## Bridge to Excellence Year 8 Report

December 14, 2009 Prepared by: B2E Coordinator Mike Bogue

## Bridge to Excellence Retention Program Year 8 Administration

For Year 8 (Fall 2008), the Bridge to Excellence (B2E) program was open to all first-time, full-time freshmen enrolling at Arkansas Tech University's main campus, just as it had been for the previous six years. **Mike Bogue** served as B2E Program Coordinator; this is the sixth year Mr. Bogue has worked with B2E.

In addition to being Dean of Students, **Dr. Jerry Forbes** served as Retention Services Director from July 1, 2008, through October 31, 2008. On November 1, 2008, **Mr. Matthew Hauger** became the supervisor of Retention Services; Mr. Hauger is an Associate Dean, and his full title is Director of Student Success.

For Year 8, Retention Services used Form B of Noel-Levitz's online College Student Inventory (CSI), just as it had the previous year. The CSI is a standardized survey designed to gauge a student's self-perceived academic, financial, and social readiness for college.

The CSI was administered on a daily basis from April 28, 2008, through August 31, 2008. After freshmen registered for their fall classes in the Academic Advising Center in Bryan Hall 101, they took the CSI in Room 247 of the Doc Bryan Student Services Building.

#### Bridge to Excellence Retention Program Mission

The B2E program's mission -- to help freshmen make a successful transition from high school (or work) to college -- remained the same. The program's continuing goals included:

(1) increasing Arkansas Tech University's freshmen retention rate,

(2) boosting freshmen participants' GPA's,

(3) and improving Arkansas Tech University's graduation rates.

#### **Demographics**

For Year 8, B2E defined a program participant as a student who was a first-time, full-time freshman who both (1) took the CSI and (2) met at least

one time with his or her assigned mentor during the fall semester. A nonparticipant was a student who did not meet with his or her mentor.

According to these definitions, 890 first-time, full-time freshmen participated in the program for Year 8. Since 1,260 first-time, full-time students entered Tech for the Fall 2008 semester, this meant that 370 new students did not participate.

The gender and ethnicity demographics of Year 8 B2E participants practically mirrored those of the Fall 2008 freshman class as a whole:

	<b>B2E FIRST-TIME</b> ,	ALL ATU	
<b>FALL 2007</b>	FULL-TIME	FIRST-TIME,	
	FRESHMAN	<b>FULL-TIME</b>	
	PARTICIPANTS	FRESHMEN	
Female	52.7%	52.3%	
Male	47.2%	47.7%	
Black/African			
American	5.1%	5.6%	
American			
Indian/Alaskan	1.2%	1.74%	
Asian or Pacific			
Islander	1.0%	1.58%	
Hispanic/Latino	3.1%	3.1%	
White/Caucasian	87.7%	87.5%	
Other or Non-			
Resident Alien	1.8%	0.4%	

### **Intervention**

For Year 8 of the B2E program, 124 mentors took part – 79 faculty and 45 staff. The definition of a mentor continued to be a faculty or staff volunteer who helps his or her assigned freshmen to successfully make the transition from high school (or work) to college. Mentors helped their mentees understand and evaluate their CSI results and also acted as the campus contact person when a mentee had a question or concern; mentors offered mentees encouragement, advice, and feedback. The core of the program remained the same – a faculty or staff member establishing a relationship with his or her assigned students.

B2E Coordinator Mike Bogue assigned each first-time, full-time, main campus freshman to a faculty or staff mentor. For the third year in a row, all faculty mentors were assigned mentees whose majors either fell under the faculty mentor's department or, barring that, under the faculty mentor's academic school. Meanwhile, deciding students were assigned primarily to Student Services staff.

Each mentor was given two CSI Student Reports for his or her mentees; the mentor would keep one, then give the other to the mentee during the first mentor/mentee meeting. Based on the student's responses, the CSI Student Report included three sections:

- Student Background Information.
- Motivational Assessment.
- Specific Recommendations.

The mentor could use this information as a springboard to identify and encourage student strengths. In addition, the CSI could be used to determine what (if any) college-related challenges the student might have or anticipate having. When appropriate, the mentor could then refer the student to any relevant campus support service(s) and schedule a follow-up meeting. (Campus support services include academic help labs, administrative departments, clubs and organizations, etc.)

At mid-term, B2E Coordinator Mike Bogue supplied each mentor with his or her mentees' mid-term grades. Mentors were encouraged to use this information to follow-up with their mentees, cheering on those mentees who were doing well academically and offering assistance/advice to those mentees who were struggling academically. At the close of the semester, mentors were also supplied with each mentee's final grades.

