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Abstract:
College students face unique challenges as they transition to their second year of college (Gahagan & Hunter, 2006; Schaller, 2005; Tobolowsky, 2008). In their second year, students generally have to make significant decisions such as choosing a major and future career. While many services exist to support students through their first year of college, only recently have programs been developed to address the second year (Tobolowsky, 2008). Second-year programs address not only the academic needs of students, but also aid in increasing student involvement, developing community, and the creation of meaningful relationships (Beloit College, 2009; Colorado College, 2009; Colorado State University, 2008; Gahagan & Hunter, 2006; National Resource Center, 2008; Tobolowsky, 2008). This article examines unique issues among second-year students, current initiatives for second-year programs, implications for student affairs, and recommendations for future implementation of second-year programs.


*From the Executive Overview:*

*Input from students, faculty, and secondary research informs the development of program objectives, which emphasize faculty interaction, major selection, and skill development. Program developers collect information through student focus groups, faculty and student surveys, and research of existing initiatives to determine the needs of the sophomore class and program goals. Initiatives provide opportunities for intellectual exploration, assist with major declaration, encourage student interaction with faculty members, and confer academic and life skills necessary for success in the second year and beyond. Initiatives combine academic and social components to create programs that address the concerns of second-year students within the restrictions of institutional resources.*
Course-centered initiatives encourage faculty interaction, peer relationship development, intellectual exploration, and academic skill development primarily through seminars. Programming-centered initiatives facilitate social interaction with faculty, major selection, peer relationship development, and life skill development through dinners with faculty, social hours, faculty-led workshops, major fairs, and cultural events.

Sophomore programs necessitate funding for faculty compensation, workshop supplies, and food and refreshments at dinners and social hours. Sophomore seminar instructors teach courses in overload and receive stipends through program offices, which are housed in offices of academic affairs or undergraduate education. Administrators at University E reserve seats in existing seminars rather than creating new courses to minimize required resources for faculty compensation. Program offices fund social programs; at University A, an activities fee paid by all on-campus residents provides this funding.

Surveys reveal students derive the greatest value from interaction with faculty members and prefer opportunities for intellectual exploration to programs for intended majors. Students across profiled institutions develop close relationships with faculty members who often serve as advisor throughout their academic careers; students also report increased comfort approaching other faculty members. Program directors at one institution redesigned seminars for intended majors due to insufficient interest; courses now encourage exploration of academic interests within and outside students’ majors.

Retention rates and four- and five-year graduation rates have increased at one profiled institution; contacts attribute this to broader campus initiatives that encompass the sophomore success program. An assessment of the initial cohort of program participants at University C found participants maintained more ties to faculty members, were 33 percent more likely to go on to honors, were twice as likely to enter PhD programs, and were more likely to reflect positively on intellectual life at the institution.


This document was created by the Education Advisory Board to assist postsecondary institutions with the implementation of second year programs.


This article examines the challenges of defining the sophomore year due to students with sophomore level course in their first year of college or as transfer students. The primary purpose of this article is to highlight the resurgence of addressing second year students’ needs and provides recommendations on ways campuses can begin second year programs.

This book lays a foundation for second year experiences by using student development and post-secondary education research. Several authors contribute to this book to explain different successful programs that have been utilized to influence second year students’ success on college campuses. Information on designing, assessing and improving second year programs are also provided.


This is a case study that describes how The Ohio State University assessed its second year program STEP. /the program was “designed to lead to higher graduation and retention rates, improved student engagement and satisfaction, and postgraduation success.”


This is Noel-Levitz's opening summary of this document:

In response to the growing call to increase college completion rates, many campus officials have turned their attention to the “sophomore slump”—a term that broadly defines the somewhat-common and lackluster performance of a substantial portion of second-year college students. To examine this issue, this report looks beyond test scores and grade point averages at a range of “noncognitive” attitudes that influence second-year students’ motivation, engagement, persistence, and college completion. The report is based on student survey responses drawn from a sizable sample of second-year students at four-year and two-year institutions nationwide in 2012.

Among the findings:
• Only three-quarters of the second-year student respondents from four-year private and public institutions were able to affirm that they “felt energized” by the ideas they were learning in most of their courses;
• Only two-thirds of the respondents from two-year public institutions were able to affirm the statement, “I have many friends and feel at home here”;
• Respondents across institution types reported relatively low satisfaction in areas such as their frequency of communication with academic advisors and the availability of work experiences associated with students’ career interests;
• Only a slight majority of respondents across institution types indicated they had the financial resources they needed to finish college. Yet, on the upside, similar percentages of students indicated they were receptive to financial guidance;
• Approximately half of respondents from four-year institutions—led by female students—wanted help with finding a tutor for one or more courses, while fewer than one-third of these students (male and female combined) reported receiving tutoring assistance in year one; and
• Nine percent of respondents from four-year private institutions, 14 percent of respondents from four-year public institutions, and 56 percent of respondents from two-year public institutions reported that they were either undecided about continuing their enrollment or planned to transfer to another institution.


Abstract:
In the face of difficult economic circumstances, increased competition and student diversity, attrition and retention have become issues of great significance to higher education institutions seeking to survive. A large body of work has explored the relationship between attrition and the first-year experience, but there has been little focus on students’ experience of university in subsequent years despite the fact that later year attrition counts for approximately half of all attrition. This empirical research study examines students’ experience of university in six diverse universities, across the three years of business degree studies. It finds that the factors correlated with intention to withdraw from university studies are differentiated by year of study, and further differentiated by the university attended. The implications of these findings are discussed and a framework for institutional action is subsequently used to outline the dimensions of a relevant retention program.