

Memo

To: Beth Merritt Miller, Assistant Vice Provost for University Advising
Shannon Stephens, Director, Mustang Success Center

From: Matt Carlton, Statistics Department

Date: November 4, 2015

Subject: Freshman Success Program — AY 2014-15

Contents

- I. Executive Summary
- II. GPA and Academic Probation Results

I. Executive Summary

This memorandum presents the statistical analysis results for the Freshman Success Program (FSP) during Winter 2015 and Spring 2015. The primary goal of the analysis was to investigate the effects of the workshop on students' GPAs, retention status, and AP status. In total, there were 342 first-time freshmen on AP at the end of Fall 2014, of whom 325 (95.0%) participated in FSP. Additionally, 333 freshmen were on AP for the first time at the end of Winter 2015, of whom 315 (94.6%) participated in the program. Only freshmen that participated in FSP are included in the analysis.

The results of the 2014-15 FSP were comparable to previous years. In particular, a majority of Winter 2015 FSP participants were off AP after one quarter, more than 60% were off AP after two quarters, and more than 70% were retained into a second year. The results were even more favorable for Spring 2015 participants, with almost 70% off AP after one quarter and more than 86% retained into sophomore year.

II. GPA and Academic Probation Results

Table 1 summarizes GPA, AP status, and retention status. Results for the Winter 2015 cohort are comparable in every respect to previous years. Results for Spring 2015 participants were comparable to last year's spring quarter group, with one exception: the percent of students getting off AP after one quarter (i.e., at the end of spring) was down to about 70% from 80% last year. Note, though, that the mean GPA for this year's spring cohort is nearly identical to last year's.

	Spring Quarter		Winter Quarter			
	2015	2014	2015	2014	2013	2012
<i>Summary statistics</i>						
Mean cum GPA at end of FSP quarter	2.236	2.251	2.003	2.049	1.882	1.914
Percent off AP at end of FSP quarter	69.7%	80.2%	53.5%	53.5%	51.7%	47.3%
Mean cum GPA at end of subsequent quarter	N/A	N/A	2.121	2.087	2.026	2.103
Percent off AP at end of subsequent quarter	N/A	N/A	61.1%	61.8%	66.4%	62.7%
Percent enrolled next fall quarter	86.1%	86.8%	71.8%	70.1%	67.2%	67.4%

Table 1 – Summary statistics for the Winter and Spring 2015 FSP participants, and comparative statistics for previous years' participants. For the results of the 2010 and 2011 FSPs, please consult earlier memos.

Table 2 summarizes the mean term GPA across the first year for the Winter 2015 participants, separated by college. Note the increase in average term GPA from Fall 2014 to Winter 2015 for all colleges. Consistent with previous years' data, all colleges but OCOB saw a drop-off in mean GPA from winter to spring. However, this year's reductions in mean GPA were less pronounced than in previous years.

<i>Mean term GPA</i>	Winter 2015 FSP Participants		
	Fall 2014	Winter 2015	Spring 2015
CAED	1.528	2.149	1.983
CAFES	1.454	2.206	2.096
CENG	1.523	1.993	1.963
CLA	1.491	2.241	2.090
COSAM	1.360	2.075	1.909
OCOB	1.517	2.043	2.235

Table 2 – Mean term GPA by college and quarter for Winter 2015 FSP participants.

Table 3 summarizes the mean term GPA across the first year for the Spring 2015 participants, separated by college. Note the increase in average term GPA from Winter 2015 to Spring 2015 for all colleges.

<i>Mean term GPA</i>	Spring 2015 FSP Participants		
	Fall 2014	Winter 2015	Spring 2015
CAED	2.564	1.607	2.303
CAFES	2.492	1.547	2.344
CENG	2.636	1.510	2.308
CLA	2.711	1.538	2.341
COSAM	2.407	1.517	2.219
OCOB	2.515	1.474	2.341

Table 3 – Mean term GPA by college and quarter for Spring 2015 FSP participants.

Table 4 summarizes academic probation and retention information for the Winter 2015 FSP participants, separated by college. A majority of students in every college got their cumulative GPAs above 2.0 for Winter 2015, and more than 86% of students in all colleges were retained into Spring 2015. AP results for Spring 2015 and retention into Fall 2015 were less consistent across the colleges.

	Number of Students	CP Cum GPA \geq 2.0 Winter 2015	Retained to Spring 2015	CP Cum GPA \geq 2.0 Spring 2015	Retained to Fall 2015
CAED	41	63.4%	90.2%	83.8%	78.0%
CAFES	74	52.8%	91.9%	69.1%	68.9%
CENG	66	57.1%	93.9%	59.7%	77.3%
CLA	34	60.6%	88.2%	73.3%	76.5%
COSAM	44	51.2%	86.4%	55.3%	68.2%
OCOB	55	59.3%	94.5%	67.3%	65.5%

Table 4 – Academic probation and retention statistics for Winter 2015 FSP participants.

Table 5 summarizes academic probation and retention information for the Spring 2015 FSP participants, separated by college. Consistent with other measures, this group of students outperformed the Winter 2015 FSP group with respect to both GPA and persistence into sophomore year. Results were very similar to last year's.

	Number of Students	CP Cum GPA \geq 2.0 Spring 2015	Retained to Fall 2015
CAED	34	82.4%	91.2%
CAFES	68	69.1%	80.9%
CENG	95	84.0%	86.3%
CLA	36	75.0%	83.3%
COSAM	37	80.6%	83.8%
OCOB	39	71.1%	92.3%

Table 5 – Academic probation and retention statistics for Spring 2015 FSP participants.