



**Academic Performance, Retention, and Graduation Comparisons:
EOP versus Non-EOP Students**

Office of Institutional Research

California State University, San Bernardino

Emily Shindlecker, Research Technician

Tanner Carollo, Research Analyst

Jacqueline McConnaughy, Graduate Research Assistant

July 18th, 2013

Executive Summary

Many campuses have examined EOP students' performance and relied on comparisons to an overall student population which greatly differed in terms of demographics and financial support. Our study used a one-for-one matched sample which allowed EOP students to be evaluated against non-EOP students from similar backgrounds. Interestingly, while the two groups were alike in terms of expected family contribution, first-generation college status, high school grade point average, ethnicity, and gender, EOP students were found to have significantly lower SAT, ACT, ELM, and EPT scores than non-EOP students. Previous findings suggest that as students' standardized tests scores decrease, the probability for non-retention increases.

Although EOP students may begin CSUSB less academically prepared, our study showed that these students successfully equal, or outperform students with similar demographic backgrounds in terms of academic performance, retention, and graduation rates. Results indicated that EOP students consistently showed higher first-term GPAs than comparable non-EOP students despite taking a similar number of general education courses. Similarly, EOP students successfully completed an equal percentage of first-year courses as non-EOP students. EOP students showed higher second-, third-, and fourth-year retention rates and consistently lower dismissal rates than non-EOP students. While a more comprehensive analysis of six-year graduation rates would be advantageous to draw key conclusions, the 2008 EOP student cohort showed a higher four-year graduation rate than non-EOP students. Additionally, according to the National Student Clearinghouse Data Tracker, non-retained EOP and non-EOP students were likely to continue their education and graduate at other institutions in similar proportions. Overall, this study demonstrates strong support for the effectiveness of the Educational Opportunity Program at CSU San Bernardino.

The Study

The Office of Institutional Research examined differences in academic performance, retention, and graduation rates between students enrolled in Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) and students who were not enrolled in EOP. The student sample consisted of a total of 1,970 first-time freshman students entering CSU San Bernardino in the Fall quarters between 2008 and 2011.

Educational Opportunity Program (EOP)

According to CSU Mentor <http://www.csumentor.edu/planning/eop/>:

“The Educational Opportunity Program is designed to improve access and retention of historically low-income and educationally disadvantaged students. EOP students have the potential and demonstrated motivation to perform satisfactorily at a CSU, but they have not been able to realize their potential because of their economic or educational background. The program provides admission and academic assistance to EOP-eligible undergraduate students. In many cases, the program offers financial assistance to eligible students. Campuses tailor their programs to accommodate the needs of their student population”.

Academic Preparation

A one-for-one matched sample was utilized to control for pre-existing differences between EOP and non-EOP students. Specifically, students were matched on their expected family contribution, first-generation college status (college vs. no college), high school grade point average, ethnicity, and gender. Analyses verified that there were no statistically significant differences on matched variables between EOP and non-EOP students. However, results showed significant differences between EOP and non-EOP students in terms of standardized test scores. EOP students scored lower than non-EOP students on their SAT (M=826.38 vs. M=865.38), ACT (M=16.72 vs. 17.85), Entry Level Mathematics Test (M=36.65 vs. M=39.70), and English Placement Test (M=138.58 vs. M=140.50). *See Table 1.* These results suggest that despite having similar financial and demographic backgrounds, EOP students were less academically prepared at the time of matriculation than non-EOP students. In a previous study conducted by the CSUSB Office of Institutional Research ([Remediation Report, 2012](#)), results indicated that students who scored lower on EPT and ELM frequently showed lower retention and graduation rates. Accordingly, the at-risk nature of EOP students is evident.

Table 1. Matched Sample

Cohorts	Matched Variables	EOP	Non-EOP	
2008-2011	EFC	268.70	289.37	
	HSGPA	3.00	3.01	
	FG Status			
	No College	65%	65%	
	College	28%	28%	
	Unknown	7%	7%	
	Gender			
	Male	31%	31%	
	Female	69%	69%	
	Ethnicity			
	Asian	4%	4%	
	African American	13%	12%	
	Hispanic	76%	78%	
	White	3%	3%	
	Other	4%	3%	
		Comparison Variables	EOP	Non-EOP
		SAT	826.38	*865.38
	ACT	16.72	*17.85	
	ELM	36.65	*39.70	
	EPT	138.58	*140.50	

*Sig. differences at the $p < .05$ level.

