college student development (CSD) theory can enter the association with student advisees and assist them through many of the academic and personal challenges that they may face at an institution (Crisp & Cruz, 2009; Cuseo, 2003; Hagen & Jordan, 2008; Jacobi, 1991). If a mutually agreed upon affiliation transpires out of these follow-up meetings, the relationship would resemble a mentoring relationship between advisor and at-risk student. Research demonstrates that students desire to engage in an academic mentoring relationship with a faculty advisor who exhibits a high level of interest in their academic pursuits (Lee, 1999). This kind of
A study by Campbell and Campbell (1997) demonstrates that the employment of a developmental academic advising meeting with the academic advisor, functioning as mentor, can have many positive effects on the student’s level of academic achievement. Although most of the research does not directly link that positive outcome in student achievement and retention directly to those who are considered academically at-risk, the positive effects of mentoring can be linked in some research articles to improved retention and achievement. Some of the positive outcomes associated with academic mentoring include the improved ability of students to persist in their academics, and improved academic achievement (Campbell & Campbell, 1997; Jacobi, 1991).

Research regarding mentoring indicates that more empirical studies should be conducted on the specific subject of academic mentoring and connecting it to improving undergraduate success (Crisp & Cruz, 2009). One article reviews the pertinent literature related to the topic of mentoring and provides the link that exists between mentoring and its effect on undergraduate academic success (Jacobi, 1991). The author demonstrates that multiple research articles and studies have been written about follow-up academic meetings and academic mentoring. They have yielded various definitions of mentoring. This review of literature links mentoring to higher education. That link shows the similarity between mentoring and the field of developmental academic advising, as well
as how that relationship can positively impact student success, student achievement, and retention.

The positive impact that academic follow-up mentoring can have on academically at-risk students is implied in the previously mentioned article (Jacobi, 1991) through the outcome of improved academic achievement. The formation of an academic mentoring relationship that could develop out of the follow-up meetings may lead to increased student involvement, help undergraduates to become better integrated into the institution, and aid in the development of improved social skill sets. All of these are requirements for improved academic achievement, success, and retention (Cuseo, 2003; Lee, 1999).

Other research has demonstrated a more direct link between the ideas of mentoring and academic achievement among some specific undergraduate populations. This link has not been directly established with academically at-risk student achievement, but the same elements related to the mentoring relationship are common in the developmental advising affiliation. One research study matched a group of undergraduates with a faculty member and compared the academic achievement levels of that group to those who were not mentored during the same semester (Campbell & Campbell, 1997). The students who were mentored demonstrated higher semester GPAs and lower drop-out rates when compared to the non-mentored group of students. The mentored group also completed a greater number of academic credit hours than the non-mentored group. The amount of mentor and student contact was positively correlated with improved GPAs among the mentored group. Finally, some demographic
characteristics of the students, such as race and gender, were found to be unrelated to academic achievement among either group. This study demonstrated that the academic follow-up mentoring relationship can have a positive effect on undergraduate student achievement and retention when compared to a group of students who lacked consistent or any contact with an advisor.

The concept of academic mentoring can also benefit students in the areas of general satisfaction with the university and in academic achievement. When academic mentoring is correctly implemented through a follow-up advising and mentoring program, the correlations can be demonstrated. One research study discussed the effect that faculty mentoring can have on the retention and persistence of the African-American student population at a university (Lee, 1999). The author indicated that African-American students at a predominantly white institution of higher education were impacted by adjustment issues in a similar fashion to all other freshman students regarding time management, expectations, and cultural adjustments (Lee, 1999). The students surveyed in this study demonstrated a desire for a faculty advisor at their institution to serve as a mentor. Their minority status at this predominantly white university implied that the surveyed students fit a generally high-risk student category, although they are not necessarily in the academically at-risk category.

Special measures at that university, such as mentoring by faculty members serving as academic and personal advisors, helped to ensure proper integration for these students into the university culture. This successful academic and social integration aided
in student satisfaction and yielded positive results in academic achievement (Lee, 1999).

The students who participated in this study reported that they were generally adjusting slowly to the new academic environment. The students said that they might require the entire freshman year in order to feel comfortable. They also reported some levels of personal and academic confusion and feelings of detachment due to the integration process. Most of the students surveyed said that they remained optimistic about the prospect of successfully assimilating into their environment. That optimism, aided by consistent follow-up access to their faculty advisor/mentor, led to persistence and contributed positively to the overall improvement in student satisfaction and academic achievement levels among these students (Lee, 1999).

Overall, most studies and reviews of literature related to the topic of academic mentoring demonstrate that the entire field requires more research in order to draw significant links between mentoring and students’ academic achievement levels (Crisp & Cruz, 2009). Very little research exists related to the topic of creating an academic mentoring relationship with academically at-risk students. However, the research demonstrates that the academic mentoring relationship is very similar to the relationship that is formed in a developmental academic advising context (Hagen & Jordan, 2008).

Using intrusive advising has also demonstrated positive effects on student achievement among academically at-risk students (Earl, 1988). The intrusive format mandates the initial contact between student and advisor. The tenets of CSD theory can then be used to help advisors form a developmental relationship with the academically at-
risk students with the intention of positively impacting their academic achievement and retention rate. IDAA can be used to generate follow-up advising sessions that could occur on a regular basis throughout the semester. IDAA meetings can serve as an academic support service for the academically at-risk student where the student’s academic and personal progress can be discussed on a more regular basis, with the advisor.

The potential benefits of randomly assigning academically at-risk students to engage in multiple academic follow-up meetings with a developmental advisor were not measured as a part of the Lee (1999) study; however, academic and personal mentoring demonstrated a positive impact on a generally high-risk group of students. The same impact could occur with academically at-risk students who encounter academic follow-up meetings if an IDAAI staff member is conducting the follow-up meetings. Increasing the total number of meetings with the IDAAI could have a positive effect on the effort of some universities to retain greater numbers of their academically at-risk student population, particularly if a mentoring relationship is formed.

**Retention of Academically At-risk Students**

IDAA is positively associated with the topic of improving university student retention (Campbell & Campbell; 1997; Cuseo, 2003; Tinto, 2004). Retaining academically at-risk students at a university should and does serve as a primary goal for most academic institutions. Universities often lose valuable student assets by failing to make every effort to retain this student population when they allow them to become academically suspended or dismissed (Tinto, 2004). The creation and employment of a
quality IDAA program on a college campus and the correlation of that program to the empirical data associated with student satisfaction, successful student integration into the university culture, retention, academic progress, and improved academic achievement become the means through which a university can positively impact their academically at-risk student population.

Research demonstrates that three specific concepts can be related to retention, persistence, and academic achievement in higher education. In a study conducted on predictors of academic achievement in college (Robbins et al., 2004), the authors discussed educational persistence models, motivational theories, and study skills theories as they relate to the psychosocial factors that contribute to successful academic performance in college. The results demonstrated that their nine Psychosocial Study Skills Factors (PSF) contributed to successfully predicting college success. The authors drew from educational theories, motivational theories, and study skills effects in order to create a successful model for predicting academic achievement. They discussed the fact that high school grades and standardized achievement tests attain, at best, average results when they are used to select and predict the academic achievement levels of currently enrolled college students (Robbins et al., 2004). Those measures are often used as the primary admissions criteria. The authors of this study also combined the educational theories of social integration and student attrition with motivational theories as a part of their analysis of factors that influence student success after enrollment. Additionally, they
included study skills preparation into the development of nine PSF factors that they used as predictor models to accurately forecast academic success (Robbins et al., 2004).

The Robbins et al. (2004) study demonstrated that academic goal setting, incorporating study skills, and a high measure of student self-confidence serve as the best predictors for academic achievement. High cumulative GPAs achieved in college demonstrate a positive relationship with the ability to predict future academic achievement levels. However, high cumulative GPA is not as strong as the other three predictors (Robbins et al., 2004). The research demonstrates that the intentional efforts to engage students in activities like study skills assistance, academic goal setting, and developmental academic advising; to help students improve their self-confidence; and to set appropriate goals can work together to positively impact academic achievement and successfully predict academic success.

IDAA is employed to help academically at-risk students to set academic goals such as those that are positively associated with the achievement of the levels and academic success mentioned in the Robbins et al. (2004) study. Interaction with study skills workshops and other campus academic support service offerings, in addition to developmental academic advising, can help academically at-risk students to incorporate these skill sets into their academic regimen and prepare for greater success.

A comprehensive package of academic support services available on a campus can include academic follow-up meetings, career exploration classes, and learning strategies instruction. The academic support services offerings in addition to IDAA can
also be used to aid academically at-risk students with their ability to successfully integrate into their campus environment. This can impact students’ satisfaction level with the institution and improve their level of self-confidence. This ultimately leads to the ability of the university to retain the academically at-risk student population at greater levels.

**Importance of IDAA and Academic Support Services**

IDAA offerings can be used in conjunction with other academic support services to improve overall academic achievement levels of academically at-risk students (Molina & Abelman, 2000). A study was conducted in a one-semester snapshot format. The effects of three levels of intrusive academic advising interventions were measured relative to a population of academically at-risk students. The semester-long study’s results demonstrated that each of the authors’ hypotheses about the positive impact of IDAA on retention rates and cumulative GPA was found to be significant and supported (Molina & Abelman, 2000). The study showed that intrusive academic advising was the most effective application of the developmental advising model relative to successfully working with students placed on academic probation and suspension. That IDAA model can help them to identify the issues related to their current academic performance and to identify some of the roots of their academic difficulties. It can also help IDAA advisors through the formation of the developmental relationship to introduce students to the other appropriate academic support services that can help them to achieve academic good standing (Molina & Abelman, 2000). The authors demonstrated that IDAA is the most
appropriate advising model for supplying the most valuable assistance to the academically at-risk student population.

This article also shows that there is a direct correlation between intense IDAA support and the improved retention rates of the academically at-risk student population (Molina & Abelman, 2000). The article also shows that the academically at-risk students’ academic performance is most dramatically improved when the most intrusive form of IDAA is applied with them. In this study, the students were separated into four groups, each varying in the level of intensity of contact with the assigned IDAA advisor. IDAA also helped these students to identify the issues that contributed to their academic probation circumstance (Molina & Abelman, 2000). Those academically at-risk students who were academically suspended from the institution also demonstrated the most positive academic response to the most intrusive form of academic advising, upon their return to the institution.

Through the development of the IDAA relationship, the advisor and student can begin to establish rapport. The interactions between student and advisor in this encounter can also lead the participants to learn which student services may be most appropriate. Previously conducted studies, however, do not demonstrate if a more significant improvement in academic achievement levels can be achieved when academically at-risk students are randomly assigned and introduced to a comprehensive offering of additional academic support services, such as weekly IDAA academic advising follow-up meetings, learning strategies instruction, and/or career exploration, when offered in a weekly
classroom format. Previously conducted studies also do not measure the impact of having the IDAAI advisors work with students to offer a targeted academic support service, following the students’ assessment of the circumstances that precipitated their academic challenges.

**Potential Benefits of Additional Research**

Further research into this subject may demonstrate a more effective presentation of IDAA and academic support services. The method of randomly assigning the students to an introduction to specific forms of academic support services, following a student’s self-assessment, in addition to IDAA advising, may be the most effective method. It could supplant the format used by some where the students encounter a IDAA session in conjunction with offering the student a comprehensive presentation of academic support services and academic IDAA follow-up meetings, without meeting with the student prior to assigning them to engage specifically target services for improvement. Research on this topic may be able to identify some of the more impactful academic support service offering models through the use of random assignment to different delivery formats and post-engagement GPA changes.

Additional research can be conducted that could compare the impact that a specifically targeted singular academic support service, in addition to one IDAA meeting with an advisor, could have on the achievement levels of one academically at-risk student group, if that group of students conducted a self-assessment of their personal perceptions about the issues that precipitated their academic challenges. This group could be
compared to the possible impact that multiple IDAA advising sessions, conducted in addition to a comprehensive offering of academic support service encounters, could have on the post-semester cumulative GPAs of a different group of students. This second group of academically at-risk students would be randomly assigned and intrusively mandated to encounter a comprehensive offering of academic support services. The validity and reliability of this type of study could be strengthened, regarding the outcomes of the two groups of students, if the two types of academically at-risk students were randomly assigned to encounter each of these offering types, and the outcomes were measured independently, with separate groups over a two-semester period.

The assessments could be accomplished by measuring the mean cumulative GPA of each student group prior to the beginning of the semester and the mean cumulative GPA of each student group after the semester. The mean GPAs of each group could be compared, and potentially demonstrate the impact of the IDAA encounter or encounters on academically at-risk students. It could also measure the impact that the IDAA encounter, when coupled with a comprehensive offering of academic support services or a singularly targeted academic support service offering, can have on the overall academic achievement levels of groups of academically at-risk students.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this research study was to explore the effects that the intrusive developmental academic advising (IDAA) encounter and additional academic support services could have on the mean group cumulative grade point averages (GPAs) of randomly assigned groups of academically at-risk students. The GPAs of the groups of randomly assigned academically at-risk students were measured per group, based on their cumulative GPAs at the beginning and at the end of the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters. The IDAA meetings occurred for each student in all of the groups as an individual meeting between course IDAAI instructor/advisor and academic warning (AW) academically at-risk student.

One group per semester of AW academically at-risk students was enrolled in a section of the CLST 103 course. These students encountered only one mandatory IDAA advising meeting between IDAAI and AW student during the semester. This group also engaged a set of assignments intended to assist the students toward achieving academic improvement after the students completed a self-assessment of their personal academic skill set area of perceived need for improvement.

The other group of AW academically at-risk students enrolled in the CLST 105 course at this university engaged weekly one-on-one IDAA meetings with the IDAAI of this course. Additionally the students in this course completed weekly topical reflection assignments that helped them to assess their academic performance and improve their
overall personal strengths and weaknesses in the areas of reading and other academic study skills.

