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Background

The Cornerstones report, approved by the Board of Trustees in January 1998, yielded a set of general principles and supporting recommendations that were designed to guide the CSU into the next century. Principle 9 of the Cornerstones report committed the CSU to account for its performance through periodic reports to the public. After the Cornerstones Implementation Plan was approved by the Board in March 1999, the CSU Accountability Process was developed as the primary articulation of this commitment.

The Accountability Process evolved through a participative systemwide process that included input from the individual campuses, the Alumni Council, the California State Student Association, and the Academic Senate CSU. The Accountability Process that was subsequently approved by the Board in November 1999, was based upon a broad understanding, crafted through the consultative process, that accountability was important both externally in recognition of our public responsibility but also internally as a means of on-going self-assessment and review. It was also agreed that the structure of the accountability process should focus upon outcomes rather than the means of achieving them and encourage constant improvement by campuses and the system. Thus, the accountability process is based upon a carefully crafted set of principles which are summarized below.

1. Because accountability is a public-oriented process, the performance areas and indicators selected ought to be important to the CSU and well understood by the public.

2. Because accountability is an opportunity to show commitment to continued progress, the focus will be on the performance of individual campuses over time in the context of their different missions, goals, students, and environments. Whenever possible, accountability information will be presented in formats that avoid comparisons among campuses.

3. Because CSU campuses are different, the accountability process will allow the individual campus to describe, through campus selected performance areas and indicators, how it contributes to the development of its particular students.

4. The CSU will constantly evaluate performance areas and accountability indicators to ensure that they appropriately reflect institutional performance.

5. To the extent possible, the CSU will rely upon existing data, information systems, standard reports, and processes in the development of indicators and accountability reports.

The Accountability Process establishes responsibilities and requirements for annual reporting for both the CSU system and the individual campuses. The CSU system is responsible for the following performance areas:
1. Advancing the mission of the CSU
2. Maintaining appropriate balance between the system role and campus autonomy
3. Communication and cooperation within the CSU
4. Negotiation and implementation of multi-year performance and budget compacts between the CSU and the state administration

Systemwide reporting occurs through the annual Partnership Report to state government and through annual reports to the Executive Council and Academic Senate.

The campus Accountability Process addresses nine performance areas that are to be reported annually through a set of descriptive indicators. These are:

1. Quality of baccalaureate degree programs
2. Access to the CSU
3. Progression to the degree
4. Graduation
5. Areas of special state need
6. Relations with K-12
7. Remediation
8. Facilities utilization
9. University advancement

The process also identifies four additional campus performance areas that are to be reported upon over a four-year cycle through narrative reports containing campus-specific indicators. These are:

10. Quality of graduate and post-baccalaureate programs (2000, 2004, etc.)
11. Faculty scholarship and creative achievement (2001, 2005, etc.)
12. Contributions to community and society (2002, 2006, etc.)

Consistent with Cornerstones Principle 10 regarding campus autonomy, each campus may also identify self-defined performance areas and indicators that describe its distinctive mission.

Over the past several months, CSU campuses have prepared their first annual accountability reports. Based upon these reports and the aggregation of systemwide data for the various annual indicators, the first annual systemwide accountability report has been developed. Since this is the first year of reporting, the focus is upon current efforts of the campuses and the system. That is, the data presented this year establish baseline performance which can be used in subsequent years as indices or standards from which progress and improvement can be measured. In many cases, three years of data have been presented to help us begin thinking about longitudinal comparisons. However, it should be understood that the 2000 Report uses 1998-1999 data which becomes the baseline year for the process.

Annual Performance Areas, Indicators, and Reports
1. Quality of baccalaureate degree programs

Each campus will provide evidence of progress toward the identification of learning outcomes and the development of a process to assess student learning outcomes at the general education and program levels. The first indicator below describes a three-year developmental period; the second indicator addresses expectations after development of learning outcomes has been completed.

**Indicator 1.1: (first three years)** For each university, descriptions of processes for establishing and assessing student learning outcomes in general education and in the majors and for assuring that students are achieving core competencies for the degree.

Although interest in defining and assessing the outcomes of student learning has grown steadily for at least the past decade, attention to this topic has heightened more intensely in the past few years. Existing grass-roots efforts have been enhanced by WASC's emphasis on a "culture of evidence," which, in turn, has coincided with the renewed commitment to assessment expressed in the Cornerstones Report which stated that; "The California State University will award the baccalaureate on the basis of demonstrated learning, as determined by our faculty" (Principle 1).

