Abstract

ADVISING SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS ON ACADEMIC PROBATION

Kaitlyn N. Stormes

This study compares the results of four different models of academic advising support for students whose first term GPA fell below a 2.0 resulting in academic probation status. Previous research suggested that one-on-one interactions during advising are beneficial for students, especially those on academic probation. Using archival data, the current study compared the effects of four models of advising: one-on-one appointment and monthly follow-up meetings with Learning Center staff; an online orientation, two-hour workshop, and monthly follow-up meetings between the student and Learning Center staff; an online tutorial only; or an online tutorial combined with a single meeting with a professional advisor. Using analysis of variance and Pearson’s chi-square tests, the four advising models were compared on the following measures: end of term GPA and overall end of year GPA for all students in the study; end of term GPA and end of year GPA among academic probation students; academic standing at the end of the year; and retention of probationary students. Results suggest no differences in these measures of success for students on academic probation based on the academic advising support model to which they were exposed.
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Advising Students on Academic Probation

Academic advisors play an important role in college student success by providing advice to students on a variety of matters. Academic advising is defined as an intentional process that facilitates students’ academic, social, professional, and personal development (Folsom, Yoder, & Joslin, 2015). Among California State Universities, students are required to meet with an academic advisor at least once a semester during the registration period for their courses. But that is not all academic advisors do; academic advisors also work closely with each student to individualize the support needed, and to help get their caseload of students moving in the direction of achieving their academic, career, and personal goals. With mandatory one-on-one meetings between a professional advisor and a student on academic probation, advisors play an important role in assisting students toward becoming academically successful (Tinto, 2000). Advisors also support students with developing decision-making skills, study techniques, referring students to appropriate resources or support, and taking an overall holistic approach toward helping students achieve academic success in the form of good academic standing and persistence at the university (Folsom et al., 2015).

The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE, 2013), found that the more students met with their advisor, the more involved and satisfied they were with their institution overall, which was related to increased retention rates. This report also suggests greater competence, learning, and professional development is related to more visits with an advisor. Positive effects were found when students were assigned a
professional advisor (Bean & Metzner, 1985; Kot, 2014; Metzner, 1989). Specifically, Metzner (1989) found a positive association between professional advising meetings and retention and a similar relationship between poor advising and attrition. This study suggests that the more advising a student received, the better retention rates were; similarly, even poor quality advising led to lower attrition compared with students that received no advising at all. In addition, Kot (2014) found that students with a professional academic advisor had higher first-term, second-term, and first-year GPA compared to students with no formal advisor. It can be concluded that academic advising is associated to measures of academic success for students, especially in their first two years of college and for students who are struggling academically (Tinto, 2012). Overall, research suggests that academic advising should be done by a professional advisor especially for students on academic probation.

The California State University Chancellor’s office provides retention rates for all the CSUs. The average CSU 1-year retention rate is 82%. In comparison to the overall CSU retention rate, a small rural college in Northern California is trailing behind on graduation and retention rates. Humboldt State University (HSU) has a 1-year retention rate of 74%. For students on academic probation, the 1-year retention rate is even lower at 59.4% (Humboldt State University Institutional Research and Planning office, 2015). A student is placed on academic probation if their attempted units and resulting cumulative GPA Fall below a 2.0 on a 4.0 scale (Humboldt State University Office of Admissions, 2014). Research at HSU suggests that being on academic probation is an
indicator of future academic success at HSU. If retention rates partly depend on the success of HSU students, and HSU is among the lower end of graduation and retention rates among the 23 CSU campuses, something needs to be done (CSU Analytic Studies, 2015). Recently there has been a national trend shifting away from one-on-one interactions and a move toward online orientations and tutorials for students on academic probation.

Not only does the first year matter, but previous research has shown that underrepresented minority students struggle to succeed in their first year (CSU Analytic Studies, 2015; Tinto, 2012). According to Howard (2014), the CSU system is moving toward becoming more diverse, and at HSU, students who are admitted each year are more diverse than the last (HSU IRP, n.d.). For example, the cohort of first-time undergraduates who matriculated Fall 2014 is larger, is more ethnically diverse, has lower high school GPAs and SAT scores, and about half of the students need at least one remediation course upon admission compared to previous years (HSU IRP, n.d.). Specifically, at HSU, 57% of students are the first in their family to attend college, 60% are female, and the majority of HSU students come from out of the Humboldt County area (HSU IRP, n. d.). By admitting a diverse group of students who need remediation, these students are at risk of failure from the start (Howard, 2014; Tinto, 2012). In sum, high probation rates and low retention rates are not only a problem for the institution, but also for the students who attend. The institution has a responsibility to increase retention rates and decrease the amount of students who are on academic probation and those who
become disqualified (Metzner, 1989). Professional advising is one example of support HSU is implementing.

Tinto (2012) suggests the success of the advisor on improving student achievement and persistence depends on who is providing the service, and their training and commitment to student success. Generally, persistence is considered to be a measure of success for a student and retention is a way for an institution to measure this success (Tinto, 2000). Common measures of academic success are end of term and end of year GPA, academic standing, and retention. There is a continuing need to study who is providing the best advising for students to persist and achieve success.

Although advising is highly related to academic success, especially during a student’s first two years of college, there is a lot about advising that is unknown and under debate (Tinto, 2012). Among the main researchers in the field, there is no consensus about the best practices for advising students on academic probation (Kuhn, 2008; Kot, 2014; Tinto, 2012). The disagreement stems from questions about who should advise students, what style of advising to use, when this advising should happen, and for how long (Eckhardt, 1992; Gordon, Habley, & Grites, 2008; Kot, 2014). Even if researchers wanted to answer these questions, the research methods bring additional challenges. Because it is unethical to randomly assign students to receive different advising support in higher education, often there is a lack of control in studying best practices for academic advising (Gordon et al., 2008). However, researchers in the field believe this type of research is important, especially in higher education (Kot, 2014;
Kuhn, 2008; Tinto, 2012). For example, Lewin (1951), as cited by Reis and Gosling (2010), says, “Beyond experimental research…the field shall also have to develop research techniques that will permit us to do real experiments within existing ‘natural’ social groups (p.82).” As “natural” social groups are exactly what higher education consists of, action research is called for.

