Student Retention in the School of Liberal Arts

Retention Committee
School of Liberal Arts
Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis

Anne Royalty, Co-Chair
Kenneth W. Davis, Co-Chair
Robert Aponte
Larbi Oukada
Ron Sandwina
Catherine Souch
Richard E. Ward

April 20, 2001

Student Retention in the School of Liberal Arts

Summary

Increasing attention is being paid to student retention at IUPUI. In Spring 2000, Dean Herman J. Saatkamp, Jr., dean of the School of Liberal Arts (SLA), appointed us to study student retention in SLA, and to make recommendations to SLA faculty and administration.

After a year of study, we make the following recommendations. These recommendations address only those steps that can be taken within SLA, not steps that must be taken within the campus and university. Support for these recommendations can be found in our full report.

A. Retention of first-year SLA students

We recommend that SLA either (a) not admit students to SLA until they have earned 20 credit hours, or (b) let departments know, at the earliest possible time, who these few first-year students are, before they start their first semester, so that departments can give these students special attention. The SLA dean's office should also track and maintain contact with these students.

B. Retention of first-year students in SLA courses

We recommend that SLA continue and expand SLA learning communities, evaluate and implement those practices that can be demonstrated to associate with improved retention, and provide opportunity for faculty development to improve instructor effectiveness in linked courses.

We recommend that SLA continue to monitor success of critical inquiry courses and expand implementation if results warrant.

We recommend that SLA continue to study gateway courses and their role in student retention, encourage dissemination of instructional strategies that appear to have a positive impact on retention within a gateway course, and consider linking gateway courses to learning communities or critical inquiry sections.

We recommend that SLA develop assessment tools to determine the impact of technology on instructor effectiveness and student retention.

We recommend that SLA course combination and schedule guidelines be developed for use by University College advisors and students to aid in the choice of course combinations and schedules that are not overwhelming to students.

We recommend that SLA establish a stronger SLA presence in University College.

C. Retention of SLA majors to graduation

We recommend that SLA provide departments with the following information, with which we believe departments can improve retention: (1) within three days of admission, the name of, and contact information for, each student admitted to SLA, so that the appropriate department can welcome the student; (2) approximately three weeks before the beginning of each semester, a list of students who attended the previous semester but are not registered for the present semester; (3) each semester, a list of students who are on academic probation and/or whose grade point average is less than 2.3.

We recommend that SLA continue to increase the number of scholarships available to SLA students.

We recommend that SLA work to create a more welcoming environment, by considering the creation of an SLA student lounge; by sponsoring a student newsletter, written by and for students; by continuing to find funding to encourage student involvement in faculty research; and by welcoming new students with dignified rituals and ceremonies.

We recommend that SLA celebrate and reward advising, provide advising training, and continue to support making the advising database available to departments who want to use it.

We recommend that departments undertake such activities as social events, such as picnics and sports and arts events; an informal tour, introducing students to staff, faculty, and facilities; strengthened student clubs and organizations; and increased internship opportunities.

We recommend that faculty consider providing early performance feedback; creating exercises and opportunities for students to make friends; encouraging the use of study groups; integrating service learning into the curriculum, particularly with 100-200 level courses; and asking upper-division students to mentor students in 100 -200 level courses, with compensation in the form of academic credit.

A. Retention of first-year SLA students

Any discussion of student retention must begin with definitions. Traditionally, the term *retention rate* has been defined as the percentage of first-time, full-time students retained after one year. The term *graduation rate* has been defined as the percentage of students completing degrees within six years of initial enrollment.

These measures were developed to reflect the traditional college experience: full-time attendance at residential colleges by college-prepared high school graduates. Clearly such measures have problems at IUPUI:

1. Only approximately one-third of IUPUI's annual new students enter as first-time, full-time freshmen (see Appendix I, Table 1), although this proportion has been rising (from 24% in 1993, to 35% in 2000). Thus, the common focus of retention and graduation statistics represents only a minority of students at IUPUI.

2. Many students starting at IUPUI (about 40% in a recent survey by IMIR) explicitly state their intent to transfer to another institution. Another 17% state they are uncertain about their transfer plans.

