

The following information has been excerpted from the following source: Cuseo, J. (forthcoming). *Administration of the first-year seminar: Key options and critical decisions*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.

What number of credits (units) should the FYS carry?

The most recent national survey of first-year seminars reveals that 42.5% of responding campuses offer the FYS for one unit of credit, 12.6% offer it for two units, 33% offer it for three units, and about 10% for four or more units (Tobolowski, 2008). Several conceptually sound arguments can be made for the FYS to carry as many credit hours and as much contact time as possible, such as the following:

- * More credit hours allow for greater breadth (and depth) of content coverage and more extensive (and intensive) skill development.

- * More credit hours provides longer “incubation time” for the development of social-emotional ties (bonding) between students and the instructor, and among students themselves.

- * The larger the amount of credit carried by the seminar, the greater weight it will carry toward students’ GPA. A course carrying more units is more likely to be taken seriously by students and provide students with a greater *incentive* to invest more *effort* in the course. A course carrying more units is also likely to elevate *faculty expectations* of the amount of time and effort that students commit to the class. This combination of heightened student effort and higher faculty expectations is likely to magnify the seminar’s potential impact on student learning and retention.

- * More credit hours create more class-contact time for instructors to make use of engaging, student-centered pedagogy, such as class discussions and small-group work. Limiting course credit and contact time in the FYS is likely lead to greater use of the lecture method to disseminate as much information as possible in an attempt to “beat the clock” and cover as much as possible with the limited amount of contact time they have with their students.

- * More credit hours allow the FYS to better accommodate coverage of additional topics or issues that are likely to emerge over time. It is common for the seminar to be the curricular place or space for addressing student needs and campus issues that cannot be addressed elsewhere in the traditional college curriculum (e.g., technological literacy, money management, academic integrity). The seminar has displayed a capacity for functioning as a “meta-curriculum” that transcends specialized content and traverses disciplinary boundaries As Hunter and Linder (2005) note: “The use of first-year seminars to address important topics, content, and processes that do not fit logically into, or that transcend, existing disciplines has been in practice for some time” (p. 289). One FYS practitioner and researcher refers to the seminar as the “spare room” in the college curriculum, where any and all issues that do not fit into other rooms (courses) are conveniently deposited (Barefoot, 1993).

- * Offering the seminar for the same number of credits that characterize most other courses in the college curriculum (for example, three credit hours) enhances the seminar’s *credibility* in the eyes of students because the course will more likely be perceived as equivalent in value to other college courses. In contrast, a one-unit course may send the message (to both students and instructors) that the seminar is devalued, and not worthy of the amount of classroom contact time that characterizes the vast majority of courses in the college curriculum.

Empirical evidence pointing to the benefits of more credit hours and contact time for the FYS is provided in a critical review of the research conducted by Pascarella and Terenzini (1991) who found that “orientation interventions” that are longer in duration and more comprehensive in scope tend to be empirically associated with stronger direct effects on student retention. The FYS may be viewed as an “extended-orientation intervention” that extends orientation into and

through the first term, thereby increasing its duration and comprehensiveness. According to Pascarella and Terenzini's research review, this should increase the course's potential to exert stronger, direct effects on student retention.

Additional evidence for first-year seminars that carry more credit hours is provided by research conducted by Swing (2002c). Working under the aegis of the Policy Center on the First Year of College, survey-generated data were obtained from more than 31,000 students at 62 different institutions, and it was found that students enrolled in seminars that involved more contact hours generally reported larger gains in learning outcomes than students enrolled in seminars with fewer contact hours. In the principal investigator's own words:

Three-contact hour courses exceeded both 1- and 2-contact hour courses on the two factors measuring gains in academic skills (writing, speaking, and library skills), and critical thinking skills. Overall, the data show that 3-contact hour courses produce the widest range of [positive] learning outcomes. These data confirm the common wisdom applied to first-year seminars that 1-contact hour is better than none, 2 are better than 1, and 3 are better than 1 or 2 (Swing, 2002c, p. 2).

These empirical findings are consistent with Astin's (1984) theory of academic involvement, which posits that when students invest more time in the learning process (e.g., the amount of time spent in class and on course-related work outside of class). Based on a 4-year longitudinal analysis of pre/post data collected from a national survey (CIRP) that included more than 4,000 students, Astin (1993) found that the amount of time students allot to classes and out-of-class coursework correlated strongly with self-reported gains in cognitive development.

