

# FIRST TO SECOND YEAR RETENTION & SIX-YEAR GRADUATION RATES:

An Analysis by Social Identity Groups at the Campus  
and College Level



David Fairris  
Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education  
Junelyn Peeples  
Director of Institutional Research  
Melba Castro  
Director of First Year Student Success Programs



*March 2011*

**Undergraduate Education Institutional Research Report**



## Living the Promise

### Abstract

*This report examines the first to second year retention and six-year graduation rates of entering freshman students by social identity groups for the classes of 2002 and 2003. The data were analyzed at the campus level in order to better understand the first-year retention and six-year graduation rates of all entering students at UCR. Student enrollment data were disaggregated by the College in which students matriculated during their freshman year, and the above analyses were repeated at the College level. Statistical comparison of means analyses were conducted across social identity groups consisting of females and males, racial/ethnic background groups, low-income and non-low-income students, and finally first-generation and non-first-generation students at the campus level and for each College.*

## Introduction

UCR is the fourth most ethnically diverse and the fifteenth most economically diverse national university in the United States (US News and World Report, 2010). Recent reports and news articles have applauded UCR's success in helping students persist and graduate, especially those students coming from low socio-economic backgrounds and underrepresented minority groups. *The Press Enterprise* reports that minority students graduate at higher rates at UCR than at other US universities (Olson, 2010). Two recently-published Education Trust reports show that UCR graduates Hispanic, African American, and White students at nearly the same rates, and that these rates are higher than comparable public colleges or universities (Lynche & Engle, 2010; Lynche & Engle, 2010). Closing the academic achievement gap is a challenge that permeates every level of our nation's educational system. At the postsecondary level, academic achievement gaps in retention and graduation rates have traditionally been analyzed at the campus level. While an analysis at this level is important, this report examines the potential differences that may exist within various Colleges<sup>1</sup> in the university. Additionally, this research is aimed at understanding the unique experiences of students across social identity groups, which include gender, race/ethnicity, and students from low-income and first-generation backgrounds.

## Sample and Data Sources

Data were gathered for the 2002 and 2003 entering freshman classes using third week student enrollment census data files. First to second year retention and six-year graduation rates were tracked by entering cohorts. The two cohorts were analyzed separately. The total sample size is as follows:

- Fall 2002 entering freshman class: 3,509 students, and
- Fall 2003 entering freshman class: 3,844 students.

## Methodology

The analyses in this report include first to second year retention and six-year graduation rates of entering freshman students by social identity groups for the classes of 2002 and 2003. First, the data were analyzed at the campus level in order to better understand the first-year retention and six-year graduation rates of all entering students at UCR. Second, student enrollment data were disaggregated by the College in which students matriculated during their freshman year, and the above analyses were repeated at the College level. Third, statistical comparison of means analyses were conducted across social identity groups consisting of females and males, racial/ethnic background groups, low-income and non-low-income students, and finally first-generation and non-first-generation students at the campus level and for each College.

---

<sup>1</sup> This information is provided for the following Colleges: College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences (CHASS), College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences (CNAS), and College of Bourns Engineering (BCOE). While there are four Colleges at UCR, the School of Business Administration (SOBA) only has upper division students and did not become a School until 2008. As a result, this report only includes the three Colleges that existed in 2002 and 2003.

## Report Structure

This report summarizes findings for first-year retention and six-year graduation rates across the 2002 and 2003 cohorts for the campus and then by each College. The report dwells on results that are: (1) *consistent* and (2) *consistent and statistically significant across both cohorts*.

- *Consistent outcomes across both cohorts* include outcomes for retention and graduation rates that are found across the 2002 and 2003 cohorts, but are not statistically significant for both years. In some cases, these outcomes were statistically significant for one year, but not both—these findings are included in *italics* to note that statistical significance was found for one cohort only.
- *Consistent and statistically significant outcomes across both cohorts* report comparisons of means which have statistically significant results that were consistent across the 2002 and 2003 cohorts. Overall, there were few results that were found to be statistically significant across both years. In some cases, this section was not included as no statistically significant findings were seen across both cohorts.

This report provides a preliminary understanding of potential academic achievement gaps with the caveat that these analyses must be repeated in order to view whether longitudinal patterns exist.

Tables 1 through 4.1 provide an overview of the first to second year retention and six-year graduation rates of the entering freshman classes for 2002 and 2003. These tables disaggregate the findings across social identity groups for the university and each College. Additionally, Tables 5 through 8 report the comparison of means for possible differences in retention and graduation rates across gender, race/ethnicity, low-income, and first-generation status for both cohorts, broken out by campus-level and College. Statistical significance is noted in these tables by blue shading and bold text.