Campus reports show four key characteristics of the California State University's approach to identifying and assessing student learning:

- A wide variety of assessment activities are occurring on multiple fronts: at the level of the individual course, the program, and the institution as a whole.
- The most comprehensive and successful assessment activities have been occurring in the professional fields.
- Campuses have made more progress in assessing the outcomes of student learning in academic majors than in general education.
- Campuses are exploring various ways to verify and certify that learning outcomes and assessment methods have been developed.

First of all, it appears that assessment is most readily engaged at the most comprehensive or the most narrow level. Institutions find that the most expedient and readily available methods are surveys of student perception or satisfaction. At the other extreme, assessment methods focus on course tests and course grades. Much more demanding and therefore much more infrequently and more tentatively engaged is the assessment of cumulative and comprehensive student learning. In these efforts, faculty collectively define specific competencies that students must achieve and then measure whether or not a student has achieved these expectations. Achieving this level of assessment is still a challenge for many academic programs in the CSU.

Those who have met the challenge most successfully tend to be professional disciplines that have special accreditations and external state licensing examinations. Special accrediting agencies generally require learning outcomes specification in programs that prepare students for careers, such as nursing, education, business, and engineering. These departments tend to have extensive assessment programs to ensure excellence in student performance and to permit periodic measurement of how effectively students are being prepared for state licensing examinations.

In addition, greater progress in assessment has been made in assessing the learning outcomes in degree programs than in general education. There are many reasons why assessing the learning
outcomes in general education is more difficult. The competencies (writing, speaking, critical thinking, etc.) are taught in many different courses and in many different departments, which makes assessment a logistical challenge; many of the courses are taught by part-time faculty who are not thoroughly integrated into the assessment culture of the institution; and getting university-wide consensus on specific competencies and assessment methods is no easy task. Nevertheless, several campuses have developed approved statements of general education goals and objectives, and a few have experimented with pilot assessments. All of the CSU campuses have embarked upon this difficult endeavor.

These efforts are being monitored, guided, and supported through several different mechanisms. All agree that the assessment of student learning outcomes must be integrated into the regular operations of the university and not be seen as an add-on. Therefore, most CSU institutions include the requirement for outcomes assessment as part of the traditional Program Review process. On some campuses, departments are asked to prepare annual assessment reports, which are reviewed by the college dean, the academic senate, and the provost.

CSU campuses seem to be on track to have fully functioning learning assessment systems in place by 2003. This date is significant in meeting the Trustees' goal, as well as in complying with the criteria outlined in the new WASC Standards. The new accreditation criteria include: "All degrees — undergraduate and graduate — awarded by the institution are clearly defined in terms of entry-level requirements and in terms of levels of student achievement necessary for graduation that represent more than simply an accumulation of courses or credits." With continued progress, CSU campuses should be well prepared to meet this criterion.

2. Access to the CSU

The CSU is committed to providing all eligible first-time freshmen, upper-division California Community College transfers, and teacher preparation applicants with admission to a CSU campus. While these applicants may not be admitted to their first-choice CSU campus or their first-choice program, eligible applicants applying are guaranteed admission to some CSU campus.

**Indicator 2.1:** For each university, the number of first-time freshmen, upper-division community college transfers, and teacher preparation applicants who applied to the university and were admitted.

On September 20, 1999, CPEC announced enrollment demand projections to 2010. The number of Californians statewide seeking higher education between 1998 and 2010 is expected to increase by 714,753 students. It is estimated that CSU will enroll 130,000 of these students in the next ten years, an average of 13,000 annually.

The Master Plan, state law, and trustee policies are clear about the relative priorities of categories of students admitted to CSU. Highest priority is accorded to upper-division California Community College transfers. Once these students have completed the equivalent of the first two years of a bachelor's degree with at least a 2.0 GPA, they must have the opportunity to transfer to a CSU campus. Eligible first-time freshmen have second highest priority. California residents receive the highest priority in all admission categories. Campuses are also expected to maintain a balanced program and diversity as admission priorities are implemented.
In response to these mandates, CSU guarantees admission to the system to all eligible first-time freshmen and upper-division, resident transfer students. While nearly all fully eligible first-time freshmen and upper-division transfer students are admitted to the campus of their first choice, some are not. Generally, campuses will attempt to accommodate an applicant in a second-choice major at the first-choice campus if that is the student’s preference. If the student prefers redirection in the first-choice major to another campus that remains open in that major the campus will redirect the application file without requiring the applicant to submit a duplicate application form, application processing fee, or academic records.

