

**Rutgers University**  
**Newark Campus**  
**Report of the Study Group on Undergraduate Admission**  
**May 2005**

Cary Booker and John Graham, co-Chairs

Claudia Beckman, Wayne Eastman, John Gunkel, Phil Huskey, Bruce Neimeyer, Arthur Powell,  
Gary Roth, Alan Sadvnik, Mara Sidney, Jacob Sturm, Bonnie Veysey, Deborah Walker-McCall

## **1 INTRODUCTION**

In his letter of August 31, 2004 to the newly-formed 15-person faculty-staff study group on undergraduate admissions, Provost Steven J. Diner wrote:

Rutgers-Newark has a long and proud tradition of providing a first-rate education to students of modest means, to first-generation college attendees, to students of diverse racial, ethnic and religious backgrounds ... [and in particular to] students from Newark and other nearby communities. In recent years, the campus has had considerable success enrolling students with the highest academic records, attracted [in part] by our Honors College. We must continue to recruit top students from all social backgrounds at the same time that we reach out to students for whom traditional admissions criteria may not be the best predictors of success. Given these goals, it has become critical therefore for us to examine how we evaluate the potential for academic success in our admissions process, based on our experience and the best research available.

The study group met on a regular basis throughout the academic year to address these issues. We assembled and examined relevant campus-level data on student admissions, retention and graduation rates. We reviewed a recent national study on parsing the racial and ethnic gap in student achievement, prepared by the Educational Testing Service. Admissions director Bruce Neimeyer gave us a detailed look at the current application review process. FASN Associate Dean Annette Juliano reviewed some new initiatives of the college to enhance developmental education and first year courses in English and Math. Cary Booker and Deborah Walker-McCall provided an overview of academic and other services provided to EOF students in NCAS/UC and Nursing.

Our principal findings are as follows. First, Rutgers-Newark continues to attract both a highly-qualified and diverse student body, although the mix of students has been changing over time, with a moderate decline in the percent of students who are native-born African-American or of Puerto-Rican descent. Second, maintaining student diversity is a task both for admissions and on-campus academic support programs. Admissions might want to make greater use of the "qualitative review" process to better ensure that promising candidates whose academic strengths are not well represented by the usual indices have an opportunity to come to the University. Academic advising and support programs need to be strengthened using the best practices of programs on campus (i.e., the EOF programs and the Honors College) and those beyond the Rutgers community to contribute to higher retention and graduation rates overall, and among minority students in particular. *Without increasing resources for academic support services, any*

*increase in admissions by qualitative review will lead to unacceptable decreases in retention rates.* Third, an on-going program of institutional research is needed both to generate timely student data and to aid in monitoring progress on diversity issues. The study group’s findings and recommendations below are divided into four general groupings: Background and Current Status on Admissions; Importance of Advising, Financial Aid and Other Academic Support Services; Importance of Institutional Research and Monitoring; and Recommendations for Maintaining and Enhancing Diversity.

**2 BACKGROUND AND CURRENT STATUS ON ADMISSIONS**

**2.1 Undergraduate Student Profile**

By several common and widely-cited indicators, Rutgers-Newark continues to succeed in attracting both highly-qualified and racially/ethnically diverse students. Overall, the campus has been attracting an increasing number of applicants in recent years and admission has become more competitive: total applications to NCAS and the College of Nursing rose from 7,099 in 1999 to 12,058 in 2004, and the percentage admitted declined from 55 to 49 percent. For the past 8 years, Rutgers-Newark has been ranked by *US News & World Report* as the most diverse student body among all PhD-granting national universities, and this distinction remains a genuine source of campus pride. (In thinking about diversity, we take note of their methodology: “*U.S. News* factors in the total proportion of minority students—leaving out international students—and the overall mix of groups. The categories we use in our calculations are American Indians and Alaskan Natives (Native Americans), Asian-Americans and Pacific Islanders, African-Americans who are non-Hispanic, whites who are non-Hispanic, and Hispanics.”)

Racial, ethnic, and economic diversity continue to characterize our undergraduate student body, although the precise composition of students continues to change, as the table below shows.

	NCAS		UCN	
	1999	2003	1999	2003
African-American	17%	17%	32%	26%
Asian	22%	26%	10%	15%
Puerto-Rican	6%	5%	6%	4%
Other Hispanic	14%	14%	12%	11%
White	30%	30%	26%	26%
Other (or No Information)	11%	9%	14%	17%

It is likely that some of this changing racial and ethnic mix is mirrored in changes in the state's college-age population. One concern raised by the study group is how international students are accounted for within the current self reported categories. This lack of clarity within these categories makes it difficult to make comparisons over time (given the changing demographics of the college-age population) and difficult to assess diversity initiatives at the University. For example, African American in the table above includes immigrants who would not be considered “traditional minorities” by many observers. Immigration status was not known for 1999 and 2003, but in fall 2004, 22% of African American students on campus were not US citizens.

Anecdotal evidence suggests there may have been a decline in recent years in the number of minority students coming from the city of Newark and nearby communities. The study group was unable to obtain relevant data on this and recommends that it start to be collected. In terms of economic diversity, it is clear that the campus continues to serve a significant number of first generation college students and students from families of modest means. According to a recent campus survey of new students, 42% of respondents said English was not their first language, 40% are from homes where neither parent had gone to college, and 53% have families who earn less than \$50,000 per year.

One aspect of diversity the study group did not examine is the admission and academic progress (i.e., retention and graduation) of students whose first language is not English. For many of these students, campus-based ESL classes and on-going support are likely to be critical factors in their progress toward graduation.

While student diversity has been maintained, the average SAT score of all *regularly-admitted*, enrolled first-year students has risen steadily from 1065 in 1999 to an all-time high of 1125 in 2004, and average rank-in-class rose from the 75th to 81st percentile. (These statistics exclude EOF and special admit students whose SAT scores tend to be lower than average.) The study group did not have access to campus level data on trends over time in SAT scores or class rank by race and ethnicity, although national data would indicate there are likely to be a significant achievement gaps by race and ethnicity. (See Data Appendix Tables A, B, C & D)

## 2.2 Admissions Process

The current application review process is a complex one, which uses both an index number (based on weighted average of class rank and SAT scores) and a qualitative review/enhanced review in which other factors are also taken into account. The 'philosophical' basis underlying the index number used to admit about two-thirds of the students to the university is not well understood. However, this may not be a critical factor for our campus as the index is adjusted yearly depending on the total number of students to be admitted, and along with qualitative review seems to yield desired results in terms of overall enrollment growth, diversity, and improving academic profile of the entering class. Students not achieving the base index score for the year qualify for the qualitative review/enhanced review if they fall within a certain range (which again may vary by year) beneath the base. Applications subject to the qualitative review/enhanced review are examined to identify potential students who may benefit and benefit from the campus in a variety of ways that may not be captured by the traditional index. Features considered in this qualitative/enhanced review include: pre-college programs, extra curricular activities, community and volunteer service, awards and honors, employment, family obligations, essay statement, and an overall assessment by the reader. Additionally, a student's academic credentials are reassessed based on the local school context as measured by socioeconomic factors, municipality distress indicators, national free lunch program recipients, and New Jersey DFG (Abbott) school districts. Other attributes considered are parental education, ethnicity, foreign languages and veteran status.

