

INTRUSIVE INTERVENTION

ENHANCING FIRST SEMESTER STUDENT SUCCESS

June 1989

Christine Starnes

John Abbott College

705538

**INTRUSIVE INTERVENTION:
ENHANCING FIRST SEMESTER STUDENT SUCCESS**

June 1989

Christine Starnes

John Abbott College



3000007055381

71-4257
705538

Depot legal - deuxieme trimestre 1989

Bibliotheque nationale du Quebec

Code de diffusion 1532-0242

I.S.B.N. 2-9800816-8-X

Additional copies of this report can be obtained by sending
a cheque for six dollars to:

Research and Development

John Abbott College

PO 2000

Ste Anne de Bellevue

Quebec H9X 3L9

A summary of the report in English or French is also available
for two dollars.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was funded by DGEC through its Programme for Aid to Research on Teaching and Learning.

"Entry '88", the experimental programme analysed here, was the result of the dedicated collaborative work of members of Group I of the College Readiness Committee, representatives of all sectors of John Abbott College.

The study would not have been possible without the co-operation of many colleagues at John Abbott College. Fifteen dedicated teachers undertook to be mentors for the "Entry '88" students, and almost fifty agreed to monitor these students. In addition, over two hundred teachers provided data on the performance of students in the experimental and control groups. Importantly, members of Student Services devoted many hours to the program. Finally, fifty students gave of their time in December to be interviewed by the researcher on their first semester experience.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I	Definition.....page 1
	Bibliography.....page 5
Chapter II	The Study.....page 8
Chapter III	The Findings - Quantitative Data.....page 12
Chapter IV	The Findings - Naturalistic Data
	A. Profiles of Successful Students.....page 19
	B. Profiles of Less Successful Students..page 29
	C. Faculty Receptiveness.....page 39
Chapter V	Implications for Teaching.....page 43
Chapter VI	Diffusion of Findings.....page 46
Chapter VII	Budget.....page 48
Appendices	1. Student Interview.....page 49
	2. Teacher Assessmentpage 50
	3. Teacher Interview.....page 51
	4. "Entry '88" Publicity.....page 52
	5. Learning Contract.....page 54

CHAPTER ONE

INTRUSIVE INTERVENTION AND THE ENTRY '88 PROGRAM

"Entry '88", an experimental program, was based on the principle of "intrusive intervention". This posits that "high risk" students need to be required to make use of learning resources during their first semester. This position is based on two givens: "high risk" students do not recognize their weaknesses and do not voluntarily make use of resources, and failing the first semester greatly decreases their chance of completing their studies,

The term "intrusive intervention" was originally coined in the context of advising (for example in Winston) and counselling where a negative self-fulfilling prophesy was evident; Moore and Carpenter (p.96) are far from alone in pointing out that it is distressingly usual for underprepared students to go to counselling only as a last resource, in other words when it is too late. Recently, the notion of not waiting for students to "hang themselves" before intervening has been generalized, as reported by Roueche in "Successful Programs", into academic preparedness programs. Previously, "the result of this failure of institutional policy to require proper [developmental] course placement means that most of the students who need academic help choose not to take the courses or programs that are offered for them" (our underlining from Roueche et al p.33). This concept of "intrusive intervention" was able to be generalized because it is based on a number of assumptions well supported by the current literature on developmental education.

First and foremost, it is difficult for many students to adapt to the "learning environment" of a college after the "teaching environment" of high school (Gardner). There are numerous variables contributing to these difficulties, but all show that "every student should learn how to study effectively and efficiently, manage time, and still have time for social and other activities" (Schmelzer, p. 265). While the majority of students arrive at college with some sense of such strategies, the underprepared students need explicit guidance in learning to learn. Also non-Anglophone students, highly motivated and competent as they usually are, may well have such general strategies but still need explicit guidance when learning in English. An emphasis on "socio-cultural and affective dimensions" is part of the current state-of-the-arts language learning (Morley, p.18).

Secondly, we cannot expect all students to assume full responsibility for their own learning when they enter the college. The documented effectiveness of mentoring programs (for

example, Haring-Hidore) in retaining "high risk" students shows the need these students have for direct guidance and individualized support. These elements can be operative in establishing a positive "locus of control" (Roueche and Luk) without which students cannot appreciate either that external outcomes depend on their own behaviour or that long-term efforts have intrinsic value. Such students are the ones we designate as lacking motivation. In the same vein, Roueche's report on a national study showed monitoring to be one of eleven elements in successful programs.

Thirdly, teaching needs to be explicit about the learning process. "L'apprentissage...est un processus long qui doit etre guide" (Saint Onge, p.15). We all know, however, that many courses--often due to Cahiers requirements to "cover" large quantities of content--follow a lecture mode that puts full responsibility for learning on a passive student. Particularly in order to be able to cope with such courses, students must be armed with explicit learning strategies. To enrich the experience of the underprepared freshman, we must have the resources to allow students to meet the objectives of, for example, Gordon's "Univeristy 101" (p.316):

- to understand maturational changes they will undergo
- to clarify why they are in college
- to obtain information about academic programs
- to understand occupational implications of their educational choices
- to become familiar with the college's procedures, resources and services.

The same priorities are seen in Morley's paradigm for second language students (p.17-18):

- focus on learners as active creators in the learning process
- focus on the individuality of learners and individual learning styles and strategies
- focus on the intellectual involvement of learners in the learning process and in content
- focus on the special language needs of particular groups of language learners.

Fourthly, and very closely related, is the principle that learning is developmental. It depends not only upon cognitive development but also on levels of affective maturation. Whatever school of psychology one endorses, the fact that not all seventeen- or eighteen-year olds have reached the same level of development is obvious. It is important to note that although these differences may be difficult to define and trace, they are often closely related to lack of success. Dramatically, Ochberg, for example, saw "vulnerable personalities" (p.291) as one of three main causes for withdrawing from college.

"Entry '88" was thus designed by members of the John Abbott College Readiness Committee as a means of implementing this principle of "intrusive intervention". The program, a cluster of integrated support systems, was targeted for two easily identified groups of "high risk" students: the "underprepared",

the border-line students admitted (mainly in Round 3) to Social Science who have low high school averages including a number of vocational or interest, rather than academic, courses; and non-Anglophones with a score below 75 or 80% on their Michigan Placement Test who were not receiving the intensive support of specialized English courses.

The program consisted of two components for each group. One took a holistic approach and sought to provide personal support and to teach students that they must accept responsibility for their own learning. The second emphasized learning to learn. Both were made explicit to the student when enrolling in the program through negotiating a form of learning-behaviour contract.

Having signed the contract, the Social Science students worked with an advisor to choose their courses from a list of courses selected by the Committee on the basis of two criteria: being truly introductory in content and being taught by teachers who had volunteered to monitor two or three of these "high risk" students. Personal support and emphasis on individual responsibility were provided not only by this monitoring in all classes but also by regular meetings, particularly at mid-semester, with a counsellor and an advisor. In addition, students were to meet regularly with a volunteer teacher/mentor, the teacher of one of the courses they had chosen from the list of introductory courses. The mentors helped the students generalize from their experience in one course and move from the "teaching environment" that characterizes high school to the "learning environment" of college.

The second component of the program, learning to learn, was initially fostered by a sequence of workshops held prior to the beginning of the semester. These focused on learning styles and problems, reading strategies, specific study skills such as note-taking, and time management. Follow-up to these intensive sessions was provided in their selected courses. The social links set up by the workshops were continued by all participants' taking the same Humanities course, the content of which addressed concepts relating to education and transition.

The program for the English as a Second Language students, not actually undertaken due to lack of enrollment, would have been different for two reasons. These students would have come from a range of programs and be successful learners in their own language. They too would have signed a contract and then received guidance in selecting---given their interests---Humanities and complementary courses with frequent and short (rather than one or two lengthy) reading and writing assignments. As these students are generally high achievers, they would not have been monitored but would have been fully supported in facing the lower marks they receive during a first semester of studying in English. During the first week of the semester there would have been a group counselling session on realistic goal setting, and prior to the withdrawal date a meeting with both a counsellor and an

advisor to review these goals and their contract. Further personal support would have been provided by a buddy system, guaranteeing regular meetings with an anglophone who knew the college and could be a peer role model. The second element, learning to learn, would have dealt with the problems of learning in a second language. The non-Anglophones workshops were to focus on reading strategies, vocabulary development, and the conventions of English prose. Follow-up would have consisted of a library orientation session in the second week of the semester, and participation in a Study Skills group from weeks 3 to 10.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Astin, Alexander W. Four Critical Years. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.
- Beal, P.E., L. Noel. What Works In Student Retention. Iowa City: The ACT National Center for the Advancement of Educational Practices, 1980.
- Bers, Trudy H. "Evaluating Remedial Education Programs", AIR Professional File, Association for Institutional Research, No. 29 (Spring 1987).
- Bigras, Pierre et al. "Systeme de depistage et programme d'etude pour les etudiants en difficulte d'apprentissage", College de Rimouski, 1987.
- Brinkerhoff, David B. and Patrick E. Sullivan. "Concerns of New Students: A Pretest-Posttest Evaluation of Orientation", Journal Of College Student Personnel vol.23, no.5 (September 1982), p.384-390.
- Chickering, Arthur W. Education and Identity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.
- Conseil des colleges. La reussite , les echecs et les abandons au collegial, Rapport 1987-88, juin 1988.
- Dorais, Sophie. "L'aide a l'apprentissage: quelle logique suivre?" Pedagogie collegiale vol.2, no.2, decembre 1988.
- Gardner, John N. Fact Book: University 101; The Freshman Seminar. University of South Carolina.
- Giguere, Helene. "Les classes stables au cegep: portrait des pratiques des colleges et sentiments d'appertenace des etudiants et etudiantes". Conseil des colleges, 1985.
- Gleason, Maryellen. "Better Communication In Large Classes", College Teaching, vol.34, no.1, p. 21-24.
- Goldman, Rozanne, George Hildebrand, Christine Southmayd. "Report on the Lafontaine Arts Sector Tutorial Project". Montreal: Dawson College, May 1986.
- Gordon, Virginia N. and Thomas Grites, "The Freshman Seminar Course: Helping Students Succeed", Journal of College Student Personnel (July 1984), p.315-320.