3. Of the students who graduate from IUPUI, only one in five started at IUPUI as a full-time freshman student (Appendix I, Table 2). Of those graduating, 62% transferred from another institution (25% within IU, 37% from other institutions). The standard retention statistics thus miss those classes of students (part-time and transfer) where IUPUI does a relatively better job when compared with peer institutions. (IUPUI's retention of part-time students ranks third among the "Urban 13.")

4. Many entering students are under-prepared (Appendix I, Table 3). IUPUI ranks at the bottom of its peers in both average entering SAT scores and the proportion of entering students who graduated in the top 10% of their high school classes. Other peer institutions (Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Alabama-Birmingham, Georgia State, Illinois-Chicago, Akron, Houston, Southwest Texas State, Virginia Commonwealth, Louisville, Missouri-Kansas City, Nebraska-Omaha, and Wright State) have community college systems that enroll students who require significant remedial course work. Our retention of dual and regular admits (those who meet entrance requirements) compares much more favorably to peer institutions than the overall rate. The IUPUI student population is changing over time. The proportion of the students admitted on conditional status has increased dramatically in the last five years: from 55% of the student body in 1998 to 71% in 1998. This number is now falling slightly: it was 66% in 1999. Thus even when we improve retention among regular, dual, and conditional admits, overall retention goes down as the student body shifts toward conditional admits.

5. Many students have significant external commitments (family and/or work). In surveys conducted by IMIR, students at IUPUI have significantly greater external commitments (in terms of time) than those students at peer institutions. Moreover, about 50-60% of IUPUI students who responded to surveys by IMIR on why they did not return cited this as the primary factor.

However, despite these measurement problems, the large number of students who leave IUPUI within a year and the small number who graduate within six years do raise important questions.

For SLA, first-year retention is not a major problem, since SLA has very few (usually about 30) first-year students (see "Beginners" in Appendix III, Table 1). However, the retention rate for those few students reflects badly on SLA.

We recommend that SLA either (a) not admit students to SLA until they have earned 20 credit hours, or (b) let departments know, at the earliest possible time, who these few first-year students are, before they start their first semester, so that departments can give these students special attention. The SLA dean's office should also track and maintain contact with these students.

B. Retention of first-year students in SLA courses

Instructional quality, student engagement, facilities, and technology are all interrelated components that affect student retention through what transpires in the classroom. These factors are to some degree inseparable. Furthermore, there is no clear definition of how the quality of instruction can be measured. The standardized student evaluations of teaching used by SLA consider course organization, clarity of explanation, enthusiasm, ability to stimulate thinking, knowledge of course content, instructor fairness, and the student's willingness to recommend the instructor as one set of measures of instructor effectiveness. By this measure the average SLA scores for teacher effectiveness are impressive (the SLA average was greater than 4.3 on a 5.0 scale last fall.) Of course the relevance of these figures to retention are ambiguous at best first because the evaluations are usually filled out only by those students who have successfully completed the course and second because we have no data that describes how any of these factors relate to student success.

However, if we assume that instructional quality is an important factor in retention we can at least address some of the barriers that inhibit instructional effectiveness. The committee noted that teaching is only one of the demands on a faculty member's time and it is frequently not the professional activity that is most highly prized. Again, there is little explicit data on how individual faculty members feel about this issue. However, in the latest IMIR survey of IUPUI, SLA faculty rated the overall quality of teaching in the unit highly (3.39 on a 4.0 scale). This figure is slightly higher than the perception of the quality of teaching across the institution as a whole (3.18). The survey also revealed that SLA faculty believe they are spending an adequate amount of time on teaching, but they expressed a desire to have more time for research. Similarly, there is a general belief among SLA faculty that the level of preparedness of IUPUI students is inadequate. In fact, over 79% of the faculty rated our students as fair or poor and only 3% of the respondents ranked them as excellent. It is important to note that these survey results are drawn from full-time faculty. We do not know if similar attitudes are shared among part-time faculty, who staff a large percentage of SLA courses.