The mean cumulative GPAs of these four independent groups of AW students were calculated, based on their beginning of the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters cumulative GPAs and on their end of the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters cumulative GPAs. The GPAs for each group were compared to the GPAs of the other groups. The Spring 2012 groups were measured both at the end of the Spring 2012 semester and at the end of the Fall 2012 semester, respectively. This measured the possibility of the lasting effect of the Spring 2012 treatment. The Fall 2012 groups were measured only at the beginning and end of Fall 2012. These academic support services, as well as the IDAA meetings, were transacted on the same campus of a private university, located in the Mid-Atlantic region of the United States (US).

**Design**

A causal-comparative research design was used in this research study in order to demonstrate the impact of the different levels of interaction with IDAA advising and additional academic support services on the four groups, two groups per semester, of academically at-risk students as they attempted to progress toward academic good standing during the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters (Ary, Jacobs, Razaveih, & Sorenson, 2006). The pre-semester group GPAs were measured, per group, and served as the pretest for this research study. The pretest in this instance could not impact the internal validity of the study because the students were selected to enter one of the two
treatment groups based on their current AW status at the institution. They were then randomly assigned to either treatment, based on their class schedule for that semester and the available course that would fit an appropriate time slot.

The post-semester mean cumulative GPAs for each group were compared under the parameters of this research study design. They were evaluated for potential change in the independent variables associated with each group who encountered the two different course formats during the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters, respectively (Ary et al., 2006). The mean pre-semester cumulative GPAs of each group were compared to the mean post-semester GPAs for each group. All mean pre-semester and post-semester cumulative GPAs were compared between groups, noting any potential differences in group academic achievement level.

**Questions and Hypotheses**

**Research Question 1.** Will one group of academically at-risk students mandated to receive only one IDAA encounter, and perform academic skills assignments associated with their self-assessed academic improvement need area, demonstrate academic improvement at the end of the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters, when their potential improvement is measured and compared to the potential improvement demonstrated by the other 5 cohort groups, 6 total including this group, referenced in this study (Table 1)? The six cohort groups include; group 1 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=141 students, group 2 who registered for CLST 105 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=86
students, group 3 who registered for CLST 103 during the Fall 2012 semester, n=107, group 4 who registered for CLST 105 during the Fall 2012 semester, n=114, group 5 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall 2012 semester, n=57, and finally group 5 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall 2012 semester, n=39.

**Research Question 2.** Will one group of academically at-risk students mandated to receive only one IDAA encounter and perform academic skills assignments associated with their self-assessed academic improvement need area, demonstrate academic improvement when their potential improvement is measured at the end of the Fall 2012 semester and compared to the potential improvement demonstrated by the other 5 cohort groups, 6 total including this group, referenced in this study (Table 1)? The six cohort groups include; group 1 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=141 students, group 2 who registered for CLST 105 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=86 students, group 3 who registered for CLST 103 during the Fall 2012 semester, n=107, group 4 who registered for CLST 105 during the Fall 2012 semester, n=114, group 5 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall 2012 semester, n=57, and finally group 5 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall 2012 semester, n=39.
**Research Question 3.** Will one group of academically at-risk students, mandated to receive weekly IDAA encounters and required to engage weekly academic skill set augmentation assignments, demonstrate academic improvement when their potential improvement is measured at the end of the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters and compared to the potential improvement demonstrated by the other 5 cohort groups, 6 total including this group, referenced in this study (Table 1)? The six cohort groups include; group 1 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=141 students, group 2 who registered for CLST 105 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=86 students, group 3 who registered for CLST 103 during the Fall 2012 semester, n=107, group 4 who registered for CLST 105 during the Fall 2012 semester, n=114, group 5 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall 2012 semester, n=57, and finally group 5 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall 2012 semester, n=39.

**Research Question 4.** Will one group of academically at-risk students, mandated to receive weekly IDAA encounters and required to engage weekly academic skill set augmentation assignments, demonstrate academic improvement when their potential improvement is measured at the end of the Fall 2012 semester and compared to the potential improvement demonstrated by the other 5 cohort groups, 6 total including this group, referenced in this study (Table 1)?
cohort groups include; group 1 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=141 students, group 2 who registered for CLST 105 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=86 students, group 3 who registered for CLST 103 during the Fall 2012 semester, n=107, group 4 who registered for CLST 105 during the Fall 2012 semester, n=114, group 5 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall 2012 semester, n=57, and finally group 5 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall 2012 semester, n=39.

**Null Hypothesis 1 HO.** The mean level of academic improvement of an academically at-risk group of students, enrolled in a course during the Spring 2012 semester, who received only one IDAA encounter and completed academic skills assignments associated with their self-assessed academic improvement need area, will show no statistically significant improvement when their mean cumulative GPAs are measured at the end of the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters and compared to the mean cumulative GPAs achieved by the other 5 cohort groups, 6 total including this group, referenced in this study (Table 1). The six cohort groups include; group 1 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=141 students, group 2 who registered for CLST 105 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=86 students, group 3 who registered for CLST 103 during the Fall 2012 semester, n=107, group 4 who registered for CLST 105
during the Fall 2012 semester, n=114, group 5 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall 2012 semester, n=57, and finally group 5 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall 2012 semester, n=39.

**Null Hypothesis 2 HO.** The mean level of academic improvement of an academically at-risk group of students, enrolled in a course during the Fall 2012 semester, who received only one IDAA encounter and completed academic skills assignments associated with their self-assessed academic improvement need area, will show no statistically significant improvement when their mean cumulative GPA is measured at the end of the Fall 2012 semester and compared to the mean cumulative GPAs achieved by the other 5 cohort groups, 6 total including this group, referenced in this study (Table 1). The six cohort groups include; group 1 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=141 students, group 2 who registered for CLST 105 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=86 students, group 3 who registered for CLST 103 during the Fall 2012 semester, n=107, group 4 who registered for CLST 105 during the Fall 2012 semester, n=114, group 5 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall 2012 semester, n=57, and finally group 5 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall 2012 semester, n=39.
Null Hypothesis 3 HO. The mean level of academic improvement of an academically at-risk group of students enrolled in a course during the Spring 2012 semester, who received weekly IDAA encounters and were required to engage weekly academic skill set augmentation assignments, will show no statistically significant improvement when their mean cumulative GPAs are measured at the end of the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters and compared to the mean cumulative GPAs achieved by the other 5 cohort groups, 6 total including this group, referenced in this study (Table 1). The six cohort groups include; group 1 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=141 students, group 2 who registered for CLST 105 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=86 students, group 3 who registered for CLST 103 during the Fall 2012 semester, n=107, group 4 who registered for CLST 105 during the Fall 2012 semester, n=114, group 5 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall 2012 semester, n=57, and finally group 5 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall 2012 semester, n=39.

Null Hypothesis 4 HO. The mean level of academic improvement of an academically at-risk group of students enrolled in a course during the Fall 2012 semester, who received weekly IDAA encounters and were required to engage weekly academic skill set augmentation assignments, will show no statistically significant improvement when their mean cumulative GPA is measured at the end
of the Fall 2012 semester and compared to the mean cumulative GPAs achieved by the other 5 cohort groups, 6 total including this group, referenced in this study (Table 1). The six cohort groups include: group 1 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=141 students, group 2 who registered for CLST 105 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=86 students, group 3 who registered for CLST 103 during the Fall 2012 semester, n=107, group 4 who registered for CLST 105 during the Fall 2012 semester, n=114, group 5 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall 2012 semester, n=57, and finally group 5 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall 2012 semester, n=39.

Participants

Population for the study. The total population of AW, academically at-risk students at Liberty University (LU) during the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters, who were randomly enrolled in the CLST 103 or CLST 105 courses, comprise the four groups of students that were considered for this research study. The members of this AW academically at-risk student population were all subject to be randomly enrolled in one of these two courses due to their academic probation (AP)/academic suspension (AS)/academic warning (AW), AP/AS/AW student status at this university prior to the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters, respectively. University policy mandates that any AW academically at-risk student, which includes the population of students who are AP
or AS, at this institution must be enrolled in one of four CLST 100-level courses. The AW students at this university received what can be deemed an academic hold, which blocks their campus computing access until they confer with the campus personnel who enrolled them in one of these courses. Thus the campus personnel member who randomly assigns the student to the course would remove the hold after the student contacts them. Only students enrolled in CLST 103 or CLST 105 during the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters and considered as AW academically at-risk students were included in this research study.

The at-risk student groups were randomly enrolled in one of these courses under the direction of the Director of the Learning Center (LC)/Special Needs Advisor who works in the Center for Academic Support and Academic Services (CASAS) at this university. This director assigned the course enrollment duties to a member of the LC IDAAI faculty/advising staff. This faculty advisor randomly enrolls all AW students in one of the applicable CLST courses (CLST 101, 102, 103 or 105) at this university prior to each semester (LU, 2010/2011). The computer hold remains in place, related to the AW student’s schedule, until the condition of enrollment and maximum semester credit hours are achieved. Once the student is properly enrolled, the hold is removed. The random assignment of the AW academically at-risk student at this university is transacted by the IDAAI faculty advisor in the LC based on finding an available slot on the student’s course schedule that matches an available time that the course is offered. Following scheduling of the course the student’s total semester credit hour enrollment is
dropped to the appropriate level. The course scheduled is a CLST 100 level, one-credit course section that best fits that AW student’s schedule. Only the AW students enrolled in CLST 103 or CLST 105 were considered as a part of the population for this study.

The total number of students enrolled in the CLST 103 and CLST 105 courses during the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters were noted. A Likert-style questionnaire was constructed for this study with the assistance of the Director of the LC. It was also reviewed by the IDAAI instructor/advisors for the CLST 103 and CLST 105 classes during the Spring 2012 semester. This questionnaire was adapted from a previously used questionnaire for the purposes of gathering relevant information on the population of students enrolled in this course during previous semesters. This questionnaire was distributed to all students enrolled in the CLST 103 and 105 courses during the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters. The responses to this questionnaire were provided to the researcher for all AW students (see Appendix A).

The Director of the CASAS LC at this university provided all pre-semester and post-semester GPA information for all AW at-risk students enrolled in the CLST 103 and CLST 105 courses, which comprised the population for this study. The GPAs were measured for potential change prior to and at the end of the respective semesters. The total number of AW academically at-risk students enrolled in the CLST 103 and 105 courses during the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters are included in Table 1 as well as in Figure 1.
**Description of sample.** Once the population of AW at-risk students was randomly placed into the CLST 103 or CLST 105 classes during the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters, they could be identified as sample groups for this study. Only the AW students enrolled in the CLST 103 and 105 courses were considered as a part of the group sample for each course during both semesters. Any LU students may enroll in the CLST 103 or 105 courses as long as they meet the qualifications for the course. However, only the AW academically at-risk students enrolled in one of these two courses during these two semesters were considered a part of the sample groups. They were identified based on their pre-semester GPA and their random enrollment in the specific course. The composite mean cumulative GPAs for each group of AW academically at-risk students enrolled in the CLST 103 or 105 courses during the two semester periods made up the four sample groups considered as a part of this study.

1. CLST 103 Spring 2012: n=141 students
2. CLST 105 Spring 2012: n=86 students
3. CLST 103 Fall 2012: n=107 students
4. CLST 105 Fall 2012: n=114 students
5. CLST 103 Spring 2012 during Fall 2012: n=57 students
6. CLST 105 Spring 2012 during Fall 2012: n=39 students

*Figure 1.* All AW academically at-risk students, separated into groups.
Table 1

*All AW Academically At-Risk Students, Separated Into Groups*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Spring 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Spring 2012 during Fall 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLST 103</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLST 105</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All AW academically at-risk students who participated in the CLST 103 or CLST 105 courses during the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters were included in the calculation and comparison of the mean group pre-semester and post-semester cumulative GPAs. Any students not considered AW by this institution during the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters, but enrolled in the CLST 103 or 105 courses during these semesters, were excluded from the data analysis. The purpose of this research study was to explore the effects that the IDAA encounter and additional academic support services could have on the mean group cumulative GPAs of randomly assigned groups of academically at-risk students. These cumulative GPAs were measured at the beginning and at the end of the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semester for the four groups. The Spring 2012 groups were measured both at the end of the Spring 2012 semester and at the end of the Fall 2012 semester, respectively. This measured the possibility of the lasting effect of the Spring 2012 treatment. The Fall 2012 groups were measured at the beginning and end
of Fall 2012 only. Two groups of AW academically at-risk students were randomly assigned to enroll in the CLST 103 or CLST 105 courses during each semester.

Setting

Liberty University (LU) is a private and accredited institution of higher learning, which grants degrees on the associate, bachelor, master, and doctorate levels. It has functioned as a university since its inception in 1971 (LU, 2010/2011). The CLST 1 credit courses are offered through the LU Learning Center. They offer the AW academically at-risk students what can be deemed as IDAA advising as a part of both the CLST 103 and CLST 105 course offerings. The LU CASAS LC offers a variety of academic and career support services to the undergraduate student population. It provides specific academic assistance to its AW student population, based on the theoretical framework that undergirds the IDAA models, which have been proven successful when instructors of courses like the CLST classes, who also function as advisors, attempt to assist and retain greater numbers of their enrolled academically at-risk student populations (Abelman & Molina, 2001; Earl, 1988; Garnett, 1990; Hart & Speece, 1998; Kanar, 2008; Kirk-Kuwaye & Nishida, 2001; Lipsky & Ender, 1990; Molina & Abelman, 2000; Nilson, 2003; Steingass & Sykes, 2006).

The LU Learning Center (LC) advisors are specifically hired and trained as IDAA faculty advisors by the Learning Center based on their ability to successfully employ these IDAA models and theories in an effort to assist the AW student population to achieve good standing. The Learning Center’s academic support services are offered to
all AW students at LU. They are a part of the academic support offerings provided by the LU Center for Academic Support and Advising Services (CASAS). The LC faculty advisors use the CLST courses and IDAA advising in a mandatory format to provide the necessary assistance to their AP/AS/AW academically at-risk students.

