Academic Outcomes for Students in Residential Academic Programs (RAPs) During Their Freshman Year

Perry Sailor

University of Colorado Boulder, PBA, October 2013

This is an update/follow-up of a study we did in 2011. For results of the original study, please contact us at oda@colorado.edu.

Summary

For fall frosh entering 2010 through 2012, we compared RAP vs. non-RAP students on:

- Mean cumulative GPA at the end of the first year
- Percent of students meeting or exceeding a 2.0 cumulative GPA
- Retention rates to the 1st spring
- Retention rates to the 2nd fall

For frosh entering in fall 2007, we compared RAP and non-RAP students on:

• 6-year graduation rate

In all the above comparisons, RAP students exceeded their non-RAP counterparts even when predicted GPA (PGPA, a measure of academic preparation at UCB entry) and residency were statistically controlled. However, we cannot say that RAP participation *caused* this success, because students self-select into RAPs, and students who choose RAPs may differ from those who do not on many attributes related to academic success that are not entirely captured by PGPA.

Details of present findings

Fall 2010-13 frosh

- First-year GPAs averaged 2.96 for RAP students, 2.76 for non-RAP, a difference of .20 GPA points. The gap was .18 points among non-residents, .22 points among residents.
- The difference in college-specific predicted GPA at entry (a measure derived from high school grades and SAT/ACT scores) was only .07 points, and was about the same for residents and non-residents.
- A lower percentage of RAP students than non-RAP had a cumulative GPA below 2.0 (a proxy for academic probation).
- More RAP students than non-RAP continued at UCB in the first spring after entry, and the 2nd fall after entry.

CU-Boulder PBA -sailorRD-

L:\ir\tracking\anal\GradPred\RAPOutcomes2013.sas 1st-year cum GPA, % below 2.0, and retention rates For 2010-12 frosh in RAPs vs. not

	Ν	Coll- spec- ific PGPA	of	GPA <2.0	Retai- ned 1st spring	ned 2nd
Residency NRES	Sum	Mean	Mean	00	olo	00
Not RAP	3,746	2.89	2.66	17%	92%	78%
RAP	3,481	2.95	2.84	12%	94%	84%
RES						
Not RAP	4,833	3.01	2.83	13%	93%	83%
RAP	4,268	3.09	3.05	8%	97%	90%
All						
Not RAP	8,579	2.96	2.76	15%	93%	81%
RAP	7,749	3.03	2.96	10%	96%	87%

- When PGPA and residency were statistically controlled in a general linear models procedure, RAP participation was associated with a GPA advantage of 0.12. No other variables (e.g. gender, ethnicity, financial resources) were controlled in the present study; however, the more detailed earlier study referenced above did control for these and other variables, and still found that RAP students graduated at a higher rate than non-RAPs.
- About 90% of RAP participants met or exceeded a 2.0 cumulative GPA (the cutoff in most colleges for academic probation), compared to 85% of non-RAP students.
- The retention rate to the second fall was 87% for RAP students, 81% for non-RAP. This 6-percentage point difference in retention rate in favor of RAP students was maintained when residency and PGPA were statistically controlled in a logistic regression analysis.

Fall 2007 freshmen, 6-year graduation rate

 The 6-year graduation rate for freshmen entering in the fall of 2007 (the most recent entering class to have had 6 years to graduate, the federal standard) was 73% for RAP students, vs. 67% for non-RAPs. A logistic regression analysis controlling for PGPA and residency showed that the 6 percentage point advantage for RAP students remained.

Data for individual RAPs in the fall 2010-13 analysis

L:\ir\tracking\anal\GradPred\RAPOutcomes2013.sas lst-year cum GPA, % below 2.0, and retention rates For 2010-12 frosh in RAPs vs. not

