

Assessing the Perceived Effectiveness of Early Intervention Action Plans in Improving Outcomes for At-Risk Learners in the Arabic School

Pervaiz Masih, EdD

Student Learning Specialist, Arabic School, Undergraduate Education

Early intervention (EI) rests on the assumption that learners who are identified early, advised proactively, and supported with tailored follow-up are more likely to recover academically than those who are left to self-correction after repeated failures. The project applied a mixed-methods approach and examined the implementation and perceived usefulness of EI action plans provided to 75 at-risk learners in the Arabic School (UAD) who were placed in EIs between September 2025 and March 2026; of these, 65 learners responded to the six-question survey instrument. Results showed that 55 learners (84.6%) reported receiving and implementing a written action plan, while 10 (15.4%) reported never receiving or implementing an action plan after their EIs. Perceived usefulness was strongly positive: 27 learners (41.5%) rated the plan very helpful, and 33 (50.8%) rated it helpful, meaning that 60 out of 65 respondents (92.3%) described the intervention as beneficial. Qualitative analysis showed that learners most often described authentic listening practice, vocabulary review using digital tools, reading practice, and structured study routines as effective. The respondents also credited zero, seventh, and lunch hours, along with 1-on-1 mentoring, as the enabling conditions that made the action plans workable. The findings support the conclusion that EIs are most powerful when diagnoses are followed by a written plan, repeated mentor contact, and modality-specific strategy instruction that learners can implement immediately. The inquiry offers practice-based implications for EI follow-ups, self-regulated learning, and foreign language support systems in fast-paced instructional settings.

Keywords: Early Intervention, At-Risk Learners, Advising, Student Mentoring, Self-Regulated Learning

INTRODUCTION

Early intervention has become a central response to academic risk in higher education because it shifts institutional practice from reaction to prevention. Rather than waiting until learners accumulate repeated failures, an early intervention model identifies performance gaps while there is still time to respond with advising, mentoring, and targeted instructional supports. Research across higher education has shown that such targeted interventions can improve students' academic outcomes when they are focused on a concrete problem, theoretically grounded, and delivered early enough to change learners' behaviors before those behaviors harden into patterns of disengagement (Heisserer & Parette, 2002; Harackiewicz & Priniski, 2018; Lizzio & Wilson, 2013). This premise is especially relevant in intensive language learning programs, where slow recovery is costly because every day of delay compounds vocabulary overload, listening demands, reading speed requirements, and anxiety about falling behind the learning curve.

Within foreign language education, early intervention is not simply an administrative process. It is also a sound pedagogical strategy. A learner who struggles in listening comprehension may actually be facing a layered problem involving inadequate vocabulary breadth, weak metacognitive monitoring, overreliance on word-for-word translation, and a lack of effective review routines. Zimmerman (2002) argued that self-regulated learners set goals, manage time, select strategies, monitor performance, and seek help when needed. In foreign language settings, those capabilities are not peripheral; they are part of successful learning itself. Likewise, metacognitive work in second language listening has shown that learners benefit when teachers make the listening process more explicit and help students plan, monitor, and evaluate their comprehension strategically rather than passively hoping that repeated exposure will solve the problem (Goh, 2008).

The DLIFLC's EI-SOPs provide a solid framework for identifying and supporting at-risk learners through established criteria, procedures, and expectations. Within UAD, limited evidence was available on how consistently learners received and implemented written action plans and how helpful they perceived the recommended strategies to be. This created a gap between the procedural expectations of the EI process and learners' actual experiences with the interventions. This inquiry therefore examined the perceived effectiveness of EI action plans among at-risk learners in UAD. It also identified the targeted skill areas, strategies, and support mechanisms learners considered most useful. The project was informed by self-regulated learning, metacognition, and higher-education intervention research, emphasizing planning, monitoring, strategic practice, and timely, structured support.

