UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH ALABAMA

2016 Freshman Cohort Retention Report

Executive Summary

This report summarizes the one-year retention of 1,955 students in the University of South Alabama (USA) 2016 first-time full-time baccalaureate degree-seeking freshman cohort. The one-year retention rate for the 2016 freshman cohort was 78%.

Results indicated retention of students who have a lower high school GPA or lower ACT Composite, are from the Florida service area, or are first generation students may require additional resources and monitoring to enable and/or encourage them to persist towards successfully completing a degree at USA. 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.

Freshmen who lived on campus were more likely to return so expanding the on campus housing capacity should receive further consideration. Similarly, 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.

The importance of financial support in the form of freshman scholarships or other types of scholarships was also clear, particularly since students with a higher unmet financial need were less likely to return to USA. 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 2016 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 2016 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 1,955 first-time full-time baccalaureate degree-seeking freshmen students in the University of South Alabama (USA) 2016 freshman cohort. Retention in the context of this report is defined as whether freshmen students returned and enrolled one year later in the Fall 2017 semester. Similar to reports written by Institutional Research

about the 2007 through 2016 freshman cohorts, the input-environment-outcome (IEO) model developed by Alexander W. Astin[1] was used as a conceptual framework to guide this analysis.

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 (78%). 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 2016 semester[4]. The fourth model and fifth model tested a different outcome variable known after the end of the Summer 2017 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 (78%) of the 1,955 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 78%. In addition, significant mean differences for the input, environmental, and the outcome variables known midway through or after the end of the Fall 2016 semester and after the end of the Summer 2017 semester are reported.

Input Variable Cross Tabular Results

For the input variables included in this analysis (see Table 1), female students (79%) returned at a higher rate than male students (76%). In terms of race/ethnicity, Non-Resident Alien (77%), African-American (76%), multiracial (75%), and Hispanic (71%) students returned at a lower rate than the cohort retention rate (78%).

[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.

[2] Input variables: Gender, race/ethnicity, age, region, high school GPA, ACT Composite score, first generation status, USA rank as institution of choice, and expectation to graduate from USA.

[3] Environmental variables: USA Day attendance, orientation session attended, college, USA freshman scholarship, other scholarship, Pell Grant, expected family contribution, unmet financial need, housing, learning community, Freshman Seminar, and Greek life participation.

[4] Outcome/other variables after Fall 2016: Number of at-risk midterm grades received and probation status (model 3).

[5] Outcome variables after Summer 2017: USA hours earned (model 4) and USA GPA (model 5).

Table 1: Comparison of Input Variables to 2016 Cohort Retention Rate

Variable	Retention Rate >= 78%	Count	Retention Rate < 78%	Count
Gender				
	Female (79%)	1,048	Male (76%)	907
Race/Ethnicity				
	Other (83%)	40	Non-Resident Alien (77%)	167
	Asian (82%)	33	African-American (76%)	381
	White (78%)	1,174	Multiracial (75%)	81
			Hispanic (71%)	79
**Age*				
	*18 years old (79%)	1,566	17 years old or younger (76%)	107
			19 years old (70%)	196
			20 years old or older (70%)	86
Region				
	Rest of Alabama (81%)	733	International (77%)	167
	Rest of United States (79%)	161	Mississippi service area (77%)	109
			Mobile or Baldwin County (75%)	700
			Florida service area (71%)	85
**High School GPA*				
	*3.51-4.0 (85%)	991	3.01-3.5 (74%)	647
			3.0 or lower (62%)	300
**ACT Composite Score*				
	*30 or higher (92%)	132	20-21 (70%)	294
	24-25 (84%)	319	19 or lower (70%)	291
	26-27 (81%)	213		
	28-29 (81%)	164		
	22-23 (78%)	296		
**First Generation*				
	No (79%)	1,570	*Yes (70%)	385
USA Rank as Institution of Choice				
	Fifth choice or lower (90%)	10	Second choice (76%)	157
	Fourth choice (88%)	8		
	Third choice (85%)	40		
	First choice (83%)	493		
Expectation to Graduate from USA				
	Yes (82%)	655	No (71%)	14
	Uncertain (78%)	45		

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.

Retention comparisons based on age showed that only students who were 18 years old (79%) returned at a higher rate than the cohort retention rate (78%). The mean difference between retention of 18-year-old students compared to students who were 19 years old was statistically significant (see Appendix: ANOVA Tables). Comparisons based on what region the student came from showed international students (77%), students from the Mississippi service area (77%), students from Mobile or Baldwin County (75%), and students from the Florida service area (71%) returned at a lower rate than the overall cohort (78%).

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 74%) returned at a lower rate than the overall cohort (78%). Similarly, students who had an ACT Composite score of 20-21

or lower (70%) returned at a lower rate than the cohort retention rate (78%). 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 26-27 and 22-23 or lower was also statistically significant (see Appendix: ANOVA Tables).

The retention rate of students who indicated they were a first generation student (70%) on the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) application was lower than the overall cohort (78%). The mean difference between students who indicated they were a first generation student compared to students who were not first generation students was statistically significant (see Appendix: Independent T-Test Tables).

Two questions from the Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement (BCSSE) were also included in the input variables summary found in Table 1. However, responses to these two BCSSE questions were not included in logistic regression models because only 691 (35%) of the students in the cohort responded to both of these BCSSE questions and the retention rate of respondents to both questions was 82%.

The first BCSSE question included in this report asked the respondent to rank what choice USA was compared to other institutions the student considered from a high of “first choice” to a low of “fifth choice or lower” institution to attend. Ironically, students who indicated USA was not their “first choice” or “second choice” institution to attend were more likely to return to USA.

The second BCSSE question included in this report asked the respondent to indicate whether he/she expected to graduate from USA. Only students who did “not” expect to graduate from USA (71%) had a retention rate lower than the overall cohort (78%).

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 83%) returned at a higher rate than the overall cohort (78%). In terms of the orientation session attended, the retention rate of students who attended one of the first three freshman summer orientation sessions was at least 84%. Retention rates based on the orientation session attended ranged from a high of 91% for students who attended the Freshman Session 1 to a low of 63% for students who attended the Freshman Session 10 orientation session. When using the Freshman Session 1 orientation session as a comparison group, there was a significant mean difference between the Freshman Session 1 group in comparison to Freshman Sessions 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, and 10 and the combined group that attended either the August Orientation session, a transfer orientation session, or an unknown orientation session (see Appendix: ANOVA Tables).

Table 2: Comparison of Environmental Variables to 2016 Cohort Retention Rate

Variable	Retention Rate >= 78%	Count	Retention Rate < 78%	Count
**USA Day Attendance*				
	Attended Multiple USA Days (88%)	25	*Did Not Attend (76%)	1,413
	Attended 1 USA Day (83%)	517		
**Orientation Session*				
	*Freshman Session 1 (91%)	185	Freshman Session 7 (77%)	185
	Freshman Session 2 (87%)	186	Freshman Session 5 (76%)	178
	Freshman Session 3 (84%)	184	May Orientation (75%)	51
	Freshman Session 6 (79%)	178	Freshman Session 9 (71%)	106
	International Orientation (79%)	105	Freshman Session 8 (70%)	151
	Freshman Session 4 (78%)	179	August/Other Orientation 67%)	163
			Freshman Session 10 (63%)	104
**College*				
	*Continuing Education (100%)	9	Arts & Sciences (76%)	582
	Allied Health (81%)	286	Computing (76%)	84
	Nursing (79%)	312	Education (71%)	141
	Engineering (78%)	366		
	Business (78%)	175		
**USA Freshman Scholarship*				
	*Yes (82%)	1,076	No (72%)	879
**Other Scholarship*				
	*Yes (83%)	1,080	No (71%)	875
Pell Grant				
	No (79%)	1,232	Yes (75%)	723
Expected Family Contribution				
	$15,001 to $25,000 (80%)	187	$0 (76%)	674
	$3,751 to $7,500 (80%)	163		
	$1 to $3,750 (79%)	312		
	$7,501 to $15,000 (79%)	215		
	$25,001 or higher (78%)	215		
**Unmet Financial Need*				
	*-$5,001 or lower (91%)	179	-$1 to -$5,000 (77%)	327
	$1 to $5,000 (83%)	224	$0 (77%)	303
	$5,001 to $10,000 (80%)	311	$10,001 to $15,000 (73%)	250
			$15,001 or higher (63%)	172
Test Fee Waiver				
	No (78%)	1,895	Yes (70%)	60
**Housing*				
	*On campus (81%)	1,132	Off campus (72%)	823
**Learning Community*				
	*Yes (79%)	1,419	No (74%)	536
Freshman Seminar				
	Yes (78%)	1,454	No (77%)	501
**Greek Life Participation*				
	*Yes (87%)	227	No (76%)	1,728

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.