There are several ongoing efforts within the school to improve instructional effectiveness. For example, in conversations with Associate Dean Barbara Jackson from University College the committee learned that a substantial number of SLA faculty have been engaged in the development and teaching of linked courses, first year experience courses, and critical inquiry courses. These efforts are directed specifically at improving retention. More to the point many of these initiatives have been developed specifically to improve retention in SLA courses. For example, the Department of Sociology has been awarded a grant to study the effectiveness of linking an introductory Sociology class (R100) with an introductory composition course (W131). In preparation for this project the Department of Sociology conducted a critical review of the pedagogy and instructional methods associated with R100. The lessons learned from these findings were then incorporated into the approach developed for the "linked" sections. It is hoped that the "learning community" created by this linkage and the coordination of assignments, goals and instructional methods will improve retention. The grant includes support for careful assessment of the program's effect on retention.

The Office of Information Management and Institutional Research (IMIR) has been carefully evaluating the impact of the above-described initiatives on student retention, including those courses offered in Liberal Arts. Their latest report (IMIR Report Volume 6, number 3; March 2001) stated that "Recent efforts to improve student retention at American colleges and universities generally follow from research findings that have demonstrated the importance of student involvement in their learning experiences, (*as well as)* faculty interaction with students . . . ") (3) Learning communities were developed in response to this research and as of last semester the vast majority of first year students were involved in such experiences. While for the institution as a whole, the effect of the learning communities on retention has yet to be demonstrated, students involved in SLA learning communities during the 1999 academic year were retained at a higher than predicted rate (70% retained vs. 51% predicted retention.) Similar data was not yet available for the year 2000. However, DFW rates in SLA learning communities for the year 2000 were higher than predicted, perhaps indicating the lack of a sustained positive impact of these efforts on first year retention.

In addition to learning communities, SLA faculty were also involved in the pilot study of the "Critical Inquiry" course. This course is designed to supplement those first year courses that "have challenging reading assignments." Anthropology A104, "Culture and Society" was designated such a course and Drs. Barbara Jackson and Gina Sanchez teamed to offer linked sections of A104 and Critical Inquiry in the Fall of 2000. Results indicated a slightly higher (but non-significant) grade point average among participants compared to non-participants (2.68 vs. 2.59) However, it is noteworthy that the nonparticipants entered the class with both a lower average SAT score and high school class ranking than nonparticipants. This may suggest that the experience had a relatively higher positive impact on student performance. Information on retention rate of these students was not available.

Another example of a school-wide initiative to improve the quality of instruction can be found in the efforts to encourage the use of innovative learning technologies in SLA courses. Workshops, teaching grants, and the incorporation of technology as an item

assessed on faculty annual reports reflect this effort. However, there is as yet no plan to assess how the incorporation of technology in SLA course affects retention.

Finally, although there is not a direct link with quality of instruction, several SLA courses have been designated "gateway" courses. These are defined as those courses most often associated with poor student retention and performance. SLA faculty who teach these courses in Anthropology, Communication Studies, English, History, Philosophy, Political Science and Sociology have been involved in assessing the reasons for the high failure and withdrawal rates of students in these courses. One consistent observation has been that student attendance during the first two weeks of the course is the best predictor of longer term student success in the course. That is, a common finding among students who fail or withdrawal is that they stop attending class after one or two weeks and then never officially withdraw or withdraw after the semester is well underway and they are officially failing. A "gateway" committee has been constituted for the university, and grants have been made available for studying and implementing ways of successfully improving retention in these courses.

We recommend that SLA continue and expand SLA learning communities, evaluate and implement those practices that can be demonstrated to associate with improved retention, and provide opportunity for faculty development to improve instructor effectiveness in linked courses.

We recommend that SLA continue to monitor success of critical inquiry courses and expand implementation if results warrant.

We recommend that SLA continue to study gateway courses and their role in student retention, encourage dissemination of instructional strategies that appear to have a positive impact on retention within a gateway course, and consider linking gateway courses to learning communities or critical inquiry sections.