#### **General Conclusions**

# All Fall 2008 B2E participants and non-participants were main campus freshmen only.

For Fall 2008 to Spring 2009, the retention rate for these main campus B2E participants (n=890) was higher than that for main campus non-participants (n=370). According to the 11<sup>th</sup> Class Day Report data for Spring 2009, 87.64% of B2E partakers returned for the Spring 2009 semester, while only 78.65% of non-partakers came back. This means that the retention rate for B2E participants was 8.99% higher than that for non-

participants.

For Fall 2008 to Fall 2009, the retention rate for these main campus B2E participants (n=890) was also higher than that for main campus non-participants (n=370). According to the  $11^{th}$  Class Day Report data for Fall 2009, 75.17% of B2E partakers returned for the Fall 2009 semester, while only 60.81% of non-partakers came back. This means that the retention rate for B2E participants was 14.36% higher than that for non-participants.

The GPA (Grade Point Average) of both groups was also impacted, with B2E participants having a higher average GPA than non-participants. At the end of the Fall 2008 semester, the cumulative GPA for B2E partakers was 2.878, as compared to the overall GPA of 2.293 for non-partakers. This means B2E participants had a fall GPA that was 0.585 higher than the fall GPA of non-participants.

Appendix A contains the retention rate data for Years 1-8 of the program, while Appendix B contains the retention rate data for Years 3-8 of the program (B2E was opened to all freshmen in Fall 2003).

Appendix C contains the fall semester GPA data for Years 1-8.

Next, Appendix D shows the Arkansas Tech retention rates for freshman cohorts from 2001 on.

Finally, Appendix E provides the freshman cohort graduation rates by B2E program year.

# BRIDGE TO EXCELLENCE YEAR 8 REPORT Appendix A

# ATU Freshman Cohort Retention Rates by B2E Program Year \*

Semester/	Number of	B2E	Non-	Percentage	
Year			Participants'	Difference	
	Program	Retention	Retention	In favor of	
	Participants	Rate	Rate	B2E	
FALL TO SPRING					
Year 1 (2001)	105	89.52%	81.91%	7.61%	
Year 2 (2002)	310	86.77%	79.53%	7.24%	
Year 3 (2003)	751	90.01%	74.83%	15.18%	
Year 4 (2004)	811	87.92%	70.10%	17.82%	
Year 5 (2005)	855	88.07%	72.47%	15.60%	
Year 6 (2006)	764	88.99%	72.07%	16.92%	
Year 7 (2007)	885	89.15%	76.40%	12.75%	
Year 8 (2008)	890	87.64%	78.65%	8.99%	
			AVERAGE : 12.76%		
FALL TO FALL			-		
Year 1 (2001)	105	82.86%	66.00%	16.86%	
Year 2 (2002)	310	72.26%	63.60%	8.66%	
Year 3 (2003)	751	76.83%	59.01%	17.83%	
Year 4 (2004)	811	73.98%	53.20%	20.78%	
Year 5 (2005)	855	74.04%	58.71%	15.33%	
Year 6 (2006)	764	73.95%	54.85%	19.10%	
Year 7 (2007)	885	73.11%	58.49%	14.72%	
Year 8 (2008)	890	75.17%	60.81%	14.36%	
			AVERAGE : 15.95%		

\* Data from Arkansas Tech University Institutional Research.

## **BRIDGE TO EXCELLENCE YEAR 8 REPORT** Appendix B

# ATU Freshman Cohort Retention Rates by B2E Program Year Since <u>Full Implementation</u> (Fall 2003)\*

Semester/ Year	Number of B2E Program Participants	B2E Participants' Retention Rate	Non- Participants' Retention Rate	Percentage Difference In favor of B2E
Fall to Spring				
Year 3 (2003)	751	90.01%	74.83%	15.18%
Year 4 (2004)	811	87.92%	70.10%	17.82%
Year 5 (2005)	855	88.07%	72.47%	15.60%
Year 6 (2006)	764	88.99%	72.07%	16.92%
Year 7 (2007)	885	89.15%	76.40%	12.75%
Year 8 (2008)	890	87.64%	78.65%	8.99%
		88.63 %	AVERAGE	: 14.54%
Fall to Fall				
Year 3 (2003)	751	76.83%	59.01%	17.82%
Year 4 (2004)	811	73.98%	53.20%	20.78%
Year 5 (2005)	855	74.04%	58.71%	15.33%
Year 6 (2006)	764	73.95%	54.85%	19.10%
Year 7 (2007)	885	73.11%	58.39%	14.72%
Year 8 (2008)	890	75.17	60/81%	14.36%
		74.38%	AVERAGE	: 17.02%

\* Data from Arkansas Tech University Institutional Research. Fall 2001 and 2002 were B2E pilot studies. B2E was opened up to all freshmen beginning in Fall 2003.