Retention comparisons based on the college housing the major the student initially selected showed Continuing Education (100%), Allied Health (81%), Nursing (79%), Business (78%), and Engineering (78%) students returned at an equal or higher rate than the overall cohort (78%). When using Continuing Education as a comparison group, there was a significant mean difference between students who initially selected a major in Continuing Education in comparison to students in all other colleges (see Appendix: ANOVA Tables). However, it should be noted only nine students in the 2016 freshman cohort initially enrolled in a major in Continuing Education. In addition, in Spring 2017 Continuing Education was closed and the majors and all students enrolled in one of the Continuing Education majors were transferred over to Education instead.

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] (83%) returned at a higher rate than the cohort retention rate (78%). 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 (75%), who had an expected family contribution of $0 (76%), or who received a NACAC fee waiver for ACT or SAT test-taking purposes due to meeting one of the indicators of economic need (70%) returned at a lower rate than the overall cohort (78%). On the other hand, students who had an unmet financial need of -$5,001 or lower (91%) returned at a much higher rate than the cohort retention rate (78%). The mean difference between retention of students with an unmet financial need of -$5,001 or lower in comparison to students in all other higher unmet financial need comparison groups except for the $1 to $5,000 of financial unmet need group was statistically significant (see Appendix: ANOVA Tables).

Students who lived on campus (81%) or participated in a learning community (79%) returned at a higher rate than the overall cohort (78%). The mean difference between retention of students who lived on campus compared to students who did not live on campus was statistically significant (see Appendix: Independent T-Test Tables). Similarly, the mean difference between retention of students who participated in a learning community and students who did not participate in a learning community was statistically significant as well (see Appendix: Independent T-Test Tables).

Students who took Freshman Seminar (78%) returned at a similar rate compared to students who did not take Freshman Seminar (77%). However, students who participated in Greek life (87%) returned at a higher rate than the overall cohort (78%). 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 2016 Cross Tabular Results

Outcome variables incorporated into this analysis that were known midway through or after Fall 2016 included the number of at-risk midterm grades (D, F, or U) a student had in Fall 2016 and whether the student was placed on probation after Fall 2016 (see Table 3). Students who did not have an at-risk midterm grade or had only one at-risk midterm grade returned at a higher rate (at least 79%) than the overall cohort (78%). The mean difference for students who did not have an at-risk midterm grade in Fall 2016 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 2016 to 2016 Cohort Retention Rate

Variable	Retention Rate >= 78%	Count	Retention Rate < 78%	Count
**Number of At-Risk Midterm Grades in Fall 2016*				
	*No At-Risk MT Grades (88%)	911	2 At-Risk MT Grades (68%)	298
	1 At-Risk MT Grade (79%)	498	3 At-Risk MT Grades (53%)	135
			4 or More At-Risk MT Grades (40%)	113
**Probation Status after Fall 2016*				
	No (85%)	1,637	*Yes (39%)	318
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 2016 returned at a much higher rate (85%) compared to students who were placed on probation after the Fall 2016 semester ended (39%). The mean difference between students who were not on probation and students who were placed on probation was statistically significant (see Appendix: Independent T-Test Tables).

Outcome Variable After Summer 2017 Cross Tabular Results

Outcome variables incorporated into this analysis that were known after Summer 2017 included the number of hours earned after Summer 2017 at USA and the USA GPA after Summer 2017 (see Table 4). Except for at the lowest two USA hours earned groups (0 to 6 and 6.5 to 12 hours earned), as the number of USA hours earned increased the retention rate also increased. Similarly, 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 2017 to 2016 Cohort Retention Rate

Variable	Retention Rate >= 78%	Count	Retention Rate < 78%	Count
**USA Hours Earned after Summer 2017*				
	*30.5 or more (95%)	815	18.5-24 (69%)	179
	24.5-30 (89%)	592	12.5-18 (40%)	137
			0-6 (18%)	119
			6.5-12 (15%)	94
**USA GPA after Summer 2017*				
	3.51-4.0 (94%)	490	*2.0 or lower (34%)	356
	3.01-3.5 (90%)	458		
	2.51-3.0 (84%)	371		
	2.01-2.5 (83%)	261		
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 2017 returned at a higher rate (at least 89%) compared to students who earned 18.5 to 24 or fewer hours (at most 69%). 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 2017 returned at a much higher rate (at least 83%) compared to students with a USA GPA of 2.0 or lower (34%). 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 2016 semester: 1) the number of at-risk midterm grades a student had in Fall 2016 and 2) whether the student was placed on probation after Fall 2016 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 2017 semester. The fourth model tested the number of USA hours earned after Summer 2017 and the fifth model tested the USA GPA after Summer 2017 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 1,673 students for the second model to a high of 1,955 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 1,655. The retention rate for this subset of 1,655 students was 79%. With a similar retention rate (79% compared to 78%) and 1,655 students representing 85% 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 four steps (see Appendix: Logistic Regression Tables). The final step (step 4) of the first model showed the model correctly classified students in this cohort who *returned* 99.6% of the time and students who did not return 3.5% of the time for an overall classification rate of 78.7%.

For each variable included in the first model, a comparison group was selected (gender=male, race/ethnicity=White, age=20 years old or older, region=Florida service area, high school GPA=3.0 or lower, first generation status=Yes, and ACT Composite score=19 or lower). Values greater than "1" (Exp *B*) indicated the odds of the outcome (student *returning*) was higher compared to the selected comparison group. Values less than "1" indicated the odds of the outcome (student *returning*) was lower compared to the selected comparison group.

In the first model (see Appendix: Logistic Regression Tables), high school GPA, first generation status, ACT Composite score, and region were significant in the final step (step 4) of the model. The final step of the 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=1.688 and 3.51-4.0=3.264) 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 since the confidence intervals for the two higher high school GPA comparison groups did not encompass an odds value less than one.

The final step (step 4) of the first model showed the odds (Exp *B*) of a student *returning* was greater for a student who was not a first generation student (1.588) than for a first generation student. The confidence intervals (95%) also indicated the odds of a student *returning* was greater for a student who was not a first generation student than for a first generation student since the confidence intervals did not encompass an odds value less than one.

A review of the final step (step 4) of the first model showed the odds (Exp *B*) of a student *returning* was greater for a student with an ACT Composite score of 22-23 or higher (22-23=1.270, 24-25=1.634, 26-27=1.255, 28-29=1.119, and 30 or higher=2.981) than for a student with an ACT Composite score of 19 or lower. In addition, the confidence intervals (95%) indicated the odds of a student *returning* was greater for a student with an ACT Composite score of 24-25 or 30 or higher than for a student with an ACT Composite score of 19 or lower since the confidence intervals did not encompass an odds value less than one.

In addition, the final step (step 4) results of the first model for the region the student came from showed the odds (Exp *B*) of a student *returning* was greater for students from Mobile or Baldwin County (1.280), the rest of Alabama (1.930), the Mississippi service area (1.260), and the rest of the United States (1.654) than for students from the Florida service area. In addition, the confidence intervals (95%) indicated the odds of a student *returning* was greater for a student who was from the rest of Alabama (CI=1.120-3.326) than for a student who was from the Florida service area since the confidence intervals did not encompass an odds value less than one.

Model 2: Logistic Regression with Input and Environmental Variables

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, which college housed the major the student selected at initial enrollment in Fall 2016=Arts & 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, expected family contribution=$0, unmet financial need=$15,001 or higher, 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).

The second model consisted of four steps (see Appendix: Logistic Regression Tables). In comparison to the first model, the correct classification rate for the second model slightly decreased to 97.4% for *returning* students while the classification rate for the second model increased to 13.8% for students who did not return. The overall correct classification rate for the second model was 79.3%.

Once again, high school GPA, first generation status, ACT Composite score, and region were significant in the final step (step 4) of the second model (see Appendix: Logistic Regression Tables). In addition, housing, participation in Greek life, unmet financial need, and the orientation session attended were significant in the final step (step 4) of the second model.

The final step (step 4) 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=1.580, and 3.51-4.0=2.954) 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 since the confidence intervals for the two higher high school GPA comparison groups did not encompass an odds value less than one.

When looking at the first generation status of the student, the final step (step 4) of the second model showed the odds (Exp *B*) of a student *returning* was greater for a student who was not a first generation student (1.488) than for a first generation student. Additionally, the confidence intervals (95%) indicated the odds of a student *returning* was greater for a student who was not a first generation than a first generation student since the confidence intervals did not encompass an odds value less than one.