Academic advising in higher education is difficult to study, however the few studies that exist suggest that advising is an important component of student success (Crookston, 1994; Kuhn, 2008; O’Banion, 2009). Because studying advising is important to student success, it is important to study the academic advising programs that HSU offers, and it is essential to discover how to best support these students.

Humboldt State University (HSU), a university of 8,790 students, has undergone a lot of changes in the advising support offered for students on academic probation over the years. Since 2009, HSU has moved from individual to group advising, and then to online-only support for students on academic probation. These services were primarily provided by the campus Learning Center whose primary function is academic support such as tutoring, writing, and study skills (Humboldt State University Learning Center, n. d.). The university stopped requiring one-on-one meetings between students on academic probation and professional staff in Spring 2013. In Fall 2014, a new model of advising was initiated where students were required to meet with a student services professional. Beginning Fall 2014, students were required to meet with a professional academic advisor within the Academic and Career Advising Center. First-time undergraduates on
academic probation were to meet with their professional advisor one-on-one in addition completing an online tutorial, whereas students who were not in this program only completed an online tutorial.

A number of questions are related to these changes at HSU. What difference does this shift in advising make for students on academic probation? Does having a professional advisor, as opposed to a faculty advisor or student services professional make a difference? Do one-on-one meetings make a difference?

Recently collected data offers the opportunity to analyze the effects of one-on-one meetings with a professional advisor in order to evaluate and assess the first phase of this initiative as compared to previous advising models. This study presented here evaluated academic advising for students on academic probation based on overall GPA among all students in this study, GPA among academic probation students, academic standing among probation students, retention of probation students.

The purpose of this thesis is to evaluate the impacts of previous and current academic probation advising support models implemented at HSU. Results will add to the knowledge base of what we know about academic advising for students on academic probation, and assist administrators to create effective programs to support these students. In addition, this study will help inform the HSU campus on current information about how support students on academic probation while also examining the effectiveness of the current academic advising support available for students on academic probation.
Literature Review

Academic Advising

Academic advising began in the early 19th century in the United States of America and this service became a critical component of students’ academic success (Folsom et al., 2015; Kot, 2014). Originally, faculty advisors acted as students’ surrogate parents, “in loco parentis”, and became mentors to help guide students through their education during the early stages of college (Sweeton & Davis, 2001). Later in 1971, advising expanded the caregiver role and began to incorporate vocational or career advising (Folsom et al., 2015).

As the academic advising role expanded to incorporate support for career-related goals, it became important for advisors to balance their support for their caseload of students. Kot (2014), says that professional advisors in a centralized advising office are ideal for students, especially in their first two years or if they are on academic probation. Often at universities, an advisor is one of the only people on campus of which students are required to meet with one-on-one (Folsom et al., 2015). Because academic advising reaches all students, the manner in which this service is delivered becomes especially important. Further, how the student receives advising can have an impact on their experience and success, and thus plays an important role in student persistence in college and institutional retention rates (Tinto, 2000).

In the 1990’s, advising focused on two main styles of advising, prescriptive and developmental. Over the years, advising transitioned from prescriptive to developmental
or student-centered style of advising and even more intrusive advising approaches (Crookston, 2009).

**Prescriptive advising.** Prescriptive advising provides general information to students, such as the institution’s academic rules and policies, which allow for the advisor to provide standard guidance for all students rather than individualizing advising for each student (Crookston, 1994; Winston, Miller, Ender, & Grites, 1984; Winston & Sander, 1984). Academic advisors using this advising style focus on program and degree requirements, and the student is often not involved in making decisions (Heisserer & Parette, 2002). This style of advising may be best if advisors have large caseloads or time constraints. Although, the student becomes a passive recipient, they still gain valuable information (Heisserer & Parette, 2002; Winston et al., 1984; Winston & Sander, 1984).

**Developmental advising.** Developmental advising goes beyond the degree requirements and into detail about other aspects of students’ lives. A developmental advisor focuses on each student’s personal situation (emotional and financial); academic, personal, and professional goals; and involves the student in the decision making process (Gordon et al., 2008; Heisser & Parette, 2002; Hendey, 1999). This style of academic advising is a holistic and systematic process “based on a close student-advisor relationship intended to aid students in achieving educational, career, and personal goals through the use of a full range of institutional and community resources (Hendey, 1999, p.2).” These resources may include life and career planning, decision-making skills, and
professional development (Winston et al., 1984). Through balancing the various aspects of life, and feeling emotionally supported by their advisor, students may be better able to focus on doing well in school (Tinto, 2012). Developmental advising is also a form of teaching; the advisor provides the student with support and a safe space for confiding and seeking skills needed to make decisions, problem solve, and work together to create a plan in order to achieve each student’s goals (Crookston, 1994).

**Faculty academic advisors.** Generally academic advising is provided by two types of university employees, faculty advisors and professional advisors. For faculty, advising is one component of their work, which often includes teaching, conducting research, and providing other services to the campus. According to Kot (2014), full-time faculty advisors have little to no incentives to specifically provide academic advising. If a faculty advisor’s main role is not advising, yet faculty advisors are performing advising for first and second year undergraduates, it could be seen as an area for change because this is a critical time for new students (Folsom et al., 2015; Tinto, 2012).

Nationwide, there are fewer full-time faculty than in the past due to budget cuts; many universities limit the number of tenure track faculty positions, leading to an increase in advisees assigned to each faculty member (Paulson, 2002). Although advising is part of the workload for faculty, their performance on advising is often not considered for retention, tenure, or promotion (RTP) decisions. If faculty are not being evaluated on the quality of advising they provide to students, then who should be advising students, especially in their first two years of college? Researchers suggest that
advising, especially in the first two years, should be done by professional academic advisors (Folsom et al., 2015; Gordon et al., 2008; Tinto, 2012; Tuttle, 2002).

