Infrastructure for Coordinated Assessment: Standard Two

In this chapter, we have chosen to focus on our capacity to have a “coordinated” assessment process for student learning. We offer our notable successes and the areas identified for improvement by the Campus Outcome Teams in the areas of General Education, degree programs, curriculum review process, and support for student success, paying particular attention to advising and retention. We link these to our capacity to implement our new mission, vision, and values.

Assessment of Student Learning (CFR 2.2, 2.4, 2.7)

Faculty and academic administrator discussions during the WASC proposal development process identified two dominant needs required to address assessment activities. The first calls for coordinating student-learning assessment to eliminate unnecessary duplication of reporting activities (e.g., 5 Year Program Reviews, CSU Accountability Reports, WASC Accreditation, specialized accreditation, tenure track requests) while recognizing the different purposes, audiences, and/or criteria for review and evaluation of these reports. Second, these reports need to be used in meaningful, explicit, and transparent ways to make programmatic decisions. The multiple reports, which departments have had to prepare, have resulted in increasing frustration and cynicism among the faculty, who see few results from hours of labor. Some faculty see learning assessment as one more unfunded mandate that is intrusive, threatening to academic freedom, and that presages loss of institutional autonomy. In addition to these two areas, another concern is the need to coordinate the assessment of student learning across our multiple campuses.

Through the WASC Campus Outcome Team discussions, CSUH has articulated three purposes for coordinating assessment of student learning outcomes and integrating the results into program and curricular review.

1. **Accountability**: To demonstrate to students, parents, Board of Trustees, WASC, and the publics it serves that CSUH is providing quality education;
2. **Program Improvement**: To provide program faculty, staff, and administrators with timely information and feedback that ensures a process by which there is an institutional commitment for quality program improvement; and
3. **Program and Resource Alignment**: To provide the means to ensure that CSUH offers the appropriate array of academic programs and that institutional resources align effectively with the academic programs’ needs.

General Education (CFR 2.2)

CSUH’s General Education (GE) program aims to provide students with an academically rich, multicultural educational experience, consistent with our new Mission Statement. The 1995 WASC accreditation report offered a critique that focused on the smorgasbord of courses resulting in a lack of curricular coherence and no clear purpose for general education. The university made dramatic changes in the lower division GE component. The new program, begun in fall 1998, features yearlong general education learning communities (aka “Clusters”) for freshmen students. The Clusters are comprised of thematically integrated courses in Natural Sciences, Humanities, and/or Social Science with thematic links connecting communication,
composition, information literacy courses, and a freshman seminar in each learning community.  

[Sample Freshmen Year]  These clusters give students a peer community to support learning, and faculty and social connections essential for student retention and academic success that are often missing on a commuter campus.² 

The GE program recently underwent a 5-year program review that took two-years (2001 to 2003).  Many constituencies and an outside reviewer were consulted.  Reactions varied widely.  The university Committee on Instruction and Curriculum (CIC) recommended several changes, which were approved by the Academic Senate.  These changes included the elimination of the mandatory sophomore cluster, a reduction from 3 to 2 units in general studies, and an increase from 1 to 2 units in information literacy. 

The Clusters have been the focus of the most intensive and consistent assessment effort on this university and serve as a model for degree programs. Assessment, mostly indirect measures of program outcomes for the first six years, began as CSUH offered its first freshman learning community clusters in fall 1998. We can now document that CSUH students who have participated in the learning community program, when compared to freshman students who entered before 1998, stay in school longer and perform better on the University Writing Skills Test than other first-time test takers. Learning community students report significant interaction with and learning from those who are different from them in culture, race, religion, and other areas. The impact reported by CSUH students is above levels reported by students in our national comparison group [G.E. Assessment Report 1995-2002]. Analysis of assessment data has led to many changes, most in the freshman seminar course (General Studies 1010, 1011, 1012, 1013). 

