Note: Do not cite, quote, or disseminate without the permission of the author. Questions, comments, and items of clarification regarding this report should be directed to Dr. Kristina M. Cragg, Assistant to the President for Strategic Research & Analysis, Valdosta State University.

Attainable Increases in Retention and Graduation Rates and the Students that Comprise Graduation Rates: Student Success in Four-Year Public Institutions

Kristina M. Cragg, Ph.D.,[*,†] Angela Elder Henderson,[*] and Jessica Thompson[*]

Email: kmcragg@valdosta.edu
Phone: 229-245-6517
FAX: 229-245-6519

Submitted: June 1, 2009

* Strategic Research and Analysis, Valdosta State University, 1500 North Patterson Street, Valdosta, Georgia, 31698-0179.
†Address correspondence to: Kristina M. Cragg, Strategic Research and Analysis, Valdosta State University, 1500 North Patterson Street, Valdosta, Georgia, 31698-0179. Email: kmcragg@valdosta.edu.

Abstract

As the umbrella of accountability hovers over institutions in higher education, every facet of measuring institutional success has come under the microscope – including retention and graduation rates. Thus, increasing retention and graduation rates is among many institutions' goals. However, many students in higher education are not counted in retention or graduation rates, leaving successful students uncounted and an inaccurate assessment of colleges and universities and the students they enroll. Federal reporting definitions have not been updated to reflect current higher education environments. This paper examines attainable retention and graduation rates and the number of students not counted in graduation rates at four-year public institutions. Results provide context for institutional discussions to improve graduation and retention rates as well as state and accrediting region comparisons.

KEYWORDS:

1. Retention Rates
2. Graduation Rates
3. Four-Year Public Institutions
4. Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS)
5. Persistence

Introduction

Despite college and university programming efforts and extensive research conducted in the area of retention and graduation (Pascarella & Terrenzini, 1991, 2005) retention and graduation rates have remained stable at 50% (Tinto, 1993). This may be due to the fact that the federal definitions for calculating graduation rates have not been updated to reflect current higher education environments. As such, a large percentage of students attending higher education institutions are not counted in graduation rates, leaving successful students uncounted and an inaccurate picture of success and efficiency at colleges and universities for public constituents. Conversations on revising the definitions looked promising, receiving national attention (Adelman, 2007; Adelman, Seybert, Kelman, & Krotseng, 2007); however, Congress did not make changes to retention and graduation rate definitions in the Higher Education Act (HEA) reauthorization in 2008.

As the federal and state governments, as well as accrediting agencies, call for higher education institutions to be more accountable for the funding they receive and students they accept, colleges and universities struggle to meet the unspecified accountability demands of the public by using existing standards, such as retention and graduation rates. Over the last decade, "federal priorities have focused in particular on consumer protection, transparency in reporting, accountability, and collaboration" (Burke & Associates, 2005, p. 60). In return, those policies and actions made at the federal level have a direct impact on individual state legislators and their actions towards public institutions of higher education.

The purpose of this study is to analyze retention and graduation rate gains and losses over the past three years as well as to identify the number and percentage of students that are not being counted in graduation rates. The study delves further into retention and graduation rates by

examining data by state and accrediting zones. Utilizing publically available data from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), this study focuses on four-year public institutions and provides answers to three key questions: 1) what is an achievable retention rate?; 2) what is an achievable graduation rate?; and 3) how many students are not being counted in graduation rates? This study adds value to the literature because it is the first to examine graduation rates vertically, rather than a traditional horizontal cohort approach and to quantify the number of students not counted in graduation rates by state and accrediting region.

Background

Nearly 25 years ago Noel and Levitz (1985) stated that the majority of research focusing on retention and graduation rates was "narrowly conceived, both conceptually in the literature and operationally on campuses" (p. 350). While research regarding retention has become widespread, little has been done to examine the formulas used as the basis for creating federal retention and graduation rates. Hagedorn (2005) acknowledges that the current federal IPEDS formula for retention and graduation rates has shortcomings in that "the current definitions and formulas do not include all students and so may provide inaccurate measures of retention" (p. 100). Hagedorn (2005) pointed to Summerskill's (1962) work which suggested the need for a standardized system of measuring retention for more accurate comparison across institutions. More than four decades later a formula that counts all (or nearly all) students is not being utilized (Adelman 2007; Hagedorn, 2005).

Historical Background of Retention and Graduation Rates

Beginnings of Retention and Graduation Rates

The "College Student Mortality" study conducted in 1938 by McNeely was the first federal study of student attrition across multiple institutions (Berger & Lyon, 2005). This study,

published with the support of the U.S. Department of the Interior and the Office of Education, gathered data from sixty institutions on:

> attrition, average time to degree completion, points in the academic career in which attrition was most prevalent, impact of institutional size, impact of other factors (gender, age at entrance, location of home, type of lodging, participation in extracurricular activities, and engagement in part-time work), and reasons for departure (academic dismissal, financial difficulties, illness and death, lack of interest, and being called home by parents). (Berger & Lyon, 2005, p. 14)

The purpose of retention rates, and subsequently graduation rates, has transformed over time from the original goal of improved programs and services (Noel, 1985) into an inaccurate measure of effectiveness. An increased focus exclusively on retention over the past decade has resulted in institutions trying to "hold students at all costs," just as Noel (1985) forecasted (p. 1). Retention and graduation rates ignore the varying levels of academic capabilities and preparation of entering students (Noel, 1985).

A study by Astin (1997) tried to more accurately assess institutional effectiveness to determine an achievable retention rate based upon the characteristics of students attending the institution. Early definitions to measure student success included Tinto (1985) where he defined and limited dropout "to those situations in which there is failure on the part of both the individual and the institution, a failure of the student to achieve and of the institution to facilitate the achievement of reasonable and desired educational goals" (p. 29). Tinto (2006) continues to address this disparity, noting that:

> When the issue of student retention first appeared on the higher educational radar screen, now some 40 years ago, student attrition was typically viewed through the lends [sic] of

> psychology. Student retention or the lack thereof was seen as the reflection of individual attributes, skills, and motivation. Students who did not stay were thought to be less able, less motivated, and less willing to defer the benefits that college graduation was believed to bestow. Students failed, not institutions. (p. 2)

While, many scholars (Braxton, Hirschy, & and McClendon, 2004; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Tinto, 1987, 1993), acknowledge departure rates little is known about the percentage of students who drop out of their first institution and then go on to another institution and graduate and become a successful recipient of a higher education degree. Tinto (1985) noted, "It is simply unreasonable to expect all entering students to be sufficiently informed of the character of the institution to accurately assess congruency before matriculation" (p. 40). So too is it unreasonable to assume that individual preferences, beliefs, and values will not change during students' college careers (Tinto, 1985). If key experts recognized three decades ago that first time students may change their minds after learning more about the institution, then why does our current definition not reflect this?

Reporting Retention and Graduation Rates

Submission of institutional data via the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) was mandated in the Higher Education Act of 1992 for all institutions that receive federal student aid under Title IV (IPEDS, n.d.). IPEDS began consistently collecting institutional data in 1993 and continued revising the instrument and process through 2000 (IPEDS, n.d.). In 2001 the previously paper-based system was completely redesigned for online data collection (IPEDS, n.d.). Additional data elements have been added to the collection process as needed.