- Grant, M.K., D.R. Hoerber. "Basic Skills Programs: Are They Working?" AAHE-ERIC Higher Educational Research Report (No.1); Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1978.
- Haring-Hidore, Marilyn. "Developing Mentoring Programs for Retention of High-Risk Students", Reading Improvement vol.23 (Fall 1986), p.239-43.
- Klosek, John. "Assisting English-as-a-Second-Language Students" in Wilson, Helping Special Student Groups.
- Kristine, Frank J. "Developing Study Skills: More than a handout", College Teaching vol.33, no.2 (Spring 1985), p. 84-87.
- Moore, William and L.N. Carpenter, "Academically Underprepared Students" in Noel, Levitz and Saluri, Increasing Student Retention. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985.
- Morley, Joan. "Current Directions in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages: A State-of-the-Art Synopsis", TESOL News vol. 4 (1987), p.16-20.
- Pace, Robert. Measuring Outcomes of College Undergraduates.
- Ochberg, Richard L. "College Dropouts: The Developmental Logic of Psychosocial Moratoria", Journal of Youth and Adolescence vol.15, no.4 (1986), p.287-302.
- Roueche, John E. A New Look At Successful Programs. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, New Directions for College Learning Assistance, no.11 (March 1983).
- Roueche, John E., George A. Baker III and Suanne D. Roueche. "College Responses to Low-Achieving Students: A National Study", American Education (June 1984), p.31-35.
- Roueche, John E. and Luk. "Overcoming Learned Helplessness In Community College Students".
- Roueche, John E, and Jerry J. Snow. Overcoming Learning Problems. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.
- Saint-Onge, Michel. "Moi, j'enseigne, mais eux, apprennent-ils?" Pedagogie collegiale vol.1, no.1 (octobre 1987), p.13-15.
- Schmelzer, Ronald V., Claire D. Schmelzer, Robert A. Figler, William G. Brozo. "Using the Critical Incident Technique to Determine Reasons for Success and Failure of University Students', Journal of College Student Personnel vol.23, no.3 (May 1987), p.261-266.
- Starling, Roy. "Professor as Student: The View from the Other Side", College Teaching vol.35, no.1, p.3-7.

Tinto, Vincent. Leaving College: Rethinking the Causes and Cures of Student Attrition.

Wilson, Lester (ed.). Helping Special Student Groups. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.

Winston, Roger B., Theodore C. Miller, Steven C. Ender, Thomas J. Grites. Developmental Academic Advising. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1984.

Wolke, Robert L. "The grade sheet is not the place to show compassion", The Thursday Report.

CHAPTER TWO

THE STUDY OF "ENTRY '88"

THE PROBLEM

Any teacher in the cegep system is armed with an arsenal of anecdotal evidence concerning the learning difficulties of the students of the 80's. Statistics document but do not explain the failure to learn experienced by these students. Specifically, at John Abbott in the 88-3 semester over 44% of the students failed at least one course while over 60% withdrew from at least one course. Thus students do not achieve close to thirty percent of what they undertake. To cite but one of the many reports on file at CADRE, a 1985 study at Rimouski showed that twenty percent of students were in such difficulty that they were failing 50% of their courses. It hardly needs to be stated that the price--in both human and financial terms--of such failures is unacceptable.

This profound problem can be addressed in two ways. One would be to modify the learning demands made of the students by college studies. In essence this would mean to lower the standards of the curriculum as developed over the years and described in the Cahiers. As these objectives and requirements have been carefully selected with reference to social, vocational and academic requirements, this first option is unacceptable. In the same way that "the grade sheet is not the place to show compassion" (Wolke), lowering standards is neither a productive nor a humane way of dealing with a gap between requirements and ability. Instead, the problem must be addressed by developing the students' abilities to meet the prescribed demands. The number of studies existing at CADRE of such initiatives is witness, if a somewhat unfortunate one, to both the breadth of this problem and to consensus on the second form of solution to the problem.

Any such solution must meet two types of demands, those of timing and those of student needs. The fact that attrition problems are compounded after the first semester means that effective intervention for all "high risk" students must be during or prior to that period. But homogeneity of timing does not infer that all "high risk" students require the same form of support. Their requirements will vary according to the causes of their weakness, of which there are many. At John Abbott, the College Readiness Committee has defined eight types of "high risk" students:

learning disabled
immersion casualties
those with educational "gaps"
the immature

academically underprepared
system casualties
non-Anglophones
motivational casualties

The literature concerning "high risk" students supports this concept of diversity and thus the need for a range of support systems.

OBJECTIVES

The general and long-term objective of the study was to improve the college experience of "high risk" students by assessing the effectiveness of a means of enabling them to meet the demands of college learning.

More specifically, the study sought to gather and analyse both quantitative and naturalistic data concerning the outcomes of a program of "intrusive intervention" for two groups of students: non-Anglophones with Michigan Placement Test scores under 80% and students in Social Science with low high school averages.

METHODS

Selection of Students

This was designed as quasi-experimental study. For each type of "high risk" student to be investigated, a target group of a hundred and fifty was selected according to definitional criteria. The underprepared students were the border-line students admitted to Social Science with grades below 60-65% who had taken some non-academic courses. (Figures show that in 1986, for example, such students failed 42% of their courses, certainly a sign of difficulty.) The non-Anglophones were those with a score below 85% on their Michigan Placement Test. (This is the normal score required by North American institutions for admission, thus a form of pre-requisite in other colleges and universities.) Any students receiving the intensive support of special English courses were not, however, be studied to ensure investigation only of students with perceived needs not otherwise met. Each ranked group of students was then divided into two, those informed of the program and those not. In principle this would have allowed two control groups: one which had refused the program and one which had been unaware of its existence. In fact, very few students wished to participate. The necessity of remedial programs being voluntary forced us, as Bers has pointed out (p. 5), into a truly quasi-experiemntal design.

The experimental group (N=15) were students who volunteered to enroll in the "Entry '88" program. The Social Science control groups were formed by matching the high school transcripts of participants with those of non-participants. The matching was

based first on overall average, then on percentage of non-academic courses. Where possible, sex was also matched. Control Group I (N=19) were students with no knowledge of the program and Control Group II (N=14) those who had declined to participate. The English as a second language groups, neither of which received a treatment, were made up of one student per score of 76 to 85 on the Michigan Test; the "Invited" group (N=12) were those who had refused the program and the "Not Invited" group (N=15) those unaware of it. These four control groups replicated the "normal" experience of the "high risk" student by "coping" as they saw fit. While there was no direct intervention provided to them, existing college resources were of course available should, denying our hypothesis, they have chosen to avail themselves of such opportunities.

To avoid any Hawthorn effect, neither the experimental nor the control groups knew they were being studied until the very end of their first semester. At that point they were interviewed in order to provide much of the naturalistic data; at the same time they authorized collection of data concerning themselves. All previous measurements had been integrated into the workshops. Students who did not come to the interview were sent a waiver letter to ensure their agreement to being part of the study.

Data Collection

The impact (or lack thereof) of the "Entry '88" program was measured in terms of a number of variables. Following Mingle (86), we believe that the success of a program cannot be judged on a sole variable such as retention. Concerning the student, the normal quantitative data was collected: full grade average, withdrawal/failure rate. Given the co-operation of our colleagues we were also able to collect data on the absences that had been monitored, and the interviews provided information on hours of remunerated work and of studying. The quantitative data was submitted to rank correlation.

The naturalistic data was derived from the student interview (Appendix 1) and a teacher assessment form (Appendix 2). The taped student interviews were validated by a "rap session" with no teachers present. Perhaps due to only three students attending, the transcript of the encounter showed no incongruence with the interviews. Further data were drawn from a debriefing meeting with those teachers most actively involved in the program, the mentors. This naturalistic data has been assembled into profiles, using the three categories of Grant and Hoeber (78). The picture of the college response was drawn in general from the high degree of co-operation from faculty and in particular from the teacher assessment form. Perceptions of the needs of first semester students were also gathered in a series of September interviews (Appendix 3) with interested faculty, those who had attended a Pedagogical Day on the topic of first year students.

DESIGN

The study was thus designed to build on previous and current efforts in the field of developmental education. It began with an awareness both of the theoretical work in the United States and of provincial experiments such as the design of 360 courses and special studies such as those at Rimouski, Limoilou, Lionel Groulx and St. Lawrence. The study sought to build on these in two ways. Firstly it aimed to investigate a new principle of intrusive intervention. Thus while the focus of the workshops and other learning support systems that constituted the treatment of the experimental group were informed by our previous experience at John Abbott and by the innovations of other colleges, all activities were within the context of "intrusive intervention". Although the need "to get them to commit themselves" (Goldman et al, p.20) has often been stated, the impact of this principle has not yet been documented in our system. In addition, by providing not only quantitative data related to the current concern of student retention but also naturalistic data on the "high risk" students at the end of their first semester, the study adds a dimension to the composite picture of the weaker student being formed in the network.

CHAPTER THREE
QUANTITATIVE FINDINGS

QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS OF "ENTRY '88"

1. Persistence

Although we posit that no one variable should be used to measure the effectiveness of a program, we do recognize that retention is a prime concern of many institutions and is thus considered a indicator of success greater even than grades. This means that the findings of a one-semester study can be only a first chapter to our analysis.

Looking at this first semester, all "Entry '88" students returned in January whereas two (6.06%) controls did not.

2. Withdrawals

There is little consensus as to whether withdrawing is making a realistic decision or simply giving up; however, most of the students interviewed saw it as a positive move and few felt any regrets. Fewer (40% compared to 48.5%) "Entry '88" withdrew from no courses. Only 22.14% of all students in Social Science that semester were in this category. So we can deduce that "Entry '88" students felt greater confidence in their courses, even if sometimes ill-founded. This also suggests greater satisfaction with their courses, a conclusion supported by what they said in the interviews. More experimentals (53.33% compared to 33.33%) withdrew from one course. Responses in the interviews showed the latter to be decisions not to fail a course, a form of realistic mid-term goal setting. More clearly positive is that fact that no "Entry '88" students withdrew prior to September 20 whereas 6 (18.18%) controls did; we hypothesize that guided course selection led to less spontaneous, often irrational rejection of the teacher or the content of a course.

3. Courses Passed

This is the indicator that is most important to students and parents as well as to many faculty.

73.33% of "Entry '88" passed 4 or more courses ten percent more than in the control groups. More specifically, 13.33% (2) "Entry '88" passed 7 courses compared to 9% (3) of the controls.

In the total Social Science cohort, 89.3% passed 4 or more and 47.05% passed all 7. However, 13.33% (2 - the individuals who rejected the post-workshop components of the program) "Entry '88" passed no courses compared to 6.06% (2) of the controls. The average for all students in Social Science was 1.29%. This underlines the fact that both control and experimental groups were indeed "high risk".