More direct and authentic assessment is now possible with approval of a GE mission statement, passed by the Academic Senate on June 3, 2003, and approved learning outcomes, passed by the Academic Senate in winter 2004 and fall 2004 for most GE requirements [G.E. Mission/Outcomes Senate Approval]. The mission statement expresses the goal that graduates make measurable progress toward becoming educated persons in a diverse society. The learning outcomes describe expectations for entry-level and upper division students, and allow CSUH to move from mostly standardized measures of students’ perceptions of their learning and experiences to more authentic and direct measures of student learning through embedded assessment. 

Four freshman learning community clusters are currently designing embedded assessment strategies. Faculty teams will analyze the data during summer 2005. All courses approved for the 2004-09 GE program are expected to be engaged in directly assessing student acquisition of GE learning outcomes through embedded strategies by the end of the 2006-07 academic year. GE’s assessment plan includes course-embedded assessments, student evaluations, University Writing Skills pre- and post-test data, retention and graduation figures, student grades, and standardized assessments of student expectations and experiences for comparison to a national data set. 

In the freshmen learning communities right now, the richest part of multicultural learning comes from the interactions of students. The freshman class is the most diverse class in an already diverse student body. However, the faculty who teach in freshman learning communities do not reflect the class’ diversity, except in gender. Two learning community themes deal with issues
directly related to multicultural issues: Viewing Diversity (social science), with a focus on a culturally and racially diverse world and Gender in the Arts, Literature, and Society (humanities). These two learning communities are among those that fill most quickly. To meet student interest in themes about human diversity, the GE Coordinator is meeting with faculty who are interested in developing new learning communities with themes that make the multicultural nature of our communities, state, and nation and/or the experience of racism, sexism, and homophobia a focus of the learning. Such themes have the potential to support deep inquiry into and difficult dialogues about the experiences and issues that arise daily and offer students’ personally meaningful and supportive learning. Two General Education Program goals [G.E. Outcomes – Multicultural Competency] address multicultural competency; General Studies, Humanities, Social Science, and Cultural Groups and Women’s learning outcomes support these goals.

The Office of General Education sits in a difficult position vis-à-vis academic departments that have responsibility for courses and faculty teaching courses that carry GE credit. Assessment data may or may not have an effect on who is teaching what content for general education. Frequent and late changes in teaching assignments in freshman learning communities endanger thematic integration and collaboration—essential characteristics of learning communities. More lecturers teach in freshman learning communities than is ideal to create student-faculty connections that continue beyond the first year. Retention, tenure, and promotion practices seemingly reward faculty for teaching major and not general education courses. Some believe that the university currently provides limited recognition for the additional work required to teach in thematically integrated and collaboratively taught learning communities. The General Education COT concluded that it would be ideal if all department chairs and faculty shared the vision of a dynamic and evolving learning community program that engages, challenges, and supports freshmen learning.

**Degree Programs (CFR 2.2)**
During the past seven years, CSUH has increased its capacity to integrate and institutionalize assessment of student learning. To date all degree programs have identified student learning outcomes and almost all degree programs, including graduate programs, have in place mission and goal statements, indicators, and identification of entry and exit courses where the assessment can be included. [Degree Program Outcomes] Progress on the actual collection and use of assessment data have been hindered by a lack of adequate resources. All academic programs need to measure the outcome indicators and to use these results for program improvement.

The following chronology demonstrates what we have accomplished as well as what is needed to coordinate and actualize efforts:

**1998:** University Goals and Objectives [University Goals & Objectives 1998-2002] require assessment plans at the department level and the Office of Faculty Development launches an “Assessment Plan Competition” with monetary awards.

**2000:** the CSUH—WASC 2000 Five-Year Report using the University Goals and Objectives and the CSU Accountability Initiative as organizing criteria finds almost all programs in the “discussion phase.” An overly ambitious timeline is set for all disciplines to have completed
assessment plans and begin collecting data. A CSUH Assessment Council is convened. [CSUH-WASC 2000 Five Year Report: volume 1 / volume 2]

2001: the CSUH Faculty Senate adopts new Policies and Procedures for Five Year Reviews and Plans that require programs to include the “Outcomes Assessment” document and to summarize what has been learned from this information, what steps the program has taken in response, and what further steps should be taken." [5-Year Program Review Policy on Outcomes]. The CSUH Assessment Council initiates a joint statement between the Academic Senate and the provost that agrees to a research and development phase for a five-year period (2001-2006). [Firewall Statement]

2004: the Assessment Officer catalogues all available program-level assessment information, now part of the Institutional Portfolio that includes the most current three to five student learning outcomes from each degree program. These outcomes also will be listed in the 2006/08 University Catalog.