For UAD at-risk learners, the problem is intensified by the pace, right-to-left language transition, content density, and the cumulative nature of learning gaps. Missing one set of vocabulary items affects the next reading task, the next listening event, and the next opportunity to speak or write accurately. Wang and Treffers-Daller (2017) found that vocabulary knowledge was a particularly strong predictor of second language listening performance, reinforcing the idea that listening,

reading, and vocabulary retention should not be treated as isolated deficits. In the same way, mentoring and advising matter not only because they deliver information but because they help learners re-enter a cycle of effort, feedback, and accountability. Studies of mentoring and student-faculty partnerships have shown that structured relationships can improve persistence, especially for students who are already at risk of academic failure or disconnection (Nagda et al., 1998; Vivian, 2005). The present project, therefore, treats early intervention as an integrated system composed of identification, written planning, mentor-mentee participation, strategy implementation, and follow-up reflection.

ACTION PLAN

Rationale and Problem of Practice

The problem of practice driving this project is straightforward: UAD needs evidence about whether early intervention action plans are reaching learners in a usable form and whether the content of those plans aligns with the actual learning barriers students report during follow-ups. If the plans are too generic, insufficiently monitored, or poorly matched to modality-specific challenges, then the intervention process may satisfy procedural requirements without producing meaningful academic recovery. If, however, the plans are being implemented and learners can describe concrete benefits from specific strategies and mentor contact, then the school has evidence to strengthen and standardize the most effective features of the current system.

Research Question

How effective are early intervention action plans, as perceived by UAD at-risk learners, after the intervention has been implemented and followed up?

Data Collection

This action inquiry applied a mixed-methods approach for data collection and analysis, combining descriptive quantitative analysis with qualitative thematic coding. The quantitative data described the effectiveness of written and implemented action plans followed for three to four weeks with the support of the learner mentor(s) (also known as counselors). The qualitative strand examined learners' narrative explanations of the strategies they practiced, the support they sought from mentors and teaching teams, and the further assistance they still needed.

The data were collected using MS Forms, comprising six questions (see Appendix), and a link was sent to 75 at-risk learners who participated in EIs from September 2025 through March 2026. The response rate was 87% ($n=65$). For the quantitative analysis, all responses were cleaned for case variation and minor formatting inconsistencies. Simple frequency counts and percentages were calculated for implementation, helpfulness, and modality categories. For the qualitative analysis, the narrative fields were read iteratively and coded for recurring themes. A practical

coding frame emerged around five strategy themes: a) listening practice and authentic input, b) vocabulary tools and review, c) reading practice, d) study routines and time management, and e) speaking or writing reinforcement. A second coding frame was applied to mentor support and requests for further assistance. Because a single response could include multiple ideas, qualitative themes were treated as overlapping rather than mutually exclusive. This approach preserved the complexity of learner narratives and better matched the reality of multimodal language intervention.

Snapshot of the Follow-up Dataset

The quantitative findings indicate a high level of engagement with the action-plan intervention. Among the 65 respondents, 55 (84.6%) reported receiving a written action plan and implementing the recommended strategies. In contrast, 10 learners (15.4%) indicated that they had neither received nor implemented an action plan. Reasons for students not receiving an action plan included: (a) the mentor/counselor changed during that time and the student did not receive the action plan; (b) the student was expected to follow it on his/her own without a written plan; and (c) the action plan was never developed or distributed to the student. These results suggest that the intervention was successfully communicated and translated into practice for most learners, demonstrating substantial participation in the follow-up support process, but that there is room for improvement.

Learners also reported highly favorable perceptions of the action plans' effectiveness. Twenty-seven respondents, or 41.5%, rated their action plans as very helpful, while 33 respondents, or 50.8%, rated them as helpful. Combined, 92.3% of respondents provided a positive assessment of the intervention. Only four learners, or 6.2%, selected a neutral response, and one learner, or 1.5%, considered the plan not helpful; no respondent rated it as not helpful at all. Overall, the findings indicate that the action plans were widely perceived as relevant and beneficial for supporting learners' academic needs and the implementation of strategies (see Table 1).

Table 1

Descriptive Frequencies Derived from the Follow-Ups

Indicator	Count	Percent	Interpretation
Received and implemented written action plan	55	84.6%	Most respondents confirmed implementation of a formal plan.
Did not confirm written action plan implementation	10	15.4%	A smaller but meaningful group did not confirm application.
Rated plan very helpful	27	41.5%	Strongest positive endorsement category.
Rated plan helpful	33	50.8%	Substantial positive endorsement category.
Rated plan neutral	4	6.2%	Possible partial application or uncertain impact.
Rated plan not helpful	1	1.5%	Very limited negative response.

