

Student Persistence and Arizona State University's Academic Status Report System

REPORT AUTHORS

Abigail Colburn, MS, UIA Doctoral Student Research Fellow
Arizona State University

Tray Geiger, PhD, Project Supervisor
Arizona State University



The UIA Doctoral Research Fellows Program is supported by the Carnegie Corporation of NY



BACKGROUND, PURPOSE, AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

As one of the largest institutions of higher education in the country, one of Arizona State University's (ASU) main goals is to provide all students with a high-quality educational experience. In part, achieving this goal is realized by ASU supporting each unique student's path to academic success.

Background

ASU has and continues to develop and refine its strategies and utilization of technology tools to anticipate students' needs, proactively identify students who need assistance, coordinate personal and real-time outreach, and take prompt action where necessary. One such strategy that ASU uses is an academic early warning system (EWS) known as Academic Status Reports (ASRs). An ASR is a means by which class instructors can provide weekly personalized feedback to each student regarding their progress in a class. Each ASR requires a letter grade, which should reflect the student's current performance in the class. Letter grades are then used to classify each ASR as either "positive" or "negative." There are also three optional components of each ASR: one or more reasons (out of a pre-determined list of 21 options) for which the instructor issued the ASR; one or more recommended actions (out of a pre-determined list of 14 options) that the student should take to improve their performance (see Appendix A); and a free-text comment that the instructor can include to provide additional details, suggestions, or words of encouragement¹. While providing weekly ASRs for each student are not mandatory, the ASU Office of the University Provost recommends that all instructors issue ASRs to students, as EWSs have been demonstrated to have a positive effect on student success (Kuh, Kinzie, Schuh, & Whitt, 2005; Trussel & Burke-Smalley, 2018).

While ASRs were always available for students' academic advisors to view, prior to the Fall 2017 term there were no means by which ASR data was automatically collected and sent to advisors. There were also no standard university-wide expectations of when and how advisors should use ASR data to provide outreach and assistance to students to best support them. The Advisor Portal, a component of ASU's customer relationship management software, Salesforce, was implemented in the Fall 2017 term with the goal of sharing early warning signals with advisors so they could provide outreach and support for students in real-time (e.g., rather than waiting until the end of the semester after grades were posted).

During the 2017-2018 academic year, ASR-specific Salesforce cases (herein ASR cases) and the ensuing proactive advisor outreach became an additional component of the ASR system designed to identify and assist students at risk for not persisting and/or succeeding academically. These initial ASR cases were created based on a set of limited criteria (see Appendix B), which resulted in many Salesforce cases being created, yet with minimal differentiation between what type of outreach different students might have needed or best benefitted from. Subsequent and ongoing limited descriptive analyses of ASRs and ASR case data resulted in refined criteria for later terms.

Purpose and Research Questions

From an institutional intervention standpoint, ASRs serve as both a signal (i.e., that a student is struggling) and a treatment (i.e., students who are struggling proactively receive communication and outreach). This dual signal/treatment element has rendered it difficult to accurately and effectively evaluate the multiple facets of the greater ASR system, and, to date, no large-scale analyses of the effectiveness of ASR cases as related to student success (i.e., student persistence to the next term or graduation at the conclusion of the current term, hereafter referred to as "student persistence") has been completed. Therefore, in this cross-sectional secondary data analysis, we sought to evaluate whether the ASR case component of the ASR system effectively supported undergraduate student success.

Our study was guided by two specific research questions: (1) What was the relationship, if any, between students receiving one or more ASR cases and the likelihood of persisting to the next term? and (2) What student-level variables, if any, significantly moderated the association between students receiving one or more ASR cases and the likelihood of persisting to the next term? It is worth reiterating that we solely focused on comparing students with ASRs who either did or did not receive an ASR case. While ASU ultimately is interested in comparing student persistence between students who did and did not receive ASRs (irrespective of ASR cases), significant time, energy, and resources across the university are utilized to support the ASR case-creation and outreach process each term.