Use of the qualitative/enhanced review in its present form is relatively new, having been introduced in response to recent Supreme Court decisions. Consequently, its impact on student

academic success and on the cultural, racial and ethnic mix of students on campus cannot be reasonably evaluated at this time and should be monitored in future years. Nevertheless, the longstanding success of programs such as the Educational Opportunity Fund (EOF) program, which long has used a version of qualitative review in some of its admissions decisions, suggests that, at least with adequate and appropriate academic support for students (as discussed in more detail below), there may be the possibility of greater flexibility in the minimum index number used to admit incoming students without compromising the quality and effectiveness of the educational program.

### **2.3 Transfer Students**

Transfer students are a significant proportion of undergraduate students on campus. The total number of applications by transfers rose from 2,423 in 1999 to 3,089 in 2003, while the percent admitted declined from 47 to 31%. Since 1999, more than 400 new transfer students have enrolled each year, and reached a peak of 573 students in 2002. Transfer students compare well with other students in terms of retention and graduation rates. For example, for the cohorts of full-time transfer students who entered NCAS between 1995 and 1999, 4-year graduation rates ranged from 51 to 56%, comparable to 6-year graduation rates for students who entered NCAS as freshmen. Furthermore, graduation rates for African-American and Hispanic transfer students were somewhat lower than average, but comparable to 6-year graduation rates for similar minority students who entered as freshmen. The study group did not have enough time or data to pursue all of the many issues related to transfer students, although it does appear that the transfer system is a major pipeline to campus for traditional minorities, and this pipeline may need to be strengthened. In 2003, 26% of newly enrolled transfer students were African-American, 4% were Puerto Rican and 13 percent were non-Puerto Rican Hispanic. The study group noted with concern the lack of strong, established and on-going institutional ties (such as minority student recruiting, expedited transcript evaluation and other transfer programs) between the campus and our nearest neighbor, Essex County College. Further, there does not seem to be support for the unique needs of transfer students once they reach campus.

### **2.4 Retention and Graduation Rates**

Overall retention and graduation rates for the campus compare favorably with other urban universities nationally. For example, 54% of Rutgers-Newark students who entered as freshmen in 1995 graduated within 6 years, compared with just 41% at Wayne State University, 45% at Temple University and 47% at George Mason University. Nevertheless, differences in retention and graduation rates for major racial and ethnic groups on campus were observed, with African-Americans and Hispanics below the overall campus averages and Whites and Asians above.

Among all regularly-admitted, full-time first-year NCAS students who entered between 1995 and 2000, three-year retention rates fluctuated between 67% and 73% for white students, between 66% and 78% for Asian students, between 61% and 77% for African-American students, and between 61% and 69% for Hispanic students. For all regularly-admitted NCAS students who entered between 1995 and 1997, the percentage who graduated within 6 years ranged from 52 to 57%. Among these same cohorts, 6-year graduation rates ranged from 52% to 59% for white students, from 52% to 63% for Asian students, from 47% to 49% percent for African-American

students and from 47% to 59% for all Hispanic students. Lack of adequate on-going academic support (including advising, mentoring and monitoring of student progress) seems to be one important factor in understanding retention and graduation rates in general and the lower retention and graduation rates of minority students in particular. Improvements in student academic support could likely have a positive impact on the overall retention and graduation rates for the campus. (See Data Appendix Tables E, F, G & H)

### **3 IMPORTANCE OF ADVISING, FINANCIAL AID AND OTHER ACADEMIC SUPPORT SERVICES**

The study group learned that there are growing campus concerns regarding the resources available to students for advisement and student services and that any increases in admissions through a greater reliance on qualitative review would likely require substantial increases in resources required for an expansion and improvement in these kinds of services. The study group examined the Honors College and the EOF Program as models for special services, and studied the challenges involved with operating effective developmental education programs. The group also briefly considered the significance of financial aid issues as they relate to admissions and retention.

#### **3.1 Honors College and EOF**

Both the Honors College which attracts high-achieving students and the EOF programs in NCAS and Nursing which attract economically-disadvantaged students who show academic promise are model programs of student success. Separate data for Honors College students were not examined by the study group, but anecdotal evidence suggests these students are retained and graduate at much higher rates than the overall campus rates. Among EOF students, one, two and three-year retention rates of those who entered in 1999 or 2000 are higher than those of regularly-admitted students. (It should be noted, however, that 6-year graduation rates of NCAS EOF students are still lower than those of regularly-admitted students.) The study group noted that both the Honors College and the EOF programs are also model programs of high levels of student advising and support. For example, the EOF programs require student participation in a summer program, provide ongoing academic counseling support, and administer academic support courses for selected regular course offerings. Unfortunately, few comparable academically-oriented programs or services are available for the majority of students on our campus. Some of this may be due to the gap between the expectations of our research-oriented faculty (who may perceive that they are not rewarded for doing a significant amount of undergraduate advising) and the needs of the current campus student population. Some of this may also be due to severe resource constraints, particularly in the Dean of Students Office.

#### **3.2 Developmental Courses**

The study group noted with particular concern the difficulty experienced by many students who are placed in developmental courses. Currently, about one of every four entering students takes at least one developmental course offered by the Department of Urban Education (formerly the Department of Academic Foundations) in either mathematics (003:101 and/or 003:102) or English (003:142,143).

Students in developmental courses receive little or no on-going special attention, academic advising, or monitoring. In spite of this, a high percentage of students placed in these developmental courses succeed in passing them on their first attempt. For example, more than 90% receive a grade of C or better in communications skills (003:142). But, unfortunately, their success in developmental courses does not necessarily translate into success in passing college-wide required courses in English composition (350:101,102) and algebra (640:112 or 640:113). For example, only 36% of fall 1999 entering students who took communications skills in their first year were able to pass the two semester English composition requirement by the end of their second year, compared with 62% of non-developmental students (who passed by the end of their first year). As a result, students who begin in developmental courses make slower progress and are less likely to graduate than other students. Among all students who first entered Rutgers-Newark between 1993 and 1999, graduation rates for students who were placed in developmental English (003:142) were 8 to 17 percentage points lower than those of other students, graduation rates for students placed in computation and algebra (003:101) were 22 to 44 percentage points lower, and graduation rates for students placed in elements of mathematics (003:102) were 6 to 24 percentage points lower.