The Academic Warning (AW) undergraduate student designation at LU is based on four different academic levels of completed credit hours. Students are placed on Level I AW if their cumulative GPA is below a 1.5 when they had fewer than 24 total completed credit hours. Level 2 requires a cumulative GPA of below a 1.65 for students who have 24-47 credit hours. Level 3 requires a cumulative GPA of below a 1.85 for students who have 48-71 credit hours. Any student on Level 4 AW status would have 72 or more credit hours and must below a 2.00 cumulative GPA at LU as an undergraduate student (LU, 2011/2012). Academic standing is calculated at the end of each of the spring and fall semesters. The university registrar calculates the cumulative GPA and generates a list of students who are on AW. The AW designation includes students placed on Academic Probation (AP) and Academic Suspension (AS). Thus, students in this study can be summarily referred to as AW academically at-risk students.

The College Learning Strategies (CLST) courses have specific descriptions and learning objectives for all enrolled students. They are not limited to only AW academically at-risk students at LU; however, the IDAA program and its coursework component in the forms of the CLST 101, 102, 103, and 105 classes are specifically used to provide academic support services assistance to the AW academically at-risk student
population (LU, 2011/2012). The CLST 103-Individualized Lab in Reading and Study Strategies (CLST 103) one-credit-hour course is described as an individualized curriculum in reading and study strategies based on the student’s goal and assessed needs. The varied curriculum focuses on academic, personal, and/or spiritual domains. It is delivered in a lab format, with the instructor serving also as advisor, and provides the student with instructor/advisor interaction (see Appendix B) (LU, 2011/2012). The course exists to provide students who may lack adequate scholastic preparation with a form of individualized assistance in one or more specific areas of study. It is also designed to help enhance a student’s opportunity to achieve academic goals. This occurs via a self-assessment form completed by the student at the beginning of the course, and the instructor/advisor applies the learning strategy instruments to assist that student to achieve academic success by providing academic support in that specific student-identified and student-perceived area of academic need. The course is delivered in lab format. The CLST 105 course is offered in a different design to all LU students. It is one of the required courses that the AW academically at-risk students can be randomly assigned to complete.

The CLST 105-Strategies for the Application of College Learning Skills (CLST 105) one-credit-hour course provides students with a comprehensive offering of strategies and academic support services that enables them to apply college learning skills to their other college coursework. It incorporates a one-on-one mentoring/advising process in the form of IDAA, where applicable, to the AW at-risk student via weekly meetings between
instructor/advisor and student during the term of the course. It is designed to create an awareness of current academic progress and to encourage the motivation, as well as the responsibility, necessary for the enrolled student to achieve and sustain academic success. It is delivered in a semester-long one-credit-course format, where the class meets on a weekly basis, as well as incorporating the one-on-one individualized IDAA for AW students (see Appendix C) (LU, 2011/2012). This course also attempts to provide students who may lack adequate academic preparation, a form of individualized assistance in one or more specific areas of study. It also attempts to help the AW academically at-risk to achieve their academic goals.

AW students enrolled in this course receive individualized IDAA advising, as well as a class structure, in order to present a comprehensive offering of IDAA advising and broad academic support services. This comprehensive offering of additional academic support services includes the one-on-one academic advising/mentoring IDAA meetings, an all-inclusive offering and assessment of progress related to the learning strategies instruction offered in each class, and career exploration work incorporated into the course. These appear as a part of the learning objectives for the course.

Instrumentation

This study could demonstrate the potential effectiveness of the random assignment format of IDAA as well as the potential benefits of combining IDAA with an additionally offered and comprehensively apportioned group of academic support services. This format is offered in the CLST 105 course. The potential benefits would be
measured with the post-semester GPAs of the students in the CLST 103 lab-style course, where the AW students perform a self-assessment of their academic needs and the IDAAI offers academic support service related to each specific student’s self-identified perceived academic need area. The instruments employed in this study involved the IDAA processes as they distinctively occur within the structure of each course. The instruments in this study also included the additional academic support services offerings provided to both groups of AW academically at-risk students. They were be implemented over a 2-semester period.

The measurement of the four AW academically at-risk, participating groups of students’ cumulative GPAs occurred at the beginning and at the end of the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters, respective to both the CLST 103 and CLST 105 courses. The groups included all students who were designated AW by the university. They could be enrolled in any of the sections of the CLST 103 or 105 courses, as long as they were enrolled in the course as a mandatory condition of their AW status at the university. The potential changes in the four groups of students’ pre-semester and post-semester cumulative GPAs served as the basis for analyzing the effectiveness of the instruments employed.

A questionnaire, employing five questions using a Likert scale format, was employed as an additional instrument. This questionnaire was distributed to students upon completion of their specific course. The results were analyzed and provided additional support related to any perceptible GPA changes following the semester. A
form of this questionnaire has been employed by the instructors/advisors for this course since the course’s inception at LU. It has been revised for the purposes of this research study and changed from an open-ended question format to fit a Likert scale format, for the purposes of interpretation of the results. All instructors of the courses during the Spring 2012 semester reviewed and revised the questionnaire in order to support the validity of the instrument (see Appendix A). A similar questionnaire is often presented to academically at-risk students by IDAA instructors and advisors at many institutions and can provide valuable insight to the advisors who work with this student population (Heisserer & Parette, 2002; Mann et al., 2003/2004).

The students were randomly enrolled in each course for the purpose of providing IDAA and academic support services prior to attendance. The instruments employed in this research study were derived from the tenets of developmental academic advising, the effectiveness of employing intrusive advising methods with academically at-risk students, and the importance of supplying additional academic support services in order to aid this population’s ability to achieve academic success (Earl, 1988; Garnett, 1990; Hagen & Jordan 2008; King, 2005). Many studies and articles have verified the effectiveness of employing developmental academic advising, additional support services offerings, and intrusive advising as the most effective tools for providing effective assistance to the academically at-risk student population on a college campus (Abelman & Molina, 2001; Abrams & Jernigan, 1984; Austin et al., 1997; Campbell & Campbell, 1997; Cuseo, 2003; Earl 1988, Garnett, 1990; Hart & Speece, 1998; Heisserer & Parette, 2002;

The mean cumulative GPAs were measured at the beginning and end of both the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters for all four groups of AW academically at-risk students who were randomly enrolled in either the CLST 103 course or the CLST 105 course during those semesters. The Spring 2012 groups were measured both at the end of the Spring 2012 semester and at the end of the Fall 2012 semester, respectively. This measured the possibility of the lasting effect of the Spring 2012 treatment. The Fall 2012 groups were measured at the beginning and end of Fall 2012 only. Each of their GPAs was compared with the beginning and end of semester mean cumulative GPAs of three other randomly enrolled groups of at-risk students.

**Procedures**

Permission to use all student data for this study was requested and received from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of the institution where the IDAA and academic support services encounters have occurred. That permission request included the use of all data pertaining to this study, including the cumulative GPAs recorded prior to, and after the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters. The permission request to use the student information included the intention to use the results of all questionnaires distributed to the AW academically at-risk students enrolled in the CLST 103 and CLST 105 courses during these semesters.
The procedural aspects of this specific study began with the random enrollment of the AW academically at-risk students in the CLST 103 or CLST 105 courses prior to the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters by a designated representative of the LU CASAS LC. The students were randomly enrolled in a course based on the availability of time to participate in one of the courses. Once the AW students were identified and their schedules were adjusted by the LU Registrar, the students were mandatorily enrolled in a maximum of 13 credits, including their enrollment by the LU LC faculty advisor in a CLST 103 or CLST 105 section that fit their academic schedule.

**Data Analysis**

Data analysis required the calculation of the mean cumulative GPAs for each group of those AW academically at-risk students who were enrolled in the CLST 103 or CLST 105 courses during the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters, respectively. The Spring 2012 groups were measured both at the end of the Spring 2012 semester and at the end of the Fall 2012 semester. This measured the possibility of the lasting effect of the Spring 2012 treatment. The Fall 2012 groups were measured at the beginning and end of Fall 2012 only. The beginning of semester cumulative GPAs and the CLST 103 or CLST 105 courses taken during the Spring or Fall 2012 semesters served as the covariates for each randomly pre-assigned group of at-risk students. The dependent variables for each group were the post-semester cumulative GPAs.

An analysis of covariance (ACNOVA) statistical procedure was employed in order to provide a test of statistical significance (Ary et al., 2006; Howell, 2008). This
method also controls for the possible threats to internal validity that could occur via experimenter effects, possible diffusion effects between groups, or subjects’ attitude concerns.

Additionally, a questionnaire employing five questions using Likert scale results was employed and distributed to each student upon completion of the specific course. The results were analyzed and provide additional support related to any perceptible GPA changes following the semester. A version of this questionnaire has been employed by the instructors/advisors for this course since the course’s inception. It was revised from an open-ended question format to a Likert scale format for the purposes of this research study (see Appendix A). All instructors of the courses during the Spring 2012 semester reviewed and revised the questionnaire in order to support the validity of the instrument. A similar questionnaire is presented to academically at-risk students by IDAA instructors and advisors at many institutions and provides valuable insight to the advisors who work with this student population (Heisserer & Parette, 2002; Mann et al., 2003/2004).

The recommended sample size for the paired sample t-tests method is 30 students per group (Ary et al., 2006). The total number of students in all groups could have fallen below the recommended sample size during the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters when considering the enrollment of only students who were deemed AW status at this university.

These recommended sample sizes were intended to compensate for the possible effects of history, maturation, regression, and the fact that pre-testing could not occur as a
part of this research study. However, the random assignment of these academically at-risk students by LU personnel should have compensated for the potential effects of this recommended though not mandated sample size of 30 students per group, if the circumstance were to occur (Ary et al., 2006). Also, the ANCOVA test is a more powerful test and provides the most readily interpretable results.

The researcher considered the mean averages of the AW students. The researcher did not consider their standardized achievement test scores or their high school GPAs. These data were not made available to the researcher. Thus, these potential threats to the validity of the study were not considered through the use of an ANCOVA comparison test in order to partially adjust for these pre-existing extraneous variables (Ary et al., 2006).

Other possible extraneous variables were not available to the researcher and were not considered. These other possible extraneous variables included gender, ethnicity, total credit hours attempted during that semester (AW students at this institution were limited to a total of 13 attempted hours or fewer, until good standing was achieved), and total number of course withdrawals, if any occurred during the Spring and Fall 2012 semesters. An F-test could partially control for these extraneous variables and allow the comparison of the pre and post-semester GPAs to demonstrate levels of possible academic achievement incurred by the groups of academically at-risk students. The F-test and t-test are not the most highly recommended tests under the design. The ANCOVA
test could be used to partially adjust the initial differences between the four groups of academically at-risk students (Ary et al., 2006).

Evidence demonstrates the effectiveness of combining IDAA with additional academic support services when advisors are working with academically at-risk students (Austin et al., 1997; Earl, 1988; Heisserer & Parette, 2002; Kirk-Kuwaye & Nishida, 2001; Mann et al., 2003/2004; Molina & Abelman, 2000). This research study was not dependent on individual students’ mean cumulative GPA comparisons, but rather on the aggregate of cumulative GPAs means for each group of academically at-risk students who encountered all pre-assigned encounters. These comparisons occurred through calculating the mean GPAs prior to and after the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters. The Spring 2012 groups were measured both at the end of the Spring 2012 semester and at the end of the Fall 2012 semester. The Fall 2012 groups were measured at the beginning and end of Fall 2012 only.

These factors could have allowed the potential academic achievement effect of randomly assigning these students to encounter more intensive levels of academic support services and IDAA, to become apparent. Factors that could have presented threats to the internal validity of this study were controlled via the appropriate data analysis methodology formats (Ary et al., 2006; Howell, 2008).

Other factors that could have impacted the post-semester cumulative GPAs of the students were considered to be a part of the normal interaction of AW academically at-risk students with the campus environment. Potential influences such as a difference in
study habits achieved throughout the semester by a specific academically at-risk student, differences in test taking (or other assessment skills), or improved motivation were not measured or evaluated as a part of this study. Data related to these potential differences could not be obtained.

Potential threats to the external validity of the study, such as personal attitude changes, the impact of the IDAAI or other academic support services encounters on the students improved motivation, the campus setting, or the fact that no novelty effect could have been present due to the blind course assignment that transpired when the at-risk students were assigned to the CLST 103 or CLST 105 course of their choice, were all considered appropriate and as factors germane to a college student’s development (Ary et al., 2006; Hagen & Jordan, 2008). As long as other extraneous variables were considered, the results could be generalized to each group of academically at-risk students considered in this study. The Robbins et al. (2004) study evaluated some of these factors as not having as significant an influence on academic achievement of at-risk students as some of the factors more closely related to IDAA and other support services encounters.
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS

Descriptive statistics related to pre-semester and post-semester cumulative GPAs for all groups during the semesters of measurement were calculated. Statistical analysis was conducted via SPSS statistical software. The one-way ANCOVA test was conducted for this study. The covariates were the pre-semester GPAs, the dependent variables were the post-semester GPAs, and the independent variables were the CLST 103 and 105 courses taken by the different cohort groups during the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters. An ANCOVA test was used to control for the major and minor assumptions, based on the robust cohort sizes and by assuming normality of the data, homogeneity of variance, linearity, homogeneity of regression, and the reliability of the measurement of the covariate (Ary et al., 2006; Howell, 2008; Pallant, 2010).

The ANCOVA test measured the effects of the independent variables, CLST 103 and 105 courses, on the dependent variable, the post-semester cumulative GPAs. These effects on the dependent variables were relative to each of the four hypotheses, totaling six measurements, including the Spring 2012 semester cohorts from the CLST 103 and 105 courses whose Fall 2012 semester cumulative GPAs were additionally calculated. These ANCOVA assessments were taken, where the independent variables were each cohort group enrolled in each CLST 103 and 105 course during each of their respective times, and the dependent variables were the post-semester cumulative GPAs. The covariates, again were the pre-semester cumulative GPAs. Descriptive statistics related to
the collected surveys associated with each course were also calculated. Hypotheses were supported when p-values were less than \( p < 0.01 \).

