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Report Presented December 2019
Program to improve first-generation student retentions delivers significant gains.

First-generation students who participated in the Aggie First Scholar program experienced significant gains in persistence compared to similar students who did not (DID = 9.2%, p < .01).

**INTRODUCTION:** First-generation students lag behind continuing-generation peers in terms of graduation rates and average time to graduation. This phenomenon has been extensively studied in higher education with the intent of closing the gap seen between generational statuses. Utah State University provides services to support first-generation students. In the 2018/2019 academic year, USU initiative a full-kit initiative to help first-generation student participate in several proven first-year student milestones. This report explores the impact of full-kit use of services and the individual impact of each service on first-generation student persistence.

**METHODS:** Students who self-identified as first-generation on their USU application were invited to participate in the Aggie First Scholars (AFS) program. AFS was developed to support first-generation students during their first academic year through peer mentoring. The program developed a full-kit of services believed to support first-year success. These programs included:

- Complete a FAFSA
- Meet with an advisor
- Initiate a degree plan
- Participate in Connections
- Complete orientation modules

Additionally, students could have one-on-one or group meetings with a mentor. Students level of participation in the various programs was assessed for its impact on student persistence.

AFS students were compared to similar students through prediction-based propensity score matching. This technique matched participating students with non-participants based on their persistence prediction and their propensity to participate. The differences between predicted and actual persistence rates were compared using difference-in-difference testing.

**FINDINGS:** Students who participated in at least 4 of the AFS full-kit services were more likely to persist to the next term. Peer mentoring emerged as a significant single milestone for first-generation students.
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Do first-generation students who participate in AFS programs experience a change in persistence?

WHY PERSISTENCE?
Student success can be defined in various ways. One valuable way to view student success is through progress towards graduation. Progress towards graduation reflects students acquiring the necessary knowledge and accumulating credentials that prepare them for graduation. Progress towards graduation can be measured through student persistence. Here, persistence is defined as term-to-term enrolment at Utah State University. As a measurement, persistence facilitates a quick feedback loop to identify what’s working well and what can be better (Baer, Hagman, & Kil, 2020; Colver, 2019).

WHY USE ANALYTICS?
Higher education professionals labor to support student success in all its various forms, not just through persistence. However, professionals now have access to far more data than they can feasibly interpret and utilize to support student success without the help of analytics. Fortunately, USU has access to professional tools that can process and organize data into insights that have historically been hidden from view (Appendix A). University professionals can leverage insights to directly influence student success (Baer, Kil, & Hagman, 2019). Indeed, analytics aligns with USU’s mission to be a “premier student-centered land-grant institution” by allowing professionals to know what is going well and what could be better (see Appendix G for the evaluation cycle).

FIRST GENERATION STUDENTS & PERSISTENCE
Nationally, graduation rates are lower and average time to graduation is longer for first generation students compared to their continuing-generation peers. The higher drop-out and duration of college career have been, in part, attributed to students academic and social integration (US Department of Education, 1998; Tinto, 1975) and a lack of institutional knowledge (Hottinger & Rose, 2006).

In order to support first-generation student success USU created targeted programming to bolster student first-year success for first-generation students. University professionals identified first-year milestones associated with student success. The milestones, taken together (in the “full-kit”), were believed to have a beneficial impact on students persistence at USU. Student mentoring in individual and group settings supported social integration and the guidance through the first-year milestones provided scaffolded institutional integration. Meeting with academic advisors facilitated the connection to academics.

This report explores the impact of AFS programming on first-generation student persistence between their first and third semesters. It was anticipated that completion of individual first-year milestones would improve student persistence, but that the largest impact would be felt by students who participated in all, or most, of the milestones; i.e. students who utilized the full-kit of programs.
Alleviating Bottlenecks to Success for First-Generation Students: Theory of Constraints in Practice

THEORY OF CONSTRAINTS

The theory of constraints was born out of the manufacturing industry (Goldratt, 1984). It combated siloed processes to view the production process as a whole. The theory suggests that there are portions of any process that serve as bottlenecks to productivity. By identifying the bottlenecks, concerted effort can relieve the constraint and improve the process. An improved process facilitates success. Since 1984, when the theory of constraints was first introduced, it has grown in popularity as a tool for improving process across numerous fields, including higher education.