The foregoing logical arguments and empirical findings point to the conclusion that first-year seminars should be offered for as many academic units as campus culture and politics will allow. This conclusion is consistent with the recommendation offered by John Gardner (1989), founding father of the "freshman year experience" movement,

I believe in asking for as much credit as the political process seems willing to grant. The more credit awarded, the more work can be legitimately asked of students and hence the more likely the probability of achieving desirable outcomes. Possible outcomes for freshman seminars are

much more likely to be achieved in an academic credit-bearing course awarding three semester credits rather than one, because more time will be spent in instruction, more time can be asked of the students to do out-of-class assignments, more effort will be expended, and more student time, energy, and interest will be invested (p. 46).

Class Scheduling

When should the FYS begin and end?

Perhaps the first administrative decision that needs to be made with respect to *scheduling* the FYS is when the course should start and stop. Although all first-year seminars are designed for delivery during the student's first term in college, some seminars start *before* their first term

begins, and some stop *before* their first term *ends*. For instance, Gardner-Webb College (NC) begins its FYS during the orientation period that precedes the fall term. The University of Colorado at Colorado Springs begins its FYS two days prior to the onset of new students' first term and ends its course at midterm, as does Castleton State College (VT).

Among the advantages associated with starting the FYS before the start of the term is that it allows students special time together to bond as a unit and get situated on campus before the onset and onslaught of a full schedule of classes. The pre-term FYS experience can also be used to promote academically-related peer interactions prior to the start of the term—a time that would otherwise be entirely consumed by social activities. Although there appears to be no published evidence on the comparative effectiveness of early-starting versus traditionally scheduled seminars, a FYS that includes a pre-term component represents a very *proactive* approach to promoting the success of new students, allowing them the opportunity get settled in, get early support, and get a “jump start” on the college experience. This practice is consistent with the oft-cited principle of “front loading”—redistributing resources to provide support to new college students because it is the time when support and can have the most impact (National Institute of Education, 1984). For this reason, it is recommended that this proactive strategy be adopted, if the college can accommodate the logistical and fiscal demands associated with bringing new students to campus prior to the onset of their first-term classes.

Offering a firm recommendation about when to *end* the FYS is more challenging. Some institutions end the FYS at midterm, rather than at the end of the first term. Solid arguments can be made for concluding the course at either time. Listed below are the pros and cons of both decisions, along with some suggested strategies for resolving the issue empirically.

The Case for Concluding the FYS *Before* the End of the Academic Term

If the FYS is offered for one or two units, it might be advantageous to offer the course only during the *first half or first two-thirds of the term*. This scheduling strategy has three potential advantages: (a) It further “front loads” the course so that students experience it, in its entirety, at an earlier point in their first term, thus delivering the course's content more *proactively*. (b) It can promote greater *course continuity* by having students meet *more frequently* during a more limited time frame, rather than spreading out class sessions out across the entire term—which results in larger time gaps between successive class meetings. (c) If the FYS carries only one or two academic credits, it will meet during the first half of the term with about the *same frequency and regularity* as a “normal” 3-unit course, perhaps sending the message to students that the seminar is *equally important* as other courses in their class schedule. (d) By concluding the seminar before the end of the term, new students will have one less course to manage during the last weeks of the term and one less exam to take during finals week, thereby relieving some of the stress that is likely to accompany their first experience with college finals.

The Case for Continuing the Course *Throughout* the Academic Term

This scheduling strategy has the following advantages: (a) At midterm, students often experience their “first wave” of college exams, deadlines, and evaluations. Because first-year students often receive their first formal academic feedback at this time, the period after midterm

can often serve as a key “teachable moment” for new college students. For students who are struggling academically, this may be the first time they become aware of how poorly they are actually doing. Immediately after midterm, the FYS can provide a meaningful forum or supportive sanctuary for intentional reflection and discussion on how to effectively self-monitor academic progress, how to respond constructively (rather than defensively) to midterm feedback, and how to use their midterm grades as feedback to improve their subsequent academic performance—before it eventuates in low first-term grades, academic probation, or academic dismissal. Support through and after midterms may also enable students to better cope with the “midterm slump”—a time of the semester when the “honeymoon” period for first-term college students may begin to decline, and the novelty or thrill of simply being in college is replaced by their first major encounter with its academic demands. In their book, *Teaching Within the Rhythms of the Semester*, Duffy and Jones (1995) refer to this period as the “doldrums” and describe it as, “A time when the reality of papers, projects, and exams seem to color every course. More students are absent from class, and those who are in class frequently appear distracted or overwhelmed” (p. 162).