We recommend that SLA develop assessment tools to determine the impact of technology on instructor effectiveness and student retention.

We recommend that SLA course combination and schedule guidelines be developed for use by University College advisors and students to aid in the choice of course combinations and schedules that are not overwhelming to students. We believe that both retention rates and DFW rates may be improved if students are advised and encouraged not to take too many of SLA's most challenging courses at the same time or before having adequate preparation. The guidelines should emphasize course prerequisites in order to assure that lack of preparation alone does not prevent student success. The guidelines should also discourage unduly difficult schedules or combinations of classes that are associated with high DFW rates.

We recommend that SLA establish a stronger SLA presence in University College (UC). SLA should create one or more SLA/UC academic advising positions, with special responsibilities for representing SLA to UC students and other advisors. This new advisor

or advisors could also develop and/or implement the suggested new guidelines for SLA course combinations and schedules that we have recommended.

C. Retention of SLA majors to graduation

If there is an abiding truism regarding retention it is that the problem is shared by everybody: faculty, secretaries, administrative assistants, graduate assistants, work-study students, deans—everybody. Getting students to persist in their studies and graduate is not somebody else's problem. It is a collective albatross, the weight of which is the difference between SLA providing campus-wide leadership or being relegated to following paths others have created.

We begin with the premise that solutions should not create extra time for faculty or impose a significant financial commitment. Given these limitations, several creative opportunities remain.

Suggestions for improving retention are found at the school, department, and individual faculty level. Many suggestions center around a basic premise: students will persist if they feel a sense of belonging or identification.

A common complaint among students is that they are treated like a number, shuffled from one nameless staff member to another. We would like to see SLA provide the best student care system in the University. Ideally, a student would never leave an office with an unanswered question or an unresolved problem. To achieve this state of affairs will require more information sharing and more rapid dissemination of information.

Departments often don't have the information needed to improve retention, and information is not given in a timely manner.

We recommend that SLA provide departments with the following information, with which we believe departments can improve retention: (1) within three days of admission, the name of, and contact information for, each student admitted to SLA, so that the appropriate department can welcome the student; (2) approximately three weeks before the beginning of each semester, a list of students who attended the previous semester but are not registered for the present semester; (3) each semester, a list of students who are on academic probation and/or whose grade point average is less than 2.3.

We recommend that SLA continue to increase the number of scholarships available to SLA students. These scholarships should be as inclusive as possible, with an emphasis on first-generation and minority students.

We recommend that SLA work to create a more welcoming environment, by considering the creation of an SLA student lounge; by sponsoring a student newsletter, written by and for students; by continuing to find funding to encourage

student involvement in faculty research; and by welcoming new students with dignified rituals and ceremonies.

SLA must continue to improve academic advising. There can be no doubt that academic advising is an integral part of retaining students. IUPUI students place great value on the importance of academic advising. In the 1999 IUPUI Student Satisfaction Survey, students ranked getting information about major requirements and academic advising as the 6th and 8th most important aspects of their IUPUI experience among 63 items.

SLA has made strides toward improving advising as shown in Appendix III, Table 5. Given the significant relationship between advising and retention, SLA must continue to improve. There is no reason why SLA should not be rated as the best school for academic advising.

We recommend that SLA celebrate and reward advising, provide advising training, and continue to support making the advising database available to departments who want to use it. Advising is an integral part of the teaching process and, like teaching, is a learned skill. There is currently no formal training of advisors, and new faculty and/or advisors are often given little instruction or guidance. Training sessions could include "Introduction to Academic Advising," "Advising Minority Students," "Advising At-Risk Students," "Advising First-Generation Students," and "Using Technology to Improve Advising." Exchange of information between and among advisors and staff is a crucial component of an effective advising system, particularly in departments where there is more than one advisor. The on-line database presently being used by the Department of Communication Studies has greatly improved the coordination of information among advisors and staff. Notes taken by one advisor are easily accessed by other advisors. Moreover, the database allows one to discover, for example, students who have not seen their advisor in a specified time, students who have not selected a capstone, and students who are first year and may need more attention.