Postsecondary institutions have been required to submit data annually on first-year retention rates to the federal government through IPEDS data collection since 2003 (IPEDS, n.d.). Reporting of institutional, degree-seeking, undergraduate, one-year retention rates was optional for the 2003-04 IPEDS collection cycle and became a mandatory reporting item in the 2004-05 cycle (IPEDS, n.d.). IPEDS defines retention rate as:

> A measure of the rate at which students persist in their educational program at an institution, expressed as a percentage. For four-year institutions, this is the percentage of first-time bachelors (or equivalent) degree-seeking undergraduates from the previous fall who are again enrolled in the current fall. For all other institutions this is the percentage of first-time degree/certificate-seeking students from the previous fall who either re-enrolled or successfully completed their program by the current fall. (IPEDS, n.d., para. 17)

IPEDS began to collect institutional graduate rate data in the 1997 survey cycle with the introduction of the Graduation Rate Survey (GRS) (National Center for Education Statistics, 1997). The GRS was designed to aid institutions in providing graduation and transfer rates to the Department of Education per the Student Right to Know Act requirement for institutions offering athletically-related student aid (National Center for Education Statistics, 1997). To this end, the GRS collected data on "the number of full-time first-time degree-seeking students in a particular year (cohort) and their status after 6 years at 4-year institutions or after 3 years at less than 4-year institutions" (National Center for Education Statistics, 1997, p. II-1). This impetus behind implementation of the GRS is still evident in the current IPEDS definition of graduation rates as "The rate required for disclosure and/or reporting purposes under Student Right-to-Know. This

rate is calculated as the total number of completers within 150% of normal time divided by the revised cohort minus any allowable exclusions" (IPEDS, n.d., para. 14).

Accountability in Higher Education

As the federal and state governments, as well as accrediting agencies, call for higher education institutions to be more accountable for the funding they receive and students they accept, colleges and universities struggle to meet the unspecified accountability demands of the public by using existing standards, such as retention rates. Much of the heightened awareness on accountability is due to the final report issued by the Spellings Commission (2006) which stated that "too many decisions about higher education—from those made by policymakers to those made by students and families—rely heavily on reputation and rankings derived to a large extent from inputs such as financial resources rather than outcomes" (p. 14). Tinto (2006) noted that the extent of the resulting emphasis on this practice is increasing as:

> Many states now use some measure of institutional retention and/or graduation rates in their accountability programs for state sponsored or supported institutions. Several organizations and at least one well-known news magazine now rank institutions and in some cases states, by some measure of retention. Even the Federal government is considering using institutional retention rates in a national system of higher educational accountability. Indeed a number of states already use institutional retention in their accountability systems. (p. 5)

Over the last decade, "federal priorities have focused in particular on consumer protection, transparency in reporting, accountability, and collaboration" (Richardson & Smalling, 2005, p. 60). In return, those policies and actions made at the federal level have a direct impact on individual states and their actions towards their institutions of higher education.

In today's fierce accountability debate, institutions conform to the accountability triangle illustrated by Burke and Associates (2005) in *Achieving Accountability in Higher Education*. In this triangle, colleges and universities must adhere to "state priorities, academic concerns, and market forces" (p. 23). Today, institutions in higher education serve students, parents, market, economy, politics, and many other stakeholders and sectors in the nation and throughout the world. If students remain enrolled in higher education institutions, thus are retained, then their retention not only produces more capital income for the institution, but public and private sectors have the potential to benefit simultaneously. Furthermore, to be effective in higher education, efforts made must equally contribute to all three areas of the accountability triangle (state priorities, academic concerns, and market forces).

One response to the increased call for accountability was the development of the Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA) by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC) in 2007 (Voluntary System of Accountabililty, 2007). The VSA offers four-year public institutions the opportunity to submit data which demonstrates outcomes and accountability to be viewed by prospective students, parents, and constituents (Voluntary System of Accountabililty, 2007). In an effort to present a more accurate portrayal of graduation and retention, the National Student Clearinghouse is creating:

> A cohort retention and graduation rate table compliant with the undergraduate success rate for the Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA). The new measure provides a more accurate assessment of student progress by including transfer patterns in the enrollment and graduation rates of exiting students. 'By using Clearinghouse data, VSA participants can capture the educational attainments of students who transfer out to other

> institutions and produce a truer picture of student success,' said Christine Keller, executive director of the VSA. (2008, p. 5)

Linking Retention and Graduation Rates to Funding

In a recent move to more explicitly link institutional funding to accountability, the Ohio General Assembly is contemplating a new funding formula which "would appropriate dollars based on colleges' ability to retain and graduate students" (Moltz, 2009). While in theory, performance-based funding rewards and encourages institutions to retain and graduate students, in reality performance-based funding based on retention and graduation rates may benefit only flagship institutions with existing high retention and graduation rates. Lower tiered institutions and community colleges with lower retention and graduation rates may be disadvantaged in this process, thus creating a divide of the have and have-not institutions.

Discussions of Changing Retention and Graduation Rates

Noel & Levitz (1985) suggested "that the attrition rate in four-year institutions decreases by half with each passing year" (p. 352). Adelman (2006) takes this one step further by suggesting that graduation rates calculated using the "Congressional Methodology" by the U.S. Department of Education indicated that "roughly half of traditional-age undergraduates are excluded from the Education Department's calculation of graduation rates" (p. 57). Exclusion of nearly fifty percent of students entering postsecondary institutions suggests that measures such as retention and graduation rates are inherently inaccurate from the start. As Adelman (2006) noted, "If our 'official' data – formulated in response to a Congressional mandate – exclude half of the entering students in higher education, those data don't mean much" (p. 57). As a result, Adelman declared, "It is counterproductive to make decisions based on assumptions derived from unexamined numbers. Yet that is what we in higher education do when we fail to question

statistical assertion" (p. 57). Even the final report of the Spellings Commission (2006) acknowledges:

> Extensive government data on higher education do exist, but they leave out large numbers of nontraditional students who are increasingly attending our colleges and universities and rarely focus on outcomes. Data collected by the National Center for Education Statistics through the Graduation Rate Survey under the Integrated Postsecondary Education Systems (IPEDS) are limited to full-time, first-time degree- or certificate-seeking students. Unfortunately, for a significant portion of students—those who enroll on a part-time basis and those who transfer to other institutions—no data exist on time to degree for individual students or completion for students who, in an increasingly common pattern, begin their studies, drop out, and then restart. (p. 15)

Retention and Graduation Rates of Public Institutions

Public and private institutions accepting federal aid must report data to IPEDS (IPEDS, n.d.), which includes retention and graduation rates. According to NCES, a public institution can be defined as "an educational institution whose programs and activities are operated by publicly elected or appointed school officials and which is supported primarily by public funds" (IPEDS, n.d.). Public institutions are essentially "owned" by the state while private institutions are not. These differences have played a role in how institutions are held accountable by each state and the public constituencies that they represent, thus it is important to examine public and private institutions separately (Zumeta, 2005).

Who Is and Is Not Included in Retention and Graduation Rates

Retention and graduation rates, in theory, provide institutions with an accurate measure of the percentage of students who enroll at an institution and return the following year and

graduation rates within four and six years, respectively. In practice, using the formula defined by the federal government, retention rates provides institutions with the percentage of first-time, degree-seeking cohort students who enroll at an institution in Fall and reenroll the following Fall term. Similarly, graduation rates provides institutions with the percentage of first-time, degree-seeking cohort students who enroll at an institution in Fall and graduate, measured after four and six years (150%).

Using the narrow definition provided by the federal government eliminates the opportunity to count all students; it excludes student groups such as transfers, part-time, and stop-outs. This limited view of retention creates an inaccurate snapshot of the number of students actively pursuing a degree.

Methodology

The purpose of this study is to examine attainable retention and graduation rates and the students that comprise them, or the percentage of students excluded from traditional graduation rate calculations at four-year public institutions in an effort to determine the accuracy of the current graduation formula. This study utilizes publically available data from the IPEDS housed in the NCES.