Recent work led by the FASN Dean's office and members of the Urban Education, English, and Mathematics departments to make improvements to these courses and the commensurate academic support will need to be closely monitored to assess the impact on student success and progress in these critical courses.

### **3.3 Financial Support**

Financial support is a critical factor in student success. Although we did not directly review campus based data on this matter national research and anecdotal references suggest that a significant majority of our students work while attending school. Further, available evidence suggests that the more hours per week a student works the less likely he or she is to be successful in their course work. We suspect that the lack of financial support has a negative impact on student retention and graduation but little campus level data was available for our review. (See Data Appendix Tables I, J, K, L & M)

## **4 IMPORTANCE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND MONITORING**

A strong program of ongoing institutional research focused on the issues of admission, retention, and academic support is critical to the ability to monitor and evaluate policies related to these areas. Working with Associate Provost Gary Roth, the study group was able to have some special Rutgers-Newark student data assembled by the Office of Instructional Research and Academic Planning in New Brunswick and the Office of Admissions (some of which are appended to this report), but these tables of data represent a one-time effort rather than an ongoing project. It is also critical for Rutgers-Newark to participate in national surveys and databases that support evaluation of admission, retention, and academic support.

The study group identified two compelling reasons for an intensive program of institutional research. First, as the campus strives to maintain a diverse body of students, admissions must

adhere to a strict policy of admitting only students who are likely to succeed at Rutgers-Newark. This requires that the effectiveness of developmental courses, first-year English and mathematics courses, and the quality of advisement and student services be continually monitored and measured against retention and graduation rates. The information must be retrievable in terms of many student variables including race and ethnicity, financial and economic status, high school rank in class, first language, admission type, SAT scores, and first-year course placements.

A second important need for strong institutional research is to monitor possible achievement gaps between racial and ethnic groups to take corrective actions. In addition to supporting the enrollment of a student body with strong academic qualifications and the enrollment of critical masses of students from different racial and ethnic groups, the admissions and retention process at Rutgers-Newark should, where possible, strive to reduce gaps in terms of academic preparation and academic achievement between students of different racial and ethnic groups. We strongly support EOF and similar programs that have the effect of working to reduce the achievement gap among different groups of students, and urge their expansion where feasible. It is important for the school to be concerned about preparation and achievement gaps and to monitor preparation gaps at the admissions stage and achievement gaps later, so that the gaps do not rise by default as the school pursues its critical mass and high standards objectives. Regular monitoring through institutional research is critical to any effort to address achievement and preparation gaps.

Rutgers-Newark needs a constantly evolving program of institutional research to generate analytical tools that are broadly accessible. Ideally, faculty committees and administrators should be able to query databases and retrieve relevant information in real time as they work to understand and advise about student profiles, retention rates, admissions policies, academic standards, and student services.

## **5 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MAINTAINING AND ENHANCING DIVERSITY**

The study group explored several strategies for adjusting the profile of incoming students when there is a need to increase the enrollment of students from minority groups that have been historically underrepresented in higher education. In each approach, significant increases in resources for admissions functions, student services, facilities, and financial aid would be required.

### **5.1 Increase Admissions based on Qualitative Review**

Qualitative review is a resource-intensive admissions procedure that looks beyond class rank and SAT scores to give added weight to other student characteristics. Applicants placed in the qualitative review pool were not admitted through the regular admissions process but were held over in this pool based on criteria set up by the admissions office. The study group believes that an increased and possibly modified use of qualitative review could result in the admission of greater numbers of promising candidates who have desirable qualities not well represented on campus but whose academic strengths are not captured by class rank and SAT scores. The Committee recognizes that the qualitative review process was created partly in response to legal considerations raised by recent court decisions; however, we believe that the qualitative review

process needs more study to ensure that the historic mission of the Newark campus is served. Specific consideration should involve one or more of the following:

- i. Establish qualitative review for applicants from all Abbott-District schools. Within the state designated Abbott school districts are promising young men and women trapped in low performing schools. The Newark campus has historically served promising young people who have arrived at college from less than ideal circumstances. We should make every effort to discern the academic merit of students coming from the Abbott school districts and admit them to the University when we believe they can be successful here.
- ii. Allow applicants to select their review type. The Committee informally heard of an admission strategy used locally in which applicants were asked to choose whether their application would be reviewed according to the traditional indices or according to a qualitative review criterion. The implications of such a practice are unclear to the Committee but should be explored.
- iii. Introduce an increase in the ratio of qualitative reviews to regular admits. Currently there is a narrow screen used to filter applicants into the qualitative review pool. Consideration should be given to broadening the screens to expand the qualitative review pool and to increasing the overall number of students accepted to the Newark campus through qualitative review.

If the qualitative and enhanced review process were to be applied to the entire application pool, each application would receive a qualitative review in addition to its regular review, which would require an additional 15 minutes per application. All applications would then need to be run through the enhanced review calculations prior to their decisions being encoded onto the admissions system. These decisions would then need to be encoded into the system after these calculations are made which would add yet another step to the review process and would require more time by the admissions officer to complete. It is quite clear that the expansion of qualitative and enhanced review process would necessitate many more resources for the admissions office, which is already understaffed according to its director.

## **5.2 Enhance Academic Support Services to Improve Retention**

Concerns about student retention and graduation rates, especially among students placed in developmental courses, indicate that additional consideration should also be given to enhancing academic support services for all admitted students. The study group believes that such enhancements, which are warranted even for the current student population, would be absolutely vital with any expansion of qualitative review in the admissions process. Consideration of these services should include:

- i. Hire additional counselors for regular advising and monitoring. Both the Honors College and the EOF programs provide hands-on counseling support to their students. This support includes academic advising, socialization to the college environment, and active ongoing outreach. These programs provide a supportive network that supports students' as they struggle to master various aspects of college life. This proactive approach to



student development has a proven record of success and aspects of it could be implemented across the campus to strengthen support for student achievement.