(b) For beginning college students, the last weeks of their first academic term can be a very stressful period in terms of time-management demands and performance pressures relating to meeting imminent deadlines for term papers or final projects, and preparing for their first “final-exam week” in college. A FYS that continues through to the end of the first term can provide support for new students during this “crunch period.”

(c) The last weeks of the fall term are often sandwiched in-between two major holidays—Thanksgiving and Christmas—a time when students return home, revisiting hometown friends and family, and possibly rekindle separation-anxiety issues. These social developments have the potential to adversely affect new students’ persistence to successful completion of their first time, or their motivation to return for a second term.

Terminating the FYS at midterm would mean that students lose access to a class and classmates that may be evolved into a social support system by this point in the term. Sudden withdrawal of this support at this time may leave new students more vulnerable to the academic, emotional, and social stressors that can emerge during the critical final weeks of the first term.

Since sound arguments can be made for ending the FYS before, or at the end of the first term, both scheduling strategies may be offered as options for FYS instructors. If an instructor has a strong preference for one or the other of these course-scheduling formats, that instructor will probably be a more enthusiastic and effective teacher when working with his or her preferred scheduling format. Also, providing instructors a choice between scheduling formats is another way to give instructors a sense of ownership or control of the course, which should increase their instructional satisfaction and motivation.

Another potential advantage of allowing instructors either scheduling option is that it creates two scheduling formats, which allows for a comparative assessment of student and instructor perceptions of each format. For instance, a question could be included on the course-evaluation instrument that asks students for their views on the scheduling format of the course. Students in the full-term course could be asked whether they felt the course would have been more effective if it met more frequently and ended at midterm. In contrast, students in the half-term course could be asked whether they felt the seminar would have been more effective if it met less frequently

and continued throughout the entire term. Or, the two scheduling formats could be compared with respect to their impact on the intended outcomes of the FYS (e.g., student retention or first-term GPA).

Lastly, it should be noted that some institutions offer a two-term FYS, extending it into a course that spans the entire first year. For example, Clark Atlanta University (GA), Ferris State University (MI), and the University of Charleston (WV) continue the FYS into the following terms, thus making it a yearlong course. Extending the FYS beyond the first term to create a full-year course is clearly advantageous, because it generates extended course-contact time, which is likely to result in greater course impact. Furthermore, a second-term FYS can supply timely support for student adjustments that peak during the second half of the first college year (Hunter & Gahagan, 2004). It is noteworthy that most first-year attrition tend to occur between the end of the first year and the start of the second (sophomore) year, which suggests that supporting students at the end of their first year may be a timely strategy for increasing the likelihood that first-year students will return for their sophomore year.

Length and Frequency of Class Meetings

Another scheduling decision to be made is the *length and frequency* of individual class sessions. It may be advantageous to schedule class meetings for a longer period than the common 50-minute session because this will provide the instructor more time and flexibility to accommodate the logistical demands of small-group work, such as preparing students for the group task, rearranging seats for students to form groups, and reconvening the whole class following completion of small-group tasks. Naturally, selecting longer class periods carries with it the disadvantages of less frequent class meetings per week and longer time gaps between successive class sessions. However, since it is strongly recommended that the FYS involve less instructor-centered lecturing and more student-centered pedagogy, such as the use of collaborative learning groups, the benefits of longer class sessions should outweigh their costs.

References

Abrami, P. S., d'Apollonia, S., & Cohen, P. (1990). Validity of student ratings of instruction:

- What we know and what we do not. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 92, 219-231.
- Abrams, H., & Jernigan, L. (1984). Academic support services and the success of high-risk students. *American Educational Research Journal*, 21, 261-274.
- Ambron, J. (1991). History of WAC and its role in community colleges. In L. C. Stanley & J. Ambron (Eds.), *Writing across the curriculum in community colleges* (pp. 3-8). New Directions for Community Colleges, no. 73. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- American Council on Education (1995). *Campus trends, 1994*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Astin, A. W. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 25, 297-308.
- Astin, A. W. (1991). *Assessment for excellence: The philosophy and practice of assessment and evaluation in higher education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Atlas, J. (1988, June 5). "The battle of the books." *New York Times*, p. 24.
- Backes, P. S. (1994, July). *Infusing FYE concepts into traditional first-year courses: An innovative program's effect on retention and student success*. Paper presented at the Seventh International Conference on the First-Year Experience, Dublin, Ireland.
- Barefoot, B. O. (1993). A nationwide focus on freshmen. *The Keystone* (Newsletter of the Wadsworth College Success Series) (Spring), p. 9.
- Barefoot, B. O. (2000, Sept. 15). *First-year seminar evaluation*. First-Year Assessment Listserv (FYA) Series. [On-line serial]. <http://www.brevard.edu/fyc/listserv/remarks/barefoot.htm>
- Barefoot, B. O., & Fidler, P. P. (1992). *Helping students climb the ladder: 1991 national survey of freshman seminar programs*. (Monograph No. 10). Columbia, SC: National Resource Center for The Freshman Year Experience, University of South Carolina.
- Barefoot, B. O., & Fidler, P. P. (1996). *The 1994 survey of freshman seminar programs: Continuing innovations in the collegiate curriculum*. (Monograph No. 20). National Resource Center for The Freshman Year Experience & Students in Transition, University of South Carolina.
- Barefoot, B. O., Warnock, C. L., Dickinson, M. P., Richardson, S. E., & Roberts, M. R. (Eds.)(1998). *Exploring the evidence, Volume II: Reporting outcomes of first-year seminars*. (Monograph No. 29). Columbia, SC: National Resource Center for The

First-Year Experience and Students in Transition, University of South Carolina.

- Barr, M. J., & Upcraft, M. L. (Eds.)(1990). *New futures for student affairs*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Beal, P., & Noel, L. (1980). *What works in student retention*. Iowa City, Iowa : The American College Testing Program.
- Berman, D. I. (1993, February). *University of South Carolina's University 101 Program: An open discussion*. Annual Conference of The Freshman Year Experience, Columbia, South
- Black, M. (1994). The CLUE program: Involving new students in out of-class life. *The Keystone* (Newsletter of the Wadsworth College Success Series) (Fall), pp. 4-5.
- Bonwell, C. C., & Eison, J. A. (1991). *Active learning: Creating excitement in the classroom*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1. Washington, D.C.: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.
- Boyer, E. L. (1987). *College: The undergraduate experience in America*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- “Building Communities: The lessons of campus communication at the University of Oregon” (1995). *The Freshman Year Experience Newsletter*, 7(4), pp. 7-9.
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1990). *Campus life: In search of community*. Princeton, NJ: Author.
- Carney, M., & Weber, J. (1987, November). *Student response to a survey of interest in a freshman orientation course*. Paper presented at the Conference of The Freshman Year Experience, Tulsa, Oklahoma.
- Carter, D. J., & Wilson, R. (1995). *Minorities in higher education*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
- Cashin, W. E. (1995). *Student ratings of teaching: The research revisited*. IDEA Paper No. 32. Manhattan, Kansas: Kansas State University, Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development.
- Catone, J. E. (1996). “Triad” program gives entering students three kinds of support. *The First-Year Experience Newsletter*, 9(2), p. 7.
- Clendinin, C. (2004, Oct. 26). “Learning communities with FYS & Writing.” (Message posted to the First-Year Experience Listserv. Retrieved April 10, 2005 from fye-list@listserv.sc.edu.

