UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH ALABAMA

2018 Freshman Cohort Retention Report

Executive Summary

This report summarizes the one-year retention of 1,889 students in the University of South Alabama (USA) 2018 first-time full-time baccalaureate degree-seeking freshman cohort. The one-year retention rate for the 2018 freshman cohort was 74%.

Results indicated retention of students with a lower high school GPA or lower ACT Composite score or students who are 20 years old or older may require additional resources and monitoring to enable and/or encourage them to persist towards successfully completing a degree at USA. Students who participated in Greek life at USA were more likely to return to USA which emphasizes the importance of students becoming involved in student organizations at USA that allow them to connect with students with similar interests outside of the classroom as well. Similar to previous studies, students attending the earlier freshman summer orientation sessions were more likely to return than students attending the later orientation sessions meaning that the orientation session attended could provide another key factor for identifying at-risk freshmen students early on in their college experience.

The importance of financial support in the form of freshman scholarships or other types of scholarships was also clear. Additional USA freshman scholarships should be considered to continue to attract top students to attend USA. In addition, need-based grants could be utilized to assist students in greater need of financial support to encourage them to return to and persist towards completing a degree at USA.

Results also showed students who received an at-risk midterm grade (D, F, or U) in the Fall 2018 semester in four or more courses for lack of attendance and/or poor academic performance and students who were placed on probation after the Fall 2018 semester ended were unlikely to return to USA one year later. These findings highlight the importance of intervening prior to the end of the fall semester with students who receive an at-risk midterm grade to help prevent these students from subsequently receiving a low USA GPA and being placed on probation after the fall semester concludes.

Overview

The following report provides a detailed analysis about the one-year retention of the 1,889 first-time full-time baccalaureate degree-seeking freshmen students in the University of South Alabama (USA) 2018 freshman cohort. Retention in the context of this report is defined as whether freshmen students returned and enrolled one year later in the Fall 2019 semester. Similar to reports written by Institutional Research, the input-environment-outcome (IEO) model developed by Alexander W. Astin[1] was used as a conceptual framework to guide this analysis.

[1] Astin, A. W. (2002). Assessment for excellence: The philosophy and practice of assessment and evaluation in higher education. American Council on Education, Oryx Press.

Cross tabular results for each variable and whether the student returned are reported. Comparisons for each subgroup are made to the overall retention rate of the cohort (74%). Significant mean differences for the input, environmental, and outcome variables are also indicated.

Additionally, five logistic regression models were tested. The first model included the input[2] variables. The second model included the input and the environmental[3] variables. The third model included two outcome variables known midway through or after the end of the Fall 2018 semester[4]. The fourth model and fifth model tested a different outcome variable known after the end of the Summer 2019 semester[5]. The predictive power of each model for explaining whether the student would return (Yes/No) is reported as well as which variables were significant in each of the five models.

Cross Tabular Results

Cross tabular results for each variable and whether the student returned are summarized in the following section. Comparisons are made for each subgroup of the variable to the one-year retention rate (74%) of the 1,889 freshmen in the cohort. These comparisons illustrate which subgroups of students returned at higher, similar, or lower rates than the overall cohort retention rate of 74%. In addition, significant mean differences for the input, environmental, and the outcome variables known midway through or after the end of the Fall 2018 semester and after the end of the Summer 2019 semester are reported.

Input Variable Cross Tabular Results

For the input variables included in this analysis (see Table 1), female students (77%) returned at a higher rate than male students (69%). The mean difference between female students and male students was statistically significant (see Appendix: Independent T-Test Tables).

[2] Input variables: Gender, race/ethnicity, age, region, first generation status, high school GPA, and ACT Composite score.
[3] Environmental variables: USA Day attendance, orientation session attended, college, USA freshman scholarship, other scholarship, Pell Grant, Subsidized Stafford Loan, test fee waiver, housing, learning community, Freshman Seminar, and Greek life participation.
[4] Outcome variables midway through/after Fall 2018: Number of at-risk midterm grades received and probation status (model 3).
[5] Outcome variables after Summer 2019: USA hours earned (model 4) and USA GPA (model 5).

Table 1: Comparison of Input Variables to 2018 Cohort Retention Rate

Variable	Retention Rate >= 74%	Count	Retention Rate < 74%	Count
**Gender*				
	*Female (77%)	1,131	Male (69%)	758
**Race/Ethnicity*				
	*Asian (86%)	72	African-American (71%)	380
	Other (84%)	73	Non-Resident Alien (64%)	14
	Hispanic (75%)	75		
	White (74%)	1,176		
	Multiracial (74%)	99		
**Age*				
	17 years old or younger (79%)	78	19 years old (71%)	139
	18 years old (75%)	1,642	*20 years old or older (47%)	30
Region				
	Mississippi service area (81%)	159	Florida service area (71%)	103
	Rest of Alabama (75%)	704	Rest of United States (68%)	143
	Mobile or Baldwin County (74%)	766	International (64%)	14
First Generation				
	No (76%)	1,237	Unknown (73%)	227
			Yes (71%)	425
**High School GPA*				
	*3.51 or higher (83%)	1,224	3.01-3.5 (61%)	499
			3.0 or lower (47%)	162
**ACT Composite Score*				
	*30 or higher (86%)	218	20-21 (68%)	296
	28-29 (84%)	159	19 or lower (66%)	271
	24-25 (77%)	328		
	26-27 (77%)	178		
	22-23 (74%)	319		

Note: *Significant mean difference at .05 p level based on Independent T-Test for two group comparisons or at least one group with significant mean difference at .05 p level based on Games-Howell procedure for multiple group comparisons. Significantly different group indicated by orange fill color. Comparison group indicated by "*" and gray fill color.

In terms of race/ethnicity, African-American (71%) and Non-Resident Alien (64%) students returned at a lower rate than the cohort retention rate (74%). The mean difference between retention of Asian students and African-American students was statistically significant (see Appendix: ANOVA Tables).

Retention comparisons based on age showed that students who were 18 years old or younger returned at a higher rate (at least 75%) than the cohort retention rate (74%). The mean difference between retention of student who were 20 years old or older compared to students who were 18 years old or younger was statistically significant (see Appendix: ANOVA Tables).

Comparisons based on what region the student came from showed students from the Mississippi service area (81%) and students who came from Alabama but lived outside of Mobile or Baldwin County (75%) returned at a higher rate than the overall cohort (74%). The retention rate of students who indicated they were not a first generation student (76%) on the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) application was slightly higher than the overall cohort (74%).

For the most part, as high school GPA or ACT Composite score decreased, retention also decreased. Students who had a high school GPA ranging between 3.01-3.5 or lower (at most 61%) returned at a lower rate than the overall cohort (74%). Similarly, students who had an ACT Composite score of 20-21 or lower (at most 68%) returned at a lower rate than the cohort retention rate (74%). The mean difference between retention of students with a high school GPA of 3.51 or higher in comparison to both of the

lower high school GPA groups was statistically significant (see Appendix: ANOVA Tables). The mean difference between retention of students with an ACT Composite score of 30 or higher in comparison to students with an ACT Composite score of 22-23 or lower was also statistically significant (see Appendix: ANOVA Tables).

Environmental Variable Cross Tabular Results

For the environmental variables included in this analysis, USA Day attendance results (see Table 2) showed students who attended one or more USA Day (at least 79%) returned at a higher rate than the overall cohort (74%). There was a significant mean difference between students who attended multiple USA Days in comparison to students who attended one USA day or did not attend an USA Day (see Appendix: ANOVA Tables).

Table 2: Comparison of Environmental Variables to 2018 Cohort Retention Rate

Variable	Retention Rate >= 74%	Count	Retention Rate < 74%	Count
**USA Day Attendance*				
	*Attended Multiple USA Days (100%)	6	Did Not Attend (73%)	1,527
	Attended 1 USA Day (79%)	356		
**Orientation Session*				
	Freshman Session 5 (87%)	182	Freshman Session 8 (71%)	191
	Freshman Session 2 (84%)	177	Freshman Session 7 (70%)	191
	Freshman Session 1 (81%)	181	May Orientation (68%)	34
	Freshman Session 3 (80%)	173	Freshman Session 9 (63%)	161
	Freshman Session 4 (79%)	169	August/Other Orientation (59%)	126
	Freshman Session 6 (76%)	171	*Freshman Session 10 (56%)	133
College				
	Nursing (80%)	297	Arts and Sciences (72%)	595
	Allied Health (79%)	293	Engineering (72%)	240
	Education (76%)	190	Business (68%)	179
			Computing (68%)	95
**USA Freshman Scholarship*				
	*Yes (82%)	1,060	No (65%)	829
**Other Scholarship*				
	*Yes (80%)	1,202	No (64%)	687
**Pell Grant*				
	No (78%)	1,078	*Yes (69%)	811
**Subsidized Stafford Loan*				
	No (78%)	976	*Yes (70%)	913
Test Fee Waiver				
	No (74%)	1,733	Yes (71%)	156
**Housing*				
	*On campus (76%)	1,158	Off campus (72%)	731
Learning Community				
	Yes (75%)	1,418	No (71%)	471
Freshman Seminar				
	No (76%)	509	Yes (73%)	1,380
**Greek Life Participation*				
	*Yes (90%)	222	No (72%)	1,667

Note: *Significant mean difference at .05 p level based on Independent T-Test for two group comparisons or at least one group with significant mean difference at .05 p level based on Games-Howell procedure for multiple group comparisons. Significantly different group indicated by orange fill color. Comparison group indicated by "*" and gray fill color.