- ii. Run parallel and supplementary support programs for selected classes. The EOF program has had success running parallel support programs for College Algebra and first year Biology. These courses provide regularly scheduled instructor and peer tutoring support for students in these classes. The parallel courses are designed to closely follow the syllabus of their parent courses. This model or similar models of supplemental support could be implemented for additional introductory level courses where students traditionally struggle to achieve success. Additionally, the Committee received an overview of the recent changes in the introductory and developmental English and mathematics courses and the accompanying supplemental support. The results of changes to these courses, which serve as a gateway to the full academic experience of the University, should be monitored and evaluated carefully.
- iii. Develop preparatory summer programs. The EOF programs have run successful summer programs to bridge students into the University since the inception of the program in the state. These summer programs immerse students in the college culture by providing an intense and rigorous academic experience that challenges students and exposes them to the level of work they will face when they matriculate in the fall. It would be worthwhile to provide such an experience for students admitted to the University through an expanded qualitative review process.
- iv. Increase opportunities for students to obtain additional financial support. One of the key impediments to college success for all students is a lack of adequate financial support for their college education. The lack of sufficient funds makes it necessary for too many of our students to work at least near-full-time hours. For students who may also need to invest additional time and effort into the academic endeavor, opportunities for additional funding are critical to their retention and ultimate success in school.

### **5.3 Strengthen Transfer Recruiting**

As discussed above, transfer students are a significant proportion of undergraduate students on campus and compare well with other students in terms of retention and graduation rates. The transfer system is a major pipeline to campus for traditional minorities, and this pipeline should be strengthened. The study group noted with concern the lack of strong, established and on-going institutional ties (such as minority student recruiting, expedited transcript evaluation and other transfer programs) between Rutgers-Newark and Essex, Hudson and Union County Colleges, our 3 closest neighbors with significant pools of minority students.

### **5.4 Establish Pipeline Programs**

Pre-college pipeline programs offer opportunities to address critical student needs before students matriculate into the University. According to the preliminary results of a study conducted by Alan Sadovnik students at one of the top Newark high schools—where 100% of their students pass the 11<sup>th</sup> grade proficiency exam—often place into developmental courses

when they matriculate into Rutgers University. Pre-college programs that begin a relationship with students as early as the 6<sup>th</sup> grade and work with them in engaging enrichment activities that are congruent with what they are learning in middle and high school would serve to address critical academic needs while exposing students to the campus and college experience. Offering additional incentives on campus for the creation and maintenance of such programs (i.e., key staff positions, incentives for faculty involvement, and improved access to facilities) could fill a critical gap in campus efforts to strengthen diversity—particularly for students who come from the Newark Public Schools and other similar districts.

### **5.5 Enhance Undergraduate Research Opportunities**

To attract the very best minority applicants the Campus could strengthen a strategy of highlighting and increasing opportunities for research, internships, and other special scholarly activities that are congruent with the theme of the Newark campus mission. Rutgers-Newark must continue aggressively to upgrade the infrastructure for scholarship and research facilities. The Honors College in particular may be able to attract well-qualified minority students to campus by combining more competitive financial aid packages with an emphasis on personal attention and enhanced undergraduate research opportunities.

•

Study Group on Undergraduate Admissions

Data Appendix

May 2005

TABLE A

Newark Campus															
First Year Students															
By Ethnicity															
PERSONS APPLIED															
	1999		2000		2001		2002		2003						
Native American	13		28		11		13		20						
Asian/Pacific Islander	1443		1785		2086		2116		2090						
Latino	701		848		826		871		833						
Other	470		614		431		461		369						
TOTAL	7099		8234		8873		9168		8413						
PERSONS ADMITTED															
	1999		2000		2001		2002		2003						
	N	% of Apps	N	% of Apps	N	% of Apps	N	% of Apps	N	% of Apps					
Native American	1	7.7	11	39.3	5	45.5	5	38.5	9	45.0					
Asian/Pacific Islander	916	63.5	1044	58.5	1190	57.0	1253	59.2	1200	57.4					
Latino	312	44.5	387	45.6	369	44.7	348	40.0	345	41.4					
Other	228	48.5	307	50.0	187	43.4	197	42.7	156	42.3					
TOTAL	3899	54.9	4299	52.2	4618	52.0	4553	49.7	4009	47.7					
PERSONS ENROLLED															
	1999		2000		2001		2002		2003						
	N	% of AD's	% of Class	N	% of AD's	% of Class	N	% of AD's	% of Class	N	% of AD's	% of Class	N	% of AD's	% of Class
Native American		0.0	0.0	1	9.1	0.1	1	20.0	0.1		0.0	0.0	3	33.3	0.3
Asian/Pacific Islander	190	20.7	28.6	179	17.1	25.7	199	16.7	28.4	267	21.3	31.0	285	23.8	33.0
Latino	81	26.0	12.2	105	27.1	15.1	103	27.9	14.7	102	29.3	11.8	108	31.3	12.5
Other	60	26.3	9.0	84	27.4	12.1	37	19.8	5.3	49	24.9	5.7	43	27.6	5.0
TOTAL	665	17.1	100.0	697	16.2	100.0	701	15.2	100.0	861	18.9	100.0	864	21.6	100.0

TABLE 18

All Day Undergraduate Colleges University-wide

ENROLLED First Year Students'  
Mean SAT Scores and Rank-in-class

REGULAR

	SAT-VERBAL					SAT-MATH				
	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Camden	547	543	544	546	554	550	554	551	558	571
Cook	570	569	558	567	573	593	595	587	594	594
Douglass	558	558	558	554	560	554	561	559	555	558
Engineering	588	586	584	588	593	665	666	665	668	666
Livingston	549	560	568	562	581	575	586	593	591	601
Mason Gross	584	556	587	579	591	570	561	581	574	580
Newark	523	538	529	524	536	542	563	556	561	570
Nursing	547	561	546	556	560	553	567	564	565	570
Pharmacy	628	629	605	615	640	671	672	661	681	688
Rutgers	606	611	619	611	619	627	640	643	641	645
TOTAL	578	580	582	578	588	602	609	609	610	615
NJ SAT-Takers	498	498	499	498	501	510	513	513	513	515
Nat'l SAT-Takers	505	505	506	504	507	511	514	514	516	519

	SAT-COMPOSITE					RANK-IN-CLASS				
	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Camden	1097	1097	1095	1104	1125	77	75	75	78	76
Cook	1163	1164	1146	1160	1167	82	80	78	79	81
Douglass	1112	1119	1117	1109	1118	77	77	77	75	78
Engineering	1253	1252	1249	1257	1259	82	84	84	85	85
Livingston	1124	1146	1160	1153	1182	72	74	76	79	79
Mason Gross	1154	1117	1168	1152	1171	72	65	72	72	78
Newark	1065	1102	1085	1085	1106	75	79	79	80	81
Nursing	1100	1128	1110	1121	1130	79	86	86	88	88
Pharmacy	1299	1301	1266	1295	1328	91	92	91	92	92
Rutgers	1233	1251	1262	1252	1264	86	87	88	87	88
TOTAL	1180	1189	1191	1188	1203	81	82	82	83	83
NJ SAT-Takers	1008	1011	1012	1011	1016					
Nat'l SAT-Takers	1016	1019	1020	1020	1026					

Notes: All SATs are recentered.