¹For additional details about ASRs, see Arizona State University, 2020a, 2020b.

Literature Review

For decades, researchers have demonstrated a strong relationship between student academic success and persistence/graduation rates (Astin, 1975, 1993; Tinto, 1993), as well as between academic advising and student success (Fowler & Boylan, 2010; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Academic advisors can provide students with needed academic support and resources, assistance in navigating an institution's complex rules and regulations, and social and emotional support (Donaldson, McKinney, Lee, & Pino, 2016; Soria, Laumer, Morrow, & Marttinen, 2017; Vianden, 2016; Young-Jones, Burt, Dixon, & Hawthorne, 2013), all of which are vital to a student's success. Further, this support from advisors is often the most beneficial for students who struggle academically and/or who lack the social and cultural capital that privileges many of their peers (e.g., first-generation students, first-year students; Earl, 1988; Schwebel, Walburn, Jacobsen, Jerrolds, & Klyce, 2008; Young-Jones et al., 2013).

Academic advising is typically categorized as either proactive (i.e., intrusive; Glennen, 1975) or reactive (i.e., prescriptive). Proactive advising is deliberate intervention and outreach by advisors (Earl, 1988), and has been shown to result in improved rates of student success (Rodgers, Blunt, & Trible, 2014). Additionally, the use of EWS data by academic advisors; personalized data-driven signals and tools, such as ASRs; and frequent advisor outreach often have a positive effect on the quality of academic advising and subsequent student success (Arnold & Pistelli, 2012; Gutierrez et al., 2020; Pardo, Jovanovic, Dawson, Gasevic, & Mirriahi, 2019; Phillips, 2013; Swecker, Fifolt, & Searby, 2013).

Research Design, Methods, & Data Sources

We completed a cross-sectional secondary data analysis. Our dataset included ASR-level, Salesforce case-level, and student demographic data for five terms (Fall 2017 through Fall 2019), excluding summer semesters. Students were included if, per term, they were undergraduates enrolled in a bachelor's degree program at one of ASU's four metropolitan campuses (i.e., Tempe [main campus], Downtown Phoenix, Polytechnic, West campus), received one or more ASRs, and had a complete set of outcome and demographic data. These criteria resulted in a total of 77,785 cases across the five terms mentioned above, with each case representing a unique student per term.

On average across all terms, the majority of students in our sample were male (55.1%), Caucasian (47.8%), and in-state Arizona residents (65.8%), respectively (see Table 1). Additionally, 26.2% of students were first generation, 35.0% were Pell eligible, 24.2% were new full-time first-year students (FTFYS) (i.e., Freshmen), and 6.9% were new transfer students. Across all terms, 90.6% of students persisted to the next term and 26.7% received at least one ASR case in a term. Greater proportions of students received ASRs in fall compared to spring terms, as well as received ASR cases in Fall 2017 and Spring 2018 compared to latter terms.

We utilized SPSS v26.0 (IBM, 2020) statistical software to perform five separate binary multiple logistic regression analyses, one for each term, as students were not necessarily unique between terms. We utilized these regressions to determine odds ratios (ORs) for the odds of students persisting

(no, yes) by ASR case (0 cases, ≥ 1 case) (significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$) (see Table 2). Categories for all categorical variables were mutually exclusive. We included ASR-level variables (count of positive ASRs received, count of negative ASRs received) and selected student demographic variables (student campus, cumulative grade point average [GPA], age) in the model as covariates. We categorized cumulative GPA into three groups (low [< 2.00], moderate [$2.00-2.99$], and high [≥ 3.00]) to account for linearity assumptions. We also included additional student demographic variables (enrollment load, FTFYS status, new transfer student status, Pell eligibility, gender, race/ethnicity, international student status, first generation student status, in-state residency) in the model as potential moderators. Lastly, we included interactions between receiving one or more ASR cases and all potential moderators in the model. Additional ORs were determined via Pearson's Chi-Square tests for significant interactions (see Table 3). We evaluated model fit using Nagelkerke adjusted R², accuracy in classification (% of cases correctly classified for outcome variable based on predictors in model), sensitivity (% of true positives), specificity (% of true negatives), and Hosmer-Lemeshow goodness-of-fit (see Table 4).