The provost and college deans now require assessment data in each program’s next five-year review report. This decision ties assessment of student learning, specialized accreditation, WASC, and CSU Accountability requirements into program review. This should make the process more meaningful for faculty. During 2004-05 and 2005-06, almost half of all degree programs (21 out of 52) will complete their five-year review process. Additionally, the provost, deans, and the Offices of Faculty Development and Institutional Research and Assessment are coordinating support for the faculty as they measure and use assessment results. In fact, CSU and CSUH policies require that each department conduct assessment of student learning outcomes and describe the use of their results no later than their next scheduled five-year academic review.

Student learning outcomes for master’s degrees stress independent research skills, mastery of knowledge at an appropriate level, and mastery of professional abilities (sometimes as the result of internships or other relevant outside classroom activities) [Graduate Program Outcomes]. Capstone requirements foster research and critical thinking competencies of students, especially in the graduate programs. Every graduate degree requires a thesis, project, or comprehensive examination where the student must demonstrate competency in research, analytical thinking, and mastery of professional knowledge or skills in the case of the creative arts. Approximately two-thirds (32/48) of the undergraduate degree programs have a capstone or senior seminar course where assessment of research ability occurs.

While the student evaluation form asks students to what degree the course met the stated course goals, the current requirements for syllabi do not call for explicit inclusion of course and program learning outcomes. Such a recommendation is expected to come before the Academic Senate for consideration in the 2004-2005 academic year.

Curricular Approval and Program Review (CFR 2.4, 2.7)
CSUH has long-standing, well-established curricular approval and program review processes and is on its way to integrating its use of student learning results with those processes. The Committee on Instruction and Curriculum, (CIC), a standing committee of the Academic Senate with several subcommittees (General Education, Writing Skills, Critical Thinking, Technology
and Instruction, Graduate Programs, Cultural Groups/Women, Lifelong Understanding, and Basic Skills Requirement Appeals) has responsibility for approval of new programs and any curricula that affect students across the university’s colleges. Requests for new degree programs also go to another Senate standing committee, the Committee on Academic Planning and Resources (CAPR). Curricular proposals originate in the department and college-level curriculum committees review them for approval. CIC and the Academic Senate review curricular proposals involving more than one college, all proposed new programs and new options. Thus, the institution’s faculty takes collective responsibility for establishing, reviewing, fostering, and demonstrating the attainment of academic standards befitting the established expectations. New degree programs must also be approved by the CSU Chancellor’s Office.

Departments prepare their five-year academic reviews reports and CAPR reviews them. These reviews must describe the program’s use of learning outcomes. The Academic Senate takes action on CAPR’s recommendations that can include continuation with no change, continuation with modifications, or program discontinuance. The institution’s expectations for student learning as articulated by these committees are widely shared among its members through the actions of the Academic Senate, college, and department level discussions, and publications such as the University Catalog. All programs offered by the institution are subject to review as cited above, including analyses of the achievement of program learning objectives and outcomes. Each program review includes at least one outside reviewer. Where external professional accreditation is involved, a team of external reviewers report on the program. Academic review and professional accreditation self-studies include analysis of the assessment of educational objectives and results of license examinations and placement tests where appropriate.

The Academic Senate passed recommendations based upon findings of the Academic Standards Subcommittee [Academic Standards Report] to encourage departments and faculty to establish policies (if they have not already done so) on grading standards, academic honesty, course requirements (outcomes-based), completion of course assignments, required work outside of classroom meetings ( guideline is 2 hours of study per academic unit), standards for classroom behavior and participation, and use of the Internet for classroom assignments. Departments are to urge faculty to report these policies on course syllabi. Departments and programs are to collect data on academic standards, including department GPAs, for their five-year reviews, insure that their assessment plans address the implementation of academic standards policies, and communicate their standards to area high schools and community colleges.

