



# A Tale of Three Models: What Contributes to Student Persistence

**Becky Patterson: Executive Director, Office of Institutional Research and Planning**

**Arnold Hook: Assistant Director, Office of Institutional Research and Planning**

**Il Barrow, Senior Institutional Research Analyst, Office of Institutional Effectiveness**

**Robert (Bob) Goldstein: Vice Provost, Institutional Research, Effectiveness, and Analytics**



# OUTLINE

- 
- Explanation of models
    - 1<sup>st</sup> to 2<sup>nd</sup> year
    - 1<sup>st</sup> to 3<sup>rd</sup> year
    - 1<sup>st</sup> to 4<sup>th</sup> year
  - Model results
  - Descriptive statistics: 2008, 2009, 2010 cohorts
  - Putting the data to use



## PURPOSE

- Provide decision support with regard to the development of an enrollment management plan and help around the issues of retention and graduation to forward our effort to obtain the 2020 Strategic Plan goal of a 60% graduation rate in 2020.
- Identify a return on the investment of national surveys.



COOPERATIVE INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH PROGRAM  
at the HIGHER EDUCATION RESEARCH INSTITUTE AT UCLA



## ESTABLISHING THE COHORTS

Entering Cohort Year (1 <sup>st</sup> Fall)	Cohort Size*	Retained 2 <sup>nd</sup> Fall	Retained 3 <sup>rd</sup> Fall	Retained 4 <sup>th</sup> Fall	Percent of Cohort Retained – 4 <sup>th</sup> Fall
2008	1,738	1,351	1,178	1,066	61%
2009	1,701	1,338	1,160	1,060	62%
2010	1,578	1,243	1,070	975	62%

\*Note: The cohort size was determined by the number of students in the Graduation Rate Survey (GRS) cohort who responded to 4 specific questions that were similar on both the BCSSE (2008) and the CIRP (2009, 2010).



# Methodology

---



## Creation of the Third Model (1<sup>st</sup> to 4<sup>th</sup> Fall)

---

- Binary Logistic Regression
- Cut point: 67% - represents the proportion of students in the fall 2008 and fall 2009 cohorts returning in the 4<sup>th</sup> fall (fall 2011 and fall 2012 respectively)
- Stepwise regression: backward elimination



## Comparison of variables: the three models

---



## SIGNIFICANT VARIABLES

### 1<sup>ST</sup> Fall to 2<sup>ND</sup> Fall (First Model)

- Distance from home
- **First generation**
- **Number of days from application to admission**
- First-semester cumulative GPA (end of first fall semester)

### 1<sup>ST</sup> Fall to 3<sup>RD</sup> Fall (Second Model)

- First-Year cumulative GPA
- Second-Year cumulative GPA
- **At least one grade of 'W'**
- At least 50% of general education courses complete
- **Change in academic standing**
- Participation in Greek activities

### 1<sup>ST</sup> Fall to 4<sup>TH</sup> Fall (Third Model)

- **Any grade of 'D', 'F', or 'W'**
- **College-ready in mathematics**
- 2<sup>nd</sup> fall and 3<sup>rd</sup> fall GPA of 2.5 or greater
- **Lost financial aid from 1<sup>st</sup> fall to 2<sup>nd</sup> fall**
- **Lost financial aid from 2<sup>nd</sup> fall to 3<sup>rd</sup> fall**
- Retained 3<sup>rd</sup> fall





## ACCURACY OF PREDICTIONS

### **1<sup>ST</sup> Fall to 2<sup>ND</sup> Fall (First Model)**

- 80.2% overall
- 70.5% on those not returning
- 82.8% on those who did return

### **1<sup>ST</sup> Fall to 3<sup>RD</sup> Fall (Second Model)**

- 80.7% overall
- 80.5% on those not returning
- 80.8% on those who did return

### **1<sup>ST</sup> Fall to 4<sup>TH</sup> Fall (Third Model)**

- 85.0% overall
- 93.8% on those not returning
- 90.8% on those who did return



## HISTORICAL RETENTION AND PERSISTENCE RATES

Entering Freshmen Cohort (Full-Time)		Retention Rates <sup>1</sup>		Persistence Rates <sup>2</sup>			
Year	N	After First Year	After Second Year	After Third Year	After Fourth Year	After Fifth Year	After Sixth Year
1999	2,289	72.3%	55.4%	49.8%	46.8%	44.3%	45.0%
2000	2,238	72.0%	59.0%	54.0%	50.0%	47.0%	48.0%
2001	2,212	75.2%	62.3%	56.1%	54.2%	51.6%	50.7%
2002	2,212	77.1%	64.1%	59.5%	55.5%	52.0%	53.1%
2003	2,199	75.5%	64.9%	60.3%	55.2%	54.2%	54.6%
2004*	2,307	76.5%	64.9%	60.2%	55.5%	55.4%	55.0%
2005	2,256	78.1%	65.4%	61.3%	55.6%	55.7%	56.1%
2006	2,383	78.0%	66.6%	63.5%	58.5%	58.1%	57.5%
2007	2,527	77.7%	66.8%	62.4%	57.8%	58.2%	58.6%
2008	2,548	78.5%	68.2%	63.3%	59.7%	57.8%	
2009	2,441	77.7%	66.2%	61.4%	57.5%		
2010	2,512	77.7%	65.4%	60.7%			
2011	2,511	77.1%	65.9%				
2012	2,645	77.9%					



# Descriptive Statistics (Third Model)

---



# DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Entering Cohort	Applied as an 'undecided' major		Total
	Yes	No	
2008	459	1,279	1,738
2009	501	1,200	1,701
2010	441	1,137	1,578