Note. Multiple selections were permitted, so totals exceed the number of respondents.

DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Among the 65 respondents (at-risk learners), 55 (84.6%) reported receiving a written action plan and implementing the suggested strategies, with or without their mentors/instructors. Only 10 (15.4%) respondents mentioned that they never received any written action plan to follow for three to four weeks. These results indicate that the school is generally successful in moving from diagnosis to implementation. Yet the data also signal an implementation gap worth attention. If these students had received timely support, they would have largely benefited as well. A rate of 84.6% is strong, meaning that roughly one in six respondents did not confirm receipt and implementation of a written plan. In an intensive language environment, that proportion is large enough to matter because the learners who do not act on the intervention are often the very learners who can least afford a delay in structured support.

Table 1 shows that the perceived helpfulness was strong. Among the 65 respondents, 27 (41.5%) rated the action plan very helpful, 33 (50.8%) rated it helpful, four (6.2%) were neutral, and only one (1.5%) rated it not helpful. Put differently, 60 of 65 learners (92.3%) experienced the plan positively. This pattern matters because action inquiry is concerned with whether local practice is producing usable value, not merely whether procedures were completed. The overwhelming concentration of responses in the helpful and very helpful categories suggests that early intervention is being experienced as more than bureaucratic compliance. It is functioning as applied support.

A closer look at the implementation and helpfulness adds nuance. Several respondents who reported not receiving and implementing a written plan still rated the support as helpful or very helpful. This likely means that the intervention system is delivering useful support even when learners do not perceive it as a formal written action plan. The implication is not that documentation is unimportant. Rather, it is that the school may already be doing some effective advising informally, and that formalization could improve consistency without replacing human responsiveness. In practice, a learner may remember the one-on-one coaching, tailored homework, or zero-hour support more vividly than the document itself. That finding supports a dual emphasis on both paperwork and relationships.

The modality data clearly show where intervention energy is concentrated. Because the survey allowed multiple selections, frequencies reflect the number of times a modality was named, not the number of unique learners with only one need. Listening comprehension appeared most often, selected 57 times (87.7% of respondents). Vocabulary learning and retention came next with 39 mentions (60.0%), followed by study habits and time management with 34 mentions (52.3%). Reading comprehension (23, 35.4%) and speaking (22, 33.8%) were also common but less frequent (see Table 2).

Table 2
Action Plans According to the Modalities

Rank	Targeted Modality or Skill Area	Frequency
1	Listening comprehension	57
2	Vocabulary learning and retention	39
3	Study habits and time management	34
4	Reading comprehension	23
5	Speaking	22

Note. Multiple selections were permitted, so totals exceed the number of respondents.

This modality pattern aligns well with the literature on language-learning difficulties. Listening tends to expose multiple deficits simultaneously: lexical gaps, processing speed, uncertainty tolerance, attention drift, and weak inferencing (Goh, 2008). Vocabulary retention is similarly cross-cutting because insufficient retention undermines both receptive and productive performance (Wang & Treffers-Daller, 2017). The prominence of study habits and time management in the data suggests that many intervention challenges are not purely linguistic (Zimmerman, 2002). They also involve how learners distribute their effort, when they review, how they revisit old material, and whether they can sustain a realistic plan over time. In this sense, the materials support a broad understanding of early intervention. It is not simply about “fixing a weak skill.” It is about helping learners stabilize the study system that carries all skills.

The qualitative narratives from Questions 4, 5, and 6 make this even clearer. The most frequent strategy theme in the responses was listening practice through authentic or semi-authentic input.