## Campus-Level Results

The campus retention rate was 84.9 percent in 2002 and 84.8 percent in 2003. The general population of freshmen is retained at fairly similar rates across the two years. Six-year graduation rates also do not vary much between the 2002 and 2003 cohorts -- 64.3 percent versus 65 percent, respectively. However, when observing these rates along gender, race/ethnicity, and socio-economic status some variation exists both within and across cohorts. We begin by reporting campus-level outcomes that are, first, consistent and then, second, consistently statistically significant across both cohorts.

### Consistent Outcomes in First-Year Retention across Both Cohorts: Campus-Level Analysis

- The following groups persisted below the campus averages in 2002 and 2003: men and students from Hispanic, White, first-generation and low-income backgrounds.
- African American students in the 2002 cohort were retained at 92.8 percent, which is much higher than any other group. While still above the campus average, the African American retention rate dropped to 85.8 percent in 2003. Thus, the retention rate for African Americans in 2002 appears to be a bit of an anomaly. However, the retention rate for African Americans has remained high in proceeding years. For example, first-year retention for this group in 2008 was 89 percent (Appendix A).

- Females and students from African American, Asian, non-low-income and non-first-generation backgrounds persisted above the campus averages across both cohorts.
- Both first-generation and low-income students are less likely to persist than their non-first-generation and non-low-income counterparts. *(The difference in means for first-generation students compared to non-first-generation students was statistically significant for the 2003 cohort only. The difference in means for low-income students compared to non-low-income students was statistically significant for the 2002 cohort only.)*

### Consistent and Statistically Significant Findings in First-Year Retention across Both Cohorts: Campus Level Analysis

- Hispanics and Whites have lower retention rates when compared to Asians at levels that are statistically significant in both years.

### Consistent Outcomes in Six-Year Graduation Rates across Both Cohorts: Campus Level Analysis

- The campus six-year graduation rates were 64.3 percent in 2002 and 65 percent in 2003. The following groups fell below the campus average in 2002 and 2003: men and students from Hispanic, White, first-generation, and low-income backgrounds.
- Women and students from African American, Asian, non-first-generation and non-low-income students graduated above the average rates for the campus across both cohorts.
- First-generation students graduate at lower rates than their non-first-generation peers. *(This finding is statistically significant for the 2003 cohort only.)*
- Low-income students graduate at lower rates than their non-low-income peers. *(This finding is statistically significant for the 2002 cohort only.)*

### Consistent and Statistically Significant Findings in Six-Year Graduation Rates across Both Cohorts: Campus Level Analysis

- Women graduate at statistically significantly higher rates than men.
- African American students graduate at statistically significantly higher rates compared to Hispanic students.



**UCR is committed to understanding and supporting the unique experiences of all of our students**

## Results by College

The following section provides a discussion of the findings by College. These analyses provide the rates for students who persisted and graduated in their entering College. For example, the CHASS analysis refers to students who matriculated into CHASS, were retained in CHASS, and graduated in CHASS. The same analysis is repeated for CNAS and BCOE. A large proportion of students move from CNAS and BCOE into CHASS during their time at UCR. This is why the campus retention and graduation rate percentages are larger than the weighted combination of the College-level percentages (Tables 1 through 4.1).

### College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences

The College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences (CHASS) is the largest College at UCR. In 2002 and 2003 more than fifty-five percent of entering freshmen matriculated into CHASS. Overall, students entering CHASS are retained and graduated at nearly the same rate as the campus averages. There were no consistent and statistically significant differences in first-year retention rates across social identity groups in this College for both cohorts.

#### Consistent Outcomes in First-Year Retention across Both Cohorts: CHASS

- Students entering in CHASS are retained at nearly the same rate as the campus average.
- Women persist at slightly higher rates than men. (*This finding was statistically significant for the 2003 cohort only.*)
- African American students persist at higher rates than other ethnic groups across both cohorts. (*The fall 2002 cohort of African American students persisted at statistically significant higher rates than Hispanic and Asian students.*)
- Hispanic students had the lowest retention rates in the College in 2002 and 2003.
- Students from low-income backgrounds were less likely to be retained compared to their non-low-income counterparts across both cohorts. (*These results are statistically significant for the 2002 cohort only.*)

#### Consistent Outcomes in Six-Year Graduation Rates across Both Cohorts: CHASS

- Whites and Hispanics, along with males graduated below the College average rates in 2002 and 2003.
- African American students graduated above the average rates for the College.
- African Americans graduated at higher rates than Hispanic, Asians, and White students across both cohorts. (*These results are statistically significant for the 2002 cohort only.*)

#### Consistent and Statistically Significant Findings in Six-Year Graduation Rates across Both Cohorts: CHASS

- Women graduate at higher rates than men at statistically significant levels.