Determining Attainable Public Four-Year Institution Retention and Graduation Rates

Public four-year colleges or universities with available cohort, retention, and graduation trend data in IPEDS were included in the study. In addition to retrieving retention and graduation rates for four-year institutions for the last three years, the following institutional variables were selected for more detailed analyses: state, institutional size category, degree of urbanization and total revenue. This inquiry resulted in 535 public institutions for inclusion in the study. Detailed analyses, including calculations of differences in change of retention and graduation rates were

calculated from academic year 2004-2005 to 2006-2007. To analyze our findings, data was transferred to SPSS. Some variables (total revenue, retention rate changes, and graduation rate changes) were quartered to create ranges to allow for equitable comparisons between groups. From here, frequencies of all variables were generated in addition to crosstab comparisons of change in retention and graduation rates and total revenue generated. Pivot tables of averages were also created based on larger groupings of institutions by state and regional accrediting agency.

Determining the Number of Students Not Counted in Graduation Rates

Public four-year colleges or universities with available cohort, retention, and graduation trend data in IPEDS were included in the study. In addition to retrieving retention rates for four-year institutions for the last three years, the following institutional variables were selected for more detailed analyses: state, first-time, full-time cohort, and four, five, and six-year graduation rates. This inquiry resulted in 535 public institutions for inclusion in the study.

Detailed analyses, including calculations of percentages of undergraduates and total students excluded from traditional retention calculations, were determined for each institution for the years 2005-2007. To analyze our findings, the percentages of undergraduates that are excluded from retention rates were averaged by institution to create a three year average. Pivot tables of averages were also created based on larger groupings of institutions by state and regional accrediting agency.

Calculations: Step by Step

The data elements necessary to build the estimated number of students not counted in retention rates include the most recent first-time, full-time cohort, full-time retention rate, and four, five, and six year graduation rates. A Microsoft Excel template was constructed to

consistently apply formulas to the data. The first column, upon which subsequent calculations are based, is the first-time, full-time cohort. The first calculation, representing year one, is the first-time, full-time cohort multiplied by the one-year retention rate.

Years two and three are calculated on 80% and 70%, respectively, of the students retained in one year. The number of students retained in the fourth year is calculated by taking the cohort minus the differences of numbers retained year to year plus the number of students who graduated in four years. Years five and six are calculated the same as year four, using the number of five and six year graduates in place of four year figures. Building upon the numbers for years one through six, the total number of students included in retention rates are calculated by summing the cohort, the number of students retained one year, the number retained two years, the number retained three years, the number graduated in four years, the number graduated in five years, and the number graduated in six years.

This calculation provides the number of students on campus during an academic year that will contribute toward the institutional graduation rate, during the appropriate time that graduation rates are calculated for each cohort. These are students who were included in any first-time, full-time cohort (not just one-year). Using this figure as a basis, calculations can be made to estimate the number of students retained who were or were not included in any first-time, full-time cohort. Once the calculations were complete, three year averages were calculated for each institution, and the data were sorted by quartile, state, and accrediting body.

Limitations

This study contains at least three limitations. First, a formula was generated from a single institution's data and then applied to multiple institutions. This may result in inaccurate data for some institutions due to the "one size fits all" approach. Second, data on private colleges

or two-year colleges were not included in this study; only public four-year institutions were examined. Institutions lacking three years of recent IPEDS trend data were eliminated from analysis. Finally, institutions which generated figures outside the normal range (above 100% or below 0%) were removed from the final analysis.

Results

The IPEDS data utilized in this study were analyzed using crosstabs to provide granular information by state and accrediting body. This section includes the results for graduation rate gains by state and accrediting body for four-year public institutions as well as the results for the number and percentage of students that contribute toward graduation rates at four-year public institutions

Attainable Retention Rate Gains

The complete analysis utilized data from 535 four-year public institutions in all fifty states, Washington, DC, Guam, and Puerto Rico. Of the 535 institutions included in this study, the average change in retention rates from academic year 2004-05 to 2005-06 was 0.01. While no institution purposefully aims to decrease their retention rate, the average change in retention rates from academic year 2005-06 to 2006-07 was a decrease of 0.15. Table 1 shows the number of institutions by their accreditation body, retention rate change from academic year 2005-06 to 2006-07, and amount of revenue generated in fiscal year 2006. The highest percentage (5.05%) of institutions are within the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA) region, generated less than $71.5 million, and had an increase of two or more percentage points. In addition the second highest proportion (4.49%) of institutions reported to Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), generated more than $326.4 million, and either produced a static retention rate or it increased by one percentage point. When examining all institutions

regardless of their accreditation agency, the highest percentage of institutions (13.27%) generated more than $326.5 million and had either no change in their retention rate or it increased by one percentage point.

Attainable Graduation Rate Gains

The same set of data was utilized with the analysis of retention rates. Of the 535 institutions included in this study, the average change in graduation rates from academic year 2004-05 to 2005-06 was 0.40 and from 2005-06 to 2006-07 was 0.22. Table 1 shows the number of institutions by their accreditation body, graduation rate change from academic year 2005-06 to 2006-07, and amount of revenue generated in fiscal year 2006. As noted in the preceding section, the highest percentage (5.05%) of institutions are within NCA, generated less than $74.5 million, and had an increase of two or more percentage points in their graduation rate. However, when examining all institutions regardless of their accreditation agency, the opposite phenomenon occurs. The highest percentage of institutions (11.40%) generated more than $326.5 million and had either no change in their retention rate or it increased by one percentage point.

Students that Contribute Toward Graduation Rates

The final analysis included data on 535 four-year public institutions in all fifty states, Washington, DC, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. As shown in Table 2, the three year percentage average of undergraduates who do not count at institutions with each state ranged from 27.1% (Puerto Rico) followed closely behind by Delaware (29.2%) to a high of 71.4% (Alaska). The three year average percentage of undergraduates who do not count for all 535 institutions was 44.0%.

While the percentages provide informative information about which states are graduating large portions of their student population that began at a four year institution, the number of students not counted is critical. As shown in Table 2, the three-year average number of undergraduates who do not count at institutions with each state ranged from 971 students (Virgin Islands) to a high of 229,064 students (California). The three-year average number of undergraduates who do not count for all 535 institutions was 2,323,226 students. This is equivalent to the 2007 total student population[1] at the 535 four-year public universities included in the study in California, Texas, New York, Florida, Michigan, and Ohio – combined.

Discussion and Policy Implications

The results of this study hold very important policy implications in two areas: setting attainable retention and graduation rate goals and counting all students in graduation rates.

Implications for Attainable Retention and Graduation Rate Gains/Losses

Most institutions aim to increase their retention and graduation rates – no institution's goal is to decrease retention and graduation rates. As part of strategic planning, many institutions set a retention and graduation rate goal – typically 1% per year increase. As evidenced in this research, this is unrealistic as institutions, on average, are not attaining a 1% increase, thus setting up false or unattainable expectations. This is critical for those institutions that receive funding based on projected gains or for those senior administrators that are evaluated by systems offices or boards of trustees based upon retention or graduation rate goals.

Implications for Counting All Students in Graduation Rates

The results of this study showed that on average 44% of students attending four-year public institutions between 2005 and 2007 were not contributing toward graduation rates. Why is

[1] Total enrollment of the 535 four-year institutions in California, Texas, New York, Florida, Michigan and Ohio is 2,310,278. This number is derived from IPEDS 2007 Total Enrollment by institution.

it acceptable that only 56% of our students attending four-year public institutions "count"? The current definitions for calculating graduation rates exclude more than 2 million students, of which, many could be counted as being "successful" if they were counted in a transfer rate as suggested by Adelman (2007).

Current definitions suggest a limited view of counting only a select group of students assumes that the higher education institutions that students enter to help them grow and change is not rewarded for this effort. Counting only a select group of students because of their ability to choose the "right" first institution may border on discrimination, or at the least, insinuate to institutions that they should only focus on those students who "count," especially for those states where funding and performance evaluations are dependent on graduation rates.