Findings & Results

Within each term, students receiving ASRs and one or more ASR cases was significantly associated with a 0.390-0.724 decrease in the odds of persisting than students who received ASRs but no ASR cases (exact odds depended on term; see Table 2). Further, every additional negative ASR a student received was significantly associated with an additional 0.871-0.913 decrease in the odds of persisting. This finding was in line with our expectations, as the majority of criteria used to create ASR cases included receiving one or more negative ASRs. Also, within each term, regardless of whether a student received one or more ASR cases, receiving an ASR and being a part-time or out-of-state student was significantly associated with a 0.283-0.456 or 0.543-0.753 decrease in the odds of persisting, respectively. Older students had significantly lower odds in persisting compared to younger students, with a 0.961-0.975 decrease in odds per year. Conversely, from Spring 2018 and beyond, being an international student was significantly associated with a 1.885-2.313 increase in the odds of persisting compared to being a non-international student. Lastly, compared to having a cumulative GPA of 2.00 or lower, having a cumulative GPA between 2.00 and 2.99 (5.462-7.807) or above 3.00 (16.161-22.178) was consistently significantly associated with an increase in the odds of persisting. The odds of persisting did not appear to be consistently significantly related to the number of positive ASRs a student received, student campus, Pell eligibility, gender, race/ethnicity, or first generation status.

Regarding FTFYS and new transfer students, for each of the three Fall terms, we found significant interactions between students having one or more ASR cases and being a FTFYS or new transfer student, respectively (see Table 3). First, being a FTFYS and receiving an ASR, regardless of whether ASR cases were received, was significantly associated with a 1.233-2.446 increase in the odds of persisting compared to being a non-FTFYS with ASRs but no ASR cases. Odds of persisting were further significantly increased when compared against non-FTFYSs who received one or more ASR cases (1.576-2.692). Second, and conversely, in Fall 2018 and Fall 2019, being a new transfer student and receiving an ASR was significantly

associated with a 0.638-0.7230 decrease in the odds of persisting compared to non-new transfer students with an ASR and one or more ASR cases. In all Fall terms, odds of persisting were further significantly decreased when comparing against non-new transfer students with ASRs but no ASR cases (0.576-0.698). While there were no significant interactions in spring terms, being a FTFYS in a spring term with an ASR was significantly associated with a 0.430-0.452 decrease in the odds of persisting compared being a non-FTFYS with an ASR. Lastly, consistent significant interactions were not observed between students with one or more ASR cases and gender, international student status, and residency, respectively.

Discussion & Implications

The ASR system provides both a signal for and potential method to assist students at risk of not persisting to the next term. In general, while it is difficult to evaluate the effectiveness of students receiving ASRs and/or having ASR cases, this analysis allowed us to generate several hypotheses worthy of future research, as well as elucidated several pertinent findings that are worthy of discussion.

First, overall, students who received ASRs and one or more ASR cases had significantly lower odds of persisting to the next term compared to students with ASR but without an ASR case. This could suggest that the criteria used to generate ASR cases between Fall 2017 and Fall 2019 were effective in signaling students who were less likely to persist. Or, it is also possible that the proactive advisor outreach that accompanies ASR cases might have been insufficient to reduce disparities in student persistence. However, while these significantly lower odds were observed across all students in each sample, our findings indicated that the odds of persisting for students with ASRs varied by different demographics (e.g., part-time, out-of-state, FTFYS), independent of receiving ASR cases. While the majority of results are in line with prior research regarding student-level factors and persistence (e.g., Elder, 2020), some are worthy of additional discussion given the intricacies of the ASR and ASR case-generating process.