## College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences

The College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences (CNAS) is the second largest College at UCR. Close to one-third of UCR's freshmen matriculate into CNAS. Overall, the College's first to second year retention rates were about five to eight percentage points below the campus averages for 2002 and 2003. With regard to graduation rates, slightly over one-third of students who matriculate into CNAS will graduate with a degree from the College; one-third will leave UCR altogether and roughly one-third will "swirl" to CHASS. While there are some differences in retention rates across social identity groups, the disparities are much larger for six-year graduation rates. For example, the difference in graduation rates between Asian and Hispanic students was nearly 20 percentage points in 2003.

### Consistent Outcomes in First-Year Retention across Both Cohorts: CNAS

- Hispanic, White, first-generation, and low-income students persisted below the College's average rates in 2002 and 2003.
- Students from non-low-income, non-first-generation, African American and Asian backgrounds persisted above the campus averages in both years.
- Low-income students persist at lower rates than their non-low-income peers. (*This finding was statistically significant for the 2003 cohort only*).

### Consistent and Statistically Significant Findings in First-Year Retention across Both Cohorts: CNAS

- Asian students persist at higher rates when compared to White students.
- First-generation students persist at lower rates than non-first-generation students at statistically significant levels for both cohorts.

### Consistent Outcomes in Six-Year Graduation Rates across Both Cohorts: CNAS

- Hispanic, first-generation, and low-income students graduated at lower rates than the average rates for the College in 2002 and 2003. Hispanic students had the lowest graduation rates in the College.
- Non-first-generation, non-low-income, and Asian students graduated above the average rates for the College.

### Consistent and Statistically Significant Findings in Six-Year Graduation Rates across both Cohorts: CNAS

- Hispanic students on average graduate at significantly lower rates than White and Asian students.
- First-generation students graduate at lower rates than non-first-generation students at statistically significant levels.
- Low-income students are less likely to graduate in six-years than non-low-income students at statistically significant levels.

## **Bourns College of Engineering**

The Bourns College of Engineering (BCOE) is the smallest College at UCR. A total of 414 students (11.8 percent) matriculated in 2002 and 363 students (9.4 percent) in 2003. Less than one third of students who matriculate as freshmen into the College will graduate in the Bourns College of Engineering. When analyzing the differences among students from various social identity groups for both cohorts, no consistent statistically significant differences were found in the College. However, it is difficult to determine whether these differences exist due to the small sample size among some of the social identity groups. For example, in the 2002 cohort, only 16 African American and 58 female students matriculated into BCOE.

### **Consistent Outcomes in First to Second Year Retention across both Cohorts: BCOE**

- Women and students from Hispanic and White backgrounds were retained below the average retention rates in BCOE for both cohorts.
- Men persist at higher rates than women.
- Students from first-generation backgrounds persist at lower rates than students from non-first-generation backgrounds.
- When viewing outcomes amongst racial/ethnic groups African American and Asian students persist above the average rates in BCOE across both cohorts.

### **Consistent Outcomes in Six-Year Graduation Rates across both Cohorts: BCOE**

- Women, Hispanic, and White students graduated below the College average rates in 2002 and 2003. Of any racial/ethnic group, Hispanic students had the lowest graduation rates in the College.
- Men graduate at higher rates than women.
- Asians and males are the only groups that graduated at higher rates than the average in BCOE across both cohorts.



**UCR has implemented a variety of academic and co-curricular support programs to support students throughout their undergraduate education**



## Discussion<sup>2</sup>

---

There is relative parity in retention rates across gender, race/ethnicity, and first-generation and low-income student groups at the campus-level at UCR. The only statistically significant differences are seen with the higher rates for Asian students compared to Hispanics and Whites. Graduation rates tell a somewhat different story, but here too the differences are not profound; women consistently graduate at higher percentages than men, African American students have graduation rates that exceed those of Hispanic students. It is important to note that retention and graduation rates among social identity groups fluctuate from one year to the next. For example, the retention and graduation rates for African Americans in the 2002 cohort were well above the campus average and averages in the Colleges. These rates decreased for the 2003 cohort, which would lead us to believe that the 2002 African-American cohort was a bit of an anomaly. However, while rates vary over time, there are also trends that persist across the two periods – for example, Hispanic students have lower than average retention and graduation rates on campus and at all three Colleges during both years.