The Academic Review COT examined CSUH and other CSUs’ policies and procedures and interviewed many of the present and past administrators including deans, associate deans, program chairs, faculty and staff from all four colleges. [Academic Review COT Recommendation] The COT carefully examined the results in light of the three primary functions of academic program review stated above and found that despite the requirement for an assessment plan in the five-year reviews, departments have work to do to insure a systematic, comprehensive, and embedded program of assessment of student outcomes. The assessment reports submitted to date are not sufficient to determine the quality and effectiveness of most academic programs at CSUH. CSUH must identify what data are most useful and timely for academic review. The COT recommended significantly more involvement of college administrators in preparation of and response to program review documents. Their
recommendation was that upon Senate approval of CAPR recommendations, that the provost, department chair, and dean should meet, discuss and document any implementation and resource agreements, to the extent possible, covering the next five years. Annual reports are recommended to record the Program’s activities and progress in implementing the agreements in light of resources received. CAPR does not review the General Education program. Currently, CIC conducts GE Program review and recommends program revisions to the Academic Senate although it has no established procedures or standards for assessing program effectiveness. The GE COT recommended the GE Program undergo regular academic program review. CAPR will consider the recommendation during the 2004-2005 academic year.

**SUPPORT FOR STUDENT SUCCESS**

CSUH believes that academic learning and student development should be integrated and transformative, not just a matter of in-class instruction. Our mission promises to prepare students to realize their goals, pursue meaningful life work, and be socially responsible contributors to their communities. Our particular challenge is to provide student services that are culturally relevant for our student body from vastly different backgrounds. Our two primary concerns are the effectiveness of our advising and retention. Currently, the Executive Director of Student Retention and Advising Services is analyzing these issues. She has drafted a University Retention Action Plan that offers recommendations for improving the retention, persistence to graduation, and graduation of CSUH undergraduate students. Key University personnel are reviewing the draft. [Appendix III (CFRs 2.10-2.14)]

While the university values the role student services play in student learning and development, budget reductions have had a serious impact on student services and co-curricular activities across the university. Staff reductions due to layoffs and reassignments have affected the quantity and timeliness of services. The university has reduced the Division of Students Affairs’ budget by over a million dollars during the past three years. Adequate funding levels for student services are critical to the well-being of students and the university. Inaccessible and inadequate services could have a negative effect on student persistence and students’ progression toward the completion of their degree.

Across the university, offices and departments are experiencing increased demand for their services. For example, the Student Center for Academic Achievement experienced a 109% growth in Center usage since the fall of 2001, a 65% increase since fall of 2002, and a 30% increase overall in 2003-2004. Preliminary figures show a significant increase in Center usage in fall 2004 when compared to fall 2003. The Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) provides intensive advising, supplemental instruction, and other support services to an ethnically diverse population of low-income first generation undergraduate students. For the Fall, 2004 term an administrative support assistant, whose position has been cut due to budget reductions, processed over 4200 applications to the program. The loss of this position means that existing staff will absorb that function and reduce their student appointment hours. Budget reductions has also affected the Summer Bridge Program that provides developmental and supplemental instruction during the summer to students admitted to the university with remedial needs. The number of Summer Bridge
Participants has been reduced from a high of 74 during the Summer of 1998 to a low of 40 during the Summer of 2004.

Until a few years ago, the University Advisement Center focused its time and services on students who had not declared a major, approximately 800 students per term. The UAC expanded its scope due to the burgeoning need for general education advising by entering transfers, students who were on academic probation or subject to disqualification, and graduating seniors who needed to know if they had deficiencies in their coursework that would preclude their graduation. As a result of adding these populations, the University Advisement Center worked with over 6,000 students during the 2003-2004 academic year. Budget reductions and reassignment of a full-time adviser led the University Advisement Center to reduce its hours of operation, restructure its service delivery to include a greater number of “group” advising sessions and on-line advising “chats”, and enter into intra-division and cross-division collaborations and sharing of resources. Even with these changes and new partnerships, UAC staff will be hard pressed to provide the desired level of service to all students who seek their assistance this year.