The homogeneity of regression demonstrated the significance of the interaction between the covariate pre-semester GPAs and the independent variables in the form of the CLST 103 and 105 courses, measuring their ability to successfully predict the dependent variables, post-semester GPAs (Pallant, 2010). The results of the ANCOVA were considered not to be significant, where \( F(5, 532) = 1.75 \), and the level of significance \( p = .12 \). This meant that the level of significance for this test was greater than \( \alpha = .01 \) because there were more than \( n > 500 \) data sets, \( n = 544 \). That is \( p = .12 > \alpha (.01) \) (Table 2). The ANCOVA results were meaningful.

The test of the homogeneity of variance, according to the Levene’s test results from SPSS data output, did not show a significant relationship between the covariate pre-semester GPAs and the dependent variable post-semester GPAs, controlling for the factor or different course numbers enrolled in by semester, where \( F(5, 538) = 5.18 \), and the level of significance \( p = .000 \), thus \( p < .01 \). The pre-semester GPAs did not demonstrate a significant linear relationship with the post-semester GPAs when the CLST 103 and 105 cohort groups were controlled. Pre-semester GPAs served as an appropriate covariate (Pallant, 2010). However, a scatter plot test demonstrated that the relationship between the pre-semester GPAs, serving as the covariate, and the dependent variable, the post-semester GPAs, were linearly aligned (Figure 2).
Figure 2. Scatter plot for pre-semester GPAs and post-semester GPAs.
Table 2

*Test of Homogeneity of Regression.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course number*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PreSemGPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>error</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>82.12</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptive Statistics

The study participants included 544 total students. The CLST 103 Spring 2012 cohort group included $n=141$ students. The CLST 105 Spring 2012 cohort group included $n=86$ students (Table 3). The CLST 103 Fall 2012 cohort group included $n=107$ students. The CLST 105 Fall 2012 cohort group included $n=114$ students. The number of CLST 103 Spring 2012 cohort group students who returned to enroll in classes and complete the Fall 2012 semester included $n=57$ students. The number of CLST 105 Spring 2012 cohort group students who returned to enroll in classes and complete the Fall 2012 semester included $n=39$ students, where all students who were AW status were included. All other LU students enrolled in these courses were excluded from the study.
Table 3

*Descriptive Statistics for Post-Semester GPAs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course number by semester</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- CLST 103 Spring 2012</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- CLST 105 Spring 2012</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- CLST 103 Fall 2012</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- CLST 105 Fall 2012</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- CLST 103 Spr/Fall 2012</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- CLST 105 Spr/Fall 2012</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 1

Will one group of academically at-risk students mandated to receive only one IDAA encounter, and perform academic skills assignments associated with their self-assessed academic improvement need area, demonstrate academic improvement at the end of the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters, when their potential improvement is measured and compared to the potential improvement demonstrated by the other 5 cohort groups, 6 total including this group, referenced in this study (Table 1)? The six cohort groups include; group 1 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=141 students, group 2 who registered for CLST 105 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=86 students, group 3 who registered for CLST 103 during the Fall 2012 semester, n=107, group 4 who registered for CLST 105 during the Fall 2012 semester, n=114, group 5 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall 2012 semester, n=57, and finally group 5 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall 2012 semester, n=39.

Null Hypothesis 1 HO. The mean level of academic improvement of an academically at-risk group of students, enrolled in a course during the Spring 2012 semester, who received only one IDAA encounter and completed academic skills assignments associated with their self-assessed academic improvement need area, will show no statistically significant improvement when their mean cumulative GPAs are measured at the end of the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters and compared to the
mean cumulative GPAs achieved by the other 5 cohort groups, 6 total including this
group, referenced in this study (Table 1). The six cohort groups include; group 1 who
registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=141 students, group 2 who
registered for CLST 105 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=86 students, group 3 who
registered for CLST 103 during the Fall 2012 semester, n=107, group 4 who registered
for CLST 105 during the Fall 2012 semester, n=114, group 5 who registered for CLST
103 during the Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall
2012 semester, n=57, and finally group 5 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring
2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall 2012 semester, n=39.

The results of the ANCOVA, reflective of testing the null hypothesis $H_0$, were
not significant, indicating that the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. There is no
statistically significant difference where $F(5, 537) = 2.82, p = .016$, for the level of
significance $\alpha = .01$. This suggested that there was not a strong relationship between the
post-semester GPAs and that they were not a result of their enrollment in the CLST 103
course during the Spring 2012 semester and measuring their post-semester GPAs during
the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters, respectively (Table 4).

The partial eta squared $\eta^2 = .03$ means that 3% of the variance in the post semester
GPAs is explained by the CLST 103 and 105 courses functioning as the independent
variables (Pallant, 2010). There is a significant relationship between the covariate pre-
semester GPAs, $p = .00$, for the level of significance $\alpha = .01$, and the dependent variable,
the post-semester GPAs (Table 4). The partial eta squared $\eta^2 = .20$ associated with the
covariate means that 20% of the variance in the dependent variable is explained by the pre-semester GPAs (Pallant, 2010).

Table 4

*Test of Between Subjects Effects*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Partial eta squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected model</td>
<td>30.10&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>32.27</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>47.24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47.24</td>
<td>303.93</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-semester GPA</td>
<td>21.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.25</td>
<td>136.69</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course numbers</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>83.46</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1966.06</td>
<td>544</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Follow-up tests were conducted to evaluate contrast estimated marginal means and pairwise differences between the cohort groups. Contrast estimate results were derived from the Bonferroni procedure in order to compare the pairwise error rate and to
control for a Type I error (Howell, 2008; Pallant, 2010). The adjusted priori level of significance across pairwise comparisons was $\alpha^{'}=.01/15=.00067$. The pairwise comparisons for the adjusted means $p=.02$, for $p<.00067$ demonstrates that according to the adjusted priori alpha level of significance $\alpha^{'}=.00067$, there is no significant difference between the adjusted means for the post-semester GPAs of the students who took CLST 103 and CLST 105, where the covariate, the pre-semester GPAs, was removed (Pallant, 2010) (Table 5).

Table 5

*Pairwise Comparisons Test Results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial eta squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Number</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>83.47</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The null hypothesis 1 HO is not rejected, where there is not a significant difference between the mean cumulative post-semester GPAs of the cohort group who were enrolled in CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester measured at the end of the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters and the cumulative GPAs of the additional groups referenced in this study. Research Question 1 asks if one group of academically at-risk
students mandated to receive only one IDAA encounter and perform academic skills assignments associated with their self-assessed academic improvement need area, demonstrate academic improvement at the end of the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters, when their potential improvement is measured and compared to the potential improvement demonstrated by the additional groups referenced in this study.

According to pairwise comparisons of means and adjusted means between the CLST 103 Spring 2012 cohort’s mean cumulative GPAs at the end of Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 and the additional groups referenced in this study, these comparisons demonstrate that the mean cumulative GPAs and adjusted mean cumulative GPAs of the CLST 103 Spring 2012 semester cohort following the Spring 2012 semester, are lower than those mean cumulative GPAs of the additional groups. The mean cumulative GPAs and the adjusted cumulative GPAs of the CLST 103 Spring 2012 semester cohort following the Fall 2012 semester are higher, with one exception, and demonstrated improvement after one semester removed from the CLST 103 course, when compared to those mean cumulative GPAs of the additional groups. The mean cumulative GPAs for the CLST 103 Spring 2012 semester cohort are outlined in Table 6.
Table 6

Pairwise Comparisons of Post-Semester GPAs Spring 2012(1) and Fall 2012(4)  

CLST 103 Cohorts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>Adjusted mean&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Adjusted mean difference&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>1.71-1.83</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>1.76-1.81</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>1.71-1.78</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>1.76-1.85</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1.71-1.90</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>1.76-1.90</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>1.71-2.05</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>1.76-1.93</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>1.71-2.12</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>1.76-1.94</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-2</td>
<td>2.05-1.83</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>1.93-1.81</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-3</td>
<td>2.05-1.78</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>1.93-1.85</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-4</td>
<td>2.05-1.90</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>1.93-1.90</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>2.05-2.12</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>1.93-1.94</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 2

Will one group of academically at-risk students mandated to receive only one IDAA encounter and perform academic skills assignments associated with their self-assessed academic improvement need area, demonstrate academic improvement when their potential improvement is measured at the end of the Fall 2012 semester and compared to the potential improvement demonstrated by the other 5 cohort groups, 6 total including this group, referenced in this study (Table 1)? The six cohort groups include; group 1 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=141 students,
Null Hypothesis 2 HO. The mean level of academic improvement of an academically at-risk group of students, enrolled in a course during the Fall 2012 semester, who received only one IDAA encounter and completed academic skills assignments associated with their self-assessed academic improvement need area, will show no statistically significant improvement when their mean cumulative GPA is measured at the end of the Fall 2012 semester and compared to the mean cumulative GPAs achieved by the other 5 cohort groups, 6 total including this group, referenced in this study (Table 1). The six cohort groups include; group 1 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=141 students, group 2 who registered for CLST 105 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=86 students, group 3 who registered for CLST 103 during the Fall 2012 semester, n=107, group 4 who registered for CLST 105 during the Fall 2012 semester, n=114, group 5 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall 2012 semester, n=57, and finally group 5 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall 2012 semester, n=39.
finally group 5 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall 2012 semester, n=39.

The results of the ANCOVA, reflective of testing the null hypothesis $H_0$, were not significant, indicating that the null hypothesis is not rejected. There is no statistically significant difference where $F(5, 537) = 2.82, p = .016$, for the level of significance $\alpha = .01$. This suggests that the differences in the post-semester GPAs were not a result of their enrollment in the CLST 103 course during the Fall 2012 semester, when their cumulative GPAs were measured at the end of the Fall 2012 semester (Table 4).

The null hypothesis $H_0$ is not rejected, where there is no significant difference between the mean cumulative post-semester GPAs of the cohort group enrolled in CLST 103 during the Fall 2012 semester measured at the end of the Fall 2012 semester and the mean cumulative GPAs of the additional groups referenced in this study. Research Question 2 asks if one group of academically at-risk students, mandated to receive only one IDAA encounter and perform academic skills assignments associated with their self-assessed academic improvement need area, demonstrate academic improvement when their potential improvement is measured at the end of the Fall 2012 semester only, and compared to the potential improvement demonstrated by the additional groups referenced in this study. According to pairwise comparisons of means and adjusted means between the CLST 103 Fall 2012 cohort’s mean cumulative GPAs at the end of Fall 2012 and the additional groups referenced in this study, these comparisons, while not significant, demonstrate that the mean cumulative GPAs and adjusted mean cumulative GPAs of the
CLST 103 Fall 2012 semester cohort are generally lower than those mean cumulative GPAs of the additional groups. The mean cumulative GPAs for the CLST 103 Fall 2012 semester cohort are outlined in Table 7.

Table 7

*Pairwise Comparisons of Post-Semester GPAs Fall 2012(3) CLST 103 Cohort*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>Adjusted mean&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Adjusted mean difference&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-1</td>
<td>1.78-1.71</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1.85-1.76</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2</td>
<td>1.78-1.83</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>1.85-1.81</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>1.78-1.90</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>1.85-1.90</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>1.78-2.05</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>1.85-1.93</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6</td>
<td>1.78-2.12</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>1.85-1.94</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 3

Will one group of academically at-risk students mandated to receive weekly IDAA encounters and required to engage weekly academic skill set augmentation assignments, demonstrate academic improvement when their potential improvement is measured at the end of the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters and compared to the potential improvement demonstrated by the other 5 cohort groups, 6 total including this group, referenced in this study (Table 1)? The six cohort groups include; group 1 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=141 students, group 2 who
registered for CLST 105 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=86 students, group 3 who registered for CLST 103 during the Fall 2012 semester, n=107, group 4 who registered for CLST 105 during the Fall 2012 semester, n=114, group 5 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall 2012 semester, n=57, and finally group 5 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall 2012 semester, n=39.

Null Hypothesis 3 HO. The mean level of academic improvement of an academically at-risk group of students enrolled in a course during the Spring 2012 semester, who received weekly IDAA encounters and were required to engage weekly academic skill set augmentation assignments, will show no statistically significant improvement when their mean cumulative GPAs are measured at the end of the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters and compared to the mean cumulative GPAs achieved by the other 5 cohort groups, 6 total including this group, referenced in this study (Table 1). The six cohort groups include; group 1 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=141 students, group 2 who registered for CLST 105 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=86 students, group 3 who registered for CLST 103 during the Fall 2012 semester, n=107, group 4 who registered for CLST 105 during the Fall 2012 semester, n=114, group 5 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall 2012 semester, n=57, and finally group 5 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall 2012 semester, n=39.
The results of the ANCOVA, reflective of testing the null hypothesis $3 \, H_0$, were not significant, indicating that the null hypothesis is not rejected. There is no statistically significant difference where $F(5, 537) = 2.82, p = .02$, for $p < .01$. This suggests that the differences in the post-semester GPAs were not a result of their enrollment in the CLST 105 course during the Spring 2012 semester, measuring their post-semester GPAs during the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters, respectively (Table 4).