To be sure, each department has its own unique retention challenges. The following suggestions may or may not be practical or relevant for any particular department. Moreover, some of these suggestions are already common practice among some departments.

We recommend that departments undertake such activities as social events, such as picnics and sports and arts events; an informal tour, introducing students to staff, faculty, and facilities; strengthened student clubs and organizations; and increased internship opportunities.

Informal, outside the classroom conversation has been shown to improve retention. Faculty should initiate these conversations. Genuine expressions of concern go a long ways toward making students feel they are not simply another number. Many students respond best to less lecturing, more group work and experiential learning exercises, and peer teaching.

We recommend that faculty consider providing early performance feedback; creating exercises and opportunities for students to make friends; encouraging the use of study groups; integrating service learning into the curriculum, particularly with 100-200 level courses; and asking upper-division students to mentor students in 100 -200 level courses, with compensation in the form of academic credit.

Appendix I: Selected characteristics of students entering IUPUI

(all data from V. Borden and K. Burton, IMIR, IUPUI).

Table 1: Mode of admission of students to IUPUI Students tracked by standard retention statistic (in bold).

Mode of admission	***1993***	***1994***	***1995***	***1996***	***1997***	***1998***	***1999***	***2000***
Fall First-Time Full-Time Freshmen	**1416**	**1373**	**1742**	**1989**	**2040**	**2435**	**2440**	
All other First-Time Freshmen	1564	1391	1573	1615	1585	1620	1617	
Transfers	1868	1870	2221	2276	2429	2380	2321	
IU Intercampus transfers	1169	1164	1199	1228	1218	1179	1074	
Total	6017	5798	6735	7108	7272	7614	7452	
Percent Fall First-Time Full-Time Freshmen	**24%**	**24%**	**26%**	**28%**	**28%**	**32%**	**33%**	**35%**

Table 2: Data for one year (1998-99) to illustrate entry mode of students who graduated from IUPUI.

Undergraduate Degree Recipients by Entry Mode	***1998-99***
Full Time Beginners	**21%**
Part-Time Beginners	12%
Transfers	37%
Inter Campus Transfers	25%
Non Degree	5%

Table 3: Relative proportions of entering students who do not meet unconditional admission requirements[1]

	1994	**1995**	**1996**	**1997**	**1998**	**1999**
Total Students Admitted	1990	2442	2766	2712	3186	3147
Direct/Dual Admits	362	437	416	403	400	432
UC – Regular	527	610	590	607	522	634
UC - Conditional	1101	1395	1760	1702	2264	2081
Admitted on conditional status	**55%**	**57%**	**64%**	**63%**	**71%**	**66%**

[1] Indiana University Board of Trustees requirement for unconditional admission is that students graduate in the top half of their high school class, attain an SAT score above the average for test takers in Indiana, and complete a minimum of college preparatory courses in high schools. Those students who do not meet these criteria at IUPUI are now (post 1997) called conditional admits.

Appendix II: Retention of first-time full-time students in large enrolling SLA courses

Low retention rates are closely related to high failure rates, especially in first year courses. The courses of particular concern to SLA in this regard are listed below.

Table 1: First-time freshman retention in the SLA courses in top 25 freshmen courses (Note: this is just one semester - Fall: 1999)

	No. 1st time Freshmen	Avg HS % Rank	DFW Rate	**One Year Retention Rate**			
				All 1st Time Freshmen	Successful completers	DF W	Difference
ANTH A104	105	48	36.5	47.1	57.6	28.9	28.7
COMM C110	296	49	30.4	56.4	67.5	31.1	36.4
COMM C180	131	45	22.5	54.2	65.0	17.2	47.8
ENG W001	372	41	25.0	55.4	64.9	26.9	38.0
ENG W131	1014	49	29.4	58.3	70.7	28.5	42.2
HIST H113	82	43	40.2	53.7	69.4	30.3	39.1
POLS Y103	86	40	47.7	45.3	53.3	36.6	16.7
SOC R100	181	42	47.2	46.2	63.2	27.1	36.1

Appendix III: Retention of SLA majors

Table 1: Retention of new SLA students

A. Lower division courses (students with freshman or sophomore standing)

Beginners are those relevant to the standard retention statistic. Clearly there are a wide variety of experiences for SLA students, and there are very small numbers in each category. At the lower division level, SLA is doing a better job of retaining students in all other categories than those beginning in SLA.

