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NECC offered the first College Success Seminar (CSS) course section in the Spring 2009 semester. Beginning in Fall 2010, the first revamped CSS sections were offered as one of three of the Achieving the Dream (AtD) strategies to improve student success. That first section had an enrollment of sixteen students. As displayed in Figure 1, CSS has grown over the subsequent semesters, though it generally reflects the rise and fall of NECC’s overall enrollment. In Fall 2015, the course was renamed First Year Seminar (FYS) but its content remained basically the same. CSS/FYS completers have demonstrated increased success over non-CSS/FYS completers with several variables.

**Figure 1**

Table 1 shows that the student populations that have been targeted by the college for improved academic performance are being served by FYS.

**Table 1.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **FYS-Spring 2016 Demographics** | | **Overall College Population** | |
|  | Count | % of Total | Count | % of Total |
| Male | 82 | 42.5% | 2,169 | 38.4% |
| Hispanic | 106 | 54.9% | 2,128 | 37.7% |
| Hispanic Male | 44 | 22.8% | 737 | 13.1% |
| All Minority\* | 114 | 59.1% | 2,568 | 45.5% |
| <=25 | 174 | 90.2% | 3,788 | 67.1% |
| Total | 193 |  | 5,649 |  |

\**Minority* excludes WHT and UNK

Generally, students who assessed into FYS, took FYS, and completed with a grade of A – C have been more successful overall than those students who assessed into FYS but did not take FYS. The course completion rate for the developmental courses taken the same semester was much higher for FYS completers (87%) versus (66%) those who assessed and did not take FYS.

**Table 2.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Developmental**  **Course Completion**  **(A-C)** | **Fall 2011** | | **Spring 2012** | | **Fall 2012** | | **Spring 2013** | | **Fall 2013** | | **Spring 2014** | | **Fall 2014** | | **Spring 2015** | | **Fall 2015** | | **Spring 2016** | |
| **N** | **%** | **N** | **%** | **N** | **%** | **N** | **%** | **N** | **%** | **N** | **%** | **N** | **%** | **N** | **%** | **N** | **%** | **N** | **%** |
| FYS Completers | 136 | 89% | 40 | 80% | 316 | 89% | 108 | 89% | 313 | 89% | 112 | 83% | 256 | 86% | 119 | 83% | 262 | 87% | 104 | 87% |
| Assessed but did not take | 116 | 72% | 78 | 81% | 325 | 62% | 342 | 67% | 487 | 67% | 467 | 62% | 393 | 66% | 400 | 62% | 363 | 66% | 369 | 66% |
| Assessed but did not take and completed at least 1 developmental  course | 91 | 89% | 69 | 86% | 233 | 85% | 281 | 83% | 367 | 86% | 360 | 84% | 298 | 88% | 309 | 84% | 216 | 91% | 73 | 94% |

Table 3 demonstrates that FYS completers also completed the semester with higher term GPAs (3.2 average) than those students who elected not to take FYS (2.4).

**Table 3.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Average Term GPA** | **Fall 2011** | **Spring 2012** | **Fall 2012** | **Spring 2013** | **Fall 2013** | **Spring 2014** | **Fall 2014** | **Spring 2015** | **Fall 2015** | **Spring 2016** |
| CSS/FYS Completers | 3.0 | 3.2 | 3.1 | 3.2 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.2 | 3.1 | 3.2 |
| Assessed but did not take | 2.3 | 2.6 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.2 | 2.4 |
| Assessed but did not take and completed at least 1 developmental course | 2.8 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 3.1 | 3.0 |

FYS completers also completed the semester with more completed (A-C) term credits (6.9) than those students who elected not to take FYS (6.2).

**Table 4.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Average Term Credits Completed A - C** | **Fall 2011** | **Spring 2012** | **Fall 2012** | **Spring 2013** | **Fall 2013** | **Spring 2014** | **Fall 2014** | **Spring 2015** | **Fall 2015** | **Spring 2016** |
| CSS/FYS completers | 9.5 | 7.3 | 9.9 | 9.0 | 9.8 | 8.1 | 9.5 | 7.5 | 9.6 | 6.9 |
| Assessed but did not take | 5.4 | 5.7 | 5.0 | 5.4 | 5.4 | 5.7 | 5.4 | 5.4 | 4.8 | 6.2 |
| Assessed but did not take and completed at least 1 course | 6.9 | 6.4 | 7.0 | 6.6 | 7.2 | 7.4 | 7.2 | 7.0 | 6.9 | 7.3 |

Furthermore, FYS completion seems to have an impact on student retention. The fall-to-fall and fall-to-spring retention rates of new students, as well as new degree-seeking students, who complete FYS are consistently much higher than that student group as a whole. (Retention includes: students who graduate, students who transfer to another school, and students who return to NECC, where each student is counted only once.)

**Table 5.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Retention Rates** | **All Students** | **Completed at least 6 credits A-C** | **CSS/FYS Completers A-C** |
| New Students Fall 2014 to Spring 2015 | 66.4% | 88.1% | 85.3% |
| New Students Fall 2014 to Fall 2015 | 60.1% | 77.7% | 77.6% |
| New Students Fall 2015 to Spring 2016 | 61.7% | 86.9% | 84.4% |
| New, Degree-seeking Students Fall 2014 to Spring 2015 | 69.6% | 90.5% | 92.2% |
| New, Degree-seeking Students Fall 2014 to Fall 2015 | 59.6% | 77.9% | 81.1% |
| New, Degree-seeking Students Fall 2015 to Spring 2016 | 66.7% | 88.6% | 89.7% |

Additionally, the return rate is higher for new students who took FYS than for new students who did not take FYS.

**Table 6.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Fall 2015 New Students** | **Returned Spring 2016** | **Return Rate** | **Spring 2016 New Students** | **Returned Fall 2016** | **Return Rate** |
| **Total** | 1,724 | 1,032 | 59.9% | 593 | 223 | 37.6% |
|  | **Fall 2015** | | | **Spring 2016** | | |
| **Took FYS** | 397 | 261 | 65.7% | 102 | 37 | 36.3% |
| **Completed C or better** | 269 | 226 | 84.0% | 50 | 27 | 54.0% |
| **Did not take FYS** | 1,327 | 771 | 58.1% | 491 | 186 | 37.9% |

On the other hand, the cumulative GPA of students who took FYS was lower than the cumulative GPA of new students who did not take FYS. However, in all the groups, the students who returned the following term showed an increase in cumulative GPA.

**Table 7.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Average Cumulative GPA** | **Fall 2015 New Students** | **Fall 2015 New Students that returned Spring 2016** | **Spring 2016 New Students** | **Spring 2016 New Students that returned Fall 2016** |
|  | **As of the end of Fall 2015** | **As of the end of Spring 2016** | **As of the end of Spring 2016** | **As of the end of Fall 2016** |
| **Took FYS** | 2.36 | 2.95 | 1.77 | N/A |
| **Completed C or better** | 3.14 | 3.16 | 3.26 | N/A |
| **Did not take FYS** | 2.51 | 3.08 | 2.44 | N/A |