

Noel-Levitz Report on Undergraduate Trends in Enrollment Management

2013 Student Retention and College Completion Practices Report for Four-Year and Two-Year Institutions

What's working to increase student retention and college completion rates at the undergraduate level? To find out, Noel-Levitz conducted a 87-item, Web-based poll of campus officials in the spring of 2013 as part of the firm's continuing series of benchmark polls for higher education. For context, the report includes some comparative findings from parallel Noel-Levitz studies in the springs of 2011, 2009, and 2007.

Among the findings:

- Academic support programs, honors programs, and first-year student programs emerged as the top-ranked, most effective strategies and tactics across higher education for improving student retention and college completion rates.
- Tracking students' persistence and progression patterns, term by term, ranked at or near the top for four-year private and public institutions in a new category in this year's report: "Top 10 internal operations practices."
- Programming designed specifically for students of color was rated a top practice in 2013 for two-year public institutions but was only being used by approximately one-third of respondents from this sector.
- Improvements in recent graduation rate trends were reported by at least 41 percent of the poll's respondents across sectors while another 40 to 46 percent reported stable rates, and only 13 to 14 percent reported declines.
- Using a "reverse transfer" process to help students finish degrees at their previous institution made this year's list of the "five least-used strategies and tactics" among respondents from four-year private and public institutions—but this practice received positive ratings from the majority of these respondents who were using it.
- Less than half of respondents across sectors reported having a campuswide committee for student retention that they felt good about, and less than half of respondents reported having a current, written plan for student retention and college completion that they felt good about.

Readers are encouraged to compare the findings in this report to the most and least effective practices on their campus. For past rankings of student retention practices, and for additional reports, visit www.noellevitz.com/BenchmarkReports.

See the Appendix of this report for detailed findings from all 87 items on the poll.



Highlights

Top 10 most effective strategies and tactics by institution type	3
Five least-effective practices and five least-used practices	4
Top three programs targeted for special populations	5
Top three practices for retaining online learners	5
Top 10 internal operations NEW!	6
Five least-effective and five least-used internal operations NEW!	7
Planning and leadership practices highlights.....	8

Appendix/Complete findings

Complete findings by institution type	9
Responding institutions	34
About Noel-Levitz and our higher education research	36

Findings color key

Four-year private institutions

Four-year public institutions

Two-year public institutions

About the rankings and the statistical process used in this study

All of the findings in this report are judged to be statistically significant. This determination was made by calculating a statistical confidence interval for each finding (e.g., means, medians, proportions, and other relevant test statistics) and then judging the confidence interval to be acceptably small relative to the size of the finding.

To identify the most and least effective practices for this study, as well as least-used practices, respondents were asked to rate each practice on the following scale:

Very effective Somewhat effective Minimally effective Method not used

To report the findings as accurately as possible, the rankings of effectiveness were based only on the relative effectiveness options that were chosen by respondents: “very effective,” “somewhat effective,” and “minimally effective.”

This approach of excluding the fourth response, “method not used,” allows emerging, less-frequently-used practices to be included in the top rankings—those practices that are rated very effective but which are not currently being used by the majority of institutions. For example, as shown in the Appendix on page 18, only 56 percent of four-year public institution respondents reported using programs designed specifically for international students. Yet among those respondents, 27 percent rated this practice “very effective,” placing it tenth on the list of top 10 strategies and tactics for that sector. For more information on this year’s study, please see page 34.

Note: To identify the proportion of institutions using a particular method, we simply calculated the inverse of those who selected, “method not used.”

Top 10 most effective strategies and tactics by institution type

Below are the 10 items respondents most frequently rated “very effective” among 37 strategies and tactics that were measured for their usage and effectiveness. For complete findings, please see the Appendix. Note: The top 10 practices identified do not include internal operations, which this year are reported separately on page 6 and in the Appendix.

New this year: See effectiveness ratings and usage levels for 31 internal operations reported separately on page 6 and in the Appendix.

Rank*	Four-year private	Four-year public	Two-year public
1.	Academic support program or services	Honors programs for academically advanced students	Tutoring
2.	Programs designed specifically for first-year students ¹	Programs designed specifically for first-year students ¹	Academic support program or services
3.	Giving students practical work experiences in their intended major to apply their learning ²	Academic support program or services	Honors programs for academically advanced students
4.	Honors programs for academically advanced students	Providing supplementary instruction	Mandatory advising by professional staff, one-on-one
5.	Tutoring	Learning communities	Giving students practical work experiences in their intended major to apply their learning ²
6.	Advising by professional staff, one-on-one	Mandatory advising by professional staff, one-on-one	Programs designed specifically for students of color
7.	Mandatory advising by professional staff, one-on-one	Giving students practical work experiences in their intended major to apply their learning ²	Programs designed specifically for first-year students ¹
8.	Early-alert and intervention system	Tutoring	Advising by professional staff, one-on-one
9.	Advising specifically for students approaching graduation to ensure they are on track	Programs designed specifically for students who are at risk academically	Mandatory faculty advising, one-on-one
10.	Programs designed specifically for students who are at risk academically	Programs designed specifically for international students	Programs designed specifically for veterans

Bold indicates practices that were *not* being used by more than a quarter of institutions within the sector (please see Appendix for details). Of the practices shown above, the following six were shared across sectors: academic support program or services; programs designed specifically for first-year students; honors programs for academically advanced students; giving students practical work experiences in their intended major to apply their learning; tutoring; and mandatory, one-on-one advising by professional staff.

* These rankings are based on the respondents who were using each particular practice and excluded those who selected “method not used.” See ranking methodology, page 2.

- 1 The full wording for this item on the poll was as follows: Programs designed specifically for first-year students (e.g., orientation for first-year students, a first-year experience program, etc.).
- 2 The full wording for this item on the poll was as follows: Giving students practical work experiences in their intended major to apply their learning (e.g., internships, volunteer work, experiential learning, service learning, etc.)

Note: Many of the top-rated practices shown above and on page 6 were *not* rated “very effective” by the majority of respondents despite being rated more highly compared to other practices. Please see Appendix for specific proportions of respondents choosing each rating category.

Five least-effective practices and five least-used practices

The first table below shows the five items respondents most frequently rated “minimally effective” among the 37 strategies and tactics that were measured for their usage and effectiveness. The second table shows the five items that respondents most frequently rated “method not used.”

Five least-effective strategies and tactics

Rank	Four-year private	Four-year public	Two-year public
1.	Programs designed specifically for second-year students	Programs designed specifically for online learners	Identifying re-entry dates for students who are leaving
2.	Remaining in contact with students who are leaving	Interviews or surveys with students who are withdrawing, before they leave	Remaining in contact with students who are leaving
3.	Online social networking to engage student in online communities	Remaining in contact with students who are leaving	Interviews or surveys with students who are withdrawing, before they leave
4.	Using a “reverse transfer” process to help students finish degrees at their previous institution	Identifying re-entry dates for students who are leaving	Programs designed specifically for online learners
5.	Identifying re-entry dates for students who are leaving	Programs designed specifically for adult/nontraditional students	Financial literacy programs to assist students and parents with managing their personal finances

In the table below showing the five least-used practices for each sector, the majority of the 15 practices shown received positive ratings from the respondents who were using them.

Bold indicates practices that were being used by half or more of institutions within the sector. For more details, please see the Appendix. Of the practices shown above, two were shared across sectors: remaining in contact with students who are leaving and identifying re-entry dates for students who are leaving.

Five least-used strategies and tactics

Rank	Four-year private	Four-year public	Two-year public
1.	Using a “reverse transfer” process to help students finish degrees at their previous institution	Programs designed specifically for second-year students	Programs designed specifically for second-year students
2.	Programs designed specifically for second-year students	Identifying re-entry dates for students who are leaving	Identifying re-entry dates for students who are leaving
3.	Programs designed specifically for online learners	Programs designed specifically for online learners	Programs designed specifically for transfer students
4.	Programs designed specifically for veterans	Programs designed specifically for adult/non-traditional students	Mandatory faculty advising, one-on-one
5.	Programs designed specifically for students of color	Using a “reverse transfer” process to help students finish degrees at their previous institution	Programs designs specifically for international students

Bold indicates practices that half or more of respondents using them rated either “very effective” or “somewhat effective.” See Appendix for details. Of the practices shown above, one practice was shared across sectors: Programs designed specifically for second-year students.

Top three programs targeted for special populations

The table below shows the three special-population-focused programs that respondents from each sector most frequently rated “very effective” among 11 such programs that were measured. For complete findings, please see the Appendix.

Honors programs were rated highly but were not being used by more than one-quarter of respondents from four-year private institutions and two-year public institutions.

Rank	Four-year private	Four-year public	Two-year public
1.	Programs designed specifically for first-year students ¹	Honors programs for academically advanced students	Honors programs for academically advanced students
2.	Honors programs for academically advanced students	Programs designed specifically for first-year students ¹	Programs designed specifically for students of color
3.	Programs designed specifically for students who are at risk academically	Programs designed specifically for students who are at risk academically	Programs designed specifically for first-year students ¹

Bold indicates programs targeted for special populations that were *not* being used by more than a quarter of institutions within the sector (please see Appendix for details). Across sectors, top-rated programs targeted for special populations included programs designed specifically for first-year students and honors programs, which also appear on the top 10 lists on page 3.

1 The full wording for this item on the poll was as follows: Programs designed specifically for first-year students (e.g., orientation for first-year students, a first-year experience program, etc.).

Top three practices for retaining online learners

The table below shows the three online-learner-focused practices that respondents from each sector most frequently rated “very effective” among 10 such practices that were measured. For complete findings, please see the Appendix.

Rank	Four-year private	Four-year public	Two-year public
1.	Mandatory online interaction between faculty and students	Required training program for online faculty	Required training program for online faculty
2.	Required training program for online faculty	Faculty development and support in online technology and online teaching pedagogy	Faculty development and support in online technology and online teaching pedagogy
3.	Technical support to address online connection issues	Technical support to address online connection issues	Technical support to address online connection issues

Bold indicates practices for retaining online learners that were *not* being used by more than a quarter of institutions within the sector (please see Appendix for details). Across sectors, top-rated practices for retaining online learners included a required training program for online faculty and technical support to address online connection issues.