4. Overall Grade Averages

The difference here was small: 58.58% for "Entry '88" and 56.22% for the controls.

5. Absences

Despite the emphasis placed on attendance in the workshops and in the contract, "Entry '88" students did not have a better record than the controls. 28.5% of them missed less than ten percent of their classes compared to 50% of the controls. Also over 57% of them missed between ten and twenty-five percent of their classes (compared to 40%) and over 14% missed over twenty-five percent (compared to 10%).

6. Study Hours

26% of "Entry '88" studied less than 10 hours a week compared to 32% of the controls. At the other end of the scale, they also performed better: 45% of them studied 15 or more hours a week compared to 21% of the controls. While neither set of figures speaks to an enormous commitment to learning, the workshop guidance and follow up from monitoring teachers seems to have had an effect.

7. Working Hours

There were no major differences between the number of hours devoted to remunerated work between the experimental and controls. Thus the workshops do not seem to have fostered any shifts of priorities. Both groups did show a negative correlation between number of hours worked and academic success.

8. Predictability

As the tables below show, no predictability of ranking was suggested by the high school marks which originally selected these groups. As will be seen in the following chapter, this does not bely the fact that the chosen students were indeed "high risk".

TABLE I - ENTRY '88

Name	Passed Courses	Grade Average	Study Hours	High School Grade
CK	7	71.85	6	67
JK	7	71	3-16	62
PL	6	71	12-13	63
JE	6	69	8	68
TR	6	67.29	15	66
DP	6	65.14	12	64
DG	5	69	28	65
CS	5	65.33	1-25	63
LL	5	63.29	7	69
KN	4	63.67	15	66
SN	4	53.16	20	69
GW	3	62.2	15	69
TV	2	49.83	3	64
JR	0	22.8	8-12	67
MP	0	13	10	69

TABLE II - CONTROL 1

Name	Passed Courses	Grade Average	Study Hours	High School Grade
NA	7	73.86	17-21	67
AM	7	68.14	10	65
RS	6	66.3	10	65
LE	5	61.57	14	68
AJ	5	69.83	18	66
MK	5	62.86	10	64
CB	4	59.8	10-12	69
JJ	4	61.86	25	67
PL	4	61.17	3-4	69
SML	4	63	13	67
AR	4	65.66	10	69
EV	4	61.83	15	68
SJ	3	39	9-10	66
PP	3	46.57	8	64
LT	3	59.75	4	69
SMG	2	48	9	61
AP	2	50	10	65
CP	1	42.8	5	65
MS	0	13.57	n.a.	70

TABLE III - CONTROL 2

Name	Passed Courses	Grade Average	Study Hours	High School Grade
RP	7	75	15-20	69
SB	6	69.5	10	69
WR	6	70.5	7	67
PS	6	78.5	7	68
CC	5	69.83	8-10	69
SL	5	60.14	4-10	69
VS	5	54.57	4-5	69
DF	4	66.4	5	67
AJ	4	63.17	10	66
CCH	3	50.8	32	62
SE	3	47.4	1-6	68
CP	1	53.25	10	67
GR	1	21	14	68
RL	0	0	n.a.	62

9. Changes Over The Semester

An objective measure of the experimental students was provided by their writing a "Learning And Study Skills Strategies Inventory" (HYH Publishing Company, Inc., 1987) during the workshop. This was given to them again in December, when ten of the fifteen completed it. It had been hoped to compare their December results to those of the control group, but too few of the latter returned the tests to make this comparison meaningful.

Of those who took the test a second time, all raised their range of percentile rankings over the ten categories tested. Eight raised their upper scores and the two who didn't compensated by raising their lower scores. Scores for the individual components were raised in from two to ten categories in all but one case where they fell in four.

QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS OF ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE GROUPS

Not surprisingly, given that neither of these groups had received a treatment, there was no distinction between "Inviteds" and "Not Inviteds". Any hypothesis that those who refused to participate were over confident was not supported. Indeed the assumption that had defined them as a target group, that the lack of support in the main stream created a negative learning situation, was itself refuted. The reports below are for the total group of 27, a highly successful cohort.

1. Persistence

Only one (3.7%) of these students failed to register in January, 1989.

2. Withdrawals

These students showed high short-term persistence. 44% of them stayed in all their courses whereas 39.82% of the total pre-university population did so. Over 85% of them had taken 7 courses at Registration whereas only 73% of the high risk had done so. Another 37% withdrew from only one course; thus less than 15% withdrew from two or three courses.

3. Courses Passed

Over 85% of them passed four or more courses, very close to the 92.67% of the total pre-university population that semester. More impressively, almost fifty percent of them passed 7 courses compared to 55.59% of the total group, predominantly studying in their own language.

4. Overall Grade Average

This group of students certainly suggested that once the basic language competence represented by a Michigan score of 75 is established, language is not a hindrance to academic success. Their overall average was 69.67%, well over ten percent higher than the "high risk" groups.

5. Absences

Absence reports were received on twenty of this group. Their pattern was similar to the full group of "high risk" students: 35% missed less than ten percent of their classes, 50% missed up to twenty-five percent, and 15% were absent more than that.

6. Study Hours

Interviews were conducted with nineteen of these students, so the sample for study and work hours is smaller than for the "high risk" group.

As with all students canvassed, the number of hours devoted to studying was surprisingly low. The average for this group was 12.32 hours per week. There was no significant difference between this group and the "high risk" group. A slightly larger percentage of them (36.8%) studied less than ten hours a week, and an even closer number (31.5%) studied over 15 hours.

7. Work Hours

As well as generally achieving or at least surviving better than the "high risk" groups, these students were able to work more. Fewer of them (21% rather than 37%) did not have a paying job. More of them worked up to twelve hours a week (26% compared to 13%) or between thirteen and twenty hours a week (47% compared to 31%).

8. Predictability

As with the "high risk" group, the ranking of incoming scores did not parallel the ranking of end-of-semester grades.

TABLE IV - ESL STUDENTS

Name	Passed Courses	Grade Average	Michigan Score
MV	8	75.55	82
HB	8	74	79
MS	8	67.73	81
CV	7	87.57	78
FF	7	82.57	82
NT	7	76.43	84
MB	7	75.43	81
SW	7	75	82
RY	7	71.57	85
SH	7	71.57	77
MB	6	78.17	76
JR	6	73.23	79
ML	6	70.33	78
MP	6	70.33	78
GV	6	63.14	84
SC	5	81.8	76
JB	5	78	80
SP	5	76.6	85
VL	5	68.4	83
MF	5	64.17	81
JK	5	60.88	80
IV	4	70.75	80
MVA	4	55.29	84
OL	3	55	83
BD	3	49.17	83
MVO	2	46.43	79
AP	1	32	85

QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS OF ALL GROUPS OF FIRST SEMESTER STUDENTS

(This analysis was carried out by Hikmat Ajakie, Mathematics Department, John Abbott College, to whom we are greatly indebted.)

Working Hours Versus Courses Passed

The analysis showed a negative correlation of (-0.26) between non-academic working hours and the number of courses passed. This is a significant value at the 95% level of probability.

The variable hours worked was set to be the independent variable and courses passed as the dependent variable. The study has also shown that only 6% of the variability in the number of courses passed is attributed to the variability in hours worked while 94% of variability is attributed to factors other than those statistically analysed here.

These conclusions are based on a sample size of 62 subjects.

Absence Versus Overall Grade Average

It was found that the number of absences from class and lower grade averages correlated with a correlation value of (-0.87) which is significant at the 95% level of probability.

The number of hours of absence was used as the independent variable and the grades at the end of the semester used as the dependent or the response variable. The study has also shown that 76% of the variability in grades can be explained by the variability in absence. The other 24% of grade variability is due to factors other than those statistically analysed.

CONCLUSION

While the small size of the overall sample and the number of sub-groups did not allow any psychometric statistical comparison of the control and experimental groups, the quantitative data above attests to the efficacy of the program.

CHAPTER FOUR: NATURALISTIC FINDINGS

A. PROFILES OF MORE SUCCESSFUL STUDENTS

INTRODUCTION

Congruent with the current literature (for example Mingle 1986) which stresses that the effectiveness of a program cannot be judged on the basis of one variable, the profiles in this and the following chapter are presented in order to provide a more complex portrait of the students in the experimental and control groups. Given the unobtrusive design of the study, these are not intended to be psychological profiles. Rather they register more naturally observable factors and draw particularly on the categories of development defined by Grant and Hoerber (1978): cognitive, behavioural, and affective. The cognitive measure here is limited to course success and teacher perceptions. The behavioural section looks not only at factors related to effort such as attendance and study hours compared to work hours but also at those behaviours that suggest the lack of integration that Tinto has highlighted as a cause for student failure. Incongruence, feeling at odds with the institution, was measured by reported use of college resources such as Student Services and special laboratories. Isolation was gauged by involvement with any non-academic college activities. The affective section looks particularly at the student's self-image as a learner and at future motivation or sense of purpose as expressed in advice to new students.

The profiles of the experimental group, which the preceding chapter has shown to have been more successful in their first semester, are presented first.

Dominique

Academic Success

Dominique had a high school average of 65 and ended his first semester with a college average of 69. He had passed five courses, failed one and withdrawn from one. All but one reporting teachers rated his involvement as excellent, supported by careful preparation.

College Behaviour

His attendance attested to definite diligence. Of the four courses reported, he had attended 98.3% of his classes, not missing a session in Math and English in which he did well, and being present 96% of the time in Humanities and Psychology which he failed. He showed no signs of incongruence: he frequently saw his Academic Advisor, used the Writing Centre and

the Math Lab (as a quiet place for studying), and also met with his Mathematics teacher in office hours. This diligence was again underlined in his report of studying for 28 hours a week and having no work other than his studies. The fact that he was not aware of having used study skills from the workshop may have been due to his taking a strategies-oriented writing course during his first semester and feeling all his ideas came from there. Although he raised his lowest LASSI percentile on the post-test, his highest fell and his percentile ranking dropped in 4 of the 10 categories. Overall, he did not seem to have established a balanced life having joined no clubs and only been in the audience for one college event. This isolation was endorsed by reports from the Entry '88 common course that he was not accepted in their group.