The null hypothesis $3 \, H_0$ is not rejected, where there is no significant difference between the mean cumulative post-semester GPAs of the cohort group who were enrolled in CLST 105 during the Spring 2012 semester measured at the end of the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters and the mean cumulative GPAs of the additional groups referenced in this study. Research Question 3 asks if one group of academically at-risk students, mandated to receive weekly IDAA encounters and required to engage weekly academic skill set augmentation assignments, demonstrated academic improvement when their potential improvement was measured at the end of the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters and compared to the potential improvement demonstrated by the additional groups referenced in this study. According to pairwise comparisons of means and adjusted means between the CLST 105 Spring 2012 cohort’s cumulative GPAs at the end of Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 and the additional groups referenced in this study, these comparisons, while not significant, demonstrate that the mean cumulative GPAs and adjusted mean cumulative GPAs of the CLST 105 Spring 2012 semester cohort following the Spring 2012 semester, are lower than those mean cumulative GPAs of the additional
groups. The mean cumulative GPAs and the adjusted cumulative GPAs of the CLST 105 Spring 2012 semester cohort following the Fall 2012 semester are all higher and demonstrated improvement after one semester removed from the CLST 105 course, when compared to those mean cumulative GPAs of the additional groups. The mean cumulative GPAs for the CLST 105 Spring 2012 semester cohort are outlined in Table 6.

Table 8

*Pairwise Comparisons of Post-Semester GPAs Spring 2012(2) and Fall 2012(6)*

*CLST 105 Cohorts*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>Adjusted mean&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Adjusted mean difference&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-1</td>
<td>1.83-1.71</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.81-1.76</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>1.83-1.78</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.81-1.85</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>1.83-1.90</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>1.81-1.90</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>1.83-2.05</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>1.81-1.93</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-6</td>
<td>1.83-2.12</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>1.81-1.94</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>2.12-1.71</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>1.94-1.76</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-3</td>
<td>2.12-1.78</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>1.94-1.85</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-4</td>
<td>2.12-1.90</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>1.94-1.90</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-5</td>
<td>2.12-2.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1.94-1.93</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Research Question 4**

Will one group of academically at-risk students, mandated to receive weekly IDAA encounters and required to engage weekly academic skill set augmentation assignments, demonstrate academic improvement when their potential improvement is measured at the end of the Fall 2012 semester and compared to the potential improvement demonstrated by the other 5 cohort groups, 6 total including this group, referenced in this study (Table 1). The six cohort groups include: group 1 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=141 students, group 2 who registered for CLST 105 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=86 students, group 3 who registered for CLST 103 during the Fall 2012 semester, n=107, group 4 who registered for CLST 105 during the Fall 2012 semester, n=114, group 5 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall 2012 semester, n=57, and finally group 5 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall 2012 semester, n=39.

**Null Hypothesis 4 HO.** The mean level of academic improvement of an academically at-risk group of students enrolled in a course during the Fall 2012 semester, who received weekly IDAA encounters and were required to engage weekly academic skill set augmentation assignments, will show no statistically significant improvement when their mean cumulative GPA is measured at the end of the Fall 2012 semester and compared to the mean cumulative GPAs achieved by the other 5 cohort groups, 6 total including this group, referenced in this study (Table 1). The six cohort groups include;
group 1 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=141 students, 
group 2 who registered for CLST 105 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=86 students, 
group 3 who registered for CLST 103 during the Fall 2012 semester, n=107, group 4 who 
registered for CLST 105 during the Fall 2012 semester, n=114, group 5 who registered 
for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during 
the Fall 2012 semester, n=57, and finally group 5 who registered for CLST 103 during 
the Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall 2012 semester, 
n=39.

The results of the ANCOVA, reflective of testing the null hypothesis $H_0$, were 
not significant, indicating that the null hypothesis is not rejected. There is no statistically 
significant difference where $F(5, 537) = 2.82, p = .02$, for $p < .01$. This suggests that the 
differences in the post-semester GPAs were not a result of their enrollment in the CLST 
105 course during the Fall 2012 semester, when their cumulative GPAs were measured at 
the end of the Fall 2012 semester (Table 4).

The null hypothesis $H_0$ is not rejected, where there is no significant difference 
between the mean cumulative post-semester GPAs of the cohort group enrolled in CLST 
105 during the Fall 2012 semester, measured at the end of the Fall 2012 semester, and the 
mean cumulative GPAs of the additional groups referenced in this study. Research 
Question 4 asks if one group of academically at-risk students mandated to receive weekly 
IDAA encounters and required to engage weekly academic skill set augmentation 
assignments, demonstrated academic improvement when their potential improvement
was measured at the end of the Fall 2012 semester and compared to the potential improvement demonstrated by the additional groups referenced in this study. According to pairwise comparisons of means and adjusted means between the CLST 105 Fall 2012 cohort’s cumulative GPAs at the end of Fall 2012 and the additional groups referenced in this study, these comparisons, while not significant, demonstrate that the mean cumulative GPAs and adjusted cumulative GPAs of the CLST 104 Fall 2012 semester cohort are higher, with two exceptions, than those mean cumulative GPAs of the additional groups. The mean cumulative GPAs for the CLST 105 Fall 2012 semester cohort are outlined in Table 9.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>Adjusted mean</th>
<th>Adjusted mean difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-1</td>
<td>1.90-1.71</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>1.90-1.76</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-2</td>
<td>1.90-1.83</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1.90-1.81</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-3</td>
<td>1.90-1.78</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.90-1.85</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>1.90-2.05</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>1.90-1.93</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>1.90-2.12</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>1.90-1.94</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey Descriptive Statistics

The study participants included $n = 43$ respondents to the questionnaire distributed at the end of the Spring 2012 semester to the cohort enrolled in the CLST 103 course (Appendix A). Due to the fact that the survey was blindly responded to by students, there is no way of knowing if all respondents were among the AW student population. Any LU student could have enrolled in CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester. The total enrolled cohort in CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester was $n = 141$. The results of the survey are listed below (Table 10). The students were asked to respond to five total questions, based on a Likert-style questionnaire with responses ranging from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree.”

Based on the results of the questionnaire, the majority of the students either agreed or strongly agreed that CLST 103 was generally a helpful course. Question 1 asked if the personalized IDAA style conferences with the professor helped them to reach their academic goals as a student; an average of $M = .87$ agreed or strongly agreed that the course had helped. Question 2 asked if the academic advice provided through this course had helped them to improve academically as students; an average of $M = .84$ responded that they agreed or strongly agreed. Question 3 asked if the assistance provided by specific measures in the form of offering academic support service(s) (ex. filing repeats, tutoring options, study strategies etc.) provided in this course had helped the students to function and perform better at this university; an average of $M = .74$ responded that they agreed or strongly agreed. Question 4 asked if the overall structure of
this course, including all academic advising meetings as well as the academic support service(s) provided in this course, had helped them to improve as students; an average of $M = .84$ agreed or strongly agreed that the course had helped. Question 5 asked if the student would recommend this specific course to anyone who had encountered academic challenges; an average of $M = .87$ agreed or strongly agreed that they would recommend the course. An average of $M = .83$ agreed or strongly agreed with all five questions, demonstrating that the CLST 103 course, including IDAA and additional academic support services, had been beneficial to their academic improvement and overall success.

Table 10

*Survey Descriptive Statistics for CLST 103 Spring 2012 Cohort*

$N = 43$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 1</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 5</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study participants included $n = 39$ respondents to the questionnaire distributed at the end of the Spring 2012 semester to the cohort enrolled in the CLST 105 course (see Appendix A). Due to the fact that the survey was blindly responded to by
students, there is no way of knowing if all respondents were among the AW student population. Any LU student could have enrolled in CLST 105 during the Spring 2012 semester. The total enrolled cohort in CLST 105 during the Spring 2012 semester was \( n = 86 \). The results of the survey are listed below (Table 11). The students were asked to respond to five total questions, based on a Likert-style questionnaire, with responses ranging from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree.”

Based on the results of the questionnaire, the majority of the students either agreed or strongly agreed that CLST 105 was very helpful to their academic progress. Question 1 asked if the personalized IDAA style conferences with the professor helped them to reach their academic goals as a student; an average of \( M = .89 \) agreed or strongly agreed that the course had helped. Question 2 asked if the academic advice provided through this course had helped them to improve academically as students; almost all students, an average of \( M = .98 \), responded that they agreed or strongly agreed. Question 3 asked if the assistance provided by specific measures in the form of offering academic support service(s) (ex. Filing repeats, tutoring options, study strategies, etc.) provided in this course had helped the students to function and perform better at this university; again, almost all students, an average of \( M = .97 \), responded that they agreed or strongly agreed. Question 4 asked if the overall structure of this course, including all academic advising meetings as well as the academic support service(s) provided in this course, had helped them to improve as students; once more, all but one student, an average of \( M = .98 \), agreed or strongly agreed that the course had helped. Question 5 asked if the student
would recommend this specific course to anyone who had encountered academic challenges; an average of $M = .92$ agreed or strongly agreed that they would recommend the course. An average of $M = .95$ agreed or strongly agreed with all five questions, demonstrating that the CLST 105 course during the Spring 2012 semester, including IDAA and additional academic support services, had provided a tremendous benefit to their academic improvement and overall success.

Table 11

*Survey Descriptive Statistics for CLST 105 Spring 2012 Cohort*

$N = 39$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 1</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 5</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survey Descriptive Statistics*

The study participants included $n = 56$ respondents to the questionnaire distributed at the end of the Fall 2012 semester to the cohort enrolled in the CLST 103 course (see Appendix A). Due to the fact that the survey was blindly responded to by students, there is no way of knowing if all respondents were among the AW student population. Any LU student could have enrolled in CLST 103 during the Fall 2012
semester. The total enrolled cohort in CLST 103 during the Fall 2012 semester was \( n = 107 \). The results of the survey are listed below (Table 12). The students were asked to respond to five total questions, based on a Likert-style questionnaire with responses ranging from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree.”

Based on the results of the questionnaire, the majority of the students either agreed or strongly agreed that CLST 103 was generally a helpful course. Question 1 asked if the personalized IDAA style conferences with the professor helped them to reach their academic goals as a student; an average of \( M = .86 \) agreed or strongly agreed that the course had helped. Question 2 asked if the academic advice provided through this course had helped them to improve academically as a student; an average of \( M = .86 \) responded that they agreed or strongly agreed. Question 3 asked if the assistance provided by specific measures in the form of offering academic support service(s) (ex. filing repeats, tutoring options, study strategies etc.) provided in this course had helped the students to function and perform better at this university; an average of \( M = .91 \) responded that they agreed or strongly agreed. Question 4 asked if the overall structure of this course, including all academic advising meetings as well as the academic support service(s) provided in this course, had helped them to improve as a student; an average of \( M = .88 \) agreed or strongly agreed that the course had helped. Question 5 asked if the student would recommend this specific course to anyone who had encountered academic challenges; an average of \( M = .88 \) agreed or strongly agreed that they would recommend the course. An average of \( M = .88 \) agreed or strongly agreed with all five questions,
demonstrating that the CLST 103 course, including IDAA and additional academic support services, had been beneficial to their academic improvement and overall success.

Table 12

Survey Descriptive Statistics for CLST 103 Fall 2012 Cohort

\( N = 56 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 1</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 5</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study participants included \( n = 93 \) respondents to the questionnaire distributed at the end of the Fall 2012 semester to the cohort enrolled in the CLST 105 course (see Appendix A). Due to the fact that the survey was blindly responded to by students, there is no way of knowing if all respondents were among the AW student population. Any LU student could have enrolled in CLST 105 during the Fall 2012 semester. The total enrolled cohort in CLST 105 during the Fall 2012 semester was \( n = 114 \). The results of the survey are listed below (Table 13). The students were asked to respond to five total questions, based on a Likert-style questionnaire with responses ranging from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree.”
Based on the results of the questionnaire, the majority of the students either agreed or strongly agreed that CLST 105 was very helpful to their academic progress. Question 1 asked if the personalized IDAA style conferences with the professor helped them to reach their academic goals as a student; an average of $M = .89$ agreed or strongly agreed that the course had helped. Question 2 asked if the academic advice provided through this course had helped them to improve academically as a student; almost all students, an average of $M = .93$, responded that they agreed or strongly agreed. Question 3 asked if the assistance provided by specific measures in the form of offering academic support service(s) (ex. filing repeats, tutoring options, study strategies etc.) provided in this course had helped the students to function and perform better as at this university; again almost all students, an average of $M = .83$, responded that they agreed or strongly agreed. Question 4 asked if the overall structure of this course, including all academic advising meetings as well as the academic support service(s) provided in this course, had helped them to improve as a student; once more, all but one student, an average of $M = .89$, agreed or strongly agreed that the course had helped. Question 5 asked if the student would recommend this specific course to anyone who had encountered academic challenges; an average of $M = .87$ agreed or strongly agreed that they would recommend the course. An average of $M = .88$ agreed or strongly agreed with all five questions, demonstrating that the CLST 105 course during the Fall 2012 semester, including IDAA and additional academic support services, had provided a tremendous benefit to their academic improvement and overall success.
Survey Descriptive Statistics for CLST 105 Fall 2012 Cohort

$N = 93$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 1</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 5</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

The results of the ANCOVA met the appropriate level for the test of the homogeneity of regression. Also, use of a scatter plot demonstrated that there was a linear relationship relative to the homogeneity of variance. The ANCOVA test, conducted to accept or reject the null hypothesis $H_0$, demonstrated that the results were not significant, indicating that the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. There is no statistically significant difference where $F(5, 537) = 2.82$, $p = .016$, for the level of significance $\alpha = .01$, suggesting that there is not a strong relationship between the post-semester GPAs and that they were not a result of student enrollment in the CLST 103 and CLST 105 courses during the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters. The $p$-value=.016 was not considerably beyond the level of significance $\alpha = .01$, although the hypotheses are correctly not rejected.
When using the supporting evidence related to the Research Questions by analyzing the post-semester mean and adjusted mean GPAs as well as the survey data obtained from the CLST 103 and CLST 105 Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 cohorts, indications exist that the CLST 105 course and the weekly form of IDAA advising offered in this course assist the students to attain higher post-semester GPAs, both during the semester that they take the course, and during the following Fall 2012 semester in the case of the CLST 105 Spring 2012 semester cohort. Additionally, the CLST 103 course and IDAA format and the related survey data indicate that the enrolled students appreciated the course and that it also aided in the attainment of higher post-semester GPAs for the Spring 2012 semester CLST 103 cohort, who’s Fall 2012 semester mean cumulative GPAs were measured.