Entry Type	Entry Year	Enter Cohort	Retained by SLA		Retained by Other IU School/ Campus		Not Retained within IU System	
			N	%	N	%	N	%
Beginners	1995	30	13	43.3%	5	16.7%	12	40.0%
	1996	25	13	52.0%	6	24.0%	6	24.0%
	1997	19	8	42.1%	5	26.3%	6	31.6%
	1998	29	14	48.3%	1	3.4%	14	48.3%
	1999	32	16	50.0%	2	6.3%	14	43.8%
External Transfers	1995	27	18	66.7%	4	14.8%	5	18.5%
	1996	17	11	64.7%	1	5.9%	5	29.4%
	1997	26	16	61.5%	2	7.7%	8	30.8%
	1998	32	15	46.9%	2	6.3%	15	46.9%
	1999	32	20	62.5%	1	3.1%	11	34.4%
Transfer from University College	1995	63	40	63.5%	7	11.1%	16	25.4%
	1996	79	49	62.0%	9	11.4%	21	26.6%
	1997	77	49	63.6%	12	15.6%	16	20.8%
	1998	86	39	45.3%	16	18.6%	31	36.0%
	1999	104	66	63.5%	9	8.7%	29	27.9%

Transfer from Other IUPUI Programs	1995	11	6	54.5%	0	0.0%	5	45.5%
	1996	11	4	36.4%	2	18.2%	5	45.5%
	1997	21	14	66.7%	0	0.0%	7	33.3%
	1998	21	13	61.9%	3	14.3%	5	23.8%
	1999	13	9	69.2%	2	15.4%	2	15.4%
Transfer from Other IU Campuses	1995	17	8	47.1%	2	11.8%	7	41.2%
	1996	20	13	65.0%	4	20.0%	3	15.0%
	1997	13	8	61.5%	2	15.4%	3	23.1%
	1998	13	6	46.2%	1	7.7%	6	46.2%
	1999	8	6	75.0%	0	0.0%	2	25.0%
All Others*	1995	15	8	53.3%	1	6.7%	6	40.0%
	1996	17	10	58.8%	2	11.8%	5	29.4%
	1997	14	9	64.3%	0	0.0%	5	35.7%
	1998	14	8	57.1%	1	7.1%	5	35.7%
	1999	10	6	60.0%	2	20.0%	2	20.0%

B. Upper division courses (students with freshman or sophomore standing)

Transfer from University College	Upper Division	1995	35	19	54.3%	6	17.1%	10	28.6%
		1996	45	30	66.7%	4	8.9%	11	24.4%
		1997	50	33	66.0%	6	12.0%	11	22.0%
		1998	64	49	76.6%	5	7.8%	10	15.6%
		1999	68	47	69.1%	10	14.7%	11	16.2%
Transfer from other IUPUI programs	Upper Division	1995	54	36	66.7%	3	5.6%	15	27.8%
		1996	48	35	72.9%	3	6.3%	10	20.8%
		1997	56	36	64.3%	5	8.9%	15	26.8%
		1998	47	24	51.1%	3	6.4%	20	42.6%
		1999	62	36	58.1%	6	9.7%	20	32.3%
Transfer from other IU campuses	Upper Division	1995	56	18	32.1%	24	42.9%	14	25.0%
		1996	48	13	27.1%	18	37.5%	17	35.4%
		1997	54	18	33.3%	17	31.5%	19	35.2%
		1998	48	13	27.1%	20	41.7%	15	31.3%
		1999	34	12	35.3%	13	38.2%	9	26.5%
External Transfers	Upper Division	1995	34	15	44.1%	2	5.9%	17	50.0%
		1996	19	8	42.1%	0	0.0%	11	57.9%
		1997	15	11	73.3%	2	13.3%	2	13.3%
		1998	32	19	59.4%	0	0.0%	13	40.6%
		1999	33	21	63.6%	2	6.1%	10	30.3%

Table 2: Retention of SLA students through to graduation

This includes all students and is not limited to those with full-time status. Retention clearly improves after the sophomore year, but not quite as much as one might expect. When students are stratified by demographic and/or preparedness, analysis of variance showed cumulative GPA (both IU and total) were significantly different (at $p<.05$ level) for retained vs. not retained students for all class levels, gender was significant for seniors and ethnicity was significant for sophomores and seniors.