In terms of the orientation session attended, the retention rate of students who attended one of the first six freshman summer orientation sessions was at least 76%. Retention rates based on the orientation session

attended ranged from a high of 87% for students who attended the Freshman Session 5 to a low of 56% for students who attended Freshman Session 10. When using the Freshman Session 10 orientation session as a comparison group, there was a significant mean difference between the Freshman Session 10 group in comparison to Freshman Sessions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6. (see Appendix: ANOVA Tables).

Retention comparisons based on the college housing the major the student initially selected showed Nursing (80%), Allied Health (79%), and Education (76%) students returned at a higher rate than the overall cohort (74%). Business and Computing tied for the lowest one-year retention rate at 68%.

Scholarship retention rate comparisons illustrated that receiving scholarships positively affected retention. Students receiving a USA freshman scholarship (82%) or some other type of scholarship[6] (80%) returned at a higher rate than the cohort retention rate (74%). The mean difference between students who received a USA freshman scholarship compared to students who did not receive a USA freshman scholarship was statistically significant (see Appendix: Independent T-Test Tables). Similarly, the mean difference between students who received some other type of scholarship compared to students who did not was also statistically significant (see Appendix: Independent T-Test Tables).

Financial aid related comparisons showed a relationship between the financial resources of the student and/or the student's family and retention. Students who received a Pell Grant (69%), received a Subsidized Stafford Loan (70%), or received a NACAC fee waiver for ACT or SAT test-taking purposes (71%), due to meeting one of the indicators of economic need, returned at a lower rate than the overall cohort (74%).

Students who lived on campus (76%) returned at a higher rate than the overall cohort (74%). The mean difference between retention of students who lived on campus and students who did not live on campus was statistically significant (see Appendix: Independent T-Test Tables).

A Freshman Seminar course is typically one of the courses included in a learning community. Interestingly, results showed students who participated in a learning community (75%) returned at a higher rate than students who did not participate in a learning community (71%). However, students who did not take Freshman Seminar (76%) returned at a higher rate compared to students who took Freshman Seminar (73%).

Lastly, students who participated in Greek life (90%) returned at a higher rate than the overall cohort (74%). In addition, the mean difference between retention of students who participated in Greek life and students who did not participate in Greek life was statistically significant (see Appendix: Independent T-Test Tables).

Outcome Variable Midway Through or After Fall 2018 Cross Tabular Results

Outcome variables incorporated into this analysis that were known midway through or after Fall 2018 included the number of at-risk midterm grades (D, F, or U) a student had in Fall 2018 and whether the student was placed on probation after Fall 2018 (see Table 3). Students who did not have an at-risk midterm grade (86%) returned at a higher rate than the overall cohort (74%). The mean difference for students who did not have an at-risk midterm grade in Fall 2018 compared to students who had an at-risk midterm grade in one or more courses was statistically significant (see Appendix: ANOVA Tables).

[6] Other scholarship includes third party private scholarships that are not considered a USA Freshman scholarship.

Table 3: Comparison of Outcome Variables Midway Through/After Fall 2018 to 2018 Cohort Retention Rate

Variable	Retention Rate >= 74%	Count	Retention Rate < 74%	Count
**Number of At-Risk Midterm Grades in Fall 2018*				
	*No At-Risk MT Grades (86%)	948	2 At-Risk MT Grades (58%)	228
	1 At-Risk MT Grade (76%)	490	3 At-Risk MT Grades (45%)	117
			4 or More At-Risk MT Grades (25%)	106
**Probation Status after Fall 2018*				
	No (83%)	1,608	*Yes (25%)	281
Note: *At least one group with significant mean difference at .05 p level based on Games-Howell procedure for multiple group comparisons. Significantly different group indicated by orange fill color. Comparison group indicated by "*" and gray fill color.				

Students who were not on probation after Fall 2018 returned at a much higher rate (83%) compared to students who were placed on probation after the Fall 2018 semester ended (25%). The mean difference between students who were placed on probation and students who were not on probation was statistically significant (see Appendix: Independent T-Test Tables).

Outcome Variable After Summer 2019 Cross Tabular Results

Outcome variables incorporated into this analysis that were known after Summer 2019 included the number of hours earned after Summer 2019 at USA and the USA GPA after Summer 2019 (see Table 4). As the number of USA hours earned increased the retention rate also increased. For the most part, students with a higher USA GPA were more likely to return than students with a lower USA GPA.

Table 4: Comparison of Outcome Variables After Summer 2019 to 2018 Cohort Retention Rate

Variable	Retention Rate >= 74%	Count	Retention Rate < 74%	Count
**USA Hours Earned after Summer 2019*				
	*30.5 or more (94%)	842	18.5-24 (60%)	141
	24.5-30 (87%)	544	12.5-18 (26%)	137
			6.5-12 (9%)	97
			0-6 (5%)	106
**USA GPA after Summer 2019*				
	3.51-4.0 (92%)	542	*2.0 or lower (20%)	330
	3.01-3.5 (89%)	467		
	2.01-2.5 (82%)	198		
	2.51-3.0 (79%)	330		
Note: *At least one group with significant mean difference at .05 p level based on Games-Howell procedure for multiple group comparisons. Significantly different group indicated by orange fill color. Comparison group indicated by "*" and gray fill color.				

Students who earned 24.5 to 30 or more hours at USA after Summer 2019 returned at a higher rate (at least 87%) compared to students who earned 18.5 to 24 or fewer hours (at most 60%). The mean difference between students who earned 30.5 or more hours at USA compared to students in all other USA hours earned groups was statistically significant (see Appendix: ANOVA Tables).

Students with a USA GPA of 2.01 to 2.5 or higher after Summer 2019 returned at a much higher rate (at least 79%) compared to students with a USA GPA of 2.0 or lower (20%). Furthermore, the mean difference between students who had a USA GPA of 2.0 or lower compared to students in all other USA GPA groups was statistically significant (see Appendix: ANOVA Tables).

Logistic Regression Results

The focus of this study was to determine which student characteristics (inputs) and environmental characteristics (institutional/other support characteristics) can be used to best predict the retention of USA freshmen students. Since the focus of this study was prediction and classification of a dichotomous

outcome variable, stepwise logistic regression was used. This technique allows for the identification of significant variables that contribute to the classification of individuals by using an algorithm to determine the importance of predictor variables. Stepwise logistic regression was used to identify significant variables in the model for predicting the outcome variable. Results of the final step for the model are reported including the classification rate for the model. Additionally, an analysis of the proportionate change in odds for significant variables is provided.

As a part of this study, five logistic models were tested. The first model included the input variables. The second model included the input variables and the environmental variables. The third model tested two outcome variables known midway through or after the Fall 2018 semester: 1) the number of at-risk midterm grades a student had in Fall 2018 and 2) whether the student was placed on probation after Fall 2018 to see what happened when these variables were used as predictors of retention. The fourth and fifth models tested a different outcome variable known after the Summer 2019 semester. The fourth model tested the number of USA hours earned after Summer 2019 and the fifth model tested the USA GPA after Summer 2019 to see what happened when these outcomes were used as individual predictors of retention.

The number of students (selected cases) included in each model varied based on what variables were included in the final model because some students in the cohort had missing data, such as a high school GPA and/or an ACT Composite score. Because complete cases were required to compute the results, the final number of students used for each model ranged from a low of 1,767 students for the first and second models to a high of 1,889 students for the third model. The total number of students without any missing data for any of the variables used in the five different models was 1,748. The retention rate for this subset of 1,748 students was 76%. With a similar retention rate (76% compared to 74%) and 1,748 students representing 93% of the entire cohort, the models tested provided a solid representation of retention for this population. Since the focus for the models tested was to predict *returning* students, the outcome was coded with students not returning as a "0" and students *returning* as a "1". This focus meant results would predict the odds of whether the student would *return* one year later.

Model 1: Logistic Regression with Input Variables Only
The first model consisted of one step (see Appendix: Logistic Regression Tables). Step 1 of the first model showed the model correctly classified students in this cohort who *returned* 95.2% of the time and students who did not return 16.0% of the time for an overall classification rate of 75.6%.

For each variable included in the first model, a comparison group was selected (gender=male, race/ethnicity=white, age=17 years or younger, region=Mobile or Baldwin County, high school GPA=3.0 or lower, first generation status=No, and ACT Composite score=19 or lower).

In the first model (see Appendix: Logistic Regression Tables), high school GPA was significant in step 1 of the model. Step 1 of the first model showed the odds (Exp *B*) of a student *returning* was greater for a student in the two higher high school GPA comparison groups (3.01-3.5=1.727 and 3.51-4.0=5.664) than for a student with a high school GPA of 3.0 or lower. Additionally, the confidence intervals (95%) indicated the odds of a student *returning* was greater for a student in the two higher high school GPA comparison groups than for a student with a high school GPA of 3.0 or lower.

Model 2: Logistic Regression with Input and Environmental Variables
The second model consisted of two steps (see Appendix: Logistic Regression Tables). In comparison to the first model, the correct classification rate for the second model slightly decreased to 94.0% for *returning* students while the classification rate for the second model increased to 21.0% for students who did not return. The overall correct classification rate for the second model was 75.9%.

The second model included the input and also the environmental variables. For each environmental variable included in the second model a comparison group was selected (number of USA Days attended=did not attend, orientation session attended=either the August Orientation session, a transfer orientation session, or an unknown orientation session, the college housing the major the student selected at initial enrollment in Fall 2018=Arts and Sciences, whether the student received a USA freshman scholarship=no, whether the student received some other type of scholarship=no, whether the student received a Pell Grant=no, whether the student received a Subsidized Stafford Loan=no, whether the student received a test fee waiver=no, whether the student lived on or off campus=off campus, whether the student participated in a learning community=no, whether the student took Freshman Seminar=no, and whether the student participated in Greek life=no).