**Professional academic advisors.** Tuttle (2002) suggests professional academic advisors are ideal for new students and explains that advising is more than helping students with their schedules. Professional advisors are assigned a caseload of students based on major or educational interests, are housed in either a centralized advising center or in specific academic departments, work closely with new undergraduate students exploring majors and careers, as well as help students with other areas of academics they may be struggling with (Gordon et al., 2008). Without responsibilities in other areas like teaching and research, professional advisors are better able to focus on the students and their needs as well as making themselves more available as a resource (Folsom et al., 2015; Gordon et al., 2008; Tinto, 2012; Tuttle, 2002). The majority (if not all) of professional advisor’s work time is dedicated to advising students and staying up to date with current policy changes, resources, activities, and services on campus.

Professional advisors typically have training in foundations of academic advising as well as advising in specific skills and tasks in related fields such as communication and counseling techniques, cultural competence, learning skills, and specific degree-related awareness such as transfer articulations, and requirements for general education (Gordon, et al., 2008). It is not that faculty advisors are incapable of these practices; rather, professional advisors have specific training in student development theory and college student life and are do not have the additional responsibility to balance their time.
or effort with other duties (Folsom et al., 2015). Lastly, it is suggested that professional advisors are best for undergraduates’ first two years at a university (Tuttle, 2002). This is important because, it is the first two years that primarily determine overall persistence, retention, and academic success (Tinto, 2012). Research shows that because of their vast knowledge of general education requirements, professional advisors provide the ideal support for first-time undergraduate students academically as well as assisting with the transition to college life (Tuttle, 2002).

**First two years.** The first two years of academic advising support are critical for helping students acclimate into college (Folsom et al., 2015). As many students attend college far from their homes, it is important for students to make their transition into college comfortable. Advisors work to help students with conceptual, informational, and relational skills (Folsom et al., 2015; Gordon et al., 2008). The success of a student in their first two years narrows down to a few factors such as community involvement (living on campus), confidence and success in their major, social integration, and involvement in high-impact practices (Tinto, 2012; Tukibayeva, & Gonyea, 2014).

**Academic advising at HSU.** At HSU, in the late 20th century, it became a requirement to have every student meet with an academic advisor at least once prior to registering for courses. Currently, the primary academic advisors at HSU are faculty, with a few exceptions based upon students’ majors. However, HSU is transitioning to assigning a professional advisor to all first-time undergraduates for their first two years, after which they will be assigned a faculty advisor in their major. The first step in this
transition is to have a group of professional advisors engage with first-time undergraduates in select departments. There has been a shift in the way academic advising has been defined, as well as a shift in approach to working with students on academic probation. For purpose of this study, academic advising will be defined using the new operational definition for HSU:

Advising is an intentional process that facilitates student’s academic, professional, and personal development. Using student development theory to establish learning outcomes, professional advisors help students get the most out of their college experience. Professional Academic Advisors connect students to campus and community resources, provide information about opportunities to enhance the student’s education, and discuss how students can integrate their education into their personal and professional goals (HSU, 2013).

Humboldt State University’s centralized advising office, the Academic and Career Advising Center, houses professional advisors who work one-on-one with students to pair academic and career goals, and provide resources to support and guide students through their transition into college and beyond graduation.

In Fall 2014, HSU began the first cohort called Phase One, which consisted of first-time undergraduate students who declared majors within select departments who were assigned a professional advisor based on their declared major. The academic departments included in Phase One were: Biological Sciences, Environmental Science and Management, Psychology, Sociology, Undeclared, and Wildlife. In addition, student
athletes and students in Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) were included in Phase One. A student was assigned a Phase One professional advisor upon declaring a major that fit within the departments listed above or if they were an athlete or EOP student. After their second year, or changing their major to one not included in Phase One (athletes and EOP students were excluded), the students’ advisor transitioned to a faculty advisor.

The overarching goals of the new advising model were to increase retention and graduation rates, reduce time to graduation, and close the achievement gap between underrepresented minority (URM) and non-URM students (HSU, 2013). By professional advisors supporting students on academic probation, Phase One included a best-practice advising model to promote retention (Great Schools Partnership, n. d.).

**Academic probation.** If a student’s overall grade point average (GPA) or the cumulative GPA falls below 2.0 on a 4.0 scale a student is placed on academic probation (AP) (Humboldt State University Catalog, 2014). At HSU, one measurement of student academic success is their GPA. For example, a student is in good academic standing if their GPA is above a 2.0, and student is placed on academic probation if their term or cumulative GPA is below a 2.0. Once on academic probation, students have two consecutive semesters to return to good standing, or they will not be able to return to the university before reapplying if they meet the reinstatement criteria (Humboldt State University Catalog, 2014). Additionally, there is an academic disqualification threshold which depends on a students’ class standing. Students will be academically disqualified if
their cumulative or HSU GPA is below the appropriate level for their class standing. For example, first-year undergraduates need an HSU GPA above 1.5 in order to avoid disqualification.

**Other programs/ previous research.** There are many ways that universities provide support to academic probation students. For example, some institutions have implemented proactive probation interventions that are more hands-on than HSU’s online-only tutorial probation program (Education Advisory Board, 2012). These universities have students on academic probation enroll in supplemental courses for the entire semester in order to learn academic skills such as studying, note and test-taking strategies. By requiring students to take a course, and meet monthly for one-on-one follow up meetings, universities such as Sonoma State University and California State University Fullerton have seen improvements in student success and retention (Education Advisory Board, 2013). Phase One advising support for students on academic probation at HSU was redesigned to provide additional support to students using best practices in the first stage of implementation, in order to meet the unique needs of the campus.

Approximately, at HSU, seven percent of first-time undergraduate students on academic probation are disqualified because of failure to increase GPA above the threshold for their class standing (HSU IRP, 2015). Other universities require that students attend courses, workshops, and mandatory meetings with an advisor but HSU only requires an online orientation for students who are not in Phase One (Education Advisory Board, 2012). Meeting in person with an advisor is recommended for
increasing student success (Tinto, 2012). Since 2014, Phase One advising support was created to help increase student success, and provide more support for students on academic probation.