- Cross, K. P. (1993). Reaction to “Enhancing the productivity of learning” by D. B. Johnstone. *AAHE Bulletin*, 46(4), p. 7.
- Cuseo, J. (1999, January). *Process is content: Infusing effective teaching-learning principles into instructional delivery of the freshman seminar*. Paper presented at the National Conference on Students in Transition. Irvine, CA.
- Cuseo, J. (2002). *Organizing to collaborate: A taxonomy of higher education practices for promoting interdependence with in the classroom, across the campus, and beyond the college*. Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press.
- Cuseo, J. (2003). Comprehensive support for students during the first year of college. In G. L. Kramer & Associates, *Student academic services: An integrated approach* (pp. 271-310). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cuseo, J. (2004a, February). *Teaching the first-year seminar: How do we motivate students and maximize course impact?* Presentation made at the Annual Conference on the First-Year Experience. Addison, Texas.
- Cuseo, J. (2004b). *The empirical case against large class size: Adverse effects on the teaching, learning, and retention of first-year students*. Posted manuscript, First-Year Assessment Listserv (FYA). Series. [On-line serial]. Policy Center for the First Year of College. <http://www.brevard.edu/fyc/listserv>
- Cuseo, J., Fecas, V. S., & Thompson, A. (2007). *Thriving in college and beyond: Research-based strategies for academic success and personal development*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.
- Davis, B. G. (1993). *Tools for teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Davis, T. M., & Murrell, P. H. (1993). *Turning teaching into learning: The role of student responsibility in the collegiate experience*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 8. Washington, D.C.: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.
- Donovan, R. A., & Schaier-Peleg, B. (1988). Making transfer work. *Change*, 20(1), pp. 33-37.
- Duffy, D. K., & Jones, J. W. (1995). *Teaching within the rhythms of the semester*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Evenbeck, S. E., & Jackson, B. (2005). Faculty development and the first year. In M. L. Upcraft, J. N. Gardner, & B. O. Barefoot, & Associates, *Challenging and supporting*

the first-year student: A handbook for improving the first year of college (pp. 257-274). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fenzel, M. (2000). "Instructor pay." (Message posted on the First-Year Experience Discussion List.) Retrieved April 25, 2000, from fye-list@vm.sc.edu.

Fidler, P. P., & Hunter, M. S. (1989). How seminars enhance student success. In M. L. Upcraft, J. N. Gardner, and Associates, *The freshman year experience* (pp. 216-237). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

"First-Year Honors Students Report their Interests and Needs" (1994). *The Freshman Year Experience Newsletter*, 6(3), p. 3.

Fleming, J. (2002). Who will succeed in college? When the SAT predicts black students' performance. *The Review of Higher Education*, 25(3), 281-296.

Gabelnick, F., MacGregor, J., Matthews, R. S., & Smith, B. L. (1990). Learning communities: Creating connections among students, faculty, and disciplines. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, No. 41. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gardner, J. N. (1980). *University 101: A concept for improving university teaching and learning*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina. (Eric Reproduction No. 192 706)

Gardner, J. N. (1986). The freshman year experience. *College and University*, 61(4), 261-274.

Gardner, J. N. (1989). Starting a freshman seminar program. In M. L. Upcraft, J. N. Gardner, and Associates (pp. 238-249). *The freshman year experience*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gardner, J. N. (1992). *Freshman seminar instructor training: Guidelines for design and implementation*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina, National Resource Center for The Freshman Year Experience.

Gardner, J. N. (1996). Power to the peers. *The Keystone* (Newsletter of the Wadsworth College Success Series) (fall), pp. 1-3.

Gardner, J. N. & Davies, A. (1996). *University 101 syllabus*. Columbia, The University of South Carolina.

Gardner, J. N., Upcraft, M. L., & Barefoot, B. O. (2005). Conclusion: Principles of good practice for the first college year and summary of recommendations. In M. L. Upcraft, J. N. Gardner, & B. O. Barefoot, & Associates, *Challenging and supporting the first-year student: A handbook for improving the first year of college* (pp. 515-524). San Francisco: Jossey-

Bass.

Goldsweig, S. (1993, October). *Coming full circle: From at-risk to empowerment*. Paper presented at The Freshman Year Experience Small College Conference, Philadelphia, PA.

Gordon, V. N. (1983). Meeting the career development needs of undecided honors students. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 24(1), 82-83.

Gordon, V. N., & Grites, T. J. (1984). The freshman seminar course: Helping students succeed. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 25(4), 315-320.

Grimes, K. (2000). Incentives for FYE teachers. (Message posted on the First-Year Experience Discussion List.) Retrieved September 21, 2000, from FYE-LIST @ VM.SC.EDU.

Hadwin, A. F., & Winne, P. H. (1996). Study strategies have meager support: A review with recommendations for implementation. *Journal of Higher Education*, 67(6), 692-715.

Harmon, B. (2003, Sept. 4). "Peer mentor program." Message sent to the First Year Experience Discussion List. Retrieved Oct. 1, 2004 from fye-list@listserv.sc.edu

Hattie, J., Biggs, J. & Purdie, N. (1996). Effects of learning skills interventions on student learning: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research* 66(2), 99-136.