Congress should consider revising the current definition for calculating graduation rates or add additional measures to count all students during the next reauthorization to the Higher Education Act (HEA); the current HEA is scheduled to expire on September 30, 2014. Revisions and/or additions to the current definitions will allow the Federal and state governments, institutions, think-tanks, and researchers to more accurately assess the efficiency and effectiveness of higher education institutions. Additionally, scarce financial and human capital resources could be targeted to those students and institutions that are likely to drop-out or have high drop-out rates, respectively, thereby increasing student and institutional success.

Retention and graduation rates are used by institutions, states, boards/trustees, federal government, as well as research organizations. Additionally, evaluation of retention rates includes a measure of effectiveness, resource and budget allocation, performance evaluation, and institutional improvement. All of these uses have serious implications, especially when retention rates are not an accurate indicator of institutional success.

References

Adelman, C. (2006). The propaganda of numbers. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 53*(8), 57.

Adelman, C. (2007). *Making graduation rates matter.* Retrieved May 12, 2009, from Inside Higher Ed.com: http://www.insidehighered.com/layout/set/print/views/2007/03/12/adelman

Adelman, C., Seybert, J., Kelman, M., & Krotseng, M. C. (2007, June 5). Emerging framework for graduation rate reporting. *Association for Institutional Research 47th Annual Forum*. Kansas City, Missouri.

Astin, A. W. (1997). How "good" is your institution's retention rate? *Research in Higher Education, 38*(6), 647-658.

Berger, J. B., & Lyon, S. C. (2005). Past to present: A historical look at retention. In A. Seidman, *College student retention: Formula for student success* (pp. 1-29). Westport, CT: Praeger Press.

Braxton, J. M., Hirschy, A. S., & and McClendon, S. A. (2004). *Understanding and reducing college student departure.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Burke, J. C. (2005). The many faces of accountability. In J. C. Burke, *Achieving accountability in higher education* (pp. 1-24). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Burke, J. C., & Associates. (2005). *Achieving accountability in higher education.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Hagedorn, L. S. (2005). How to define retention: A new look at an old problem. In A. Seidman, *College student retention: Formula for student success* (pp. 89-105). Westport, CT: Praeger Press.

IPEDS. (n.d.). *About IPEDS*. Retrieved May 6, 2009, from http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/about/

IPEDS. (n.d.). *Changes to IPEDS data collections, 2003-04*. Retrieved May 4, 2009, from IPEDS: http://nces.ed.gov/IPEDS/surveys/datacollection2003-04.asp

IPEDS. (n.d.). *IPEDS glossary*. Retrieved May 21, 2009, from National Center of Education Statistics: http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/glossary/

IPEDS. (n.d.). Graduation rate. In *IPEDS Glossary*. Retrieved May 21, 2009, from http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/glossary/?charindex=G

IPEDS. (n.d.). *IPEDS history*. Retrieved May 21, 2009, from National Center for Education Statistics: http://web.archive.org/web/20071106154931/http://nces.ed.gov/IPEDS/about/ipeds_history.asp

IPEDS. (n.d.). Retention rate. In *IPEDS Glossary*. Retrieved May 21, 2009, from http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/glossary/?charindex=R

Levitz, R., & Noel, L. (1985). Using a systematic approach to assessing retention needs. In L. Noel, R. Levitz, D. Saluri, & Associates, *Increasing student retention* (pp. 345-365). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Moltz, D. (2009, April 30). *Adopting performance-based funding.* Retrieved May 2, 2009, from Inside HigherEd.com: http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2009/04/30/ohio

National Center for Education Statistics. (1997). *IPEDS graduation rate survey: Guidelines for survey respondents.* NCES.

National Student Clearinghouse. (2008). *Clearinghouse to provide undergraduate success measure for VSA initiative. The Clearinghouse Record*. Retrieved May 9, 2009, from National Student Clearinghouse: http://research.studentclearinghouse.org/content/misc/TheNSCRecord_Spring2008_research.pdf

Noel, L. (1985). Increasing student retention: New challenges and potential. In L. Noel, R. S. Levitz, & Associates, *Increasing student retention* (pp. 1-27). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students: A third decade of research (2 ed.).* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Richardson Jr., R. C., & Smalling, T. R. (2005). Accountability and governance. In J. C. Burke, *Achieving accountability in higher education* (pp. 55-77). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Summerskill, J. (1962). Dropouts from college. In N. Standards, *The american college.* New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Tinto, V. (1985). Dropping out and other forms of withdrawal from college. In L. Noel, R. Levitz, D. Saluri, & Associates, *Increasing student retention* (pp. 28-43). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Tinto, V. (1987). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition (1ed.).* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition (2nd ed.).* Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press.

Tinto, V. (2006). Research and practice of student retention:What next? *Journal of College Student Retention*, 1-19.

U.S. Department of Education. (2006). *A test of leadership: Charting the future of U.S. higher education.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

Voluntary System of Accountabililty. (2007). *Voluntary system of accountability Q&A.* Retrieved May 9, 2009, from Voluntary System of Accountabililty Program: http://www.voluntarysystem.org/docs/faq/Q&A.pdf

Zumeta, W. (2005). Accountability and the private sector: State and federal perspectives. In J. Burke, & Associates, *Achieving accountability in higher education* (pp. 25-54). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Table 1: Retention Rate and Graduation Rate Gains/Losses by Revenue Category, by State, 2005-06 to 2006-07

State	*	Retention Rate Ranges (from 2005-06 to 2006-07)	Total Revenue Generated (FY2006)					n	Graduation Rate Ranges (from 2005-06 to 2006-07)	Total Revenue Generated (FY2006)					n
			< 71.4 M	71.5 M to 138.9 M	139 M to 326.4 M	> 326.5 M	missing			< 71.4 M	71.5 M to 138.9 M	139 M to 326.4 M	> 326.5 M	missing	
AK	**4**	**Total**	**1**		**1**	**1**		**3**	**Total**	**1**		**1**	**1**		**3**
		Decreased 3 or More	1					1	Decreased 3 or More						
		Decreased 1 or 2				1		1	Decreased 1 or 2			1			1
		Same or Increased 1			1			1	Increased 2 or More	1			1		2
AL	**5**	**Total**	**2**	**4**	**3**	**4**		**13**	**Total**	**2**	**4**	**3**	**4**		**13**
		Decreased 3 or More		2				2	Decreased 3 or More	1		1			2
		Decreased 1 or 2		1	2	2		5	Decreased 1 or 2		2	1	1		4
		Same or Increased 1		1	1	1		3	Same or Increased 1			1	1		2
		Increased 2 or More	2			1		3	Increased 2 or More	1	2		2		5
AR	**2**	**Total**	**4**	**1**	**3**	**1**		**9**	**Total**	**4**	**1**	**3**	**1**		**9**
		Decreased 3 or More		1	1			2	Decreased 3 or More			2			2
		Decreased 1 or 2			1			1	Decreased 1 or 2	1		1			2
		Same or Increased 1	2		1	1		4	Same or Increased 1	1	1				2
		Increased 2 or More	2					2	Increased 2 or More	2			1		3
AZ	**2**	**Total**				**3**		**3**	**Total**				**3**		**3**
		Decreased 1 or 2				2		2	Decreased 1 or 2						
		Same or Increased 1				1		1	Same or Increased 1				3		3
CA	**6**	**Total**	**1**	**5**	**9**	**15**		**30**	**Total**	**1**	**5**	**9**	**15**		**30**
		Decreased 3 or More	1	2	4	1		8	Decreased 3 or More		1	3			4
		Decreased 1 or 2		2	4	1		7	Decreased 1 or 2		2	2	6		10
		Same or Increased 1		1		11		12	Same or Increased 1			2	6		8
		Increased 2 or More			1	2		3	Increased 2 or More	1	2	2	3		8
CO	**2**	**Total**	**5**	**3**	**1**	**3**		**12**	**Total**	**5**	**3**	**1**	**3**		**12**
		Decreased 3 or More	1	1		1		3	Decreased 3 or More						
		Decreased 1 or 2	2		1	1		4	Decreased 1 or 2	1	3	1	1		6
		Same or Increased 1	1			1		2	Same or Increased 1	1			1		2
		Increased 2 or More	1	2				3	Increased 2 or More	3			1		4
CT	**3**	**Total**		**3**	**2**	**1**	**2**	**8**	**Total**		**3**	**2**	**1**	**2**	**8**
		Decreased 3 or More			1			1	Decreased 3 or More					1	1
		Decreased 1 or 2		1			2	3	Decreased 1 or 2						
		Same or Increased 1				1		1	Same or Increased 1		2		1		3
		Increased 2 or More		2	1			3	Increased 2 or More		1	2		1	4