Affective

His self-image as a student was optimistic rather than strong. "I'm not a brain...I'm doing better now than at high school." He saw the reason for the improvement as his sense of purpose: "Here, it's my career I'm going for." Although in Social Science, he planned to move to Police Technology and was greatly aided by his mentor, a teacher in that program. While he had this clear sense of purpose, he could not translate that into a strategy and could recommend to new students only that they should be aware that they could not go out every night.

Jason

Academic Success

Jason had a high school average of 68 and ended his first semester with a college average of 69. He had passed six courses, failed none and withdrawn from one. "It wasn't that the course itself was too hard. It's just I found the work load a bit tough...when I rush things I screw up." His teachers rated him as adequate, but there was concern that his interest in work was undermined by chatting with neighbours.

College Behaviour

His attendance perhaps reflected his level of commitment. Of the two courses reported, he had attended 80% of his classes. He showed no strong signs of incongruence: he used the Math Lab and responded to his Economics and Chemistry teachers' (both participants in the program) initiatives for contact. His focus on learning was undercut by his report of studying only 8 hours a week even though he had no job. But those hours seem to have been well used as he reported using note-taking skills and time management throughout the semester. In fact he had internalized the strategies from the workshop sufficiently to have acted on the fact that he was a visual learner by asking teachers to put key ideas on the board. He did not seem to be isolated. Rather he had decided not to join the football team during his first year because he recognized that this might lead him to "lose perspective", and he had still participated in a couple of college events.

Affective

His self-image as a student was firm. He rated himself at 7.5 as a learner, recognizing that although he works very hard 75% is an excellent mark for him. The realism of his "hard work" is questionable when balanced against 8 hours a week of study. Nevertheless, he had a sense of cutting his coat according to his cloth in advising new students to pick "smartly" courses that were not too hard.

Jody

Academic Success

Jody had a high school average of 62 (according to her, greatly lowered by a failed French) and ended her first semester with a college average of 71. She had passed all her seven courses. Her teachers rated her from limited to average, saying she went through the motions but did not get deeply involved.

College Behaviour

Her attendance was more than adequate; she was absent from only 7% of reported classes. However, her average in those---65.25%---was lower than her overall average. She showed some signs of incongruence. Although she said she loved her courses and had discussed a borderline first assignment grade with her English teacher and found that the resulting guidelines led to a higher grade on the second assignment, she did not make use of any other college resources. In particular she put up real barriers between herself and her mentor, even showing some hostility. Her study hours seemed to be task-based, ranging from 3 to 16 a week. That range and her working for 15 hours a week may have been related to her feeling that the time management learned in the workshop had been really helpful. This feeling was supported by her upper percentile on the LASSI rising from 45 to 85 and her showing improvement in two areas. Her membership in the hockey team proved there was no isolation, but she saw no reason to extend this involvement and would not go out of her way to participate in other events.

Affective

Her self-image as a student was ambiguous. She rated herself at 7 as a learner but could not articulate any reasons for this middle-of-the-line decision. She showed a real sense of strategy in advising new students to keep on top and see a teacher as soon as they saw any problem with a course. "As soon as you start falling behind, that's when you lose it all."

Caroline

Academic Success

Caroline had a high school average of 67 and ended her first semester with a college average of 71.85. She had passed all her seven courses. Her teachers rated her from average to excellent; she showed signs of thoughtfulness and kept up with her work but seemed to need considerable guidance.

College Behaviour

Her attendance was exemplary; she was absent from none of the reported classes, and her average in these---76.5%---was higher than her overall average. Concretely she showed few signs of incongruence, having used the Language Laboratory and gone to see her language teacher, an unsuccessful venture as that teacher was "never in". On the other hand she developed a real relationship with her mentor. Her study hours---6 a week---did not show great commitment perhaps because of her working elsewhere from 15-20 hours a week. Nevertheless she was pleased to report she was using the form of notetaking learned in the workshops in several courses. Her feeling that she had learned "the proper way" to study was supported by her upper percentile on the LASSI rising from 35 to 90 and her showing improvement in all ten areas tested. She was certainly not isolated and attended a range of college functions.

Affective

Her self-image as a student was low. She rated herself at 6 as a learner, for the specific reason that she did not put a lot of energy into studying. Rationally, then, her advice to new students was to put more time into studying at the beginning of the semester, so they wouldn't have to do so much at the end.

Patrick

Academic Success

Patrick had a high school average of 63 and ended his first semester with a college average of 71. He had passed 6 courses and withdrawn from one. He felt one should only drop if definitely going to fail. His teachers rated him as adequate: he worked hard, even enthusiastically, but did not grasp or appear particularly interested in concepts.

College Behaviour

His attendance was not impressive as he was absent 16% of the time from the reported classes but getting an average in these---77%---that was higher than his overall average. He showed few signs of incongruence, but met with his Advisor and English teacher (a participant in the program) and saw his mentor regularly. His study hours---12-13 a week---showed some commitment, especially as he worked for 20 hours a week. Although his highest LASSI percentile dropped from 95 to 85, he did show improvement in five areas. Yet he was not aware of utilizing the skills from the workshops. An affable person, he did not seem isolated and attended a number of Agora events.

Affective

His self-image as a student was solid. He rated himself at 7.5 as a learner, stressing that he had learned a lot over the semester. His advice to new students was concrete and positive.

Lisa

Academic Success

Lisa had a high school average of 69 and ended her first semester with a college average of 63.29. She had passed five of her seven courses. Her teachers rated from limited to excellent; those who saw that she had strong motivation were still concerned about lack of skills. The range may have been due to what she termed her "attitude": "if it's a bad teacher, I won't work".

College Behaviour

Her attendance was adequate, absences being well under 10% in reported classes though her average in these---58%---was lower than her overall average. She showed few signs of incongruence: indeed she met with her Mathematics and and Psychology teachers and used the Mathematics Laboratory. She had not met regularly with her mentor, seeing no need because she had no problems. Her study hours varied but averaged around 7 a week. The fact that she worked 14-15 hours a week endorsed her statement that she had always had good time management. In addition, she had picked up note-taking skills from the workshop. She did not seem isolated and attended a number of Agora events.

Affective

Her self-image as a student was realistic. She rated herself at 7 as a learner because she felt she tried hard but that things did not click as quickly for her as for others. She had learned from her first semester that you should drop a course in which you are having trouble rather than stubbornly sticking to what you have undertaken.

Salwa

Academic Success

Salwa had a high school average of 69 and ended her first semester with a college average of 53.16. She had passed four of her courses, failed two and dropped one. She had failed an exam in the latter because she had had two exams on the same day. Her teachers rated her as adequate stressing total lack of motivation wherever she ran into any difficulty.

College Behaviour

Her attendance was questionable in all reported classes where her average---49.75%---was lower than her overall average. She showed few signs of incongruence: she met with her Psychology teacher to discuss a project and saw the Financial Aid Advisor. She also met regularly and openly with her mentor. Because she had had a mentor, she found it easier to talk to other teachers. Her number of study hours was high, 20 a week, perhaps because she did not have a job. She had used the workshop system of annotating her text book for her Psychology class. She did not seem isolated and attended a number of Agora events.

Affective

Her self-esteem as a student was low. She gave herself only a 6 as a learner and could articulate only that she was passable

but...Still her advice to new students was concrete: work in advance, see your teacher.

Karen

Academic Success

Karen had a high school average of 66 and ended her first semester with a college average of 63.67. She had passed four of her courses, failed two and dropped one. Her teachers rated her from limited to adequate showing willingness to work in most courses but not being able to translate that into acceptable assignments.

College Behaviour

Her attendance was not ideal---over 10% absences---in all reported classes but her average---67%---was higher there than her overall average. She showed few signs of incongruence: she met with her English teacher a couple of times and saw her advisor frequently as well as using the Business Laboratory. Her study hours were solid, 15 a week, although she also devoted 12 hours a week to her job. Despite the fact that she did not feel she had used any of the workshop study skills, her LASSI top percentile rose from 35 to 65 and she had improved in all but three areas. She did not seem isolated and attended a number of Agora events.

Affective

Her self-esteem as a student was low. She gave herself only a 6 because she was not a hard worker. Still, her advice to new students was very positive: you do have time to study and have fun in school.

Michael

Academic Success

Michael had a high school average of 69 and ended his first semester with a college average of 13. He had passed none of his courses, failed 6 and dropped one. All teachers rated him as limited; he seemed overwhelmed by the work and did not confront his problems. In particular he did everything possible to avoid his mentor.

College Behaviour

His attendance was very weak---almost 50% absences---in all reported classes, but his average---15.6%---was marginally higher there than the overall average. He showed few external signs of incongruence, having met with his Mathematics teacher and seen a Financial Advisor as well as using the Career Shop. Yet he resisted his mentor's initiatives. His study hours of 10 a week were impressive relative to the others in as much as ~~the 25~~ hours a week he devoted to a job. Not surprisingly, he felt he had made use of the time management skills from the workshop. He was far from isolated having tried out for football and attended many sporting events.

Affective

His self-esteem as a student was low. He gave himself only a 6 but could not say why. His advice was rather negative, offering no strategies and stressing that teachers "don't come after you".

Darren

Academic Success

Darren had a high school average of 64 and ended his first semester with a college average of 65.14. He had passed six of his courses and failed one. His teachers rated him from limited to excellent; for those who rated him adequate to excellent he showed interest and handed in all assignments and often participated with enthusiasm in class discussions.

College Behaviour

His attendance was adequate---about 10% absences---in all reported classes, but his average---55%---was lower there than the overall average. He showed no signs of incongruence: indeed, he met several times with his Humanities and Geoscience teachers and saw a placement officer as well as using the Writing Centre and the Psychology Laboratory. He had also kept well in touch with his mentor. His study hours of 12 a week were only average, and he had no job. He felt he had made use of many strategies from the workshop: annotating the text, taking notes, time management (but that only at the beginning of the semester). He was far from isolated having attended sporting events nightly as well as Agora happenings.

Affective

His self-esteem as a student was not yet firm. He gave himself a 7 because he knew he could be doing better than he was. He said he was "a bit slow", not a slow learner but slow at doing things. Being in residence was an undermining factor. His advice was concretely based on his own experience: use time management and do two hours of studying a night from the beginning of the semester.

Tanya

Academic Success

Tanya had a high school average of 66 and ended her first semester with a college average of 67.29. She had passed six of her courses and failed one. Her teachers rated her as adequately doing all her work but not really participating in class probably, they felt, because of shyness.