*Academic probation at HSU.* In an effort to provide assistance to students on academic probation, a hold is placed on the student’s account, which prevents the student from registering for the next semester or changing their schedule. A registration hold labeled “Academic Probation”, is removed only after completing mandatory steps indicated on their student account. The mandatory steps have varied over the years and historically more was required from students on academic probation. For example, in person meetings, workshops, follow-up meetings, and online trainings were required but currently the majority of students only have to complete an online tutorial, unless they are in Phase One. This study examined the four advising models that HSU has provided to students on academic probation since 2009 (See Appendix A).

*Advising Model 1.* Starting in Fall 2009 and ending Spring 2011, students on academic probation met one-on-one with a Learning Center staff member to discuss the rules and regulations of being on academic probation and circumstances that contributed to academic probation status (Humboldt State University Learning Center, n. d.). During these meetings, an Academic Success Plan (ASP) was also created to help the student turn their grades around. This plan needed to be signed by the students’ faculty advisor and brought back to the Learning Center (LC) in order for the student’s hold to be
removed. In addition to this requirement, students also met with staff in the LC for monthly follow-up appointments (Humboldt State University Learning Center, n. d.).

Advising Model 2. From Fall 2011 to Spring 2012, workshops and an online orientation program replaced one-on-one advising support from LC staff. The ASP was created during a two-hour academic probation on-campus workshop, run by two LC staff and two student employees. The students on academic probation were required to bring their ASP to their faculty advisor for a review and signature before getting their holds released. In addition to the online orientation and two-hour workshop, students were required to attend monthly follow-up meetings with a Learning Center staff member (Humboldt State University Learning Center, n. d.).

Advising Model 3. Beginning in Spring 2013, students on academic probation (AP) were only required to complete an online tutorial created by HSU, to remove their “Academic Probation Hold” before registering for classes (Humboldt State University Learning Center, n. d.). The online-only tutorial, alerts students that they need to take action in order to avoid disqualification. Completion of the tutorial produces an ASP, which is then automatically emailed to the student and their assigned academic advisor but no in-person meetings or signatures were required. The Learning Center approximates that completing this tutorial should require about 34 minutes of the students’ time (Humboldt State University Learning Center, n. d.). Once students complete the tutorial, their holds are removed between 24 to 48 hours later. Students are no longer required to meet monthly with an LC staff member, but are encouraged to
follow-up with them, attend workshops, and meet with their faculty advisor but are not held accountable for these initiatives.

Advising Model 4. In addition to the LC online tutorial, students who are in Phase One and on academic probation, have an additional hold on their student account which is removed only after meeting with their professional academic advisor. At this meeting, the student fills out an Intake Form (see Appendix B), which provides an opportunity for the student to reflect on their life and the circumstances that led to the resulting academic probation standing. This meeting provides the advisor an opportunity to take a holistic approach to each student’s situation. During the meeting, the professional advisor and the student strategize actions and agree on the specific steps the student will take to return to good academic standing (see Appendix C). Phase One advisors provide more assistance for students on academic probation than the online-only model that was implemented in 2013. By providing additional support for students on academic probation, both retention and students’ GPAs should increase (Kot, 2014; Tinto, 2000, 2012).

Measures of student success. Increasing student retention is an important goal for the university as it benefits students (Tinto, 2012). Humboldt State University seeks to retain and successfully graduate students. Impacts to funding are also at risk as a consequence of low retention rates (Dougherty et al., 2014). The low retention rates also have implications for the students. If there are not improvements made to better support students on academic probation, and thus increase retention, one result is when students
become disqualified from the university and enter the workforce without a degree, and are burdened by student loans. However, academic probation is just one aspect of the various reasons why students may not be retained (Tinto, 2012). Some variables outlined by Demetriou and Schmitz-Sciborski (2011) that influence retention include: academic preparation, academic motivation and engagement, social engagement, financing college, and demographic characteristics.

As the university has a responsibility for retaining and graduating students, better assisting students on academic probation could be one way of better meeting that mark (Tinto, 2000). Additionally, as noted, not being able to retain and graduate students has the potential for the loss of funding, national ranking, and ability to attract students in the future (Dougherty et al., 2014). Currently, HSU is on an enrollment-based funding model (California’s Legislative Analyst’s Office, 2007). This model is based on enrollment data and campus capacity (California’s Legislative Analyst’s Office, 2006). Paradoxically, performance-based funding (PBF) is more closely associated to the budget being based on performance measures such as retention and graduation rates (National Conference of State Legislatures, n. d.; Dougherty et al., 2014).

There is discussion amongst administrators and within the California State University system (including HSU) of moving toward a performance-based funding model (National Conference of State Legislatures, n. d.; Dougherty et al., 2014). This model is currently implemented in 30 other states. If HSU moves to this model, budgeting will be allocated based on institutional performance. Some indications of
performance are course completion, time to complete degree, transfer rates, and number of degrees awarded and number of low-income and minority graduates (Coles, 2004).

There are four more states including Colorado, Georgia, Iowa, and South Dakota which are in the process of transitioning to this model. California could be the next state to transition, which emphasizes the importance of increasing retention in order to meet performance criteria for budgeting. In addition, recruiting new students requires higher rates of retention and graduation rates, as these rates are quality indicators important to prospective students and their parents (Tinto, 2012). If HSU is not able to better retain and graduate students, then another consequence may be that future students may not wish to attend.

Potential students see the retention and graduation rates of the university when applying to the university, and this information is also available for students on HSU’s data dashboards (HSU IRP Data Dashboards, 2016). Thus increasing retention is important not only financially for the institution, but also for the entire student population, including prospective students.