Table 1: Retention Rate and Graduation Rate Gains/Losses by Revenue Category, by State, 2005-06 to 2006-07 (cont.)

State	*	Retention Rate Ranges (from 2005-06 to 2006-07)	Total Revenue Generated (FY2006)					n	Graduation Rate Ranges (from 2005-06 to 2006-07)	Total Revenue Generated (FY2006)					n
			< 71.4 M	71.5 M to 138.9 M	139 M to 326.4 M	> 326.5 M	missing			< 71.4 M	71.5 M to 138.9 M	139 M to 326.4 M	> 326.5 M	missing	
DC	**1**	**Total**		**1**				**1**	**Total**		**1**				**1**
		Decreased 3 or More		1				1	Decreased 1 or 2		1				1
DE	**1**	**Total**		**1**			**1**	**2**	**Total**		**1**			**1**	**2**
		Decreased 1 or 2							Decreased 1 or 2		1				1
		Same or Increased 1		1			1	2	Increased 2 or More					1	1
FL	**5**	**Total**			**4**	**6**		**10**	**Total**			**4**	**6**		**10**
		Decreased 1 or 2			2			2	Decreased 3 or More			1			1
		Same or Increased 1			2	4		6	Same or Increased 1			2	5		7
		Increased 2 or More				2		2	Increased 2 or More			1	1		2
GA	**5**	**Total**	**9**	**5**	**2**	**3**		**19**	**Total**	**9**	**5**	**2**	**3**		**19**
		Decreased 3 or More	3	1				4	Decreased 3 or More	2					2
		Decreased 1 or 2	2	2				4	Decreased 1 or 2	2	2				4
		Same or Increased 1	1			2		3	Same or Increased 1	3			1		4
		Increased 2 or More	3	2	2	1		8	Increased 2 or More	2	3	2	2		9
GU	**6**	**Total**		**1**				**1**	**Total**		**1**				**1**
		Same or Increased 1		1				1	Decreased 3 or More		1				1
HI	**6**	**Total**		**1**		**1**		**2**	**Total**		**1**		**1**		**2**
		Decreased 1 or 2		1				1	Decreased 1 or 2						
		Same or Increased 1				1		1	Increased 2 or More		1		1		2
IA	**2**	**Total**			**1**	**2**		**3**	**Total**			**1**	**2**		**3**
		Decreased 1 or 2				1		1	Decreased 1 or 2			1			1
		Same or Increased 1			1	1		2	Same or Increased 1				2		2
ID	**4**	**Total**	**1**		**2**	**1**		**4**	**Total**	**1**		**2**	**1**		**4**
		Decreased 3 or More	1					1	Decreased 3 or More			1			1
		Decreased 1 or 2							Decreased 1 or 2				1		1
		Same or Increased 1			1			1	Same or Increased 1	1					1
		Increased 2 or More			1	1		2	Increased 2 or More			1			1
IL	**2**	**Total**		**2**	**3**	**5**		**10**	**Total**		**2**	**3**	**5**		**10**
		Decreased 3 or More			1			1	Decreased 3 or More						
		Decreased 1 or 2			1	1		2	Decreased 1 or 2		1	1	1		3
		Same or Increased 1		2		3		5	Same or Increased 1		1	2	2		5
		Increased 2 or More			1	1		2	Increased 2 or More				2		2

Table 1: Retention Rate and Graduation Rate Gains/Losses by Revenue Category, by State, 2005-06 to 2006-07 (cont.)

State	*	Retention Rate Ranges (from 2005-06 to 2006-07)	Total Revenue Generated (FY2006)					n	Graduation Rate Ranges (from 2005-06 to 2006-07)	Total Revenue Generated (FY2006)					n
			< 71.4 M	71.5 M to 138.9 M	139 M to 326.4 M	> 326.5 M	missing			< 71.4 M	71.5 M to 138.9 M	139 M to 326.4 M	> 326.5 M	missing	
IN	**2**	**Total**	**6**	**3**	**1**	**4**		**14**	**Total**	**6**	**3**	**1**	**4**		**14**
		Decreased 3 or More	4					4	Decreased 3 or More		1				1
		Decreased 1 or 2		2		1		3	Decreased 1 or 2		1		1		2
		Same or Increased 1				3		3	Same or Increased 1	4	1	1	2		8
		Increased 2 or More	2	1	1			4	Increased 2 or More	2			1		3
KS	**2**	**Total**	**1**	**3**	**1**	**2**		**7**	**Total**	**1**	**3**	**1**	**2**		**7**
		Decreased 3 or More		1	1			2	Decreased 3 or More		1				1
		Decreased 1 or 2	1	2		1		4	Decreased 1 or 2		1		1		2
		Same or Increased 1				1		1	Same or Increased 1	1	1		1		3
		Increased 2 or More							Increased 2 or More			1			1
KY	**5**	**Total**		**2**	**4**	**2**		**8**	**Total**		**2**	**4**	**2**		**8**
		Decreased 3 or More		1	1			2	Decreased 3 or More		1	2			3
		Decreased 1 or 2			1	1		2	Decreased 1 or 2		1				1
		Same or Increased 1			1	1		2	Same or Increased 1			1			1
		Increased 2 or More		1	1			2	Increased 2 or More			1	2		3
LA	**5**	**Total**	**1**	**5**	**5**	**1**		**12**	**Total**	**1**	**5**	**5**	**1**		**12**
		Decreased 3 or More	1	1	2			4	Decreased 3 or More		1				1
		Decreased 1 or 2			1			1	Decreased 1 or 2			2			2
		Same or Increased 1		1	1			2	Same or Increased 1		1	1	1		3
		Increased 2 or More		3	1	1		5	Increased 2 or More	1	3	2			6
MA	**3**	**Total**	**5**	**4**	**3**	**1**		**13**	**Total**	**5**	**4**	**3**	**1**		**13**
		Decreased 3 or More	1					1	Decreased 3 or More	3	3	1			7
		Decreased 1 or 2	1	1	1			3	Decreased 1 or 2	1		2			3
		Same or Increased 1	1	2		1		4	Same or Increased 1		1		1		2
		Increased 2 or More	2	1	2			5	Increased 2 or More	1					1
MD	**1**	**Total**	**1**	**5**	**4**	**2**		**12**	**Total**	**1**	**5**	**4**	**2**		**12**
		Decreased 3 or More		3	2			5	Decreased 3 or More			1	1		2
		Decreased 1 or 2				1		1	Decreased 1 or 2		1	1			2
		Same or Increased 1		2		1		3	Same or Increased 1		2		1		3
		Increased 2 or More	1		2			3	Increased 2 or More	1	2	2			5

Table 1: Retention Rate and Graduation Rate Gains/Losses by Revenue Category, by State, 2005-06 to 2006-07 (cont.)