Consistently, students having ASRs and one or more ASR cases in a Fall term significantly affected the odds of persisting for both FTFYS (decreased) and new transfer students (increased). ASU has previously observed demographic distinctions in these populations, respectively, as well as in their support needs. Therefore, we see these significant associations as being affirmations of our case-creation criteria. That being said, accurately making sense of FTFYSs' odds of persisting was potentially complicated by changes in the ASR case-creation criteria. Beginning in Fall 2018, case-creation criteria were refined to purposefully target FTFYSs, as first-year students have been found to require more support and outreach (Young-Jones, 2013). This change in case-creation criteria likely contributed to the increase in the number of unique FTFYS students who received ASR cases in subsequent Fall terms, as well as to the number of total ASR cases generated. Since there was no easy way to accurately incorporate the case-creation criteria as a control into our analyses given the nested structure of the data, it was not possible at this time to determine how these changes in criteria might have affected our results.

As indicated above, the odds of persisting were similar for students with ASRs but with or without ASR cases across all other demographics. This similarity could very well be due to the myriad other general and nuanced factors that influence persistence (e.g., affordability, institutional fit, psychosocial attributes, family influence; Tinto, 1993) that we were not able to include in our models. Moreover, we do not have baseline data at the start of terms, before any proactive advisor outreach, to provide insight into the differences (or lack thereof) in the odds of persisting between students receiving ASRs and one or more ASR cases and those receiving ASRs but no cases within each demographic group. Therefore, we were not able to definitively determine whether the observed similarities in persisting at the end of terms between students with ASRs having one or more ASR cases or no cases were indicative of ASR case creation being an effective method to support these different students. However, it is possible that receiving an ASR case is indeed an effective means to improve the odds of persisting for students with ASRs, as students who were signaled to be at risk of not persisting (e.g., those who received a case) ended up having similar (i.e., not significantly different) odds of persisting as students without such early warning signals (i.e., ASR cases).

Based on this research, we offer several suggestions for future analyses, as well as potential refinements to the ASR case-creation criteria. One important facet of the ASR outreach process that warrants future attention is advisor behavior. This analysis should utilize multi-level modeling, given the nested structure of both the advisor outreach data within cases, and case data within students. Potential differences between advisors' outreach methods, frequency, and timeliness might shed additional light on the nuances of the effectiveness of the ASR case outreach process. Moreover, both specific to ASR/EWS processes and in general, more insight is needed into the effect of advisor behavior on student persistence among different student demographic groups at ASU, and at other institutions. Findings from multiple advising approaches and institutions may help elucidate targeted approaches for different students.

We also recommend continued investigation into several specific subgroups of students receiving ASRs, such as FTFYS, new transfer, part-time, out-of-state, and older students, and how these different students might best be supported through ASRs and/or ASR case outreach. Other institutions may benefit from investigation into these students as well, given the plethora of research supporting the notion that students with different circumstances benefit more from targeted differentiated EWSs and support. Additionally, based on the greater odds of persistence for FTFYSs with ASRs compared to non-FTFYSs with ASRs in conjunction with FTFYS-specific ASR case-creation criteria, we recommend implementation of EWS and/or outreach approaches tailored for FTFYSs at other institutions. At ASU, future student success efforts might benefit from further refinement of the ASR case-creation criteria, such as the inclusion of additional data points (e.g., cumulative GPA). Utilizing such data might help the university both target students who are truly in need of the most assistance, as well as tailor and further personalize the outreach these students receive.