**Statement of the Problem**

Each year, for the past five years, an average of 16.2% of HSU students were on academic probation. Almost half of those students (7.2%) were unable to return to good academic standing and consequently, were disqualified from the institution. In 2011, 73% of first-time full-time undergraduates were retained for one year. Sixty percent were retained two years and 56% were retained for three years (HSU IRP, n. d.). In
comparison to the average CSU system rates, HSU is underperforming because the average 1-year retention rates for CSU are 82% and 2-year retention rates are 73%. This is a problem not only for the university, but also the students who attend. The university is trying to increase retention rates and reducing the amount of students on academic probation will help HSU meet this goal. If this can be accomplished, both the institution and the students will benefit. By demonstrating an increase in measures of success and retention, this research will provide insight to improve advising support provided to for students on academic probation.

Importance of this Research

This study examines the efficacy of the portion of the Phase One advising model designed to assist students on academic probation and increase their end of year GPA and resulting academic standing as well as overall retention. There is a lack of consensus on what academic advising is, and who should support students during their first and second-years of college (Tuttle, 2002). Migden (1989), suggests professional advisors are most qualified to serve the academic needs of first-year students. As noted earlier, professional advisors’ sole duty is advising compared to faculty advisors who are also conducting research and teaching. Phase One involves professional advisors using a developmental advising style assigned to a caseload of students for two years.

There are a number of reasons why Phase One, the new advising model was created. One rationale is if these students have a repeated one-on-one relationship with a professional advisor, this may allow students to feel more confident asking questions and
seeking resources needed to become successful. Kirk-Kuwaye and Nishida (2001) suggest high advisor involvement will help students on academic probation to increase GPA, persist at the university, and get on a track towards becoming academically successful. This interpersonal involvement is important for students on academic probation as they may be experiencing more difficulty in their academics so asking for help may pose additional challenges (Kirt-Kuwaye & Nishida, 2001). Another rationale is that there are inconsistencies among faculty advisors regarding knowledge of general education requirements, programs, policies and procedures, and overall time allotted for academic advising (Kot, 2014; Tinto, 2012). The advising program was intended to help all students, and in its first year, did its best to help students on academic probation as well.

**Research Purpose**

For the purpose of this research, the main focus was to study HSU Phase One students who have earned below a 2.0 term or cumulative GPA, and were consequently on academic probation. This research compared four models of academic advising support on measures of academic success i.e. end of term GPA, end of year GPA, academic standing, and retention.
Hypotheses

**Hypothesis 1.** With the use of the new advising model, there will be an increase in end of term GPA (Spring term) for students in Phase One compared to the GPA of student cohorts who received different academic advising support.

**Hypothesis 1a.** There will be an increase in end of year GPA for students in Phase One compared to the GPA of student cohorts who received different academic advising support.

*Hypothesis 1 and 1a rationale.* Research by Tuttle (2002) suggests that professional advisors serve students best (compared to faculty advisors) especially in their first two years. Research on student support services to help students find a sense of belonging is related to academic success outcomes (Tinto, 2000, 2012). Assuming, students meet with a professional advisor, it is expected that these students will have higher GPA than students in the past who did not have a professional advisor and were not part of Phase One (Migden, 1989).

**Hypothesis 2.** There will be an increase in academic probation students’ end of term GPA (Spring term) for students in Phase One compared to the end of year GPA of students on academic probation who were not exposed to the Phase One model.

**Hypothesis 2a.** There will be an increase in end of year GPA for students on academic probation in Phase One compared to the end of year GPA of student cohorts who received different academic advising support.
**Hypothesis 2 rationale.** Research suggests that with an active professional advisor assisting students on academic probation, their GPA and overall academic success will improve (Midgen, 1989; Kirk-Kuwaye & Nishida, 2001). Students who participated in an academic probation intervention and met with their advisor three or more times improved their GPA compared to students who did not (Preuss & Switalski, 2008). With the use of probation interventions, previous research found increased GPA therefore it is expected that this study, will find a similar outcome (Kot, 2014; Preuss & Switalski, 2008).

**Hypothesis 3.** More students on academic probation will return to good standing with the new Phase One program compared to students who did not receive professional academic advising.

**Hypothesis 3 rationale.** Preuss and Switalski (2008) found that students moved to good standing when participating in academic probation interventions especially when they met with an advisor at least once, compared to students who did not participate or meet with their advisor. Thus, it is expected that if students who are required to meet with a professional advisor one-on-one, more students will return to good standing compared to students who received other probation support interventions. In addition, (one-on-one meetings with a professional advisor) should be less likely to become academically disqualified compared to students in previous years.
Hypothesis 4. One-year retention rates will be higher for Phase One students on academic probation compared to students who did not receive support from a professional advisor.

Hypothesis 4 rationale. According to Tinto (1993) as cited by Kot (2014), “Effective retention programs recognize academic advising as being at the core of institutional success to educate and retain students (p. 529).” Research by Kot (2014) suggests retention rates increase when students work one-on-one with professional advisors who are committed to providing advising to students about their academic and career goals. Professional advisors take a holistic approach to advising students and talk not only about academics, but also other aspects of students’ lives, and help them feel connected to campus staff (Folsom et al., 2015; Krause & Coates, 2008; & Tinto, 2012). Connectedness is particularly important for HSU, as currently, 85% of current students are from areas outside of Humboldt County (HSU IRP, n. d.).

Summary of research purpose. The purpose of this research was to assess the effectiveness of academic probation support offered for students at HSU, primarily in Phase One, HSU’s new advising model. It was expected that Phase One student’s end of term GPA would be higher with the current advising model of students in these majors compared to previous student’s end of term GPAs. End of term and end of year GPAs should be higher for Phase One students when compared to other advising models. It was hypothesized that compared to previous advising support models, students on academic probation in Spring 2015 (who received the new intervention) would improve their end of
year GPA, end of term (Spring) GPA, improve their academic standing, and more students will be retained. In sum, active involvement from professional advisors paired with one-on-one advising support for students on academic probation, could provide the help needed for struggling students resulting in higher end of term GPA, end of year GPA, academic standing, and retention rates.