Although the ANCOVA test demonstrated that there was no significant difference between the mean cumulative post-semester GPAs of the students enrolled in CLST 103 and CLST 105 during the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters, respectively, the additional indications could prove useful for academic advisors as they employ the IDAA method and additional academic support services in their effort to aid AW students toward the achievement of academic good standing.
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

Summary of Findings

**Summary of descriptive statistics.** The study population included 544 total students who were enrolled in either the CLST 103 course or the CLST 105 course during the Spring 2012 semester or the Fall 2012 semester. The mean post-semester GPAs for these students was measured following the specific semester that they were enrolled in the specific courses. Relative to the two Spring 2012 semester cohort groups, their Fall 2012 post-semester GPAs were also measured and compared to the other 5 cohort groups, 6 total including this group, referenced in this study (Table 1). The six cohort groups include; group 1 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=141 students, group 2 who registered for CLST 105 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=86 students, group 3 who registered for CLST 103 during the Fall 2012 semester, n=107, group 4 who registered for CLST 105 during the Fall 2012 semester, n=114, group 5 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall 2012 semester, n=57, and finally group 5 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall 2012 semester, n=39.

**Summary of null hypotheses.** The results of the ANCOVA, reflective of testing the null hypotheses HO, were not significant, indicating that the null hypotheses cannot be rejected. There is no statistically significant difference where F(5, 537) = 2.82, p = .016,
for the level of significance $\alpha=.01$, suggesting that there is not a strong relationship between the post-semester GPAs and that they were not a result of student enrollment in the CLST 103 and CLST 105 courses during the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters, respectively (Table 4). However, there were some indications that demonstrated improved levels of achievement, based on the pairwise comparisons between the mean post-semester GPAs and the adjusted mean post-semester GPAs.

**Summary of research questions.** The research questions ask if one group of academically at-risk students, mandated to receive either one IDAA encounter or multiple IDAA encounters during a semester, and to perform academic skills assignments that were associated with their self-assessed academic improvement need area, or engaged on a weekly basis, would demonstrate academic improvement when their potential improvement was measured at the end of the Spring and/or Fall 2012 semester relative to their cohort group, and compared to the potential improvement demonstrated by the other 5 cohort groups, 6 total including this group, referenced in this study (Table 1). The six cohort groups include; group 1 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=141 students, group 2 who registered for CLST 105 during the Spring 2012 semester, n=86 students, group 3 who registered for CLST 103 during the Fall 2012 semester, n=107, group 4 who registered for CLST 105 during the Fall 2012 semester, n=114, group 5 who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall 2012 semester, n=57, and finally group 5
who registered for CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester and returned to enroll for classes during the Fall 2012 semester, n=39.

According to pairwise comparisons of means and adjusted means between a specific cohort group and the additional groups referenced in this study, these comparisons, while not significant, demonstrate that the mean cumulative GPAs and adjusted cumulative GPAs of certain cohort groups were higher than those mean cumulative GPAs of other groups. The two groups who enrolled in the CLST 103 or CLST 105 during the Spring 2012 semester and had their mean post-semester GPA measured at the end of the Fall 2012 semester demonstrated significant improvement during the semester following their enrollment in their course (Table 6; Table 8).

Summary of survey descriptive statistics. The surveys were distributed to the students enrolled in the CLST 103 and 105 courses during the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters. Question number 4 asked if the overall structure of the course, including all academic advising meetings, as well as the academic support service(s) provided in the course, had helped them to improve as a student; an average of $M = .86$ agreed or strongly agreed that the course had helped. These students were from the CLST 103 Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 cohorts (Table 10; Table 12).

Question number 4 asked if the overall structure of this course, including all academic advising meetings as well as the academic support service(s) provided in this course, had helped them to improve as a student; an average of $M = .89$ agreed or strongly agreed that the course had helped. These students were from the CLST 105
Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 cohorts (Table 11; Table 13). The responses provided to these questions indicate that the students believed that both course formats, including the IDAA academic advising meeting types and the academic support services offered in the different courses, helped them to improve as students during that specific semester of enrollment. Responses to the other four survey questions similarly demonstrated that the students found the course structure, IDAA advising format offered, and additional academic support offered were generally helpful to their academic development as well as aiding their ability to more successfully integrate into the university.

**Discussion of Findings and Implications**

**Discussion of descriptive statistics.** The study population included 544 total students who were enrolled in either the CLST 103 course or the CLST 105 course during the Spring 2012 semester or the Fall 2012 semester. The mean post-semester GPAs for these students were measured following the specific semester that they were enrolled in the specific courses. Relative to the two Spring 2012 semester cohort groups, their Fall 2012 post-semester GPAs were measured and compared to the other groups.

The descriptive statistics associated with this study imply concepts for future research related to this group. Records for the four cohort groups measured for post-semester GPAs at six different times indicated that the Spring 2012 cohorts who enrolled in CLST 103 and CLST 105 during that semester suffered the attrition of many members of those cohort groups prior to their return to campus for the Fall 2012 semester (Table 1). The Spring 2012 semester CLST 103 cohort group enrolled $n=141$ AW students
during that semester. During the Fall 2012 semester \( n=57 \) students returned to campus, and their Fall 2012 post-semester GPAs were included in the study. A total of 60% of the students did not return to enroll in LU for the Fall 2012 semester from this cohort. The national average related to undergraduate student retention rates generally demonstrates that 33% of all students may persist to graduation in 5 years (Tinto, 2004).

This average is diminished by the circumstances associated with those students in an academically at-risk student population. This study demonstrated that 40% of all AW students in this cohort returned to continue to work toward academic good standing. This provides a positive implication, particularly if 33% of this original population were able to continue to persist toward good standing and ultimately graduation. The CLST 103 course provided assistance to these students via one IDAA academic advising meeting and a self-assessment of the student’s greatest area of academic weakness.

The Spring 2012 semester CLST 105 cohort group enrolled \( n=86 \) AW students during that semester. During the Fall 2012 semester \( n=39 \) students returned to campus, and their Fall 2012 post-semester GPAs were included in the study. A total of 55% of the students did not return to enroll at LU for the Fall 2012 semester from this cohort. This study demonstrated that over 45% of all AW students in this cohort returned to continue to work toward academic good standing. This provides a positive implication, particularly if 33% of this original population were able to continue to persist toward good standing and ultimately graduation (Tinto, 2004). The CLST 105 course provided assistance to these students via a weekly IDAA academic advising meeting and regularly
offered academic support modules that were encountered on a weekly basis when the students attended the course.

**Discussion of null hypotheses.** The results of the ANCOVA, reflective of testing the null hypotheses HO, were not significant, indicating that the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. There is no statistically significant difference where $F(5, 537) = 2.82$, $p = .016$, for the level of significance $\alpha = .01$, suggesting that there was not a strong relationship between the post-semester GPAs and that they were not a result of students’ enrollment in the CLST 103 and CLST 105 courses during the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters, respectively (Table 4).

The study demonstrated that the null hypotheses were not rejected. The results of the ANCOVA demonstrated that the CLST 103 and CLST 105 course did not have a significant impact on the post-semester GPAs. The $p$-value of $p = .016$ demonstrated a difference of .006, when the level of significance was set at $\alpha = .01$ because $N \geq 500$, where $N = 544$ total post-semester GPAs measured. The study implies that there was a potential to reject the null hypotheses if additional measurement of the CLST 103 and CLST 105 cohorts’ Fall 2012 semester and post-Spring 2013 semester cumulative GPAs could have been taken. Those data were not available at the time of the study and were not able to be included. However, the difference of $p = .006$ relative to the level of significance $\alpha = .01$ implies that additional data could have potentially allowed a rejection of the null hypotheses HO. This also implies that the CLST 103 and CLST 105 courses could demonstrate that the academic support services and IDAA advising structures
offered through these courses could have a more significant impact on the students’ cumulative GPAs if they were measured at the end of the semester after they were enrolled in the course, as well as after the semester of their enrollment in the course, for all AW students who were included in the study.

**Discussion of research questions.** The research questions, in summary ask; if one group of academically at-risk students mandated to either receive only one IDAA encounter or multiple IDAA encounters during a semester, and perform academic skills assignments that were associated with their self-assessed academic improvement need area or, when students engaged academic support service offerings on a weekly basis, did the different cohorts demonstrate academic improvement when their potential improvement was measured at the end of the Spring and/or Fall 2012 semester relative to their cohort group, and compared to the potential improvement demonstrated by the additional groups referenced in this study. According to pairwise comparisons of means and adjusted means between a specific cohort group and the additional groups referenced in this study, these comparisons, while not significant, demonstrated that the mean cumulative GPAs and adjusted cumulative GPAs of certain cohort groups were higher than those mean cumulative GPAs of other groups. The two groups who enrolled in the CLST 103 (group 5) or CLST 105 (group 6) during the Spring 2012 semester and had their mean post-semester GPA measured at the end of the Fall 2012 semester demonstrated significant improvement during the semester following their enrollment in their course (Table 6; Table 8).
The pairwise comparisons of the mean and the adjusted mean cumulative GPAs attributed to each cohort imply that the CLST 103 and CLST 105 courses could have had some impact on the post-semester GPAs relative to each cohort group. The comparison of the mean post-semester GPAs of the cohorts from CLST 103 (group 5) and CLST 105 (group 6) enrolled during Spring 2012 who had their GPAs measured following the Fall 2012 semester indicates the greatest level of improvement (Table 6; Table 8).

The CLST 105 cohort measured after Fall 2012, one semester following enrollment in the course, demonstrated improvement in their mean cumulative GPAs over all comparison groups. The CLST 103 cohort measured after Fall 2012, one semester following enrollment in the course, demonstrated improvement in their mean cumulative GPAs when measured against all comparison groups with the exception of one group. That group was the CLST 105, labeled group (6) in this study (Table 1). This implies that the CLST 103 and CLST 105 courses had an impact on the improvement of the mean cumulative GPAs of the enrolled students who persisted to complete the Fall 2012 semester following their enrollment in the course during the Spring 2012 semester.

**Discussion of survey descriptive statistics.** The surveys were distributed to the students enrolled in the CLST 103 and 105 courses during the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters. Question number 4 asked if the overall structure of this course, including all academic advising meetings as well as the academic support service(s) provided in this course, had helped the individual to improve as a student. An average of \( M = .86 \) from the CLST 103 Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 cohorts agreed or strongly agreed that the course
had helped (Table 10; Table 12). Question number 4 asked if the overall structure of this course, including all academic advising meetings as well as the academic support service(s) provided in this course, had helped them to improve as students. An average of $M = .89$ from the CLST 105 Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 cohorts agreed or strongly agreed that the course had helped (Table 11; Table 13).

The responses provided to these questions imply that the students believed that either the CLST 103 course format or the CLST 105 course format, both of which included the IDAA academic advising meetings and additional academic support services offered in their distinctive course formats, helped them to improve as students during that specific semester of enrollment. The CLST 105 cohorts responses demonstrated the higher level of course satisfaction when compared to the positive responses also supplied by those enrolled in the CLST 103 courses. Responses to the other survey questions similarly demonstrated that the students found their specific course structure to be helpful to their academic development and to their university integration.

More specifically comparing the survey respondents $M = .83$ of the students enrolled in CLST 103 during the Spring 2012 semester to the $M = .95$ of students enrolled in the CLST 105 course during the Spring 2012 semester, two conclusions can be derived from the surveys. The students enrolled in CLST 105 believed that the course provided greater academic advising and additional support services, which helped lead to greater levels of academic success. They also believed that the more intensive format of IDAA and introductions to LU academic support services, such as filing paperwork,
helped their academic adjustment to LU. The Robbins et al. (2004) study discussed the idea that self-efficacy can assist students regarding their academic achievement level.

Two additional studies that discuss a significant correlation between more intense levels of IDAA and academic improvement. In those studies the more intensive IDAA provided during a specific time frame resulted in higher levels of academic achievement. This implies that the CLST 105 course, based on survey results, allowed the students to believe that the more intensive IDAA provided in that course helped them to succeed at a higher level academically (Abelman & Molina, 2001; Kirk-Kuwaye & Nishida, 2001; Molina & Abelman, 2000). The results of this study may not have demonstrated a significant relationship between academic achievement and intrusive academic advising assisting students to greater levels of academic achievement; however, based on the results of the surveyed students in the different course formats, the more intensive IDAA assisted the students to achieve at a higher level.

Outline of Study Limitations

Limitations. This research study is limited by the following factors:

1. Possible differences in the study habits of any individual academically at-risk student achieved throughout the semester cannot be measured or evaluated as a part of this study.

2. Any potential differences in the motivation level of a specific academically at-risk student cannot be measured or evaluated as a part of this study.
3. Any potential differences in the test-taking habits of a specific academically at-risk student cannot be measured or evaluated as a part of this study (Robbins et al., 2004).

4. This study measured the mean cumulative GPAs of the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 cohort groups of AW students enrolled in CLST 103 and CLST 105 during the Spring 2012 or Fall 2012 semesters, when they were enrolled in the respective courses. Also, this study measured the mean cumulative GPAs of the Spring 2012 cohort groups following the Fall 2012 semester, after they had completed the CLST 103 or 105 courses during the previous semester.

5. This study did not measure the mean cumulative GPAs of the Fall 2012 cohort groups enrolled in CLST 103 and CLST 105 during the Spring 2013 semester, after they had completed the CLST 103 or 105 courses during the previous semester.

Assumptions. The following assumptions apply to this research study:

1. The cumulative GPA data used in the study were accurately calculated and reported. They were based on each academically at-risk student’s cumulative GPA, as it was calculated prior to the beginning and after the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters.