College Behaviour

Her attendance was inadequate---about 20% absences---in all reported classes where her average---62.2%---was lower than the overall average. She showed no signs of incongruence: she met with teachers after an illness and saw a Counsellor as well as using Health Services and the Mathematics Laboratory after every test. Her study hours of 12 a week were above average, but she had no job. She felt she was making use of the notetaking and

reading survey strategies from the workshop, and although her LASSI percentile range remained the same, she improved in five of the ten areas tested. She did not seem isolated having attended a range of Agora events.

Affective

Her self-image as a student was not yet clear. She gave herself a 7 but could not articulate why. Still, her advice was concrete: do your work fast and really study, not just look over your material, early on to help prepare for the end-of-semester overload.

Jamie

Academic Success

Jamie had a high school average of 67 and ended his first semester with a college average of 22.8. He had passed none of his courses, failed five and withdrawn from two. His teachers, except in the Design course, rated him as limited due to skipping classes and not handing in assignments.

College Behaviour

His attendance was grossly inadequate---over 50% absences---in all reported classes where the average---26%---was marginally higher than the overall average. He showed some signs of incongruence: he had only a vague memory of meeting with a counsellor or advisor and had not seen a need to meet with teachers. Yet he felt this was because he always spoke up in class. He also had little contact with his mentor. His study hours ranged from 10 to 12 a week, and he spent 10 hours a week at his job. He felt he was making use of a range of workshop strategies: notetaking, SQ4R, and time management. He did not seem isolated having attended a number of Agora events and most hockey games.

Affective

His self-esteem as a student was low. He gave himself a 6 because his mind wandered and he could not focus on reading on the few times when he had tried to do so. He had no strategies to offer new students. "It's fun but you can't get carried away...you don't have anyone to back you up."

Colleen

Academic Success

Colleen had a high school average of 63 and ended her first semester with a college average of 65.33. She had passed five of her courses, failed one and withdrawn from one. Her teachers rated her adequate, doing her work but being held back by shyness.

College Behaviour

Her attendance was adequate---a little over 10% absences---in all reported classes where the average---61.5%---was marginally lower than the overall average. She showed some signs of incongruence,

having seen an Advisor five times but not having had contact with teachers. Meetings with her mentor were not successful, but they had perhaps been undermined by initial confusion as to who her mentor was. Her study hours ranged from 1 to 25 depending on demands; the high number was demanding as she spent 19 hours a week at her job. She was aware of making use only of notetaking skills from the workshop, yet her LASSI highest percentile rose from 30 to 70 and she improved in three areas. She seemed totally isolated, a fact that she was almost proud of given her desire to return to another province from which she felt her father's company had cruelly wrested her.

Affective

Her self-image as a student was clear. She assertively gave herself a 7 because she worked hard and was efficient. Despite her dislike of Quebec, rather than the college, her advice to new students was positive: "If (her emphasis) you want to meet people, get involved".

Tina

Academic Success

Tina had a high school average of 64 and ended her first semester with a college average of 49.83. She had passed two of her six courses and failed two. Her teachers rated her as limited; she did the work but was not very responsive.

College Behaviour

Her attendance was adequate---a little over 10% absences---in all reported classes where the average---55%---was higher than the overall average. She showed some signs of incongruence, having used no resources and seen no teachers. She reported that when she asked a question in class she had been told to read the book; "it's basically like you're talking to a wall". Her meetings with her mentor were sporadic. Her study hours were the lowest of the group, 3 a week, perhaps because she spent 20 hours a week at her job. On the other hand, she was aware of making use of notetaking skills from the workshop in three of her courses and of using the "speed reading" in three. Not surprisingly, her LASSI highest percentile rose from 40 to 90 and she improved in all but three areas. She did not seem isolated, having attended hockey games and Agora events.

Affective

Her self-image was firm. She gave herself a 7 because she is right in the middle. Nevertheless, her advice to new students was negative: don't slack off.

Greg

Academic Success

Greg had a high school average of 69 and ended his first semester with a college average of 62.2. He had passed three of his six courses, failed two, and withdrawn from one. His teachers rated him from limited to excellent, his good humour going a long way

despite great difficulty with written English.

College Behaviour

His attendance was poor---over 25% absences---in the one reported class yet that mark---71%--- was higher than the overall average. He showed few signs of incongruence: he had been to the Writing Centre and for extra sessions with his Counsellor but he had not contacted teachers. His study hours were adequate, 15 a week. He had been working for 15 hours a week in the first half of the semester but had given up his job because of school pressure. He was aware of making use of notetaking skills and planning sheets from the workshop. His highest LASSI percentile rose from 55 to 80 and he improved in four areas. He was not at all isolated, participating in intramurals and attending sporting events and debates.

Affective

His self-image was low. He rated himself as a 5 because that represented his effectiveness despite the fact that he tried hard. Still his advice to new students was constructive: you have to put a lot of effort into it, more than 110% if you're an average student.

B. PROFILES OF LESS SUCCESSFUL STUDENTS

INTRODUCTON

The fifteen profiles below are of students from the two Social Science control groups who match, in terms of high school averages and sex, each of the fifteen "Entry '88" students. In order to minimize the motivation variable, the students were chosen from Group I, those not invited to participate, wherever possible. Where the two criteria did not allow a match, the student was selected from Group II, those who refused to participate in the program.

Susan

Academic Success

Susan had a high school average of 61 and ended the first semester with a college average of 48, having passed two of seven courses, failed five, and withdrawn from none. Her teachers rated her from limited to adequate, stressing that she did the work but never seemed to get involved.

College Behaviour

Her attendance was poor---over 25% absences-- in the reported classed where the mark---44.25%---was slightly lower than the overall average. Ostensibly she showed no signs of incongruence, having used the Computer Lab and had contact with teachers of Sociology, Business and Psychology. Yet she stated that teachers "do not care", that they only take attendance because they have to [not the case in our college] and that only a couple knew her name. She felt her study hours, 15 a week, were considerable but were not "recognized" by her teachers. She worked for 16 hours a week but was organized enough to use her breaks and the end of the afternoon to study at school. She had a definite work pattern, taking notes and paying attention in class, making a schedule, and finding an appropriate place to study. She seemed rather isolated, only occasioanally "stopping by" the Agora and saying she did not have time for college events.

Affective

Her self-esteem was low. She rated herself as a 5 because that was all that was now recognized. At high school, though, she felt her effort had been acknowledged. This change perhaps accounted for the deep anxiety she displayed at the end of the semester. She had not worked out a strategy and could only advise new students to take courses they felt they could handle.

Christine

Academic Success

Christine had a high school average of 62 and ended the first semester with a college average of 50.8, having passed three courses, failed two, and withdrawn from two. Her teachers rated her as limited, given to talking at the back of the class.

College Behaviour

Her attendance was very poor---44% absences-- in the reported classes where the marks---36.3%---were considerably lower than the overall average. She showed no signs of incongruence, having used the Psychology Lab, learned about the Learning Skills Centre and had contact with teachers of Sociology, English and Psychology once or twice in order to clarify assignments. Her study hours showed unusual commitment, averaging 23 a week, even though she worked for 32 hours a week. Perhaps because of this juggling, she had a sense of how to study, taking notes in class, highlighting her text, and keeping an agenda of due dates. She seemed relatively isolated, only having time to watch "Agora stuff" for a short while.

Affective

Her self-image was firm. She rated herself as a 7 because she tries very hard but does not always get "the sense of it". She saw college assignments as being very new, forcing you to think for yourself rather than following detailed directions. So she gave direct advice to new students: listen carefully and do not fall behind.

Anthony

Academic Success

Anthony had a high school average of 63 and ended the first semester with a college average of 63.17, having passed four courses and withdrawn from one, an Economics course he felt was duplicating what he was learning in Business. His teachers rated him as adequate, working conscientiously but producing flawed results.

College Behaviour

His attendance was shaky, having missed three classes in the one course reporting; in this he received only 53%. He showed some signs of incongruence: he used no college resources and only once contacted a teacher. His study hours were not excessive, 10 a week, possibly because he worked for 12 hours a week and played rugby. He saw the need to have a clear idea of schedule and also took notes in all classes and then made notes from his notes. He was not isolated as he played lots of sports and attended many Agora and Theatre events.

Affective

His self esteem reflected the teacher assessment. He rated himself at 7 for how well (rather than how much) he studied. Having taken five courses he disliked, his advice to new students focussed on preparing for Registration so "you know what

you're getting into".

Peter

Academic Success

Peter had a high school average of 64 and ended the first semester with a college average of 46.57, having passed three courses, failed four and withdrawn from none. His teachers rated him from limited to excellent, conscientiously attending and participating but not always completing or directly addressing assignments. In particular he seemed to avoid written assignments.

College Behaviour

His attendance was adequate---about 13% absences---in the reported classes where the mark---47%---was fractionally higher than the overall average. He showed some signs of incongruence: he had used no college resources, but he had twice seen two different teachers, and he was most co-operative with the researcher. His study hours were not excessive, 8 a week, yet he decided whether or not to work both Friday night and Saturday depending on homework. He did not describe any clear study strategies. He seemed isolated, having participated in no events.

Affective

His self-esteem was strong. He rated his ability to learn and utilize what he had learned at 8, in strong contrast to his subsequent results. His advice to new students focussed on timing---using breaks---rather than on how to study.

Marissa

Academic Success

Marissa had a high school average of 64 and ended the first semester with a college average of 62.86, having passed five of seven courses, failed two and withdrawn from none. Her teachers rated her as adequate, quiet and retiring but conscientious.

College Behaviour

Her attendance was fine---about 6% absences---in the reported classes where the mark---68%---was somewhat higher than the overall average. She showed some signs of incongruence: she had used no college resources and had contact with only her English teacher. Her study hours were not excessive, only 10 a week, although she had no job. She could not describe any clear study strategies. She seemed isolated, having only once stopped at the Agora.

Affective

Her self-esteem was low. She rated herself at 6 because she found "it difficult". She could not though give any more concrete advice on how to face difficulties than not to slack off.

Robert

Academic Success

Robert had a high school average of 65 and ended the first semester with a college average of 66.3%, having passed six courses, failed none and withdrawn from one. His teachers rated him as adequate, fulfilling his responsibilities but no more, thus verging on being apathetic.

College Behaviour

His attendance was fine---about 9% absences---in the reported classes where the mark---66.67%---was fractionally higher than the overall average. He showed some signs of incongruence, having used no college resources and had contact only once with one teacher. His study hours were not excessive, only 10 a week, although he had no job. He could not describe any clear study strategies. He seemed isolated having participated in no college events.