Entering Cohort	Enrolled as an 'undecided' major		Total
	Yes	No	
2008	444	1,294	1,738
2009	482	1,219	1,701
2010	505	1,073	1,578



# DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Entering Cohort	Enrolled with more than 15 pre-college credits		Total
	Yes	No	
2008	115	1,623	1,738
2009	176	1,525	1,701
2010	146	1,432	1,578

Number of days from application to admissions									
Entering Cohort	#	Mean	Minimum	Percentiles					Maximum
				10th	25th	50th	75th	90th	
2008	1,738	259	76	192	224	262	294	325	613
2009	1,701	269	61	200	231	274	307	335	693
2010	1,578	263	70	196	224	266	301	327	551



# DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Entering Cohort	Entered UofL college ready in mathematics		Total
	Yes	No	
2008	1,446	292	1,738
2009	1,421	280	1,701
2010	1,351	227	1,578
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,218</b>	<b>799</b>	<b>5,017</b>

Entering Cohort	Entered UofL college ready in English		Total
	Yes	No	
2008	1,529	209	1,738
2009	1,490	211	1,701
2010	1,412	166	1,578
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,431</b>	<b>586</b>	<b>5,017</b>



# DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Entering Cohort	Entered UofL college ready in reading		Total
	Yes	No	
2008	1,553	185	1,738
2009	1,505	196	1,701
2010	1,411	167	1,578
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,469</b>	<b>548</b>	<b>5,017</b>

Entering Cohort	Any grade of D, F, or W		Total
	Yes	No	
2008	1,057	681	1,738
2009	1,373	328	1,701
2010	1,155	423	1,578



# DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Entering Cohort	Lost financial aid money from 1 <sup>st</sup> to 2 <sup>nd</sup> fall		Total
	Yes	No	
2008	895	843	1,738
2009	1,004	697	1,701
2010	919	659	1,578

Entering Cohort	Lost financial aid money from 2 <sup>nd</sup> to 3 <sup>rd</sup> fall		Total
	Yes	No	
2008	609	1,129	1,738
2009	550	1,151	1,701
2010	574	1,004	1,578





## FOR THOSE NOT RETAINED IN THE 4<sup>TH</sup> FALL...

Entering Cohort	Subsequent enrollment in another institution		Total
	2-year	4-year	
2008	199	152	351
2009	200	174	374
2010	188	110	298
<b>Total</b>	<b>587</b>	<b>436</b>	<b>1,023</b>

Entering Cohort	Subsequent enrollment in another institution		Total
	Private	Public	
2008	69	282	351
2009	46	328	374
2010	41	257	298
<b>Total</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>867</b>	<b>1,023</b>



## MOST POPULAR MAJORS

Top five majors at UofL	Entering cohort			Total
	2008	2009	2010	
Undecided	444	482	505	1,431
Biology	144	176	149	469
Nursing	154	135	122	411
Psychology	74	82	83	239
Mechanical Engineering	63	62	49	174

Top five majors of those than transferred to another institution	Entering cohort			Total
	2008	2009	2010	
Undecided	44	36	38	118
Nursing	6	9	6	21
Associate in Science	7	4	5	16
Criminal Justice	4	5	7	16
Business Administration	6	2	7	15



## FOR THOSE NOT RETAINED IN THE 4<sup>TH</sup> FALL...

Top five transfer institutions	Entering cohort			Total
	2008	2009	2010	
Jefferson Community and Technical College	114	98	120	332
Indiana University Southeast	30	28	17	75
University of Kentucky	15	17	18	50
Elizabethtown Community College	13	16	17	46
Northern Kentucky University	7	22	9	38

Top five institutions of those that transferred and earned at least one grade of D, F, or W at UofL	Entering cohort			Total
	2008	2009	2010	
Jefferson Community and Technical College	56	91	98	245
Indiana University Southeast	15	26	8	49
University of Kentucky	5	12	11	28
Elizabethtown Community College	4	16	13	33
Northern Kentucky University	3	19	6	28



## FOR THOSE NOT RETAINED IN THE 4<sup>TH</sup> FALL...

---

Entering Cohort	Earned a degree at another institution		Total
	Associate	Bachelor	
2008	33	55	88
2009	17	58	75
2010	9	3	12
<b>Total</b>	59	116	175



Implementing the results

---



## PUTTING THE DATA TO USE...

- Justified establishing a consultancy agreement with AACRAO to assess the institutional enrollment management plan including institutional fit and issues of affordability
- Promoted the expanded and applied use of the national student engagement surveys (i.e., NSSE, FSSE, BCSSE)
- Prompted the re-examination of the institutional advising model based on national best practices
- Identified problematic 'gate keeper' courses that adversely impact student persistence to develop academic and non-academic support strategies
- Examined course sequencing within academic programs in relation to student enrollment patterns
- Identified under-utilized high impact practices for growth opportunities (e.g., learning communities, international service opportunities, etc.)



## CONTACT INFORMATION

Becky Patterson: Executive Director, Office of Institutional Research and Planning

([becky.patterson@louisville.edu](mailto:becky.patterson@louisville.edu))

Arnold Hook: Assistant Director, Office of Institutional Research and Planning

([arnold.hook@louisville.edu](mailto:arnold.hook@louisville.edu))

Robert (Bob) Goldstein: Vice Provost, Institutional Research, Effectiveness, and Analytics

([rsgold03@louisville.edu](mailto:rsgold03@louisville.edu))



**THANK YOU!**