Except for students with an ACT Composite score of 28-29, the final step (step 4) of the second model showed the odds (Exp *B*) of a student *returning* was greater for a student with an ACT Composite score of 22-23 or higher (22-23=1.408, 24-25=1.680, 26-27=1.216, and 30 or higher=1.708) than for a student with an ACT Composite score of 19 or lower. In addition, the confidence intervals (95%) indicated the odds of a student *returning* was greater for a student with an ACT Composite score of 24-25 (CI=1.078-2.619) than a student with an ACT Composite score of 19 or lower since the confidence intervals did not encompass an odds value less than one.

A review of the results of the final step (step 4) of the second model for the region the student came from showed the odds (Exp *B*) of a student *returning* was greater for students from Mobile or Baldwin County (2.074), the rest of Alabama (1.896), the Mississippi service area (1.270), and the rest of the United States (1.511) than for students from the Florida service area. In addition, the confidence intervals (95%) indicated the odds of a student *returning* was greater for a student from Mobile or Baldwin County (CI=1.133-3.796) or from the rest of Alabama (CI=1.065-3.375) than for a student from the Florida service area since the confidence intervals did not encompass an odds value less than one.

The final step (step 4) of the second model showed the odds (Exp *B*) of a student *returning* was greater for a student that lived on-campus (1.730) than for a student that lived off-campus. The confidence intervals (95%) also indicated the odds of a student *returning* was greater for a student that lived on-campus than for a student that lived off-campus since the confidence intervals did not encompass an odds value less than one.

When looking at participation in Greek life, the final step (step 4) of the second model showed the odds (Exp *B*) of a student *returning* was greater for a student that participated in Greek life (2.037) 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 for a student that did not participate since the confidence intervals did not encompass an odds value less than one.

Unmet financial need results showed in the final step (step 4) of the second model that the odds (Exp *B*) of a student *returning* was greater for a student in all six lower unmet financial need groups ($10,001 to $15,000=1.350, $5,001 to $10,000=2.035, $1 to $5,000=2.008, $0=1.750, -$1 to -$5,000=1.116, and -$5,001 or lower=2.939) than for a student who had an unmet financial need of $15,001 or higher. In addition, the confidence intervals (95%) indicated the odds of a student *returning* was greater for a student who had an unmet financial need in all of the lower unmet financial need groups except $10,001 to $15,000 and -$1 to -$5,000 than for a student who had an unmet financial need of $15,001 or higher since the confidence intervals did not encompass an odds value less than one.

Finally, except for the Freshman Session 10 orientation, the final step (step 4) of the second model showed the odds (Exp *B*) of a student *returning* was greater for a student who attended any of the other orientation sessions (May Orientation=1.233, Freshman Session 1=3.071, Freshman Session 2=1.849, Freshman Session 3=1.753, Freshman Session 4=1.203, Freshman Session 5=1.214, Freshman Session 6=1.409, Freshman Session 7=1.310, Freshman Session 8=1.016, Freshman Session 9=1.102) 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 1 orientation than for a student who attended either the August Orientation session, a transfer orientation session, or an unknown orientation session since the confidence intervals did not encompass an odds value less than one.

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 2016 semester had already begun. The third model included outcome variables known midway through or after the Fall 2016 semester ended (number of at-risk midterm grades in Fall 2016 and probation status after Fall 2016). The fourth model (number of hours earned after Summer 2017) and fifth model (USA GPA the student attained after Summer 2017) included a different outcome variable known after the Summer 2017 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 2016 semester (third model) or Summer 2017 semester (fourth and fifth models) ended.

Model 3: Logistic Regression with Variables Midway Through or After Fall 2016
The third model included variables known midway through or after Fall 2016. For each variable included in the third model a comparison group was selected (number of at-risk midterm grades in Fall 2016=four or more at-risk midterm grades and whether the student was placed on probation after Fall 2016=yes).

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 slightly decreased to 92.2% for *returning* students. However, in comparison to the first and second model, the classification rate for the third model substantially increased to 43.6% for students who did not return since this snapshot included data known after the end of the Fall 2016 semester instead of pre-Fall 2016 semester data. The overall correct classification rate for the third model was 81.3%.

In the final step (step 2) of the third model, probation status after Fall 2016 and the number of at-risk midterm grades in Fall 2016 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 2016 (5.915) than for a student who was placed on probation after Fall 2016. 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 2016 than a student who was placed on probation after Fall 2016 since the confidence intervals did not encompass an odds value less than one.

When looking at the number of at-risk (D, F, or U) midterm grades in Fall 2016, 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 2016 (three at-risk midterm grades=1.103, two at-risk midterm grades=1.093, one at-risk midterm grade=1.496, no at-risk midterm grades=2.375) than for a student who had four or more at-risk midterm grades in Fall 2016. The confidence intervals (95%) also indicated the odds of a student *returning* was greater for a student who had no at-risk midterm grade in Fall 2016 than a student who had four or more at-risk midterm grades in Fall 2016 since the confidence intervals did not encompass an odds value less than one.

Model 4: Logistic Regression with USA Hours Earned After Summer 2017 Variable
The fourth model included the USA hours earned after the end of the Summer 2017 semester. The comparison group selected for the fourth model was zero to six hours earned after the end of the Summer 2017 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 (94.1%) was slightly lower than the first and second models. However, in comparison to the other three models, the correct classification rate was much higher for students who did not return (61.9%) since this snapshot included data known after the end of the Summer 2017 semester. The overall correct classification rate for the fourth model was 87.1%.

The fourth model showed the odds (Exp *B*) of a student *returning* was greater for a student with 12.5-18 or more hours earned (12.5-18=3.130, 18.5-24=10.521, 24.5-30=37.836, 30.5 or more=90.417) than for a student with six or fewer hours earned at the end of Summer 2017 (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 since the confidence intervals for the four higher USA hours earned comparison groups did not encompass an odds value less than one.

Model 5: Logistic Regression with USA GPA After Summer 2017 Variable
The fifth model included the USA GPA after the end of the Summer 2017 semester. The comparison group selected for the fifth model was an USA GPA of 2.0 or lower after the end of the Summer 2017 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 (92.1%) was similar to the third model and slightly lower than the other three models. The correct classification rate for the fifth model for students who did not return (56.2%) was higher than the first, second, and third models since this snapshot included data known after the end of the Summer 2017 semester instead of pre-Fall 2016 semester data, but was lower than the fourth model. The overall correct classification rate for the fifth model was 84.3%.

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=9.440, 2.51-3.0=9.995, 3.01-3.5=17.198, 3.51-4.0=29.119) than for a student with an USA GPA of 2.0 or lower at the end of Summer 2017 (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 since the confidence intervals for the four higher USA GPA comparison groups did not encompass an odds value less than one.

Peer Comparisons
Finally, to gain a better idea about how USA one-year retention rates compared to one-year retention at 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 13 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 was low compared to the other peer institutions over this same time period. The USA retention rate over this time period ranged from a low of 65% for the 2010 freshman cohort to a high of 73% for the 2014 freshman cohort. The retention rate of peer institutions over this same period ranged from a low of 62% for the University of New Orleans 2014 freshman cohort to a high of 88% for the Florida International University 2014 freshman cohort.

Table 5: One-Year Retention Rate Peer Comparisons * Ranked by 2014 Cohort Retention Rate * High to Low

Institution Name	2014 Cohort Retention	2013 Cohort Retention	2012 Cohort Retention	2011 Cohort Retention	2010 Cohort Retention
Florida International University	88	84	84	82	82
Old Dominion University	82	81	80	80	80
University of North Florida	80	83	82	83	81
University of North Texas	79	78	75	76	78
Florida Atlantic University	78	75	77	78	79
Texas State University	78	76	77	76	79
University of Massachusetts-Boston	78	80	77	79	75
University of Memphis	77	78	76	76	77
University of Nebraska at Omaha	77	77	75	72	73
Indiana University-Purdue University-Indianapolis	74	71	72	72	72
University of Montana	73	73	73	74	72
University of South Alabama	**73**	**71**	**68**	**66**	**65**
University of Texas at Arlington	71	69	71	72	71
University of New Orleans	62	69	67	65	67

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 from the Florida service area or first generation students 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 2016 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.

This annual retention study compared retention of freshmen who lived on campus to freshmen who lived off campus. Freshmen who lived on campus were significantly more likely to return to USA the following year. Therefore, expanding the on campus housing capacity for freshmen to live in should receive further consideration.