Affective

His self-image was firm. He rated himself at 7 because of all the things he didn't do. His advice was realistic if not very specific: be prepared for lots of work.

Alexandra

Academic Success

Alexandra had a high school average of 66 and ended the first semester with a college average of 69.83, having passed five courses, failed one and withdrawn from none. Her Anthropology teacher, the only one reporting, rated her as an adequate student who regularly consulted to improve the final draft of her essay.

College Behaviour

Her attendance was inadequate---20% absences---in the one reported class where the mark---76%---was higher than the overall average. She showed few signs of incongruence: although she had used no college resources, she had contacted both her English and Philosophy teachers a couple of times. Importantly, she talked in very positive terms about the college. Her study hours were more than the average, 18 a week, although she had a job for 15 hours a week. She had a sense of how to study, taking notes in most classes, making notes from her text and using time management. She did not seem isolated, having investigated the possibility of women playing football and attended a number of Agora events.

Affective

Her self esteem was high. She assertively rated herself at 7 although she did not explain why. She specified the need to do a lot more work, especially reading, than at high school.

Dino

Academic Success

Dino had a high school average of 67 and ended the first semester with a college average of 66.4, having passed four courses, failed one and withdrawn from two, one of them prior to September

20. His teachers reated him as limited, making little effort, showing little interest, and not responding to offers of extra help.

College Behaviour

His attendance was not consistent---17% absences---in the reported classes where the mark---61.3%---was lower than the overall average. He showed no signs of incongruence: he had been to Manpower, used the Computer Lab, and contacted his English teacher several times. He was not committed to studying, doing perhaps an hour a day, none if there was no homework, even though he did not have an outside job. Further more, he had no sense of how to study. He was not particularly involved in the College but did attend a number of Agora events.

Affective

His self-image was not firm. He rated himself as 7 or 7.5 because he did not feel he was doing very much. His advice to new students showed little awareness of coping: he merely warned that teachers start "packing in the homework at the end".

Stephanie

Academic Success

Stephanie had a high school average of 67 and ended the first semester with a college average of 63 having passed four courses, failed one and withdrawn from two which she had been certain she could not pass. Her teachers rated her as limited, producing low level work and not being very attentive in class.

College Behaviour

Her attendance was adequate---10% absences---in the reported classes where the mark---60.5%---was lower than the overall average. She showed some signs of incongruence, having used no college resources and contacted only her English teacher. Her study hours were only adequate, 13 a week, although she had no job. Still, she had a definite sense of having been taught how to study at high school, defining key terms in the text, making notes on lectures and readings, and doing homework the night it is assigned. She was not isolated, having attended a number of Agora events even though she devoted her weekends to a non-college team. In addition, she stated that it was easy to meet people at JAC.

Affective

Her self-image was realistic. She rated herself between 6 and 7 because she felt she lacked discipline, citing losing marks in Physical Education for lateness as an example. She had learned from her first semester experience that you need to want to get into your work. She felt her parents had helped her settle down after the beginning when she had been caught up in social life because of meeting so many new people.

Germar

Academic Success

Germar had a high school average of 68 and ended the first semester with a college average of 21% having passed one course, failed three and withdrawn from three. Two he had found too hard ("I didn't feel comfortable because I wasn't good enough") and one he never "got into" because of lack of attendance. He had not been able to register in any of the courses he wanted at Registration. The one reporting teacher rated him as limited.

College Behaviour

His attendance was not reported. He showed some signs of incongruence: he only occasionally used the Math Lab and the computers and had not contacted any teachers. His study hours were high, 14 a week, given that he had a job for 30 hours a week. He had a system for studying: taking notes in all classes, making notes in his text books, and using time management. He seem isolated, having only attended one or two movies and sitting in the back of the class never uttering a word.

Affective

His self-esteem was very low. He rated himself as 3 and could not explain why. He felt he had come to like the College over the semester but suggested a painful beginning in saying that new students need to "get with it early" by reading up and taking note of what they hear in order to "learn as much as they can about the place in the first few days".

Lorraine

Academic Success

Lorraine had a high school average of 67 and ended the first semester with a college average of 61.57 having passed five of seven courses, failed two, and withdrawn from none, a fact she regretted. Her teachers rated her from limited to excellent, not participating much except in her Humanities course where she showed determination to succeed.

College Behaviour

Her attendance was fine---6% absences---in the reported classes where the mark---58.75%---was lower than the overall average. She showed no signs of incongruence: in fact, she had used the Writing Centre, Mathematics and Accounting Labs, taken Study Skills workshops, and contacted her Accounting teacher. Her study hours were above average, 14 a week, although she also worked for 14 hours a week. Since the workshop she had started to take notes and use time management. She seemed somewhat isolated, having attended very few college events.

Affective

Her self-esteem was shaky. She thought she might rate herself at 7 but didn't really know because learning at high school had been so much easier when it was dictated. Implicitly her advice to new students was to take a workshop. She felt she had not learned to "be that way" (learn to learn) until after the

workshop, and then it had been too late to apply those principles.

Chantelle

Academic Success

Chantelle had a high school average of 69 and ended the first semester with a college average of 59.8, having passed four courses, failed one, and withdrawn from two. She had clear reasons for dropping, feeling one teacher was "unfair" and the other course was something she could not enjoy. Still, she regretted having set herself behind as she had wanted to get to university in four semesters. Her teachers rated her from limited to excellent, attending her classes but with seeming incomprehension in some compared to determination to succeed in others.

College Behaviour

Her attendance was reasonable---10% absences---in the one reported class where the mark---71%---was considerably higher than the overall average. She showed signs of incongruence, having used no college resources and seen a teacher only to hand in an assignment. Her study hours were average, 10-12 a week, although she worked for 9-20 hours a week. The low number of study hours may have been because she found college work easier than high school. For studying, she had a system of annotating a text which she had developed herself. She seemed somewhat isolated, having attended no college events, but she stated that although she had been uncomfortable at the beginning of the semester, by the end she always saw someone she knew.

Affective

Her self-esteem was high. She calmly rated herself at 8 but without explaining why. She had no constructive advice for new students other than to avoid breaks in their schedule. She also suggested that college is not the big change everyone expects. She felt she had wasted time in a three-and-a-half and a six-hour break because she was able to do homework for only an hour at a time.

Sylvia

Academic Success

Sylvia had a high school average of 69 and ended the first semester with a college average of 60.14, having passed five courses, failed one, and withdrawn from none. She felt, though, that she should have dropped a course because the work load piles up due to all teachers being on a three-week cycle. Her teachers rated her as limited to adequate, showing fair improvement but a resistance to the "academic game" that made it difficult for her to participate.

College Behaviour

Her attendance was far from exemplary---21% absences---in the reported classes where the mark---71%---was considerably higher than the overall average. She showed some signs of incongruence, having made no use of college resources and only once contacted a teacher. Her study hours were less than average, 4 a week unless she had papers when she would put in 2 hours a night. She worked for 10, sometimes 15, hours a week. She was using the indenting format of notetaking taught in high school for all her courses. She did not seem isolated, attending Agora events and spending a lot of time in the Cafeteria.

Affective

Her self-esteem was vulnerable. She rated herself at 4, not for her capability but for how much she was making use of it. The cause of that malaise was probably reflected in her negative advice to new students: never go to the "Caf" because you'll never get out.

Louis

Academic Success

Louis had a high school average of 69 and ended the first semester with a college average of 59.75, having passed three courses, failed one and dropped three (one of them prior to September 20 because it was a three-hour class and he could only concentrate for an hour). The one reporting teacher rated him as limited.

College Behaviour

His attendance was not adequate---17% absences---in the one reported class where the mark---65%---was the same as the overall average. He showed signs of incongruence: he had tried to sign up for a study skills workshop but after all places had been filled, and he had intended to but did not go to see a Counsellor. Similarly he failed to connect with his Humanities teacher to get information on a large project. He did not seem committed to studying, doing a bit of reading here and there just before class, cramming for tests, and some days doing no work at all. He did some highlighting in his text books and sometimes took notes; however, although he frequently forgot about assignments, he felt it was childish to get a notebook in which to keep track of them. He worked for up to 16 hours a week; when working he got little sleep and so found he slept a lot at home. He was not particularly isolated, attending Agora events even if they made him late for class, but he was nervous that a lot of his friends had left the college.

Affective

His self esteem was very low. "I'm pretty insecure." He rated himself as 4 although he would have like to be a 10. His advice was to get a note-book (agenda). He ended by chastizing himself saying he had to "smarten up".

Vince

Academic Success

Vince had a high school average of 69 and ended the first semester with a college average of 54.57 having passed five courses and failed two. Although he had officially withdraw from no courses, his parents had agreed he should concentrate on six. His teachers rated him as limited, questioning his seriousness and seeing his interest as waning over the term.

College Behaviour

His attendance was inadequate---19% absences---in the one reported classes where the mark---43%---was considerably lower than the overall average. He showed some real signs of incongruence, having used no college resources and not contacted any teachers. His study study hours were below average, 4 to 5 a week, although he had given up his job in order to come to cegep. Also, he had little sense of how to study, finding note-taking hard because the teachers speak so quickly. He preferred the high school system where they give you papers or put the material on the board. He seemed socially at ease, but his involvement was primarily talking with friends in the Cafeteria.

Affective

His self-esteem reflected the teacher assessment. He rated himself as 5, reiterating that he had bad work habits. He suggested these were exacerbated by sleeping problems. (One teacher noted he slept a lot in class). He had constructive advice to offer new students although he recognized it was a cliché that he had been told but had not acted upon: talk to your teachers and work consistently even when there is no exam.

CONCLUSION

These profiles are the result of non-obtrusive research focussing on relatively objective variables, namely those that could be reported by teachers or in an open interview (as opposed to a counselling session). Clearly they do not present a black and white contrast of the control and experimental groups. This lack of a clear pattern substantiates the common assumptions that "high risk" students merit that label for a variety of reasons and that their problems cannot be solved or even alleviated by one form of remedy.

The naturalistic data, like the quantitative findings, show that some "high risk" students succeeded in a number of ways without the treatment provided by "Entry '88". However, overall the "Entry '88" group did better. Their profiles show that they tended to live in a more positive aura, and more of their teachers rated them as adequate rather than limited, which was the common response about the controls. If we look at five indicators---academic survival (passing), awareness of study skills, more than ten hours of studying, 90% attendance, and positive self-image---we see that more of the "Entry '88" group succeeded in each category. In addition, on the average they

succeeded in 3.33 of the categories whereas the controls only succeeded in 2.6. Importantly, the widest difference between the groups was in study skills awareness and positive self-image.