Table C

STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS											
	NCAS					UCN					
	F99	F00	F01	F02	F03	F99	F00	F01	F02	F03	
Status	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Full-Time	84	84	86	87	87	39	35	41	39	41	
Part-Time	16	16	14	13	13	61	65	59	61	59	
Gender											
Male	44.4	45.3	45.2	44.8	44.2	43.8	43.5	44.6	44.2	45.1	
Female	55.6	54.7	54.8	55.2	55.9	56.2	56.5	55.4	55.8	54.9	
Race/Ethnic											
White	30	30	31	31	30	26	27	26	26	26.2	
African-American	17	16	16	17	16.9	32	28	27	26	26.4	
Puerto Rican	6	5	5	5	4.6	6	5	5	5	3.9	
Other Hispanic	14	14	13	13	13.6	12	11	11	12	11.2	
Asian	22	23	24	24	25.9	10	12	14	14	15.3	
Other/No Inf	11	12	11	10	8.9	14	17	17	17	17	
Age											
25 and over	19	17	18	22	21.8	55	51	53	52		
Under 25	81	83	82	78	78.2	45	49	47	48		
Residence											
In-State	94.4	93.7	91.3	91.4	92.2	97.2	96.3	95.6	96.8	97.7	
Out of State	5.6	6.3	8.7	8.6	7.8	2.8	3.7	4.4	3.2	2.3	

<b>UNDERGRADUATES</b>														
<b>NEWARK CAMPUS</b>														
<b>FALL 2004</b>														
<b>Race-Ethnicity by Citizenship</b>														
<i>(excludes non-matriculating undergrads)</i>														
	1-NatAm		2-Asian		3-Black		4-Hispanic		5-PR	6-White		7-Other		
<b>Citizen</b>	14	88%	858	60%	977	78%	593	72%	268	100%	1509	83%	332	69%
<b>PermRes</b>	2	13%	478	33%	240	19%	211	26%		0%	278	15%	125	26%
<b>Foreign</b>			81	6%	27	2%	11	1%		0%	25	1%	16	3%
<b>Unknown</b>			17	1%	5	0%	6	1%		0%	7	0%	5	1%
	16		1434		1249		821		268		1819		478	

Table D

Table E

RUTGERS, THE STATE UNIVERSITY  
 NEWARK COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES  
 1-, 2- AND 3-YEAR RETENTION  
 FIRST-TIME, FULL TIME, FIRST-YEAR STUDENTS  
 FALL 1995 - FALL 2000  
 ADMIT TYPE - REGULAR

SCHOOL	COHORT YEAR	RETENTION	AFRICAN AMERICAN		AMERICAN INDIAN		ASIAN		LATINO		WHITE		NON-RESIDENT ALIEN		UNKNOWN		TOTAL	
			Enrolled	%	Enrolled	%	Enrolled	%	Enrolled	%	Enrolled	%	Enrolled	%	Enrolled	%	Enrolled	%
NCAS	1995	COHORT	38		1		64		59		109		10		40		321	
		1-YEAR	29	76.3	0	0	57	89.1	49	83.1	92	84.4	7	70.0	37	92.5	271	84.4
		2-YEAR	28	73.7	0	0	55	85.9	42	71.2	89	81.7	9	90.0	33	82.5	256	79.8
		3-YEAR	25	65.8	0	0	49	76.6	37	62.7	80	73.4	9	90.0	33	82.5	233	72.6
	1996	COHORT	44				77		65		101		5		41		333	
		1-YEAR	34	77.3			70	90.9	56	86.2	84	83.2	2	40.0	32	78.0	278	83.5
		2-YEAR	30	68.2			59	76.6	50	76.9	73	72.3	3	60.0	28	68.3	243	73.0
		3-YEAR	27	61.4			58	75.3	45	69.2	69	68.3	2	40.0	26	63.4	227	68.2
	1997	COHORT	53				79		71		109		9		60		381	
		1-YEAR	44	83.0			64	81.0	54	76.1	92	84.4	7	77.8	52	86.7	313	82.2
		2-YEAR	40	75.5			61	77.2	51	71.8	84	77.1	6	66.7	45	75.0	287	75.3
		3-YEAR	39	73.6			52	65.8	46	64.8	79	72.5	5	55.6	42	70.0	263	69.0
	1998	COHORT	43		1		96		52		149		15		31		387	
		1-YEAR	37	86.0	1	100	85	88.5	44	84.6	124	83.2	13	86.7	28	90.3	332	85.8
		2-YEAR	30	69.8	1	100	77	80.2	35	67.3	110	73.8	9	60.0	25	80.6	287	74.2
		3-YEAR	33	76.7	1	100	74	77.1	33	63.5	100	67.1	8	53.3	20	64.5	269	69.5
	1999	COHORT	45				147		62		151		19		41		465	
		1-YEAR	38	84.4			136	92.5	56	90.3	127	84.1	18	94.7	36	87.8	411	88.4
		2-YEAR	30	66.7			123	83.7	46	74.2	112	74.2	12	63.2	34	82.9	357	76.8
		3-YEAR	32	71.1			114	77.6	41	66.1	106	70.2	10	52.6	26	63.4	329	70.8
	2000	COHORT	38		1		137		57		169		22		62		486	
		1-YEAR	31	81.6	1	100	117	85.4	47	82.5	141	83.4	15	68.2	52	83.9	404	83.1
		2-YEAR	28	73.7	1	100	103	75.2	41	71.9	122	72.2	9	40.9	49	79.0	353	72.6
		3-YEAR	25	65.8	0	0	97	70.8	35	61.4	119	70.4	7	31.8	45	72.6	328	67.5



Table F

RUTGERS, THE STATE UNIVERSITY

NEWARK COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES  
UNIVERSITY COLLEGE-NEWARK