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, particularly since students with a higher unmet financial need were less likely to return to USA. 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 2016 semester for lack of attendance and/or poor academic performance and students who were placed on probation after the Fall 2016 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 2016 freshman cohort that will be completed by the Office of Institutional Research during the Fall 2017 semester. The second retention study will use National Student Clearinghouse data to explore the issue of "Where did non-returning freshmen in the 2016 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

2016 Freshman Cohort Retention Report Independent T-Test Tables

2016 Cohort * Gender * Group Statistics

Gender T-Test		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
One-Year Retention	Male	907	.76	.428	.014
	Female	1048	.79	.407	.013

2016 Cohort * Gender * Independent Samples Test

		Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Lower	95% Confidence Upper
One-Year Retention	Equal variances assumed	11.742	.001	-1.718	1953	.086	-.032	.019	-.070	.005
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.712	1880.973	.087	-.032	.019	-.070	.005

2016 Cohort * First Generation * Group Statistics

First Generation		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
One-Year Retention	No	1570	.79	.405	.010
	Yes	385	.70	.457	.023

2016 Cohort * First Generation * Independent Samples Test

		Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Lower	95% Confidence Upper
One-Year Retention	Equal variances assumed	47.187	.000	3.796	1953	.000	.090	.024	.043	.136
	Equal variances not assumed			3.527	541.005	.000	.090	.025	.040	.140

2016 Cohort * USA Freshman Scholarship * Group Statistics

Freshman Scholarship		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
One-Year Retention	No	879	.72	.451	.015
	Yes	1076	.82	.381	.012

2016 Cohort * USA Freshman Scholarship * Independent Samples Test

		Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Lower	95% Confidence Upper
One-Year Retention	Equal variances assumed	129.337	.000	-5.722	1953	.000	-.108	.019	-.145	-.071
	Equal variances not assumed			-5.626	1721.649	.000	-.108	.019	-.145	-.070

2016 Freshman Cohort Retention Report Independent T-Test Tables

2016 Cohort * Other Scholarship * Group Statistics

Other Scholarship		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
One-Year Retention	No	875	.71	.453	.015
	Yes	1080	.83	.378	.011

2016 Cohort * Other Scholarship * Independent Samples Test

		Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Lower	95% Confidence Upper
One-Year Retention	Equal variances assumed	149.840	.000	-6.161	1953	.000	-.116	.019	-.153	-.079
	Equal variances not assumed			-6.046	1699.089	.000	-.116	.019	-.153	-.078

2016 Cohort * Pell Grant * Group Statistics

Pell Grant		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
One-Year Retention	No	1232	.79	.408	.012
	Yes	723	.75	.432	.016

2016 Cohort * Pell Grant * Independent Samples Test

		Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Lower	95% Confidence Upper
One-Year Retention	Equal variances assumed	14.169	.000	1.913	1953	.056	.037	.020	-.001	.076
	Equal variances not assumed			1.884	1442.891	.060	.037	.020	-.002	.076

2016 Cohort * Received Test Fee Waiver * Group Statistics

Received Test Fee Waiver		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
One-Year Retention	No	1895	.78	.415	.010
	Yes	60	.70	.462	.060

2016 Cohort * Received Test Fee Waiver * Independent Samples Test

		Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Lower	95% Confidence Upper
One-Year Retention	Equal variances assumed	6.178	.013	1.433	1953	.152	.078	.055	-.029	.186
	Equal variances not assumed			1.297	62.057	.199	.078	.060	-.042	.199

2016 Freshman Cohort Retention Report Independent T-Test Tables

2016 Cohort * Housing * Group Statistics

Housing		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
One-Year Retention	Off Campus	823	.72	.448	.016
	On Campus	1132	.81	.389	.012

2016 Cohort * Housing * Independent Samples Test

		Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Lower	95% Confidence Upper
One-Year Retention	Equal variances assumed	89.676	.000	-4.818	1953	.000	-.092	.019	-.129	-.054
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.712	1617.172	.000	-.092	.019	-.130	-.053

2016 Cohort * Learning Community * Group Statistics

Learning Community		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
One-Year Retention	No	536	.74	.441	.019
	Yes	1419	.79	.407	.011

2016 Cohort * Learning Community * Independent Samples Test

		Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Lower	95% Confidence Upper
One-Year Retention	Equal variances assumed	23.806	.000	-2.546	1953	.011	-.054	.021	-.095	-.012
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.456	899.913	.014	-.054	.022	-.097	-.011

2016 Cohort * Freshman Seminar * Group Statistics

Took Freshman Seminar		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
One-Year Retention	No	501	.77	.422	.019
	Yes	1454	.78	.415	.011

2016 Cohort * Freshman Seminar * Independent Samples Test

		Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Lower	95% Confidence Upper
One-Year Retention	Equal variances assumed	.855	.355	-.466	1953	.641	-.010	.022	-.052	.032
	Equal variances not assumed			-.463	856.285	.644	-.010	.022	-.053	.033

2016 Freshman Cohort Retention Report Independent T-Test Tables

2016 Cohort * Greek Life Participation * Group Statistics

Greek Life Participation		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
One-Year Retention	No	1728	.76	.425	.010
	Yes	227	.87	.335	.022

2016 Cohort * Greek Life Participation * 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
One-Year Retention	Equal variances assumed	74.686	.000	-3.712	1953	.000	-.109	.029	-.166	-.051
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.456	330.130	.000	-.109	.024	-.157	-.061

2016 Cohort * Probation After Fall 2016 * Group Statistics

Probation After Fall 2016		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
One-Year Retention	No	1637	.85	.356	.009
	Yes	318	.39	.488	.027

2016 Cohort * Probation After Fall 2016 * 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
One-Year Retention	Equal variances assumed	240.438	.000	19.946	1953	.000	.465	.023	.419	.510
	Equal variances not assumed			16.176	385.056	.000	.465	.029	.408	.521

2016 Freshman Cohort Retention Report ANOVA Tables

2016 Cohort * Race * Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable:

Games-Howell

(I) Race		Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval Bound	95% Confidence Interval Bound
White	African-American	.021	.025	.981	-.05	.09
	Asian	-.034	.069	.999	-.25	.18
	Hispanic	.076	.053	.783	-.08	.24
	Multiracial	.031	.050	.996	-.12	.18
	Non-Resident Alien	.018	.035	.999	-.09	.12
	Other	-.041	.062	.994	-.23	.15
African-American	White	-.021	.025	.981	-.09	.05
	Asian	-.054	.072	.987	-.28	.17
	Hispanic	.055	.056	.957	-.11	.22
	Multiracial	.011	.053	1.000	-.15	.17
	Non-Resident Alien	-.003	.039	1.000	-.12	.11
	Other	-.061	.065	.963	-.26	.14
Asian	White	.034	.069	.999	-.18	.25
	African-American	.054	.072	.987	-.17	.28
	Hispanic	.109	.085	.859	-.15	.37
	Multiracial	.065	.084	.986	-.19	.32
	Non-Resident Alien	.052	.076	.993	-.18	.28
	Other	-.007	.091	1.000	-.28	.27
Hispanic	White	-.076	.053	.783	-.24	.08
	African-American	-.055	.056	.957	-.22	.11
	Asian	-.109	.085	.859	-.37	.15
	Multiracial	-.044	.070	.996	-.25	.17
	Non-Resident Alien	-.058	.061	.965	-.24	.12
	Other	-.116	.080	.769	-.36	.12
Multiracial	White	-.031	.050	.996	-.18	.12
	African-American	-.011	.053	1.000	-.17	.15
	Asian	-.065	.084	.986	-.32	.19
	Hispanic	.044	.070	.996	-.17	.25
	Non-Resident Alien	-.013	.058	1.000	-.19	.16
	Other	-.072	.078	.967	-.31	.16
Non-Resident Alien	White	-.018	.035	.999	-.12	.09
	African-American	.003	.039	1.000	-.11	.12
	Asian	-.052	.076	.993	-.28	.18
	Hispanic	.058	.061	.965	-.12	.24
	Multiracial	.013	.058	1.000	-.16	.19
	Other	-.059	.069	.979	-.27	.15
Other	White	.041	.062	.994	-.15	.23
	African-American	.061	.065	.963	-.14	.26
	Asian	.007	.091	1.000	-.27	.28
	Hispanic	.116	.080	.769	-.12	.36
	Multiracial	.072	.078	.967	-.16	.31
	Non-Resident Alien	.059	.069	.979	-.15	.27