In short, "Entry '88" enabled students to feel better about themselves by relating to both peers and faculty and to be more aware of themselves as learners.

C. TEACHERS' VIEWS OF THE PROGRAM

FACULTY VIEW OF THE NEEDS OF FIRST SEMESTER STUDENTS

In September 1988, 31 people who had attended a Pedagogical Day activity on the subject of first semester/year students were interviewed in order to provide a working definition of the needs of the first semester student at John Abbott.

Not surprisingly, given that all these people had invested a day in May to discussing the first year experience, all felt strongly that we need directly to address the special needs of new students. The "huge gap" between high school and college; students' deficiencies in motivation, purpose, basic skills, sense of reality or the value of reflection; the need of support during the failure that is engendered by experimenting; immaturity; the need to improve the first year in order to improve the full college career; the college's lack of direction; the need for the college to reflect an atmosphere of learning - all these were cited as reasons for devoting our energies to enriching the first year experience. There was solid, but not total, support for a special course such as "University 101" to fulfill these needs.

Discussion of how to meet these student needs was within a clearly articulated context. Many stressed the basic philosophical point that it must not be forgotten that the whole of cegep is a transition experience, either to university or the world of work. Concretely, it must not be forgotten that a major reason why we are currently not meeting the needs of new students is that we are facing classes of 45 rather than 35.

Given this serious caveat, there was consensus on first semester objectives although not everyone gave them the same emphasis. Everyone cited learning skills, including the use of college resources. One group linked these to social needs (the need to feel comfortable), another linked them to personal growth. A further group (5 teachers and the 4 non-faculty interviewed) articulated the need to address the "whole" student. The purpose of a special course for this group was summarized by one teacher as providing a context within which students can decide that they can become what they decide to be, by another as an introduction to the concept of learning.

Agreement was further shown on the components of a desirable course for these students. Reading and writing, using college resources, logical thinking, and personal development should be key components, and the methods should include group dynamics, study habits, clarification of grading policies and criteria, giving of oneself. Most endorsed compulsory attendance.

Interesting suggestions were made of further components: interviewing a professor, a LASSI inventory, clarification of meaning, financial management, wellness, giving credit for participation in extra curricular activities, involving students in charting their accumulated grades through the semester, buddies or mentors. A number of people stressed the need to ensure linkage to other courses. Some felt high risk students should have a reduced course load. Finally, some follow-up mechanism was suggested as a means of dealing with delayed crises and of underlining the fact that first semester students are beginning a process.

It was also stressed that a course alone cannot meet these needs. Other changes must be made: liaison with high schools and universities, improved admissions, up graded or extended (3 or 4 days) orientation, consistent grading standards, a sequence of the core courses, a faculty lounge to enable pedagogical exchanges. Everyone underlined the need for serious professional development aimed not only at training faculty to teach a first semester course but also at sensitizing all teachers to the special needs of first semester students, whether they be high school graduates or the more mature students.

FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN "ENTRY '88"

The interest in and support for the program shown by teachers at the College was both gratifying and heartening.

The first knowledge that faculty not on the Readiness Committee had of "Entry '88" was when they were approached at the end of the winter semester 1988 and asked whether they would be willing to have one of their courses included in the curriculum. The people approached were those known to have an interest in this type of pedagogy and to be teaching introductory courses. In agreeing to participate, they were agreeing to monitor the performance of several students in their class and to use "intrusive" techniques such as telephoning after one or two absences early in the semester. One or two teachers declined on philosophical grounds, one or two because they felt they did not have any extra time to devote to such intervention. Otherwise support was forthcoming in both principle and practice, so that forty-five teachers took part in the experiment.

All but one of those willing to be listed on the curriculum had also offered to be a "mentor" to one student. Only fifteen did so simply because of the low number of participants. Not only did these individuals provide the opportunity of this type of encounter to their students but they also came to a briefing during the first week of classes and a debriefing at the end of the semester.

In addition to this active participation, teacher co-operation was needed to collect the data on attendance and class behaviour. This meant contacting 198 (out of a total population

of about 350) teachers. Three immediately replied that such reports would countervail the confidentiality they guarantee in their courses. The reply rate from the others was 65.8%. Given that this entailed answering the "Teacher's Assessment of a Learner's Potential" (Appendix 2) on each student (the average was three per teacher) as well as reporting on absences, this high response rate can be seen as active support for this type of program.

IMPACT OF THE PROGRAM AND THE STUDY ON FACULTY

The assessment form asked teachers whether knowledge of "Entry '88" had affected their interaction with the student. Only about one-sixth of those who were participating said it had made a difference whereas the vast majority of other faculty saw no difference. A number of participating faculty and a very few of the others said knowledge of the program made no difference because they intervene with all their students. This strongly underlines the need to build awareness in the college of the needs of first semester students.

Three people pointed to problems ensuing from the "intrusive intervention". One non-participant allowed a student twice to write examinations late and then realized this was not good for her. Two mentors questioned fairness of giving the benefit of the doubt in terms either of grades or deadlines.

BENEFITS OF THE PROGRAM TO STUDENTS

The other specific comments made on the assessment form pointed to ways in which teachers felt they had been encouraged to help their students.

1. Being known

Several people mentioned that the study meant they knew the student by name. As one pointed out, "saying hello by name may [does, according to the literature] have some motivational value.

2. More contact

The principles of the "Entry '88" program and the study of the control groups meant that many teachers tried to contact students or made an effort to speak to them. This seemed particularly important with shyer students who would never come forth on their own. Yet it was not a form of "babying"---an objection often heard---but rather, as one teacher said, a way to make the students more aware of their responsibilities as learners. Although some mentors found resistance to establishing such an intensive relationship, most other teachers found that their expressed concern was appreciated. Certainly the vast majority of students interviewed appreciated "knowing" a member of faculty and found that once having spoken to one person, they

could then more easily go to see others.

3. Monitoring

Not surprisingly given the request for information on attendance and assignment completion, knowledge of the study led many to make a point of seeing whether the student was in class and to draw attention to late assignments. A number reported that one personal mention of spotty attendance led to an improvement. Others reported improved deadline fulfillment.

4. Focussed guidance

Many teachers gave more explanation, particularly of assignment requirements. Encouragingly one noted that having done this early in the term, the "high risk student" subsequently needed no more than others. This focussed guidance usually consisted of explanations that were both more careful and more patient.

5. Mentoring

This was the least successful aspect of the program. The few mentors who were able to set up regular meetings with the student found these were appreciated. They also saw benefits accruing to the student: "her work in the course improved as she came to know me better". However, most had difficulties establishing such an on-going relationship and the rejection of their offer of special support was a disappointment or frustration, even a source of anxiety. This element of the program had suffered from not being more carefully piloted beforehand.

CHAPTER FIVE

IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHING

THE NEED FOR SPECIAL PROGRAMS

"Entry '88" did enhance the chance of success of its participants. The quantitative findings show this objectively; the profiles show it more naturalistically. The "Entry '88" students tended to see both themselves and the college more positively. What they were most clearly able to articulate about the benefits of the program were knowing what to expect in classes and, over and over, having made friends. They also appreciated faculty contact. Undoubtedly this social base was linked to their more positive self-image. Teachers on the whole confirmed this more positive view by seeing these students as adequate rather than limited, the tendency for the control groups. The fact that the program fostered both positive self-image and awareness of learning-to-learn merits not only its being repeated at our college ("Entry '89" has already been approved by Academic Council) but also its being transferred elsewhere.

Certain features were crucial to the success of the program. On the College's side, the first and foremost is that all involved---both Student Service professionals, who invested enormous energy into the program, and the participating faculty---were committed to the concept. Endeavours such as this cannot simply be contractually added to a person's work load. The personnel must be committed and be the "super-persons" of the campus, innovative teachers and excellent communicators willing to give of themselves. Secondly, the program had validity because it was the responsibility, not simply of a few individuals, but of a committee of Academic Council and because the principles of the program had been officially endorsed in a motion at Academic Council. In addition, as a result of the need to collect data on the control groups, the program benefitted from having a reasonably high profile.

On the students' side, it was essential that the program be voluntary. "You can lead a horse to water, but you can't make it drink" was a cliché given meaning in assessing the experience. Deciding to enroll in the program, no matter how pressured by parents, was a statement of commitment by the students, an acknowledgement of need. The two students who fared the worst were those who decided after the workshop that they had no need for the support of the program. Once the students had acknowledged their need for support, it was crucial that the program specifically define for them these needs. This was done

in the Learning Contract Appendix 5). For this awareness to be internalized, the students had to be treated individually. This began in the summer with the with one-to-one meetings with both a Counsellor and an Advisor and continued with more personalized attention from teachers as well as mentoring for those who chose to avail themselves of this opportunity. In essence the program provided a structure. What counted was the interaction within that structure. That interaction allowed the student to feel like a whole person.

THE NEED FOR COLLEGE-WIDE CONCERN

If such a program is to be successful, it cannot exist in a vacuum. Rather, it must take place within an institution that shows by its priorities and actions that it is committed to providing quality education to individuals.

In general, there is a need for sensitization of all sectors of the college to the needs of new students, whether they enter from high school---focussing on being taught rather than on learning, or from the work force---still bearing high-school memories and expectations. This sensitization demands dissemination of existing literature, establishment of professional development courses and special workshops, and local research. (John Abbott is fortunate to have the "Easing The Transition" project currently underway.)

More specifically, a wide range of programs and services needs to be provided for these students. These include but are not limited to:

- Improved and extended orientation
- Follow-up to Parents' Night
- Improved living/learning environment in residences or other types of student housing
- Full range of extra curricular activities to ensure involvement with the institution
- Peer tutoring and peer counselling/advising
- Career counselling
- Learning Skills Centre
- Early warning intervention for students at risk of failing
- Library orientation workshops
- Special programs for special groups (eg. second language students)
- Buddy systems
- Making one office visit a course requirement
- Faculty advisory groups
- Literature in student language on college policies and procedures, including a dictionary of "acadamese"

THE NEED FOR IMPROVED PEDAGOGY

If the needs of first semester students are truly to be met, there must be innovative pedagogy in all introductory courses, not just those of special programs.