Top 10 most effective internal operations by institution type **NEW!**

Below are the 10 items respondents most frequently rated “very effective” among 31 internal operations that were measured for their usage and effectiveness. For complete findings, please see the Appendix.

Tracking, assessment, and goal-setting were rated among the most effective internal operations across sectors.

Rank*	Four-year private	Four-year public	Two-year public
1.	Institutionwide emphasis on the teaching of undergraduates and undergraduate learning	Tracking persistence and progression patterns, term by term, for all students who matriculate	Institutionwide emphasis on the teaching of undergraduates and undergraduate learning
2.	Tracking persistence and progression patterns, term by term, for all students who matriculate	Title III or Title V funding	Title III or Title V funding
3.	Using a retention software application to help track and manage student retention	Identifying courses that are more difficult or less difficult to complete	Benchmarking performance against peer institutions (e.g., retention and completion rates, credit hours or courses completed, etc.)
4.	Using an incoming student assessment to identify students’ strengths, weaknesses, needs, and concerns that need to be addressed for their support and progress	Identifying courses with high withdrawal and/or failure rates	Required training program for adjunct faculty
5.	Statistical modeling to predict the likelihood of an incoming student persisting to degree completion	Adjusting admissions standards to address attrition	Using an incoming student assessment to identify students’ strengths, weaknesses, needs, and concerns that need to be addressed for their support and progress
6.	Setting measurable goals to improve the retention rate from term-to-term or year-to-year	Institutionwide emphasis on the teaching of undergraduates and undergraduate learning	Tracking credit hours attempted versus completed for each term
7.	Using student satisfaction assessments to make changes to address attrition	Tracking retention rates for specific academic programs	Setting measurable goals to improve the retention rate from term-to-term or year-to-year
8.	Assessing what’s important to your currently enrolled students to help ensure their satisfaction and success	Using an incoming student assessment to identify students’ strengths, weaknesses, needs, and concerns that need to be addressed for their support and progress	Tracking persistence and progression patterns, term by term, for all students who matriculate
9.	Tracking rates of academic probation	Tracking rates of academic probation	Setting measurable goals for college completion rates
10.	Tracking retention rates for specific academic programs	Setting measurable goals to improve the retention rate from term-to-term or year-to-year	Using a retention software application to help track and manage student retention

Bold indicates practices that were *not* being used by more than a quarter of institutions within the sector (please see Appendix for details). Of the practices shown above, the following four were shared across sectors: an institutionwide emphasis on the teaching of undergraduates and undergraduate learning; tracking persistence and progression patterns, term by term, for all students who matriculate; using an incoming student assessment to identify students’ strengths, weaknesses, needs, and concerns that need to be addressed for their support and progress; and setting measurable goals to improve the retention rate from term-to-term or year-to-year.

* These rankings are based on the respondents who were using each particular practice and excluded those who selected “method not used.” See ranking methodology, page 2.

Five least-effective and five least-used internal operations **NEW!**

Among the 31 internal operations, here are the least-effective and least-used items.

Five least-effective internal operations (items most frequently rated “minimally effective”)

In the table below, the majority of the five least-used practices for four-year private and public institutions received positive ratings from the respondents who were using them.

Rank	Four-year private	Four-year public	Two-year public
1.	Setting measurable goals for credit hours or courses completed	Training in professional service skills for front-line staff, new employees, or student employees to make campus atmosphere student-centered	Statistical modeling to predict the likelihood of an incoming student persisting to degree completion
2.	Required training program for adjunct faculty	Development of faculty skills in instruction, advising, and student interaction	Research into what attracted and convinced students to enroll in order to keep promises and understand expectations
3.	Faculty mentor program to strengthen the skills of new, continuing, or adjunct faculty	Using established communication procedures to regularly communicate persistence, retention, and completion rate data throughout the campus	Using a retention software application to help track and manage student retention
4.	Monitoring student demand vs. student usage of academic support services	Building agreement among faculty, staff, and administration regarding retention and college completion concerns	Using student engagement assessments to make changes to the ways faculty and staff interact with students to address attrition
5.	Research into what attracted and convinced students to enroll in order to keep promises and understand expectations	Research into what attracted and convinced students to enroll in order to keep promises and understand expectations	Adjusting admissions standards to address attrition

Bold indicates practices that were being used by half or more of institutions within the sector. For more details, please see the Appendix. Of the practices shown above, only one was shared across sectors: Research into what attracted and convinced students to enroll in order to keep promises and meet expectations.

Five least-used internal operations (items most frequently rated “method not used”)

Rank	Four-year private	Four-year public	Two-year public
1.	Using a retention software application to help track and manage student retention	Required training program for adjunct faculty	Statistical modeling to predict the likelihood of an incoming student persisting to degree completion
2.	Statistical modeling to predict the likelihood of an incoming student persisting to degree completion	Setting expectations for student engagement during hiring process for new faculty	Using a retention software application to help track and manage student retention
3.	Setting measurable goals for credit hours or courses completed	Using student engagement assessments to make changes to the ways faculty and staff interact with students to address attrition	Adjusting admissions standards to address attrition
4.	Title III or Title V funding	Using a retention software application to help track and manage student retention	Using an incoming student assessment to identify students’ strengths, weaknesses, needs, and concerns that need to be addressed for their support and progress
5.	Required training program for adjunct faculty	Statistical modeling to predict the likelihood of an incoming student persisting to degree completion	Setting expectations for student engagement during hiring process for new faculty

Bold indicates practices that half or more of respondents using them rated either “very effective” or “somewhat effective.” See Appendix for details. Of the practices shown above, two practices were identified by all three sectors: using a retention software application to help track and manage student retention, and statistical modeling to predict the likelihood of an incoming student persisting to degree completion.

Planning and leadership practices highlights

Despite the need for stronger planning and leadership in today's challenging environment, many respondents questioned the quality of their written plans, and less than one-half of respondents indicated they had a committee that was of good or excellent quality, as shown in the table below.

Quality ratings of written plans, individual leadership positions, and committees

Percent of respondents in agreement

Survey Items		Four-year private		Four-year public		Two-year public	
		Yes	Yes, and it's of good or excellent quality*	Yes	Yes, and it's of good or excellent quality*	Yes	Yes, and it's of good or excellent quality*
My institution has a written plan to guide student retention and college completion efforts ¹	2013	57.3%	30.1%	60.8%	31.7%	59.0%	27.4%
	2011	60.0%	33.8%	60.6%	43.9%	60.0%	27.0%
	2009	63.7%	33.9%	67.2%	36.1%	56.8%	27.2%
	2007	30.1%	NA	53.0%	NA	40.2%	NA
My institution has an individual position within our institution charged with primary responsibility for leading and coordinating retention activities and for getting retention results	2013	73.7%	53.5%	64.6%	44.3%	60.7%	37.6%
	2011	75.4%	53.8%	67.7%	47.7%	69.7%	36.4%
	2009	76.2%	46.5%	70.0%	48.3%	55.7%	33.0%
	2007	58.5%	NA	56.1%	NA	44.9%	NA
My institution has a retention committee to lead and coordinate retention efforts	2013	78.4%	49.3%	77.2%	41.8%	65.2%	39.1%
	2011	79.8%	49.6%	70.8%	46.2%	63.6%	29.3%
	2009	79.2%	45.3%	88.3%	53.3%	67.1%	34.1%
	2007	61.8%	NA	65.2%	NA	57.5%	NA

Less than one-third of respondents across institution types reported having a written retention plan they felt good about. In addition, only two-fifths to one-half of respondents reported having a committee they felt good about.

* These percentages indicate the percentage of respondents who rated the quality of these items as "good" or "excellent" as opposed to "fair," "poor," or "no" (nonexistent).

¹ In the 2011, 2009, and 2007 studies, this item read: My institution has a current written retention plan to guide its efforts.

How colleges and universities determine their most and least effective practices for student retention and college completion

Primary Data for Identifying Effective Practices (Respondents could choose just one of the following three responses)	Four-year private	Four-year public	Two-year public
Outcomes data	49.2%	66.7%	50.4%
Informal feedback mechanisms	34.7%	29.5%	39.1%
Student feedback data	16.1%	3.8%	10.4%

Approximately half to two-thirds of institutions nationwide indicated they were primarily using outcomes data to determine their most and least effective practices. Using outcomes as the primary basis for identifying effective practices is the preferred approach that Noel-Levitz recommends to its clients, and we encourage all campuses to adopt this standard.

Appendix: Complete findings by institution type

The following tables include the complete findings of this study, divided and color-coded for each of the three sectors examined.

Contents

Four-year private institutions

Pages 10-17:

Usage and Effectiveness of 37 Strategies and Tactics for Student Retention and College Completion	10
Usage and Effectiveness of Programs Targeted to Special Populations	12
Usage and Effectiveness of Practices for Retaining Online Learners	13
Usage and Effectiveness of 31 Internal Operations Practices	14
Planning and Leadership Practices	16

Four-year public institutions

Pages 18-25:

Usage and Effectiveness of 37 Strategies and Tactics for Student Retention and College Completion	18
Usage and Effectiveness of Programs Targeted to Special Populations	20
Usage and Effectiveness of Practices for Retaining Online Learners	21
Usage and Effectiveness of 31 Internal Operations Practices	22
Planning and Leadership Practices	24

Two-year public institutions

Pages 26-33:

Usage and Effectiveness of 37 Strategies and Tactics for Student Retention and College Completion	26
Usage and Effectiveness of Programs Targeted to Special Populations	28
Usage and Effectiveness of Practices for Retaining Online Learners	29
Usage and Effectiveness of 31 Internal Operations Practices	30
Planning and Leadership Practices	32

NA notation: Please note that effectiveness ratings are unavailable (shown as “NA”) in cases where the number of respondents was too small to provide statistically significant findings.