Once again, high school GPA was significant in the final step (step 2) of the second model (see Appendix: Logistic Regression Tables). In addition, participation in Greek life and the orientation session attended were significant in the final step (step 2) of the second model.

The final step (step 2) of the second model showed the odds (Exp *B*) of a student *returning* was greater for a student in the two higher high school GPA comparison groups (3.01-3.5=1.684 and 3.51-4.0=5.188) than for a student with a high school GPA of 3.0 or lower. Additionally, the confidence intervals (95%) indicated the odds of a student *returning* was greater for a student in the two higher high school GPA comparison groups than for a student with a high school GPA of 3.0 or lower.

When looking at participation in Greek life, the final step (step 2) of the second model showed the odds (Exp *B*) of a student *returning* was greater for a student that participated in Greek life (3.078) than for a student that did not participate. The confidence intervals (95%) also indicated the odds of a student *returning* was greater for a student that participated in Greek life than non-participants.

Finally, the final step (step 2) of the second model showed the odds (Exp *B*) of a student *returning* was greater for a student who attended one of the first eight freshman summer orientation sessions (Freshman Session 1=1.739, Freshman Session 2=2.144, Freshman Session 3=1.771, Freshman Session 4=1.609, Freshman Session 5=2.862, Freshman Session 6=1.306, Freshman Session 7=1.119, and Freshman Session 8=1.257), than for a student who attended either the August Orientation session, a transfer orientation session, or an unknown orientation session. In addition, the confidence intervals (95%) indicated the odds of a student *returning* was greater for a student who attended the Freshman Session 2 or Freshman Session 5 orientation than for a student who attended either the August Orientation session, a transfer orientation session, or an unknown orientation session.

Model 3, Model 4, and Model 5: Logistic Regression Outcome Variable Models
Since outcomes of student success are different from inputs (student characteristics or institutional/other support characteristics), the third, fourth, and fifth models only included outcomes of interest after the Fall 2018 semester had already begun. The third model included outcome variables known midway through or after the Fall 2018 semester ended (number of at-risk midterm grades in Fall 2018 and probation status after Fall 2018). The fourth model (number of hours earned after Summer 2019) and fifth model (USA GPA the student attained after Summer 2019) included a different outcome variable known after the Summer 2019 semester ended. The first and second models can be used based on data known before or at least early on after the student comes to campus. However, the third, fourth, and fifth models can only be used after the Fall 2018 semester (third model) or Summer 2019 semester (fourth and fifth models) ended.

Model 3: Logistic Regression with Variables Midway Through or After Fall 2018
The third model (see Appendix: Logistic Regression Tables) consisted of two steps. In comparison to the first and second model, the correct classification rate for the third model of 95.0% was similar for

returning students. However, in comparison to the first and second model, the classification rate for the third model substantially increased to 43.1% for students who did not return since this snapshot included data known after the end of the Fall 2018 semester instead of pre-Fall 2018 semester data. The overall correct classification rate for the third model was 81.6%.

The third model included variables known midway through or after Fall 2018. For each variable included in the third model a comparison group was selected (number of at-risk midterm grades in Fall 2018=four or more at-risk midterm grades and whether the student was placed on probation after Fall 2018=yes).

In the final step (step 2) of the third model, probation status after Fall 2018 and the number of at-risk midterm grades in Fall 2018 were significant (see Appendix: Logistic Regression Tables). The final step (step 2) of the third model showed the odds (Exp *B*) of a student *returning* was greater for a student who was not placed on probation after Fall 2018 (7.695) than for a student who was placed on probation after Fall 2018. The confidence intervals (95%) also supported this finding because the odds for a student *returning* was greater for a student who was not on probation after Fall 2018 than a student who was placed on probation after Fall 2018.

When looking at the number of at-risk (D, F, or U) midterm grades in Fall 2018, the final step (step 2) of the third model showed the odds (Exp *B*) of a student *returning* was greater for a student who had three or fewer at-risk midterm grades in Fall 2018 (no at-risk midterm grades=4.780, one at-risk midterm grade=3.200, two at-risk midterm grades=2.286, and three at-risk midterm grades=1.783) than for a student who had four or more at-risk midterm grades in Fall 2018. The confidence intervals (95%) also indicated the odds of a student *returning* was greater for a student with two or fewer at-risk midterm grades in Fall 2018 than a student who had four or more at-risk midterm grades in Fall 2018.

Model 4: Logistic Regression with USA Hours Earned After Summer 2019 Variable
The fourth model included the USA hours earned after the end of the Summer 2019 semester. The comparison group selected for the fourth model was zero to six hours earned after the end of the Summer 2019 semester. Since the fourth model only included one variable, the model consisted of one step (see Appendix: Logistic Regression Tables). The correct classification rate for the fourth model for *returning* students (96.5%) was slightly higher than the first, second, and third models. However, in comparison to the other three models, the correct classification rate was much higher for students who did not return (62.2%) since this snapshot included data known after the end of the Summer 2019 semester. The overall correct classification rate for the fourth model was 87.9%.

The fourth model showed the odds (Exp *B*) of a student *returning* was greater for a student with 6.5-12 or more hours earned (6.5-12=2.066, 12.5-18=6.931, 18.5-24=29.768, 24.5-30=130.332, 30.5 or more=341.681) than for a student with six or fewer hours earned at the end of Summer 2019 (see Appendix: Logistic Regression Tables). Additionally, the confidence intervals (95%) indicated the odds of a student *returning* was greater for a student in the four higher USA hours earned comparison groups than for a student with zero to six USA hours earned.

Model 5: Logistic Regression with USA GPA After Summer 2019 Variable
The fifth model included the USA GPA after the end of the Summer 2019 semester. The comparison group selected for the fifth model was an USA GPA of 2.0 or lower after the end of the Summer 2019 semester. Since the fifth model only included one variable, the model consisted of one step (see Appendix: Logistic Regression Tables). The correct classification rate for the fifth model for *returning* students (95.4%) was similar to other four models. The correct classification rate for the fifth model for students who did not return (56.6%) was higher than the first, second, and third models since this snapshot included data known after the end of the Summer 2019 semester instead of pre-Fall 2018

semester data, but was lower than the fourth model. The overall correct classification rate for the fifth model was 85.6%.

The fifth model showed the odds (Exp *B*) of a student *returning* was greater for a student with an USA GPA of 2.01-2.5 or higher (2.01-2.5=18.346, 2.51-3.0=15.143, 3.01-3.5=31.846, 3.51-4.0=46.143) than for a student with an USA GPA of 2.0 or lower at the end of Summer 2019 (see Appendix: Logistic Regression Tables). In addition, the confidence intervals (95%) indicated the odds of a student *returning* was greater for a student in the four higher USA GPA comparison groups than for a student with an USA GPA of 2.0 or lower.

Peer Comparisons

Finally, to better understand how USA one-year retention rates compared to peer institutions, the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) Data Center was used to compare USA one-year retention rates to the rates of nine peer institutions (see Table 5). A retention rate trend over a period of five years based on the latest available retention rate data in IPEDS showed the USA retention rate fell approximately in the middle of the comparison group over that period of time. The USA one-year retention rate over this period ranged from a low of 68% for the 2012 freshman cohort to a high of 78% for the 2016 freshman cohort. The one-year retention rate of peer institutions over this same period ranged from a low of 62% for the Wright State University 2012 freshman cohort to a high of 83% for the East Carolina University 2015 and 2016 freshman cohorts.

Table 5: One-Year Retention Rate Peer Comparisons * Ranked by 2016 Cohort Retention Rate * High to Low

Institution Name	2016 Cohort Retention	2015 Cohort Retention	2014 Cohort Retention	2013 Cohort Retention	2012 Cohort Retention
East Carolina University	83	83	80	81	81
University of North Dakota	81	80	81	80	75
Ohio University	80	82	79	80	79
Florida Atlantic University	79	77	78	75	77
University of South Alabama	78	73	73	71	68
East Tennessee State University	76	71	71	69	66
University of Missouri-Kansas City	75	75	75	73	73
University of Nevada-Las Vegas	74	77	74	77	77
University of Toledo	74	74	72	70	68
Wright State University	65	66	67	66	62

Source: National Center for Education Statistics IPEDS Data Center

Implications

Based on what we know about a student before the student steps foot on campus (input variables), one-year retention of students with lower high school GPAs and students with lower ACT Composite scores is a concern. This prompts further reflection regarding admission standards and the allocation of resources to support at-risk students. In addition, students who are 20 years old or older may require additional resources and monitoring to enable and/or encourage them to persist towards successfully completing a degree at USA.

When we look at the institutional support and other support provided to a student (environmental variables), the orientation session students in the 2018 cohort attended provided a significant predictor of student retention, with students attending the earlier Freshman Summer orientation sessions more likely to return than students attending the later orientation sessions. The orientation session attended by students provides a key factor for identifying at-risk freshmen students early in their college experience.

Students who participated in Greek life at USA were more likely to return to USA. This emphasizes the importance of students becoming involved in student organizations at USA that allow them to connect with students with similar interests outside of the classroom as well.

The importance of financial support in the form of freshman scholarships or other types of scholarships was also clear. Additional USA freshman scholarships should be considered to continue to attract top students to attend USA. In addition, need-based grants could be utilized to assist students in greater need of financial support to encourage them to return to and persist towards completing a degree at USA.