By design, higher education is intended to be rigorous. Liberal arts education is intended to promote holistic personal development, co-curricular immersion, social integration, and specialized discipline specific training (Colver, 2018). Obtaining a degree is not a simple task. However, in addition to the intended rigor of higher education there are often unintended rigors that constrain degree completion.

Complicated processes associated with financial aid, major declaration, graduation applications, and all the steps in-between can hinder students progress towards completion. These process constraints are not part of the necessary rigor of university.

Interestingly, the strain of these complicated processes is often not equally dispersed across all student segments. Specifically, continuing-generation students often have an upper-hand since they have familial support in finding resources and understanding processes (Peabody, 2013). Taking a close look at constraints can promote equity within higher education.

Following the identification of constraints, targeted efforts are made to exploit the constraint. In this report the targeted efforts focused on building first-generation students’ social, academic, and institution integration to alleviate process constrains that can result in drop-out.

Specifically for first-generation students, first-year milestone activities were selected that promote holistic student success. To support social integration, peer mentors regularly reached-out to students to provide opportunities to networking and socialize. Peer mentors also encouraged and guided students through processes associated with academic and institutional integration. Students were encouraged to meet with an academic advisor, begin a degree plan, complete a FAFSA, attend first-year seminar, and engage in orientation modules. Each of these milestones are believed to be impactful on student persistence, however, the combined effect was expected to be more powerful as a full-kit, multifaceted approach to relieving the constraints to persistence. This report explores the impact of the full-kit of services and the individual impacts of single milestone participation.
Participation Among First-Time, Full-Time Freshmen in First-Year Milestones

FIRST-YEAR MILESTONES

Several university resources were identified as important first-year milestones. The below milestones set students on a path towards retention.

- Consulting with an Advisor
- Participating in Connections (first-year seminar)
- Completing all Online Orientation Modules
- Initiating a Degree-Plan
- Submitting a FAFSA

These milestones were considered to be effective retention efforts for all first-year students.

FIRST-GENERATION STUDENTS

Given that first-generation students lag behind continuing generation peers in their time to graduation and graduation rates, but not ability, it was necessary to provide greater attention and support to their needs. A strength of the AFS methods was to promote retention by leveraging the existing milestones to put first-generation students on a path towards degree completion.

In addition to mentioned milestones, AFS had a unique support available only to AFS participants, peer mentoring. The peer mentors scaffolded many of the milestone, giving direction and reminders of dates and deadlines. In addition to being a resource for the first-year milestones, peer mentors also provided opportunities for socialization and networking.

FULL-KIT MILESTONE COMPLETION

In Fall 2018, AFS focused on delivering the full-kit of first-milestones to participants. Mean participation was 3 initiatives, with a median at 4 milestones. 12% of AFS participants completed the full-kit, 23.4% competed 5 milestones, and 24.7% completed 4.

The most widely participated in first-year milestone was the completing of a FAFSA. The least utilized resources was peer mentoring networking, see Table 1.

TABLE 1:
Targeted Programs Participation Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Aggie First Scholars</th>
<th>Continuing-Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fa17 N = 487</td>
<td>Fa18 N = 619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advising</td>
<td>58.5% NA</td>
<td>67.6% NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Planning</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took First-Year</td>
<td>63.2% NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>43.1% NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation Modules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitted FAFSA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met with a Mentor</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The proportion of students initiating a degree plan was higher among the AFS population. Of the students who initiated a degree plan, roughly a quarter self-initiated and 20% self-modified their plan. The rates of self-creation and modification was similar for continuing generation students.

Student participation in Connections, USU’s first-year seminar program, was also higher among AFS participants during Fall 2018. In Fall 2017, AFS participation in Connections was similar to their continuing-generation peers.

FAFSA data is protected and was unavailable with the exception of the percent of students who completed the process for AFS students in the 2018/2019 academic year. First-generation students tend to have greater need for financial support and this is reflected in the high proportion of AFS students completing a FAFSA, 81.9%. The USU average FAFSA completion is far lower, closer to 60%.

USU provides a phased-online orientation for new students. This method of orientation has shown effective impacts on student institutional knowledge and persistence (Simmons & Dickamore, 2019). There are 5 modules; modules 1 through 4 are required. Module 5 still contains valuable, time-specific institutional knowledge, but there are no holds or other consequences attached to module completion.

AFS participant use of mentoring events was lower than expected, around 20% each semester. However, when considered across the academic year, 33.9% of AFS students during the Fall of 2018 met at least once with a peer mentor.