## **BRIDGE TO EXCELLENCE YEAR 8 REPORT**

## Appendix C: ATU Freshman Cohort Grade Point Average (GPA) Comparison by B2E Program Year \*

\* Data from Arkansas Tech University Institutional Research.

Semester/Year	B2E	Non-	Difference
	Participants	Participants	
End of Fall (1st Semester)			
Year 1 (2001)	NA	NA	NA
Year 2 (2002)	2.886	2.379	0.507
Year 3 (2003)	2.872	2.321	0.551
Year 4 (2004)	2.780	2.323	0.457
Year 5 (2005)	2.810	2.388	0.422
Year 6 (2006)	2.875	2.240	0.635
Year 7 (2007)	2.746	2.181	0.565
Year 8 (2008)	2.878	2.293	0.585
		<b>AVERAGE:</b>	0.532
End of Fall (2nd Semester)			
Year 1 (2001)	NA	NA	NA
Year 2 (2002)	2.888	2.510	0.378
Year 3 (2003)	2.885	2.371	0.514
Year 4 (2004)	2.769	2.395	0.374
Year 5 (2005)	2.827	2.541	0.286
Year 6 (2006)	2.877	2.439	0.438
		<b>AVERAGE:</b>	0.398
End of Fall (3rd Semester)			
Year 1 (2001)	3.056	2.666	0.390
Year 2 (2002)	2.955	2.670	0.285
Year 3 (2003)	2.945	2.568	0.377
Year 4 (2004)	2.910	2.594	0.316
Year 5 (2005)	2.920	2.696	0.224
Year 6 (2006)	2.957	2.539	0.418
		AVERAGE	: 0.335

# BRIDGE TO EXCELLENCE YEAR 8 REPORT Appendix D

# ATU Freshmen Cohort Retention Rates 2001-2008\* (First-Time, Full-Time, Degree-Seeking)

<sup>\*</sup> Most recent data from Arkansas Tech University Institutional Research. Data excludes cohort students who graduated within 2-6 years.

Cohort Group	First Semester	First Year	Second Year	Third Year	Fourth Year	Fifth Year
(Total Number)	(Fall to Spring)	(Fall to Fall)				
2001 (1205)	82.8%	67.5%	53.0%	46.8%	24.4%	10.4%
2002 (1170)	81.5%	65.9%	53.4%	46.6%	22.8%	10.4%
2003 (1339)	83.4%	69.0%	56.2%	49.9%	25.7%	10.1%
2004 (1296)	81.2%	66.2%	51.5%	46.1%	24.8%	
2005 (1320)	82.6%	68.6%	55.5%	48.7%		
2006 (1300)	82.2%	66.1%	49.9%			
2007 (1368)	84.7%	67.9%				
2008 (1260)	85.0%	71.03%				

# **BRIDGE TO EXCELLENCE YEAR 8 REPORT** Appendix E

# ATU Freshmen Cohort Graduation Rates by B2E Program Year \* (First-Time, Full-Time, Degree-Seeking)

h					
Cohort	B2E	Graduated	Graduated	Graduated	Eventually
Group	Participation	in 4 Years	in 5 Years	in 6 Years	Graduated
2001	B2E (N=105) NON-B2E	37.14% 18.27%	56.19% 31.73%	56.19% 36.36%	59.05% 39.36%
	(N=1,100) ENTIRE COHORT (N=1,205)	19.92%	33.86%	38.09%	<u> </u>
	B2E (N=310)	25.16%	43.55%	48.06%	48.71%
2002	NON-B2E (N=860)	15.93%	27.79%	33.72%	34.53%
	ENTIRE COHORT (N=1,170)	18.38%	31.97%	37.52%	38.29%
	B2E (N=751)	26.36%	45.41%		
2003	NON-B2E (N=588)	11.56%	22.96%		
	ENTIRE COHORT (N=1,339)	19.87%	35.55%		
2004	B2E (N=811)	20.10%			
	NON-B2E (N=485)	9.28%			
	ENTIRE COHORT (N=1,296)	16.05%			

\* Data from Arkansas Tech University Institutional Research.