Finally, results showed students who received four or more at-risk midterm grades (D, F, or U) in the Fall 2018 semester for lack of attendance and/or poor academic performance and students who were placed on probation after the Fall 2018 semester ended were unlikely to return to USA one year later. These findings highlight the importance of intervening prior to the end of the fall semester with students who receive an at-risk midterm grade to help prevent these students from subsequently receiving a low USA GPA and being placed on probation after the fall semester concludes.

Future Retention Research

This report is the first of two one-year retention studies about the 2018 freshman cohort that will be completed by the Office of Institutional Research during the Fall 2019 semester. The second retention study will use National Student Clearinghouse data to explore the issue of "Where did non-returning freshmen in the 2018 cohort go?" This study will determine how many non-returning freshmen students transferred to another college or university or "stopped out" of college altogether.

APPENDIX

2018 Freshman Cohort Retention Report Cross Tabs

2018 Cohort * Gender * One-Year Retention Crosstabulation

			One-Year Retention		
			No	Yes	Total
Gender	Female	Count	257	874	1131
		% within Gender	22.7%	77.3%	100.0%
	Male	Count	232	526	758
		% within Gender	30.6%	69.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	489	1400	1889
		% within Gender	25.9%	74.1%	100.0%

2018 Cohort * Race * One-Year Retention Crosstabulation

			One-Year Retention		
			No	Yes	Total
Race	White	Count	308	868	1176
		% within Race	26.2%	73.8%	100.0%
	African-American	Count	109	271	380
		% within Race	28.7%	71.3%	100.0%
	Asian	Count	10	62	72
		% within Race	13.9%	86.1%	100.0%
	Hispanic	Count	19	56	75
		% within Race	25.3%	74.7%	100.0%
	Multiracial	Count	26	73	99
		% within Race	26.3%	73.7%	100.0%
	Non-Resident Alien	Count	5	9	14
		% within Race	35.7%	64.3%	100.0%
	Other	Count	12	61	73
		% within Race	16.4%	83.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	489	1400	1889
		% within Race	25.9%	74.1%	100.0%

2018 Cohort * Age * One-Year Retention Crosstabulation

			One-Year Retention		
			No	Yes	Total
Age	17 years or younger	Count	16	62	78
		% within Age	20.51%	79.49%	100.0%
	18 years old	Count	417	1225	1642
		% within Age	25.4%	74.6%	100.0%
	19 years old	Count	40	99	139
		% within Age	28.8%	71.2%	100.0%
	20 years or older	Count	16	14	30
		% within Age	53.3%	46.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	489	1400	1889
		% within Age	25.9%	74.1%	100.0%

2018 Freshman Cohort Retention Report Cross Tabs

2018 Cohort * Region * One-Year Retention Crosstabulation

			One-Year Retention		
			No	Yes	Total
Region	Mobile or Baldwin County	Count	199	567	766
		% within Region	26.0%	74.0%	100.0%
	Rest of Alabama	Count	178	526	704
		% within Region	25.3%	74.7%	100.0%
	Mississippi Service Area	Count	31	128	159
		% within Region	19.497%	80.503%	100.0%
	Florida Service Area	Count	30	73	103
		% within Region	29.1%	70.9%	100.0%
	Rest of United States	Count	46	97	143
		% within Region	32.2%	67.8%	100.0%
	International	Count	5	9	14
		% within Region	35.7%	64.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	489	1400	1889
		% within Region	25.9%	74.1%	100.0%

2018 Cohort * First Generation * One-Year Retention Crosstabulation

			One-Year Retention		
			No	Yes	Total
First Generation	No	Count	303	934	1237
		% within First Generation	24.49%	75.51%	100.0%
	Yes	Count	125	300	425
		% within First Generation	29.4%	70.6%	100.0%
	Unknown	Count	61	166	227
		% within First Generation	26.9%	73.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	489	1400	1889
		% within First Generation	25.9%	74.1%	100.0%

2018 Cohort * HS GPA Logistic * One-Year Retention Crosstabulation

			One-Year Retention		
			No	Yes	Total
HS GPA Logistic	3.0 or lower	Count	86	76	162
		% within HS GPA Logistic	53.1%	46.9%	100.0%
	3.01-3.5	Count	197	302	499
		% within HS GPA Logistic	39.48%	60.52%	100.0%
	3.51 or higher	Count	204	1020	1224
		% within HS GPA Logistic	16.7%	83.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	487	1398	1885
		% within HS GPA Logistic	25.8%	74.2%	100.0%

2018 Freshman Cohort Retention Report Cross Tabs

2018 Cohort * ACT * One-Year Retention Crosstabulation

			One-Year Retention		
			No	Yes	Total
ACT	19 or lower	Count	91	180	271
		% within ACT	33.6%	66.4%	100.0%
	20-21	Count	94	202	296
		% within ACT	31.8%	68.2%	100.0%
	22-23	Count	84	235	319
		% within ACT	26.3%	73.7%	100.0%
	24-25	Count	74	254	328
		% within ACT	22.6%	77.4%	100.0%
	26-27	Count	41	137	178
		% within ACT	23.0%	77.0%	100.0%
	28-29	Count	25	134	159
		% within ACT	15.7%	84.3%	100.0%
	30 or higher	Count	30	188	218
		% within ACT	13.8%	86.2%	100.0%
Total		Count	439	1330	1769
		% within ACT	24.8%	75.2%	100.0%

2018 Cohort * Number USA Days Attended * One-Year Retention Crosstabulation

			One-Year Retention		
			No	Yes	Total
Number USA Days Attended	Did Not Attend	Count	413	1114	1527
		% within Number USA Days Attended	27.0%	73.0%	100.0%
	Attended 1 USA Day	Count	76	280	356
		% within Number USA Days Attended	21.3%	78.7%	100.0%
	Attended Multiple USA Days	Count	0	6	6
		% within Number USA Days Attended	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	489	1400	1889
		% within Number USA Days Attended	25.9%	74.1%	100.0%

2018 Freshman Cohort Retention Report Cross Tabs

2018 Cohort * Orientation * One-Year Retention Crosstabulation

			One-Year Retention		
			No	Yes	Total
Orientation	August Freshman Orientation	Count	36	39	75
		% within Orientation	48.0%	52.0%	100.0%
	August Transfer Orientation	Count	2	3	5
		% within Orientation	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
	Freshman Session 01	Count	34	147	181
		% within Orientation	18.8%	81.2%	100.0%
	Freshman Session 02	Count	29	148	177
		% within Orientation	16.4%	83.6%	100.0%
	Freshman Session 03	Count	34	139	173
		% within Orientation	19.7%	80.3%	100.0%
	Freshman Session 04	Count	35	134	169
		% within Orientation	20.7%	79.3%	100.0%
	Freshman Session 05	Count	23	159	182
		% within Orientation	12.6%	87.4%	100.0%
	Freshman Session 06	Count	41	130	171
		% within Orientation	24.0%	76.0%	100.0%
	Freshman Session 07	Count	57	134	191
		% within Orientation	29.8%	70.2%	100.0%
	Freshman Session 08	Count	55	136	191
		% within Orientation	28.8%	71.2%	100.0%
	Freshman Session 09	Count	60	101	161
		% within Orientation	37.3%	62.7%	100.0%
	Freshman Session 10	Count	58	75	133
		% within Orientation	43.6%	56.4%	100.0%
	May Freshman Orientation	Count	11	23	34
		% within Orientation	32.4%	67.6%	100.0%
	May Transfer Orientation	Count	2	13	15
		% within Orientation	13.3%	86.7%	100.0%
	Transfer Orientation 01	Count	1	0	1
		% within Orientation	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Transfer Orientation 03	Count	0	2	2
		% within Orientation	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Unknown/Did Not Attend	Count	11	17	28
		% within Orientation	39.3%	60.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	489	1400	1889
		% within Orientation	25.9%	74.1%	100.0%

2018 Freshman Cohort Retention Report Cross Tabs

2018 Cohort * Orientation Logistic * One-Year Retention Crosstabulation

			One-Year Retention		
			No	Yes	Total
Orientation Logistic	August/Transfer/Unknown Orientation	Count	52	74	126
		% within Orientation Logistic	41.3%	58.7%	100.0%
	May Orientation	Count	11	23	34
		% within Orientation Logistic	32.4%	67.6%	100.0%
	Freshman Session 1	Count	34	147	181
		% within Orientation Logistic	18.8%	81.2%	100.0%
	Freshman Session 2	Count	29	148	177
		% within Orientation Logistic	16.4%	83.6%	100.0%
	Freshman Session 3	Count	34	139	173
		% within Orientation Logistic	19.7%	80.3%	100.0%
	Freshman Session 4	Count	35	134	169
		% within Orientation Logistic	20.7%	79.3%	100.0%
	Freshman Session 5	Count	23	159	182
		% within Orientation Logistic	12.6%	87.4%	100.0%
	Freshman Session 6	Count	41	130	171
		% within Orientation Logistic	24.0%	76.0%	100.0%
	Freshman Session 7	Count	57	134	191
		% within Orientation Logistic	29.8%	70.2%	100.0%
	Freshman Session 8	Count	55	136	191
		% within Orientation Logistic	28.8%	71.2%	100.0%
	Freshman Session 9	Count	60	101	161
		% within Orientation Logistic	37.3%	62.7%	100.0%
	Freshman Session 10	Count	58	75	133
		% within Orientation Logistic	43.6%	56.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	489	1400	1889
		% within Orientation Logistic	25.9%	74.1%	100.0%