Does generation status influence student persistence?

**PERSISTENCE GAP AT USU: FIRST- & CONTINUING-GENERATION STUDENTS**

To identify the impact of generation status on student persistence, first-generation students were compared to continuing generation peers. A robust comparison of groups required that student inputs must be balanced between groups (see Appendix A). To accomplish this, the analysis used a technique called prediction-based propensity score matching. In this method first-generation students were matched with similar continuing generation students (See Appendix B for analytic details). Matching helps account for differences in student inputs between the two groups and better isolates the effect of being generation status on student persistence. Briefly, students are matched on their likelihood to persistence and their propensity to be AFS to ensure a good comparison between groups.

Generation status was compared during the 2017/2018 and 2018/2019 academic years. In 2018/2019, first-generation students were encouraged to participate robustly in the full-kit of milestones. AFS services were also available during the 2017/2018 academic year, but the full-kit approach had not yet been adapted.

**DEFINITION**

Persistence is defined as term-to-term enrollment. Persistence rate for a given term is a measure of next term enrollment. Such that, a Fall 2018 persistence rate reflects students enrolled in Fall 2018 who attended again in Spring 2019.
Students from Fall 2017 and Spring 2018 academic year were used to estimate the persistence gap since services were business-as-usual. This sample provides a baseline for the gap between AFS and similar continuing generation students. In Fall 2017 the mean persistence difference between AFS and similar continuing generation students was -3.14% (CI: -7.34% to 1.16%). In Spring 2018 the difference in persistence was -3.50% (CI: -8.91 to 1.89%). Neither term reached statistical significance. Between these two semesters, it is estimated that USU could have lost 24 first generation students who were otherwise expected to persist.

First-generation students from Fall 2018 and Spring 2019 academic year benefited from targeted, full-kit programming designed to close the gap between AFS and continuing generation students. In Fall 2018 the mean persistence difference between AFS and similar continuing-generation students was -2.75% (CI: -6.15% to 0.65%). In Spring the difference was -0.14 (CI: -4.94 to 4.66%). Between these two semesters, it is estimated that USU lost 15 AFS students who were otherwise expected to persist. Again, neither term reached statistical significance, the small gains may reflect a closing in the persistence gap between first generation and continuing-generation peers at USU, see Figure 2.

Impact by Level of Participation

Not all AFS students took advantage of the full-kit of services. As seen above, only 12% participated in all 6 milestones, 23% completed 5, and 24% completed 4 milestones. Figure 3 illustrates the change in persistence by students level of participation compared to similar AFS students who engaged in fewer services. The small number of participants who completed the full-kit made the estimate less accurate (the analysis needs a minimum of 250 participants for accurate estimation, but prefers analyses with over 1,000). While the number of participants remained small in the 4 plus analysis, a significant difference was detected. The change in persistence is associate with retaining an estimated 23 (CI: 6 to 41) first-generation students who were otherwise not expected to persist. This increase reflects an estimated $109,336.25 (CI: $28,522.50 to $194,903.75) in retained tuition, assuming a net tuition of $4,753.75 (see Appendix C).
CHANGE IN PERSISTENCE COMPARED TO SIMILAR CONTINUING-GENERATION PEERS

A limiting factor in the above analyses was a restricted comparison group. While there were 370 students who participated in 4 or more milestones, there were only 294 eligible comparison students in the AFS populations (with a total AFS population of 619).

The following analysis looked at the level of participation compared to similar continuing generation peers. In Figure 4 the change in persistence is displayed. While none of the analyses reached statistical significance, the practical gains suggest that participation at the 5 Plus or 4 Plus level are associated with gains in persistence. Additional years of data will increase the sample size, and will permit a more accurate estimate and understanding of the impact of full-kit services on student persistence.

CHANGE IN PERSISTENCE BY TERM

Illume impact isolates the association between initiatives by term. Neither term raised to statistical significance, however, the estimated gain in persistence is much larger in spring (see Figure 5). This number reflects the persistence rate between spring and fall, or, in other words, students who are retained from spring to the fall semester. The increase in persistence between spring and fall may suggest that AFS activities are associated with retention over the summer-melt.