REFERENCES

- Arizona State University. (2020a). Academic status report. Retrieved from <https://provost.asu.edu/advisors/academic-status-report>
- Arizona State University. (2020b). Academic status report resources. Retrieved from <https://students.asu.edu/asrr>
- Arnold, K. E., & Pistilli, M. D. (2012). Course signals at Purdue: Using learning analytics to increase student success. *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Learning and Analytics*, 267-270. doi: 10.1145/2330601.2330666
- Astin, A. W. (1975). *Preventing students from dropping out*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college: Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Donaldson, P., McKinney, L., Lee, M., & Pino, D. (2016). First-year community college students' perceptions of and attitudes toward intrusive academic advising. *NACADA Journal*, 36(1), 30-42. doi: 10.12930/NACADA-15-012
- Earl, W. R. (1988). Intrusive advising of freshmen in academic difficulty. *NACADA Journal*, 8(2), 27-33. doi: 10.12930/0271-9517-8.2.27
- Fowler, P. R., & Boylan, H. R. (2010). Increasing student success and retention: A multidimensional approach. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 34(2), 2-4, 6, 8-10. doi:
- Glennen, R. E. (1975). Intrusive college counseling. *College Student Journal*, 9(1), 2-4.
- Gutierrez, F., Seipp, K., Ochoa, X., Chiluiza, K., De Laet, T., & Verbert, K. (2020). LADA: A learning analytics dashboard for academic advising. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 107(2020), 1-13. doi:
- Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J., Schuh, E. J., & Whitt, E. *Student success in college: Creating conditions that matter*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- IBM. (2020). IBM SPSS software. Retrieved from https://www.ibm.com/analytics/spss-statistics-software?lnk=STW_US_STESCH&lnk2=trial_SPSS&pexp=def&psrc=none&mhsrc=ibmsearch_a&mhq=spss
- Pardo, A., Jovanovic, J., Dawson, S., Gasevic, D., & Mirriahi, N. (2019). Using learning analytics to scale the provision of personalised feedback. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 50(1), 128-138. doi: 10.1111/bjet.12592
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students: A third decade of research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Phillips, E. D. Improving advising using technology and data analytics. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 45(1), 48-55. doi: 10.1080/00091383.2013.749151
- Rodgers, K., Blunt, S., & Triple, L. (2014). A real PLUSS: An intrusive advising program for underprepared STEM students. *NACADA Journal*, 34(1), 35-42. doi: 10.12930/NACADA-13-002
- Schwebel, D. C., Walburn, N. C., Jacobsen, S. H., Jerrolds, K. L., & Klyce, K. (2008). Efficacy of intrusively advising first-year students via frequent reminders for advising appointments. *NACADA Journal*, 28(2), 28-32. doi: 10.12930/0271-9517-28.2.28
- Soria, K. M., Laumer, N. L., Morrow, D. J., & Marttinen, G. (2017). Strengths-based advising approaches: Benefits for first-year undergraduates. *NACADA Journal*, 37(2), 55-65. doi: 10.12930/NACADA-16-010
- Swecker, H. K., Fifolt, M., & Searby, L. (2013). Academic advising and first-generation college students: A quantitative study on student retention. *NACADA Journal*, 33(1), 46-53. doi: 10.12930/NACADA-13-192
- Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of students attrition* (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Trussel, J. M., & Burke-Smalley, L. (2018). Demographic and student success: Early warning tools to drive intervention. *Journal of Education for Business*, 93(8), 363-372. doi: 10.1080/08832323.2018.496893
- Vianden, J. (2016). Ties that bind: Academic advisors as agents of student relationship management. *NACADA Journal*, 36(1), 19-29. doi: 10.12930/NACADA-15-026a
- Young-Jones, A. D., Burt, T. D., Dixon, S., & Hawthorne, M. J. (2013). Academic advising: Does it really impact student success? *Quality Assurance in Education*, 21(1), 7-19. doi: 10.1108/09684881311293034