Method

Participants

This study analyzed a sample of 3,019 Humboldt State University first-time undergraduates who matriculated Fall semester from 2009 to 2014. These students were in a Phase One major Fall census and in a Phase One major at Spring census. Of the 3,019 students, 881 were placed on academic probation following their first semester at HSU. The following academic departments are part of the Phase One program being evaluated: Biological Sciences, Environmental Science and Management, Psychology, Undeclared, Sociology, and Wildlife students. Going back to 2009, 600 student athletes and 856 students in the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) would have been part of Phase One, regardless of their major. However, due to the additional resources these students receive, they were excluded from this study (see Table 1).

Four cohorts of students in the same departments from previous years (from 2009 through 2014) will be used as comparison groups. Each group received different probation interventions. Advising Model 1 \( (n = 956) \) was exposed to one-on-one appointments and monthly follow-up meetings. Advising Model 2 \( (n = 484) \) was
exposed to an online orientation, 2-hour workshop, and monthly follow-up meetings. Advising Model 3 ($n = 1029$) was only exposed to an online-only tutorial. Finally, Advising Model 4 ($n = 550$) was exposed to an online-only tutorial and one-on-one meeting with a professional advisor (see Appendix A).

Secondary data analysis provided student demographics for all students in this study (see Table 1). Of the 3,019 students who were Phase One majors, 46% ($n = 1,396$) were first generation, 38% ($n = 1,136$) were underrepresented minority students, 40% ($n = 1,220$) needed remediation where 14% ($n = 425$) needed both math and English, 7.5% ($n = 226$) needed English only, and 19% ($n = 569$) needed math only. Eighty-five percent ($n = 2,562$) live on campus, and 18% ($n = 540$) took an average of 14 units.

Of the 881 students who were in a Phase One major and on academic probation, 44.4% ($n = 468$) were first generation, 47% ($n = 415$) were underrepresented minority students, 47.8 % ($n = 421$) needed remediation where 18.4% ($n = 162$) needed both math and English, 9.8% ($n = 86$) needed English only, and 19.6% ($n = 173$) needed math only, 86.4% ($n = 761$) live on campus, and 18.3% ($n = 16$) took an average of 14 units.
### Table 1

**Participant Demographics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Participants Count</th>
<th>All Participants %</th>
<th>Probation Students Count</th>
<th>Probation Students %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>3,019</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation</td>
<td>1,136</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remediation</td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URM</td>
<td>1,136</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lives On Campus</td>
<td>2,562</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>86.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (14) units</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Count is actual number of participants and % represents this percentage.
Study Procedure

First-time undergraduates who declared a major in one of the selected departments, were automatically assigned a professional advisor through the Academic and Career Advising Center. However, Students who declared a major in one of the selected departments prior to Fall 2014 had a different advising model (see Appendix A).

Secondary data analysis was used to examine existing data records and demographics of the participants in this study. There was no random assignment when the data was collected, thus the study is a quasi-experiment. Humboldt State University actively collects information and data about their students and this information is then stored in the Strategic Data Repository (SDR). The SDR is an Oracle database that contains all of HSU’s student data. These data are used for evaluating institutional effectiveness. Together PeopleSoft and SDR house much of the institution’s data on students and campus employees. This database is maintained by staff in the Office of Institutional Research and Planning (IRP), and is the source of data for various specialized reporting. After submitting a data request through IRP, Institutional Review Board approval was obtained (IRB # 15-009).

Data Analysis

In order to clean and code the dataset, IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 23.0. was used. Missing data was missing at random. Of the missing data, 9.5% of all participants did not return after their first semester so their end of Spring term GPA was
not present, and 14.87% of students on academic probation did not return after Fall semester. For those who did not return after Fall semester, they did not have an end of Spring GPA which is why the sample size for the GPA end of term (Spring) is smaller. Parametric data was checked for homogeneity of variance and assumptions of normality were met. For Hypotheses 1 and 2, the dependent variable is GPA end of Spring term, a continuous variable, so analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used. Similarly, for Hypotheses 1a and 2a, the dependent variable was GPA and of year, a continuous variable, and an ANOVA was used. For the Hypothesis 3, the dependent variable was academic standing, a categorical variable, so Pearson’s chi-square test of independence was used. An additional chi-square test of independence was used to test Hypothesis 4, as the dependent variable, retention, was categorical. A student could only be in one category, either retained or not. Hypothesis 5 did not have a large enough sample size to test, and was omitted from the study.

Before doing the study, power analyses were run to determine minimum sample sizes necessary to avoid a type II error. After running power analyses for the tests of frequencies and mean comparisons, with an alpha of .05, power of 0.80, and an effect of $\varphi = 0.09$, the sample size needed was 785. For the parametric tests, a sample size of 1096 was needed with an alpha of .05, power of .80, $\eta^2 = 0.10$. For the following analyses, sufficient power of 0.80 was present in all cases, and minimum sample sizes were obtained.
Results

In regards to Hypothesis 1, there was not a significant effect of end of term GPA on levels of advising support treatments. Advising Model 1 ($M = 2.29, SD = 1.15$) did not differ from Advising Model 2 ($M = 2.17, SD = 1.19$), Advising model 3 ($M = 2.27, SD = 1.20$), or Advising Model 4 ($M = 2.26, SD = 1.24$), $F(3, 2728) = 0.762, p = .515, \eta^2 = .001$. Indicating there was no difference in end of term GPA depending on advising support.

Similarly, there was not a significant effect for Hypothesis 1a, on end of year GPA on academic advising support models. Where Advising Model 1 ($M = 2.51, SD = 0.95$) did not differ from Advising Model 2 ($M = 2.43, SD = 0.98$), Advising Model 3 ($M = 2.50, SD = 1.00$), or Advising Model 4 ($M = 2.50, SD = 1.01$), $F(3, 3015) = 1.070, p = .361, \eta^2 = .001$. There was no difference in the outcome of end of year GPA depending on the advising support model students received.

