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## Overview

This session explores the process of building and rebuilding a Success Course to engage and respond to the needs of diverse learners. As we discuss measures for developing and improving transitional supports, we will examine:
D characteristics of the "non-traditional" student
> revising a Success Course for diverse learners
> longitudinal measures of efficacy:

- the Learning and Study Strategies Inventory or LASSI-2 (Weinstein, Palmer \& Shute, 2002), persistence rates, and academic performance outcomes
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## Non-traditional learners

Many of our students could be characterized as non-traditional, with circumstances or backgrounds that would have made them unlikely to attempt or be successful at other tertiary institutions

What measures are used to characterize "non-traditional" or diverse learners?

According to the National Center for Education Statistics (2010) in the U.S., characteristics or factors that identify non-traditional learners include:

- Non-sequential learner
- Part-time studies
- Works 35 hours a week or more
- Has dependents
- Single parent
- Has a completion certificate rather than a high school diploma
- Is financially independent


## Northern and Remote School Division



## Building a Success Course

- Fundamentals of Inquiry was approved by Senate as a credit-bearing course for 2005 to address issues of academic preparation as well as integration into the greater academic community
- Not an extended orientation program
- An interdisciplinary course designed to emphasize skills that transfer broadly across disciplines
- team taught
- Incoming students referred (through counsellor or self) are encouraged to take this critical thinking and learning skills "Success Course"
- High standards including a major Research Paper


## Control Group

- Students in Introductory Psychology participated in the Research Board approved study for additional research credit in their course
- Tracked since their enrolment in 2005 or 2006
- Institutional records accessed included high school grades, age, prior GPA (if any), and geographical catchment area
- Students completed the LASSI-2 in the first and last weeks of the semester


## Demographics

Control Group (Psychology Class)

- $\mathrm{n}=78$, 2005-2007
- $19.2 \%$ male
- $29 \%(n=23)$ with at least one "risk factor"

Success Course (Inquiry Class)

- $\mathrm{n}=172,2005-2011$
- $24.4 \%$ male
- $64 \%(n=110)$ with at least one "risk factor"


## High School Grades



## Potential Risk Factors - comparison issues

|  | Psychology Class | Success Course |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Health Issues | $n / a$ | $19.2 \%(n=33)$ |
| International or <br> EAL Student | $6.4 \%(n=5)$ | $2.9 \%(n=5)$ |
| College Transfer | $2.6 \%(n=2)$ | $7.6 \%(n=13)$ |
| No High School | $1.3 \%(n=1)$ | $8.1 \%(n=14)$ |
| Northern or <br> Remote School <br> Division | $7.7 \%(n=6)$ | $15.1 \%(n=26)$ |

## Potential Risk Factors - significant differences

|  | Psychology Class | Success Course | Chi-Square |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Prior GPA (on a 4.0 scale) | $\begin{gathered} 2.60 \\ 2.6 \% \leq 2.0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.88 \\ 18.6 \% \leq 2.0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \chi^{2}(\mathrm{df} 1)=11.751 \\ p=.001 \end{gathered}$ |
| Low high school average | 8.3\% | 28.9\% | $\begin{gathered} \chi^{2}(\mathrm{df} 1)=11.797 \\ p=.001 \end{gathered}$ |
| Mature | 6.4\% | 25.6\% | $\begin{gathered} \chi^{2}(\mathrm{df} 1)=12.516, \\ p=.000 \end{gathered}$ |

Self-declared
Aboriginal
8.9\%
15.1\%
$\chi^{2}(\mathrm{df} 1)=5.386$,
$p=.02$ ancestry

## Rebuilding the Success Course

$>$ Moved from team-taught to central instructor with guest lectures
$>$ Revised curricula:

- theories of attributions and motivation
- weekly writing tasks
- peer review in small groups
-Added a one hour a week lab or small group tutorial led by a peer mentor


## Fundamentals of Inquiry labs

$\checkmark$ Peer cooperative learning program
$\checkmark$ Allow for more informal interaction
$\checkmark$ Emphasize learning as a process
$\checkmark$ Practice specific skills discussed in class
$\checkmark$ Encourage the discussion of affective components of learning

## LASSI-2 Overview

Provides standardized scores and norms for a 10 -scale assessment of students' awareness about and reported use of learning and study strategies:

- Freedom from anxiety, attitude, concentration, information processing, motivation, self-testing, selecting main ideas, use of support services, time management or test taking.


## Weinstein, Palmer \& Schulte (2002)

$>$ WILL components
$>$ attitude, motivation, concentration
$>$ SKILL components
$>$ selecting main ideas, information processing, test strategies
$>$ SELF REGULATION components
$>$ anxiety, time management, use of study aids, self-testing

| Percentiles | ANX | ATT | CON | INP | MOT | SFT | SMI | STA | TMT | TST |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 95 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 90 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 85 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 75 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 70 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 45 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 40 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 35 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Percentiles | ANX | ATT | CON | INP | MOT | SFT | SMI | STA | TMT | TST |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 95 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 90 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 85 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 75 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 70 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 55 |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 45 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 40 | $\overline{7}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $x$ | X |  |  |
| 35 |  |  | $1$ |  |  |  |  |  | X | X |
| 30 |  |  | $\not x$ |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25 |  | $7$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20 |  | $7$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Marland, Dearlove \& Carpenter (2015)