However, even during these fiscally stringent times, new initiatives throughout the university are intentionally promoting student success by providing students the academic, social, and co-curricular experiences that will make them successful students, responsible citizens, effective leaders, and productive employees. New programs and services tailored to the freshman year are being implemented to address the information, academic, housing, and service needs of the growing number of first-time freshmen. CSUH hired a Freshman-Year Experiences Coordinator to work with Student Life and Residence Life staff to develop activities and programs.

The Division of Student Affairs has set the foundation for strategic planning, program assessment, and continuous improvement in student services at a divisional level. The Division is engaged in a comprehensive strategic planning process and is implementing a singular database and tracking system for all of its units. These major efforts will provide structures for informed planning and systems for capturing benchmark and longitudinal data to evaluate the effectiveness of student services within the division; identify utilization trends by student categories and units; determine resource allocation priorities; administer utilization and student satisfaction surveys; and identify programs and strategies that improve student retention and graduation. However, since all segments of the university are engaged in the delivery of services to students, the responsibility for assessment of student services crosses all divisions. Systematic and consistent assessment of student services throughout the university is critical to measuring their effectiveness, establishing institutional priorities, and allocating university resources appropriately.

Retention and Graduation Rates
One measure of institutional performance and the effectiveness of student services is the degree to which we are successful at retaining (retention) students through to fulfillment of their educational goals (graduation). Student retention and graduation rates are important to the university for a variety of reasons. Of greatest importance is the
university’s commitment to student learning and success as defined in the university’s mission and values. CSUH strives to provide the best educational experience possible for students, and for ensuring that each student admitted to the university has the opportunity to achieve her or his educational goals, especially those students whose retention and graduation are well below those of others, e.g. undergraduate African American male and female and Latino male students.

One-Year Retention of First-Time Full-Time Freshmen: The University has been successful at improving the retention of its first-time freshmen over the past several years. The one year retention of first–time freshmen has increased from 78.5% (Fall 1997 to Fall 1998) to 81.6% (Fall 2002 to Fall 2003). Implementation of freshmen learning communities, adherence to established remediation policies, increased student services, and a significant decrease in the admission of students who do not meet published admission criteria may help explain this 3.1% increase.³

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>RETENTION RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2002</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2001</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2000</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1999</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1998</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1997</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1996</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-Year Retention Rate Comparisons by Ethnicity and Gender: A preliminary CSUH analysis of first-time freshmen one-year retention rates by ethnicity and gender for students entering the university in the Fall of 2002 shows White students achieving the highest one-year retention rate (86.1%) followed by Asians (85.7%), Latinos (81.5%), and African Americans (67.8%). The disaggregated data by sex reveals low retention rates for African American males (63%), African American females (67%) and Latino males (67%).

Two-Year Retention Rate Comparisons – Regularly Admitted First-Time Freshmen Disaggregated by Ethnicity: Two-year retention rate comparisons by ethnicity for Fall 2000 to fall 2002 as compared to fall 1997 to fall 1999 show improvement for all groups. Asians students had the highest persistence rates (71% to 72%) and the least improvement. White students showed the greatest improvement (59% to 70%). African American and Hispanic students’ persistence improved equally (61% to 67%). The overall two-year retention of regularly admitted CSUH students rose from 65% (1997-1999) to 69% (2000-2003).

CSU System Comparisons – Retention and Graduation Rates
First-Time Full-time Freshmen – CSUH’s one-year retention rate for First-Time Full-Time Freshmen entering the CSU in the Fall 2002 was 81.6% and above the systemwide average of 79.8%. CSUH’s six-year graduation rates for First-Time Full-Time Freshmen
entering the CSU in the Fall 1997 was 43.6%, just slightly below the systemwide average of 43.7%.  