Learners repeatedly mentioned that they listened to news audio and listening passages from the core curriculum. They also reported using tools that use authentic materials, such as the University of Maryland's online National Foreign Language Center (NFLC) and DLIFLC's Global Language Online Support System (GLOSS), Parascribe, and Transcript Trainer 5.0. One respondent wrote that "practice[ing] listening on GLOSS and NFLC" was the key action. Another reported that "using Parascribe, listening to authentic material were helpful to close the gap in authentic vocabulary and improve listening skills." Still another described using news and radio because it made the language feel available "while running errands or going to and from places." These comments suggest that action plans were most persuasive when they transformed listening from a vague weakness into a concrete routine linked to a named resource.

Vocabulary learning and retention was the second-strongest theme. Learners shared that they engaged in repeated writing activities, reviewed old vocabulary, studied words before class, and utilized digital flashcards and also DLIFLC's Networked Pronunciation Feedback (NetProf) tool for effective learning and retention purposes. One student reported writing the vocabulary "15-20 times" and then noticing better spelling and retention. Another described learning eight words at a time between homework segments. These descriptions are important because they reveal that vocabulary support becomes more credible when it is operationalized in manageable behaviors such as chunking, spaced repetition, multimodal review, and planned recycling. They also support the larger argument that vocabulary learning is not merely a list-learning task. It is a disciplined review process tied to retention, recognition, and transfer.

Reading practice was also visible in the responses, though it often appeared as part of a combined strategy package rather than as a stand-alone intervention. Students mentioned reading extra passages, reading aloud, previewing material before class, and using reading to support pronunciation or reporting. What stands out is that learners did not describe reading help mainly in terms of grammar explanation. Instead, they framed it as a way to become familiar with passages, reduce surprise during class, and increase speed or confidence. That pattern suggests that intervention in reading is most effective when it reduces cognitive load before graded performance, rather than when it overburdens students with excessive new material.

The study-routines theme may be the most educationally significant of all because it connects specific modality work with self-regulated learning. Learners described setting a timeline after school, dedicating fixed study blocks, previewing the next day's material, taking breaks between homework sections to learn vocabulary, and limiting competing activities. These are classic self-regulatory moves involving planning, pacing, distributed practice, and self-monitoring (Zimmerman, 2002). They matter because many language interventions fail not because the recommended strategies are wrong but because students do not embed them in a sustainable routine. The follow-up comments indicate that action plans were most likely to feel effective when they helped the learner decide not only what to study, but when and how to do it (see Table 3).

Table 3
Tools and Strategies Applied

Rank	Strategy Theme	Frequency
1	Listening practice and authentic input	43
2	Vocabulary tools and review strategies	29
3	Reading practice	21
4	Study routines and time management	16
5	Speaking and writing reinforcement	12

Note. Themes overlap because one learner could mention more than one strategy.

Support from mentors and the teaching teams (TTs) formed the backbone of implementation. According to the early intervention SOPs 2025 (section 6.e), the mentor/counselor develops and implements the action plan with the learner. The most common support theme was structured extra time, especially the zero, seventh, and eighth hours, as well as lunch hours. A second major support theme was one-on-one mentoring sessions. Learners also mentioned that tailored homework, supplemental materials, and topic-specific review content helped a lot in building good study habits and confidence. These findings suggest that the action plans worked best when they were attached to scheduled opportunities for contact rather than left as independent advice. Advising literature has long argued that at-risk students benefit from proactive, structured, and relational support rather than from optional help that requires them to solve the help-seeking problem alone (Heisserer & Parette, 2002; Thomas, 2020). The presented data strongly support that claim (see Table 4).

Table 4
Support Sought or Received from the Teaching Team/Mentor

Rank	Support Category	Frequency (<i>n</i>)	Percentage
1	Structured extra hours	45	48.9%
2	One-on-one mentoring sessions	34	37.0%
3	Tailored homework or instructional materials	10	10.9%
4	No additional support reported	3	3.3%

Note. Theme frequencies are non-exclusive, and percentages represent the share of coded mentions, not the share of 65 respondents.