$\square$ LASSI concentrates "on cognitive, behavioural and attitudinal approaches to learning in isolation from individual, national or disciplinary educational contexts" (p. A-42).
$\square$ Raises issues about the use of the LASSI with mature students who are relying on their recollection of behaviour during high school
$\square$ Examines the latent constructs which underlie the grouping of the ten subscales

| Percentiles | ANX | ATT | CON | INP | MOT | SFT | SMI | STA | TMT | TST |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 95 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 90 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 85 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 75 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 70 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 55 |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50 |  |  |  | $11$ |  | X |  |  |  |  |
| 45 | X |  |  | $7$ | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| 40 | $X$ |  | $x$ |  |  |  | $N$ | X | X | X |
| 35 | $7$ |  |  |  |  |  | X |  | X | X |
| 30 |  |  | X |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20 |  | $7$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Percentiles | ANX | ATT | CON | INP | MOT | SFT | SMI | STA | TMT | TST |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 95 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 90 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 85 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 75 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 70 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 55 |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50 |  |  |  | $1$ |  | X |  |  |  |  |
| 45 | X |  |  |  | $X$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 40 | $X$ |  | $x$ |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | X | X | X |
| 35 | $7$ |  |  |  | $1$ |  | X |  | X | X |
| 30 |  |  | $7$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25 | - | $\sqrt{ }$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

control \begin{tabular}{ll|l|l|l|}

Scale \& \begin{tabular}{l}
Pre-Test <br>
Mean

 \& 

Post-Test <br>
Mean
\end{tabular} \& Significance <br>

\cline { 2 - 4 } ANX \& 24.12 \& 25.62 \& $p<.05$ <br>
\hline ATT \& 31.50 \& 30.82 \& <br>
\hline CON \& 26.15 \& 26.15 \& <br>
\hline INP \& 28.13 \& 27.85 \& <br>
\hline MOT \& 31.10 \& 31.13 \& <br>
\hline SFT \& 25.51 \& 23.73 \& $p<.01$ <br>
\hline SMI \& 26.50 \& 28.12 \& $p<.01$ <br>
\hline STA \& 25.12 \& 23.56 \& $p<.01$ <br>
\hline TMT \& 25.82 \& 24.05 \& $p<.01$ <br>
\hline TST \& 28.87 \& 28.97 \& <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}

Figure 1. Comparison of Pre-Post LASSI
Percentiles for Students in Control Group


Success Course

| Scale | Pre-Test <br> Mean | Post-Test <br> Mean | Significance |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| ANX | 21.30 | 23.65 | $p<.001$ |
| ATT | 31.91 | 32.37 | $p>.05$ |
| CON | 24.76 | 26.79 | $p<.001$ |
| INP | 26.56 | 28.98 | $p<.001$ |
| MOT | 29.06 | 30.55 | $p<.001$ |
| SFT | 22.82 | 24.44 | $p<.001$ |
| SMI | 23.91 | 27.90 | $p<.001$ |
| STA | 25.09 | 26.45 | $p<.01$ |
| TMT | 23.65 | 24.84 | $p<.01$ |
| TST | 25.66 | 27.95 | $p<.001$ |

Figure 2. Comparison of Pre-Post LASSI Percentiles for Success Course


## Latent Constructs: 3-factor agreement

- Comprehension:
- Information Processing (with Self-Testing and perhaps Use of Study Aids)
- Goals:
- Freedom from Anxiety (with Selecting Main Ideas and Test Strategies)
- Self-Regulation:
- Affect: Attitude + Motivation

O Effort: Time Management + Concentration

## Persistence Rates (\%)



## Academic Performance

## For the Control Group,

- There was a significant correlation of nontraditional status and sessional GPA, $r=-.25, p=.03$
- No other factor reached this level of significance
- Significant difference between sessional grades for traditional and non-traditional learners $\left(t_{(75)}=2.231, p=.03\right)$
- Traditional students $M=2.99, S D=.78$
- Non-traditional students $M=2.54, S D=.88$


## Academic Performance

For the Success course,

- No difference between sessional grades for traditional and non-traditional learners ( $p=.29$ )
- Traditional students $M=2.33, S D=.95$
- Non-traditional students $M=2.16, S D=1.06$
- Significant correlation between \# risk factors and sessional GPA, $r=-.21, p=.006$


## Sessional GPA by Number of Risk Factors



## Sessional GPA by Year of Study



## Summary - Results

$\checkmark$ Just being a non-traditional learner was associated with lower grades, more attrition and a lower graduation rate in the control group
$\checkmark$ For the Success class there appears to be an additive effect of the number of risk factors

## Summary - Implications

Incorporating labs into the Success Course:
$\checkmark$ help students improve their awareness of and use of learning skills
$\checkmark$ while keeping their self-efficacy beliefs grounded in reality
$\checkmark$ provides practice opportunities and frequent feedback to facilitate transferability of these skills
$\checkmark$ more informal interaction with faculty
$\checkmark$ a peer cooperative learning environment
$\checkmark$ a safe space to discuss current challenges and problem-solve solutions
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