While relative parity exists at the campus level, such is not the case at the College level, where larger and persistent differences in retention and graduation rates exist. CHASS mirrors to a large degree the story for the university as a whole, and in fact here the only persistent difference is in the superior graduation rates of women over men. While CHASS represents a relative success story, there are significant challenges in BCOE and CNAS, where students are trained in the Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) disciplines. The numbers are so small for BCOE that none of the differences is found to be robust and statistically significant, but the quantitative magnitude of some of those differences is unsettling. In CNAS, the larger number of students does allow for meaningful tests of statistical differences (especially for retention rate comparisons), and here we observe retention rates that are higher for Asian students compared to White students and for non-first-generation students compared to those who are first-generation. Persistent differences in graduation rates hold for a number of social identity groups in CNAS as well: Asian students have higher graduation rates compared to Hispanics, as do White students compared to Hispanics. A similar advantage is observed with regard to non-first-generation or non-low-income students compared to their first-generation and low-income counterparts in the College.

Besides the observed differences in retention and graduation rates across social identity groups in BCOE and CNAS, a real challenge exists in the overall rates themselves – on the surface, they seem far too low. However, low retention and graduation rates are not uncommon in the STEM fields, due primarily to the lack of good mathematical training preceding college matriculation. Nonetheless, these results would seem to suggest that BCOE and CNAS should perhaps strive to be more selective in admissions or find ways to more rapidly alert students to their long-term lack of success in these Colleges, and swiftly move them into fields for which they are a better match, rather than losing them to attrition from the university altogether.

---

<sup>2</sup> The existence of differences in simple means, discussed thus far in these results, begs the question of causality – these differences could result from differences in student ability, for example, or from factors such as differences in motivation level, different treatment on campus, or from feelings of being treated differently. An exploratory analysis was conducted to test conditional differences in means which controls for student academic ability as measured by high school GPA and SAT scores (math and verbal). Although we are reluctant to draw strong conclusions from the analysis that condition on ability in making comparisons across social identity groups, we note that doing so yields some interesting results. For example, the persistent differences we observe in both the campus and College-levels with regard to graduation rates continue to hold once we condition on ability. This suggests that the observed differences are likely due to unobserved differences in, for example, the motivation levels of student groups or differences in the way these groups are treated, or feel they are treated, by the institution during their time here.

And, indeed, both Colleges have taken up this issue more forcefully in recent years by raising the bar for placing students in the more challenging mathematics courses and taking a less tolerant approach of not allowing students to languish in remedial mathematics courses and remain in STEM majors when analyses have revealed that they are very unlikely to be ultimately successful in a STEM field without good mathematics skills. Both Colleges have coupled these efforts with first-year experience programs in the past five years, which have boosted overall retention rates. Statistical analysis reveals that participating in a First-Year Learning Community (FYLC) impacts a student's likelihood of being retained by four percentage points (Fairris, Peeples, & Beleche, 2008; Fairris & Peeples, 2009; Fairris, Peeples, & Castro, 2010). An additional analysis of the impact of participating in a FYLC across social identity groups found that while all groups benefit from participating, females and Hispanic students experience the highest positive impact. How the recent combination of early academic support programs, community building, and greater direction about the probability of success for certain groups of students translates into graduation rates in these two Colleges will have to await later analysis, when the initial cohorts who received these services complete their degrees.

This report explores the retention and graduation rate outcomes of students at UCR across social identity groups and across the Colleges on campus. Pointing to retention and graduation rate outcomes across social identity groups at the campus level, the *Chronicle of Higher Education* identified UCR as a campus with the potential to be a model research university that serves to provide both access and excellence (Habel, 2007). "As the nation grows more racially diverse and seeks to improve degree-completion rates across socioeconomic groups...public research institutions are going to have to follow Riverside's lead and learn to help a wider array of students graduate" (Habel, 2007). UCR has achieved such success because of its commitment to carefully analyzing student data to identify weaknesses, and initiating programs to address those weaknesses. This report identifies areas for yet further improvement in retention and graduation rate outcomes at UCR. The results of this report have been widely discussed on campus, and indeed have already been acted upon programmatically in a variety of ways in the STEM disciplines, as UCR strives to be an even better model for both access and excellence in higher education.