For Hypothesis 2, when looking at students who are on academic probation, there was not a significant effect of end of term GPA on advising treatment for students on academic probation. There was no difference between Advising Model 1 ($M = 1.56, SD = 1.15$), Advising Model 2 ($M = 1.63, SD = 1.14$), Advising model 3 ($M = 1.60, SD = 1.18$), or Advising Model 4 ($M = 1.64, SD = 1.18$), $F(3, 746) = 0.275, p = .843, \eta^2 = .001$. There was not a difference in terms of end of term GPA for students on academic probation depending on advising support.
Similar results were found for Hypothesis 2a, in terms of end of year GPA. There was not a significant effect on end of year GPA on advising treatment for students on academic probation, where Advising Model 1 \((M = 1.85, SD = 1.01)\), Advising Model 2 \((M = 1.83, SD = 1.19)\), Advising model 3 \((M = 1.90, SD = 1.04)\), and Advising Model 4 \((M = 1.92, SD = 1.04)\) did not differ, \(F(3, 877) = 0.226, p = .878, \eta^2 = .001\). There is no difference in terms of end of year GPA for students on academic probation regardless of advising model they received.

For Hypothesis 3, academic standing was studied for students on academic probation. The type of advising model of support offered did not have a significant effect on whether students on academic probation return to good standing, \(\chi^2(6) = 10.89, p = .092, \varphi = .111\). There is no difference in terms of academic standing based on the advising treatments that students on academic probation received (see Table 2).
### Table 2

*Academic Standing*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disqualified</th>
<th>Good Standing</th>
<th>Academic Probation and Reinstatement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advising Model 1 Count</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>113.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising Model 1 Expected</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>108.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising Model 2 Count</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising Model 2 Expected</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising Model 3 Count</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>150.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising Model 3 Expected</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>137.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising Model 4 Count</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising Model 4 Expected</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Count is actual number of participants and Expected represents what we would expect statistically if the treatment did not have an effect.
For Hypothesis 4, retention was studied and the type of advising support model did not have a significant effect on whether students on academic probation were retained, $\chi^2(3) = 1.639, p = .651, \phi = .043$. There was no difference in advising models when looking at retention (see Table 3).

The results described above suggest that there was no influence of academic advising support on the academic outcomes of the students studied.
Table 3  
*Retention*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Retained</th>
<th>Not Retained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advising Model 1 Count</td>
<td>138.0</td>
<td>108.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising Model 1 Expected</td>
<td>132.1</td>
<td>113.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising Model 2 Count</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising Model 2 Expected</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>68.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising Model 3 Count</td>
<td>166.0</td>
<td>168.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising Model 3 Expected</td>
<td>148.0</td>
<td>145.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising Model 4 Count</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising Model 4 Expected</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>80.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Count is actual number of participants and Expected represents what we would expect statistically if the treatment did not have an effect.


**Discussion**

Significant differences between advising support treatments were expected but it is clear from the results that this was not the case. Regardless of the Phase One advising group that was studied, advising models had no significant influence on either end of term GPA, end of year GPA, academic standing, or retention. It is important to acknowledge that this was the first year this program was implemented. Overall, with action research comes many limitations. Additionally, there were many unforeseen circumstances that may have led to the results this study found. Discussing the limitations helps the university to recognize the problems now, and prepare more structure for implementation as well as data collection prior to professional advising moving campus-wide. Even though the results were not significant, we cannot say if changes are made, whether professional advisors serving students on probation will make more of a difference in the future.

**Limitations**

Assessing programs at a university brings many challenges and limitations that may have contributed as to why this study did not find differences among advising treatments. The first limitation is the lack of randomized control available in higher education. Without being able to randomly assign students to different treatment groups, there is a possible confound of history and cohort effects.
The data obtained for this study from the university database was messy. First, the data provided needed to be defined by the Humboldt State University Data Dictionary, and matched to the CSU Enrollment Reporting System (ERS). Even after fields were determined, further work needed to done to ensure variables were valid. For example, the GPA variable I was provided was not the original GPA students had when they were on academic probation in the past. It was upwardly adjusted for the classes they retook after the original probation notice. When studying students and their GPAs over time, the valid variable would be the original GPA students earned that put them on academic probation, not the adjusted GPA. The university was unaware of this discrepancy, and thus was making decisions based on bad data. Because of this study (I noticed the error and created a valid measure of GPA for this thesis) the university was made aware of this issue, and was able to create a valid measure of original GPA for students.

Further issues with the data came when defining treatment groups and who would be included in the sample for this study. For example, even with a Fall census to Spring census definition for the Phase One cohort, it is unknown whether students remained in the program the full academic year. One reason is because, at this time, the data is not available to follow students in and out of Phase One majors to get an accurate sample of students who were actually served. When a student uses campus services, their interactions are documented in the Oracle database PeopleSoft through the use of student service codes. Even if a student met with an advisor, there was no probation code
available to indicate what the meeting was about. Thus there was not an accurate way to measure how many meetings a student attended, how long meetings were, and amount of meetings for students in this study. Discovering the issue of coding deficiencies through this study provided me an opportunity to bring awareness of this issue to the director of advising, and resulted in the creation of new and specific coding protocols for a variety of advising services to eliminate this problem going forward.

The previous example of advising service codes led to further investigation of the processes and other documentation for the meetings Phase One students had with their professional advisor. It is possible that with more structure to academic advising meetings, less advising variability, less advisor turnover, a better definition of Phase One cohort, more than one required meeting, and better documentation for students support services, different outcomes may be found. Although this program was partially implemented, this study provided stakeholders an opportunity to communicate efforts and design a stable structure for advising prior to going campus wide.