CHANGE IN PERSISTENCE BY STUDENT SEGMENTS

Illume Impact delved into impact by various student segments to identify how the program influenced students with specific characteristics. Please note that the student segments are not mutually exclusive. Two student segments emerged as showing significant differences between comparison students:

- STEM Majors
- Students with Mixed Modality Courses

Both groups had smaller sample sizes that desired, but suggests that students in STEM majors are more likely to be retained if they complete at least 4 of the first-year milestones compared to similar continuing-generation peers. Similarly, students who have some online or broadcast courses appear from completing at least 4 of the AFS full-kit milestones.

Appendix D lists all student segments with non-significant findings.

FIGURE 4 Change in Persistence Compared to Continuing-Generation Peers

Mean change in persistence [dots] by level of participation in full-kit services for the 2018/2019 academic year with confidence intervals [lines] compared to similar continuing-generation students.

FIGURE 5 Change in Persistence Compared to Continuing-Generation Peers by Term

Mean change in persistence compared to similar continuing-generation students.
Impact by Individual AFS Supports

THE PLAN TO CLOSE THE GAP
The above analysis looked at the impact of full-kit services on student persistence, the following pages outline the impact by single student support to explore the salience of single services on student persistence.

- Academic advising
- Developing a degree plan
- First-year seminar (Connections)
- FAFSA support
- New student orientation
- Peer mentoring

TABLE 2: Targeted Programs Participation Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Used Resource</th>
<th>Did Not Use Resource</th>
<th>Did Not Use Resource</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
<td>Spring 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advising</td>
<td>379 222 279 237</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Planning</td>
<td>398 221 372 144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took First-Year Seminar</td>
<td>425 194 na na</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filed a FAFSA</td>
<td>na na 507 112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed New Student Orientation</td>
<td>383 236 na na</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met with a Mentor</td>
<td>122 484 136 428</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACADEMIC ADVISING
448 unique AFS students, or 72.4%, met with advisors during their first year at USU. The gain in persistence from meeting with an advisor was not statistically significant, but is practically significant. Students who met with an advisor experienced a 3.55% higher persistence rate. Figure 6A illustrates that the difference is more associated with a drop in persistence for students who did not meet with an advisor than a gain in persistence for AFS students who did meet with an advisor. This suggests that meeting with an advisor is an important element of closing the persistence gap. While meeting with an advisor does not drastically increase persistence, it prevents a drop in persistence.

DEGREE PLANNING
423 unique AFS students, or 68.3%, completed a degree plan during their first year at USU. The gain in persistence from making a degree plan was non-significant, but it was practically significant. Students who created a degree plan experienced a 3.86% higher persistence rate. Figure 6B illustrates that the difference is completely associated with a drop in persistence for students who did not create a plan. This suggests that meeting with an advisor is an important element of closing the persistence gap for first generation students. While there is no gain for AFS who have a degree plan, AFS students who do not have a markedly reduced persistence.

FIGURE 6A & 6B ADVISING & DEGREE PLANNING PREVENT DROP-OUT
Predicted and actual persistence for AFS students who used advising (6A) or degree planning (6B) compared to similar AFS students who did not use the resources.
FIRST-YEAR SEMINAR

439 unique AFS students, or 68.7%, registered for USU’s first-year experience (Connections). Of those students who took Connections, 425 passed the course with a C- or higher. The gain in persistence was not statistically significant for students taking Connections or for students passing Connections. The gains are practically significant and follow the same trends seen in academic advising and degree planning. AFS students who took Connections remained at their predicted persistence, AFS students who did not participate in the seminar dropped from their predicted persistence of 88.0% to their actual persistence of 84.2%. See Figure 7A.

FAFSA

507 unique AFS students, or 81.9%, completed a FAFSA during their first year at USU. The change in persistence from completing a FAFSA was not statistically significant. Interestingly, students who did not complete a FAFSA had slightly higher (though not statistically significant) persistence than AFS students who did not complete a FAFSA application. See Figure 7B for an illustration of the change in persistence.

NEW STUDENT ORIENTATION

USU adopted a phased, online orientation model. The phased orientation allows USU to present small amounts of information to incoming students at the right time. The series includes 5 modules. Modules 1 - 3 are required; modules 4 & 5 are optional. Each includes important information designed to help students succeed at USU. This analysis compared AFS students who completed all 5 modules to AFS students who did not. The difference between students was not statistically significant, nor was it practically significant. See Figure 7C.