Several CSU campuses are approaching the point at which their current physical and operational capacity will not permit all eligible students to be admitted. When a program or campus receives more eligible applicants than can be enrolled, the program or campus is considered “impacted.” Program impactation has enabled most CSU campuses to manage enrollment pressures. Now, some campuses are beginning to find that they have more qualified applicants than they have space for across the entire campus. San Luis Obispo, Chico, and San Diego State University have been designated as impacted and authorized to control their enrollment through the use of supplementary admission criteria. Long Beach and Fullerton are also experiencing increased enrollment pressures that may result soon in requests from these campuses to limit the number of students admitted. In addition, popular majors such as architecture, nursing, occupational therapy, and physical therapy are impacted at all campuses offering them. These are known as systemwide impacted programs, and are filled on the basis of applicants who apply during the first month of the filing period.

In response to these increasing enrollment pressures, the Board of Trustees adopted a set of principles at its March 2000 meeting to be effective for students seeking admission to the CSU for fall 2001. These principles were designed to aid the Chancellor and campuses in carrying out the mission of the CSU and to ensure that CSU campuses continue to comply with the provisions of the Master Plan for Education. The Trustees' principles reaffirm CSU’s commitment to the Master Plan to accommodate within the CSU all fully eligible students in the upper one-third of recent California high school graduates and all fully eligible, upper-division California community college transfer students. As a result of these principles, CSU and individual campuses will make every effort to serve more students by increasing existing enrollment capacity. Increased capacity can be achieved by implementing such approaches as more flexible scheduling and year round operations, expanding distance learning and use of technology, increasing the capacity of existing off-campus centers, establishing new centers, and using facilities more imaginatively.

Campuses will utilize to the fullest extent possible program impactation prior to requesting campuswide impactation. Program impactation has been in place for many years, and students and counselors are familiar with this enrollment management practice. Under program impactation, a student may be held to higher, program-specific admission requirements if the total number of CSU-eligible applicants during the first month of the application filing period exceeds the number of eligible applicants who can be accommodated. Supplementary admission criteria will be used to screen applicants for impacted programs, and criteria are publicized widely. Supplementary admission criteria are used in campuswide impactation situations.
If campuswide impaction is necessary, first-time freshmen and upper-division transfer students will be admitted to a local CSU campus on the basis of standard CSU system eligibility criteria. For purposes of admission, "local" first-time freshmen are defined as those students who graduate from a high school historically served by a CSU campus in that region; local upper-division transfer students are defined as those who want to transfer from a community college historically served by a CSU campus in that region. In large metropolitan areas served by more than one campus, it is possible that a student may be considered a local applicant to more than one CSU campus. As a result of this approach, CSU-eligible students are guaranteed admission to at least one local CSU campus. Admission, however, does not include assurance of admission to a specific program.

The enrollment management principles adopted by the CSU Board of Trustees ensure that CSU-eligible students are not denied access to their local campus if impacted and they do not wish to relocate to another area of the State. Students are not prevented from applying to campuses outside their region. Students from other parts of the state may continue to establish eligibility for admission to impacted campuses outside of their area, but they will be required to meet the supplemental admission criteria which usually include a grade point average higher than the systemwide GPA. Each CSU campus will continue to maintain a balanced student body and to provide broad-based access to the people of California.

Basic systemwide application, admission, and enrollment indicators (2.1) are not nearly as telling as the other indicators, but there are suggestive patterns. Consistent with Tidal Wave II projections, CSU is receiving more freshman applications, admitting more freshmen, and enrolling more new students. New freshmen are the driving force in higher educational growth in California, and trends in CSU applications track with the demographics. The growth in applications for first-time freshman admission from 1996-1997 to 1999-2000 was almost twice the growth observed in upper-division CCC applications and postbaccalaureate/graduate applications.

Although not currently available, future reports will provide information on the number of eligible students who were admitted to impacted programs, the number who were denied access to impacted programs, and the number redirected to other CSU campuses. This information will be available for the next accountability reporting cycle. For this cycle, basic application information is provided to support campus background discussions on the extent to which access has been provided to eligible students.

The percentage of admissions of freshman applicants dropped a few percentage points from 1998-1999 to 1999-2000. While this is not a particularly alarming reduction, it is consistent with the concerns that Trustees raised in spring 2000 about the extent to which access is being impaired by campus and program impaction, especially to California high school graduates. Although the percentage of freshman admitted dropped slightly from 67% to 64%, the percentage enrolling increased from 59% to 62%, which might indicate positive effects of our efforts to improve student preparation. The net effect is that the percentage of applicants who are admitted and actually enrolled dropped from 42% in 1996-97 to 39% in 1998-99 and rose to 40% in 1999-2000.
While CSU is receiving more applications, from California Community College (CCC) students seeking admission as upper-division, CSU and CCC leadership agreed in the mid-90s that it is in the best interests of the Master Plan transfer function for the CSU to admit only fully-eligible upper-division transfer applicants. Since 1997-1998, admission rates have hovered between 69% and 72% instead of above 80%, indicated in 1996-97. Despite the reduction in “admit rates,” CSU enrollments of upper-division California Community College transfer students actually have increased by 8 percent, from 36,884 in 1996-1997 to 40,003 in 1999-2000. Increases in the number of applications and increasing enrollments from admissions counterbalanced the drop in admission rates.