TABLES

Table 1

Student Demographics per Term

	Fall 2017		Spring 2018		Fall 2018		Spring 2019		Fall 2019		Total	
	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)
All	16,560		11,605		18,226		13,846		17,548		77,785	
Gender												
Male	9,315	(56.3)	6,692	(57.7)	9,963	(54.7)	7,616	(55.0)	9,271	(52.8)	42,846	(55.1)
Female	7,245	(43.8)	4,913	(42.3)	8,263	(45.3)	6,230	(45.0)	8,277	(47.2)	34,931	(44.9)
Race/Ethnicity												
Caucasian	8,095	(48.9)	5,557	(47.9)	8,828	(48.4)	6,589	(47.6)	8,076	(46.0)	37,145	(47.8)
Asian & Pacific Islander	2,361	(14.3)	1,682	(14.5)	2,492	(13.7)	1,834	(13.2)	2,190	(12.5)	10,559	(13.6)
Black & African American	919	(5.5)	627	(5.4)	948	(5.2)	776	(5.6)	905	(5.2)	4,175	(5.4)
Hispanic & Latinx	4,057	(24.5)	2,921	(25.2)	4,718	(25.9)	3,712	(26.8)	4,821	(27.5)	20,229	(26.0)
American Indian & Alaska Native	246	(1.5)	167	(1.4)	259	(1.4)	217	(1.6)	279	(1.6)	1,168	(1.5)
Native American & Pacific Islander	40	(0.2)	28	(0.2)	46	(0.3)	31	(0.2)	48	(0.3)	193	(0.2)
Unknown	842	(5.1)	623	(5.4)	935	(5.1)	687	(5.0)	1,229	(7.0)	4,316	(5.5)
Arizona Resident	10,754	(64.9)	7,691	(66.3)	11,903	(65.3)	9,291	(67.1)	11,562	(65.9)	51,201	(65.8)
International	1,797	(10.9)	1,316	(11.3)	1,607	(8.8)	1,328	(9.6)	1,356	(7.7)	7,404	(9.5)
First Generation	4,350	(26.3)	2,948	(25.4)	4,795	(26.3)	3,587	(25.9)	4,740	(27.0)	20,420	(26.3)
FTFYS	5,452	(32.9)	143	(1.2)	6,280	(34.5)	185	(1.3)	6,783	(38.7)	18,843	(24.2)
New Transfer	1,383	(8.4)	457	(3.9)	1,587	(8.7)	562	(4.1)	1,375	(7.8)	5,364	(6.9)
Full-Time Enrollment	15,656	(94.5)	10,822	(93.3)	17,217	(94.5)	12,900	(93.2)	16,722	(95.3)	73,317	(94.3)
Pell Eligible	5,766	(34.8)	4,108	(35.4)	6,207	(34.1)	4,989	(36.0)	6,103	(34.8)	27,173	(34.9)
Cumulative GPA												
< 2.00	1,753	(10.6)	1,235	(10.6)	1,863	(10.2)	1,345	(9.7)	1,787	(10.2)	7,983	(10.3)
2.00-2.99	6,153	(37.2)	4,815	(41.5)	6,293	(34.5)	5,323	(38.4)	7,178	(31.9)	28,187	(36.2)
≥ 3.00	8,654	(52.3)	5,555	(47.9)	10,070	(55.3)	7,178	(51.8)	10,158	(57.9)	41,615	(53.5)
≥ 1 ASR Case	4,987	(30.1)	4,035	(34.8)	4,062	(22.3)	3,424	(24.7)	4,261	(24.3)	20,769	(26.7)
Persistence to Next Term	15,271	(92.2)	10,190	(87.8)	16,749	(91.9)	12,383	(89.4)	16,118	(91.9)	70,711	(90.9)

Note: Student counts represent unique students within each term, but not necessarily across terms.

Abbreviations: ASR, Academic Status Report; FTFYS, full-time first-year student; GPA, grade point average.