State	*	Retention Rate Ranges (from 2005-06 to 2006-07)	Total Revenue Generated (FY2006)					n	Graduation Rate Ranges (from 2005-06 to 2006-07)	Total Revenue Generated (FY2006)					n
			< 71.4 M	71.5 M to 138.9 M	139 M to 326.4 M	> 326.5 M	missing			< 71.4 M	71.5 M to 138.9 M	139 M to 326.4 M	> 326.5 M	missing	
ME	3	**Total**	**5**		**2**			**7**	**Total**	**5**		**2**			**7**
		Decreased 3 or More	3					3	Decreased 3 or More						
		Decreased 1 or 2			1			1	Decreased 1 or 2						
		Same or Increased 1	1		1			2	Same or Increased 1	2		1			3
		Increased 2 or More	1					1	Increased 2 or More	3		1			4
MI	2	**Total**	**1**	**3**	**6**	**5**		**15**	**Total**	**1**	**3**	**6**	**5**		**15**
		Decreased 3 or More			2			2	Decreased 3 or More	1			1		2
		Decreased 1 or 2							Decreased 1 or 2			1			1
		Same or Increased 1		2	2	5		9	Same or Increased 1		1	3	4		8
		Increased 2 or More	1	1	2			4	Increased 2 or More		2	2			4
MN	2	**Total**	**5**	**2**	**3**	**1**		**11**	**Total**	**5**	**2**	**3**	**1**		**11**
		Decreased 3 or More							Decreased 3 or More	1					1
		Decreased 1 or 2		1	2			3	Decreased 1 or 2		1	2			3
		Same or Increased 1	2	1				3	Same or Increased 1	1					1
		Increased 2 or More	3		1	1		5	Increased 2 or More	3	1	1	1		6
MO	2	**Total**	**4**	**2**	**6**	**1**		**13**	**Total**	**4**	**2**	**6**	**1**		**13**
		Decreased 3 or More	2					2	Decreased 3 or More	1	1				2
		Decreased 1 or 2							Decreased 1 or 2	1		3	1		5
		Same or Increased 1			4	1		5	Same or Increased 1	1		1			2
		Increased 2 or More	2	2	2			6	Increased 2 or More	1	1	2			4
MS	5	**Total**	**3**	**1**	**1**	**3**		**8**	**Total**	**3**	**1**	**1**	**3**		**8**
		Decreased 3 or More	2	1				3	Decreased 3 or More	1			1		2
		Decreased 1 or 2							Decreased 1 or 2	1	1				2
		Same or Increased 1				3		3	Same or Increased 1	1		1	1		3
		Increased 2 or More	1		1			2	Increased 2 or More				1		1
MT	4	**Total**	**4**		**2**			**6**	**Total**	**4**		**2**			**6**
		Decreased 3 or More							Decreased 3 or More	1					1
		Decreased 1 or 2	1					1	Decreased 1 or 2			2			2
		Same or Increased 1			2			2	Same or Increased 1	1					1
		Increased 2 or More	3					3	Increased 2 or More	2					2

Table 1: Retention Rate and Graduation Rate Gains/Losses by Revenue Category, by State, 2005-06 to 2006-07 (cont.)

State	*	Retention Rate Ranges (from 2005-06 to 2006-07)	Total Revenue Generated (FY2006)					n	Graduation Rate Ranges (from 2005-06 to 2006-07)	Total Revenue Generated (FY2006)					n
			< 71.4 M	71.5 M to 138.9 M	139 M to 326.4 M	> 326.5 M	missing			< 71.4 M	71.5 M to 138.9 M	139 M to 326.4 M	> 326.5 M	missing	
NC	**5**	**Total**	**2**	**4**	**5**	**5**		**16**	**Total**	**2**	**4**	**5**	**5**		**16**
		Decreased 3 or More		2	1			3	Decreased 3 or More	1	1				2
		Decreased 1 or 2				2		2	Decreased 1 or 2		1	1	3		5
		Same or Increased 1				3		3	Same or Increased 1		2	3	2		7
		Increased 2 or More	2	2	4			8	Increased 2 or More	1		1			2
ND	**2**	**Total**	**4**		**2**			**6**	**Total**	**4**		**2**			**6**
		Decreased 3 or More	1		1			2	Decreased 3 or More	1		1			2
		Decreased 1 or 2	1					1	Decreased 1 or 2						
		Same or Increased 1	1					1	Same or Increased 1	1		1			2
		Increased 2 or More	1		1			2	Increased 2 or More	2					2
NE	**2**	**Total**	**3**	**1**	**1**	**1**		**6**	**Total**	**3**	**1**	**1**	**1**		**6**
		Decreased 3 or More	2					2	Decreased 3 or More	2					2
		Decreased 1 or 2		1		1		2	Same or Increased 1	1		1	1		3
		Increased 2 or More	1		1			2	Increased 2 or More		1				1
NH	**3**	**Total**	**1**	**2**		**1**		**4**	**Total**	**1**	**2**		**1**		**4**
		Decreased 3 or More	1					1	Decreased 3 or More		1				1
		Same or Increased 1		1		1		2	Same or Increased 1				1		1
		Increased 2 or More		1				1	Increased 2 or More	1	1				2
NJ	**1**	**Total**		**3**	**6**	**1**	**2**	**12**	**Total**		**3**	**6**	**1**	**2**	**12**
		Decreased 3 or More		1			1	2	Decreased 3 or More			4			4
		Decreased 1 or 2		1	2		1	4	Decreased 1 or 2		2	1			3
		Same or Increased 1			3	1		4	Same or Increased 1				1	1	2
		Increased 2 or More		1	1			2	Increased 2 or More		1	1		1	3
NM	**2**	**Total**	**3**		**1**	**2**		**6**	**Total**	**3**		**1**	**2**		**6**
		Decreased 3 or More	1					1	Decreased 3 or More			1			1
		Decreased 1 or 2	1					1	Decreased 1 or 2	1					1
		Same or Increased 1				1		1	Same or Increased 1						
		Increased 2 or More	1		1	1		3	Increased 2 or More	2			2		4
NV	**4**	**Total**				**2**		**2**	**Total**				**2**		**2**
		Decreased 3 or More							Decreased 3 or More				1		1
		Increased 2 or More				2		2	Increased 2 or More				1		1

Table 1: Retention Rate and Graduation Rate Gains/Losses by Revenue Category, by State, 2005-06 to 2006-07 (cont.)