Increases in the numbers of applications, admissions, and enrollments in the postbaccalaureate and graduate division, in essence, reflect the CSU’s commitment to increase the number of students it is preparing for teaching in California’s K-12 classrooms. Much of the growth in postgraduate students can be attributed to substantial increases in the number of students earning a teaching credential in the “fifth year” programs.
Between fall 1996 and fall 1998 the number of CSU students enrolled in multiple- and single-subject programs rose sharply from 9,358 to 14,064. During this period, the CSU increased its capacity in teacher preparation from a baseline of 7,098 CY FTES to 9,998 CY FTES – an increase of 2,900 CY FTES, or 41%.

3. Progression to the degree

The CSU will provide clear paths to the baccalaureate degree for first-time freshmen and transfer students. The goal is that the total number of units completed toward the degree, in both GE and the major, is comparable for students who entered as freshmen and for students who entered as transfer students.

**Indicator 3.1:** For each university, the percentage of students, both first-time freshmen and upper-division California Community College transfer students, who progress from their first to their second year of attendance.
Nationally, universities and colleges are focusing increasing attention on first-year retention rates, because at many institutions drop out during the first year accounts for three-quarters of all attrition. The first-year retention rate of CSU is excellent – above the rate of comparable institutions serving the same types of students: About 80 percent of regularly-admitted, first-time freshmen and California Community College transfers continue to their second year at CSU campuses. First-year retention of students admitted by exception is not as strong. Campuses recognize that they need to take the time to assure that they really have the resources to provide students admitted by exception with the additional assistance necessary for student success.

Indicator 3.2: For each university, the number of units completed by upper-division California Community College transfer students who graduated as compared to the number of units completed by upper-division students who also graduated but entered the CSU as first-time freshmen.

Indicators show that California Community College (CCC) junior transfers progress through the upper-division as efficiently as CSU students who entered as first-time freshmen. The average differences, shown below in semester and quarter credit units, between native and CCC transfer students are relatively small.
The indicators, however, may raise questions about whether natives and transfers are efficiently making their way to degree. Two years in the upper-division, some would argue, should amount to 60 semester credit units (or 90 quarter credit units). This approach would ring true if all CSU degrees required only 120 semester credit units (or 180 quarter credit units). But while the CSU has adjusted its minimum units to the baccalaureate to 120 semester units (and 180 quarter credit units), some bachelor of science degrees require over 130 semester credit units (just under 200 quarter credit units) and some engineering baccalaureate degrees requires just under 150 semester credit units (215 quarter credit units).

To explore the issue of systemwide efficiencies and differentials between native students and junior transfers, additional analysis of units completed by natives/junior transfers and by discipline area across the system was undertaken. The results suggest fairly efficient progress to degree (averages mostly within 10 percent of minimum units to degree) for both junior transfers and natives in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Studies</th>
<th>Biological/Life Sciences</th>
<th>Business &amp; Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Fine &amp; Applied Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Languages</td>
<td>Health Professions</td>
<td>Home Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Public Affairs/Services</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A few disciplinary areas suggest the need for additional analysis and discussion.
Agriculture and Natural Resources (up to 138 semester or 207 quarter units required for degree at some campuses): Junior transfers, on average, require 160 semester (240 quarter) units versus 144 semester (216 quarter) for natives — or at least one semester or two quarters more than natives.

Architecture and Environmental Design (up to 167 semester or 251 quarter units required for degree at some campuses): Junior transfers, on average, require 183 semester (275 quarter) units versus 171 semester (257 quarter) for natives — or about a semester or two quarters more than natives.

Engineering (up to 148 semester or 215 quarter units required for degree at some campuses): Junior transfers, on average, require 170 semester (255 quarter) units versus 161 semester (242 quarter) for natives — or almost a semester or at least one quarter more than natives.

However, before turning to any further disciplinary explorations, the CSU wants to ensure that its indicator trends are sound. To do this, the CSU is undertaking in fall 2000 a comprehensive transcript analysis of CCC junior transfers who recently graduated from the CSU. Preliminary results from this study should be available in January 2001.

4. Persistence and Graduation

The CSU, through clear statements of graduation requirements, effective advising, and effective access to courses, will assist students to achieve their degree objectives.