Table 2**Odds of Persistence (Expressed as Odds Ratios [ORs]) to the Next Term per Term**

Variable	Reference Category	Fall 2017	Spring 2018	Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019
≥ 1 ASR Case	0 ASR cases	0.390***	0.724*	0.661**	0.677**	0.502***
Count of Positive ASRs Received	—	0.999	1.082	1.102**	1.109*	1.076
Count of Negative ASRs Received	—	0.872***	0.877***	0.871*	0.882***	0.913***
Student Campus	Tempe Campus	1.065	0.951	0.899	1.039	0.963
Enrollment Load [^]	Full-Time Enrollment	0.284***	0.456***	0.320***	0.445***	0.283***
FTFYS Status [^]	Non-New FTFYS	1.008###	0.430*	1.132###	0.452*	1.105###
New Transfer Student Status [^]	Non-New Transfer Student	1.127##	1.238	1.617***#	0.79	1.386***
Cumulative GPA:		†	†	†	†	†
2-2.99	< 2.00	7.045***	6.157***	6.271***	5.462***	7.807***
≥ 3.00	< 2.00	18.413***	18.555***	20.74***	16.161***	22.178***
Pell Eligibility [^]	Not Eligible	1.267*	1.044	1.413***	1.082	1.412***
Gender [^]	Male	0.794*#	0.919	0.918	0.875	0.935
Race/Ethnicity [^] :		†				
Asian & Pacific Islander	Caucasian	1.793**	1.058	1.177	1.191	1.388
Black & African American	Caucasian	0.910	0.990	0.897	1.071	0.778
Hispanic & Latinx	Caucasian	0.944	1.047	1.037	1.364	0.864
American Indian & Alaska Native	Caucasian	0.755	0.989	0.740	0.954	0.851
Native American & Pacific Islander	Caucasian	◇	0.381	3.113	1.432	0.870
Unknown	Caucasian	1.525	0.709	0.887	1.388	0.905
International Student Status [^]	Non-International Student	1.273	1.958**	2.018**#	2.313***	1.885**
Age (y)	—	0.962***	0.975**	0.969***	0.976**	0.961***
First Generation Student Status [^]	Non-First Generation Student	0.958	0.955	0.894	0.794*	0.938
Residency [^]	In-State (Arizona) Resident	0.581***##	0.753*	0.699***	0.543***	0.705***

Note: Binary logistic regression was performed to determine odds ratios for the odds of persistence to the next term (no, yes) by ASR case (0 cases, ≥ 1 case).

Abbreviations: ASR, Academic Status Report; FTFYS, full-time first-year student; GPA, grade point average.

[^]Interaction between predictor and ASR case (0 cases, ≥ 1 case) included in model.

*P < 0.05, **P < 0.01, *** P < 0.001

†Significant categorical predictor (> 2 categories, P < 0.05)

#Significant interaction between predictor and ASR case (0 cases, ≥ 1 case) (P < 0.05) (## P < 0.01, ### P < 0.001)

◇Not interpretable due to too small of a sample size.

Table 3**Odds of Persistence to the Next Term for Students With (≥ 1) and Without ASR Cases**

Moderator	Reference Category	Fall 2017		Fall 2018		Fall 2019	
		With	Without	With	Without	With	Without
FTFYS	Non-FTFYS	1.576***	1.233*	2.461***	2.135***	2.692***	2.446***
New Transfer Student	Non-New Transfer Student	0.795	0.638**	0.576**	0.722**	0.698*	0.723**
Gender	Male	1.180*	0.971				
International Student	Non-International Student			1.481*	1.980***		
Residency	In-State (Arizona) Resident	1.355***	0.896				

Note: Odds ratios were determined via Pearson's Chi-Square test for moderators with significant interactions in the binary logistic regression model. No interactions were significant in Spring 2018 or Spring 2019 terms.

Abbreviations: ASR, Academic Status Report, FTFYS, full-time first-year student.