			Retained by School of Liberal Arts					Retained by Other IU School/Campus		% Retained by SLA or Other Schl/Cmp	Not Retained within IU System	
			Re-Enrolled									
Class	Year	Total Students	Same Class	Ad-vanced Class	Earned Degree	Total Retained by SLA	Percent Retained by SLA	N	% of Total		N	% of Total
F	1995	99	16	32	0	48	48.5%	9	9.1%	57.6%	42	42.4%
	1996	79	11	26	0	37	46.8%	12	15.2%	62.0%	30	38.0%
	1997	83	10	28	0	38	45.8%	13	15.7%	61.4%	32	38.6%
	1998	86	11	27	0	38	44.2%	6	7.0%	51.2%	42	48.8%
	1999	106	14	34	0	48	45.3%	10	9.4%	54.7%	48	45.3%
S	1995	246	52	88	5	145	58.9%	25	10.2%	69.1%	76	30.9%
	1996	236	62	79	4	145	61.4%	22	9.3%	70.8%	69	29.2%
	1997	252	46	110	2	158	62.7%	23	9.1%	71.8%	71	28.2%
	1998	263	50	83	8	141	53.6%	28	10.6%	64.3%	94	35.7%
	1999	236	60	87	4	151	64.0%	22	9.3%	73.3%	63	26.7%
J	1995	336	64	136	4	204	60.7%	32	9.5%	70.2%	100	29.8%
	1996	303	74	124	3	201	66.3%	29	9.6%	75.9%	73	24.1%
	1997	304	72	120	4	196	64.5%	30	9.9%	74.3%	78	25.7%
	1998	344	73	150	7	230	66.9%	39	11.3%	78.2%	75	21.8%

	1999	341	74	130	10	214	62.8%	36	10.6%	73.3%	91	26.7%
Sen	1995	534	193	0	169	362	67.8%	46	8.6%	76.4%	126	23.6%
	1996	477	159	0	147	306	64.2%	40	8.4%	72.5%	131	27.5%
	1997	469	162	0	144	306	65.2%	42	9.0%	74.2%	121	25.8%
	1998	471	164	0	143	307	65.2%	32	6.8%	72.0%	132	28.0%
	1999	514	190	0	158	348	67.7%	33	6.4%	74.1%	133	25.9%

Note: Figures exclude non-SLA majors.

Definitions:

Total Students - The number of students enrolled for a given fall semester in SLA excluding non-majors.

Re-enrolled Same Class - The number of students who re-enrolled within SLA one year later with the same class standing.

Re-enrolled Advanced Class - The number of students who re-enrolled within the SLA one year later and moved to the next class level (freshmen advanced to sophomore, etc.)

Earned Degree - Earned a degree or certificate in SLA program after the beginning of the base fall semester and before the start of the following fall semester.

Total Retained by SLA - The total number of students enrolled in SLA for a given fall semester who either re-enrolled in SLA for the following fall or earned a degree prior to the following fall (re-enrolled same class + re-enrolled advanced class + earned degree).

Percent Retained by SLA - Total Retained by SLA / Total Students

Retained by Other IU School/Campus - The number or percent of the students enrolled in SLA for a given fall semester who either enrolled in another IUPUI school or at another IU campus the following fall semester or who earned a degree from another IUPUI school or other IU campus prior to the start of the following fall.