Helfgot, S. R. (1986). Opportunities in diversity. In D. G. Creamer & C. R. Dassance (Eds.), *Opportunities for student development in two-year colleges* (pp. 21-36). NASPA Monograph Series, volume 6. Washington, DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.

Heller, S. (1988, January 13). "General education reform should stress how students learn, report says." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. A11, A14.

Henderson, D. X. (2005, Jan. 24). "Students who fail the course." (Message posted to the First-Year Experience Listserv) Retrieved April 9, 2005 from fye-list@listserv.sc.edu.

Hodges, R. B., & Yerian, J. (2001). *The first-year Prompts Project: A qualitative research study revisited*. Retrieved December 18, 2001, from <http://www.brevard.edu/listserv/remarks/hodges.htm>

Hunter, M. S. & Gahagan (2004). It takes a year. *About Campus* (September-October), pp. 31-32.

Hunter, M. A., & Linder, C. W. (2005). First-year seminars. In M. L. Upcraft, J. N. Gardner, B. O. Barefoot, & Associates, *Challenging and supporting the first-year*

- student: A handbook for improving the first year of college* (pp. 275-291). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hunter, M. S., & Skipper, T. L. (Eds.)(1999). *Solid foundations: Building success for first-year seminars through instructor training and development* (Monograph No. 29). Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina. National Resource Center for The First-Year Experience and Students in Transition.
- Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1983). *Power in staff development through research on training*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision of Curriculum Development.
- Keeling, S. (2003). Advising the millennial student. *NACADA Journal*, 23 (1 & 2), 30-36.
- Knapp, J. R., & Karabenick, S. A. (1988). Incidence of formal and informal academic help-seeking in higher education. *Journal of College Student Development*, 29(3), 223-227.
- Kuh, G. D., Gonyea, R. M., & Williams, J. M. (2005). What students expect from college and what they get. In T. Miller, B. Bender, J. Schuh, and Associates (Eds.), *Promoting reasonable expectations: Aligning student and institutional thinking about the college experience* (pp. 34-64). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass/National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.
- Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J., Schuh, J. H., Whitt, E. J., & Associates (2005). *Student success in college: Creating conditions that matter*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kuh, G., Shedd, J., & Whitt, E. (1987). Student affairs and liberal education: Unrecognized (and unappreciated) common law partners. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 28(3), 252-260.
- Laufgraben-Levine, J. (2005). Building learning communities for first-year students. In R. S. Feldman (Ed.), *Improving the first year of college: Research and practice* (pp. 195-218). Mahwah, NJ:
- Leamson, R. N. (1995). Expanding the appeal of the orientation course. *The Keystone* (Newsletter of the Wadsworth College Success Series)(Fall), pp. 6-7.
- Lenning, O. T. (1988). Use of noncognitive measures in assessment. In T. W. Banta (Ed.), *Implementing outcomes assessment: Promise and perils* (pp. 41-52). New Directions for Institutional Research, No. 50. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Levin, M., & Levin, J. (1991). A critical examination of academic retention programs for at-risk minority college students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 32, 323-334.

- Levine, A. (1976). Between the stages of life: Adult women on a college scene. *Educational Horizons*, 54, 154-162.
- Levine, J. H., & Tompkins, D. P. (1996). Making learning communities work: Seven lessons from Temple University. *AAHE Bulletin*, 48(1), pp. 3-6.
- Levitz, R. (1992). Minority student retention. *Recruitment & Retention in Higher Education*, 6(4), pp. 4-5.
- Levitz, R. (1993). Putting “community” into community colleges: Non-skill-based retention targeting. *Recruitment and Retention in Higher Education*, 7(2), pp. 4-6.
- Levitz, R. (1994). The freshman seminar: An overview. *Recruitment and Retention Newsletter*, 8(10), pp. 4-7.
- Levitz, R., & Noel, L. (1989). Connecting student to the institution: Keys to retention and success. In M. L. Upcraft, J. N. Gardner, & Associates, *The freshman year experience* (pp. 65-81). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lifton, D. (2005). Ithaca College. In B. F. Tobolowsky, B. E. Cox, & M. T. Wagner (Eds.). *Exploring the evidence: Reporting research on first-year seminars, Volume III* (Monograph No. 42) (pp. 71-73). Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina, National Resource Center for The First-Year Experience and Students in Transition.
- Malone, R. (1981). Toward a theory of intrinsically motivated instruction. *Cognitive Science*, 4, 333-369.
- Markus, H. (1976). The return to school. *Educational Horizons*, 54, 154-162.
- Morris, L. V. & Cutright, M. C. (2005). University of South Carolina: Creator and standard-bearer for the first-year experience. In B. O. Barefoot, J. N. Gardner, M. Cutright, L. V. Morris, S. S. Schroeder, S. W. Schwartz, M. J. Siegel, & R. L. Swing, *Achieving and sustaining institutional excellence for the first year of college* (pp. 349-376). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Natalicio, D. S., & Smith, M. (2005). Building the foundation for first-year student success in public, urban universities: A case study. In M. L. Upcraft, J. N. Gardner, & B. O. Barefoot, & Associates, *Challenging and supporting the first-year student: A handbook for improving the first year of college* (pp. 155-175). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- National Institute of Education (1984). *Involvement in learning: Realizing the potential of*