Usage and Effectiveness of 37 Strategies and Tactics for Student Retention and College Completion at Four-Year Private Institutions—Ordered by Percent Rated “Very Effective”

Survey Items— Four-Year Private Institutions	Institutions Using Method	Very Effective	Somewhat Effective	Minimally Effective	Very or Somewhat Effective
Academic support program or services	98.5%	43.9%	50.5%	5.6%	94.4%
Programs designed specifically for first-year students (e.g., orientation for first-year students, a first-year experience program, etc.)	94.0%	43.9%	46.0%	10.2%	89.8%
Giving students practical work experiences in their intended major to apply their learning (e.g., internships, volunteer work, experiential learning, service learning, etc.)	93.4%	42.7%	45.4%	11.9%	88.1%
Honors programs for academically advanced students	73.9%	39.5%	41.5%	19.0%	81.0%
Tutoring	99.0%	37.1%	50.3%	12.7%	87.3%
Advising by professional staff, one-on-one	68.3%	36.8%	50.7%	12.5%	87.5%
Mandatory advising by professional staff, one-on-one	45.7%	36.3%	52.7%	11.0%	89.0%
Early-alert and intervention system	90.5%	33.3%	51.1%	15.6%	84.4%
Advising specifically for students approaching graduation to ensure they are on track	76.0%	32.2%	54.4%	13.4%	86.6%
Programs designed specifically for students who are at risk academically	89.9%	28.1%	45.5%	26.4%	73.6%
Mandatory faculty advising, one-on-one	75.4%	28.0%	56.0%	16.0%	84.0%
Financial aid and scholarships aimed at retention	75.1%	27.7%	54.7%	17.6%	82.4%
Faculty advising, one-on-one	96.5%	26.7%	58.1%	15.2%	84.8%
Providing each continuing student with an academic plan/roadmap of remaining courses needed	77.4%	26.6%	53.2%	20.1%	79.9%
Learning communities	50.8%	26.0%	47.0%	27.0%	73.0%
Mandatory academic support (required courses, workshops, etc.)	77.9%	25.2%	55.5%	19.4%	80.6%
Using on-campus student employment as a strategy to engage/retain students	74.4%	23.6%	45.3%	31.1%	68.9%
Programs designed specifically for international students	56.8%	23.0%	43.4%	33.6%	66.4%
Career services	89.8%	22.6%	52.5%	24.9%	75.1%
Providing supplementary instruction	59.6%	20.3%	61.0%	18.6%	81.4%
Programs designed specifically for adult/non-traditional students	48.2%	19.8%	47.9%	32.3%	67.7%

Survey Items— Four-Year Private Institutions	Institutions Using Method	Very Effective	Somewhat Effective	Minimally Effective	Very or Somewhat Effective
Providing career services during students' first year to help students see the connection between coursework and careers	74.4%	19.6%	49.3%	31.1%	68.9%
Programs designed specifically for students who are at risk for reasons other than academics	71.2%	19.1%	48.2%	32.6%	67.4%
Co-curricular programs aimed at retention	76.9%	19.0%	56.2%	24.8%	75.2%
Ongoing communication to stay in touch with current students via e-mail, the Web, regular mail, etc.	91.0%	18.8%	52.5%	28.7%	71.3%
Programs designed specifically for students of color	43.2%	17.4%	53.5%	29.1%	70.9%
Programs designed specifically for online learners	33.3%	15.2%	40.9%	43.9%	56.1%
Interviews or surveys with students who are withdrawing, before they leave	85.4%	14.7%	39.4%	45.9%	54.1%
Programs designed specifically for transfer students	65.3%	14.6%	53.1%	32.3%	67.7%
Programs designed specifically for veterans	35.2%	12.9%	50.0%	37.1%	62.9%
Identifying re-entry dates for students who are leaving	54.8%	12.0%	41.7%	46.3%	53.7%
Online social networking to engage students in online communities	72.7%	11.1%	39.6%	49.3%	50.7%
Financial literacy programs to assist students and parents with managing their personal finances	53.1%	10.6%	45.2%	44.2%	55.8%
Addressing issues with courses that have high withdrawal and/or failure rates	58.2%	10.5%	49.1%	40.4%	59.6%
Using a "reverse transfer" process to help students finish degrees at their previous institution	19.7%	10.3%	41.0%	48.7%	51.3%
Remaining in contact with students who are leaving	58.1%	8.7%	40.0%	51.3%	48.7%
Programs designed specifically for second-year students	29.1%	8.6%	36.2%	55.2%	44.8%

Usage and Effectiveness of Programs Targeted to Special Populations for Four-Year Private Institutions

Note: This data is a subset of the data presented in the previous, 37-item table.

Survey Items— Four-Year Private Institutions	Institutions Using Method	Very Effective	Somewhat Effective	Minimally Effective	Very or Somewhat Effective
Programs designed specifically for first-year students (e.g., orientation for first-year students, a first-year experience program, etc.)	94.0%	43.9%	46.0%	10.2%	89.8%
Honors programs for academically advanced students	73.9%	39.5%	41.5%	19.0%	81.0%
Programs designed specifically for students who are at risk academically	89.9%	28.1%	45.5%	26.4%	73.6%
Programs designed specifically for international students	56.8%	23.0%	43.4%	33.6%	66.4%
Programs designed specifically for adult/non-traditional students	48.2%	19.8%	47.9%	32.3%	67.7%
Programs designed specifically for students who are at risk for reasons other than academics	71.2%	19.1%	48.2%	32.6%	67.4%
Programs designed specifically for students of color	43.2%	17.4%	53.5%	29.1%	70.9%
Programs designed specifically for online learners	33.3%	15.2%	40.9%	43.9%	56.1%
Programs designed specifically for transfer students	65.3%	14.6%	53.1%	32.3%	67.7%
Programs designed specifically for veterans	35.2%	12.9%	50.0%	37.1%	62.9%
Programs designed specifically for second-year students	29.1%	8.6%	36.2%	55.2%	44.8%

Usage and Effectiveness of Practices for Retaining Online Learners for Four-Year Private Institutions

Survey Items— Four-Year Private Institutions	Institutions Using Method	Very Effective	Somewhat Effective	Minimally Effective	Very or Somewhat Effective
Mandatory online interaction between faculty and students	54.4%	33.9%	46.4%	19.6%	80.4%
Required training program for online faculty	62.6%	30.6%	37.1%	32.3%	67.7%
Technical support to address online connection issues	72.4%	29.6%	49.3%	21.1%	78.9%
Faculty development and support in online technology and online teaching pedagogy	73.7%	24.7%	45.2%	30.1%	69.9%
Academic support services specifically for online learners	47.7%	22.6%	41.5%	35.8%	64.2%
Student services geared to online learners, including registration and financial aid	53.5%	22.2%	50.0%	27.8%	72.2%
Early-alert and intervention system for online learners	27.3%	18.5%	55.6%	25.9%	74.1%
Orientation program for online learners	54.5%	18.2%	49.1%	32.7%	67.3%
Faculty advisor assigned to each online learner	43.0%	15.2%	58.7%	26.1%	73.9%
Feedback mechanisms to identify program improvements for online learners	59.2%	13.8%	46.6%	39.7%	60.3%

Respondents were also given a blank field in which to describe additional practices for retaining online learners. In this field, only one practice was mentioned by two or more respondents: academic advising specifically for online learners.

Usage and Effectiveness of 31 Internal Operations Practices for Student Retention and College Completion for Four-Year Private Institutions

Note: Many of these internal operations were previously ranked among the earlier, large list of strategies and tactics but this year are reported separately.

Survey Items— Four-Year Private Institutions	Institutions Using Method	Very Effective	Somewhat Effective	Minimally Effective	Very or Somewhat Effective
Institutionwide emphasis on the teaching of undergraduates and undergraduate learning	90.8%	38.4%	40.7%	20.9%	79.1%
Tracking persistence and progression patterns, term by term, for all students who matriculate	85.2%	29.3%	53.3%	17.4%	82.6%
Using a retention software application to help track and manage student retention	25.1%	28.6%	36.7%	34.7%	65.3%
Using an incoming student assessment to identify students' strengths, weaknesses, needs, and concerns that need to be addressed for their support and progress	66.8%	28.2%	39.7%	32.1%	67.9%
Statistical modeling to predict the likelihood of an incoming student persisting to degree completion	40.9%	25.3%	39.2%	35.4%	64.6%
Setting measurable goals to improve the retention rate from term-to-term or year-to-year	76.0%	23.5%	51.7%	24.8%	75.2%
Using student satisfaction assessments to make changes to address attrition	85.6%	22.8%	49.7%	27.5%	72.5%
Assessing what's important to your currently enrolled students to help ensure their satisfaction and success	85.1%	22.3%	48.8%	28.9%	71.1%
Tracking rates of academic probation	80.1%	21.7%	39.5%	38.9%	61.1%
Tracking retention rates for specific academic programs	72.1%	21.1%	52.8%	26.1%	73.9%
Using student life evaluations to make changes to student life programs and services to address attrition	74.0%	20.7%	50.3%	29.0%	71.0%
Identifying courses that are more difficult or less difficult to complete	67.0%	20.5%	53.8%	25.8%	74.2%
Setting measurable goals for college completion rates	75.0%	20.4%	49.7%	29.9%	70.1%
Tracking credit hours attempted versus completed for each term	59.4%	17.9%	51.3%	30.8%	69.2%
Training in professional service skills for front-line staff, new employees, or student employees to make campus atmosphere student-centered	58.2%	17.5%	41.2%	41.2%	58.8%