2016 Freshman Cohort Retention Report ANOVA Tables

2016 Cohort * Age * Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable:

Games-Howell

(I) Age		Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	Interval Bound	Interval Bound
17 years or younger	18 years old	-.034	.043	.856	-.15	.08
	19 years old	.058	.053	.694	-.08	.20
	20 years or older	.059	.065	.798	-.11	.23
18 years old	17 years or younger	.034	.043	.856	-.08	.15
	19 years old	.092*	.034	.039	.00	.18
	20 years or older	.094	.051	.262	-.04	.23
19 years old	17 years or younger	-.058	.053	.694	-.20	.08
	18 years old	-.092*	.034	.039	-.18	.00
	20 years or older	.001	.060	1.000	-.15	.16
20 years or older	17 years or younger	-.059	.065	.798	-.23	.11
	18 years old	-.094	.051	.262	-.23	.04
	19 years old	-.001	.060	1.000	-.16	.15

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

2016 Freshman Cohort Retention Report ANOVA Tables

2016 Cohort * Region * Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable:

Games-Howell

(I) Region		Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	Interval Bound	Interval Bound
Mobile or Baldwin County	Rest of Alabama	-.053	.022	.144	-.12	.01
	Mississippi Service Area	-.018	.044	.999	-.14	.11
	Florida Service Area	.047	.052	.946	-.10	.20
	Rest of United States	-.036	.036	.919	-.14	.07
	International	-.014	.037	.999	-.12	.09
Rest of Alabama	Mobile or Baldwin County	.053	.022	.144	-.01	.12
	Mississippi Service Area	.036	.043	.962	-.09	.16
	Florida Service Area	.100	.052	.386	-.05	.25
	Rest of United States	.017	.035	.996	-.08	.12
	International	.040	.036	.878	-.06	.14
Mississippi Service Area	Mobile or Baldwin County	.018	.044	.999	-.11	.14
	Rest of Alabama	-.036	.043	.962	-.16	.09
	Florida Service Area	.065	.064	.914	-.12	.25
	Rest of United States	-.018	.052	.999	-.17	.13
	International	.004	.052	1.000	-.15	.15
Florida Service Area	Mobile or Baldwin County	-.047	.052	.946	-.20	.10
	Rest of Alabama	-.100	.052	.386	-.25	.05
	Mississippi Service Area	-.065	.064	.914	-.25	.12
	Rest of United States	-.083	.059	.727	-.25	.09
	International	-.061	.060	.912	-.23	.11
Rest of United States	Mobile or Baldwin County	.036	.036	.919	-.07	.14
	Rest of Alabama	-.017	.035	.996	-.12	.08
	Mississippi Service Area	.018	.052	.999	-.13	.17
	Florida Service Area	.083	.059	.727	-.09	.25
	International	.022	.046	.997	-.11	.15
International	Mobile or Baldwin County	.014	.037	.999	-.09	.12
	Rest of Alabama	-.040	.036	.878	-.14	.06
	Mississippi Service Area	-.004	.052	1.000	-.15	.15
	Florida Service Area	.061	.060	.912	-.11	.23
	Rest of United States	-.022	.046	.997	-.15	.11

2016 Cohort * High School GPA * Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable:

Games-Howell

(I) HS GPA Logistic		Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	Interval Bound	Interval Bound
3.0 or lower	3.01-3.5	-.112*	.033	.002	-.19	-.03
	3.51 or higher	-.226*	.030	.000	-.30	-.16
3.01-3.5	3.0 or lower	.112*	.033	.002	.03	.19
	3.51 or higher	-.114*	.021	.000	-.16	-.07
3.51 or higher	3.0 or lower	.226*	.030	.000	.16	.30
	3.01-3.5	.114*	.021	.000	.07	.16

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

2016 Freshman Cohort Retention Report ANOVA Tables

2016 Cohort * ACT Composite * Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable:

Games-Howell

(I) ACT		Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
19 or lower	20-21	.004	.038	1.000	-.11	.12
	22-23	-.076	.036	.350	-.18	.03
	24-25	-.136*	.034	.001	-.24	-.04
	26-27	-.108	.038	.069	-.22	.00
	28-29	-.107	.041	.124	-.23	.01
	30 or higher	-.220*	.035	.000	-.32	-.11
20-21	19 or lower	-.004	.038	1.000	-.12	.11
	22-23	-.080	.036	.289	-.19	.03
	24-25	-.139*	.034	.001	-.24	-.04
	26-27	-.112	.038	.052	-.22	.00
	28-29	-.110	.041	.098	-.23	.01
	30 or higher	-.224*	.035	.000	-.33	-.12
22-23	19 or lower	.076	.036	.350	-.03	.18
	20-21	.080	.036	.289	-.03	.19
	24-25	-.060	.032	.491	-.15	.03
	26-27	-.032	.036	.975	-.14	.07
	28-29	-.031	.039	.986	-.15	.09
	30 or higher	-.144*	.033	.000	-.24	-.04
24-25	19 or lower	.136*	.034	.001	.04	.24
	20-21	.139*	.034	.001	.04	.24
	22-23	.060	.032	.491	-.03	.15
	26-27	.028	.034	.982	-.07	.13
	28-29	.029	.037	.986	-.08	.14
	30 or higher	-.084	.031	.097	-.18	.01
26-27	19 or lower	.108	.038	.069	.00	.22
	20-21	.112	.038	.052	.00	.22
	22-23	.032	.036	.975	-.07	.14
	24-25	-.028	.034	.982	-.13	.07
	28-29	.001	.041	1.000	-.12	.12
	30 or higher	-.112*	.035	.028	-.22	-.01
28-29	19 or lower	.107	.041	.124	-.01	.23
	20-21	.110	.041	.098	-.01	.23
	22-23	.031	.039	.986	-.09	.15
	24-25	-.029	.037	.986	-.14	.08
	26-27	-.001	.041	1.000	-.12	.12
	30 or higher	-.113	.038	.053	-.23	.00
30 or higher	19 or lower	.220*	.035	.000	.11	.32
	20-21	.224*	.035	.000	.12	.33
	22-23	.144*	.033	.000	.04	.24
	24-25	.084	.031	.097	-.01	.18
	26-27	.112*	.035	.028	.01	.22
	28-29	.113	.038	.053	.00	.23

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

2016 Freshman Cohort Retention Report ANOVA Tables

2016 Cohort * Institution of Choice * Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable:

Games-Howell

(I) USA as Institution of Choice		Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	Interval Bound	Interval Bound
1st choice	2nd choice	.067	.038	.391	-.04	.17
	3rd choice	-.018	.060	.998	-.19	.15
	4th choice	-.043	.126	.996	-.49	.40
	5th choice or lower	-.068	.101	.958	-.41	.27
2nd choice	1st choice	-.067	.038	.391	-.17	.04
	3rd choice	-.086	.067	.699	-.27	.10
	4th choice	-.111	.130	.906	-.56	.34
	5th choice or lower	-.136	.106	.705	-.48	.20
3rd choice	1st choice	.018	.060	.998	-.15	.19
	2nd choice	.086	.067	.699	-.10	.27
	4th choice	-.025	.137	1.000	-.48	.43
	5th choice or lower	-.050	.115	.992	-.40	.30
4th choice	1st choice	.043	.126	.996	-.40	.49
	2nd choice	.111	.130	.906	-.34	.56
	3rd choice	.025	.137	1.000	-.43	.48
	5th choice or lower	-.025	.160	1.000	-.52	.47
5th choice or lower	1st choice	.068	.101	.958	-.27	.41
	2nd choice	.136	.106	.705	-.20	.48
	3rd choice	.050	.115	.992	-.30	.40
	4th choice	.025	.160	1.000	-.47	.52

2016 Cohort * Expectation to Graduate * Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable:

Games-Howell

(I) Expectation to Graduate From USA		Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	Interval Bound	Interval Bound
No	Yes	-.110	.126	.666	-.44	.22
	Uncertain	-.063	.140	.894	-.42	.29
Yes	No	.110	.126	.666	-.22	.44
	Uncertain	.047	.064	.750	-.11	.20
Uncertain	No	.063	.140	.894	-.29	.42
	Yes	-.047	.064	.750	-.20	.11

2016 Freshman Cohort Retention Report ANOVA Tables

2016 Cohort * USA Day * Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable:

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	-.073*	.020	.001	-.12	-.03
	Attended Multiple USA Days	-.125	.067	.172	-.29	.04
Attended 1 USA Day	Did Not Attend	.073*	.020	.001	.03	.12
	Attended Multiple USA Days	-.052	.068	.729	-.22	.12
Attended Multiple USA Days	Did Not Attend	.125	.067	.172	-.04	.29
	Attended 1 USA Day	.052	.068	.729	-.12	.22