Indicator 4.1: For each university, student graduation rates, disaggregated by relevant sub-populations (first-time freshmen and upper-division transfer students) and by key student characteristics (full- and part-time attendance, etc.).

The CSU is committed to providing its students with the instructional opportunities and guidance to make progress to degree at the pace and intensity students prefer. This makes the CSU job much more difficult than that for the UC or independent institutions who essentially require that students enroll at a pace to complete in four or five years. There are a variety of persistence and graduation rate indicators that must be reported (the federal IPEDS-GRS and CPEC continuation and graduation rates), but none of these take into account the pace and intensity of the path to the baccalaureate that students elect to take.

Graduation rates for regularly admitted students who enter the CSU as first-time freshmen.

The national Joint Commission on Accountability Reporting’s (JCAR’s) methodology for computing graduation rates takes pace and intensity to degree explicitly into account by reviewing the units each student attempts across four academic years and assigning the person to one of three groups:

1. The traditional full-time student who has carried course loads over four years that are sufficient to complete the degree in four years.
2. The student who has carried course loads over four years, at a pace and intensity to complete the so-called 4-year baccalaureate degree within 6 years. Under federal financial aid rules, 150 percent of 4 academic years is permitted for receipt of full-time financial aid, so this category of persistent part-time student aligns most closely with many students currently on financial aid.

3. The partial load/stop-out student who has carried loads over four years that typically reveal periods of non-attendance and varied course load patterns. The student, after four years, is not on track to graduate in even six years.

**Fall 1993 First-Time Freshmen -- Pace to Degree**

- 14% Full-time Students
- 20% Persistent Part-time Students
- 66% Partial Load/Stop-out Students

About eighty-six percent of fall 1993 first-time freshmen are making progress to degree at a pace and intensity to complete within six years. About one in five students was taking coursework consistent with graduation in four years. About one in seven was enrolling and taking courses much less regularly, so that, at best, they were taking “partial loads.”

The annual disclosure of six-year graduation rates is required federally. For fall 1993 first-time freshmen who enrolled in at least 12 units during the first term of entry (the federal IPEDS specification for six-year graduation rate reporting), the CSU has a 39 percent six-year graduation rate. Using the JCAR methodology, the only other approved federal graduation rate methodology, the CSU has an overall 38 percent six-year graduation rate. But the six-year graduation rates by pace and intensity of path to degree are very telling:

- The traditional full-time students' six-year rate is 65 percent — a six-year graduation rate on par with those of the nation's most selective institutions. The estimated final graduation rate for these students is 70 percent.¹

- The persistent part-time students' six-year graduation rate is 37 percent — a rate in the same ballpark as institutions like the CSU. The estimated final graduation rate for these students is 50 percent.²

- The partial load/stop-out students' six-year graduation rate is almost nil — 2 percent. The estimated final graduation rate for these students is 13 percent.³

---

¹ Analysis was performed on each subgroup and it was found that, if a student had not received the degree at six-years but was still enrolled, likelihood of graduation is extremely high.

² See footnote 1.

³ See footnote 1.
To the extent that CSU campuses attract highly motivated students who take 15 to 18 unit course loads term after term – like those who typically attend the nation’s most selective institutions – the CSU graduation rate is comparable. But eight of ten CSU first-time freshmen tend to be on financial aid and cautious about overloading themselves with coursework. Unlike their counterparts, they stop out more and change majors more. JCAR indicators suggest that we need to focus more attention on these students to reduce the proportion whom we have called “partial load” students by early identification and advising.

**Graduation rates for regularly admitted students who enter the CSU as CCC junior transfers.**

Most required reporting on persistence and graduation provides no information about the kinds of progress that transfer students make to degree. In the CSU, new undergraduate transfers outnumber first-time freshmen by a factor of almost 2 to 1. To provide some indication of the persistence and graduation of this important segment of the CSU student body, we have applied the JCAR methodology to the fall 1996 California Community College junior transfers (regular admits).

Contrary to common wisdom, California Community College junior transfers are much more likely than first-time freshmen to carry course loads that will enable them to graduate in two years (37 percent vs. 20 percent).

Overall fall 1995 CCC junior transfers have a 48 percent three-year graduation rate (150 percent of two-years to degree for a junior). But the three-year graduation rates by pace and intensity of path to degree are very telling:

- The traditional full-time students’ three-year rate is 65 percent, just like the first-time freshmen – a six-year graduation rate on par with those of the nation’s most selective institutions. The estimated final graduation rate for these junior transfers is 77 percent. \(^4\)

- The persistent part-time students’ three-year graduation rate is 43 percent – a graduation rate that one could argue is comparable to that of moderately selective institutions. The estimated final graduation rate for these junior transfers is 70 percent. \(^5\)

---

\(^4\) Junior transfers who had not graduated but were still enrolled after three years were very likely to receive the degree eventually.