Survey Items— Four-Year Private Institutions	Institutions Using Method	Very Effective	Somewhat Effective	Minimally Effective	Very or Somewhat Effective
Building agreement among faculty, staff, and administration regarding retention and college completion concerns	68.4%	16.4%	47.0%	36.6%	63.4%
Identifying courses with high withdrawal and/or failure rates	61.9%	15.8%	45.8%	38.3%	61.7%
Research into what attracted and convinced students to enroll in order to keep promises and understand expectations	65.5%	14.7%	38.0%	47.3%	52.7%
Development of faculty skills in instruction, advising, and student interaction	83.7%	14.6%	42.7%	42.7%	57.3%
Using established communication procedures to regularly communicate persistence, retention, and completion rate data throughout the campus	66.8%	14.5%	42.0%	43.5%	56.5%
Benchmarking performance against peer institutions (e.g., retention and completion rates, credit hours or courses completed, etc.)	77.2%	14.5%	47.4%	38.2%	61.8%
Title III or Title V funding	44.1%	14.5%	55.4%	30.1%	69.9%
Using established communication procedures to regularly communicate student satisfaction data throughout the campus	69.9%	13.9%	43.8%	42.3%	57.7%
Adjusting admissions standards to address attrition	63.3%	13.7%	44.4%	41.9%	58.1%
Setting expectations for student engagement during hiring process for new faculty	50.5%	13.3%	45.9%	40.8%	59.2%
Using student engagement assessments to make changes to the ways faculty and staff interact with students to address attrition	56.1%	12.7%	45.5%	41.8%	58.2%
Reviewing course sequences within academic programs to address attrition	58.5%	11.5%	52.2%	36.3%	63.7%
Monitoring student demand vs. student usage of academic support services	56.1%	8.2%	43.6%	48.2%	51.8%
Faculty mentor program to strengthen the skills of new, continuing, or adjunct faculty	56.4%	8.2%	42.7%	49.1%	50.9%
Required training program for adjunct faculty	50.5%	6.1%	44.4%	49.5%	50.5%
Setting measurable goals for credit hours or courses completed	42.8%	6.0%	43.4%	50.6%	49.4%

Use of Outsourcing	Percent Yes
Does your institution outsource any specific operations to help increase retention and college completion rates? (Yes/No)	12.1%

If respondents answered “yes” to the previous item, they were also given a blank field in which to describe the types of outsourcing used. The following practices were each mentioned by two or more respondents:

- Outsourcing predictive modeling for retention (five mentions)
- Outsourcing retention consulting/planning support (three mentions)
- Outsourcing online student support services including tutoring and advising (three mentions)
- Outsourcing loan default prevention services (two mentions)

Planning and Leadership Practices at Four-Year Private Institutions

Primary Basis for Identifying Most and Least Effective Practices (Respondents could choose one response only)	Percent of Institutions
Outcomes data	49.2%
Internal feedback mechanisms	34.7%
Student feedback data	16.1%

To collect the findings above, respondents were asked, “Of all the practices your institution is using for student retention and college completion, how do you determine which practices are most and least effective?”

Quality Ratings of Annual Plans, Long-Range Plans, and Committees	No (non-existent)	Yes, and It's of Excellent Quality	Yes, and It's of Good Quality	Yes, and It's of Fair Quality	Yes, and It's of Poor Quality
Written plan to guide student retention and college completion efforts	42.7%	5.0%	25.1%	22.1%	5.0%
Written plan to facilitate faculty/student engagement	50.8%	3.5%	17.6%	20.6%	7.5%
Retention committee to lead and coordinate retention efforts	21.6%	16.6%	32.7%	22.6%	6.5%
Individual position within our institution charged with primary responsibility for leading and coordinating retention activities and for getting retention results	26.3%	21.7%	31.8%	15.2%	5.1%

Note: The above percentage rates of “no/nonexistent,” “excellent,” “good,” “fair,” and “poor” are for all respondents (those who chose any of these five categories, including “no/nonexistent”). Hence, the five rates in each row of this table add up to 100 percent.

If respondents had a written plan to guide student retention and college completion ratings, they also responded to the following item:

Annual Updating of Written Plan for Student Retention and College Completion	Percent Yes
We create or update a written plan annually to guide student retention and college completion efforts (Yes/No)	48.4%

If respondents had a retention committee to lead and coordinate retention efforts, they also responded to the following item:

Empowerment of Retention Committee	Percent Yes
The retention committee is empowered to make decisions that affect multiple areas of campus (Yes/No)	50.0%

All respondents answered the following:

General Trend of Cohort Graduation Rate Over Past Three Years	Percent in Agreement
Increased 10% or more	1.0%
Increased 5% to 9.9%	6.8%
Increased 1% to 4.9%	34.9%
Remained stable (within +/- 1%)	43.2%
Decreased 1% to 4.9%	11.5%
Decreased 5% to 9.9%	1.6%
Decreased 10% or more	1.0%

For this item, respondents were instructed to “select one” from the above-listed seven options in response to the question, “What has been the general trend of your institution’s cohort graduation rate during the past three years?”

In addition, the following instructions were included:

4-year institutions: This is first-time, full-time freshmen who completed a four-year degree within five or six years.

2-year institutions: This is first-time, full-time freshmen who completed a two-year degree within two or three years.

Usage and Effectiveness of 37 Strategies and Tactics for Student Retention and College Completion at Four-Year Public Institutions—Ordered by Percent Rated “Very Effective”

Survey Items— Four-Year Public Institutions	Institutions Using Method	Very Effective	Somewhat Effective	Minimally Effective	Very or Somewhat Effective
Honors programs for academically advanced students	87.2%	60.3%	25.0%	14.7%	85.3%
Programs designed specifically for first-year students (e.g., orientation for first-year students, a first-year experience program, etc.)	97.5%	50.6%	39.0%	10.4%	89.6%
Academic support program or services	96.2%	40.8%	52.6%	6.6%	93.4%
Providing supplementary instruction	75.6%	39.0%	35.6%	25.4%	74.6%
Learning communities	66.7%	38.5%	46.2%	15.4%	84.6%
Mandatory advising by professional staff, one-on-one	68.4%	37.0%	42.6%	20.4%	79.6%
Giving students practical work experiences in their intended major to apply their learning (e.g., internships, volunteer work, experiential learning, service learning, etc.)	87.3%	36.2%	53.6%	10.1%	89.9%
Tutoring	100.0%	34.2%	55.7%	10.1%	89.9%
Programs designed specifically for students who are at risk academically	80.5%	29.0%	50.0%	21.0%	79.0%
Programs designed specifically for international students	55.7%	27.3%	47.7%	25.0%	75.0%
Programs designed specifically for veterans	56.4%	25.0%	36.4%	38.6%	61.4%
Programs designed specifically for students of color	55.1%	23.3%	51.2%	25.6%	74.4%
Mandatory faculty advising, one-on-one	65.8%	23.1%	46.2%	30.8%	69.2%
Providing career services during students’ first year to help students see the connection between coursework and careers	66.7%	23.1%	50.0%	26.9%	73.1%
Providing each continuing student with an academic plan/roadmap of remaining courses needed	79.5%	22.6%	56.5%	21.0%	79.0%
Addressing issues with courses that have high withdrawal and/or failure rates	79.5%	22.6%	30.6%	46.8%	53.2%
Mandatory academic support (required courses, workshops, etc.)	73.4%	22.4%	53.4%	24.1%	75.9%
Using on-campus student employment as a strategy to engage/retain students	74.4%	22.4%	53.4%	24.1%	75.9%
Career services	96.2%	21.3%	53.3%	25.3%	74.7%

Survey Items— Four-Year Public Institutions	Institutions Using Method	Very Effective	Somewhat Effective	Minimally Effective	Very or Somewhat Effective
Using a “reverse transfer” process to help students finish degrees at their previous institution	42.3%	21.2%	39.4%	39.4%	60.6%
Advising by professional staff, one-on-one	89.9%	21.1%	63.4%	15.5%	84.5%
Faculty advising, one-on-one	89.9%	19.7%	50.7%	29.6%	70.4%
Financial aid and scholarships aimed at retention	73.1%	19.3%	54.4%	26.3%	73.7%
Early-alert and intervention system	92.3%	18.1%	51.4%	30.6%	69.4%
Co-curricular programs aimed at retention	75.9%	16.7%	56.7%	26.7%	73.3%
Ongoing communication to stay in touch with current students via e-mail, the Web, regular mail, etc.	92.4%	16.4%	58.9%	24.7%	75.3%
Programs designed specifically for transfer students	62.0%	14.3%	59.2%	26.5%	73.5%
Programs designed specifically for students who are at risk for reasons other than academics	65.8%	14.0%	48.0%	38.0%	62.0%
Advising specifically for students approaching graduation to ensure they are on track	67.1%	13.2%	62.3%	24.5%	75.5%
Financial literacy programs to assist students and parents with managing their personal finances	63.3%	8.0%	52.0%	40.0%	60.0%
Identifying re-entry dates for students who are leaving	34.6%	7.4%	37.0%	55.6%	44.4%
Programs designed specifically for adult/non-traditional students	37.2%	6.9%	44.8%	48.3%	51.7%
Programs designed specifically for second-year students	19.5%	6.7%	66.7%	26.7%	73.3%
Remaining in contact with students who are leaving	45.6%	5.6%	30.6%	63.9%	36.1%
Online social networking to engage students in online communities	74.7%	5.1%	50.8%	44.1%	55.9%
Interviews or surveys with students who are withdrawing, before they leave	57.7%	4.4%	31.1%	64.4%	35.6%
Programs designed specifically for online learners	34.6%	0.0%	29.6%	70.4%	29.6%

Usage and Effectiveness of Programs Targeted to Special Populations for Four-Year Public Institutions

Note: This data is a subset of the data presented in the previous, 37-item table.

