



# IRIM RESEARCH EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

January 2018

Issue 9

## Tracking FTIAC Student Attrition Patterns by Using National Student Clearinghouse Research Executive Summary

Understanding students' attrition pattern is an important aspect of improving student success. At Eastern Michigan University (EMU), typically by the end of the first year, we lose 25% of the students from the new FTIAC class, and another 12% or so by the end of the second year. Literature indicates retaining a student through the beginning of the 3<sup>rd</sup> year is a key factor to ensuring the student will complete a degree at the same institution. The National Student Clearinghouse (NSC) provides enrollment status tracking services with an accuracy level of 98%, which is a powerful tool that we can use to identify the attrition patterns.

This study tracks and analyzes FTIAC students who left the University during their first and second year at EMU. Analysis of this study was based on data drawn from three FTIAC cohorts who started their enrollment in fall terms of 2012, 2013 and 2014, respectively. Table 1 shows our general retention picture after the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> years, as well as the number of students who transferred to other institutions after each year.

Table 1. FTIAC 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Year Retention Rates; Number of Students Who Left EMU after 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Years

Academic Term	Cohort	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Retention Rate	Attrition Count (after 1 <sup>st</sup> Year)	Enrolled in Other Institutions (NSC Data; after 1 <sup>st</sup> Year)
Fall 2012	2,612	73.8%	684	545
Fall 2013	2,848	72.5%	783	579
Fall 2014	2,588	74.7%	655	447
		End of 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year Retention Rate	Attrition Count (after 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year)	Enrolled in Other Institutions (NSC Data; after 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year)
		61.3%	327	262
		61.0%	328	258
		61.8%	334	234

Next, we looked at institutions that students transferred to after their study at EMU. Table 2 (next page) presents those institutions that received reverse transfer students from EMU after the first year. Community colleges are overwhelmingly at the top of the list. Table 3 (also next page) show the same information but for the reverse transfer after the second year. The pattern changed to a certain extent because more four-year institutions emerged and moved to the front on the list, including University of Michigan and Michigan State University.

## Research Executive Summary (continued)

Table 2. Reverse Transfer Institutions of EMU FTIAC Students after 1<sup>st</sup> Year

Institution Transferred to after 1 <sup>st</sup> Year	Number of Students	% of Students
Washtenaw Community College	247	16.6%
Wayne County Community College	95	6.4%
Henry Ford College	82	5.5%
Schoolcraft College	73	4.9%
Oakland Community College	61	4.1%
Michigan State University	43	2.9%
Macomb Community College	42	2.8%
Cuyahoga Community College	33	2.2%
Lansing Community College	31	2.1%
University of Toledo	31	2.1%
Mott Community College	28	1.9%
Jackson College	27	1.8%
Western Michigan University	25	1.7%
Grand Valley State University	24	1.6%
Baker College - Flint	23	1.6%
Wayne State University	22	1.5%
Monroe County Community College	16	1.1%
Owens Community College	16	1.1%
Oakland University	11	0.7%
Central Michigan University	10	0.7%

Table 3. Reverse Transfer Institutions of EMU FTIAC Students after 2<sup>nd</sup> Year

Institution Transferred to after 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	Number of Students	% of Students
Washtenaw Community College	152	22.7%
Schoolcraft College	38	5.7%
Wayne County Community College	34	5.1%
Henry Ford College	26	3.9%
University of Michigan	25	3.7%
Michigan State University	23	3.4%
Oakland Community College	21	3.1%
Baker College - Flint	19	2.8%
Western Michigan University	14	2.1%
Macomb Community College	12	1.8%
University of Toledo	12	1.8%
Monroe County Community College	10	1.5%

## Research Executive Summary (continued)

We then continued and examined the GPA patterns using the GPA at the time when a student left EMU by combining all three cohorts. Table 4 shows most of those reverse transfer students had a low GPA after their first year. Nevertheless, students who left EMU during their second year had a more balanced distribution across all GPA levels.

Table 4. GPA Distribution of Reverse Transfer Students

Accumulated Institution GPA	Headcount (after 1 <sup>st</sup> Year)	Headcount (after 2 <sup>nd</sup> year)
<=2	1,149	347
2-3	499	407
3-4	471	314
>=4	13	5
Grand Total	2,132	1,073

Our last phase of analysis was focused on the EMU GPA of those students by corresponding reverse transfer institutions. Table 5 shows the relatively low GPA for those students who transferred to another institution after the first year. Table 6 shows for those who transferred out from EMU had a much high GPA at the time of departure.

Table 5. EMU GPA after the 1<sup>st</sup> Year for Those Who Transferred Away

Institution Transferred to after 1 <sup>st</sup> Year	Average EMU Accumulated GPA
Oakland Community College	1.76
Schoolcraft College	1.76
Washtenaw Community College	1.73
Henry Ford College	1.58
Wayne County Community College	1.54

Table 6. EMU GPA after the 2<sup>nd</sup> Year for Those Who Transferred Away

Institution Transferred to after 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	Average EMU Accumulated GPA
University of Michigan	3.66
Schoolcraft College	2.39
Henry Ford College	2.34
Washtenaw Community College	2.21
Wayne County Community College	1.98