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

2016 Cohort * Orientation * Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable:

Games-Howell

(I) Orientation Logistic		Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	Interval Bound	Interval Bound
August/Transfer/Unknown Orientation	May Orientation	-.076	.072	.997	-.32	.17
	Freshman Session 1	-.239*	.043	.000	-.38	-.10
	Freshman Session 2	-.197*	.045	.001	-.35	-.05
	Freshman Session 3	-.168*	.046	.018	-.32	-.01
	Freshman Session 4	-.113	.048	.481	-.27	.05
	Freshman Session 5	-.090	.049	.833	-.25	.07
	Freshman Session 6	-.118	.048	.413	-.28	.04
	Freshman Session 7	-.104	.048	.618	-.27	.06
	Freshman Session 8	-.027	.053	1.000	-.20	.15
	Freshman Session 9	-.039	.058	1.000	-.23	.15
	Freshman Session 10	.034	.060	1.000	-.17	.24
	International Orientation	-.122	.054	.564	-.30	.06
Freshman Session 1	August/Transfer/Unknown Orientation	.239*	.043	.000	.10	.38
	May Orientation	.163	.065	.393	-.06	.39
	Freshman Session 2	.043	.033	.986	-.07	.15
	Freshman Session 3	.071	.035	.696	-.04	.19
	Freshman Session 4	.126*	.038	.048	.00	.25
	Freshman Session 5	.150*	.039	.008	.02	.28
	Freshman Session 6	.122	.037	.065	.00	.25
	Freshman Session 7	.135*	.038	.021	.01	.26
	Freshman Session 8	.213*	.043	.000	.07	.36
	Freshman Session 9	.201*	.049	.005	.03	.37
	Freshman Session 10	.273*	.052	.000	.10	.45
	International Orientation	.118	.045	.319	-.03	.27

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

2016 Freshman Cohort Retention Report ANOVA Tables

2016 Cohort * College * Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable:

Games-Howell

(I) College Logistic		Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval Bound	95% Confidence Interval Bound
AS	AH	-.057	.029	.511	-.15	.03
	BU	-.025	.036	.997	-.13	.08
	CS	-.004	.050	1.000	-.16	.15
	ED	.049	.042	.945	-.08	.18
	EG	-.024	.028	.990	-.11	.06
	NU	-.034	.029	.941	-.12	.05
	CE	-.242*	.018	.000	-.30	-.19
AH	AS	.057	.029	.511	-.03	.15
	BU	.032	.039	.992	-.09	.15
	CS	.053	.052	.972	-.11	.21
	ED	.105	.045	.268	-.03	.24
	EG	.033	.032	.966	-.06	.13
	NU	.023	.033	.997	-.08	.12
	CE	-.185*	.023	.000	-.26	-.12
BU	AS	.025	.036	.997	-.08	.13
	AH	-.032	.039	.992	-.15	.09
	CS	.021	.056	1.000	-.15	.19
	ED	.074	.049	.814	-.08	.22
	EG	.001	.038	1.000	-.11	.12
	NU	-.009	.039	1.000	-.13	.11
	CE	-.217*	.031	.000	-.31	-.12
CS	AS	.004	.050	1.000	-.15	.16
	AH	-.053	.052	.972	-.21	.11
	BU	-.021	.056	1.000	-.19	.15
	ED	.053	.060	.988	-.13	.24
	EG	-.020	.052	1.000	-.18	.14
	NU	-.030	.052	.999	-.19	.13
	CE	-.238*	.047	.000	-.38	-.09
ED	AS	-.049	.042	.945	-.18	.08
	AH	-.105	.045	.268	-.24	.03
	BU	-.074	.049	.814	-.22	.08
	CS	-.053	.060	.988	-.24	.13
	EG	-.072	.044	.726	-.21	.06
	NU	-.082	.045	.592	-.22	.05
	CE	-.291*	.038	.000	-.41	-.17
CE	AS	.242*	.018	.000	.19	.30
	AH	.185*	.023	.000	.12	.26
	BU	.217*	.031	.000	.12	.31
	CS	.238*	.047	.000	.09	.38
	ED	.291*	.038	.000	.17	.41
	EG	.219*	.022	.000	.15	.28
	NU	.208*	.023	.000	.14	.28

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

2016 Freshman Cohort Retention Report ANOVA Tables

2016 Cohort * Expected Family Contribution * Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable:

Games-Howell

(I) Expected Family Contribution (EFC)		Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	Interval Bound	Interval Bound
$0	$1 to $3,750	-.030	.029	.900	-.11	.05
	$3,751 to $7,500	-.042	.036	.842	-.14	.06
	$7,501 to $15,000	-.036	.032	.883	-.13	.06
	$15,001 to $25,000	-.047	.034	.728	-.14	.05
	$25,001 or higher	-.026	.033	.967	-.12	.07
$1 to $3,750	$0	.030	.029	.900	-.05	.11
	$3,751 to $7,500	-.012	.039	1.000	-.12	.10
	$7,501 to $15,000	-.005	.036	1.000	-.11	.10
	$15,001 to $25,000	-.017	.037	.998	-.12	.09
	$25,001 or higher	.004	.037	1.000	-.10	.11
$3,751 to $7,500	$0	.042	.036	.842	-.06	.14
	$1 to $3,750	.012	.039	1.000	-.10	.12
	$7,501 to $15,000	.007	.042	1.000	-.11	.13
	$15,001 to $25,000	-.005	.043	1.000	-.13	.12
	$25,001 or higher	.016	.042	.999	-.11	.14
$7,501 to $15,000	$0	.036	.032	.883	-.06	.13
	$1 to $3,750	.005	.036	1.000	-.10	.11
	$3,751 to $7,500	-.007	.042	1.000	-.13	.11
	$15,001 to $25,000	-.011	.040	1.000	-.13	.10
	$25,001 or higher	.009	.040	1.000	-.10	.12
$15,001 to $25,000	$0	.047	.034	.728	-.05	.14
	$1 to $3,750	.017	.037	.998	-.09	.12
	$3,751 to $7,500	.005	.043	1.000	-.12	.13
	$7,501 to $15,000	.011	.040	1.000	-.10	.13
	$25,001 or higher	.021	.041	.996	-.10	.14
$25,001 or higher	$0	.026	.033	.967	-.07	.12
	$1 to $3,750	-.004	.037	1.000	-.11	.10
	$3,751 to $7,500	-.016	.042	.999	-.14	.11
	$7,501 to $15,000	-.009	.040	1.000	-.12	.10
	$15,001 to $25,000	-.021	.041	.996	-.14	.10

2016 Freshman Cohort Retention Report ANOVA Tables

2016 Cohort * Unmet Financial Need * Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable:

Games-Howell

(I) Unmet Financial Need		Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	Interval Bound	Interval Bound
-$5,001 or lower	-$1 to -$5,000	.137*	.032	.000	.04	.23
	$0	.145*	.032	.000	.05	.24
	$1 to $5,000	.085	.033	.144	-.01	.18
	$5,001 to $10,000	.110*	.031	.008	.02	.20
	$10,001 to $15,000	.183*	.035	.000	.08	.29
	$15,001 or higher	.283*	.043	.000	.16	.41
-$1 to -$5,000	-$5,001 or lower	-.137*	.032	.000	-.23	-.04
	$0	.008	.034	1.000	-.09	.11
	$1 to $5,000	-.052	.034	.734	-.15	.05
	$5,001 to $10,000	-.027	.032	.982	-.12	.07
	$10,001 to $15,000	.046	.037	.873	-.06	.15
	$15,001 or higher	.146*	.044	.016	.02	.28
$0	-$5,001 or lower	-.145*	.032	.000	-.24	-.05
	-$1 to -$5,000	-.008	.034	1.000	-.11	.09
	$1 to $5,000	-.060	.035	.609	-.16	.04
	$5,001 to $10,000	-.035	.033	.942	-.13	.06
	$10,001 to $15,000	.038	.037	.951	-.07	.15
	$15,001 or higher	.138*	.044	.033	.01	.27
$1 to $5,000	-$5,001 or lower	-.085	.033	.144	-.18	.01
	-$1 to -$5,000	.052	.034	.734	-.05	.15
	$0	.060	.035	.609	-.04	.16
	$5,001 to $10,000	.025	.034	.990	-.08	.13
	$10,001 to $15,000	.098	.038	.135	-.01	.21
	$15,001 or higher	.198*	.045	.000	.06	.33
$5,001 to $10,000	-$5,001 or lower	-.110*	.031	.008	-.20	-.02
	-$1 to -$5,000	.027	.032	.982	-.07	.12
	$0	.035	.033	.942	-.06	.13
	$1 to $5,000	-.025	.034	.990	-.13	.08
	$10,001 to $15,000	.073	.036	.411	-.03	.18
	$15,001 or higher	.173*	.043	.002	.04	.30
$10,001 to $15,000	-$5,001 or lower	-.183*	.035	.000	-.29	-.08
	-$1 to -$5,000	-.046	.037	.873	-.15	.06
	$0	-.038	.037	.951	-.15	.07
	$1 to $5,000	-.098	.038	.135	-.21	.01
	$5,001 to $10,000	-.073	.036	.411	-.18	.03
	$15,001 or higher	.100	.046	.324	-.04	.24
$15,001 or higher	-$5,001 or lower	-.283*	.043	.000	-.41	-.16
	-$1 to -$5,000	-.146*	.044	.016	-.28	-.02
	$0	-.138*	.044	.033	-.27	-.01
	$1 to $5,000	-.198*	.045	.000	-.33	-.06
	$5,001 to $10,000	-.173*	.043	.002	-.30	-.04
	$10,001 to $15,000	-.100	.046	.324	-.24	.04