Academic Performance

Analyses were conducted to identify significant differences between EOP and non-EOP students on the following academic performance variables: first-term grade point average, number of general education courses students enrolled in during their first year, the percentage of general education courses completed during the first year, the percentage of all courses completed during the first year, and the percentage of courses (excluding remedial classes) completed during the first year. When combined, cohorts 2008-2011 showed significant differences between EOP and non-EOP students in terms of first-term GPA. EOP students showed a significantly higher first-term GPA ($M=2.81$) than non-EOP students ($M=2.59$). There were non-significant differences between EOP and non-EOP students in terms of the number of general education courses enrolled in the first year, the percentage of general education courses completed during the first year, the percentage of all courses completed during the first year, and the percentage of all non-remedial courses. However, these data showed that EOP students performed similar to matched non-EOP students during the course of their first year. See *Table 2*.

Table 2. Academic Performance Comparisons

Cohort	Group	First-Term GPA	# GE Courses Enrolled	% of GE Courses Completed	% of all Completed Courses	% of Completed Courses (Non - Remediation)
2008	EOP	*2.75	6.64	82%	82%	80%
	Non -EOP	2.47	6.45	81%	80%	81%
2009	EOP	*2.77	6.49	85%	85%	84%
	Non -EOP	2.56	6.28	87%	86%	85%
2010	EOP	2.83	6.79	87%	85%	85%
	Non -EOP	2.79	7.13	88%	88%	87%
2011	EOP	*2.87	7.03	86%	85%	84%
	Non -EOP	2.52	*7.69	83%	84%	83%
Total	EOP	*2.81	6.74	85%	84%	83%
	Non -EOP	2.59	6.89	85%	84%	84%

*Sig. differences at the $p<.05$ level.

Retention and Graduation Rates

Analyses were conducted to identify significant differences between EOP and non-EOP students in terms of retention and graduation rates. When combined, cohorts 2008-2011 showed significant differences between EOP and non-EOP students in retention and graduation rates. Results indicated that EOP students consistently showed higher retention rates than non-EOP students in their second (89% vs. 84%), third (59% vs. 54%), and fourth (35% vs. 31%) years. Additional analyses indicated that EOP students showed a higher graduation rate than non-EOP students in their fourth year (8% vs. 3%). See Tables 3 and 4. These results demonstrate that EOP students persist longer in their studies, and therefore, graduate at higher rates than matched non-EOP students.

Table 3. Retention and Graduation Head Counts

Cohort	Group	Count	2nd Year Retention	3rd Year retention	4th Year Retention	4-Year Graduation
2008	EOP	250	218	180	166	20
	Non -EOP	250	202	166	153	8
2009	EOP	243	216	191	176	-
	Non -EOP	243	200	175	155	-
2010	EOP	249	226	211	-	-
	Non -EOP	249	216	195	-	-
2011	EOP	243	221	-	-	-
	Non -EOP	243	210	-	-	-
Total	EOP	985	881	582	342	20
	Non -EOP	985	828	536	308	8

Table 4. Retention and Graduation Percentages

Cohort	Group	Count	2nd Year Retention	3rd Year retention	4th Year Retention	4-Year Graduation
2008	EOP	250	87%	72%	66%	*8%
	Non -EOP	250	81%	66%	61%	3%
2009	EOP	243	*89%	79%	72%	-
	Non -EOP	243	82%	72%	64%	-
2010	EOP	249	*91%	85%	-	-
	Non -EOP	249	87%	78%	-	-
2011	EOP	243	91%	-	-	-
	Non -EOP	243	86%	-	-	-
Total [†]	EOP	985	*89%	*78%	*69%	*8%
	Non -EOP	985	84%	72%	62%	3%

*Sig. differences at the p<.05 level.