2018 Freshman Cohort Retention Report Cross Tabs

2018 Cohort * College * One-Year Retention Crosstabulation

			One-Year Retention		
			No	Yes	Total
College	AH	Count	62	231	293
		% within College	21.2%	78.8%	100.0%
	AS	Count	167	428	595
		% within College	28.1%	71.9%	100.0%
	BU	Count	58	121	179
		% within College	32.4%	67.6%	100.0%
	CS	Count	30	65	95
		% within College	31.6%	68.4%	100.0%
	ED	Count	45	145	190
		% within College	23.7%	76.3%	100.0%
	EG	Count	67	173	240
		% within College	27.9%	72.1%	100.0%
	NU	Count	60	237	297
		% within College	20.2%	79.8%	100.0%
Total		Count	489	1400	1889
		% within College	25.9%	74.1%	100.0%

2018 Cohort * Freshman Scholarship * One-Year Retention Crosstabulation

			One-Year Retention		
			No	Yes	Total
FR Academic Scholarship FY1819	No	Count	293	536	829
		% within FR Academic Scholarship FY1819	35.3%	64.7%	100.0%
	Yes	Count	196	864	1060
		% within FR Academic Scholarship FY1819	18.49%	81.51%	100.0%
Total		Count	489	1400	1889
		% within FR Academic Scholarship FY1819	25.9%	74.1%	100.0%

2018 Cohort * Other Scholarship * One-Year Retention Crosstabulation

			One-Year Retention		
			No	Yes	Total
Other Scholarship	No	Count	245	442	687
		% within Other Scholarship	35.7%	64.3%	100.0%
	Yes	Count	244	958	1202
		% within Other Scholarship	20.3%	79.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	489	1400	1889
		% within Other Scholarship	25.9%	74.1%	100.0%

2018 Freshman Cohort Retention Report Cross Tabs

2018 Cohort * Pell Grant * One-Year Retention Crosstabulation

			One-Year Retention		
			No	Yes	Total
Pell Grant	No	Count	241	837	1078
		% within Pell Grant	22.4%	77.6%	100.0%
	Yes	Count	248	563	811
		% within Pell Grant	30.6%	69.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	489	1400	1889
		% within Pell Grant	25.9%	74.1%	100.0%

2018 Cohort * Subsidized Stafford Loan * One-Year Retention Crosstabulation

			One-Year Retention		
			No	Yes	Total
Subsidized Stafford Loan	No	Count	216	760	976
		% within Subsidized Stafford Loan	22.1%	77.9%	100.0%
	Yes	Count	273	640	913
		% within Subsidized Stafford Loan	29.9%	70.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	489	1400	1889
		% within Subsidized Stafford Loan	25.9%	74.1%	100.0%

2018 Cohort * Received Test Fee Waiver * One-Year Retention Crosstabulation

			One-Year Retention		
			No	Yes	Total
Received Test Fee Waiver	No	Count	443	1290	1733
		% within Received Test Fee Waiver	25.6%	74.4%	100.0%
	Yes	Count	46	110	156
		% within Received Test Fee Waiver	29.49%	70.51%	100.0%
Total		Count	489	1400	1889
		% within Received Test Fee Waiver	25.9%	74.1%	100.0%

2018 Cohort * Housing * One-Year Retention Crosstabulation

			One-Year Retention		
			No	Yes	Total
Housing	Off campus	Count	208	523	731
		% within Housing	28.45%	71.55%	100.0%
	On campus	Count	281	877	1158
		% within Housing	24.3%	75.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	489	1400	1889
		% within Housing	25.9%	74.1%	100.0%

2018 Freshman Cohort Retention Report Cross Tabs

2018 Cohort * Learning Community * One-Year Retention Crosstabulation

			One-Year Retention		
			No	Yes	Total
Learning Community	No	Count	137	334	471
		% within Learning Community	29.1%	70.9%	100.0%
	Yes	Count	352	1066	1418
		% within Learning Community	24.8%	75.2%	100.0%
Total		Count	489	1400	1889
		% within Learning Community	25.9%	74.1%	100.0%

2018 Cohort * Took Freshman Seminar * One-Year Retention Crosstabulation

			One-Year Retention		
			No	Yes	Total
Took Freshman Seminar	No	Count	121	388	509
		% within Took Freshman Seminar	23.8%	76.2%	100.0%
	Yes	Count	368	1012	1380
		% within Took Freshman Seminar	26.7%	73.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	489	1400	1889
		% within Took Freshman Seminar	25.9%	74.1%	100.0%

2018 Cohort * Greek Life Participation * One-Year Retention Crosstabulation

			One-Year Retention		
			No	Yes	Total
Greek Life Participation	No	Count	467	1200	1667
		% within Greek Life Participation	28.0%	72.0%	100.0%
	Yes	Count	22	200	222
		% within Greek Life Participation	9.9%	90.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	489	1400	1889
		% within Greek Life Participation	25.9%	74.1%	100.0%

2018 Cohort * Number At Risk Midterm Grades in Fall 2018 * One-Year Retention Crosstabulation

			One-Year Retention		
			No	Yes	Total
Number At Risk Midterm Grades in Fall 2018	No At Risk MT Grades	Count	134	814	948
		% within Number At Risk Midterm Grades in	14.1%	85.9%	100.0%
	1 At Risk MT Grade	Count	116	374	490
		% within Number At Risk Midterm Grades in	23.7%	76.3%	100.0%
	2 At Risk MT Grades	Count	95	133	228
		% within Number At Risk Midterm Grades in	41.7%	58.3%	100.0%
	3 At Risk MT Grades	Count	64	53	117
		% within Number At Risk Midterm Grades in	54.7%	45.3%	100.0%
	4 or More At Risk MT Grades	Count	80	26	106
		% within Number At Risk Midterm Grades in	75.47%	24.53%	100.0%
Total		Count	489	1400	1889
		% within Number At Risk Midterm Grades in	25.9%	74.1%	100.0%

2018 Freshman Cohort Retention Report Cross Tabs

2018 Cohort * Probation After Fall 2018 * One-Year Retention Crosstabulation

			One-Year Retention		
			No	Yes	Total
Probation After Fall 2018	No	Count	278	1330	1608
		% within Probation After Fall 2018	17.3%	82.7%	100.0%
	Yes	Count	211	70	281
		% within Probation After Fall 2018	75.1%	24.9%	100.0%
Total		Count	489	1400	1889
		% within Probation After Fall 2018	25.9%	74.1%	100.0%

2018 Cohort * USA Hours Earned After Summer 2019 * One-Year Retention Crosstabulation

			One-Year Retention		
			No	Yes	Total
USA Hours Earned After Summer 2019	0-6 hours	Count	101	5	106
		% within USA Hours Earned After Summer	95.3%	4.7%	100.0%
	6.5-12 hours	Count	88	9	97
		% within USA Hours Earned After Summer	90.7%	9.3%	100.0%
	12.5-18 hours	Count	102	35	137
		% within USA Hours Earned After Summer	74.45%	25.55%	100.0%
	18.5-24 hours	Count	57	84	141
		% within USA Hours Earned After Summer	40.4%	59.6%	100.0%
	24.5-30 hours	Count	73	471	544
		% within USA Hours Earned After Summer	13.4%	86.6%	100.0%
	30.5 or more hours	Count	47	795	842
		% within USA Hours Earned After Summer	5.6%	94.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	468	1399	1867
		% within USA Hours Earned After Summer	25.1%	74.9%	100.0%

2018 Cohort * USA GPA After Summer 2019 * One-Year Retention Crosstabulation

			One-Year Retention		
			No	Yes	Total
USA GPA After Summer 2019	2.0 or lower	Count	265	65	330
		% within USA GPA After Summer 2019	80.3%	19.7%	100.0%
	2.01-2.5	Count	36	162	198
		% within USA GPA After Summer 2019	18.2%	81.8%	100.0%
	2.51-3.0	Count	70	260	330
		% within USA GPA After Summer 2019	21.2%	78.8%	100.0%
	3.01-3.5	Count	53	414	467
		% within USA GPA After Summer 2019	11.3%	88.7%	100.0%
	3.51-4.0	Count	44	498	542
		% within USA GPA After Summer 2019	8.1%	91.9%	100.0%
Total		Count	468	1399	1867
		% within USA GPA After Summer 2019	25.1%	74.9%	100.0%

2018 Freshman Cohort Retention Report Independent T-Test Tables

2018 Cohort * Group Statistics

One-Year Retention		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Gender T-Test	No	489	.53	.500	.023
	Yes	1400	.62	.484	.013
FR Academic Scholarship FY1819	No	489	.40	.491	.022
	Yes	1400	.62	.486	.013
Other Scholarship	No	489	.50	.501	.023
	Yes	1400	.68	.465	.012
Pell Grant	No	489	.51	.500	.023
	Yes	1400	.40	.491	.013
Subsidized Stafford Loan	No	489	.56	.497	.022
	Yes	1400	.46	.498	.013
Received Test Fee Waiver	No	489	.09	.292	.013
	Yes	1400	.08	.269	.007
Housing	No	489	.57	.495	.022
	Yes	1400	.63	.484	.013
Learning Community	No	489	.72	.450	.020
	Yes	1400	.76	.426	.011
Took Freshman Seminar	No	489	.75	.432	.020
	Yes	1400	.72	.448	.012
Greek Life Participation	No	489	.04	.207	.009
	Yes	1400	.14	.350	.009
Probation After Fall 2018	No	489	.43	.496	.022
	Yes	1400	.05	.218	.006