4-, 5- AND 6-YEAR GRADUATION RATES  
FIRST-TIME, FULL-TIME FIRST-YEAR STUDENTS  
FALL 1995 - FALL 1999

REGULAR ADMIT TYPE

REGULAR ADMIT TYPE			AMERICAN			AMERICAN INDIAN			ASIAN			LATINO			WHITE			ALIEN			UNKNOWN			TOTAL		
SCHOOL	*CHRT	*GRAD	*CHRT	*CDP	%%C	*CHRT	*CDP	%%C	*CHRT	*CDP	%%C	*CHRT	*CDP	%%C	*CHRT	*CDP	%%C	*CHRT	*CDP	%%C	*CHRT	*CDP	%%C	*CHRT	*CDP	%%C
NCAS	1995	4-YEAR	38	9	23.7	1			64	15	23.4	59	10	16.9	109	22	20.2	10	3	30.0	40	8	20.0	321	67	20.9
		5-YEAR	38	14	36.8	1			64	34	53.1	59	25	42.4	109	49	45.0	10	7	70.0	40	22	55.0	321	151	47.0
		6-YEAR	38	18	47.4	1			64	40	62.5	59	30	50.8	109	60	55.0	10	8	80.0	40	28	70.0	321	184	57.3
	1996	4-YEAR	44	8	18.2				77	19	24.7	65	15	23.1	101	22	21.8	5	1	20.0	41	7	17.1	333	72	21.6
		5-YEAR	44	15	34.1				77	32	41.6	65	32	49.2	101	44	43.6	5	2	40.0	41	14	34.1	333	139	41.7
		6-YEAR	44	21	47.7				77	40	51.9	65	38	58.5	101	52	51.5	5	2	40.0	41	19	46.3	333	172	51.7
	1997	4-YEAR	53	7	13.2				79	14	17.7	71	11	15.5	109	37	33.9	9	3	33.3	60	10	16.7	381	82	21.5
		5-YEAR	53	17	32.1				79	36	45.6	71	28	39.4	109	58	53.2	9	3	33.3	60	24	40.0	381	166	43.6
		6-YEAR	53	26	49.1				79	43	54.4	71	33	46.5	109	64	58.7	9	3	33.3	60	29	48.3	381	198	52.0
	1998	4-YEAR	43	13	30.2	1			96	25	26.0	52	5	9.6	149	42	28.2	15	3	20.0	31	8	25.8	387	96	24.8
		5-YEAR	43	24	55.8	1	1	100.0	96	45	46.9	52	18	34.6	149	77	51.7	15	5	33.3	31	16	51.6	387	186	48.1
	1999	4-YEAR	45	17	37.8				147	40	27.2	62	13	21.0	151	44	29.1	19	1	5.3	41	14	34.1	465	129	27.7
UC-NEWARK	1995	4-YEAR	18	2	11.1				7	1	14.3	8			16	3	18.8				7	1	14.3	56	7	12.5
		5-YEAR	18	4	22.2				7	4	57.1	8	2	25.0	16	4	25.0				7	2	28.6	56	16	28.6
		6-YEAR	18	7	38.9				7	4	57.1	8	2	25.0	16	4	25.0				7	2	28.6	56	19	33.9
	1996	4-YEAR	18	1	5.6				11	1	9.1	10			9			1	1	100.0	3	1	33.3	52	4	7.7
		5-YEAR	18	2	11.1				11	5	45.5	10	2	20.0	9			1	1	100.0	3	3	100.0	52	13	25.0
		6-YEAR	18	5	27.8				11	6	54.5	10	3	30.0	9	2	22.2	1	1	100.0	3	3	100.0	52	20	38.5
	1997	4-YEAR	4						5			8			9	1	11.1	1			5			32	1	3.1
		5-YEAR	4						5			8	1	12.5	9	3	33.3	1			5			32	4	12.5
		6-YEAR	4						5	2	40.0	8	1	12.5	9	4	44.4	1			5			32	7	21.9
	1998	4-YEAR	10	3	30.0				7	1	14.3	13			6						3			42	4	9.5
		5-YEAR	10	4	40.0				7	1	14.3	13	3	23.1	6	3	50.0	3			3			42	11	26.2
	1999	4-YEAR	5	1	20.0				5	1	20.0	5			6						6			27	2	7.4

Table G

RUTGERS, THE STATE UNIVERSITY  
 NEWARK COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES  
 UNIVERSITY COLLEGE-NEWARK  
 FIRST-TIME, FULL-TIME TRANSFER STUDENTS  
 2-YEAR, 3-YEAR AND 4-YEAR GRADUATION RATES  
 FALL 1995 - 1999  
 ALL STUDENTS