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

2016 Freshman Cohort Retention Report ANOVA Tables

2016 Cohort * USA Hours Earned After Summer 2017 * Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable:

Games-Howell

(I) Number At Risk Midterm Grades in Fall 2016		Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	Interval Bound	Interval Bound
No At Risk MT Grades	1 At Risk MT Grade	.093*	.021	.000	.04	.15
	2 At Risk MT Grades	.201*	.029	.000	.12	.28
	3 At Risk MT Grades	.349*	.044	.000	.23	.47
	4 or More At Risk MT Grades	.484*	.047	.000	.35	.62
1 At Risk MT Grade	No At Risk MT Grades	-.093*	.021	.000	-.15	-.04
	2 At Risk MT Grades	.108*	.033	.009	.02	.20
	3 At Risk MT Grades	.256*	.047	.000	.13	.38
	4 or More At Risk MT Grades	.391*	.050	.000	.25	.53
2 At Risk MT Grades	No At Risk MT Grades	-.201*	.029	.000	-.28	-.12
	1 At Risk MT Grade	-.108*	.033	.009	-.20	-.02
	3 At Risk MT Grades	.148*	.051	.032	.01	.29
	4 or More At Risk MT Grades	.283*	.054	.000	.14	.43
3 At Risk MT Grades	No At Risk MT Grades	-.349*	.044	.000	-.47	-.23
	1 At Risk MT Grade	-.256*	.047	.000	-.38	-.13
	2 At Risk MT Grades	-.148*	.051	.032	-.29	-.01
	4 or More At Risk MT Grades	.135	.063	.208	-.04	.31
4 or More At Risk MT Grades	No At Risk MT Grades	-.484*	.047	.000	-.62	-.35
	1 At Risk MT Grade	-.391*	.050	.000	-.53	-.25
	2 At Risk MT Grades	-.283*	.054	.000	-.43	-.14
	3 At Risk MT Grades	-.135	.063	.208	-.31	.04

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

2016 Freshman Cohort Retention Report ANOVA Tables

2016 Cohort * USA GPA After Summer 2017 * Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable:

Games-Howell

(I) USA Hours Earned After Summer 2017		Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	Interval Bound	Interval Bound
0-6 hours	6.5-12 hours	.028	.051	.994	-.12	.17
	12.5-18 hours	-.225*	.055	.001	-.38	-.07
	18.5-24 hours	-.516*	.049	.000	-.66	-.37
	24.5-30 hours	-.714*	.037	.000	-.82	-.61
	30.5 or more hours	-.774*	.036	.000	-.88	-.67
6.5-12 hours	0-6 hours	-.028	.051	.994	-.17	.12
	12.5-18 hours	-.253*	.056	.000	-.41	-.09
	18.5-24 hours	-.544*	.051	.000	-.69	-.40
	24.5-30 hours	-.741*	.039	.000	-.85	-.63
	30.5 or more hours	-.802*	.038	.000	-.91	-.69
12.5-18 hours	0-6 hours	.225*	.055	.001	.07	.38
	6.5-12 hours	.253*	.056	.000	.09	.41
	18.5-24 hours	-.291*	.054	.000	-.45	-.14
	24.5-30 hours	-.489*	.044	.000	-.62	-.36
	30.5 or more hours	-.549*	.043	.000	-.67	-.43
18.5-24 hours	0-6 hours	.516*	.049	.000	.37	.66
	6.5-12 hours	.544*	.051	.000	.40	.69
	12.5-18 hours	.291*	.054	.000	.14	.45
	24.5-30 hours	-.197*	.037	.000	-.30	-.09
	30.5 or more hours	-.258*	.035	.000	-.36	-.16
24.5-30 hours	0-6 hours	.714*	.037	.000	.61	.82
	6.5-12 hours	.741*	.039	.000	.63	.85
	12.5-18 hours	.489*	.044	.000	.36	.62
	18.5-24 hours	.197*	.037	.000	.09	.30
	30.5 or more hours	-.061*	.015	.001	-.10	-.02
30.5 or more hours	0-6 hours	.774*	.036	.000	.67	.88
	6.5-12 hours	.802*	.038	.000	.69	.91
	12.5-18 hours	.549*	.043	.000	.43	.67
	18.5-24 hours	.258*	.035	.000	.16	.36
	24.5-30 hours	.061*	.015	.001	.02	.10

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

2016 Freshman Cohort Retention Report ANOVA Tables

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable:

Games-Howell

(I) USA GPA After Summer 2017		Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval Bound	95% Confidence Interval Bound
2.0 or lower	2.01-2.5	-.491*	.034	.000	-.58	-.40
	2.51-3.0	-.499*	.032	.000	-.59	-.41
	3.01-3.5	-.560*	.029	.000	-.64	-.48
	3.51-4.0	-.600*	.027	.000	-.67	-.52
2.01-2.5	2.0 or lower	.491*	.034	.000	.40	.58
	2.51-3.0	-.008	.030	.999	-.09	.08
	3.01-3.5	-.070	.027	.082	-.14	.01
	3.51-4.0	-.109*	.026	.000	-.18	-.04
2.51-3.0	2.0 or lower	.499*	.032	.000	.41	.59
	2.01-2.5	.008	.030	.999	-.08	.09
	3.01-3.5	-.062	.024	.075	-.13	.00
	3.51-4.0	-.101*	.022	.000	-.16	-.04
3.01-3.5	2.0 or lower	.560*	.029	.000	.48	.64
	2.01-2.5	.070	.027	.082	-.01	.14
	2.51-3.0	.062	.024	.075	.00	.13
	3.51-4.0	-.039	.018	.184	-.09	.01
3.51-4.0	2.0 or lower	.600*	.027	.000	.52	.67
	2.01-2.5	.109*	.026	.000	.04	.18
	2.51-3.0	.101*	.022	.000	.04	.16
	3.01-3.5	.039	.018	.184	-.01	.09

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

2016 Freshman Cohort Retention Report Logistic Regression Tables

Input Model Classification Table[a]

Observed			Predicted		
			Retention		Percentage Correct
			No	Yes	
Step 1	One-Year Retention	No	0	371	0.0
		Yes	0	1332	100.0
	Overall Percentage				78.2
Step 2	One-Year Retention	No	0	371	0.0
		Yes	0	1332	100.0
	Overall Percentage				78.2
Step 3	One-Year Retention	No	13	358	3.5
		Yes	4	1328	99.7
	Overall Percentage				78.7
Step 4	One-Year Retention	No	13	358	3.5
		Yes	5	1327	99.6
	Overall Percentage				78.7

a. The cut value is .500

Input Model Final Variables in the Equation

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 4[d]	Florida Service Area			12.186	5	.032			
	Mobile or Baldwin County	.247	.276	.801	1	.371	1.280	.745	2.198
	Rest of Alabama	.657	.278	5.600	1	.018	1.930	1.120	3.326
	Mississippi Service Area	.231	.363	.406	1	.524	1.260	.619	2.566
	Rest of United States	.503	.349	2.084	1	.149	1.654	.835	3.277
	International	.171	1.211	.020	1	.888	1.186	.110	12.745
	HS GPA_3.0 or lower			48.411	2	.000			
	HS GPA_3.01-3.5	.524	.166	9.950	1	.002	1.688	1.219	2.337
	HS GPA 3.51-4.0	1.183	.174	46.380	1	.000	3.264	2.322	4.588
	ACT Composite 19 or lower			15.077	6	.020			
	ACT Composite 20-21	-.035	.188	.035	1	.851	.965	.668	1.396
	ACT Composite 22-23	.239	.201	1.414	1	.234	1.270	.857	1.881
	ACT Composite 24-25	.491	.212	5.363	1	.021	1.634	1.078	2.474
	ACT Composite 26-27	.227	.234	.939	1	.333	1.255	.793	1.985
	ACT Composite 28-29	.113	.257	.191	1	.662	1.119	.676	1.853
	ACT Composite 30 or higher	1.092	.370	8.737	1	.003	2.981	1.445	6.151
	Not First Generation	.463	.141	10.810	1	.001	1.588	1.205	2.093
	Constant	-.443	.329	1.816	1	.178	.642		

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

b. Variable(s) entered on step 2: First Generation.

c. Variable(s) entered on step 3: ACT Composite score.

d. Variable(s) entered on step 4: Region.