\(^5\) See note 4.
The partial load/stop-out students' three-year graduation rate is low – 6 percent, but estimated final graduation rate for these junior transfers is 48 percent. The commitment of "partial load" junior transfer students to getting the baccalaureate is notably stronger than that for "partial load" first-time freshmen; the proportion of "partial load" junior transfer students who graduate is 3 to 4 times that of "partial load" first-time freshmen.

5. Areas of special state need

The CSU will make special efforts to respond to special state needs beyond our core mission of providing undergraduate education. At present, there is great need in many regions of California for credentialed teachers consistent with the requirements of K-12 education. In the future these needs might include such other professions as engineers, nurses, or social workers.

**Indicator 5.1:** For each university, the number of credentials issued by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing to candidates completing professional education requirements.

For many years, the California State University has been the premier teacher preparation sector of the State. With the "Class Size Reduction" initiative, the need for more qualified teachers reached crisis proportions. Accompanying CSU leadership and initiatives in teacher preparation, the State provided additional funding to increase the CSU teacher preparation capacity, beginning in 1997-1998. CSU teacher preparation enrollments and credential production have to date met previously set goals.

According to reports from the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC), from base year 1996-1997 to 1998-1999, the last full year for which the CCTC has complete information, the number of Multiple Subject credentials issued to first-time/new type applicants recommended by the California State University (CSU) rose from 4,951 to 6,493 – an increase of 1,542 (31 percent). To provide some perspective on the magnitude of this CSU achievement, note that CSU’s two-year credential increase is over 50 percent larger than the University of California’s (UC’s) two-year, first-time/new type multiple subject credential total (about 1,000 credentials). In a similar vein, the number of Special Education credentials issued to first-time/new type applicants recommended by the CSU in 1998-1999 (1,391) is almost twice that of the UC and independent colleges and universities combined (UC, 96; independents, 618).

---

* See note 4. More analysis needs to be done to ensure that previous analyses hold for this subgroup.
The partnership with the Governor of California asks the CSU to increase its first-time/new type credential issuances to 14,000 by CY 2002-2003, a goal that is extremely ambitious.

The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing is responsible for all annual indicator reporting on credential issuances. The CSU looks forward to continuing its work with the CCTC in its development of performance indicator reports and reconciling technical reporting issues.

6. Relations with K-12

In an effort to improve the academic preparation of entering students, the CSU will be responsive to the needs of K-12 education. Although the CSU cannot assume full control of the academic preparation of entering students, our universities can influence the level of preparation through outreach effort, K-12 and regional partnerships, and other programs.

**Indicator 6.1:** For each university, the number of CSU faculty and students, the number of high schools, and the number of high school students involved in outreach efforts.

CSU outreach and student academic preparation programs provide information and academic support to California’s diverse population of elementary, middle, secondary, and community college students, and provide services that allow them to qualify for admission and to succeed in baccalaureate study. Student academic preparation programs provide information about higher education opportunities and assist students in making informed educational choices. CSU spent over $38.6 million in 1999-2000 on outreach and student academic preparation programs.

Student academic preparation programs target students who are disadvantaged educationally and economically, who are enrolled in K-12 schools that have historical low college going rates, and who need assistance in strengthening basic skills, e.g., math and English. CSU campuses offer three types of student academic preparation services: internships, outreach, and retention. CSU provides student academic preparation services to over 562,300 students enrolled in K-18:
Students Served: 562,306
- Elementary school students: 42,236
- Middle school students: 76,139
- High school students: 421,233
- Community college students: 12,872
- Not specified by grade level: 9,736

CSU Student Interns/Tutors/Mentors: 6,274
A total of 2,062 CSU students served as tutors in the Precollegiate Academic Development Program. An additional 4,155 CSU students also served as tutors in the Educational Opportunity Grant Program, College Readiness Program, Summer Bridge, MESA, Upward Bound, Talent Search, Collaborative Academic Preparation Initiative, and other campus academic development programs.

CSU Faculty Participants: 1,176

K-12 Teachers: 6,145

CSU academic preparation programs have a distinct mission and clientele targeting different students at various points in the educational pipeline. The College Readiness Program provides support services to raise aspirations and increase retention of middle school students; the University Student Academic Development program advises high school students about courses needed to meet admission requirements and helps them acquire English and mathematics skills needed to succeed in college; Summer Bridge provides a residential instructional program for admitted at-risk students the summer before they begin their university studies; the Educational Opportunity Program and Faculty Mentoring Program provide retention services to students after they enroll in university courses; and the Graduate Equity Fellowship program provides grant and academic support to encourage students to pursue graduate education.