Survey Items— Four-Year Public Institutions	Institutions Using Method	Very Effective	Somewhat Effective	Minimally Effective	Very or Somewhat Effective
Honors programs for academically advanced students	87.2%	60.3%	25.0%	14.7%	85.3%
Programs designed specifically for first-year students (e.g., orientation for first-year students, a first-year experience program, etc.)	97.5%	50.6%	39.0%	10.4%	89.6%
Programs designed specifically for students who are at risk academically	80.5%	29.0%	50.0%	21.0%	79.0%
Programs designed specifically for international students	55.7%	27.3%	47.7%	25.0%	75.0%
Programs designed specifically for veterans	56.4%	25.0%	36.4%	38.6%	61.4%
Programs designed specifically for students of color	55.1%	23.3%	51.2%	25.6%	74.4%
Programs designed specifically for transfer students	62.0%	14.3%	59.2%	26.5%	73.5%
Programs designed specifically for students who are at risk for reasons other than academics	65.8%	14.0%	48.0%	38.0%	62.0%
Programs designed specifically for adult/non-traditional students	37.2%	6.9%	44.8%	48.3%	51.7%
Programs designed specifically for second-year students	19.5%	6.7%	66.7%	26.7%	73.3%
Programs designed specifically for online learners	34.6%	0.0%	29.6%	70.4%	29.6%

Usage and Effectiveness of Practices for Retaining Online Learners for Four-Year Public Institutions

Survey Items— Four-Year Public Institutions	Institutions Using Method	Very Effective	Somewhat Effective	Minimally Effective	Very or Somewhat Effective
Required training program for online faculty	54.5%	33.3%	46.7%	20.0%	80.0%
Faculty development and support in online technology and online teaching pedagogy	81.8%	31.1%	42.2%	26.7%	73.3%
Technical support to address online connection issues	76.4%	26.2%	52.4%	21.4%	78.6%
Mandatory online interaction between faculty and students	58.5%	16.1%	45.2%	38.7%	61.3%
Orientation program for online learners	38.2%	14.3%	47.6%	38.1%	61.9%
Faculty advisor assigned to each online learner	50.9%	13.8%	51.7%	34.5%	65.5%
Academic support services specifically for online learners	52.6%	13.3%	46.7%	40.0%	60.0%
Early-alert and intervention system for online learners	44.4%	12.5%	45.8%	41.7%	58.3%
Feedback mechanisms to identify program improvements for online learners	59.3%	12.5%	46.9%	40.6%	59.4%
Student services geared to online learners, including registration and financial aid	55.6%	10.0%	40.0%	50.0%	50.0%

Usage and Effectiveness of 31 Internal Operations Practices for Student Retention and College Completion for Four-Year Public Institutions

Note: Many of these internal operations were previously ranked among the earlier, large list of strategies and tactics but this year are reported separately.

Survey Items— Four-Year Public Institutions	Institutions Using Method	Very Effective	Somewhat Effective	Minimally Effective	Very or Somewhat Effective
Tracking persistence and progression patterns, term by term, for all students who matriculate	79.2%	39.3%	44.3%	16.4%	83.6%
Title III or Title V funding	59.5%	38.6%	25.0%	36.4%	63.6%
Identifying courses that are more difficult or less difficult to complete	89.7%	37.1%	44.3%	18.6%	81.4%
Identifying courses with high withdrawal and/or failure rates	87.0%	34.3%	41.8%	23.9%	76.1%
Adjusting admissions standards to address attrition	53.9%	31.7%	36.6%	31.7%	68.3%
Institutionwide emphasis on the teaching of undergraduates and undergraduate learning	85.5%	30.8%	47.7%	21.5%	78.5%
Tracking retention rates for specific academic programs	79.5%	30.6%	54.8%	14.5%	85.5%
Using an incoming student assessment to identify students' strengths, weaknesses, needs, and concerns that need to be addressed for their support and progress	57.9%	29.5%	47.7%	22.7%	77.3%
Tracking rates of academic probation	75.3%	27.6%	50.0%	22.4%	77.6%
Setting measurable goals to improve the retention rate from term-to-term or year-to-year	78.2%	26.2%	47.5%	26.2%	73.8%
Building agreement among faculty, staff, and administration regarding retention and college completion concerns	68.0%	25.5%	33.3%	41.2%	58.8%
Setting measurable goals for college completion rates	76.9%	25.0%	55.0%	20.0%	80.0%
Tracking credit hours attempted versus completed for each term	68.8%	24.5%	45.3%	30.2%	69.8%
Benchmarking performance against peer institutions (e.g., retention and completion rates, credit hours or courses completed, etc.)	89.7%	24.3%	48.6%	27.1%	72.9%
Research into what attracted and convinced students to enroll in order to keep promises and understand expectations	57.1%	22.7%	36.4%	40.9%	59.1%
Reviewing course sequences within academic programs to address attrition	69.7%	22.6%	45.3%	32.1%	67.9%
Setting measurable goals for credit hours or courses completed	53.2%	22.0%	41.5%	36.6%	63.4%

Survey Items— Four-Year Public Institutions	Institutions Using Method	Very Effective	Somewhat Effective	Minimally Effective	Very or Somewhat Effective
Using a retention software application to help track and manage student retention	48.7%	21.6%	40.5%	37.8%	62.2%
Development of faculty skills in instruction, advising, and student interaction	76.0%	21.1%	36.8%	42.1%	57.9%
Statistical modeling to predict the likelihood of an incoming student persisting to degree completion	52.6%	19.5%	48.8%	31.7%	68.3%
Assessing what's important to your currently enrolled students to help ensure their satisfaction and success	76.9%	18.3%	56.7%	25.0%	75.0%
Setting expectations for student engagement during hiring process for new faculty	40.8%	16.1%	48.4%	35.5%	64.5%
Monitoring student demand vs. student usage of academic support services	57.1%	15.9%	45.5%	38.6%	61.4%
Using established communication procedures to regularly communicate student satisfaction data throughout the campus	66.2%	15.7%	45.1%	39.2%	60.8%
Using student satisfaction assessments to make changes to address attrition	76.6%	15.3%	55.9%	28.8%	71.2%
Using established communication procedures to regularly communicate persistence, retention, and completion rate data throughout the campus	71.4%	14.5%	43.6%	41.8%	58.2%
Training in professional service skills for front-line staff, new employees, or student employees to make campus atmosphere student-centered	64.5%	14.3%	42.9%	42.9%	57.1%
Using student life evaluations to make changes to student life programs and services to address attrition	64.9%	14.0%	52.0%	34.0%	66.0%
Using student engagement assessments to make changes to the ways faculty and staff interact with students to address attrition	44.0%	12.1%	48.5%	39.4%	60.6%
Required training program for adjunct faculty	33.3%	12.0%	48.0%	40.0%	60.0%
Faculty mentor program to strengthen the skills of new, continuing, or adjunct faculty	59.2%	6.7%	55.6%	37.8%	62.2%

Use of Outsourcing	Percent Yes
Does your institution outsource any specific operations to help increase retention and college completion rates? (Yes/No)	16.5%

If respondents answered “yes” to the previous item, they were also given a blank field in which to describe the types of outsourcing used. The following practices were each mentioned by two or more respondents:

- Outsourcing predictive modeling for retention (four mentions)
- Outsourcing retention consulting/planning support (four mentions)
- Outsourcing retention software (two mentions)

Planning and Leadership Practices at Four-Year Public Institutions

Primary Basis for Identifying Most and Least Effective Practices (Respondents could choose one response only)	Percent of Institutions
Outcomes data	66.7%
Internal feedback mechanisms	29.5%
Student feedback data	3.8%

For this item, respondents were asked, “Of all the practices your institution is using for student retention and college completion, how do you determine which practices are most and least effective?”

Quality Ratings of Annual Plans, Long-Range Plans, and Committees	No (non-existent)	Yes, and It's of Excellent Quality	Yes, and It's of Good Quality	Yes, and It's of Fair Quality	Yes, and It's of Poor Quality
Written plan to guide student retention and college completion efforts	39.2%	7.6%	24.1%	19.0%	10.1%
Written plan to facilitate faculty/student engagement	53.2%	3.8%	17.7%	15.2%	10.1%
Retention committee to lead and coordinate retention efforts	22.8%	17.7%	24.1%	27.8%	7.6%
Individual position within our institution charged with primary responsibility for leading and coordinating retention activities and for getting retention results	35.4%	21.5%	22.8%	13.9%	6.3%

Note: The above percentage rates of “no/nonexistent,” “excellent,” “good,” “fair,” and “poor” are for all respondents (those who chose any of these five categories, including “no/nonexistent”). Hence, the five rates in each row of this table add up to 100 percent.

If respondents had a written plan to guide student retention and college completion ratings, they also responded to the following item:

Annual Updating of Written Plan for Student Retention and College Completion	Percent Yes
We create or update a written plan annually to guide student retention and college completion efforts (Yes/No)	43.8%

If respondents had a retention committee to lead and coordinate retention efforts, they also responded to the following item:

Empowerment of Retention Committee	Percent Yes
The retention committee is empowered to make decisions that affect multiple areas of campus (Yes/No)	44.6%

All respondents answered the following:

General Trend of Cohort Graduation Rate Over Past Three Years	Percent in Agreement
Increased 10% or more	3.8%
Increased 5% to 9.9%	11.4%
Increased 1% to 4.9%	34.2%
Remained stable (within +/- 1%)	38.0%
Decreased 1% to 4.9%	10.1%
Decreased 5% to 9.9%	2.5%
Decreased 10% or more	0.0%

For this item, respondents were instructed to “select one” from the above-listed seven options in response to the question, “What has been the general trend of your institution’s cohort graduation rate during the past three years?”

In addition, the following instructions were included:

4-year institutions: This is first-time, full-time freshmen who completed a four-year degree within five or six years.

2-year institutions: This is first-time, full-time freshmen who completed a two-year degree within two or three years.