Student Tracking

Students who had previously attended CSUSB but were not enrolled during the 2012-13 academic year were tracked through the National Student Clearinghouse (NSC) to identify the first school attended following non-retention. A total of 108 EOP students (53%) and 145 non-EOP students (54%) were found. Of the 108 EOP students, 80 (74%) students transferred to a community college, 10 (9%) students transferred to another CSU, 11 (10%) students transferred to a trade or technical school, and 7 (6%) students transferred to another 4-year university. Of the 145 non-EOP students, 120 (83%) students transferred to a community college, 13 (9%) students transferred to another 4-year university, 5 (3%) students transferred to another CSU, 6 (4%) students transferred to a trade or technical school, and 1 (1%) student transferred to a UC. *See Table 5.*

Table 5. Student Tracking Comparisons

Cohort	Group	Not Retained	NSC Tracked Count	NSC Tracked Percent	If not retained, where did the students go?									
					California State University		University of California		Other 4-Year		Community College		Trade or Technical School	
					Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2008	EOP	88	57	65%	7	12%	-	-	3	5%	43	75%	4	7%
	Non-EOP	106	64	60%	3	5%	-	-	6	9%	54	84%	1	2%
2009	EOP	63	28	44%	2	7%	-	-	2	7%	23	82%	1	4%
	Non-EOP	82	49	60%	1	2%	1	2%	4	8%	42	86%	1	2%
2010	EOP	37	14	38%	1	7%	-	-	2	14%	9	64%	2	14%
	Non-EOP	48	23	48%	1	4%	-	-	3	13%	17	74%	2	9%
2011	EOP	16	9	56%	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	56%	4	44%
	Non-EOP	31	9	29%	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	78%	2	22%
Total	EOP	204	108	53%	10	9%	-	-	7	6%	80	74%	11	10%
	Non-EOP	267	145	54%	5	3%	1	1%	13	9%	120	83%	6	4%

Degrees Earned at Other Institutions

Of the students not enrolled during the 2012-13 academic year, a total of 8 EOP students and 6 non-EOP students earned a degree elsewhere. Of the 8 EOP students, 1 student earned a Bachelor's Degree (Other 4-Year) and 7 students earned an Associate's Degree. Of the 6 non-EOP students, 3 students earned an Associate's Degree and 3 students earned a Certificate. Overall, EOP and non-EOP students qualified for, transferred to, and graduated at other institutions in comparable proportions.

Student Dismissals

Students attending CSUSB may be dismissed for poor grades, not meeting their remediation requirements, and/or academic dishonesty. Analyses were conducted to identify significant differences in dismissal rates between EOP and non-EOP students. When combined, cohorts 2008-2011 did not show significant differences in terms of dismissal rates; however, non-EOP students were dismissed at consistently higher rates than EOP students. *See Table 6.*

Table 6. Student Dismissal Comparisons

Cohort	Group	Count	DISM HC	DISM %
2008	EOP	250	49	20%
	Non -EOP	250	54	22%
2009	EOP	243	30	12%
	Non -EOP	243	48	*20%
2010	EOP	249	22	9%
	Non -EOP	249	23	9%
2011	EOP	243	13	5%
	Non -EOP	243	14	6%
Total	EOP	985	114	12%
	Non -EOP	985	139	14%

*Sig. differences at the p<.05 level.

Dismissal Tracking

Results showed that of the 56 dismissed EOP students who were tracked through NSC, 50 (89%) enrolled in a community college, 5 (9%) enrolled in a trade or technical school, and 1 (2%) enrolled in another 4-year university. Finally, results showed that of the 79 dismissed non-EOP students who were tracked through NSC, 75 (95%) enrolled in a community college, and 4 (5%) enrolled at a trade or technical school. *See Table 7.*

Table 7. Student Dismissal Tracking

		If not retained, where did the students go?											
Cohort	Group	DISM HC	NSC Tracked	California State University		University of California		Other 4-Year		Community College		Trade or Technical School	
				Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
2008	EOP	49	31	-	-	-	-	1	3%	28	90%	2	6%
	Non-EOP	54	35	-	-	-	-	-	-	32	91%	3	9%
2009	EOP	31	15	-	-	-	-	-	-	14	93%	-	-
	Non-EOP	48	29	-	-	-	-	-	-	29	100%	-	-
2010	EOP	22	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	71%	2	29%
	Non-EOP	22	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	100%	-	-
2011	EOP	13	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	75%	1	25%
	Non-EOP	14	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	80%	1	20%
Total	EOP	115	56	-	-	-	-	1	2%	50	89%	5	9%
	Non-EOP	138	79	-	-	-	-	-	-	75	95%	4	5%