TOTAL			AMERICAN			INDIAN			ASIAN			LATINO			WHITE			ALIEN			NKNOWN			TOTAL		
SCHOOL	*CHRT	GRADUATED IN	*CHRT	*CDP	*%C	*CHRT	*CDP	*%C	*CHRT	*CDP	*%C	*C	*CDP	*%C	*CHRT	*CDP	*%C	*CHRT	*CDP	*%C	*CHRT	*CDP	*%C	*CHRT	*CDP	*%C
NCAS	1995	2-YEARS	76	10	13.2	2	0		67	10	14.9		3	4.8	108	17	16.0	21	6	28.6	25	3	12.0	359	49	13.6
		3-YEARS	76	32	42.1	2	0		67	26	38.8		15	25.8	106	47	44.3	21	11	52.4	25	7	28.0	359	139	38.7
		4-YEARS	76	46	60.5	2	0		67	33	49.3		29	46.8	106	58	54.7	21	13	61.9	25	9	36.0	359	188	52.4
	1996	2-YEARS	68	9	13.2	4	2	50.0	63	7	11.1	68	5	7.4	118	21	17.8	17	4	23.5	35	5	14.3	373	53	14.2
		3-YEARS	68	25	36.8	4	2	50.0	63	30	47.6	68	16	23.5	118	48	40.7	17	11	64.7	35	13	37.1	373	145	38.9
		4-YEARS	68	33	48.5	4	2	50.0	63	40	63.5	68	25	36.8	118	61	51.7	17	13	76.5	35	17	48.6	373	191	51.2
	1997	2-YEARS	64	6	9.4				45	8	17.8	52	8	15.4	128	20	15.6	8	1	12.5	43	3	7.0	340	46	13.5
		3-YEARS	64	17	26.6				45	20	44.4	52	21	40.4	128	57	44.5	8	4	50.0	43	16	37.2	340	135	39.7
		4-YEARS	64	29	45.3				45	25	55.6	52	31	59.6	128	76	59.4	8	5	62.5	43	25	58.1	340	191	56.2
	1998	2-YEARS	67	9	13.4				48	9	18.8	51	5	9.8	103	15	14.6	21	3	14.3	36	3	8.3	326	44	13.5
		3-YEARS	67	24	35.8				48	22	45.8	51	15	29.4	103	42	40.8	21	8	38.1	36	10	27.8	326	121	37.1
		4-YEARS	67	34	50.7				48	30	62.5	51	20	39.2	103	59	57.3	21	11	52.4	36	18	50.0	326	172	52.8
	1999	2-YEARS	65	4	6.2	2	0		39	2	5.1	36	1	2.8	85	8	9.4	21	3	14.3	22	5	22.7	270	23	8.5
		3-YEARS	65	18	27.7	2	1	50.0	39	13	33.3	36	11	30.6	85	36	42.4	21	6	28.6	22	11	50.0	270	96	35.6
		4-YEARS	65	30	46.2	2	1	50.0	39	21	53.8	36	15	41.7	85	50	58.8	21	12	57.1	22	16	72.7	270	145	53.7
UC-NWK	1995	2-YEARS	42	5	11.9				17	2	11.8	22	2	9.1	29	4	13.8	3	2	66.7	10	0		123	15	12.2
		3-YEARS	42	10	23.8				17	7	41.2	22	7	31.8	29	13	44.8	3	2	66.7	10	2	20.0	123	41	33.3
		4-YEARS	42	18	42.9				17	9	52.9	22	8	36.4	29	17	58.6	3	2	66.7	10	3	30.0	123	57	46.3
	1996	2-YEARS	42	1	2.4				21	1	4.8	14	0		22	4	18.2	2	0		13	1	7.7	114	7	6.1
		3-YEARS	42	9	21.4				21	6	28.6	14	2	14.3	22	9	40.9	2	0		13	2	15.4	114	28	24.6
		4-YEARS	42	15	35.7				21	8	38.1	14	5	35.7	22	11	50.0	2	1	50.0	13	3	23.1	114	43	37.7
	1997	2-YEARS	34	3	8.8				18	0		17	1	5.9	18	4	22.2				9	1	11.1	96	9	9.4
		3-YEARS	34	7	20.6				18	6	33.3	17	4	23.5	18	9	50.0				9	1	11.1	96	27	28.1
		4-YEARS	34	13	38.2				18	7	38.9	17	7	41.2	18	10	55.6				9	1	11.1	96	38	39.6
	1998	2-YEARS	24	1	4.2				19	2	10.5	16	1	6.3	23	1	4.3	2	1	50.0	9	2	22.2	93	8	8.6
		3-YEARS	24	9	37.5				19	5	26.3	16	2	12.5	23	5	21.7	2	1	50.0	9	4	44.4	93	26	28.0
		4-YEARS	24	11	45.8				19	6	31.6	16	7	43.8	23	10	43.5	2	1	50.0	9	5	55.6	93	40	43.0
	1999	2-YEARS	31	3	9.7				9	2	22.2	22	0		19	3	15.8	9	0		9	0		99	8	8.1
		3-YEARS	31	10	32.3				9	5	55.6	22	4	18.2	19	7	36.8	9	2	22.2	8	4	44.4	99	32	32.3
		4-YEARS	31	16	51.6				9	6	66.7	22	8	36.4	19	11	57.9	9	4	44.4	9	4	44.4	99	49	49.5

Source Student Unit Record Enrollment Report (SURE)

%C = % Completed

COHORT = CHRT

CDP = Completed Degree Program

Table H

Six-Year Graduation Rates				
1995 First-time Freshmen Cohorts				
Metropolitan Universities Benchmark				
School	SAT average	Underrep.	Graduation Rates	
		Minorities	5-year	6-year
<b>Rutgers-Newark</b>	<b>1007</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>54%</b>
Cleveland State U	849	24%	21%	27%
Florida Atlantic U	979	25%	32%	40%
U of CO-Denver	na	34%	33%	40%
U of NC-Greensboro	1011	21%	41%	46%
U of TX-EI Paso	880	76%	15%	26%
Wayne State U	na	43%	30%	41%
Temple U	986	34%	38%	45%
U of Houston	1010	36%	11%	14%
George Mason U	930	19%	41%	47%

Table I

RUTGERS, THE STATE UNIVERSITY  
 NEWARK COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES  
 1-, 2- AND 3-YEAR RETENTION  
 FIRST-TIME, FULL-TIME, FIRST-YEAR STUDENTS  
 FALL 1995 - FALL 2000  
 ADMIT TYPE - EOF

SCHOOL	COHORT YEAR	RETENTION	AFRICAN AMERICAN		AMERICAN INDIAN		ASIAN		LATINO		WHITE		NON-RESIDENT ALIEN		UNKNOWN		TOTAL	
			Enrolled	%	Enrolled	%	Enrolled	%	Enrolled	%	Enrolled	%	Enrolled	%	Enrolled	%	Enrolled	%
NCAS	1995	COHORT	25		1		8		47		8				9		98	
		1-YEAR	23	92.0	1	100	8	100	46	97.9	8	100			8	88.9	94	95.9
		2-YEAR	15	60.0	1	100	7	87.5	33	70.2	6	75.0			8	88.9	70	71.4
		3-YEAR	10	40.0	1	100	7	87.5	30	63.8	5	62.5			6	66.7	59	60.2
	1996	COHORT	11				14		41		5				5		77	
		1-YEAR	7	63.6			14	100	34	82.9	4	80.0			6	100	65	84.4
		2-YEAR	5	54.5			12	85.7	26	63.4	4	80.0			5	83.3	53	68.8
		3-YEAR	4	36.4			11	78.6	26	63.4	4	80.0			4	66.7	49	63.6
	1997	COHORT	18				7		39		4				11		79	
		1-YEAR	16	88.9			6	85.7	30	76.9	3	75.0			10	90.9	65	82.3
		2-YEAR	14	77.8			6	85.7	26	66.7	2	50.0			9	81.8	57	72.2
		3-YEAR	11	61.1			6	85.7	19	48.7	2	50.0			7	63.6	45	57.0
	1998	COHORT	21				8		25		7				5		65	
		1-YEAR	19	90.5			6	75.0	20	80.0	7	100			4	80.0	56	84.8
		2-YEAR	16	76.2			5	62.5	14	56.0	6	85.7			4	80.0	45	68.2
		3-YEAR	16	76.2			3	37.5	12	48.0	6	85.7			5	100	42	63.6
	1999	COHORT	19				8		37		5		1		6		76	
		1-YEAR	17	89.5			8	100	33	89.2	5	100	1	100	5	83.3	69	90.8
		2-YEAR	12	63.2			8	100	31	83.8	4	80.0	1	100	5	83.3	61	80.3
		3-YEAR	11	57.9			8	100	28	75.7	4	80.0	1	100	5	83.3	57	75.0
	2000	COHORT	13				14		26		12				8		73	
		1-YEAR	12	92.3			12	85.7	22	84.6	12	100			7	87.5	65	89.0
		2-YEAR	12	92.3			12	85.7	18	69.2	11	91.7			7	87.5	60	82.2
		3-YEAR	10	76.9			12	85.7	15	57.7	10	83.3			7	87.5	54	74.0