% Retained by SLA or Other Schl/Cmp - Percent Retained by SLA + Retained by Other IU School/Campus

Not Retained within IU System - The number or percent of SLA students enrolled for a given fall semester who (1) did not re-enroll the following fall semester at any IU campus or (2) earn a degree after the start of the base fall semester and prior to the start of the following fall semester from any IU campus.

Table 3: Comparison of SLA and campus data

Class	Year	Campus Rate[1]	SLA Rate[2]	Net Difference
Freshmen	1995	64.2%	57.6%	-6.6%
	1996	62.4%	62.0%	-0.4%
	1997	62.3%	61.4%	-0.9%
	1998	64.6%	51.2%	-13.4%
	1999	62.9%	54.7%	-8.2%
Sophomore	1995	75.6%	69.1%	-6.5%
	1996	75.6%	70.8%	-4.8%
	1997	75.6%	71.8%	-3.8%
	1998	74.5%	64.3%	-10.3%
	1999	76.1%	73.3%	-2.8%
Junior	1995	78.2%	70.2%	-7.9%
	1996	78.1%	75.9%	-2.2%
	1997	77.6%	74.3%	-3.3%
	1998	79.8%	78.2%	-1.6%
	1999	78.5%	73.3%	-5.2%
Senior	1995	81.6%	76.4%	-5.2%
	1996	81.4%	72.5%	-8.8%
	1997	81.1%	74.2%	-6.9%
	1998	81.3%	72.0%	-9.3%
	1999	81.7%	74.1%	-7.6%

[1]The campus rate is the percent of students enrolled in degree-granting schools on the Indianapolis campus who re-enrolled the following semester or earned a degree within the IU System.

[2]The SLA rate is the percent of students enrolled in SLA excluding non-majors who re-enrolled the following semester or earned a degree within the IU System.

Table 4: Overall retention rates by school: One-year retention rate (%) and number of enrolled students

School	**93**	**94**	**95**	**96**	**97**
Allied Health	73% (1139)	76% (1170)	77% (1131)	77% (1050)	78% (978)
Business	85% (869)	85% (813)	86% (831)	87% (862)	87% (897)
Continuing Studies	66% (800)	70% (685)	67% (703)	66% (799)	841 (69%)
Education	80% (1216)	79% (1261)	79% (1267)	77% (1364)	76% (1340)
Eng & Tech	74% (2265)	73% (2074)	74% (1960)	73% (1905)	77% (1897)
Herron	74% (482)	79% (481)	76% (525)	78% (571)	72% (664)
Journalism	81% (75)	72% (76)	85% (65)	72% (79)	83% (65)
Liberal Arts	**72% (2018)**	**70% (2062)**	**71% (1864)**	**70% (1613)**	**71% (1481)**
Nursing	78% (1734)	84% (1189)	86% (981)	89% (843)	89% (750)
Phys Educ	71% (325)	71% (329)	70% (372)	74% (383)	70% (376)
Science	76% (1056)	76% (1109)	75% (1214)	75% (1306)	73% (1274)
Social Work	94% (166)	86% (173)	88% (186)	91% (177)	93% (165)
SPEA	76% (655)	78% (664)	80% (656)	77% (623)	77% (616)
UEC	58% (4105)	61% (3993)	63% (4262)	61% (4482)	63% (4831)
UEC_p	49% (2860)	48% (2655)	51% (3040)	49% (3377)	49% (3421)
Total	68% (19894)	69% (18867)	70% (19206)	68% (19572)	69% (19723)

Table 5: Mean comparison of SLA and campus-wide responses to the item "academic advising in your major department or school"

Year		Mean	Mean difference
1996	SLA	3.29	
	Campus-wide	3.42	-.13
1997	SLA	3.29	
	Campus-wide	3.50	-.21
1998	SLA	3.31	-.26*
	Campus-wide	3.57	
1999	SLA	3.48	.06
	Campus-wide	3.42	

* Denotes a statistically significant difference between SLA and all other schools at p. < .05.

Note: The IMIR survey uses a five point scale, ranging from -2 (very dissatisfied) to 2 (very satisfied). For purposes of this report, the scale has been changed to 1 (very dissatisfied) to 5 (very satisfied).