	N	Coll- spec- ific PGPA	Cum GPA end of 1st year	GPA <2.0	Retai- ned 1st spring	Retai- ned 2nd fall
Residency	Sum	Mean	Mean	%	SP11119 %	*
-	Julii	Mean	Mean	0	-0	·0
NRES	2 746	2 9 9	2 66	1 7 9.	0.0%	70%
Not in any RAP Andrews Hall RAP Fee	3,746 86	2.89 3.17	2.66 3.13	17% 10%	92% 95%	78% 90%
B3 - Leeds RAP Fee	103	3.03	2.73	10% 9%	95% 95%	83%
Baker RAP Fee	534		2.84	13%	93%	83%
Chancellor's Leadership RAP	133		2.79	13%	94%	80%
Communication RAP Fee	235		2.83	11%	91%	78%
Engineering Quad Program Fee	352		2.76	16%	95%	88%
Farrand Academic Program Fee	541		2.79	13%	95%	84%
Global Studies RAP Fee	280			13%	93%	80%
Health RAP Fee	34		2.98	6%	91%	65%
Honors RAP Fee	209	3.40	3.37	3%	93%	86%
Libby RAP Fee	389		2.82	10%	95%	84%
SEEDS - A&S RAP Fee	44			- 0 0 7왕	100%	82%
Sewall Academic Program Fee	470			13%	94%	85%
Sustainable by Design-ENGR RAP	71	2.91	2.72	10%	97%	83%
RES	4 000	2 01	0 0 0	1 2 0	0.2.0	0.2.0
Not in any RAP	4,833		2.83	13%	93%	83%
Andrews Hall RAP Fee	267		3.17	5%	99%	94%
B3 - Leeds RAP Fee	89	3.13	2.87	13%	99%	91%
Baker RAP Fee Changellenis Leadenship BAD	637	3.07		88	96%	90% 05%
Chancellor's Leadership RAP	141		2.84	14%	96%	85%
Communication RAP Fee	186	3.02	2.94	10%	95%	87%
Engineering Quad Program Fee	734		2.95	10%	98%	92%
Farrand Academic Program Fee	540	3.02	3.00	7%	97%	90%
Global Studies RAP Fee	270 66	3.10	3.08	10%	96%	86%
Health RAP Fee Honors RAP Fee	407	3.09 3.46	3.11 3.49	0% 2%	91% 99%	82% 93%
	407		3.49	23 78	99% 97%	90%
Libby RAP Fee SEEDS – A&S RAP Fee	429			10%	97% 97%	90%
	409	3.02		10%	97% 95%	94% 88%
Sewall Academic Program Fee Sustainable by Design-ENGR RAP	409		2.73	12%	95%	87%
Sustainable by Design-ENGR RAP	02	2.90	2.75	120	90%	0/%
All						
Not in any RAP	8,579		2.76	15%	93%	81%
Andrews Hall RAP Fee	353		3.16	6%	98%	93%
B3 - Leeds RAP Fee	192	3.08	2.80	11%	97%	86%
Baker RAP Fee	1,171	3.01	2.94	10%	94%	87%
Chancellor's Leadership RAP	274	2.96	2.82	14%	95%	83%
Communication RAP Fee	421		2.88	10%	93%	82%
Engineering Quad Program Fee	1,086		2.89	12%	97%	91%
Farrand Academic Program Fee	1,081			10%	96%	87%
Global Studies RAP Fee	550			11%	94%	83%
Health RAP Fee	100		3.06	2%	91%	76%
Honors RAP Fee	616			2%	97%	91%
Libby RAP Fee	818		2.92	9%	96%	87%
SEEDS - A&S RAP Fee	75			8%	99%	87%
Sewall Academic Program Fee	879			11%	95%	86%
Sustainable by Design-ENGR RAP	133	2.93	2.73	11%	96%	85%

CU-Boulder PBA -sailorRD-

L:\IR\Tracking\analysis\gradpred\RAPOutcomesPosting2013.docx - 8/16/2016 Page 3

Data for individual RAPs in the 6-year graduation rate analysis

6-year grad rate For 2007 frosh in RAPs vs. not

	N	Coll- spec- ific PGPA	
	Sum	Mean	00
Ν			
Not in RAP	1,304	2.87	62%
CU 101	185	3.01	64%
ChanLead	62		55%
ERAP	162		70%
Farrand	190		
Kittredge Honors	41		83%
Libby	103		
SHIP	38		
Sewall	157	2.85	66%
R	0 000	2 00	
Not in RAP		3.02	
CU 101	202		76%
ChanLead	60		72%
ERAP Farrand	221		
Kittredge Honors	83	3.10 3.45	
Libby		3.45	
SHIP		3.17	
Sewall	156		
All	100	2.))	120
Not in RAP	3.542	2.97	67%
CU 101		3.04	
ChanLead	122		
ERAP	383		79%
Farrand	371		
Kittredge Honors	124	3.44	90%
Libby	233	2.96	71%
SHIP	104	3.14	71%
Sewall	313	2.92	69%