2016 Freshman Cohort Retention Report Logistic Regression Tables

Input and Environmental Model Classification Table[a]

Observed			Predicted		
			Retention		Percentage Correct
			No	Yes	
Step 1	One-Year Retention	No	27	336	7.4
		Yes	12	1298	99.1
	Overall Percentage				79.2
Step 2	One-Year Retention	No	31	332	8.5
		Yes	23	1287	98.2
	Overall Percentage				78.8
Step 3	One-Year Retention	No	41	322	11.3
		Yes	22	1288	98.3
	Overall Percentage				79.4
Step 4	One-Year Retention	No	50	313	13.8
		Yes	34	1276	97.4
	Overall Percentage				79.3

a. The cut value is .500

2016 Freshman Cohort Retention Report Logistic Regression Tables

Input and Environmental Model Final Variables in the Equation

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	EXP(B) Lower	EXP(B) Upper
Step 4[d]	Florida Service Area			8.458	5	.133			
	Mobile or Baldwin County	.729	.308	5.595	1	.018	2.074	1.133	3.796
	Rest of Alabama	.640	.294	4.726	1	.030	1.896	1.065	3.375
	Mississippi Service Area	.239	.379	.398	1	.528	1.270	.604	2.670
	Rest of United States	.413	.366	1.271	1	.260	1.511	.737	3.099
	International	-.040	1.487	.001	1	.978	.961	.052	17.706
	HS GPA_3.0 or lower			36.977	2	.000			
	HS GPA_3.01-3.5	.457	.176	6.752	1	.009	1.580	1.119	2.230
	HS GPA 3.51-4.0	1.083	.184	34.707	1	.000	2.954	2.060	4.235
	ACT Composite 19 or lower			11.396	6	.077			
	ACT Composite 20-21	-.063	.200	.098	1	.754	.939	.635	1.390
	ACT Composite 22-23	.342	.217	2.479	1	.115	1.408	.920	2.155
	ACT Composite 24-25	.519	.226	5.246	1	.022	1.680	1.078	2.619
	ACT Composite 26-27	.195	.250	.609	1	.435	1.216	.744	1.985
	ACT Composite 28-29	-.028	.276	.011	1	.918	.972	.566	1.669
	ACT Composite 30 or higher	.535	.400	1.793	1	.181	1.708	.780	3.739
	Not First Generation	.397	.152	6.880	1	.009	1.488	1.106	2.002
	August/Other Orientation			22.472	11	.021			
	May Orientation	.210	.453	.214	1	.644	1.233	.507	2.999
	Freshman Session 1	1.122	.395	8.063	1	.005	3.071	1.416	6.662
	Freshman Session 2	.614	.360	2.913	1	.088	1.849	.913	3.744
	Freshman Session 3	.562	.351	2.563	1	.109	1.753	.882	3.487
	Freshman Session 4	.184	.337	.299	1	.584	1.203	.621	2.329
	Freshman Session 5	.194	.336	.332	1	.565	1.214	.628	2.347
	Freshman Session 6	.343	.338	1.028	1	.311	1.409	.726	2.735
	Freshman Session 7	.270	.337	.640	1	.424	1.310	.676	2.538
	Freshman Session 8	.016	.335	.002	1	.963	1.016	.527	1.959
	Freshman Session 9	.097	.361	.072	1	.788	1.102	.543	2.235
	Freshman Session 10	-.287	.352	.663	1	.416	.751	.376	1.498
	Unmet need $15,001 or higher			20.279	6	.002			
	Unmet need $10,001 to $15,000	.300	.244	1.518	1	.218	1.350	.838	2.176
	Unmet need $5,001 to $10,000	.711	.240	8.743	1	.003	2.035	1.271	3.259
	Unmet need $1 to $5,000	.697	.270	6.686	1	.010	2.008	1.184	3.405
	Unmet need $0	.560	.241	5.375	1	.020	1.750	1.090	2.809
	Unmet need -$1 to -$5,000	.110	.242	.207	1	.649	1.116	.695	1.793
	Unmet need -$5,001 or lower	1.078	.378	8.152	1	.004	2.939	1.402	6.160
	On Campus Housing	.548	.177	9.553	1	.002	1.730	1.222	2.449
	Participated in Greek Life	.712	.238	8.916	1	.003	2.037	1.277	3.250
	Constant	-1.614	.465	12.057	1	.001	.199		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: Housing.

b. Variable(s) entered on step 2: Greek Life Participation.

c. Variable(s) entered on step 3: Initial Unmet Need.

d. Variable(s) entered on step 4: Orientation Session Attended.

2016 Freshman Cohort Retention Report Logistic Regression Tables

Midway Through or After Fall 2016 Classification Table[a]

Observed			Predicted		
			Retention		Percentage Correct
			No	Yes	
Step 1	One-Year Retention	No	195	243	44.5
		Yes	123	1394	91.9
	Overall Percentage				81.3
Step 2	One-Year Retention	No	191	247	43.6
		Yes	119	1398	92.2
	Overall Percentage				81.3

a. The cut value is .500

Midway Through or After Fall 2016 Variables in the Equation

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 1[a]	Not on Probation After Fall 2016	2.208	.135	269.411	1	.000	9.095	6.987	11.838
	Constant	-.461	.115	16.016	1	.000	.631		
Step 2[b]	4 or More At Risk MT Grades			23.529	4	.000			
	3 At Risk MT Grades	.098	.276	.127	1	.722	1.103	.642	1.897
	2 At Risk MT Grades	.089	.262	.116	1	.734	1.093	.654	1.828
	1 At Risk MT Grade	.402	.264	2.329	1	.127	1.496	.892	2.508
	No At Risk MT Grades	.865	.273	10.024	1	.002	2.375	1.390	4.058
	Not on Probation After Fall 2016	1.778	.175	103.337	1	.000	5.915	4.199	8.333
	Constant	-.599	.199	9.004	1	.003	.550		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: Probation After Fall 2016.

b. Variable(s) entered on step 2: At-Risk Midterm Grades in Fall 2016.

USA Hours Earned After Summer 2017 Classification Table[a]

Observed			Predicted		
			Retention		Percentage Correct
			No	Yes	
Step 1	One-Year Retention	No	260	160	61.9
		Yes	90	1426	94.1
	Overall Percentage				87.1

a. The cut value is .500

2016 Freshman Cohort Retention Report Logistic Regression Tables

USA Hours Earned After Summer 2017 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			482.542	5	.000			
	USA Hours Earned 6.5-12	-.203	.376	.289	1	.591	.817	.390	1.708
	USA Hours Earned 12.5-18	1.141	.297	14.762	1	.000	3.130	1.749	5.602
	USA Hours Earned 18.5-24	2.353	.290	65.880	1	.000	10.521	5.960	18.572
	USA Hours Earned 24.5-30	3.633	.274	175.761	1	.000	37.836	22.112	64.741
	USA Hours Earned 30.5 or more	4.504	.290	241.220	1	.000	90.417	51.213	159.631
	Constant	-1.540	.240	41.038	1	.000	.214		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: USA Hours Earned After Summer 2017.

USA GPA After Summer 2017 Classification Table[a]

Observed			Predicted		
			Retention		Percentage Correct
			No	Yes	
Step 1	One-Year Retention	No	236	184	56.2
		Yes	120	1396	92.1
	Overall Percentage				84.3

a. The cut value is .500

USA GPA After Summer 2017 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			395.171	4	.000			
	USA GPA 2.01-2.5	2.245	.199	127.841	1	.000	9.440	6.397	13.931
	USA GPA 2.51-3.0	2.302	.179	164.629	1	.000	9.995	7.031	14.206
	USA GPA 3.01-3.5	2.845	.190	223.063	1	.000	17.198	11.840	24.981
	USA GPA 3.51-4.0	3.371	.217	241.800	1	.000	29.119	19.038	44.538
	Constant	-.676	.112	36.389	1	.000	.508		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: USA GPA After Summer 2017.