Programs that offer financial assistance, such as the Future Scholars Program, provide incentives for students to raise their academic aspirations and performance in high school college preparatory courses. Programs that provide retention services, such as faculty mentoring, complement student academic preparation services by ensuring student support services will be available as they progress in their baccalaureate studies. Each of these programs plays a critical role in advancing access and retention of students who are disadvantaged educationally and economically.

As California's population becomes more diverse, CSU systemwide offices and campuses continue to develop student academic preparation strategies that reach students from diverse backgrounds and experiences. While outreach programs increase students' knowledge and awareness of college entrance requirements, successful student academic preparation efforts challenge and motivate students to improve their academic performance, provide hope to those who are financially disadvantaged, lift student expectations, and inspire them to consider professional careers. The challenge is to attract all students—high achievers and late bloomers, urban and rural, low income and affluent, first generation college-goers, those with socioeconomically disadvantaged backgrounds, multicultural and English as a Second Language students, and adult learners.
**Indicator 6.2:** For each university, the percentage of regularly eligible students who are fully prepared in mathematics and English composition.

The joint efforts of K-12 and the CSU are beginning to improve the preparedness of freshmen, particularly in mathematics.

![Preparedness of Freshman for College Level Mathematics and English]

### 7. Remediation

**Indicator 7.1:** For each university, the percentage of students requiring remediation who complete remediation within one year.

Only 32 percent of the fall 1998 regularly-admitted first-time freshmen were prepared both for college level English and mathematics when they entered the CSU. Through coursework and other activities by fall 1999, 94 percent of the returning fall 1998 regularly-admitted first-time freshmen were prepared both in English and mathematics. The CSU is pleased with the efforts and priority that CSU campuses have placed on quickly bringing nearly all freshmen up to basic college-level proficiency levels.
In fall 1999, 37 percent of all regularly-admitted first-time freshmen were prepared both in English and in mathematics. Next cycle’s chart will contain follow-up information on the fall 1999 freshman class’ preparedness in English and mathematics, one year later.

8. Facilities utilization

To meet growing enrollment pressure, the CSU will expand its capacity by using existing facilities more effectively. Strategies to accomplish this include the fuller use of yearly, monthly, and weekly calendars and schedules, and the use of on-line instruction where educationally and qualitatively appropriate.

Indicator 8.1: For each university, the percentage of course enrollments occurring on Fridays, weekends, and summers in “lecture and laboratory space in” main campus physical facilities and the percentage not requiring “lecture and laboratory space” physical facilities.
The CSU taught 273,397 CY FTES of instruction in 1998-1999, and 54 percent of it took place on Mondays through Thursdays before 4 p.m. in lecture rooms and laboratories during the regular academic year (fall and spring semesters or fall, winter, and spring quarters) and 26 percent took place on Mondays through Thursday after 4 p.m. Friday instruction comprises only 8 percent of the total.

About 7 percent of instruction during the academic year takes place on the main campus in facilities other than lecture rooms and laboratories. This “other AY FTES” tends to be independent study where an individual faculty member and student meet in the faculty office, or physical education classes that meet outdoors or in non-lecture/laboratory space.

Campuses currently are reporting that 3 percent of instruction is taking place off-site, in K-12 schools (teacher preparation supervisions), hospitals (nursing clinical practice), community storefronts (to meet the needs of targeted students), and through technology (e.g., internet courses, televised classes beamed to homes) in 1998-1999 only 2 percent of instruction took place during state-supported summer terms, and 1 percent through experimentation with state-supported weekend and intersession lecture and laboratory classes.

By summer 2001, the CSU expects that campuses will be providing data that will allow the determination of how much of the off-site instruction (about 7,500 CY FTES) is attributable to the use of instructional technologies. Expansion in this category is important as it substitutes for new lecture rooms and laboratories.

9. University advancement

To provide support for educational excellence, the CSU will continue to seek funding through private contributions.

Indicator 9.1: For each university, an annual Voluntary Support Report with indicators for funds raised via alumni/ae, parents, other individuals, foundations, and corporations. This report will include the number of alumni/ae records, alumni/ae solicited, and alumni/ae donors in fund-raising programs.
Over the last three years, $643,135,770 has been raised in voluntary revenue through campus fund raising and private support. Voluntary support over the last three years breaks down as follows:

1996-97  $173,191,780  
1997-98  $237,435,229  
1998-99  $232,508,761

**Indicator 9.2:** For each university, an annual Special Revenues Report with indicators for funds raised via sponsorships, bequests and revocable trusts, pledges, contracts, grants, property transfers, and endowment income.