FIGURE 7A, 7B, & 7C FIRST-YEAR SEMINAR PREVENTS DROP. FILING A FAFSA & COMPLETING ORIENTATION DID NOT CONTRIBUTE TO PERSISTENCE.

Predicted and actual persistence for AFS students who passed the first-year seminar (7A), filed a FAFSA (7B), & completed orientation (7C) compared to similar AFS students who do not use the resources.
Peer Mentorship

188 unique AFS students, 30.4%, met with a peer mentor during their first year at USU. Most of these students met both during the Fall and Spring semester. Students could meet for ice cream or lunch. The gain in persistence was not statistically significant for meeting with a peer mentor, but there is practical significance (4.14%, CI: -1.60% to 9.88%). However, when only lunch meetings were considered, the analysis was statistically significant. The time spent during a lunch peer mentor meeting was greater than meeting for ice cream, this extra time to visit may contribute a significant gain in persistence (6.48%, CI: 0.57% to 12.39%).

Several student subgroups experienced significant gains from having lunch with a mentor (Figure 4).
- Caucasian & non-Hispanic/Latinx
- Female Students
- Non-STEM Majors

Given the small sample size of the analysis, it is more difficult to find statistically significant impacts for many student subgroups. The demographic representativeness of peer mentoring was worth exploring.

RACE
USU has a high population of White or Caucasian students, about 85%. Students who participated in AFS programming had a similarly high proportion of Caucasian students, 85.1%. The breakdown by race in Table 3 illustrates that about a quarter of Caucasian, Multiracial, and African-American AFS students met at least once with a peer mentor. Asian-American, Pacific Islanders, and American-Natives met at slightly higher rates (40%-50%), but the sample size was small, which makes the data less reliable.

ETHNICITY
Table 3 also illustrates the rates of participation for Hispanic/Latinx AFS students. The rate of participation for Hispanic/Latinx AFS students is slightly higher than non-Hispanic/Latinx AFS students. The overall proportion of Hispanic/Latinx students in the AFS population is greater than what would be expected from the USU general student body. 5.5% of the USU student body identifies as Hispanic/Latinx, 12.4% of the AFS students are Hispanic/Latinx.

GENDER
AFS is composed mostly of female students, 61.6% of all AFS students are women. Women also make up the majority of AFS students who meet with a peer mentor. 78.3% of people meeting with mentors are women, only 21.7% are men.

**TABLE 3:**
Race & ethnicity of students who met with a peer mentor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met with Mentor</th>
<th>Did Not Meet with Mentor</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RACE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American-Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ETHNICITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latinx</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic/Latinx</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENDER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix A

THEORETICAL FOUNDATION FOR IMPACT ANALYSES: INPUT, ENVIRONMENT, OUTPUT MODEL (ASTIN, 1993)

STUDENT INPUTS
Students bring different combinations of strengths to their university experience. Their inputs influence student life and success, but do not determine it.

STUDENT ENVIRONMENTS
The University provides a diverse array of curricular, co-curricular, and extra-curricular activities to enhance the student experience. Students selectively participate to varying degrees in activities. Student environments influence student life and success, but do not determine it.

STUDENT OUTCOMES
While student success can be defined in multiple ways, a good indicator of student success is persistence to the next term. It means that students are continuing on a path towards graduation. Persistence is influenced by student inputs and University environments.

IMPACT ANALYSIS
An impact analysis can effectively measure the influence of University initiatives on student persistence by accounting for student inputs through matching participants with similar students who chose not to participate.

Input - Environment - Outcomes
Student success is composed of both personal inputs and environments to which individuals are exposed (Astin, 1993). Impact analysis controls for student input through participant matching on (1) their likelihood to be involved in an environment and (2) their predicted persistence score. By controlling for student inputs, impact analyses can more accurately measure the influence of specific student environments on student persistence.
Appendix B

ANALYTIC DETAILS: ESTIMATING PROGRAMMATIC IMPACT THROUGH PREDICTION-BASED PROPENSITY SCORE MATCHING (PPSM)

Impact analyses are quasi-experiments that compare students who participate in University initiatives to similar students who do not. Students who participate are called participants, students who do not have a record of participation are called comparison students. The analysis results in an estimation of the effect of the treatment on the treated (ETT). In other words, it estimates the effect of participating in University initiatives on student persistence for students who participated. This estimation is appropriate for observational studies with voluntary participation (Geneletti & Dawid, 2009).