State	*	Retention Rate Ranges (from 2005-06 to 2006-07)	Total Revenue Generated (FY2006)					n	Graduation Rate Ranges (from 2005-06 to 2006-07)	Total Revenue Generated (FY2006)					n
			< 71.4 M	71.5 M to 138.9 M	139 M to 326.4 M	> 326.5 M	missing			< 71.4 M	71.5 M to 138.9 M	139 M to 326.4 M	> 326.5 M	missing	
		Total	**3**	**17**	**9**	**4**		**33**	**Total**	**3**	**17**	**9**	**4**		**33**
		Decreased 3 or More	1	5				6	Decreased 3 or More	2	3				5
NY	**1**	Decreased 1 or 2		3	2	1		6	Decreased 1 or 2			2	1		3
		Same or Increased 1	1	4	3	3		11	Same or Increased 1		4	2	3		9
		Increased 2 or More	1	5	4			10	Increased 2 or More	1	10	5			16
		Total	**7**		**2**	**9**	**2**	**20**	**Total**	**7**		**2**	**9**	**2**	**20**
		Decreased 1 or 2	1			4		5	Decreased 3 or More	5			2		7
OH	**2**	Decreased 3 or More	2				1	3	Decreased 1 or 2	1			2		3
		Increased 2 or More	4		2	2		8	Same or Increased 1			2	4	1	7
		Same or Increased 1				3	1	4	Increased 2 or More	1			1	1	3
		Total	**8**	**2**		**2**		**12**	**Total**	**8**	**2**		**2**		**12**
		Decreased 3 or More	1	1				2	Decreased 3 or More	4	1				5
OK	**2**	Decreased 1 or 2	1			1		2	Decreased 1 or 2	1	1		1		3
		Same or Increased 1	2					2	Same or Increased 1	2					2
		Increased 2 or More	4	1		1		6	Increased 2 or More	1			1		2
		Total	**2**	**2**		**3**		**7**	**Total**	**2**	**2**		**3**		**7**
		Decreased 3 or More							Decreased 3 or More	1	1				2
OR	**4**	Decreased 1 or 2	1					1	Decreased 1 or 2				1		1
		Same or Increased 1		1		3		4	Same or Increased 1	1			1		2
		Increased 2 or More	1	1				2	Increased 2 or More		1		1		2
		Total	**2**	**9**	**3**		**18**	**32**	**Total**	**2**	**9**	**3**		**18**	**32**
		Decreased 3 or More	2	2	1		3	8	Decreased 3 or More					2	2
PA	**1**	Decreased 1 or 2		1			5	6	Decreased 1 or 2		5			3	8
		Same or Increased 1		1	2		6	9	Same or Increased 1	2	2			3	7
		Increased 2 or More		5			4	9	Increased 2 or More		2	3		10	15
		Total	**6**		**2**			**8**	**Total**	**6**		**2**			**8**
		Decreased 3 or More	2					2	Decreased 3 or More	3		1			4
PR	**1**	Decreased 1 or 2	1					1	Decreased 1 or 2						
		Same or Increased 1	2		1			3	Same or Increased 1			1			1
		Increased 2 or More	1		1			2	Increased 2 or More	3					3

Table 1: Retention Rate and Graduation Rate Gains/Losses by Revenue Category, by State, 2005-06 to 2006-07 (cont.)

State	*	Retention Rate Ranges (from 2005-06 to 2006-07)	Total Revenue Generated (FY2006)					n	Graduation Rate Ranges (from 2005-06 to 2006-07)	Total Revenue Generated (FY2006)					n
			< 71.4 M	71.5 M to 138.9 M	139 M to 326.4 M	> 326.5 M	missing			< 71.4 M	71.5 M to 138.9 M	139 M to 326.4 M	> 326.5 M	missing	
RI	**3**	**Total**		**1**		**1**		**2**	**Total**		**1**		**1**		**2**
		Decreased 1 or 2		1				1	Decreased 1 or 2						
		Same or Increased 1				1		1	Same or Increased 1		1		1		2
SC	**5**	**Total**	**4**	**4**	**1**	**2**		**11**	**Total**	**4**	**4**	**1**	**2**		**11**
		Decreased 3 or More	1	1				2	Decreased 3 or More		2				2
		Decreased 1 or 2	1	1				2	Decreased 1 or 2			1			1
		Same or Increased 1	2	1		2		5	Same or Increased 1	1	1		1		3
		Increased 2 or More		1	1			2	Increased 2 or More	3	1		1		5
SD	**2**	**Total**	**5**		**2**			**7**	**Total**	**5**		**2**			**7**
		Decreased 3 or More							Decreased 3 or More	1					1
		Decreased 1 or 2	1					1	Decreased 1 or 2	1		1			2
		Same or Increased 1			2			2	Same or Increased 1			1			1
		Increased 2 or More	4					4	Increased 2 or More	3					3
TN	**5**	**Total**		**4**	**3**	**2**		**9**	**Total**		**4**	**3**	**2**		**9**
		Decreased 3 or More			1			1	Decreased 3 or More		3				3
		Decreased 1 or 2		1	2			3	Decreased 1 or 2			1	1		2
		Same or Increased 1		1		1		2	Same or Increased 1		1	1	1		3
		Increased 2 or More		2		1		3	Increased 2 or More			1			1
TX	**5**	**Total**	**3**	**9**	**7**	**10**		**29**	**Total**	**3**	**9**	**7**	**10**		**29**
		Decreased 3 or More		2	2			4	Decreased 3 or More		4		1		5
		Decreased 1 or 2		1	1	5		7	Decreased 1 or 2		2	1	1		4
		Same or Increased 1	1	2	2	5		10	Same or Increased 1	1	2	4	6		13
		Increased 2 or More	2	4	2			8	Increased 2 or More	2	1	2	2		7
UT	**4**	**Total**	**1**	**1**	**2**	**2**		**6**	**Total**	**1**	**1**	**2**	**2**		**6**
		Decreased 3 or More			1			1	Decreased 3 or More	1			1		2
		Same or Increased 1							Same or Increased 1		1	1			2
		Increased 2 or More	1	1	1	2		5	Increased 2 or More			1	1		2
VA	**5**	**Total**	**1**	**4**	**5**	**5**		**15**	**Total**	**1**	**4**	**5**	**5**		**15**
		Decreased 3 or More			1			1	Decreased 3 or More	1		1			2
		Decreased 1 or 2		1	1	2		4	Decreased 1 or 2		3		1		4
		Same or Increased 1				2		2	Same or Increased 1		1	4	2		7
		Increased 2 or More	1	3	3	1		8	Increased 2 or More				2		2

Table 1: Retention Rate and Graduation Rate Gains/Losses by Revenue Category, by State, 2005-06 to 2006-07 (cont.)

State	*	Retention Rate Ranges (from 2005-06 to 2006-07)	Total Revenue Generated (FY2006)					n	Graduation Rate Ranges (from 2005-06 to 2006-07)	Total Revenue Generated (FY2006)					n
			< 71.4 M	71.5 M to 138.9 M	139 M to 326.4 M	> 326.5 M	missing			< 71.4 M	71.5 M to 138.9 M	139 M to 326.4 M	> 326.5 M	missing	
VI	**1**	**Total**	**1**					**1**	**Total**	**1**					**1**
		Increased 2 or More	1					1	Decreased 3 or More	1					1
VT	**3**	**Total**	**3**			**1**		**4**	**Total**	**3**			**1**		**4**
		Decreased 3 or More	2					2	Decreased 1 or 2	1					1
		Same or Increased 1							Same or Increased 1	1					1
		Increased 2 or More	1			1		2	Increased 2 or More	1			1		2
WA	**4**	**Total**		**1**	**3**	**2**		**6**	**Total**		**1**	**3**	**2**		**6**
		Decreased 3 or More			1			1	Decreased 3 or More						
		Decreased 1 or 2			2			2	Decreased 1 or 2			1			1
		Same or Increased 1		1		1		2	Same or Increased 1		1		1		2
		Increased 2 or More				1		1	Increased 2 or More			2	1		3
WI	**2**	**Total**	**2**	**5**	**4**	**2**		**13**	**Total**	**2**	**5**	**4**	**2**		**13**
		Decreased 3 or More	2					2	Decreased 3 or More						
		Decreased 1 or 2		3	1			4	Decreased 1 or 2		1	1	1		3
		Same or Increased 1			2	1		3	Same or Increased 1		1	3	1		5
		Increased 2 or More		2	1	1		4	Increased 2 or More	2	3				5
WV	**2**	**Total**	**8**	**1**	**1**	**1**		**11**	**Total**	**8**	**1**	**1**	**1**		**11**
		Decreased 3 or More	6					6	Decreased 3 or More	2		1			3
		Decreased 1 or 2		1	1	1		3	Decreased 1 or 2						
		Same or Increased 1	1					1	Same or Increased 1	1	1		1		3
		Increased 2 or More	1					1	Increased 2 or More	5					5
WY	**2**	**Total**				**1**		**1**	**Total**				**1**		**1**
		Decreased 1 or 2				1		1	Same or Increased 1				1		1
Grand Total			**128**	**127**	**128**	**127**	**25**	**535**	**Grand Total**			**128**	**127**	**25**	**535**

* Accrediting Body: 1= Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE), 2= North Central Association (NCA), 3= New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC), 4= Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU), 5= Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), and 6= Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC).