American higher education (Report of the NIE Study Group on the Condition of Excellence in American Higher Education). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

National Resource Center for The First-Year Experience and Students in Transition. (2002). *2000 survey of first-year programming: Continuing innovations in the collegiate curriculum* (Monograph No. 35). Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina, National Resource Center for The First-Year Experience and Students in Transition.

Palmer, J. C. (1982). Sources and information. In B. L. Johnson (Ed.), *General education in two-year colleges* (pp. 109-118). New Directions for Community Colleges, no. 40. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pascarella, E. T. (2005). Cognitive impacts of the first year of college. In R. S. Feldman (Ed.), *Improving the First Year of College* (pp. 111-140). Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Pascarella, E. & Terenzini, P. (1991). *How college affects students: Findings and insights from twenty years of research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Petschauer-Webb, J. (2004, May). "Instructor training/FYE." (Message posted to the First-Year Experience Listserv) Retrieved April 9, 2005 from fye-list@listserv.sc.edu.

Richmond, J. (2002). The University of Rhode Island's new culture for learning. In E. Zlotkowski (Ed.), *Service learning and the first-year experience: Preparing students for personal success and civic responsibility* (Monograph No. 34) (pp. 65-78). Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina, National Resource Center for The First-Year Experience and Students in Transition.

Rosenthal, T. L., & Bandura, A. (1978). Psychological modeling: Theory and practice. In S. L. Garfield and A. E. Regin (Eds.), *Handbook of psychotherapy and behavior change: An empirical analysis* (2nd ed.) (pp. 621-658). New York: Wiley.

Scott, J. (2005). "Transfer course." (Message posted on the First-Year Experience Discussion List.) Retrieved March 24, 2000, from FYE-LIST @ VM.SC.EDU.

Siegel, B. L. (2005). Inviting first-year student success: A president's perspective. In M. L. Upcraft, J. N. Gardner, B. O. Barefoot, & Associates, *Challenging & supporting the first-year student: A handbook for improving the first year of college* (pp. 176-190). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Snyder, C. R., Harris, C., Anderson, J. R., Holleran, S. A., Irving, L. M., Sigmon, S. T., Yoshinobu, L., Gibb, J., Langelle, C., & Harney, P. (1991). The will and the ways:

Development and validation of an individual-differences measure of hope. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 570-585.

Soldner, L. B. (1998). Northern Michigan University. In B. O. Barefoot, C. L. Warnock, M. P. Dickinson, S. E. Richardson, & M. R. Roberts (Eds.) (1998). *Exploring the evidence, Volume II: Reporting outcomes of first-year seminars* (Monograph No. 29) (pp. 69-70). Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina, National Resource Center for The First-Year Experience and Students in Transition.

Staley, C. (2000, February). *Faculty training for a new paradigm: From teaching to learning*. Paper presented at the 19th Annual National Conference on The First-Year Experience, Columbia, South Carolina.

Stark, J. S., & Lattuca, L. R. (1997). *Shaping the college curriculum: Academic plans in action*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Stark, J. S., Lowther, R. J., Bentley, M. P., Ryan, G. G., Martens, M. L., Genthon, P. A., & Shaw, K. M. (1990). *Planning introductory college courses: Influences on faculty*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan: National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning. (Eric Reproduction No. 330 277 370)

Steltenpohl, E., & Shipton, J. (1986). Facilitating a successful transition to college for adults. *Journal of Higher Education*, 57(6), 637-657.