The final qualitative field, further assistance needed, adds a useful corrective. Many learners requested no further help, which implies the suggested strategies supported them, and they wanted to continue with what was working. Additional strategies addressing current or emerging weaknesses are incorporated during follow-up by a student learning specialist. However, a sizable subset still asked for stronger planning support, additional listening help,

more vocabulary retention support, or a better balance in homework load. One learner, for example, said that too many passages created overload and that learning would be better supported by focusing deeply on “one or two passages” and reviewing needed vocabulary. This comment is pedagogically important because it warns against confusing intervention with volume. More work is not necessarily a better intervention. Improved sequencing, a narrower focus, and realistic pacing may lead to greater impact (see Table 5).

Table 5

Further Assistance Requested After Completing EI Action Plan

Rank	Further-Assistance Theme	Frequency	Percentage
1	No further assistance requested	27	42.9%
2	Additional planning and time-management support	14	22.2%
3	Additional listening support	8	12.7%
4	Additional vocabulary-learning and retention support	8	12.7%
5	Adjusted homework load or instructional materials	4	6.3%
6	More individualized support	2	3.2%

Note. Counts based on coded themes from nonblank responses (not the number of respondents) and may overlap.

DISCUSSION

Taken together, the findings present a coherent picture. Early intervention action plans are perceived by students as working, but not because they exist as documents alone. They work when they convert a diffuse sense of academic risk into a manageable set of actions tied to specific modalities, concrete resources, and repeated contact with mentors. The strongest evidence for this conclusion is the combination of high helpfulness ratings and the specificity of learner narratives. Students did not merely say that the plan “helped.” They described what they actually did: for example, listening to authentic material, reviewing vocabulary on digital platforms, reading ahead, chunking learning into smaller units, writing summaries, and attending extra instructional hours. In action inquiry terms, that is valuable because it demonstrates behavioral commitment.

This project also clarifies the relationship between language deficits and study deficits. In many intensive programs, academic difficulty is initially categorized by modality: listening, reading, speaking, or vocabulary. Yet the follow-up data suggest that these categories are deeply entangled with self-regulatory processes such as planning, reviewing, distributed practice sessions, and help-seeking. This is consistent with the literature. Zimmerman (2002) positioned self-regulation as a cyclical process involving forethought, performance, and self-reflection. Goh (2008) similarly argued that listening development is strengthened when learners engage metacognitively with the task rather than remaining passive recipients of input. Students who described fixed study times, repeated reviews, or resource-specific listening routines were often the same students who described the action plan as genuinely useful.

The prominence of listening comprehension in the modality data deserves special emphasis. Listening is often the skill that exposes a learner's true processing load because it cannot be easily slowed down under live or test conditions. The findings suggest that the intervention was most useful when listening support moved beyond exhortation to resource-based, repeatable practices such as transcription, authentic listening, and guided repetition. This aligns with empirical work showing that vocabulary knowledge and general language proficiency are major contributors to listening performance, while metacognitive awareness helps learners manage the process more effectively (Wang & Treffers-Daller, 2017). For regular practice, the implication is that listening support should continue to integrate vocabulary recycling, strategic note-taking, tolerance for ambiguity, and post-listening reflection rather than treating listening as exposure alone.

The data also support the importance of carefully planned and proactive advising. Several learners benefited from zero-hour, lunch-hour, or one-on-one teaching sessions, which suggests that support was more effective when the path to access was clear and immediate. This pattern mirrors findings from higher education intervention research showing that proactive advising with clear goals can improve course outcomes and persistence (Lizzio & Wilson, 2013; Thomas, 2020).

Another important finding is the subtle mismatch between formal documentation and learner perception. Some respondents benefited from support even though they did not report receiving or implementing a formal written action plan. This implies that regular seventh hour instruction or interventions may be more visible to learners than the written artifact itself. From an EI-SOPs perspective, that is both reassuring and cautionary. It is reassuring because it shows that support is reaching students through human channels. It is cautionary because uneven recognition and implementation of the written plan can lead to less consistent follow-ups. A stronger common template, coupled with explicit discussion of what the written plan is and how it should be used, would likely increase coherence without diminishing flexibility.