Special revenue has remained consistently strong for three consecutive years. Results from special revenues total $1,444,814,936 and break down as follows:

1996-97  $406,237,529  
1997-98  $410,477,690  
1998-99  $628,099,717

**Indicator 9.3:** For each university, an annual report on alumni/ae participation as measured by formal membership in the alumni/ae association and alumni/ae program activity.

Fiscal year 1999-00 is the first year that dues-paying membership in alumni associations has been a systemwide objective. By the end of the fiscal year, twelve campuses had previously established dues-paying programs, eleven had implemented programs during the year, and two campuses were initiating plans to implement dues-paying programs in the next year. Campuses reported nearly 2 million alumni of record with approximately 80 percent of those having valid addresses.

Alumni programming among campuses was extensive and varied in response to the uniqueness of each campus and the advancement priorities of the president. Each campus sponsored major events to showcase its accomplishments and keep the alumni connected and committed.

**Indicator 9.4:** For each university, a goal to raise in private funds a sum equal to or greater than 10 percent of the university net general fund allocation.

The number of CSU campuses achieving fund raising goals of 10 percent has increased steadily from year to year. Over the last three years, campuses achieving this goal:

1996-97  12 campuses  
1997-98  14 campuses  
1998-99  18 campuses

Unaudited figures for fiscal year 1999-00 project that 18 campuses will achieve their 10 percent goal.
Periodic Performance Areas and Indicators (10-13)

Performance areas 10 through 13 will be addressed by the submission of a report from each campus on a four-year cycle. Performance area 10 will be the subject of a report in the year 2000, performance area 11 in 2001, performance area 12 in 2002, performance area 13 in 2003, etc. Eventually, each report will cover the four-year period since the prior report on that performance area. Initially, the first report on performance area 10 need cover only the preceding year, the first report on performance area 11 need cover only the preceding two years, and the first report on performance area 12 need cover only the preceding three years. Campuses should develop their own formats for these reports including selection of indicators to be used. Indicators included below for each performance area are only examples.

10. Quality of graduate and post-baccalaureate programs

The CSU will continue its commitment to provide education beyond the baccalaureate as an essential component of its mission through lifelong learning, graduate degree programs, and professional certification.

Many CSU graduate programs have attained national recognition for their overall quality. While some graduate programs are general discipline-based programs that might be found on a major university campus anywhere in the country, many of our graduate programs are specifically created to fulfill particular educational, community, or job-market needs.

These programs are geared towards ensuring that the knowledge gained through programs of study is consonant with the expectations and demands of an ever-changing society. These programs must either prepare students to succeed immediately in a professional work environment or complete and excel in doctoral education.

Quality is of paramount importance. There are many ways through which CSU institutions ensure the quality of their graduate and postbaccalaureate programs: surveys, analyses of data, external evaluations, and student placement and performance.

Compared to the undergraduate population in the CSU, the number of graduate students is sufficiently small to make survey methods practicable and useful. Most campuses survey their graduate and postbaccalaureate students when they exit the program to ascertain levels of satisfaction; some campuses follow up with students at a later date, when they are employed, to get feedback on preparation for the job. Some institutions survey the employers.

All campuses use internal data to make necessary adjustments to graduate programs. Because graduate programs are smaller and comparatively more expensive than upper- and lower-division programs, analyses of data are key to the health of the programs. Institutions look at indicators like these: the quality of applicants, the selectivity of programs in admitting applicants, the desirability of programs as reflected in actual student enrollments, the rigor of admission requirements, program size, number of graduate level courses offered per year, number of courses restricted to graduate students only, number of graduates per year, time to degree, and graduation rates.
In addition to this internal information, CSU campuses seek out external evaluations. Nearly every program undergoes a rigorous five-year program review, and most review committees include external reviewers. Many professional programs have special accreditations from external agencies like the National League for Nursing or the American Association of Colleges and Schools of Business. On some campuses, a common measure of quality is that if a program is eligible for accreditation, it should be accredited. Another way in which external evaluators play a role in ensuring quality programs in the CSU is through the issuance of professional licensures and credentials. Almost all CSU campuses examine pass rates of their graduates on these statewide and national exams.

CSU campuses also gauge the quality of their programs by looking at student placement and performance. How many achieved appropriate positions in their fields? How many published in professional journals or made presentations at professional meetings? How many graduates were admitted to and completed doctoral programs?

Finally, given the nature and mission of the CSU, our institutions carefully scrutinize how well graduate programs are serving their region and whether the applicant pools and graduates reflect the diversity of California.
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