**Undergraduate Transfers:** The one-year retention rate (fall 2002 to fall 2003) and three-year graduation rate (2000 to 2002) of California Community College transfers at CSUH (81.3%) is nearly three percentage points lower than the systemwide average (84%). CSUH’s three-year graduation rate of 57% is 7.4 percentage points higher than the systemwide average of 49.6%.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First-Time Full-Time Freshmen</th>
<th>CCC Transfers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Year Retention Fall 2002</td>
<td>6-Year Graduation Fall 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Hayward</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemwide</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**National Comparisons – Retention and Graduation Rates:** CSUH’s one-year retention and six-year graduation rates for first-time freshmen exceed the national average when compared to similar institutions across the country. The average one-year retention rate for first-time freshmen at 505 public four-year institutions located across the country is 71.9% for 2001-2002 while CSUH’s is 81%. The six-year graduation rate for first-time freshmen that attended public four-year non-doctorate granting institutions (Fall 95 to Spring 2001) is 40.3% while CSUH’s is 43.6%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First-Time Freshmen</th>
<th>1-Year Retention Fall 2001</th>
<th>6-Year Graduation Fall 1995</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSU Hayward</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public 4-Year Institutions (505)</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Retention and Graduation of Students in Academic Jeopardy: A CSUH study on six-year retention for the Fall 1996 first-time freshmen class shows that almost all students who do not continue into their second fall have dropped out by the end of the sixth year. Students who continue to their second fall, but are on academic probation, have twice the dropout rate after six years than those who continue in good academic standing. Further, two out of three students who continue to their second fall with grade point averages at or above 2.00 have graduated or are still enrolled at the end of six years. This study underscores the need for early identification of students who are in academic jeopardy and immediate intervention in the form of information and support services such as advising, mentoring and learning assistance.

Need for Increased Faculty Diversity: Retention literature supports the positive impact faculty of color have on the retention of students of color. Students of color are more likely to use advising and other retention services when faculty are of similar ethnicity. At CSUH, the ratio of students of color to faculty of color is 2:1. Because diversity on university committees, strategic planning activities, curriculum development, faculty
advising, etc. is important to the university, faculty of color are often asked to go beyond the degree of university service expected of faculty in general. Needless to say, this situation may place additional responsibilities on faculty of color.

**New Technologies:** Implementation of new technologies (imaging, degree audit and call management system) promise to improve the timeliness and reliability of information flowing to students. However, technological processes have been slow due to temporary snags, layoffs, and reassignments due to budget crises. The community looks forward to the not too distant future when these technologies enhance our ability to serve students more effectively and efficiently, provide more timely admissions decisions, make information readily accessible to students, and provide faculty and staff with additional tools in the delivery of student support services.

**Advising:** Research in the field of retention highlights the critical role effective advising plays in a student’s decision to persist to graduation. Effective advising is especially helpful for students having difficulty acclimating to the university environment and students in academic jeopardy. At CSUH, there are inherent challenges in the university’s advising infrastructure that affect service delivery, student success, and the flow and consistency/accuracy of information. These challenges include: 1) the PTR process that may not assign the level of importance to advising that this function requires; 2) the distributive nature of advising; and 3) three consecutive years of budget reductions that resulted in staff reassignments, cuts in professional development opportunities, and reductions in hours of operation.

As detailed in the conclusion, we will further address advising and retention in the Educational Effectiveness phase.

---

1. Review of the program after 6 years resulted in the elimination of sophomore clusters in favor of more freedom of choice for second year students. Continued assessment will determine the impact of this decision on student learning and on progress toward graduation. When almost all lower division general education requirements were met only in learning communities, assessment data indicated a larger number of students completed lower division general education in two years than students before Fall 1998. The question now on the table is whether students, with more freedom of choice, will complete their lower-division requirements before attaining upper division status.


3. Prior to Fall 1998, CSU students with remedial needs were not required to start developmental classes upon matriculation nor to complete them in a timely manner. Starting Fall 1998, the same quarter the freshman learning communities began, CSU policy required all students with remedial needs to begin remedial coursework their first quarter and reach baccalaureate level competence within one year. Students who failed to reach college level competence within one year (or at CSUH within a maximum of six quarters) are required to complete their developmental work elsewhere. They are free to return to CSUH upon satisfaction of remedial requirements.

4. Source: Consortium for Student Retention and Data Exchange

5. Consortium for Student Retention and Data Exchange
6 Source: Consortium for Student Retention and Data Exchange.