Table J

RUTGERS, THE STATE UNIVERSITY  
 NEWARK COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES  
 UNIVERSITY COLLEGE-NEWARK  
 4-, 5- AND 6-YEAR GRADUATION RATES  
 FIRST-TIME, FULL-TIME FIRST-YEAR STUDENTS  
 FALL 1995 - FALL 1999  
 ADMIT TYPE - EOF

EOF - ADMIT TYPE			AFRICAN AMERICAN			AMERICAN INDIAN			ASIAN			LATINO			WHITE			NON-RESIDENT ALIEN			UNKNOWN			TOTAL		
SCHOOL	*COHRT	*GRAD	*COHRT	*CDP	%C	*COHRT	*CDP	%C	*COHRT	*CDP	%C	*COHRT	%CDP	%C	*COHRT	*CDP	%C	*COHRT	*CDP	%C	*COHRT	*CDP	%C	*COHRT	*CDP	%C
NCAS	1995	4-YEAR	25			1			8	1	12.5	47	13	27.7	8	1	12.5				9	2	22.2	98	4	4.1
		5-YEAR	25	3	12.0	1			8	3	37.5	47	13	27.7	8	4	50.0				9	3	33.3	98	26	26.5
		6-YEAR	25	6	24.0	1			8	5	62.5	47	16	34.0	8	4	50.0				9	6	66.7	98	37	37.8
	1996	4-YEAR	11						14			41	3	7.3	5						6	1	16.7	77	4	5.2
		5-YEAR	11	1	9.1				14	3	21.4	41	12	29.3	5	4	80.0				6	3	50.0	77	23	29.9
		6-YEAR	11	1	9.1				14	5	35.7	41	16	39.0	5	4	80.0				6	3	50.0	77	29	37.7
	1997	4-YEAR	18	1	5.6				7	1	14.3	39	3	7.7	4	2	50.0				11	1	9.1	79	8	10.1
		5-YEAR	18	3	16.7				7	5	71.4	39	9	23.1	4	2	50.0				11	3	27.3	79	22	27.8
		6-YEAR	18	5	27.8				7	5	71.4	39	12	30.8	4	2	50.0				11	5	45.5	79	29	36.7
	1998	4-YEAR	21	2	9.5				8			25	1	4.0	7	3	42.9				5			66	6	9.1
		5-YEAR	21	12	57.1				8	1	12.5	25	4	16.0	7	5	71.4				5	3	60.0	66	25	37.9
	1999	4-YEAR	19	1	5.3				8			37			5			1	1	100.0	6			76	2	2.6
UC-NEWARK	1995	4-YEAR	4						1			1												6		
		5-YEAR	4	1	25.0				1			1												6	1	16.7
		6-YEAR	4	1	25.0				1			1												6	1	16.7
	1996	4-YEAR	4						2			6			3									15		
		5-YEAR	4						2	1	50.0	6	1	16.7	3									15	2	13.3
		6-YEAR	4						2	1	50.0	6	1	16.7	3									15	2	13.3
	1997	4-YEAR	3									2									2			7		
		5-YEAR	3	1	33.3							2									2	1	50.0	7	2	28.6
		6-YEAR	3	1	33.3							2									2	1	50.0	7	2	28.6
	1998	4-YEAR	1						2	2	100.0													3	2	66.7
		5-YEAR	1						2	2	100.0													3	2	66.7
	1999	4-YEAR	7						2			6			2						5			22		

<b>DATA WAREHOUSE</b>													
<b>ENGLISH</b>													
<b>003.142 Communications Skills</b>													
<b>First-Time Full-Time Students at NCAS/UC-N</b>													
<u>Semester</u>	<u>142</u>	<u>A-C</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>A-C</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>101/121</u>	<u>A-C</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>102/122</u>	<u>A-C</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Cumulative</u>
<b>FALL 2001</b>													
F2001	219	198	90%										
S2002	15	9	60%	158	148	94%	34	23	68%				
SS2002							14	12	86%	2	2	100%	
F2002	1	1	100%	11	7	64%	120	59	49%	20	11	55%	6%
<b>FALL 2000</b>													
F2000	159	147	92%										
S2001	9	6	67%	117	106	91%	25	19	76%				
SS2001							15	12	80%	5	3	60%	2%
F2001	2	2	100%	8	6	75%	88	45	51%	20	18	90%	13%
S2002				5	3	60%	27	15	56%	35	28	80%	31%
SS2002							6	2	33%	9	6	67%	35%
F2002				2	0		19	8	42%	20	11	55%	42%
<b>FALL 1999 COHORT</b>													
F1999	177	163	92%										
S2000	10	8	80%	140	127	91%	18	17	94%				
SS2000							13	10	77%	3	3		2%
F2000	4	4	100%	13	6	46%	104	61	59%	11	9	82%	7%
S2001	1	1	100%	13	8	62%	30	16	53%	59	44	75%	32%
SS2001							9	5	56%	8	8	100%	36%
F2001				1	0		23	17	74%	28	22	79%	49%
S2002				1	0		12	2	17%	20	12	60%	55%
SS2002							3	1	33%	5	3	60%	57%
F2002							7	2	29%	5	1	20%	58%
<b>FALL 1998 COHORT</b>													
F1998	162	144	89%										
S1999	12	6	50%	128	105	82%	12	9	75%				
SS1999				2	2	100%	8	7	88%				
F1999	3	0		19	14	74%	91	56	62%	16	16	100%	10%
S2000	2	1	50%	3	2	67%	40	20	50%	44	36	82%	32%
SS2000				2	1	50%	3	1	33%	11	6	55%	36%
F2000				2	1	50%	26	10	38%	17	10	59%	42%
S2001				2	1	50%	10	4	40%	15	11	73%	49%
SS2001							4	3	75%	5	3	60%	51%
F2001							9	2	22%	11	7	64%	55%
S2002							5	2	40%	8	4	50%	57%
SS2002							1	1	100%	5	3	60%	59%
<b>Fall 1997 COHORT</b>													
F1997	193	146	76%										
S1998	21	20	95%	120	100	83%	18	17	94%				