Accounting for bias. While ETT is appropriate for observational studies with voluntary participation, voluntary participation adds bias. Specifically, voluntary participation results in self-selection bias, which refers to the fact that participants and comparison students may be innately different. For example, students who self-select into math tutoring (or intramurals or the Harry Potter Club) may be quantitatively and qualitatively different than students who do not use math tutoring (or intramurals or the Harry Potter Club). To account for these differences, reduce the effect of self-selection bias, and increase validity, a matching technique called Prediction-Based Propensity Score Matching (PPSM) is used.

In PPSM, matching is achieved by pairing participating students with non-participating students who are similar in both their (a) predicted persistence and (b) their propensity to participate in an iterative, boot-strapped analysis (Milliron, Kil, Malcolm, & Gee, 2017).

(A) Predicted Persistence. Utah State University utilizes student data to create a persistence prediction for each student. The main benefit to students from the predictive system is an as early alert system; it identifies students in need of additional resources to support their success at USU. A secondary use of the predicted persistence scores are to evaluate the impact on student-facing programs on student success. This is an invaluable practice that fosters accountability, efficiency, and innovation for the benefit of students.

The predicted persistence scores are derived through a regularized ridge regression. This technique allows for the incorporation of numerous student data points, including:

- academic performance
- degree progress metrics
- socioeconomic status
- student engagement

The ridge regression rank orders the numerous covariates by their predictive power. This equation is then used to predict student persistence scores for students at USU. This score is utilized as one point for matching in PPSM.

(B) Propensity to Participate. The second point used for matching in PPSM is a propensity score. Propensity scores reflect a students likelihood to participate in an initiative (Rosenbaum & Rubin, 1983). It is derived through logistic ridge regression that utilizes participation status as the outcome variable. Using the equation, each student is given a propensity score which reflects their likelihood to participate regardless of their actual participation status.

Matching is achieved through bootstrapped iterations that randomly selects a subset of participant and comparison students. Within each bootstrapped iteration, comparison students are paired using 1-to-1, nearest neighbor matching. Matches are created when student predicted persistence and propensity scores match within a 0.05 calliper width. Within the random bootstrapping iterations, all participants are included at least once. Students who do not find an adequate match are excluded from the analysis (for additional details see Louviere, 2020).

Difference-in-Difference. To measure the impact of University services on student persistence, a difference-in-difference analysis is used. A difference-in-difference analysis compares the calculated predicted means from the bootstrapped iteration distributions to the actual persistence rates of participating and comparison students. In other words, the analysis looks at the difference between predicted persistence and actual persistence between the two groups of well-matched students. Statistical significance is measured at the 0.05 alpha level and utilizes confidence intervals. The results reflects the ETT.
Appendix C

ADJUSTED RETAINED TUITION MULTIPLIER

Retained tuition is calculated by multiplying retained students by the USU average adjusted tuition. Average adjusted tuition was calculated in 2018/2019 dollars with support from the Budget and Planning Office. The amounts in the below table reflect net tuition which removes all tuition waivers from the overall gross tuition amounts. Utilizing net tuition provides a more accurate and conservative multiplier for understanding the impact of University initiatives on retained tuition. The table below parses the average adjusted tuition by campus and academic level. The highlighted cell represents the multiplier used in this analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Groups</th>
<th>Net Tuition</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Average Annual Tuition &amp; Fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All USU Students</td>
<td>$148,864,384</td>
<td>33,070</td>
<td>$4,501.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduates</td>
<td>$131,932,035</td>
<td>29,033</td>
<td>$4,544.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>$16,932,349</td>
<td>4,037</td>
<td>$4,194.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan Campus Students</td>
<td>$119,051,003</td>
<td>25,106</td>
<td>$4,741.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduates</td>
<td>$107,711,149</td>
<td>22,659</td>
<td>$4,753.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>$11,339,854</td>
<td>2,447</td>
<td>$4,634.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-Wide Campus Students</td>
<td>$25,941,419</td>
<td>7,964</td>
<td>$3,257.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduates</td>
<td>$20,303,215</td>
<td>3,864</td>
<td>$5,254.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>$5,638,204</td>
<td>1,590</td>
<td>$3,546.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USU-E Price &amp; Blanding Students</td>
<td>$3,871,962</td>
<td>2,560</td>
<td>$1,512.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix D