**UCR is dedicated  
to striving for  
access and  
excellence**

## Works Cited

---

- Fairris, D., & Peeples, J. (2009). *First-year learning communities: Impact on first to second year retention, fall 2007 first-year students*. Riverside: University of California at Riverside, Undergraduate Education.
- Fairris, D., Peeples, J., & Beleche, T. (2008). *First-year learning communities: Impact on first to second year retention, fall 2007 first-year students*. Riverside: University of California at Riverside, Undergraduate Education.
- Fairris, D., Peeples, J., & Castro, M. S. (2010). *First-year learning communities: Impact on first to second year retention, 2006 and 2007 first-year students*. Riverside: University of California at Riverside, Undergraduate Education.
- Habel, S. (2007, March 23). In California, a public research university succeeds because its low-income students . *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.
- Lynche, M., & Engle, J. (2010). *Big gaps, small gaps: Some colleges and universities do better than others in graduating African American students*. Washington DC: The Education Trust.
- Lynche, M., & Engle, J. (2010). *Big gaps, small gaps: Some colleges and universities do better than others in graduating Hispanic students*. Washington DC: The Education Trust.
- Olson, D. (2010, November 7). UC Riverside: Diversity is more than numbers. *Press Enterprise*.
- US News and World Report. (2010). *Campus Ethnic Diversity, National Universities*.
- US News and World Report. (2010). *Economic Diversity, National Universities*.

**Table 1**  
**Fall 2002 Entering Freshman Cohort First-Year Retention Rates**

Variable	Campus	CHASS	CNAS	BCOE
<b>FY Retention</b>	84.9%	84.0%	77.2%	79.0%
Female	85.3%	84.8%	77.8%	74.1%
Male	84.5%	82.6%	76.3%	79.8%
African American	92.8%	92.2%	92.3%	81.3%
Hispanic	81.5%	81.0%	73.7%	77.9%
Asian	86.6%	84.2%	79.7%	84.1%
White	83.6%	85.8%	69.7%	72.4%
First-Generation	84.5%	84.7%	74.1%	78.7%
Non-First-Generation	85.5%	83.8%	79.4%	79.2%
Low-Income	83.2%	82.0%	74.5%	79.6%
Non-Low-Income	86.1%	85.5%	78.8%	78.6%

**Table 2**  
**Fall 2002 Entering Freshman Cohort Six-Year Graduation Rates**

Variable	Campus	CHASS	CNAS	BCOE
<b>6YR Grad Rate</b>	64.3%	65.4%	34.1%	27.5%
Female	67.1%	68.6%	35.1%	20.7%
Male	60.7%	59.7%	32.8%	28.7%
African American	73.9%	78.9%	37.2%	37.5%
Hispanic	61.6%	64.8%	23.7%	23.2%
Asian	65.3%	64.7%	37.0%	28.0%
White	61.5%	61.6%	34.1%	26.3%
First-Generation	63.3%	65.7%	31.0%	27.4%
Non-First-Generation	65.2%	65.3%	36.5%	27.6%
Low-Income	61.8%	63.7%	30.5%	28.3%
Non-Low-Income	65.9%	66.5%	36.4%	27.1%

**Table 1.1.**  
**Fall 2002 Entering Freshman Cohort First-Year Retention**

Variable	Campus	CHASS	CNAS	BCOE
<b>FY Retention</b>	2980/3509	1628/1938	893/1157	327/414
Female	1669/1957	1048/1236	516/663	43/58
Male	1311/1552	580/702	377/494	284/356
African American	206/222	118/128	72/78	13/16
Hispanic	714/876	451/557	165/224	74/95
Asian	1330/1535	635/754	472/592	159/189
White	564/675	333/388	147/211	55/76
First-Generation	1261/1493	729/861	347/468	129/164
Non-First-Generation	1714/2004	897/1070	543/684	198/250
Low-Income	1055/1268	574/700	310/416	121/152
Non-Low-Income	1920/2229	1052/1231	580/736	206/262

**Table 2.1**  
**Fall 2002 Entering Freshman Cohort Six-Year Graduation Rate**

Variable	Campus	CHASS	CNAS	BCOE
<b>6YR Grad Rate</b>	2256/3509	1267/1938	395/1157	114/414
Female	1314/1957	848/1236	233/663	12/58
Male	942/1552	419/702	162/494	102/356
African American	164/222	101/128	29/78	6/16
Hispanic	540/876	361/557	53/224	22/95
Asian	1002/1535	488/754	219/592	53/189
White	415/675	239/388	72/211	20/76
First-Generation	945/1493	566/861	145/468	45/164
Non-First-Generation	1307/2004	699/1070	250/684	69/250
Low-Income	783/1268	446/700	127/416	43/152
Non-Low-Income	1469/2229	819/1231	268/736	71/262