Project Implications and Recommendations

Based on the findings, several implications are useful for UGE schools' practice. First, the existing early intervention process laid out in EI-SOPs (2025) must be continued systematically and refined around the practices learners reported as helpful. The findings show that 84.6% of respondents received and implemented a written action plan and that 92.3% rated the action plan as helpful or very helpful. These results support maintaining written action plans while giving greater attention to consistent delivery, clear communication, and follow-up for learners who do not receive or recognize a written plan. The 15.4% implementation gap suggests that the immediate priority is to ensure that the existing process reaches all identified at-risk learners in a timely and understandable manner. In addition, greater transparency and stronger quality-control measures would enhance the effectiveness and consistency of the written action plan, enabling learners to receive timely, targeted, and meaningful support.

Second, listening comprehension should remain a major focus of early intervention because it was the most frequently targeted area, identified by 57 respondents (87.7%). The qualitative findings also showed that listening practice and authentic input were the most frequently reported strategy theme. Learners described using online tools and authentic listening passages. Therefore, EI action plans for learners with listening difficulties should continue to emphasize concrete, repeatable listening practices and resources that can be incorporated into regular study routines. This recommendation is further supported by learners who continued to request additional listening assistance after the intervention.

Third, vocabulary learning and study routines should be addressed as closely connected intervention needs. Vocabulary learning and retention were identified by 39 respondents (60.0%), while study habits and time management were identified by 34 respondents (52.3%). Learners reported benefiting from repeated review, digital vocabulary tools, writing words repeatedly, learning vocabulary in small chunks, previewing materials over time, and setting fixed study slots. The findings therefore support action plans that match these strategies to the learner's identified difficulty and organize them into manageable routines. This is especially relevant because planning and time-management support was the most common remaining assistance request after "no further assistance," and additional vocabulary support was also requested.

Fourth, structured mentor-mentee sessions produce better results and enhance trust and learning. Structured extra hours were the most frequently reported form of support, followed by one-on-one mentoring sessions. Learners also identified tailored homework and supplemental instructional materials as useful sources. These findings indicate that action plans are more likely to be experienced as meaningful when learners have scheduled opportunities to discuss difficulties, practice targeted skills, and receive individualized guidance. The data therefore support preserving accessible extra-hours and one-on-one sessions within the existing intervention process and connecting that support directly to the strategies identified in each learner's action plan.

Fifth, follow-up sessions complete the EI cycle and must be used to determine whether the original action plan is meeting the learner's needs and whether adjustments are necessary. Although many learners requested no further assistance, others identified continued needs in planning and time management, listening, vocabulary retention, homework load, instructional materials, or individualized support. The qualitative data also indicate that excessive practice volume may create overload for some learners, and that a narrower, better-paced focus may be more useful. Accordingly, follow-up conversations should use learner feedback to refine the existing action plan, adjust the amount or pacing of assigned support as needed, and focus on unresolved needs.

Limitations and Future Research

This action inquiry is limited in its timeframe and scope in terms of the number of at-risk learners. The data reflect input/feedback from the learners, which is self-reported and therefore subject

to memory, impression management, and individual interpretation. The qualitative coding was interpretive and designed for improvement rather than for hypothesis testing with inter-rater reliability statistics. In addition, the sample reflects a defined follow-up subset rather than the entire population of UAD at-risk learners. Also, this project does not provide UGE-wide practices and systems established in each school. Even so, these limitations do not diminish the inquiry's practical value; it still centers on the core EI-SOPs, which are implemented across UGE. In addition, action inquiry does not require perfect generalizability to be useful; it just requires disciplined data and evidence strong enough to inform better practice.

Future research could extend this project in several important directions. First, a UGE-wide analysis of EI action-plan implementation could examine similarities, differences, and emerging trends across schools, providing a more comprehensive understanding of how consistently the EI-SOPs are being applied. Second, future studies could analyze the implementation and effectiveness of EI action plans among a substantially larger population of at-risk learners. This would allow researchers to identify recurring intervention patterns, learner outcomes, and factors associated with successful or less successful interventions. Third, a qualitative review of the content and quality of individual EI action plans could determine whether the plans contain clearly stated, measurable learning objectives, learner-specific interventions, and appropriate follow-up measures. Such an analysis could also examine whether variation in the quality of written action plans is associated with differences in learner outcomes. Finally, a longitudinal study could follow at-risk learners over multiple semesters or academic phases to determine whether improvements associated with EI interventions are sustained over time and whether types of action plans produce stronger and more durable academic outcomes.