2. The random assignment of the at-risk students occurred based on using the LU personnel’s review of each student’s semester schedule and randomly
assigning each student to one CLST 103 or 105 course, at their request, which fit into that semester’s class schedule.

3. No student identifiers were used to randomly assign students to any groups.

4. Demographic characteristics were not factors in determining the cumulative GPAs of the students.

5. All Academic Warning (AW) students, which includes Academic Probation (AP) and Academic Suspension (AS) students who were enrolled in either CLST 103 or CLST 105 during the Spring and Fall 2012 semesters, respectively, were included in the calculation and comparison of the groups’ mean pre- and post-semester cumulative GPAs.

6. The measurement of the mean cumulative GPAs for the Spring 2012 cohort groups only, during the following semester, strengthen the results of the study by implying that the CLST 103 and CLST 105 courses taken during the previous semester demonstrate a potentially lasting effect on improved future academic success.

7. Any potential lasting effects implied by the measuring of post-semester cumulative GPAs of the Spring 2012 cohort groups after the Fall 2012 semester cannot be distinguished as statistically significant.
8. Lasting effect can only be measured by considering the results of a separate follow-up longitudinal study of both the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 cohort groups following post-semester cumulative GPAs.

9. The students who were not AW students were excluded from the final data analysis.

10. This study was designed to measure the potential influence of IDAA and additional academic services encounters on the cumulative GPAs of academically at-risk students. The procedural aspects of this specific study began with the random enrollment of the AW academically at-risk students in the CLST 103 or CLST 105 courses prior to the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 semesters by a designated representative of the LU CASAS LC.

Methodology and Practical Implications

Evidence has demonstrated the effectiveness of combining IDAA with additional academic support services when advisors are working with academically at-risk students (Austin et al., 1997; Earl, 1988; Heisserer & Parette, 2002; Kirk-Kuwaye & Nishida, 2001; Mann et al., 2003/2004; Molina & Abelman, 2000). This research study was not dependent on individual students’ mean cumulative GPA comparisons, but rather on the aggregate of cumulative GPA means for each group of academically at-risk students who encountered all pre-assigned encounters. These comparisons occurred through calculating the mean GPAs prior to and after the Spring and Fall 2012 semesters.
These factors allowed the potential academic achievement effect, of randomly assigning these students to encounter more intensive levels of academic support services and IDAA, to become apparent. Factors that could have presented themselves as threats to the internal validity of this study were controlled via the appropriate data analysis methodology formats (Ary et al., 2006; Howell, 2008; Pallant, 2010).

Other factors that could have impacted the post-semester cumulative GPAs of the students were considered to be a part of the normal interaction of academically at-risk students with the campus environment. Potential influences, such as a difference in study habits achieved throughout the semester by a specific academically at-risk student, differences in test taking (or other assessment skills), or improved motivation, were not measured or evaluated as a part of this study. Data related to these potential differences cannot be obtained.

Potential threats to the external validity of the study, such as personal attitude changes, the impact of the IDAAI or other academic support services encounters on the students improved levels of motivation, the campus setting, or the fact that no novelty effect could be present, due to the blind course assignment that transpired when the at-risk students were assigned to a section of the CLST 103 or CLST 105 course, were all considered appropriate and as factors germane to a college student’s development (Ary et al., 2006; Hagen & Jordan, 2008). The other extraneous variables were considered; thus, the results could be generalized to each group of academically at-risk students that was considered in this study. The Robbins et al. (2004) study concluded that some of these
factors did not have as significant an influence on academic achievement of at-risk students as some of the factors more closely related to IDAA and other academic support services encounters.

Methodology was likely positively impacted by the construction of the assistance specifically provided to academically at-risk students enrolled at LU. The CLST 103 or CLST 105 courses offered by the LU CASAS Learning Center allowed for the students to enter a structured array of course offering specifically targeted to assist the academic persistence and academic improvement of the AW academically at-risk student population at LU. Other campuses may not offer a set of courses designed to assist this population through the use of IDAA and additional academic support services offered in various formats.

The CLST 103 and CLST 105 courses also provide surveys for the students, which are a part of the student’s course review. These surveys were altered for this study. They were distributed in the same format of the course during previous semesters that were not a part of this study. This allowed for the collection of additional survey data and offered additional insight into the AW students’ perceptions relative to the assistance provided to them through the specific CLST 103 and CLST 105 course formats.

Finally, the ability for the LU LC to collect specific post-semester GPA data related to its AW student population provides practical implications for other campuses. The construction of the LC and its ability to offer targeted assistance to its academically at-risk student populations allows for them to continue to track the academic progress as
well as student attrition rates of their AW students who enrolled in their CLST courses designed to assist this student population. The LS advising faculty can track these students during their semester of enrollment in the CLST courses and beyond that semester. Studies demonstrate that well designed and structured academic support service offerings and IDAA support offered to assist the academically at-risk student population at specific institutions of higher education help these students persevere at higher rates toward academic success and graduation (Abelman & Molina, 2001; Austin et al., 1997; Earl, 1988; Garnett, 1990; Hoyt & Lundell, 2003; Kirk-Kuwaye & Nishida, 2001; Lipsky & Ender, 1990; Mann et al., 2003/2004; Molina & Abelman, 2000; Thomas & Minton, 2004; Tinto, 2004).

Recommendations for Future Research

The results of this study imply that future research studies can be designed to advance the academic support services offerings combined with the IDAA advising offerings that can result in offering more structured programs intended to assist the academic development of academically at-risk students. This study employed a structured offering of academic support modules combined with IDAA advising provided in a prearranged course setting. The results of the study indicated that the structure of these combined offerings aided the students in making progress toward academic good standing. The results also implied that additional measurements of GPA outcomes during subsequent semesters could help IDAA academic advisors design more beneficial combinations of academic support service offerings and IDAA advising that would
impact the students during the semester of encounter, and beyond if they persist academically. These outcomes measured in a longitudinal format, gauging post-semester GPA outcomes for the students in the semesters following their enrollment, can provide useful information relative to persistence rates among academically at-risk students and achievement rates relative to this population.

The study also indicated that surveyed students stated that they benefitted from the combined offerings of academic support and IDAA advising. Additional studies could track their rates of persistence and attainment while presenting them with follow-up surveys that measure their perceptions of the impact that the academic support service offerings and IDAA advising had on their continuing academic pursuits. A phenomenological study could also be conducted, related to the students perceptions of the factors that led to their academically at-risk student status as well as their perceptions of the specific forms of IDAA advising and academic support assistance that aided them in their pursuit of academic achievement. This type of study could also help to provide academic advisors with insight relative to the students who choose not to persist in their endeavor to attain an undergraduate degree from the university (Tinto, 2004). Future research related to this study could help academic advisors who work with this population to construct better offerings of IDAA academic advising and additional support services that help academically at-risk students persist toward good standing and, ultimately, graduation at improved rates.
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APPENDIX A

Questionnaire
CLST 105 and CLST 103 - End of Course Questionnaire

1. The face-to-face conferences with the professor of this course have helped me reach my academic goals as a student.

   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
   | Strongly Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Agree |
   | Agree | Disagree |

2. The academic advice provided through this course has helped me to improve academically as a student.

   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
   | Strongly Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Agree |
   | Agree | Disagree |

3. The academic support service(s) (ex. study strategies, filing repeats, tutoring options, etc.) provided in this course have helped me to function and perform better as a student at this university.

   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
   | Strongly Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Agree |
   | Agree | Disagree |

4. Overall, the format of this course, including all academic advice as well as the academic support service(s) provided in this course have helped me to improve as a student.

   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
   | Strongly Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Agree |
   | Agree | Disagree |

5. I would recommend this specific course to anyone who has encountered academic challenges.

   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
   | Strongly Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Agree |
   | Agree | Disagree |
APPENDIX B

CLST 103 Course Syllabus
LIBERTY UNIVERSITY
CLST 103-Individualized Lab in Reading and Study Strategies (1 credit hour)
Fall 2011

Professor: __________________________________________
Email: __________________________________________
Phone: __________________________________________
Office: __________________________________________

I. Course Description
   This course is an individualized program in reading and study strategies based on students' goals and assessed needs. The varied curriculum focuses on academic, personal, and/or spiritual domains. It is delivered in a lab format with faculty/student interaction.

II. Rationale
   Some students who enter college lacking adequate preparation need individualized assistance in one or more specific study areas. Other students may desire to further improve their reading and study skills through a personalized program. This course is designed to help students 'enhance their academic success' by achieving their specific academic goals.

III. Prerequisite statement
   No prerequisite required.

IV. Materials Listed
   A. Law-margined paper (or Summary-Ruled), College-Ruled paper, blue or black pen, and red pen
   B. Study materials will be provided by the Brockner Learning Center and must be returned to the center after each session.
   C. Students are strongly advised to maintain a three-ring loose-leaf notebook containing notes from all classes.
   D. For Students specifically taking this 103 course to complete the iLearn Math Program you will need to go through www.ilearnstore.com/liberty to purchase the key code.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>City/State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iLearn Math Student Key</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>iLearn, Inc.</td>
<td>Marietta, GA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. Learning Outcomes
The student will be able to:
   A. assess strengths/weaknesses in reading/study skills strategies by completing a personal analysis.
   B. classify personal study skills needs according to perceived priorities.
   C. employ a variety of audio and visual materials in completing assignments, utilizing a variety of learning modalities.
   D. apply appropriate materials to aid in achieving individual academic, personal, and spiritual goals.
   E. understand the relationship between biblical values and academic knowledge in developing a Biblical/Christian Worldview.

VI. Assignments/Requirements
   A. Assignments
      1. Student will write an Autobiography including, but not limited to, personal background, Christian testimony and academic strengths and weaknesses. This will be completed online with specific directions. (Learning Outcomes A & E)
      2. Student will initially prioritize perceived study skills needs by completing an Information Sheet. This will be completed in class with guidance from the instructor. (Learning Outcome B)
      3. Student will set at least six measurable academic, personal, and spiritual goals. This will be completed in class with guidance from the instructor. (Learning Outcome D)
4. Student will maintain a folder with all ungraded work and records for the course in neat and complete order. Written work, based on individual assignments, is required daily for credit to be given. Specific directions will be included in folder. (Learning Outcome A, B, C, D, & E)

5. Student will complete a pre-test with the Buckner Learning Center Study Skills Assessment and a post-test before the final conference. This will be completed in class with guidance from the instructor. (Learning Outcome A & D)

6. Student will have one on one interaction with the professor to discuss skills covered, future curriculum decisions, and spiritual development. (Learning Outcome B, D, & E)

B. Assignment Requirements
   1. Write neatly and legibly.
      a. Law-margin paper is required for all work which involves notetaking.
      b. College ruled paper is required for all work which involves answering exercises and summaries.
   2. Label each page.
      a. Name in upper right-hand corner.
      b. Class and section number in upper right-hand corner.
      c. Date work daily in upper right-hand corner.
      d. On top line put number and title of CQJVO or author and title of book (underlined).
      e. Grade all work in red pen and correct errors.
   3. Complete Progress Record chart daily.
   4. When each assignment is complete, staple those papers together. Return completed work in folder to professor as directed.
   5. Student will make an individual contract with the professor to work TWENTY-FIVE (25) HOURS on reading and/or study strategies of need or choice. ***FAILURE TO COMPLETE THE 25 HOUR CONTRACT WILL RESULT IN A GRADE OF F OR FN IN THE COURSE.
   6. During completion of the last session of the Twenty-five (25) hours, student must complete an evaluation and have an exit conference with their professor.

VII. Grading Policies
   A. Student will be graded on CONTENT OF WORK, ORGANIZATION OF MATERIAL, AND ACTIVE ENGAGEMENT.

   B. This course may NOT be dropped by students who are on Academic Warning/Probation.

   C. For students on Academic Warning/Probation, as stated in the Liberty University Catalog: "a grade of C or better must be earned or the course must be RETAKEN in the SUBSEQUENT semester."

   D. By September 23rd (MWF), September 22nd (TR) students are to have completed at least 12 1/2 hours. Failure to complete this time will result in a penalty of 60 points for MWF or 40 points for TR. Following this halfway mark, a mid-term grade will be posted.

   E. Failure to meet the exit conference requirement will result in the loss of 10 attendance points.

POINT CHART FOR MWF AND TR CLASSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MWF</th>
<th>TR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autobiography</td>
<td>10 pts.</td>
<td>10 pts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Points, 32 points/session (30 sessions total)</td>
<td>960 pts.</td>
<td>960 pts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckner Learning Center Study Skills Assessment</td>
<td>30 pts.</td>
<td>30 pts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1000 pts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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POINT CHART FOR MWF AND TR CLASSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>MWF</th>
<th>TR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active Engagement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record the following on each assignment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name, class, date, And ...</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author, title of book, article, CD, DVD, or computer program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record daily on chart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date, time arrived, time left, and total time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of Materials Used; book, article, CD, DVD or computer program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record stopping point; page or exercise number, track on CD or DVD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures: Correlate note taking format</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable content and progress for time spent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GRADING SCALE FOR MWF AND TR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>100% - 90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>89% - 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>79% - 70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>69% - 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>59% - 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VIII. Attendance Policies

A. For the good of the Liberty University student body, a consistent attendance policy is needed so that all students in all majors will understand the expectations of faculty in all their courses. In general, regular and punctual attendance in all classes is expected of all students. At times, students will miss classes. These absences will be identified as either excused or unexcused and will be handled per the policy below.

1. Excused Absences
   a. Excused absences include all Liberty University sponsored events, to include athletic competition or other provost-approved event.
   b. Absences due to medical illness that are accompanied by a doctor’s note will be excused.
   c. Absences due to family situations such as a death in the family or a severe medical condition will be excused.
   d. Students will not be penalized for excused absences and will be permitted to make arrangements to complete missed work.