Stephens, J., & Eison, J. (1986-1987). A comparative investigation of honors and non-honors students. *Forum for Honors*, 17(1-2), 17-25.

Strumpf, G., & Sharer, G. (Eds.) (1993). *National orientation directors association data bank 1993-1995*. College Park, MD: University of Maryland.

Swift, J. S., Jr., Colvin, C., & Mills, D. (1987). Displaced homemakers: Adults returning to college with different characteristics and needs. *Journal of College Student Development*, 28(4), 343-350.

Swing, R. L. (2002c). *How many weekly contact hours is enough?* Retrieved January 13, 2003, from www.sc.edu/fye/resources/assessment/essays/swing-8.28.02_pdfs/hours.pdf

Swing, R. L., & Upcraft, M. L. (2005). Choosing and using assessment instruments. In M. L. Upcraft, J. N. Gardner, & B. O. Barefoot, & Associates, *Challenging and supporting the first-year student: A handbook for improving the first year of college* (pp. 501-514). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Terenzini, P. T., Pascarella, E. T., & Blimling, G. S. (1996). Students' out-of-class experiences and their influence on learning and cognitive development: A literature review. *Journal of College Student Development*, 37(2), 149-162.
- Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Tinto, V. (1997). Classrooms as communities: Exploring the educational character of student persistence. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 68, 599-623.
- Tinto, V. (2000). Linking learning and leaving: Exploring the role of the college classroom in student departure. In J. M. Braxton (Ed.), *Reworking the student departure puzzle* (pp. 81-94). Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Tobolowsky, B. F., & Associates (2008). *The 2006 National survey of first-year seminars: Continuing innovations in the collegiate curriculum* (Monograph No. 51). Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina, National Resource Center for The First-Year Experience and Students in Transition.
- Tobolowsky, B. F., Mamrick, M., & Cox, B. E. (2005). *The 2003 national survey on first-year seminars: Continuing innovations in the college curriculum* (Monograph No. 41). Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina, National Resource Center for the First-Year Experience and Students in Transition.
- Tokumo, K. A., & Campbell, F. L. (1992). The freshman interest group program at the University of Washington. *Journal of The Freshman Year Experience*, 4(1), 7-22.
- Upcraft, M. L. (2005). Assessing the first year of college. In M. L. Upcraft, J. N. Gardner, & B. O. Barefoot, & Associates, *Challenging and supporting the first-year student: A handbook for improving the first year of college* (pp.469-485). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Upcraft, M. L., Ishler, J. L. C., & Swing, R. L. (2005). A beginners' guide for assessing the first college year. In M. L. Upcraft, J. N. Gardner, & B. O. Barefoot, & Associates, *Challenging and supporting the first-year student: A handbook for improving the first year of college* (pp. 486-500). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Vogelgesang, L. J., & Ikeda, E. K., Gilmartin, S. K., & Keup, J. R. (2002). Service-learning and the first-year experience: Learning from the research. In E. Zlotkowski (Ed.), *Service-learning and the-first-year experience: preparing students for personal success and civic responsibility* (pp. 15-26). Columbia: University of South Carolina, National Resource Center for The First-Year Experience and Student sin Transition.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Internalization of higher cognitive functions. In M Cole, V. John-

- Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman (Eds. & Trans.), *Mind and society: The development of higher psychological processes* (pp. 52-57). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Watts, E. I. (1999, June). *The freshman year experience, 1962-1990: An experiment in humanistic education*. Doctoral dissertation, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario (Canada.).
- Weingarten, R. H. (1993). *Undergraduate education: Goals and means*. Phoenix: Oryx Press.
- Weinstein, C. E., & Underwood, V. L. (1985). Learning strategies: The how of learning. In J. W. Segal, S. F. Chapman, & R. Glaser (Eds.), *Thinking and learning skills* (pp. 241-258). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Whitman, N. A. (1988). *Peer teaching: To teach is to learn twice*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 4. Washington D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Yockey, F. A., & George, A. A. (1998). The effects of a freshman seminar paired with supplemental instruction. *Journal of the First-Year Experience & Students in Transition*, 10(2), 57-76.
- Zlotkowski, E. (2002). Introduction. In E. Zlotkowski (Ed.), *Service learning and the first-year experience: Preparing students for personal success and civic responsibility* (Monograph No. 34) (pp. ix-xiv). Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina, National Resource Center for The First-Year Experience and Students in Transition.