2018 Freshman Cohort Retention Report Independent T-Test Tables

2018 Cohort * Independent Samples Test

		Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Gender T-Test	Equal variances assumed	29.050	.000	-3.847	1887	.000	-.099	.026	-.149	-.048
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.790	829.634	.000	-.099	.026	-.150	-.048
FR Academic Scholarship FY1819	Equal variances assumed	1.813	.178	-8.450	1887	.000	-.216	.026	-.267	-.166
	Equal variances not assumed			-8.414	845.672	.000	-.216	.026	-.267	-.166
Other Scholarship	Equal variances assumed	76.784	.000	-7.436	1887	.000	-.185	.025	-.234	-.136
	Equal variances not assumed			-7.177	801.151	.000	-.185	.026	-.236	-.135
Pell Grant	Equal variances assumed	19.211	.000	4.054	1887	.000	.105	.026	.054	.156
	Equal variances not assumed			4.015	837.525	.000	.105	.026	.054	.156
Subsidized Stafford Loan	Equal variances assumed	1.589	.208	3.866	1887	.000	.101	.026	.050	.152
	Equal variances not assumed			3.871	854.027	.000	.101	.026	.050	.152
Received Test Fee Waiver	Equal variances assumed	4.521	.034	1.072	1887	.284	.015	.014	-.013	.044
	Equal variances not assumed			1.030	795.704	.303	.015	.015	-.014	.045
Housing	Equal variances assumed	12.562	.000	-2.025	1887	.043	-.052	.026	-.102	-.002
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.003	835.854	.045	-.052	.026	-.103	-.001
Learning Community	Equal variances assumed	12.372	.000	-1.831	1887	.067	-.042	.023	-.086	.003
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.785	814.776	.075	-.042	.023	-.087	.004
Took Freshman Seminar	Equal variances assumed	6.907	.009	1.274	1887	.203	.030	.023	-.016	.075
	Equal variances not assumed			1.296	879.769	.195	.030	.023	-.015	.075
Greek Life Participation	Equal variances assumed	164.804	.000	-5.834	1887	.000	-.098	.017	-.131	-.065
	Equal variances not assumed			-7.386	1443.064	.000	-.098	.013	-.124	-.072
Probation After Fall 2018	Equal variances assumed	1907.328	.000	23.104	1887	.000	.381	.017	.349	.414
	Equal variances not assumed			16.468	555.266	.000	.381	.023	.336	.427

2018 Freshman Cohort Retention Report ANOVA Tables

2018 Cohort * Race * Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: One-Year Retention

Games-Howell

(I) Race		Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound
White	African-American	.025	.027	.966	-.05	.10
	Asian	-.123	.043	.075	-.25	.01
	Hispanic	-.009	.052	1.000	-.17	.15
	Multiracial	.001	.046	1.000	-.14	.14
	Non-Resident Alien	.095	.134	.989	-.36	.55
	Other	-.098	.046	.338	-.24	.04
African-American	White	-.025	.027	.966	-.10	.05
	Asian	-.148*	.047	.034	-.29	-.01
	Hispanic	-.034	.056	.997	-.20	.13
	Multiracial	-.024	.050	.999	-.17	.13
	Non-Resident Alien	.070	.135	.998	-.39	.53
	Other	-.122	.049	.178	-.27	.03
Asian	White	.123	.043	.075	-.01	.25
	African-American	.148*	.047	.034	.01	.29
	Hispanic	.114	.065	.579	-.08	.31
	Multiracial	.124	.061	.390	-.06	.30
	Non-Resident Alien	.218	.139	.702	-.25	.69
	Other	.025	.060	1.000	-.15	.20
Hispanic	White	.009	.052	1.000	-.15	.17
	African-American	.034	.056	.997	-.13	.20
	Asian	-.114	.065	.579	-.31	.08
	Multiracial	.009	.067	1.000	-.19	.21
	Non-Resident Alien	.104	.142	.989	-.37	.58
	Other	-.089	.067	.836	-.29	.11
Multiracial	White	-.001	.046	1.000	-.14	.14
	African-American	.024	.050	.999	-.13	.17
	Asian	-.124	.061	.390	-.30	.06
	Hispanic	-.009	.067	1.000	-.21	.19
	Non-Resident Alien	.095	.140	.992	-.38	.56
	Other	-.098	.062	.698	-.28	.09
Non-Resident Alien	White	-.095	.134	.989	-.55	.36
	African-American	-.070	.135	.998	-.53	.39
	Asian	-.218	.139	.702	-.69	.25
	Hispanic	-.104	.142	.989	-.58	.37
	Multiracial	-.095	.140	.992	-.56	.38
	Other	-.193	.140	.805	-.66	.28
Other	White	.098	.046	.338	-.04	.24
	African-American	.122	.049	.178	-.03	.27
	Asian	-.025	.060	1.000	-.20	.15
	Hispanic	.089	.067	.836	-.11	.29
	Multiracial	.098	.062	.698	-.09	.28
	Non-Resident Alien	.193	.140	.805	-.28	.66

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

2018 Freshman Cohort Retention Report ANOVA Tables

2018 Cohort * Age * Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: One-Year Retention

Games-Howell

(I) Age		Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	Interval Bound	Interval Bound
17 years or younger	18 years old	.049	.047	.730	-.07	.17
	19 years old	.083	.060	.516	-.07	.24
	20 years or older	.328*	.103	.014	.05	.60
18 years old	17 years or younger	-.049	.047	.730	-.17	.07
	19 years old	.034	.040	.833	-.07	.14
	20 years or older	.279*	.093	.027	.03	.53
19 years old	17 years or younger	-.083	.060	.516	-.24	.07
	18 years old	-.034	.040	.833	-.14	.07
	20 years or older	.246	.100	.085	-.02	.51
20 years or older	17 years or younger	-.328*	.103	.014	-.60	-.05
	18 years old	-.279*	.093	.027	-.53	-.03
	19 years old	-.246	.100	.085	-.51	.02

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

2018 Freshman Cohort Retention Report ANOVA Tables

2018 Cohort * Region * Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: One-Year Retention

Games-Howell

(I) Region		Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	Interval Bound	Interval Bound
Mobile or Baldwin County	Rest of Alabama	-.007	.023	1.000	-.07	.06
	Mississippi Service Area	-.065	.035	.444	-.17	.04
	Florida Service Area	.031	.048	.986	-.11	.17
	Rest of United States	.062	.042	.688	-.06	.18
	International	.097	.134	.975	-.34	.54
Rest of Alabama	Mobile or Baldwin County	.007	.023	1.000	-.06	.07
	Mississippi Service Area	-.058	.036	.580	-.16	.04
	Florida Service Area	.038	.048	.967	-.10	.18
	Rest of United States	.069	.042	.586	-.05	.19
	International	.104	.134	.967	-.34	.55
Mississippi Service Area	Mobile or Baldwin County	.065	.035	.444	-.04	.17
	Rest of Alabama	.058	.036	.580	-.04	.16
	Florida Service Area	.096	.055	.499	-.06	.25
	Rest of United States	.127	.050	.122	-.02	.27
	International	.162	.137	.836	-.28	.61
Florida Service Area	Mobile or Baldwin County	-.031	.048	.986	-.17	.11
	Rest of Alabama	-.038	.048	.967	-.18	.10
	Mississippi Service Area	-.096	.055	.499	-.25	.06
	Rest of United States	.030	.060	.996	-.14	.20
	International	.066	.140	.997	-.39	.52
Rest of United States	Mobile or Baldwin County	-.062	.042	.688	-.18	.06
	Rest of Alabama	-.069	.042	.586	-.19	.05
	Mississippi Service Area	-.127	.050	.122	-.27	.02
	Florida Service Area	-.030	.060	.996	-.20	.14
	International	.035	.139	1.000	-.41	.48
International	Mobile or Baldwin County	-.097	.134	.975	-.54	.34
	Rest of Alabama	-.104	.134	.967	-.55	.34
	Mississippi Service Area	-.162	.137	.836	-.61	.28
	Florida Service Area	-.066	.140	.997	-.52	.39
	Rest of United States	-.035	.139	1.000	-.48	.41

2018 Cohort * High School GPA * Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: One-Year Retention

Games-Howell

(I) High School GPA		Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	Interval Bound	Interval Bound
3.0 or lower	3.01-3.5	-.136*	.045	.008	-.24	-.03
	3.51 or higher	-.364*	.041	.000	-.46	-.27
3.01-3.5	3.0 or lower	.136*	.045	.008	.03	.24
	3.51 or higher	-.228*	.024	.000	-.29	-.17
3.51 or higher	3.0 or lower	.364*	.041	.000	.27	.46
	3.01-3.5	.228*	.024	.000	.17	.29