* $P < 0.05$, ** $P < 0.01$, *** $P < 0.001$

Table 4**Binary Logistic Regression Model Fit Statistics per Term**

	Fall 2017	Spring 2018	Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019
Nagelkerke adjusted R^2 (%)	28.5	28.8	29.1	27.0	31.9
Accuracy in Classification (%)	92.9	89.1	92.5	90.0	92.6
Sensitivity (%)	99.4	97.7	99.2	98.2	98.9
Specificity (%)	16.7	27.2	17.5	20.4	21.7
Hosmer-Lemeshow χ^2 , 8 df	12.322	10.061	15.039	9.632	7.882

Note: Hosmer-Lemeshow $\chi^2 P > 0.05$ for all terms

APPENDIX A

ASR Components

ASR Collapsed Grade Categories	
ASR Description	ASR Grades Included
Positive ASR	A+, A, A- – Excellent
	B+, B, B- – Good
	C+, C – Average
	S – Satisfactory
Negative ASR	D – Passing
	E – Failure
	EN – Failure – Never Participated
	EU – Failure – Did Not Complete
	U – Unsatisfactory

Note: ASU uses a grade of “E” to indicate a failed class rather than a grade of “F”

List of ASR Reasons, Actions

ASR Reasons	ASR Actions
Did Not Respond to Instructor	Attend Class
Does Not Follow Instructions	Call ASU Online Success Coach*
Frequently Late for Class	Complete Assignments
Inadequate Class Attendance	Consult with Librarian
Inadequate Lab Attendance	Contact Instructor via Email
Insufficient Participation	Meet with Advisor
Insufficient Research Skills	Meet with Instructor
Low Assignment Scores	Meet with Teaching Assistant
Low Quality Written Work	Recommend Dropping Class
Low Quiz and/or Exam Score(s)	Seek Academic Support
Missed Assignments	Seek Supplemental Instruction
Missed Exam(s)	Seek Tutoring for this Course
Missed Instructor Meetings	Seek Writing Assistance
Missed Quizzes	Take Academic Refresher Course
Missing Discussion Posts	
No Class Attendance	
No Submitted Assignments	
Not Comprehending Material	
Not Paying Attention in Class	
Not Responding to Email	
Poor Overall Performance	

*Only applies to ASU Online students

APPENDIX B

Salesforce ASR Case Creation Criteria per Semester

Student Population	Week(s) Applicable	Salesforce Case Subject	Criteria for Case Creation
All degree-seeking undergraduate students	1-15 (All weeks)	Attendance-Focused ASR	Students receive a case if they receive an ASR with one or more of the following reasons/actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Class Attendance • Attend Class • Recommend Drop
		Non-Attendance-Focused ASR	Student receive a case if they receive an ASR with one or more of the following reasons/actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Responding to Email • Did Not Respond to Instructor • No Submitted Assignments • Missed Exam(s) • Missed Instructor Meetings • Poor Overall Performance • Missed Assignments • Meet with Advisor • Complete Assignments

Criteria for ASR Case Creation for Fall 2018, Spring 2019, and Fall 2019 Semesters

Student Population	Week(s) Applicable	Salesforce Case Subject	Criteria for Case Creation
Full-Time First-Year Students (FTFYS)	Weeks 1-3 (Early Weeks)	Negative ASR in First-Year Seminar (FYS) Course	Students receive a case if they receive an ASR with a negative grade (i.e., grade of D, E, EN, EU, U) in an FYS course
		Negative ASR in Non-FYS Course	Students receive a case if they receive an ASR with a negative grade in a non-FYS course
		First Negative ASR	Students receive a case for the first instance (across the term) of receiving an ASR with a negative grade
FTFYS	Weeks 4-12 (Mid Weeks)	First Negative ASR	Students receive a case for the first instance (across the term) of receiving an ASR with a negative grade
		3rd or Greater Cumulative Negative ASR	Students receive a case when they receive a total of 3 or more negative ASRs across the term
		First ASR with Recommended Action of "Meet with Advisor"	Students receive a case for the first ASR they receive with a recommended action of "Meet with Advisor"
Non-FTFYS	Weeks 4-12 (Mid Weeks)	3rd or Greater Cumulative Negative ASR	Students receive a case when they receive a total of 3 or more negative ASRs across the term
		First ASR with Recommended Action of "Meet with Advisor"	Students receive a case for the first ASR they receive with a recommended action of "Meet with Advisor"
N/A – No cases created during this time	Weeks 13-15 (Late Weeks)		