It is, however, impossible to foresee innovations without systemic changes. First and foremost, there is the need for reduced class size. As long as teachers are facing classes of over forty students and trying to get to know more than 160 individuals over the short period of sixteen weeks, it is unrealistic to talk of individual instruction. Every classroom should be a "human classroom"; the latter should not be the preserve of special programs.

This context for humane education having been established, there will then be the need to enable current faculty to become aware of and have experience with the theory and practices of active learning. Even when Cahiers requirements dictate that large quantities of information have to be transmitted in a traditional lecture mode, there are strategies (for example those cited by Gleason) for involving the students in the learning process and treating them as individuals. Fostering such awareness requires "agents of change" who can talk with colleagues informally about different approaches as well as more formal structures, Performa courses and special workshops (possibly funded by Perfectionnement collectif) being the most obvious mechanisms.

THE NEED FOR RESOURCES

All that has been stated above points to the need for additional resources. It should be obvious that the affective and cognitive problems of transition cannot be addressed within a college subscribing to mass production model. Given the range of problems and the complexity of problems within each individual, the solutions must be sensitive to individuals. Thus, human resources are needed to allow a lower class size and to provide a person who can devote time and energy to co-ordinating all the components of a meaningful program for first semester students. Financial resources are needed to provide the ancillary services required in order to make such a program effective.

The mandate of the cegeps is indeed to provide a transition for young or educationally inexperienced adults into the work place or the university. The publicity of individual colleges promises a new and meaningful experience. Yet we cannot fulfill these expectations unless we are able to meet each student as a whole person when s/he enters our college. This cannot be done without additional resources.

CHAPTER SIX

DIFFUSION OF RESULTS

WITHIN THE COLLEGE

The first diffusion concerning "Entry '88" has been very "hands-on", talking to teachers who participated in last year's program about the possibility of their being involved in "Entry '89". This has been a very productive forum as it has enabled those who believe in the concept to be informed about the practical results of last year's experiment.

Both the principle of "intrusive intervention" and the particulars of our experiment have been given a more objective airing in the debate necessary to gain official approval of "Entry '89" by Academic Council and the College.

In addition, the College Readiness Committee has this year circulated a number of newsletters in order to add to the general awareness of all staff of the needs of first semester students.

WITHIN THE NETWORK

Given the shared concerns between colleges and of both language sectors about the needs of new students, it is essential that all within the network are aware of each other's experiments. To this end, a summary of this full report will be sent, in English or French as appropriate, to all colleges. In addition an article on the principle of "intrusive intervention" will be submitted to Pedagogie collegiale and another on faculty collaboration, a significant element in this program, will be submitted to Pedagogie collegiale or Cegepropos.

BEYOND THE PROVINCE

The efforts of John Abbott in meeting the needs of first semester students have already been made known to individuals active in the "first year experience" movement. Our speaker at our 1988 Pedagogical Day was John Gardner, a founder of the movement. This semester Kenneth Long, active with the University of Prince Edward Island Summer Institute which has brought such concepts to Canada, led for us a workshop on first year pedagogy. In addition, 9 members of John Abbott staff (2 non-teaching professionals, 2 administrators, 4 teachers, 1 Professional Development Counsellor) attended the First Year Experience

Conference in Toronto in November, 1988. In short, we have already become members of an active network.

The evaluation of "Entry '88" will be submitted to The Freshman Year Experience Journal in order to make known our endeavours to members of this network. After data has been collected from "Entry '89", it is hoped that a presentaion will be made at one of the Freshman Year Experience conferences.

In addition, an article on the interaction betwen faculty and Student Services, a key factor in such an endeavour, will be submitted to the Journal of Student Personnel.

CHAPTER SEVEN

BUDGET

AMOUNT GRANTED		2000.00
EXPENSES		
Liaison	140.00	
MIS personnel	412.23	
Transcript typping	30.00	
Report - printing	225.00	
- mailing	15.00	
- translation	325.00	
Dissemination - translation	750.00	
	<hr/>	
Total	1897.23	

APPENDIX 1

END-OF-SEMESTER INTERVIEW OF FIRST SEMESTER STUDENTS

1. How do you feel about the courses you registered in this semester? Which was the best? Why? Which was the worst? Why? Was this one that you chose or one you "had to take" because of your programme or scheduling problems?
2. Did you drop a course? Why (not)? How did you feel about it? Will (Would) that (have) change(d) your plan for how many semesters you will stay at JAC?
3. Have you used any of these college resources? How many times?
 - study skills workshop
 - tutorial in the Writing Centre
 - working in a subject learning centre - eg. Math,
Business, Biology
 - appointment with an Advisor
 - appointment with a Counsellor
 - Financial Aid
 - Health Services
 - Manpower
4. Have you had a meeting with a teacher (not your mentor) outside class? How many times?
4. Have you been aware of using particular study skills strategies such as SQ4R, note-taking formats, annotating texts, time management? In which courses?
5. Looking back on the semester, about how many hours have you spent doing homework and studying each week?
6. Have you joined any club or team? Which?
7. If you have a part-time job, how many hours a week do you usually work?
8. Have you attended a college event (Theatre production, Agora happening etc.)?
9. What grade out of 10 would you give yourself as a learner? Why?
10. What advice would you give to new students coming to Abbott next fall?

APPENDIX 2

TEACHER'S ASSESSMENT OF A LEARNER'S POTENTIAL

Name of Student _____

Course in which s/he enrolled _____

1. Did knowing about the study of "Entry '88" make a difference to your interaction with the student? Please explain.

2. If so, was the difference helpful to the student? How?

3. In general, how much motivation and/or involvement did this student show?

Limited

Adequate

Excellent

4. How did this show itself in the effort in preparing for classes, writing papers, and carrying out other course responsibilities?

5. How great did the student's interest, enthusiasm, and intensity of involvement with her/his work seem to be?

APPENDIX 3

TEACHER INTERVIEW ON FIRST SEMESTER STUDENTS

1. Should JAC directly address the first-year experience?
Yes_____ No___
2. Why (not)?
3. Should this be only in orientation
or in a special course? Yes_____ No___
Yes_____ No___
4. Should the course be credit-bearing? Yes_____ No___
5. Should the course be compulsory for all,
for some, Yes_____ No___
or not? Yes_____ No___
6. Which of the "10 Guidelines" [from University of South
Carolina] do you question?
7. What should the objectives of the course be?

APPENDIX 3

TEACHER INTERVIEW ON FIRST SEMESTER STUDENTS

1. Should JAC directly address the first-year experience?
Yes_____ No___
2. Why (not)?
3. Should this be only in orientation
or in a special course? Yes_____ No___
4. Should the course be credit-bearing? Yes_____ No___
5. Should the course be compulsory for all,
for some, Yes_____ No___
or not? Yes_____ No___
6. Which of the "10 Guidelines" [from University of South
Carolina] do you question?
7. What should the objectives of the course be?
8. Could these objectives be met within the context of an
adapted content course? Yes_____ No___
9. Who should teach the course?
10. How many students should be in each section of the course?
11. What institutional changes should accompany such a course?
eg. mentors, more Student Services professionals, more
careful selection of instructors of introductory courses
12. How do you respond to Gardner's statement that "I am what
I think you think I am"?

APPENDIX 4

"ENTRY '88" PUBLICITY

LETTER TO NEW STUDENTS

Dear Student,

You are invited, along with a group of other first semester Social Science students, to participate in our innovative "Entry 88" Program at John Abbott College. This program has been specifically designed to ease the sometimes difficult transition from High School to college.

It includes:

- (1) Special orientation workshops held during Registration week to introduce you to college services and to assist you in the development of the study and 'coping' skills necessary for success at the college level.
- (2) Guaranteed registration in courses chosen by you from a comprehensive list of classes taught by teachers with a special concern for and interest in assisting the first semester students.
- (3) Availability of a personal teacher-mentor to act as a your guide and consultant throughout the first semester.

Participation in the "Entry 88" Program is entirely voluntary, but once enrolled, you will be asked to commit yourself to the program by signing a contract, the cost of which will be \$20.00, refundable upon completion of the terms of the contract.

Space in the program is limited to 30 students

Enroll now by filling the enclosed form and return it no later than June 30th.

LETTER TO TEACHERS

September 9, 1988

Dear Colleague,

As you may already know, the College Readiness Committee has developed an experimental programme, "Entry '88", for a small group of "high risk" new students. Thanks to support from John Abbott's Research and Development Committee and from a DGEC funding agency, I shall be able formally to study the effectiveness of this programme.

Two of the variables to be compared between students participating in the programme and other new students are attendance and completion of assignments. I hope, therefore, that you can add to the data of the study by monitoring---keeping track of the attendance and completion of assignments---the following students:

Some of these students are "Entry '88" participants; others are in three control groups I have set up. None of the groups yet knows that the research is taking place, but information on attendance is not confidential. All the students will learn of the research in December when I plan to interview them about their first-semester experience. At that time I will destroy records concerning any students who do not wish to be part of the study.

I am enclosing two forms. The first records daily/weekly attendance and is for those teachers who do not usually take attendance. The second is a means of getting the information to me. However, please give me a call at local 477 or 845-7006 if that is easier.

Sincerely,

Christine Starnes
for College Readiness Committee
"High Risk" Group

APPENDIX 5

STUDENT LEARNING CONTRACT

In order to maximize my chances of success in the autumn semester of 1988, I agree that I shall:

1. select my courses from those on the list of recommendations and pre-register on _____ date.
2. participate in the series of study skills workshops to be held on August 18, 19, 22, 23, 24 from _____ in room H182. time
3. attend my classes regularly, as defined by the teachers of my courses.
4. meet once with _____ to discuss my progress my Counsellor in relation to my goals and any concerns I may have. This half hour (1/2 hour) appointment will take place during the week of September 26th - 30th.
5. meet once the _____ to introduce myself and my Academic Advisor find out more about Advising services. This meeting will take place between August 29th and September 6th.
6. meet with my teacher/mentor by the third week of classes and regularly thereafter as agreed upon with my mentor.
7. not withdraw from any course before discussion with my mentor.
8. agree to liaison between my teachers and my advisor/counsellor /learning skills specialist concerning my performance in class.
9. make a deposit of twenty dollars (\$20) to be refunded on completion of activities 1-8.

Completion of these activities will not only maximize the chances of my first semester success but also directly guarantee:

- a. repayment of half the deposit during week 7 (October 10 - 14) of the semester.
- b. repayment of the second half of the deposit at the end of the semester. (This is not contingent on the first repayment).

Student

Date

Counsellor