Usage and Effectiveness of 37 Strategies and Tactics for Student Retention and College Completion at Two-Year Public Institutions—Ordered by Percent Rated “Very Effective”

Survey Items— Two-Year Public Institutions	Institutions Using Method	Very Effective	Somewhat Effective	Minimally Effective	Very or Somewhat Effective
Tutoring	100.0%	37.6%	51.3%	11.1%	88.9%
Academic support program or services	99.1%	37.4%	55.7%	7.0%	93.0%
Honors programs for academically advanced students	60.2%	36.6%	36.6%	26.8%	73.2%
Mandatory advising by professional staff, one-on-one	45.3%	32.1%	47.2%	20.8%	79.2%
Giving students practical work experiences in their intended major to apply their learning (e.g., internships, volunteer work, experiential learning, service learning, etc.)	94.9%	31.3%	44.6%	24.1%	75.9%
Programs designed specifically for students of color	36.4%	30.2%	39.5%	30.2%	69.8%
Programs designed specifically for first-year students (e.g., orientation for first-year students, a first-year experience program, etc.)	86.4%	28.4%	53.9%	17.6%	82.4%
Advising by professional staff, one-on-one	89.8%	27.4%	56.6%	16.0%	84.0%
Mandatory faculty advising, one-on-one	31.6%	27.0%	40.5%	32.4%	67.6%
Programs designed specifically for veterans	53.8%	25.4%	42.9%	31.7%	68.3%
Programs designed specifically for adult/non-traditional students	37.3%	22.7%	38.6%	38.6%	61.4%
Providing each continuing student with an academic plan/roadmap of remaining courses needed	65.8%	22.1%	54.5%	23.4%	76.6%
Programs designed specifically for transfer students	27.1%	21.9%	43.8%	34.4%	65.6%
Mandatory academic support (required courses, workshops, etc.)	68.1%	21.5%	63.3%	15.2%	84.8%
Programs designed specifically for students who are at risk academically	74.4%	20.7%	48.3%	31.0%	69.0%
Providing supplementary instruction	68.1%	20.3%	59.5%	20.3%	79.7%
Programs designed specifically for international students	34.2%	20.0%	55.0%	25.0%	75.0%
Faculty advising, one-on-one	82.9%	19.6%	53.6%	26.8%	73.2%
Using on-campus student employment as a strategy to engage/retain students	83.1%	17.3%	43.9%	38.8%	61.2%
Financial aid and scholarships aimed at retention	72.9%	16.3%	65.1%	18.6%	81.4%

Survey Items— Two-Year Public Institutions	Institutions Using Method	Very Effective	Somewhat Effective	Minimally Effective	Very or Somewhat Effective
Identifying re-entry dates for students who are leaving	26.7%	16.1%	9.7%	74.2%	25.8%
Ongoing communication to stay in touch with current students via e-mail, the Web, regular mail, etc.	91.5%	15.7%	48.1%	36.1%	63.9%
Advising specifically for students approaching graduation to ensure they are on track	60.3%	15.7%	60.0%	24.3%	75.7%
Using a “reverse transfer” process to help students finish degrees at their previous institution	61.2%	15.5%	40.8%	43.7%	56.3%
Early-alert and intervention system	89.0%	15.2%	58.1%	26.7%	73.3%
Career services	93.2%	14.7%	45.9%	39.4%	60.6%
Co-curricular programs aimed at retention	59.5%	14.5%	46.4%	39.1%	60.9%
Learning communities	56.0%	13.8%	50.8%	35.4%	64.6%
Providing career services during students’ first year to help students see the connection between coursework and careers	55.6%	13.8%	41.5%	44.6%	55.4%
Programs designed specifically for students who are at risk for reasons other than academics	55.1%	13.8%	36.9%	49.2%	50.8%
Programs designed specifically for online learners	50.8%	13.3%	36.7%	50.0%	50.0%
Online social networking to engage students in online communities	78.8%	11.8%	45.2%	43.0%	57.0%
Financial literacy programs to assist students and parents with managing their personal finances	59.5%	11.6%	39.1%	49.3%	50.7%
Remaining in contact with students who are leaving	50.8%	10.0%	20.0%	70.0%	30.0%
Addressing issues with courses that have high withdrawal and/or failure rates	71.9%	8.5%	45.1%	46.3%	53.7%
Interviews or surveys with students who are withdrawing, before they leave	48.3%	7.0%	31.6%	61.4%	38.6%
Programs designed specifically for second-year students	11.9%	NA	NA	NA	NA

Usage and Effectiveness of Programs Targeted to Special Populations for Two-Year Public Institutions

Note: This data is a subset of the data presented in the previous, 37-item table.

Survey Items— Two-Year Public Institutions	Institutions Using Method	Very Effective	Somewhat Effective	Minimally Effective	Very or Somewhat Effective
Honors programs for academically advanced students	60.2%	36.6%	36.6%	26.8%	73.2%
Programs designed specifically for students of color	36.4%	30.2%	39.5%	30.2%	69.8%
Programs designed specifically for first-year students (e.g., orientation for first-year students, a first-year experience program, etc.)	86.4%	28.4%	53.9%	17.6%	82.4%
Programs designed specifically for veterans	53.8%	25.4%	42.9%	31.7%	68.3%
Programs designed specifically for adult/non-traditional students	37.3%	22.7%	38.6%	38.6%	61.4%
Programs designed specifically for transfer students	27.1%	21.9%	43.8%	34.4%	65.6%
Programs designed specifically for students who are at risk academically	74.4%	20.7%	48.3%	31.0%	69.0%
Programs designed specifically for international students	34.2%	20.0%	55.0%	25.0%	75.0%
Programs designed specifically for students who are at risk for reasons other than academics	55.1%	13.8%	36.9%	49.2%	50.8%
Programs designed specifically for online learners	50.8%	13.3%	36.7%	50.0%	50.0%
Programs designed specifically for second-year students	11.9%	NA	NA	NA	NA

Usage and Effectiveness of Practices for Retaining Online Learners for Two-Year Public Institutions

Survey Items— Two-Year Public Institutions	Institutions Using Method	Very Effective	Somewhat Effective	Minimally Effective	Very or Somewhat Effective
Required training program for online faculty	74.7%	43.2%	41.9%	14.9%	85.1%
Faculty development and support in online technology and online teaching pedagogy	88.9%	39.8%	35.2%	25.0%	75.0%
Technical support to address online connection issues	90.8%	34.8%	43.8%	21.3%	78.7%
Faculty advisor assigned to each online learner	44.9%	25.0%	40.9%	34.1%	65.9%
Mandatory online interaction between faculty and students	64.3%	22.2%	54.0%	23.8%	76.2%
Early-alert and intervention system for online learners	64.6%	20.3%	43.8%	35.9%	64.1%
Feedback mechanisms to identify program improvements for online learners	73.2%	19.7%	36.6%	43.7%	56.3%
Student services geared to online learners, including registration and financial aid	68.7%	19.1%	52.9%	27.9%	72.1%
Academic support services specifically for online learners	68.0%	19.1%	45.6%	35.3%	64.7%
Orientation program for online learners	69.7%	18.8%	31.9%	49.3%	50.7%

Usage and Effectiveness of 31 Internal Operations Practices for Student Retention and College Completion for Two-Year Public Institutions

Note: Many of these internal operations were previously ranked among the earlier, large list of strategies and tactics but this year are reported separately.

Survey Items— Two-Year Public Institutions	Institutions Using Method	Very Effective	Somewhat Effective	Minimally Effective	Very or Somewhat Effective
Institutionwide emphasis on the teaching of undergraduates and undergraduate learning	83.6%	33.0%	47.4%	19.6%	80.4%
Title III or Title V funding	58.1%	30.9%	50.0%	19.1%	80.9%
Benchmarking performance against peer institutions (e.g., retention and completion rates, credit hours or courses completed, etc.)	79.7%	25.5%	36.2%	38.3%	61.7%
Required training program for adjunct faculty	57.4%	24.2%	33.3%	42.4%	57.6%
Using an incoming student assessment to identify students' strengths, weaknesses, needs, and concerns that need to be addressed for their support and progress	43.6%	23.5%	37.3%	39.2%	60.8%
Tracking credit hours attempted versus completed for each term	65.3%	22.1%	49.4%	28.6%	71.4%
Setting measurable goals to improve the retention rate from term-to-term or year-to-year	77.1%	22.0%	39.6%	38.5%	61.5%
Tracking persistence and progression patterns, term by term, for all students who matriculate	74.6%	21.6%	45.5%	33.0%	67.0%
Setting measurable goals for college completion rates	79.7%	21.3%	39.4%	39.4%	60.6%
Using a retention software application to help track and manage student retention	24.8%	20.7%	20.7%	58.6%	41.4%
Identifying courses that are more difficult or less difficult to complete	78.0%	20.7%	47.8%	31.5%	68.5%
Tracking retention rates for specific academic programs	84.7%	20.0%	46.0%	34.0%	66.0%
Development of faculty skills in instruction, advising, and student interaction	83.1%	19.4%	42.9%	37.8%	62.2%
Reviewing course sequences within academic programs to address attrition	79.7%	19.1%	39.4%	41.5%	58.5%
Identifying courses with high withdrawal and/or failure rates	86.4%	18.6%	44.1%	37.3%	62.7%
Faculty mentor program to strengthen the skills of new, continuing, or adjunct faculty	59.8%	18.6%	42.9%	38.6%	61.4%
Monitoring student demand vs. student usage of academic support services	56.8%	17.9%	35.8%	46.3%	53.7%