2. Unexcused Absences
   a. Classes that meet:
      i. Three times per week will permit three unexcused absences per semester.
      ii. Twice per week will permit two unexcused absences per semester.
      iii. Once per week will permit one unexcused absence per semester.
   b. Questions regarding unexcused absences must be resolved by the student with the professor within one week of the absence.
   c. Extraordinary circumstances regarding excessive absences will be addressed by the student with the faculty member, department chair, and dean as required.
   d. Penalties for each unexcused absence over the permitted number per semester will be as follows:
      i. 50 points for classes that meet 3 times per week
      ii. 75 points for classes that meet 2 times per week
      iii. 150 points for classes that meet once per week
e. Students who are late for class 10 minutes or less are considered tardy but present for the class. If a student misses in-class work due to tardiness, the faculty member may choose not to allow the student to make up this work. Three class tardies will be counted as one unexcused absence.

f. Students who are more than 10 minutes late for class are considered absent.

B. Student must write excuse in folder on the class day following absence and will be required to show professor ORIGINAL documentation of illness or emergency for an absence to be excused.

C. ALL work is to be made up within ONE WEEK of absence at a time other than class time. Excused absences will receive full work points. Unexcused work will receive half work points.

D. With special permission and arrangements with the professor, students may come as often as they choose above and beyond the scheduled times. ALL WORK MUST BE COMPLETED BY November 2nd (MWF) OR November 1st (TR).

E. Student must respond to professor telephone call/email within 24 hours. Any e-mail correspondence will be through your Liberty account.

F. Student is not to leave class unless there is an emergency. If an emergency occurs, sign out on Progress Record and leave folder with the professor in charge at that class time.

IX. Other Policies

Dress Code
Students are expected to come to class dressed in a manner consistent with The Liberty Way.

Honor Code
We, the students, faculty, and staff of Liberty University, have a responsibility to uphold the moral and ethical standards of this institution and personally conform those who do not.

Academic Misconduct
Academic misconduct includes: academic dishonesty, plagiarism, and falsification. See The Liberty Way for specific definitions, penalties, and processes for reporting.

Disability Statement
Students with a documented disability may contact the Office of Disability Academic Support (DOAS) in DH 2016 to make arrangements for academic accommodations. For all disability testing accommodation requests (i.e. quieter environment, extended time, oral testing) the Tutoring/Testing Center is the officially designated place for all tests administered outside of the regular classroom.

DROP ADD POLICY
A Fallspring course may be dropped without a grade, tuition, and fee charges within the first five days of the semester. From the sixth day until the last day of class, a Fallspring course may be withdrawn with a grade of W.

Classroom Policies
The inappropriate use of technology, such as cell phones, iPods, laptops, calculators, etc. in the classroom is not tolerated. Other disruptive behavior in the classroom is not tolerated. Students who engage in such misconduct will be subject the penalties and processes as written in The Liberty Way.

X. Calendar for the semester/term

September 23rd (MWF) or September 22nd (TR) students are to have completed at least 12 1/2 hours.

November 2nd (MWF) or November 1st (TR) students are to have all 25 hours of work completed.

This laboratory class meets as regularly scheduled; topics and work are individually assigned.

XI. Bibliography
A plethora of books, Ebooks, textbooks, articles, CDs, DVDs, and computer programs are available for student use in our Bruckner Learning Center Resource area. A detailed bibliography is located at the counter in the Center.
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APPENDIX C

CLST 105 Course Syllabus
LIBERTY UNIVERSITY
CLST 105—Strategies for the Application of College Learning Skills (1 credit hour)
Spring Semester 2012 (Tuesday)

Dr. Heather Schoffstall
hschoffstall@liberty.edu
Office Phone: (434)582-2218
DH 3000, Le Bruckner Learning Center
Office Hours posted on Blackboard

I. Course Description

This course provides strategies that will enable students to apply college learning skills to their current courses. It incorporates one-on-one mentoring, as well as weekly accountability. It is designed to foster an awareness of current academic progress and to encourage the motivation and responsibility necessary for academic success.

II. Rationale

Some students need additional instruction in transitioning from the acquisition of study skills to the application of those skills in their coursework. This instruction will equip students with the skills needed to achieve greater academic success.

III. Prerequisite Statement

None

IV. Materials List

No textbook required
Some printing required

V. Learning Outcomes

The student will be able to
A. assess their strengths and weaknesses in reading and study skills strategies by completing topical weekly reflections.
B. design a personalized study plan and implement it weekly.
C. demonstrate specific study skills by completing application-based assignments.
D. display an understanding of the relationship between biblical values and academic knowledge in developing a biblical/Christian worldview. (class discussion and individual conferences)
E. demonstrate an understanding of the relationship between their academic standing, goals, and career aspirations.

VI. Assignments/Requirements

A. Assignments
1. Print current transcript. Use that information to complete the Introduction Paper.
2. Introduction Paper (Learning Outcomes D, E)
   a. 2-page minimum, 12 point font
   b. Use proper grammar, spelling, and punctuation
   c. Answer the following:
      i. What is your current academic standing?
      ii. What do you feel are the reasons for your present academic standing?
      (Good/Warning/Probation/Suspension)
      iii. List the classes from your transcript for which you have the following grades: D, F, FN or R.
      iv. What are your typical study habits? Give some examples.
      v. What study habits do you need to improve?
      vi. What distractions, if any, typically prevent you from successfully completing your assignments?
      vii. What weekly activities contribute to your spiritual life? (church attendance, devotions, prayer, etc.) This would be a good place to share your personal Christian testimony.
      viii. In what extracurricular activities are you involved? (work, sports, organizations, pastimes, etc.)
      ix. What is your family's academic history? Are you a first-generation college student or did your parents or siblings go to college?
      x. Describe your motivations for continuing your education.
      xi. What is something interesting that you would like to share about yourself?
2. Reflection Paper (Learning Outcomes D, E)
   a. 2-page minimum, 12 point font
   b. Use proper grammar, spelling, and punctuation
   c. Answer the following:
      i. Based on your completed degree completion plan, how many more classes are you required to take in order to complete your degree? How many semesters will it take?
      ii. In what ways have your family, financial, work and/or academic issues affected your academic performance this semester? Explain.
      iii. How has your spiritual life affected your academic performance?
      iv. If you are doing better academically, what obstacles, if any, have you had to overcome?
      v. Identify your academic and/or career goals. Describe your motivation to achieve them.
      vi. What accomplishments are you most proud of this semester?

3. Weekly Study Log (Learning Outcome B) – Students will outline steps to successful completion of weekly assignments (readings, papers, quizzes, tests, etc.) from all courses on their current academic schedule.

4. Weekly Self-Assessment and Review (Learning Outcome A) – Students will identify strengths and weaknesses related to various study skills. An improvement plan with proposed changes will then be designed and implemented based on these findings. Students will reflect on these assessments during the last day of class.

5. Individual Assignments (Learning Outcome C) – Students will complete application-based weekly assignments resulting from their study log, weekly reflection, and professor input. These assignments may be in the form of note cards, self-tests, study guides, Cornell notes from a textbook chapter, timelines, comparison charts or any instructor-approved study tool.

6. Monthly Calendars (Learning Outcome B) – Students will complete monthly calendars that will include dates for tests, quizzes, projects and other assignments.

7. Grade Printouts from Blackboard (Learning Outcome E) – Students will print and turn in current grades from all classes in which they are enrolled.

B. Requirements

1. For students on Academic Warning/Probation, as stated in the Liberty University Catalog: “a grade of C or better must be earned or the course must be RETAKEN in the SUBSEQUENT semester.
2. Arrangements will be made for progress conferences with the professor on a regular basis.
3. Students must bring appropriate materials (books/textbooks/notes) for in-class activities.
4. Outside assignments must be completed and turned in weekly.

VII. Grading Policies

Students will be graded on participation and the successful completion of assignments as indicated below. Participation includes being active in classroom discussions, completing class assignments and having appropriate materials for independent work.

Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation, 20 points/session (13 sessions total)</th>
<th>200 pts. 20%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction Paper</td>
<td>70 pts. 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Logs (10 at 20 points each)</td>
<td>200 pts. 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Self-Assessments (8 at 20 points each)</td>
<td>160 pts. 16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Calendars (3 at 20 points each)</td>
<td>60 pts. 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Printouts (2 at 20 points each)</td>
<td>40 pts. 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Assessment Review</td>
<td>40 pts. 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Assignments (5 at 20 points each)</td>
<td>100 pts. 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection Paper</td>
<td>70 pts. 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,000 pts. 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grading Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>900 – 1000</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800 – 899</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700 – 799</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600 – 699</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>599 and below</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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VIII. Liberty University Attendance Policy (As of September 15, 2016):
For the good of the Liberty University student body, a consistent attendance policy is needed so that all students in all majors will understand the expectations of faculty in all their courses. In general, regular and punctual attendance in all classes is expected of all students. At times, students will miss classes. These absences will be identified as either excused or unexcused and will be handled per the policy below.

Excused Absences
- Excused absences include all Liberty University sponsored events, to include athletic competition or other provost-approved event.
- Absences due to medical illness that are accompanied by a doctor’s note will be excused.
- Absences due to family situations such as a death in the family or a severe medical condition will be excused.
- Students will not be penalized for excused absences and will be permitted to make arrangements to complete missed work.

Unexcused Absences
- Classes that meet:
  - Three times per week will permit three unexcused absences per semester.
  - Twice per week will permit two unexcused absences per semester.
  - Once per week will permit one unexcused absence per semester.
- Questions regarding unexcused absences must be resolved by the student with the professor within one week of the absence. Students may appeal these decisions to the respective dean within one week.
- Extraordinary circumstances regarding excessive absences will be addressed by the student with the faculty member, department chair, and dean as required.
- Penalties for each unexcused absence over the permitted number per semester will be as follows:
  - 50 points for classes that meet 3 times per week
  - 75 points for classes that meet 2 times per week
  - 100 points for classes that meet once per week
- Students who are late for class 10 minutes or less are considered tardy but present for the class. If a student misses in-class work due to tardiness, the faculty member may choose not to allow the student to make up this work. Three class tardies will be counted as one unexcused absence. Students who are more than 10 minutes late for class are considered absent.

IX. Other Policies

Dress Code
- Students are expected to come to class dressed in a manner consistent with The Liberty Way or risk being asked to leave class and lose attendance points.

Honor Code
- We, the students, faculty, and staff of Liberty University, have a responsibility to uphold the moral and ethical standards of this institution and personally confront those who do not.

Academic Misconduct
- Academic misconduct includes: academic dishonesty, plagiarism, and falsification. See The Liberty Way for specific definitions, penalties, and processes for reporting.

Disability Statement
- Students with a documented disability may contact the Office of Disability Academic Support in DH 2016 for arrangements for academic accommodations. For all disability testing accommodation requests (e.g. quieter environment, extended time, oral testing) the Tutoring/Testing Center (DH 309S) is the officially designated place for all tests administered outside of the regular classroom.

DROPIAD Policy
- A Fall/Spring course may be dropped without a grade, tuition, and fee charges within the first five days of the semester. From the sixth day until the last day of class, a Fall/Spring course may be withdrawn with a grade of W.

Classroom Policies
1. The inappropriate use of technology, such as cell phones, iPods, laptops, calculators, etc. in the classroom is not tolerated. Other disruptive behavior in the classroom is not tolerated. Students who engage in such misconduct will be subject to the penalties and processes as written in the Liberty Way.
2. All work is to be made up within ONE WEEK of the absence. Excused absences will receive full credit. Unexcused absences will receive partial credit for completed work (prior approval of instructor required).
3. Students must respond to professor’s telephone calls/emails within 24 hours. Any e-mail correspondence will be through your Liberty Email Account.
4. Students are not to leave class unless there is an emergency.
### Calendar for the Semester/Term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tues. Date</th>
<th>Session #</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Your Assignment (Due When Class Meets)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan 17</td>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td>INTRODUCTION Information Sheet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td>TIME MANAGEMENT Study Log 1 Weekly Self-Assessment -- Time Management</td>
<td>Introduction Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Session 3</td>
<td>ORGANIZATION Study Log 2 Weekly Self-Assessment -- Organization</td>
<td>Monthly Calendar 1 -- February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 7</td>
<td>Session 4</td>
<td>NOTE-TAKING Study Log 3 Weekly Self-Assessment -- Note-taking</td>
<td>Individual Assignment 1 — Organization -- Weekly Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Session 5</td>
<td>ADVISING Study Log 4 Weekly Self-Assessment</td>
<td>Individual Assignment 2 – Completed Degree Completion Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Session 6</td>
<td>ADVISING Study Log 5 Weekly Self-Assessment</td>
<td>Monthly Calendar 2 – March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Session 7</td>
<td>INDIVIDUAL CONFERENCES Reading</td>
<td>Grade Printouts 1 from Blackboard (Bring to conference)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 6</td>
<td>Session 8</td>
<td>READING Study Log 6 Weekly Self-Assessment -- Reading</td>
<td>MID TERM GRADES AVAILABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SPRING BREAK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Session 9</td>
<td>GOAL SETTING Study Log 7 Weekly Self-Assessment -- Goal Setting</td>
<td>Individual Assignment 2 – Reading—SQ4R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Session 10</td>
<td>CONCENTRATION MEMORY Study Log 8 Weekly Self-Assessment -- Concentration Weekly Self-Assessment -- Memory</td>
<td>Monthly Calendar 3 – April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 3</td>
<td>Session 11</td>
<td>TEST PREPARATION Study Log 9 Weekly Self-Assessment -- Test Preparation</td>
<td>Individual Assignment 4 — Memory — Note cards or other study tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Session 12</td>
<td>GPA UPDATE Study Log 10 Weekly Self-Assessment</td>
<td>Individual Assignment 5 — Test Preparation -- Final Exam Preparation Plan Grade Printouts 2 from Blackboard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Session 13</td>
<td>SELF-ASSESSMENT REVIEW AND QUESTIONNAIRE</td>
<td>Reflection Paper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>