## STUDENT SEGMENTS THAT DID NOT EXPERIENCE A SIGNIFICANT CHANGE IN PERSISTENCE FROM PARTICIPATING IN 4+ MILESTONES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Student Segment**</th>
<th>Model Fit***</th>
<th>Actual Persistence</th>
<th>Comparison Students</th>
<th>Difference-in Difference CI p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>656</td>
<td>Overall Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>80.85%</td>
<td>77.44%</td>
<td>3.37% 4.30% 0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>656</td>
<td>Undergraduate Students Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>80.85%</td>
<td>77.44%</td>
<td>3.37% 4.30% 0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>655</td>
<td>First Time in College Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>80.83%</td>
<td>77.47%</td>
<td>3.32% 4.30% 0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>Full-time Courses Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>81.92%</td>
<td>78.14%</td>
<td>3.75% 4.36% 0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>582</td>
<td>White or Caucasian Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>80.11%</td>
<td>77.09%</td>
<td>3.00% 4.60% 0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>573</td>
<td>Not Hispanic or Latino Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>79.89%</td>
<td>77.24%</td>
<td>2.62% 4.64% 0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512</td>
<td>All On-Ground Status Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>81.60%</td>
<td>80.43%</td>
<td>1.17% 4.69% 0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>489</td>
<td>Non-STEM Major Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>79.35%</td>
<td>77.86%</td>
<td>1.45% 5.02% 0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477</td>
<td>Female Students Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>80.89%</td>
<td>77.79%</td>
<td>3.04% 5.03% 0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>358</td>
<td>1-3 Terms Completed Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>72.22%</td>
<td>69.36%</td>
<td>2.89% 6.55% 0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>Third Persistence Prediction Quartile (50th - 74th Percentiles) Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>84.81%</td>
<td>82.59%</td>
<td>2.09% 6.18% 0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>0 Terms Completed Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>91.30%</td>
<td>89.85%</td>
<td>1.37% 4.93% 0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>Second Persistence Prediction Quartile (25th - 49th Percentiles) Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>76.86%</td>
<td>73.48%</td>
<td>3.48% 7.54% 0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178*</td>
<td>Male Students Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>80.71%</td>
<td>76.52%</td>
<td>4.23% 8.29% 0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91*</td>
<td>Top Persistence Prediction Quartile (75th - 100th Percentiles) Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>91.36%</td>
<td>82.97%</td>
<td>8.19% 9.62% 0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82*</td>
<td>Hispanic or Latino Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>87.76%</td>
<td>79.20%</td>
<td>8.53% 11.17% 0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43*</td>
<td>Bottom Persistence Prediction Quartile (1st - 24th Percentiles) Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>55.59%</td>
<td>54.74%</td>
<td>0.97% 21.10% 0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34*</td>
<td>Part-time Courses Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>61.58%</td>
<td>64.91%</td>
<td>-3.35% 23.03% 0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27*</td>
<td>Unknown Racial Heritage Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>83.08%</td>
<td>82.25%</td>
<td>0.72% 20.09% 0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17*</td>
<td>Two or More Racial Heritages Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>91.97%</td>
<td>69.66%</td>
<td>22.38% 25.70% 0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16*</td>
<td>Asian or Asian American Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>89.19%</td>
<td>88.21%</td>
<td>0.75% 21.98% 0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6*</td>
<td>Black or African American Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>85.38%</td>
<td>14.58% 34.13% 0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5*</td>
<td>Pacific Islander Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>73.58%</td>
<td>74.85%</td>
<td>-2.01% 62.49% 0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2*</td>
<td>All Online Status Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>52.71%</td>
<td>79.79%</td>
<td>-25.01% 173.48% 0.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Cells with fewer than 250 matched student pairs are too small for reliable analysis

** Student group definitions available in Appendix F

*** Model fit refers to the predictive stability of the model between prediction and actual persistence. The model is good, when the predictive stability is within 1%, it is adequate when within 3%, and poor when it is beyond 3%.
Appendix E

MATCHING DETAILS FOR 4+ MILESTONES IN AFS PROGRAM

Matching for the analysis resulted in 93% of available participants, or 656 students, being successfully matched for the analysis. Participating students who did not have an adequate match in the comparison group during the PPSM process were excluded from the analysis.

PERSISTENCE MATCHING: Prior to matching, samples were 92% similar based on students’ predicted persistence (Figure A). Following matching the samples were 93% similar.