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

2018 Freshman Cohort Retention Report ANOVA Tables

2018 Cohort * ACT Composite * Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: One-Year Retention

Games-Howell

(I) ACT		Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval Bound	95% Confidence Interval Bound
19 or lower	20-21	-.018	.040	.999	-.14	.10
	22-23	-.072	.038	.473	-.18	.04
	24-25	-.110*	.037	.046	-.22	.00
	26-27	-.105	.043	.174	-.23	.02
	28-29	-.179*	.041	.000	-.30	-.06
	30 or higher	-.198*	.037	.000	-.31	-.09
20-21	19 or lower	.018	.040	.999	-.10	.14
	22-23	-.054	.037	.757	-.16	.05
	24-25	-.092	.036	.133	-.20	.01
	26-27	-.087	.042	.359	-.21	.04
	28-29	-.160*	.040	.001	-.28	-.04
	30 or higher	-.180*	.036	.000	-.29	-.07
22-23	19 or lower	.072	.038	.473	-.04	.18
	20-21	.054	.037	.757	-.05	.16
	24-25	-.038	.034	.924	-.14	.06
	26-27	-.033	.040	.983	-.15	.09
	28-29	-.106	.038	.081	-.22	.01
	30 or higher	-.126*	.034	.005	-.23	-.03
24-25	19 or lower	.110*	.037	.046	.00	.22
	20-21	.092	.036	.133	-.01	.20
	22-23	.038	.034	.924	-.06	.14
	26-27	.005	.039	1.000	-.11	.12
	28-29	-.068	.037	.518	-.18	.04
	30 or higher	-.088	.033	.106	-.19	.01
26-27	19 or lower	.105	.043	.174	-.02	.23
	20-21	.087	.042	.359	-.04	.21
	22-23	.033	.040	.983	-.09	.15
	24-25	-.005	.039	1.000	-.12	.11
	28-29	-.073	.043	.614	-.20	.05
	30 or higher	-.093	.039	.221	-.21	.02
28-29	19 or lower	.179*	.041	.000	.06	.30
	20-21	.160*	.040	.001	.04	.28
	22-23	.106	.038	.081	-.01	.22
	24-25	.068	.037	.518	-.04	.18
	26-27	.073	.043	.614	-.05	.20
	30 or higher	-.020	.037	.998	-.13	.09
30 or higher	19 or lower	.198*	.037	.000	.09	.31
	20-21	.180*	.036	.000	.07	.29
	22-23	.126*	.034	.005	.03	.23
	24-25	.088	.033	.106	-.01	.19
	26-27	.093	.039	.221	-.02	.21
	28-29	.020	.037	.998	-.09	.13

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

2018 Freshman Cohort Retention Report ANOVA Tables

2018 Cohort * First Generation * Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: One-Year Retention

Games-Howell

(I) First Generation		Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	Interval Bound	Interval Bound
No	Yes	.049	.025	.127	-.01	.11
	Unknown	.024	.032	.737	-.05	.10
Yes	No	-.049	.025	.127	-.11	.01
	Unknown	-.025	.037	.770	-.11	.06
Unknown	No	-.024	.032	.737	-.10	.05
	Yes	.025	.037	.770	-.06	.11

2018 Cohort * USA Day * Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: One-Year Retention

Games-Howell

(I) Number USA Days Attended		Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	Interval Bound	Interval Bound
Did Not Attend	Attended 1 USA Day	-.057	.025	.054	-.11	.00
	Attended Multiple USA Days	-.270*	.011	.000	-.30	-.24
Attended 1 USA Day	Did Not Attend	.057	.025	.054	.00	.11
	Attended Multiple USA Days	-.213*	.022	.000	-.26	-.16
Attended Multiple USA Days	Did Not Attend	.270*	.011	.000	.24	.30
	Attended 1 USA Day	.213*	.022	.000	.16	.26

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

2018 Cohort * Orientation * Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: One-Year Retention

Games-Howell

(I) Orientation Logistic		Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	Interval Bound	Interval Bound
Freshman Session 10	August/Transfer/Unknown Orientation	-.023	.062	1.000	-.23	.18
	May Orientation	-.113	.092	.985	-.43	.20
	Freshman Session 1	-.248*	.052	.000	-.42	-.08
	Freshman Session 2	-.272*	.051	.000	-.44	-.10
	Freshman Session 3	-.240*	.053	.001	-.41	-.07
	Freshman Session 4	-.229*	.053	.001	-.40	-.05
	Freshman Session 5	-.310*	.050	.000	-.47	-.15
	Freshman Session 6	-.196*	.054	.018	-.38	-.02
	Freshman Session 7	-.138	.054	.327	-.32	.04
	Freshman Session 8	-.148	.054	.217	-.33	.03
	Freshman Session 9	-.063	.058	.995	-.25	.13

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

2018 Freshman Cohort Retention Report ANOVA Tables

2018 Cohort * College * Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: One-Year Retention

Games-Howell

(I) College Logistic		Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
AS	AH	-.069	.030	.251	-.16	.02
	BU	.043	.040	.930	-.07	.16
	CS	.035	.051	.993	-.12	.19
	ED	-.044	.036	.887	-.15	.06
	EG	-.002	.034	1.000	-.10	.10
	NU	-.079	.030	.115	-.17	.01
AH	AS	.069	.030	.251	-.02	.16
	BU	.112	.042	.115	-.01	.24
	CS	.104	.054	.454	-.06	.26
	ED	.025	.039	.995	-.09	.14
	EG	.068	.038	.551	-.04	.18
	NU	-.010	.033	1.000	-.11	.09
BU	AS	-.043	.040	.930	-.16	.07
	AH	-.112	.042	.115	-.24	.01
	CS	-.008	.059	1.000	-.19	.17
	ED	-.087	.047	.506	-.23	.05
	EG	-.045	.046	.957	-.18	.09
	NU	-.122	.042	.061	-.25	.00
CS	AS	-.035	.051	.993	-.19	.12
	AH	-.104	.054	.454	-.26	.06
	BU	.008	.059	1.000	-.17	.19
	ED	-.079	.057	.810	-.25	.09
	EG	-.037	.056	.995	-.20	.13
	NU	-.114	.053	.339	-.27	.05
ED	AS	.044	.036	.887	-.06	.15
	AH	-.025	.039	.995	-.14	.09
	BU	.087	.047	.506	-.05	.23
	CS	.079	.057	.810	-.09	.25
	EG	.042	.042	.954	-.08	.17
	NU	-.035	.039	.973	-.15	.08
EG	AS	.002	.034	1.000	-.10	.10
	AH	-.068	.038	.551	-.18	.04
	BU	.045	.046	.957	-.09	.18
	CS	.037	.056	.995	-.13	.20
	ED	-.042	.042	.954	-.17	.08
	NU	-.077	.037	.371	-.19	.03
NU	AS	.079	.030	.115	-.01	.17
	AH	.010	.033	1.000	-.09	.11
	BU	.122	.042	.061	.00	.25
	CS	.114	.053	.339	-.05	.27
	ED	.035	.039	.973	-.08	.15
	EG	.077	.037	.371	-.03	.19

2018 Freshman Cohort Retention Report ANOVA Tables

2018 Cohort * Number of At Risk Midterm Grades * Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: One-Year Retention

Games-Howell

(I) Number At Risk Midterm Grades in Fall 2018		Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
No At Risk MT Grades	1 At Risk MT Grade	.095*	.022	.000	.03	.16
	2 At Risk MT Grades	.275*	.035	.000	.18	.37
	3 At Risk MT Grades	.406*	.048	.000	.27	.54
	4 or More At Risk MT Grades	.613*	.043	.000	.49	.73
1 At Risk MT Grade	No At Risk MT Grades	-.095*	.022	.000	-.16	-.03
	2 At Risk MT Grades	.180*	.038	.000	.08	.28
	3 At Risk MT Grades	.310*	.050	.000	.17	.45
	4 or More At Risk MT Grades	.518*	.046	.000	.39	.65
2 At Risk MT Grades	No At Risk MT Grades	-.275*	.035	.000	-.37	-.18
	1 At Risk MT Grade	-.180*	.038	.000	-.28	-.08
	3 At Risk MT Grades	.130	.057	.148	-.03	.29
	4 or More At Risk MT Grades	.338*	.053	.000	.19	.48
3 At Risk MT Grades	No At Risk MT Grades	-.406*	.048	.000	-.54	-.27
	1 At Risk MT Grade	-.310*	.050	.000	-.45	-.17
	2 At Risk MT Grades	-.130	.057	.148	-.29	.03
	4 or More At Risk MT Grades	.208*	.062	.009	.04	.38
4 or More At Risk MT Grades	No At Risk MT Grades	-.613*	.043	.000	-.73	-.49
	1 At Risk MT Grade	-.518*	.046	.000	-.65	-.39
	2 At Risk MT Grades	-.338*	.053	.000	-.48	-.19
	3 At Risk MT Grades	-.208*	.062	.009	-.38	-.04

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

2018 Freshman Cohort Retention Report ANOVA Tables

2018 Cohort * USA Hours Earned After Summer 2019 * Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: One-Year Retention

Games-Howell

(I) USA Hours Earned After Summer 2019		Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval Bound	95% Confidence Interval Bound
0-6 hours	6.5-12 hours	-.046	.036	.805	-.15	.06
	12.5-18 hours	-.208*	.043	.000	-.33	-.09
	18.5-24 hours	-.549*	.046	.000	-.68	-.42
	24.5-30 hours	-.819*	.025	.000	-.89	-.75
	30.5 or more hours	-.897*	.022	.000	-.96	-.83
6.5-12 hours	0-6 hours	.046	.036	.805	-.06	.15
	12.5-18 hours	-.163*	.048	.010	-.30	-.03
	18.5-24 hours	-.503*	.051	.000	-.65	-.36
	24.5-30 hours	-.773*	.033	.000	-.87	-.68
	30.5 or more hours	-.851*	.031	.000	-.94	-.76
12.5-18 hours	0-6 hours	.208*	.043	.000	.09	.33
	6.5-12 hours	.163*	.048	.010	.03	.30
	18.5-24 hours	-.340*	.056	.000	-.50	-.18
	24.5-30 hours	-.610*	.040	.000	-.73	-.49
	30.5 or more hours	-.689*	.038	.000	-.80	-.58
18.5-24 hours	0-6 hours	.549*	.046	.000	.42	.68
	6.5-12 hours	.503*	.051	.000	.36	.65
	12.5-18 hours	.340*	.056	.000	.18	.50
	24.5-30 hours	-.270*	.044	.000	-.40	-.14
	30.5 or more hours	-.348*	.042	.000	-.47	-.23
24.5-30 hours	0-6 hours	.819*	.025	.000	.75	.89
	6.5-12 hours	.773*	.033	.000	.68	.87
	12.5-18 hours	.610*	.040	.000	.49	.73
	18.5-24 hours	.270*	.044	.000	.14	.40
	30.5 or more hours	-.078*	.017	.000	-.13	-.03
30.5 or more hours	0-6 hours	.897*	.022	.000	.83	.96
	6.5-12 hours	.851*	.031	.000	.76	.94
	12.5-18 hours	.689*	.038	.000	.58	.80
	18.5-24 hours	.348*	.042	.000	.23	.47
	24.5-30 hours	.078*	.017	.000	.03	.13