Note: Number of retained or graduated student / Total Number in Cohort

**Table 3**  
**Fall 2003 Entering Freshman Cohort First-Year Retention Rates**

Variable	Campus	CHASS	CNAS	BCOE
<b>FY Retention</b>	84.8%	83.2%	79.4%	74.4%
Female	85.7%	84.5%	77.9%	67.4%
Male	83.7%	81.3%	81.2%	75.4%
African American	85.8%	85.4%	79.8%	76.9%
Hispanic	81.3%	81.1%	74.9%	71.2%
Asian	87.6%	85.2%	83.5%	76.4%
White	82.2%	81.7%	73.4%	69.3%
First-Generation	82.3%	82.2%	74.4%	66.7%
Non-First-Generation	87.0%	84.2%	83.8%	80.0%
Low-Income	83.8%	83.0%	76.4%	70.6%
Non-Low-Income	85.3%	83.4%	81.0%	76.2%

**Table 4**  
**Fall 2003 Entering Freshman Cohort Six-Year Graduation Rates**

Variable	Campus	CHASS	CNAS	BCOE
<b>6YR Grad Rate</b>	65.0%	64.4%	36.5%	30.9%
Female	66.7%	66.8%	34.5%	28.4%
Male	62.8%	60.6%	39.2%	31.2%
African American	66.4%	65.3%	27.9%	26.9%
Hispanic	59.5%	62.6%	23.2%	23.3%
Asian	70.1%	69.2%	42.8%	33.3%
White	59.9%	58.1%	39.7%	29.3%
First-Generation	61.6%	62.2%	30.7%	32.7%
Non-First-Generation	68.0%	66.4%	41.7%	29.5%
Low-Income	64.5%	65.4%	32.8%	27.7%
Non-Low-Income	65.3%	63.8%	38.5%	32.4%

**Table 3.1**

**Fall 2003 Entering Freshman Cohort First-Year Retention Rates**

Variable	Campus	CHASS	CNAS	BCOE
<b>FY Retention</b>	3259/3844	1833/2202	1015/1279	270/363
Female	1814/2117	1137/1346	565/725	31/46
Males	1445/1727	696/856	450/554	239/317
African American	235/274	123/144	83/104	20/26
Hispanic	742/913	468/577	197/263	52/73
Asian	1489/1699	765/898	531/636	126/165
Whites	572/696	357/437	135/184	52/75
First-Generation	1495/1817	873/1062	448/602	102/153
Non-First-Generation	1764/2027	960/1140	567/677	168/210
Low-Income	1151/1373	664/800	347/454	84/119
Non-Low-Income	2108/2471	1169/1402	668/825	186/244

**Table 4.1**

**Fall 2003 Entering Freshman Cohort Six-Year Graduation Rates**

Variable	Campus	CHASS	CNAS	BCOE
<b>6YR Grad Rate</b>	2498/3844	1418/2202	467/1279	112/363
Female	1413/2117	899/1346	250/725	13/46
Male	1085/1727	519/856	217/554	99/317
African American	182/274	94/144	29/104	7/26
Hispanic	543/913	361/577	61/263	17/73
Asian	1191/1699	621/898	272/636	55/165
White	417/696	254/437	73/184	22/75
First-Generation	1120/1817	661/1062	185/602	50/153
Non-First-Generation	1378/2027	757/1140	282/677	62/210
Low-Income	885/1373	523/800	149/454	33/119
Non-Low-Income	1613/2471	895/1402	318/825	79/244

Note: Number of retained or graduated student / Total Number in Cohort

Table 5. Fall 2002 Entering Freshman Cohort First-Year Retention Rates Within-College Comparison

CAMPUS				CHASS			
Male		Female		Male		Female	
84.5%		85.3%		82.6%		84.8%	
Hispanic	Asian	White		Hispanic	Asian	White	
African American	81.5%	86.6%	83.6%	81.0%	84.2%	85.8%	92.2%
	92.8%	92.8%	92.8%		92.2%	92.2%	92.2%
Hispanic		86.6%	83.6%		84.2%	85.8%	
		81.5%	81.5%		81.0%	81.0%	
Asian			83.6%			85.8%	
			86.6%			84.2%	
Non-First-Generation	Non-Low-Income			Non-First-Generation	Non-Low-Income		
First-Generation	85.5%	86.1%		First-Generation	83.8%	85.5%	
	84.5%	83.2%			84.7%	82.0%	
	Low-Income				Low-Income		
CNAS				BCOE			
Male		Female		Male		Female	
76.3%		77.8%		79.8%		74.1%	
Hispanic	Asian	White		Hispanic	Asian	White	
African American	73.7%	79.7%	69.7%	77.9%	84.1%	72.4%	81.3%
	92.3%	92.3%	92.3%		81.3%	81.3%	81.3%
Hispanic		79.7%	69.7%		84.1%	72.4%	
		73.7%	73.7%		77.9%	77.9%	
Asian			69.7%			72.4%	
			79.7%			84.1%	
Non-First-Generation	Non-Low-Income			Non-First-Generation	Non-Low-Income		
First-Generation	79.4%	78.8%		First-Generation	79.2%	78.6%	
	74.1%	74.5%			78.7%	79.6%	
	Low-Income				Low-Income		

