

DIFFERENCES IN
ENGAGEMENT FOR
STUDENTS ON
ACADEMIC PROBATION

How do **students on academic probation** perceive their engagement across campus compared with students in good academic standing? Results suggest that their perceived engagement is lower with peers and faculty.



corinne_kulesh@uri.edu

THE
UNIVERSITY
OF RHODE ISLAND

BACKGROUND

- Academic Probation
 - Cumulative GPA < 2.0
 - Nearly universal policy at colleges and universities
 - Under-researched
- Engagement
 - Engaging students in higher education in the various activities that contribute to student success and learning outcomes matters more than who the students are or where they go to college (Kuh, 2001).

DIFFERENCES IN ENGAGEMENT FOR STUDENTS ON ACADEMIC PROBATION

Main Idea

RESEARCH QUESTION

How does perceived engagement across campus differ for students who are on Academic Probation after their first semester when compared with their counterparts who are in good academic standing?

DIFFERENCES IN ENGAGEMENT FOR STUDENTS ON ACADEMIC PROBATION

Main Idea

NSSE ENGAGEMENT INDICATORS

Theme	Engagement Indicators
<i>Academic Challenge</i>	Higher-Order Learning Reflective & Integrative Learning Learning Strategies Quantitative Reasoning
<i>Learning with Peers</i>	Collaborative Learning Discussions with Diverse Others
<i>Experiences with Faculty</i>	Student-Faculty Interaction Effective Teaching Practices
<i>Campus Environment</i>	Quality of Interactions Supportive Environment

METHODS

- Fall 2018 cohort of first-time/full-time students
- Completed NSSE in Spring 2019
- Comparison of students on AP who completed NSSE (n=42) & counterparts in good academic standing who completed NSSE (n=815)
- t-tests for testing significant differences; Levene's test for equality of variances; Cohen's d for effect size

DIFFERENCES IN ENGAGEMENT FOR STUDENTS ON ACADEMIC PROBATION

Main Idea

ANALYSIS

		Independent Samples Test								
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
HO	Equal variances assumed	1.675	.198	1.026	855	.305	2.012	1.960	-1.836	5.860
	Equal variances not assumed			.909	44.292	.368	2.012	2.213	-2.446	6.470
RI	Equal variances assumed	1.025	.312	-.281	855	.778	-.507	1.801	-4.041	3.028
	Equal variances not assumed			-.260	44.614	.796	-.507	1.950	-4.435	3.422
LS	Equal variances assumed	.321	.571	.560	855	.576	1.176	2.101	-2.947	5.298
	Equal variances not assumed			.591	45.905	.557	1.176	1.988	-2.826	5.178
QR	Equal variances assumed	.393	.531	-.210	855	.834	-.474	2.259	-4.809	3.960
	Equal variances not assumed			-.195	44.646	.847	-.474	2.437	-5.384	4.435
CL	Equal variances assumed	.126	.723	3.446	855	.001	6.929	2.011	2.982	10.875
	Equal variances not assumed			3.479	45.422	.001	6.929	1.992	2.918	10.939
DD	Equal variances assumed	.116	.734	-.262	855	.793	-.610	2.327	-5.177	3.958
	Equal variances not assumed			-.260	45.240	.796	-.610	2.348	-5.339	4.120
SF	Equal variances assumed	.599	.439	-1.141	855	.254	-2.565	2.249	-6.978	1.849
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.230	46.136	.225	-2.565	2.086	-6.762	1.633
ET	Equal variances assumed	1.793	.181	1.701	855	.089	3.210	1.887	-.494	6.914
	Equal variances not assumed			1.502	44.265	.140	3.210	2.138	-1.098	7.517
QI	Equal variances assumed	.025	.876	-.241	855	.810	-.420	1.741	-3.838	2.998
	Equal variances not assumed			-.247	45.570	.806	-.420	1.700	-3.843	3.004
SE	Equal variances assumed	.267	.605	-.010	855	.992	-.019	1.961	-3.869	3.831
	Equal variances not assumed			-.010	45.288	.992	-.019	1.970	-3.985	3.947

RESULTS

- Significantly lower engagement ($p < 0.5$) in “Collaborative Learning” with medium effect size
- Marginally lower engagement ($p < 0.10$) in “Effective Teaching Practices” with small effect size
- 17% of students on AP completed NSSE vs. 30% of students in good academic standing

COLLABORATIVE LEARNING

The NSSE questions measuring the *Collaborative Learning* construct are the following: “During the current school year, how often have you.....

- (1) asked another student to help you understand course material;
- (2) explained course material to one or more students;
- (3) prepared for exams by discussing or working through course material with other students;
- (4) worked with other students on course projects or assignments.”

EFFECTIVE TEACHING PRACTICES

The NSSE questions measuring the *Effective Teaching Practices* construct are: “During the current school year, to what extent have your instructors done the following...

- (1) clearly explained course goals and requirements;
- (2) taught course sessions in an organized way;
- (3) used examples or illustrations to explain difficult points;
- (4) provided feedback on a draft or work in progress;
- (5) provided prompt and detailed feedback on tests or completed assignments.”

IN PRACTICE

- Solving problems and learning difficult material while collaborating with peers helps to deepen understanding and to prepare students for realistic group-work. It offers students opportunities to learn from each other, problem-solve together and master content by explaining it to others.
- Student learning occurs when the student is properly supported in comprehending course materials. Effective teaching practices, such as organized instruction, clear expectations, illustrative examples, and timely and specific feedback on student work, provide the foundation for student learning.

DIFFERENCES IN ENGAGEMENT FOR STUDENTS ON ACADEMIC PROBATION

Main Idea

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

- Link personal responsibility and enlightenment to support services as a powerful way of keeping all students in higher education (Moxley, Najor-Durack, & Dumbrigue, 2001)
- Intentionally promote validating experiences from faculty, administrators, and peers to promote academic and social awareness (Murphy & Hicks, 2006)
- Highlight diversity, showcase first-generation students and their successes, facilitate cultural capital by making the “rules of the game” visible, clearly communicate college expectations and what is required to be successful, and help students build relationships on campus (Stephens & Brannon, 2015)
- While NSSE does not offer much insight into the sociocultural dynamics our students experience across campus and in their classrooms, we can improve on connecting what is being learned with all students’ values, attitudes, beliefs, experiences, and perspectives (Gay, 2013)

DIFFERENCES IN
ENGAGEMENT FOR
STUDENTS ON
ACADEMIC PROBATION

Corinne Kulesh

corinne_kulesh@uri.edu

THE
UNIVERSITY
OF RHODE ISLAND

THANK YOU