PROPENSITY MATCHING: Participating and comparison students were 65% similar based on propensity score prior to matching (Figure B). Following matching, the similarity in propensity was 92%.

Both the persistence matching graph (Figure A) and the propensity matching graph illustrate substantial overlap between the red and blue lines. Detectable self-selection bias was not found between populations of participants and non-participants. A representative sample was created and used in the analysis.

FIGURE A PREDICTED PERSISTENCE: PARTICIPATING & COMPARISON STUDENTS
Participating and comparison students receive scores based on their predicted persistence to the next semester. This score is based on historical data from Utah State University students.

FIGURE B PROPENSITY TO PARTICIPATE BTW PARTICIPATING & COMPARISON STUDENTS
Participating and comparison students receive scores based on their likelihood to participate in the initiative.
## Appendix F
### STUDENT SEGMENT DEFINITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Subgroup</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 Terms Completed</td>
<td>Students with 0 terms in their collegiate career completed; incoming freshmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3 Terms Completed</td>
<td>Students who have completed 1 to 3 terms in their collegiate career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+ Terms Completed</td>
<td>Students with 4 or more terms in their collegiate career completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All On-Campus</td>
<td>Students attending all courses face-to-face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online or Broadcast</td>
<td>Students attending all courses online or via broadcast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed or Blended Course Modality</td>
<td>Students attending both face-to-face and online or broadcast courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Students</td>
<td>Undergraduate students enrolled in 12 or more credits; Graduate students enrolled in 9 or more credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Students</td>
<td>Undergraduate students enrolled in less than 12 credits; Graduate students enrolled in less than 9 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Time in College</td>
<td>Students who enter USU as new freshmen, who have maintained continuous enrollment or records of absences (i.e. LOA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Students</td>
<td>Students who attended another university prior to attending USU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readmitted Students</td>
<td>Students who attended USU, left for a time (without filing a LOA), and returned after re-applying to USU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown Undergraduate Type</td>
<td>Students with an unknown admitted type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Dual Enrollment</td>
<td>High school students simultaneously taking high school and college courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>Students with a primary major in science, technology, engineering, or mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-STEM</td>
<td>Students with a primary major that is not in science, technology, engineering, or mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Persistence Prediction Quartile</td>
<td>The total USU student population is divided so that 25% of students fall in each quartile. The top quartile contains students with the highest predicted persistence (75th - 100th percentile)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Persistence Prediction Quartile</td>
<td>The total USU student population is divided so that 25% of students fall in each quartile. The third quartile contains students with higher predicted persistence (50th - 74th percentiles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Persistence Quartile</td>
<td>The total USU student population is divided so that 25% of students fall in each quartile. The second quartile contains students with lower predicted persistence (25th - 49th percentiles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom Persistence Quartile</td>
<td>The total USU student population is divided so that 25% of students fall in each quartile. The bottom quartile contains students with the lowest predicted persistence (1st - 24th percentile students)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Students identifying as female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Students identifying as male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Subgroup</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>Students who do not identify as Hispanic or Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>Students who identify as Hispanic or Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: Two or More</td>
<td>Students who identify with two or more races</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: Unknown</td>
<td>Students who did not provide race information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: Asian</td>
<td>Students who identify as Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: Black or African American</td>
<td>Students who identify as African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: Pacific Islander</td>
<td>Students who identify as a Pacific Islander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>Students who identify as American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: White or Caucasian</td>
<td>Students who identify as White or Caucasian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AIS Evaluation Schedule

The process of program evaluation is never complete. Using the reported methodology, we will assist you to continually re-evaluate your program impacts on student retention each semester. With this report, determine a mid-initiative fidelity check to quickly assess how the activity is doing. Identify an end of initiative evaluation date, and a cadence to re-evaluate future results.

Appendix G
UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY’S EVALUATION CYCLE

EVALUATE & RE-EVALUATE
Get the data to AIS and we can run an evaluation on persistence. For goals that don’t include persistence AIS can assist you in finding resources to measure your improvement.

REFLECT & DISCUSS
Consider the report and the evaluators insights to produce discussion within your department.

MAKE DECISIONS
Formulate possible actions to improve your program. Select actions that align with your program goals.

PLAN
Make concrete plans to apply your decisions. Determine the who, where, and when of your actions.

IMPLEMENT
Put your plans into actions. Remember to periodically check the progress of your plans as they are being implemented.