Blue Shading and Bold: Statistically Significant at 0.05 level



Table 6. Fall 2003 Entering Freshman Cohort First-Year Retention Rates Within-College Comparison

CAMPUS				CHASS			
Male		Female		Male		Female	
83.7%		85.7%		81.3%		84.5%	
Hispanic	Asian	White		Hispanic	Asian	White	
African American	81.3%	87.6%	82.2%	African American	81.1%	85.2%	81.7%
	85.8%	85.8%	85.8%		85.4%	85.4%	85.4%
Hispanic	<b>87.6%</b>	82.2%		Hispanic	<b>85.2%</b>	81.7%	
	<b>81.3%</b>	81.3%			<b>81.1%</b>	81.1%	
Asian		<b>82.2%</b>		Asian		81.7%	
		<b>87.6%</b>				85.2%	
Non-First-Generation	Low Income	Non-Low-Income		Non-First-Generation	Low-Income	Non-Low-Income	
First-Generation	<b>87.0%</b>	85.3%		First-Generation	84.2%	83.4%	
	<b>82.3%</b>	83.8%			82.2%	83.0%	
CNAS				BCOE			
Male		Female		Male		Female	
81.2%		77.9%		75.4%		67.4%	
Hispanic	Asian	White		Hispanic	Asian	White	
African American	74.9%	83.5%	73.4%	African American	71.2%	76.4%	69.3%
	79.8%	79.8%	79.8%		76.9%	76.9%	76.9%
Hispanic	<b>83.5%</b>	73.4%		Hispanic	76.4%	69.3%	
	<b>74.9%</b>	74.9%			<b>71.2%</b>	71.2%	
Asian		<b>73.4%</b>		Asian		69.3%	
		<b>83.5%</b>				76.4%	
Non-First-Generation	Low-Income	Non-Low-Income		Non-First-Generation	Low-Income	Non-Low-Income	
First-Generation	<b>83.8%</b>	81.0%		First-Generation	<b>80.0%</b>	76.2%	
	<b>74.4%</b>	76.4%			<b>66.7%</b>	70.6%	

Blue Shading and Bold: Statistically Significant at 0.05 level

Table 7. Fall 2002 Entering Freshman Cohort Six-Year Graduation Rates Within-College Comparison

CAMPUS				CHASS							
Male		Female		Male		Female					
60.7%		67.1%		59.7%		68.6%					
Hispanic		Asian		White		Hispanic		Asian		White	
African American	61.6%	65.3%	61.5%	African American	64.8%	64.7%	61.6%	African American	78.9%	78.9%	78.9%
Hispanic	73.9%	73.9%	61.6%	Hispanic	64.8%	64.7%	61.6%	Hispanic	64.8%	64.8%	61.6%
Asian		65.3%	61.5%	Asian		64.7%	61.6%	Asian		64.7%	61.6%
Non-First-Generation	Non-Low-Income		Non-First-Generation	Non-Low-Income		Non-First-Generation	Non-Low-Income				
First-Generation	65.2%	61.8%	First-Generation	65.3%	66.5%	First-Generation	65.7%	63.7%			
63.3%	Low Income	61.8%	Low Income	63.7%							
CNAS				BCOE							
Male		Female		Male		Female					
32.8%		35.1%		28.7%		20.7%					
Hispanic		Asian		White		Hispanic		Asian		White	
African American	23.7%	37.0%	34.1%	African American	23.2%	28.0%	26.3%	African American	37.5%	37.5%	37.5%
Hispanic	37.2%	37.2%	23.7%	Hispanic	23.2%	28.0%	26.3%	Hispanic	23.2%	23.2%	26.3%
Asian		37.0%	34.1%	Asian		28.0%	26.3%	Asian		28.0%	26.3%
Non-First-Generation	Non-Low-Income		Non-First-Generation	Non-Low-Income		Non-First-Generation	Non-Low-Income				
First-Generation	36.5%	30.5%	First-Generation	27.6%	27.1%	First-Generation	27.4%	28.3%			
31.0%	Low Income	30.5%	Low Income	28.3%							