Hypothesis 5 (Phase One major- Sociology would perform better than a non Phase One major- Anthropology) was not able to be tested. Although the Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS) codes illustrated Sociology and Anthropology to be comparable, the data showed otherwise. For example, after eliminating Criminology and Justice Studies from the Sociology department in order to make the major comparable, the resulting low sample sizes did not permit analysis and similar issues existed for Anthropology.
Lastly, this research did not find differences in advising models a student received on measures of student success, but there are many things not accounted for. Some issues not controlled for include: financial, home, and food insecurity, class times or availability of classes, students in the wrong majors, and inconsistency with students receiving additional services such as tutoring, supplemental instruction, and involvement with high-impact practices such as research, clubs and other activities (Tukibayeva & Gonyea, 2014).

**Recommendations**

One recommendation would be for future researchers to repeat this study when some of the structural challenges have been addressed and fully implemented. The current Phase One advising model had many limitations in terms of: changes to the way students were admitted based on admissions criteria changing over time, the current HSU culture that perpetuates the belief that advising is solely class scheduling, lack of consistent structure in the one-on-one meetings, and that Phase One was recommended in Spring 14 and implemented in Fall 2014 without much time to prepare for advising students on academic probation for Spring 2015. Further, the original recommendations for professional advisors did not address criteria for academic probation. Therefore, the interventions were implemented swiftly.

In addition, future research may consider other variables that the literature supports as an effect of measures of academic success. For example, number of hours students work, extracurricular activities, first-generation, high school GPA, SAT scores,
financial aid, if students live on or off campus, involvement in clubs, research on campus or within the community, distance from primary caregiver, or number of roommates could be areas for future exploration.

Another option may be to look at correlations between number of meetings with professional advisor and measures of student success. For example, as noted earlier, the research suggests that the more times a student meets with their advisor, the higher their GPA thus indicating a positive relationship between meetings and GPA. It would also be beneficial to run analyses on the responses to the student success forms that students fill out at the initial academic probation meetings. For example, the number of hours they report spending on studying compared to the recommended 2:1 study rule HSU has (two hours studying for every one hour a student is in class).

Finally, recommendations to provide additional support opportunities for students on academic probation that may be implemented as the program is fully implemented include: students on academic probation to take a course similar to Supplemental Instruction (SI) about how to manage time and be a successful student, require monthly meetings between professional advisors and students, create study groups within the caseload of advisees in similar courses, mandatory meetings between the student and each of their professors, and have the students log their hours spent studying.

In conclusion, advising support for students did not show a difference in terms of end of Spring term GPA and end of year GPA. The same was true for students on academic probation. In addition, probation students did not differ based on advising
support in terms of end of semester GPA, end of year GPA, academic standing, or retention. Contrary to expectations, Phase One’s program of having probation students meet one-on-one with a professional advisor, did not have a significant effect on measures of student success at this time. However, more research is needed to address the underlying factors of these results. Should the program limitations be addressed, and a randomized control be created, it is unknown if increases in measures of success would be different in the future.

This study offers suggestions for conducting assessment in the future and has shed light on the data challenges, which provides an opportunity for HSU to investigate other options for tracking students during a partial implementation process. Finally, by conducting this thesis, the university was made aware of several important areas in the program that needed improvement. It is gratifying to note that these changes are currently being implemented.
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Appendix A: Four Models of Advising
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Advising support at HSU
Appendix B: Intake Form

Assess Your Skills:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th></th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concentration during class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Note taking from lectures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentration while studying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Note taking from books &amp; other sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Skills (developing &amp; organizing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Computer / Technology Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar / Punctuation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Math Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation / Oral Communication Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Time Allocation:
- Estimate the hours per week that you study: ________________________________
- Where do you usually study? ______________________________________________
- How many hours per week do you work? ____________________________
- What type of work do you do? ____________________________
- How many hours per week are you involved in sports? ________________________
- What other non-campus commitments do you have? __________________________
- How many hours per week do they demand? ____________________________

Campus Involvement:
- Do you participate in campus activities? (cultural, social, art, music, sporting events) Yes No
- Do you belong to a campus club or group? Yes No
- List: How many hours per week do you participate? ____________________________
- Do you hold any leadership positions? (club, job, or other) Yes No

Major Involvement:
- Do you meet regularly with your advisor? Yes No
- Do you meet regularly with professors? Yes No
- Do you feel your major is a good fit? Yes No
- Do you feel confident in your major or prerequisite courses? Yes No
- Have you had a career or major related job or internship? Yes No

Personal Concerns: (check areas of concern)
- Motivation
- Alcohol / drugs
- Career / major
- Significant other
- Sports
- Attitude about school
- Health
- Work
- Friends
- Low self-confidence
- Academic burnout
- Test Anxiety
- Finances
- Roommates
- Feeling lonely
- Feeling depressed
- Math Anxiety
- Family
- Living situation
- Homesickness
- Sleeping / eating habits
- General Anxiety
- Children
- Extra-curricular
- Other

Service and Resources: (check all in which you are interested)

Study Skills:
- Note taking
- Textbook Reading
- Learning Styles
- Memory
- Test Taking
- Managing Test Anxiety
- Time Management & Organization (help to stay on track)
- Tutoring (small group or individual): ____________________________

Staff: ___________________________________________________ Learning Center 2011 12/10
Appendix C: Strategies to Return to Good Standing

**Strategies to Return to Good Academic Standing**

- My current academic status is ________________ and my cumulative GPA is ________
- I need a MINIMUM term/semester GPA of _____ in order to return to good academic standing (cumulative GPA of 2.0)
- Grades I need to earn in current classes to reach my minimum term/semester GPA (use grade predictor on RamWeb):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Name</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Grade I Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- I will repeat/drop (if possible) the following courses:
  -
  -
  -
  -
- The deadline to add/drop a class without a serious and compelling reason is ____________
- I will communicate with my advisor _____ times this semester (phone appointment, email, in person)
- I will study for _____ hours outside of class time, per week.
- I will attend each of my faculty/TA's office hours _____ this semester
- I will utilize the following tutoring and study group resources:
  -
  -
  -
- I will attend the following academic skills workshops this semester:
  -
  -
  -
- I will utilize the following campus resources:
  -
  -
  -
- I will utilize a daily planner or semester-at-a-glance to track all of my major exams, papers, and projects