Survey Items— Two-Year Public Institutions	Institutions Using Method	Very Effective	Somewhat Effective	Minimally Effective	Very or Somewhat Effective
Using established communication procedures to regularly communicate persistence, retention, and completion rate data throughout the campus	65.5%	17.1%	44.7%	38.2%	61.8%
Assessing what's important to your currently enrolled students to help ensure their satisfaction and success	76.9%	16.7%	44.4%	38.9%	61.1%
Setting measurable goals for credit hours or courses completed	54.7%	15.6%	37.5%	46.9%	53.1%
Training in professional service skills for front-line staff, new employees, or student employees to make campus atmosphere student-centered	69.0%	15.0%	47.5%	37.5%	62.5%
Using established communication procedures to regularly communicate student satisfaction data throughout the campus	68.6%	14.8%	38.3%	46.9%	53.1%
Tracking rates of academic probation	68.6%	13.6%	44.4%	42.0%	58.0%
Setting expectations for student engagement during hiring process for new faculty	50.4%	13.6%	47.5%	39.0%	61.0%
Using student engagement assessments to make changes to the ways faculty and staff interact with students to address attrition	62.7%	12.2%	29.7%	58.1%	41.9%
Building agreement among faculty, staff, and administration regarding retention and college completion concerns	78.8%	11.8%	45.2%	43.0%	57.0%
Using student satisfaction assessments to make changes to address attrition	78.8%	11.8%	52.7%	35.5%	64.5%
Adjusting admissions standards to address attrition	32.2%	10.5%	36.8%	52.6%	47.4%
Using student life evaluations to make changes to student life programs and services to address attrition	56.0%	9.2%	46.2%	44.6%	55.4%
Research into what attracted and convinced students to enroll in order to keep promises and understand expectations	52.6%	6.6%	34.4%	59.0%	41.0%
Statistical modeling to predict the likelihood of an incoming student persisting to degree completion	21.1%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	33.3%

Use of Outsourcing	Percent Yes
Does your institution outsource any specific operations to help increase retention and college completion rates? (Yes/No)	9.3%

If respondents answered “yes” to the previous item, they were also given a blank field in which to describe the types of outsourcing used. Only one practice was mentioned by two or more respondents:

—Outsourcing call centers for financial aid or other operations (four mentions)

Planning and Leadership Practices at Two-Year Public Institutions

Primary Basis for Identifying Most and Least Effective Practices (Respondents could choose one response only)	Percent of Institutions
Outcomes data	50.4%
Internal feedback mechanisms	39.1%
Student feedback data	10.4%

For this item, respondents were asked, “Of all the practices your institution is using for student retention and college completion, how do you determine which practices are most and least effective?”

Quality Ratings of Annual Plans, Long-Range Plans, and Committees	No (non-existent)	Yes, and It's of Excellent Quality	Yes, and It's of Good Quality	Yes, and It's of Fair Quality	Yes, and It's of Poor Quality
Written plan to guide student retention and college completion efforts	41.0%	4.3%	23.1%	21.4%	10.3%
Written plan to facilitate faculty/student engagement	56.4%	2.6%	14.5%	20.5%	6.0%
Retention committee to lead and coordinate retention efforts	34.8%	13.9%	25.2%	20.9%	5.2%
Individual position within our institution charged with primary responsibility for leading and coordinating retention activities and for getting retention results	39.3%	17.9%	19.7%	17.1%	6.0%

Note: The above percentage rates of “no/nonexistent,” “excellent,” “good,” “fair,” and “poor” are for all respondents (those who chose any of these five categories, including “no/nonexistent”). Hence, the five rates in each row of this table add up to 100 percent.

If respondents had a written plan to guide student retention and college completion ratings, they also responded to the following item:

Annual Updating of Written Plan for Student Retention and College Completion	Percent Yes
We create or update a written plan annually to guide student retention and college completion efforts (Yes/No)	41.8%

If respondents had a retention committee to lead and coordinate retention efforts, they also responded to the following item:

Empowerment of Retention Committee	Percent Yes
The retention committee is empowered to make decisions that affect multiple areas of campus (Yes/No)	37.8%

All respondents answered the following:

General Trend of Cohort Graduation Rate Over Past Three Years	Percent in Agreement
Increased 10% or more	3.4%
Increased 5% to 9.9%	6.0%
Increased 1% to 4.9%	31.9%
Remained stable (within +/- 1%)	45.7%
Decreased 1% to 4.9%	5.2%
Decreased 5% to 9.9%	7.8%
Decreased 10% or more	0.0%

For this item, respondents were instructed to “select one” from the above-listed seven options in response to the question, “What has been the general trend of your institution’s cohort graduation rate during the past three years?”

In addition, the following instructions were included:

4-year institutions: This is first-time, full-time freshmen who completed a four-year degree within five or six years.

2-year institutions: This is first-time, full-time freshmen who completed a two-year degree within two or three years.

Responding institutions

Thank you to those who participated. Sign up to receive additional reports and information updates by e-mail at www.noellelvitz.com/ [Subscribe](#).

Representatives from 263 colleges and universities participated in Noel-Levitz's 2013 national electronic poll of student retention and college completion practices. The poll was e-mailed to campus officials at accredited, degree-granting U.S. institutions. Respondents included 199 four-year private institutions, 80 four-year public institutions, and 118 two-year public institutions. The poll was completed between April 23 and May 10, 2013. Below is a list of institutions that participated.

Four-year private institutions

Note: Any participating two-year private institutions are included among the four-year private institutions.

Abilene Christian University (TX)	Elmira College (NY)	Northwest Nazarene University (ID)
Alfred University (NY)	Emory & Henry College (VA)	Northwest University (WA)
American International College (MA)	EPIC Bible College (CA)	Notre Dame de Namur University (CA)
Anna Maria College (MA)	Fairfield University (CT)	Ohio Mid-Western College (OH)
Antioch University Santa Barbara (CA)	Fairleigh Dickinson University (NJ)	Olivet College (MI)
Arcadia University (PA)	Felician College (NJ)	Oral Roberts University (OK)
Art Institute of Charleston, The (SC)	Fisher College (MA)	Otis College of Art and Design (CA)
Augsburg College (MN)	Franciscan University of Steubenville (OH)	Ottawa University (KS)
Averett University (VA)	Franklin University (OH)	Ottawa University Arizona (AZ)
Avila University (MO)	Freed-Hardeman University (TN)	Otterbein University (OH)
Azusa Pacific University (CA)	Friends University (Undergraduate College) (KS)	Penn View Bible Institute (PA)
Baldwin Wallace University (OH)	Friends University, College of Adult and Professional Studies (KS)	Point Loma Nazarene University (CA)
Baptist Memorial College of Health Sciences (TN)	Gannon University (PA)	Point Park University (PA)
Bethany Lutheran College (MN)	Geneva College (PA)	Point University (GA)
Bethel College (KS)	Gordon College (MA)	Pontifical Catholic University of Puerto Rico, The (PR)
Bethel College (VA)	Grace University (NE)	Queens University of Charlotte (NC)
Biola University (CA)	Greensboro College (NC)	Randolph College (VA)
Bluefield College (VA)	Grove City College (PA)	Randolph-Macon College (VA)
Boston Architectural College (MA)	Hartwick College (NY)	Rhodes College (TN)
Brandman University (CA)	Heidelberg University (OH)	Roberts Wesleyan College (NY)
Brevard College (NC)	Hesston College (KS)	Rockford College (IL)
Brown Mackie College-South Bend (IN)	High Point University (NC)	Rockhurst University (MO)
Brown Mackie College-Tucson (AZ)	Hillsdale College (MI)	Sage Colleges, The (NY)
Buena Vista University (IA)	Hofstra University (NY)	Saint Joseph's College of Maine (ME)
Cabrini College (PA)	Hope International University (CA)	Salem College (NC)
Cairn University (PA)	Immaculata University (PA)	Scripps College (CA)
Campbell University (NC)	Indiana Wesleyan University (IN)	Silver Lake College of the Holy Family (WI)
Carolina Christian College (NC)	International Baptist College and Seminary (AZ)	Southern Nazarene University (OK)
Carolina College of Biblical Studies (NC)	Jarvis Christian College (TX)	Southwestern Adventist University (TX)
Carroll University (WI)	Jones International University (CO)	Southwestern Assemblies of God University (TX)
Cazenovia College (NY)	Judson University (IL)	Spring Arbor University (MI)
Cedar Crest College (PA)	Kettering University (MI)	St. Ambrose University (IA)
Central College (IA)	Keystone College (PA)	St. Catherine University (MN)
Central Methodist University (MO)	Kilian Community College (SD)	St. John's University (NY)
Chapman University (CA)	King University (TN)	St. Mary's University (TX)
Chatfield College (OH)	Lake Forest College (IL)	St. Thomas University (FL)
Chestnut Hill College (PA)	Lancaster Bible College (PA)	Stillman College (AL)
Christian Brothers University (TN)	Lawrence Technological University (MI)	Suffolk University (MA)
Cincinnati Christian University (OH)	Le Moyné College (NY)	Tabor College (KS)
Clark University (MA)	LeMoyné-Owen College (TN)	Texas Lutheran University (TX)
Clarkson College (NE)	Lindsey Wilson College (KY)	Thomas College (ME)
Coker College (SC)	Loyola University New Orleans (LA)	Thomas More College (KY)
College of New Rochelle, The (NY)	Lynchburg College (VA)	Toccoa Falls College (GA)
College of Our Lady of the Elms (MA)	MacMurray College (IL)	Trevecca Nazarene University (TN)
College of Saint Benedict/Saint John's University (MN)	Maryland Institute College of Art (MD)	Trine University (IN)
Colorado Christian University (CO)	Marymount College (CA)	Trinity Christian College (IL)
Columbia College (MO)	McKendree University (IL)	Trinity College of Florida (FL)
Columbia International University (SC)	McMurry University (TX)	Tusculum College (TN)
Columbus College of Art & Design (OH)	Menlo College (CA)	Union Bible College (IN)
Concordia University (MI)	Methodist University (NC)	Unity College (ME)
Concordia University, St. Paul (MN)	Mid-Continent University (KY)	University of Bridgeport (CT)
Converse College (SC)	Midway College (KY)	University Of Charleston (WV)
Cornell College (IA)	Millikin University (IL)	University of Dallas (TX)
DeSales University (PA)	Milwaukee Institute of Art & Design (WI)	University of Hartford (CT)
Doane College (NE)	Milwaukee School of Engineering (WI)	University of Mary (ND)
Dominican College of Blauvelt (NY)	Missouri Baptist University (MO)	University of Miami (FL)
Drake University (IA)	Montreat College (NC)	University of Mobile (AL)
Eastern Nazarene College (MA)	Moody Bible Institute (IL)	University of Pikeville (KY)
Eastern University (PA)	Moravian College (PA)	University of Portland (OR)
Edgewood College (WI)	Morehouse College (GA)	University of Puget Sound (WA)
	National University (CA)	University of Saint Joseph (CT)
	National-Louis University (IL)	University of San Francisco (CA)
	New York School of Interior Design (NY)	University of Tampa (FL)
	Newberry College (SC)	University of the Arts, The (PA)
	Newman University (KS)	Utica College (NY)