Blue Shading and Bold: Statistically Significant at 0.05 level

**TABLE 8. Fall 2003 Entering Freshman Cohort Six-Year Graduation Rates Within-College Comparison**

CAMPUS				CHASS			
Male		Female		Male		Female	
62.8%		66.7%		60.6%		66.8%	
Hispanic	Asian	White	Hispanic	Asian	White	Hispanic	Asian
African American	66.4%	70.1%	59.5%	65.3%	69.2%	62.6%	58.1%
66.4%	66.4%	59.9%	65.3%	65.3%	58.1%	62.6%	62.6%
Hispanic	70.1%	59.5%	Hispanic	69.2%	58.1%	62.6%	62.6%
59.5%	59.5%	59.9%	Asian	69.2%	58.1%	62.6%	62.6%
Asian	70.1%	59.9%	Asian	69.2%	58.1%	62.6%	62.6%
Non-First-Generation	Non-Low-Income	Non-First-Generation	Non-Low-Income	Non-First-Generation	Non-Low-Income	Non-First-Generation	Non-Low-Income
First-Generation	68.0%	65.3%	First-Generation	66.4%	63.8%	First-Generation	66.4%
61.6%	64.5%	64.5%	62.2%	65.4%	65.4%	62.2%	65.4%
Low-Income	64.5%	64.5%	Low-Income	65.4%	65.4%	Low-Income	65.4%
CNAS				BCOE			
Male		Female		Male		Female	
39.2%		34.5%		31.2%		28.4%	
Hispanic	Asian	White	Hispanic	Asian	White	Hispanic	Asian
African American	27.9%	42.8%	23.2%	26.9%	33.3%	23.3%	29.3%
27.9%	27.9%	39.7%	26.9%	26.9%	29.3%	23.3%	26.9%
Hispanic	42.8%	39.7%	Hispanic	33.3%	29.3%	23.3%	23.3%
23.2%	23.2%	23.2%	Asian	33.3%	29.3%	23.3%	23.3%
Asian	42.8%	39.7%	Asian	33.3%	29.3%	23.3%	23.3%
39.7%	42.8%	39.7%	Non-First-Generation	29.5%	32.4%	Non-First-Generation	29.5%
Non-First-Generation	41.7%	38.5%	First-Generation	32.7%	27.7%	First-Generation	32.7%
30.7%	32.8%	32.8%	Low-Income	27.7%	27.7%	Low-Income	27.7%
Low-Income	32.8%	32.8%	Low-Income	27.7%	27.7%	Low-Income	27.7%

Blue Shading and Bold: Statistically Significant at 0.05 level

## Appendix A New Entering Freshman Cohort First-Year Retention Rates

	Fall 2000	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Fall 2006	Fall 2007	Fall 2008
<b>Campus</b>	84.5%	85.4%	84.9%	84.8%	85.9%	86.2%	83.3%	84.2%	86.6%
Female	84.2%	86.2%	85.3%	85.7%	86.8%	86.4%	84.9%	85.0%	86.4%
Male	84.9%	84.3%	84.5%	83.7%	84.9%	86.0%	81.5%	83.3%	86.9%
African American	87.5%	82.8%	92.8%	85.8%	88.6%	87.5%	85.0%	87.0%	89.0%
Hispanic	83.1%	82.5%	81.5%	81.3%	84.4%	83.7%	76.8%	79.2%	84.6%
Asian	85.7%	87.0%	86.6%	87.6%	87.8%	88.6%	87.1%	87.4%	88.0%
White	83.4%	84.5%	83.6%	82.2%	81.8%	83.2%	84.5%	83.8%	86.6%

## Appendix B New Entering Freshman Cohort Six-Year Graduation Rates

	Fall 2000	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Fall 2006	Fall 2007	Fall 2008
<b>Campus</b>	63.6%	64.3%	64.3%	65.0%					
Female	67.2%	68.2%	67.1%	66.7%					
Male	59.3%	59.5%	60.7%	62.8%					
African American	60.9%	61.3%	73.9%	66.4%					
Hispanic	63.4%	62.2%	61.6%	59.5%					
Asian	65.1%	66.7%	65.3%	70.1%					
White	63.7%	61.6%	61.5%	59.9%					