CONCLUSION

This action inquiry finds that early interventions at UAD were generally perceived by learners as helpful as they progressed from identifying academic challenges and impediments to implementing specific learning strategies. Most respondents reported receiving and implementing a written action plan and rated the intervention as helpful or very helpful. The findings further showed that listening comprehension, vocabulary learning and retention, study habits, and time management were the most frequently targeted areas of support. Learner responses also highlighted the value of specific learning strategies, identified resources, structured extra instructional hours, and one-on-one mentoring in implementing their action plans. At the same time, the findings identified areas requiring continued attention, including ensuring that all at-risk learners receive and implement their action plans and providing additional support in planning, listening, vocabulary retention, and a manageable instructional workload for at least three to four weeks consistently. Overall, the findings support maintaining focused action plans, accessible and structured mentor or teaching-team support, and continued use of learner feedback to guide appropriate follow-up adjustments within the EI process.

REFERENCES

- Goh, C. C. M. (2008). Metacognitive instruction for second language listening development: Theory, practice and research implications. *RELC Journal*, 39(2), 188–213. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688208092184>
- Harackiewicz, J. M., & Priniski, S. J. (2018). Improving student outcomes in higher education: The science of targeted intervention. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 69, 409–435. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-122216-011725>
- Heisserer, D. L., & Parette, P. (2002). Advising at-risk students in college and university settings. *College Student Journal*, 36(1), 69–83.
- Lizzio, A., & Wilson, K. (2013). Early intervention to support the academic recovery of first-year students at risk of non-continuation. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 50(2), 109–120. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2012.760867>
- Nagda, B. A., Gregerman, S. R., Jonides, J., von Hippel, W., & Lerner, J. S. (1998). Undergraduate student-faculty research partnerships affect student retention. *The Review of Higher Education*, 22(1), 55–72.
- Thomas, N. G. (2020). Using intrusive advising to improve student outcomes in developmental college courses. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice*, 22(2), 251–267. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1521025117736740>
- Vivian, C. (2005). Advising the at-risk college student. *The Educational Forum*, 69(3), 336–351.
- Wang, Y., & Treffers-Daller, J. (2017). Explaining listening comprehension among L2 learners of English: The contribution of general language proficiency, vocabulary knowledge and metacognitive awareness. *System*, 65, 139–150. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2016.12.013>
- Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview. *Theory Into Practice*, 41(2), 64–70. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15430421TIP4102_2

APPENDIX

Student Feedback

Title: Assessing the Perceived Effectiveness of Early Intervention Action Plans in Improving Outcomes for UAD At-Risk Learners.

Dear Student,

These questions are used to gauge the impact or effectiveness of the provided action plan after early intervention. All information provided here is anonymous and will be solely to guide instruction.

1. Do you agree to participate in this action inquiry project? Yes/No

If YES, please move to the next question. If no, you can close the file.

2. Did you receive a written action plan and implement the suggested strategies? Yes/No

3. How helpful was the provided action plan?

A) Very helpful

B) Helpful

C) Neutral

D) Not helpful

E) Not helpful at all

4. For which modality/skill were you provided with the learning strategies? Select all that apply to you.

A) Listening comprehension

B) Reading comprehension

C) Vocabulary learning and retention

D) Speaking

E) Study habits & time management

F) Others

5. List the strategies you practiced and explain how effective they were for you.

6. To follow the action plan, what specific help did you seek or receive from your teaching team/mentor? For example, 1-on-1 sessions, lunch hour, zero hour, 8th hour, etc.

7. What further assistance do you need from the Student Learning Specialist or the TT/Mentor?

Thank you so much for your time and valuable input. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact XXX.

DIALOG ON LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION (ISSN 1058-3858) is the journal of the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center, in the U.S. Department of Defense. The views expressed herein are those of the author(s), not the Department of Defense or its elements. Further reproduction is not advisable. Whenever copyrighted materials are reproduced in this publication, copyright release has ordinarily been obtained only for use in this specific issue. Requests for reprints should be directed to the individual authors.