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

2018 Freshman Cohort Retention Report ANOVA Tables

2018 Cohort * USA GPA After Summer 2019 * Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: One-Year Retention

Games-Howell

(I) USA GPA After Summer 2019		Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	Interval	
					Bound	Bound
2.0 or lower	2.01-2.5	-.621*	.035	.000	-.72	-.52
	2.51-3.0	-.591*	.031	.000	-.68	-.50
	3.01-3.5	-.690*	.026	.000	-.76	-.62
	3.51-4.0	-.722*	.025	.000	-.79	-.65
2.01-2.5	2.0 or lower	.621*	.035	.000	.52	.72
	2.51-3.0	.030	.036	.914	-.07	.13
	3.01-3.5	-.068	.031	.185	-.15	.02
	3.51-4.0	-.101*	.030	.008	-.18	-.02
2.51-3.0	2.0 or lower	.591*	.031	.000	.50	.68
	2.01-2.5	-.030	.036	.914	-.13	.07
	3.01-3.5	-.099*	.027	.002	-.17	-.03
	3.51-4.0	-.131*	.025	.000	-.20	-.06
3.01-3.5	2.0 or lower	.690*	.026	.000	.62	.76
	2.01-2.5	.068	.031	.185	-.02	.15
	2.51-3.0	.099*	.027	.002	.03	.17
	3.51-4.0	-.032	.019	.423	-.08	.02
3.51-4.0	2.0 or lower	.722*	.025	.000	.65	.79
	2.01-2.5	.101*	.030	.008	.02	.18
	2.51-3.0	.131*	.025	.000	.06	.20
	3.01-3.5	.032	.019	.423	-.02	.08

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

2018 Freshman Cohort Retention Report Logistic Regression Tables

2018 Cohort * Input Model Classification Table[a]

Observed			Predicted		
			Retention		Percentage Correct
			No	Yes	
Step 1	One-Year Retention	No	70	368	16.0
		Yes	64	1265	95.2
	Overall Percentage				75.6

a. The cut value is .500

2018 Cohort * Input Model Final Variables in the Equation

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 1[a]	HS GPA 3.0 or lower			137.882	2	.000			
	HS GPA 3.01-3.5	.546	.198	7.632	1	.006	1.727	1.172	2.544
	HS GPA 3.51-4.0	1.734	.190	83.103	1	.000	5.664	3.901	8.224
	Constant	-.090	.173	.268	1	.604	.914		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: High School GPA.

2018 Cohort * Input and Environmental Model Classification Table[a]

Observed			Predicted		
			Retention		Percentage Correct
			No	Yes	
Step 1	One-Year Retention	No	65	373	14.8
		Yes	56	1273	95.8
	Overall Percentage				75.7
Step 2	One-Year Retention	No	92	346	21.0
		Yes	80	1249	94.0
	Overall Percentage				75.9

a. The cut value is .500

2018 Freshman Cohort Retention Report Logistic Regression Tables

2018 Cohort * Input and Environmental Model Final Variables in the Equation

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	EXP(B) Lower	EXP(B) Upper
Step 1[a]	HS GPA 3.0 or lower			135.484	2	.000			
	HS GPA 3.01-3.5	.553	.201	7.593	1	.006	1.738	1.173	2.575
	HS GPA 3.51-4.0	1.741	.193	81.449	1	.000	5.704	3.908	8.325
	Participated in Greek Life	1.251	.248	25.444	1	.000	3.495	2.149	5.684
	Constant	-.203	.177	1.324	1	.250	.816		
Step 2[b]	HS GPA 3.0 or lower			115.318	2	.000			
	HS GPA 3.01-3.5	.521	.206	6.407	1	.011	1.684	1.125	2.522
	HS GPA 3.51-4.0	1.646	.199	68.286	1	.000	5.188	3.511	7.666
	August/Other Orientation			39.118	11	.000			
	May Orientation	-.240	.449	.286	1	.593	.786	.326	1.897
	Freshman Session 1	.553	.305	3.290	1	.070	1.739	.956	3.160
	Freshman Session 2	.763	.313	5.926	1	.015	2.144	1.160	3.962
	Freshman Session 3	.571	.309	3.425	1	.064	1.771	.967	3.243
	Freshman Session 4	.476	.307	2.407	1	.121	1.609	.882	2.934
	Freshman Session 5	1.051	.332	10.038	1	.002	2.862	1.493	5.484
	Freshman Session 6	.267	.301	.787	1	.375	1.306	.724	2.353
	Freshman Session 7	.112	.287	.153	1	.696	1.119	.637	1.965
	Freshman Session 8	.229	.288	.629	1	.428	1.257	.714	2.212
	Freshman Session 9	-.122	.289	.179	1	.672	.885	.502	1.559
	Freshman Session 10	-.319	.297	1.152	1	.283	.727	.406	1.302
	Participated in Greek Life	1.124	.251	20.115	1	.000	3.078	1.883	5.031
	Constant	-.431	.272	2.510	1	.113	.650		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: Greek Life Participation.

b. Variable(s) entered on step 2: Orientation Session Attended.

2018 Cohort * Midway Through or After Fall 2018 Classification Table[a]

Observed			Predicted		
			Retention		Percentage Correct
			No	Yes	
Step 1	One-Year Retention	No	211	278	43.1
		Yes	70	1330	95.0
	Overall Percentage				81.6
Step 2	One-Year Retention	No	211	278	43.1
		Yes	70	1330	95.0
	Overall Percentage				81.6

a. The cut value is .500

2018 Freshman Cohort Retention Report Logistic Regression Tables

2018 Cohort * Midway Through or After Fall 2018 Variables in the Equation

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	EXP(B) Lower	EXP(B) Upper
Step 1[a]	Not on Probation After Fall 2018	2.669	.153	304.690	1	.000	14.421	10.687	19.459
	Constant	-1.103	.138	63.990	1	.000	.332		
Step 2[b]	4 or More At Risk MT Grades			40.607	4	.000			
	3 At Risk MT Grades	.578	.326	3.141	1	.076	1.783	.941	3.379
	2 At Risk MT Grades	.827	.294	7.912	1	.005	2.286	1.285	4.067
	1 At Risk MT Grade	1.163	.286	16.568	1	.000	3.200	1.828	5.604
	No At Risk MT Grades	1.564	.286	29.841	1	.000	4.780	2.727	8.379
	Not on Probation After Fall 2018	2.041	.179	130.619	1	.000	7.695	5.423	10.919
	Constant	-1.768	.257	47.221	1	.000	.171		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: Probation After Fall 2018.

b. Variable(s) entered on step 2: At-Risk Midterm Grades in Fall 2018.

2018 Cohort * USA Hours Earned After Summer 2019 Classification Table[a]

Observed			Predicted: Retention No	Predicted: Retention Yes	Percentage Correct
Step 1	One-Year Retention	No	291	177	62.2
		Yes	49	1350	96.5
	Overall Percentage				87.9

a. The cut value is .500

2018 Cohort * USA Hours Earned After Summer 2019 Variables in the Equation

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	EXP(B) Lower	EXP(B) Upper
Step 1[a]	USA Hours Earned 0-6			482.905	5	.000			
	USA Hours Earned 6.5-12	.726	.577	1.584	1	.208	2.066	.667	6.395
	USA Hours Earned 12.5-18	1.936	.498	15.097	1	.000	6.931	2.610	18.406
	USA Hours Earned 18.5-24	3.393	.489	48.112	1	.000	29.768	11.411	77.659
	USA Hours Earned 24.5-30	4.870	.475	105.074	1	.000	130.332	51.362	330.718
	USA Hours Earned 30.5 or more	5.834	.482	146.424	1	.000	341.681	132.814	879.019
	Constant	-3.006	.458	43.040	1	.000	.050		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: USA Hours Earned After Summer 2019.

2018 Cohort * USA GPA After Summer 2019 Classification Table[a]

Observed			Predicted: Retention No	Predicted: Retention Yes	Percentage Correct
Step 1	One-Year Retention	No	265	203	56.6
		Yes	65	1334	95.4
	Overall Percentage				85.6

a. The cut value is .500

2018 Freshman Cohort Retention Report Logistic Regression Tables

2018 Cohort * USA GPA After Summer 2019 Variables in the Equation

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	EXP(B) Lower	EXP(B) Upper
Step 1[a]	USA GPA 2.0 or lower			448.617	4	.000			
	USA GPA 2.01-2.5	2.909	.230	159.385	1	.000	18.346	11.678	28.821
	USA GPA 2.51-3.0	2.718	.193	198.041	1	.000	15.143	10.371	22.110
	USA GPA 3.01-3.5	3.461	.201	296.179	1	.000	31.846	21.472	47.232
	USA GPA 3.51-4.0	3.832	.210	334.499	1	.000	46.143	30.604	69.573
	Constant	-1.405	.138	103.088	1	.000	.245		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: USA GPA After Summer 2019.