Vanguard University of Southern California (CA)
Vaughn College of Aeronautics and Technology (NY)
Villa Maria College of Buffalo (NY)
Virginia Union University (VA)
Watkins College of Art, Design & Film (TN)
Western New England University (MA)
William Peace University (NC)
Wisconsin Lutheran College (WI)
Xavier University of Louisiana (LA)

Four-year public institutions

Albany State University (GA)
Arkansas State University-Jonesboro (AR)
Bowie State University (MD)
Brazosport College (TX)
California University of Pennsylvania (PA)
City University of New York The City College (NY)
Cleveland State University (OH)
College of Charleston (SC)
College of Coastal Georgia (GA)
Colorado State University (CO)
Columbus State University (GA)
Dixie State College of Utah (UT)
Evergreen State College, The (WA)
Georgia Southern University (GA)
Georgia State University (GA)
Great Basin College (NV)
Gulf Coast State College (FL)
Indiana University Southeast (IN)
Lamar University (TX)
Mayville State University (ND)
Metropolitan State University of Denver (CO)
Michigan State University (MI)
Midland College (TX)
Minot State University (ND)
Mississippi State University (MS)
Mississippi University for Women (MS)
Missouri Southern State University (MO)
Montana State University - Northern (MT)
Montana Tech of The University of Montana (MT)
Montclair State University (NJ)
Morgan State University (MD)
Murray State University (KY)
New York City College of Technology/City University of New York (NY)
Nicholls State University (LA)
Ohio State University Mansfield Campus, The (OH)
Pittsburg State University (KS)
Plymouth State University (NH)
Purdue University North Central Campus (IN)
Ramapo College of New Jersey (NJ)
Saginaw Valley State University (MI)
Salem State University (MA)
Salisbury University (MD)
South Carolina State University (SC)
Southern Illinois University Edwardsville (IL)
Southern Polytechnic State University (GA)
Southern Utah University (UT)
State University of New York College at Oswego (NY)
Sul Ross State University (TX)
Tarleton State University (TX)
Texas Woman's University (TX)
University of Akron College of Business (OH)
University of Arkansas Main Campus (AR)
University of Central Arkansas (AR)
University of Central Missouri (MO)
University of Delaware (DE)
University of Houston - Victoria (TX)
University of Louisiana at Monroe (LA)
University of Maryland Eastern Shore (MD)
University of Minnesota-Morris (MN)
University of Mississippi (MS)
University of North Dakota Main Campus (ND)

University of Northern Iowa (IA)
University of Pittsburgh at Bradford (PA)
University of Puerto Rico at Utuado (PR)
University of South Carolina Beaufort (SC)
University of South Carolina Columbia (SC)
University of South Florida (FL)
University of Southern Mississippi (MS)
University of Virginia's College at Wise, The (VA)
University of West Alabama, The (AL)
University of West Georgia (GA)
University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point (WI)
Valley City State University (ND)
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (VA)
West Liberty University (WV)
West Virginia State University (WV)
Western Connecticut State University (CT)
Western Illinois University (IL)
Western Oregon University (OR)
Youngstown State University (OH)

Two-year public institutions

Alamance Community College (NC)
Alexandria Technical & Community College (MN)
Allen Community College (KS)
Amarillo College (TX)
Arkansas State University-Beebe (AR)
Arkansas State University-Newport (AR)
Asheville - Buncombe Technical Community College (NC)
Bay Noc Community College (MI)
Bellingham Technical College (WA)
Belmont College (OH)
Big Sandy Community and Technical College (KY)
Brookdale Community College (NJ)
Broome Community College (NY)
Butler Community College (KS)
Cabrillo College (CA)
Cape Fear Community College (NC)
Carl Albert State College (OK)
Cayuga Community College (NY)
Central Oregon Community College (OR)
Central Texas College (TX)
Central Wyoming College (WY)
Cincinnati State Technical and Community College (OH)
Clinton Community College (IA)
College of the Ouachitas (AR)
Columbus State Community College (OH)
Columbus Technical College (GA)
Community College of Allegheny County (PA)
Community College of Beaver County (PA)
Copiah-Lincoln Community College (MS)
Cossatot Community College of the University of Arkansas (AR)
Crafton Hills College (CA)
Davidson County Community College (NC)
Delaware County Community College (PA)
Delaware Technical Community College, Stanton Campus (DE)
Dutchess Community College (NY)
East Central College (MO)
East Central Community College (MS)
East Mississippi Community College (MS)
Eastern Arizona College (AZ)
Eastern Gateway Community College (OH)
Eastern New Mexico University-Roswell (NM)
Eastern West Virginia Community and Technical College (WV)
Elgin Community College (IL)
Erie Community College (NY)
Fort Peck Community College (MT)
Fort Scott Community College (KS)
Gateway Technical College (WI)
Grays Harbor College (WA)
Gwinnett Technical College (GA)

Harrisburg Area Community College (PA)
Hillsborough Community College (FL)
Hinds Community College (MS)
Hocking College (OH)
Howard Community College (MD)
Hutchinson Community College and Area Vocational School (KS)
Inver Hills Community College (MN)
Iowa Lakes Community College (IA)
Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana (IN)
Ivy Tech Community College-Central Indiana (IN)
Jefferson College (MO)
Kent State University Trumbull Campus (OH)
La Guardia Community College/City University of New York (NY)
Lakeland Community College (OH)
Lakeshore Technical College (WI)
Lee College (TX)
Lurleen B. Wallace Community College (AL)
Luzerne County Community College (PA)
Macomb Community College (MI)
Meridian Community College (MS)
Metropolitan Community College - Blue River (MO)
Minneapolis Community and Technical College (MN)
Mitchell Technical Institute (SD)
Mohave Community College (AZ)
Mohawk Valley Community College (NY)
Morgan Community College (CO)
Mountain Empire Community College (VA)
Neosho County Community College (KS)
North Dakota State College of Science (ND)
North Florida Community College (FL)
North Hennepin Community College (MN)
North Iowa Area Community College (IA)
Northeast Community College (NE)
Northern Maine Community College (ME)
Northern Virginia Community College (VA)
Ocean County College (NJ)
Odessa College (TX)
Okefenokee Technical College (GA)
Oxnard College (CA)
Paul D. Camp Community College (VA)
Piedmont Technical College (SC)
Quinebaug Valley Community College (CT)
Rio Salado College (AZ)
Rochester Community and Technical College (MN)
Rock Valley College (IL)
San Antonio College (TX)
Snead State Community College (AL)
Snow College (UT)
South Arkansas Community College (AR)
South Plains College (TX)
Southeastern Community College (NC)
Southern Arkansas University Tech (AR)
Southwest Wisconsin Technical College (WI)
Spokane Community College (WA)
Texas State Technical College Waco (TX)
Trenholm State Technical College (AL)
University of Arkansas Community College at Morrilton (AR)
University of Hawaii Leeward Community College (HI)
University of Hawaii Windward Community College (HI)
Victor Valley College (CA)
Victoria College (TX)
Walters State Community College (TN)
Washington State Community College (OH)
Wayne Community College (NC)
West Virginia Northern Community College (WV)
Western Texas College (TX)
Wilkes Community College (NC)
Wisconsin Indianhead Technical College (WI)
Wor-Wic Community College (MD)

Questions about this report? Want to discuss the findings?

We hope you found this report to be helpful and informative. If you have questions or would like additional information about the findings, please contact Noel-Levitz at 1-800-876-1117 or ContactUs@noellevitz.com. In addition, please contact us if you would like a complimentary telephone consultation to discuss your strategies for student retention and college completion with a Noel-Levitz expert.

About Noel-Levitz and our higher education research

A trusted partner to higher education, Noel-Levitz focuses on strategic planning for enrollment and student success. Our consultants work side by side with campus executive teams to facilitate planning and to help implement the resulting plans.

For more than 20 years, we have conducted national surveys to assist campuses with benchmarking their performance. This includes benchmarking marketing/recruitment and student success practices and outcomes, monitoring student and campus usage of the Web and electronic communications, and comparing recruitment budgets and policies. There is no charge or obligation for participating, and responses to all survey items are strictly confidential. Participants have the advantage of receiving the findings first, as soon as they become available.

For more information, visit www.noellevitz.com.

Higher Ed Benchmarks

Related reports from Noel-Levitz

Benchmark Poll Report Series
www.noellevitz.com/BenchmarkReports

E-Expectations Report Series
www.noellevitz.com/E-ExpectationsSeries

Latest Discounting Report
www.noellevitz.com/DiscountingReport

National Student Satisfaction-Priorities Reports
www.noellevitz.com/SatisfactionBenchmarks

National Freshman Attitudes Reports
www.noellevitz.com/FreshmanAttitudes

All material in this report is copyright © by Noel-Levitz, LLC. Permission is required to redistribute information from Noel-Levitz, LLC, either in print or electronically. Please contact us at ContactUs@noellevitz.com about reusing material from this report.

Read more about Noel-Levitz's higher education trend research at www.noellevitz.com/TrendResearch.

How to cite this report

Noel-Levitz (2013). *2013 student retention and college completion practices report for four-year and two-year institutions*. Coralville, Iowa: Noel-Levitz. Retrieved from www.noellevitz.com/BenchmarkReports.

Find it online.

This report is posted online at www.noellevitz.com/BenchmarkReports.

Sign up to receive additional reports or our e-newsletter.

Visit our Web page: www.noellevitz.com/Subscribe