Table 2: Average % of and Number of Undergraduates that "Do Not Count", Four-Year Public Institutions

			Average of % of UG that "Do Not Count"				Number of UG Students that "Do Not Count"			
State	n	*	2005	2006	2007	3 Year Average	2005	2006	2007	3 Year Average
Alabama	13	5	45.6%	42.1%	43.4%	43.7%	51,995	51,409	54,699	52,701
Alaska	3	4	70.6%	70.7%	72.8%	71.4%	17,869	17,092	17,610	17,524
Arizona	3	2	46.6%	40.5%	39.1%	42.1%	35,277	34,388	34,107	34,591
Arkansas	9	2	41.3%	42.1%	40.2%	41.2%	24,902	25,977	27,245	26,041
California	30	6	48.0%	44.7%	44.0%	45.5%	230,722	226,397	230,073	229,064
Colorado	12	2	46.3%	45.6%	45.4%	45.8%	58,148	57,092	56,638	57,293
Connecticut	8	3	34.5%	34.1%	35.6%	34.7%	18,432	18,735	19,342	18,836
DC	1	1	75.5%	41.7%	70.9%	62.7%	3,905	2,208	3,641	3,251
Delaware	2	1	27.1%	31.4%	29.1%	29.2%	6,843	6,974	6,257	6,691
Florida	10	5	47.4%	46.4%	47.2%	47.0%	106,947	110,688	116,446	111,360
Georgia	19	5	39.3%	39.6%	41.2%	40.0%	64,018	65,441	68,726	66,062
Guam	1	6	40.5%	45.5%	49.8%	45.2%	1,141	1,329	1,503	1,324
Hawaii	2	6	53.6%	55.0%	53.4%	54.0%	9,334	9,728	9,397	9,487
Idaho	4	4	55.5%	54.6%	53.3%	54.5%	22,987	22,075	22,103	22,388
Illinois	10	2	47.7%	48.2%	48.8%	48.2%	62,548	63,961	65,435	63,981
Indiana	14	2	48.3%	47.6%	46.0%	47.3%	66,038	64,480	64,113	64,877
Iowa	3	2	43.9%	40.3%	37.2%	40.5%	22,034	19,915	19,030	20,327
Kansas	7	2	54.3%	54.1%	54.5%	54.3%	37,631	37,650	37,942	37,741
Kentucky	8	5	43.8%	41.8%	41.1%	42.2%	40,082	38,958	40,128	39,723
Louisiana	12	5	46.4%	42.7%	41.8%	43.6%	51,934	46,614	44,235	47,594
Maine	7	3	62.2%	60.4%	62.0%	61.5%	17,118	16,746	16,540	16,801
Maryland	12	1	41.6%	41.4%	43.8%	42.2%	53,832	58,166	59,602	57,200
Massachusetts	13	3	42.0%	42.5%	41.8%	42.1%	33,621	35,500	35,667	34,930
Michigan	15	2	42.3%	45.2%	42.7%	43.4%	90,979	95,385	91,402	92,589
Minnesota	11	2	51.2%	51.7%	49.6%	50.8%	49,002	49,153	48,785	48,980
Mississippi	8	5	53.8%	52.8%	50.1%	52.2%	28,551	27,583	25,924	27,353
Missouri	13	2	44.7%	46.3%	44.3%	45.1%	50,899	52,034	50,167	51,034
Montana	6	4	44.8%	44.8%	42.7%	44.1%	12,487	13,088	12,679	12,751
Nebraska	6	2	44.0%	42.5%	41.4%	42.6%	14,841	14,553	14,331	14,575
Nevada	2	4	46.7%	49.8%	47.9%	48.1%	17,082	18,413	17,665	17,720
New Hampshire	4	3	38.0%	34.7%	33.2%	35.3%	6,347	5,680	6,164	6,064
New Jersey	12	1	51.7%	50.6%	50.8%	51.0%	50,607	50,412	50,895	50,638
New Mexico	6	2	50.5%	48.2%	51.0%	49.9%	18,444	18,914	20,386	19,248
New York	33	1	42.7%	43.3%	44.0%	43.3%	118,872	121,602	125,835	122,103

Table 2: Average % of and Number of Undergraduates that "Do Not Count", Four-Year Public Institutions (cont.)

			Average of % of UG that "Do Not Count"				Number of UG Students that "Do Not Count"			
State	**n**	*	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**3 Year Average**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**3 Year Average**
North Carolina	16	5	37.6%	39.1%	38.0%	38.2%	56,759	60,754	63,015	60,176
North Dakota	6	2	47.6%	47.3%	48.9%	47.9%	12,036	12,149	11,111	11,765
Ohio	20	2	43.9%	42.6%	41.9%	42.8%	82,941	82,095	81,831	82,289
Oklahoma	12	2	51.7%	52.7%	48.8%	51.1%	44,730	43,560	40,262	42,851
Oregon	7	4	55.6%	55.2%	52.2%	54.3%	35,411	34,288	33,893	34,531
Pennsylvania	32	1	32.1%	28.5%	29.3%	30.0%	70,443	68,439	74,485	71,122
Puerto Rico	8	1	28.7%	30.3%	22.2%	27.1%	12,464	10,787	6,610	9,954
Rhode Island	2	3	42.0%	37.6%	36.4%	38.7%	7,710	6,810	6,673	7,064
South Carolina	11	5	36.5%	36.3%	34.4%	35.7%	26,907	27,033	26,166	26,702
South Dakota	7	2	55.0%	54.3%	54.3%	54.5%	13,593	13,475	13,865	13,644
Tennessee	9	5	43.8%	43.0%	40.7%	42.5%	44,918	44,314	44,086	44,439
Texas	29	5	52.9%	50.8%	50.5%	51.4%	186,495	180,575	182,419	183,163
Utah	6	4	67.3%	66.0%	61.5%	65.0%	62,491	61,496	57,622	60,536
Vermont	4	3	32.1%	35.6%	35.9%	34.5%	3,738	5,224	5,082	4,681
Virgin Islands	1	1	46.8%	47.4%	37.8%	44.0%	1,023	1,077	822	974
Virginia	15	5	32.7%	36.9%	32.4%	34.0%	52,464	57,209	55,475	55,049
Washington	6	4	46.9%	47.2%	47.5%	47.2%	37,240	37,095	37,632	37,322
West Virginia	11	2	47.3%	45.9%	44.5%	45.9%	20,781	21,311	21,339	21,144
Wisconsin	13	2	36.1%	38.5%	38.2%	37.6%	44,218	50,671	49,735	48,208
Wyoming	1	2	55.0%	48.5%	47.3%	50.3%	5,227	4,592	4,491	4,770
TOTAL	535		NA	NA	NA	NA	2,317,059	2,321,294	2,331,326	2,323,226
AVERAGE	**NA**		**44.7%**	**44.0%**	**43.4%**	**44.0%**	**42,165**	**42,242**	**42,424**	**43,023**

* Accrediting Body: 1=Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) 41.2%, 2= North Central Association (NCA) 46.4%, 3=New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC) 41.1%, 4=Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) 54.9%, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) 42.8%, and Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) 48.2%.