

# **Committee on Educational Policy**

## **Item 1: Report on Accountability**

### ***Slide 2***

Principle 9 of Cornerstones 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 Accountability Process was developed to provide for this reporting. Reports were to go from the campuses and from the system as a whole to the Trustees, and from the CSU System to the State.

Indicators for reporting were to be important and understandable, and campus reports were intended to show progress and be used for continuous improvement—not to be used as bases for comparison among and between campuses.

### ***Slide 3***

This is the fourth biennial report to this Board, and reports on 2004-2005 data.

### ***Slide 4***

As established by the Accountability Process, reports were to consider nine significant indicators, as shown on this slide.

The campus reports have been compiled in a single, rather thick volume that has been provided. Today, I want to provide a summary of the information that is contained in your agendas, on the CSU's overall performance on each of these nine indicators.

### ***Slide 5***

There's important context to consider our performance in each of these areas. For Indicator 1 (Program Quality), we should be concerned with the importance of "demonstrated learning" as a basic principle of Cornerstones, but we need also to be cognizant of the expectations that WASC holds that institutions establish a "culture of evidence." Equally relevant are the recent holdings and recommendations of the Spellings Commission, as well as expectations of the several professional accrediting associations that accredit the CSU's professional programs.

### ***Slide 6***

Progress has been good on "Program Quality." The campuses have made the best progress in individual degree programs—especially in professional disciplines; all baccalaureate degree programs have designated learning outcomes—but we still have work to do in the area of assessing General Education. Accordingly, our campuses are experimenting with some of the leading national measures of engagement in learning and baccalaureate outcomes.

### ***Slide 7***

Indicator 2, Access, is central to the CSU's mission as defined within the California Master Plan, but must be addressed within the context of impaction on a number of CSU campuses.

### ***Slide 8***

This indicator is measured in several ways: by numbers of applicants admitted, numbers of eligible students not admitted (which is what impaction leads to), and numbers of non-admitted eligible students who were eventually admitted to another campus other than their campus of choice.

### ***Slide 9***

This slide shows our performance on these three measures with respect to Community College transfers, from 2000-2001 through 2004-2005. The number of admitted transfers has increased in this period by nearly 30 percent—to almost 70,000 students. In the same period, the number of eligible upper-division transfer students from CCC who were denied admission because of impaction has increased from 1,900 to just over 3,200—but 1,200 of those students were admitted to another CSU campus.

Performance on “Access” with respect to CCC transfers has been good, despite the ever-increasing pressures of higher numbers of applications.

### ***Slide 10***

Similarly, the numbers of freshman applicants admitted and of eligible freshman applicants who were not admitted have both increased in this period—again, due to pressures of ever-higher numbers of applications for seats in CSU campuses. The number of admitted freshmen has increased by about 38 percent—from 106,500 to nearly 146,000. At the same time, the number of eligible freshman applicants who have been turned away from impacted campuses has risen from just below 11,000 to over 25,000. On a positive note, however, about 70 percent of those denied eligible students have been admitted to another CSU campus.

### ***Slide 11***

To summarize the CSU's performance on the Access indicator: we have had rapidly increasing numbers of applications, admissions, and enrolled students. “Impaction” of campuses has resulted in turning away about 5% of eligible transfer students and 13% of eligible freshman applicants—but a considerable proportion of those students have been admitted to another CSU campus, other than their campus of choice.

### ***Slide 12***

Indicator 3, Progression to Degree, needs to be considered in the context of focused national attention on first-year retention—because of its importance to ultimate graduation rates—and concern with the length of time that students take to achieve their degree. If students take longer than necessary to graduate, they are, in effect, taking spaces that new students could occupy—thus creating a “pipeline” problem.

### **Slide 13**

This table shows first-year retention—or continuation—rates for both freshman (black lines) and CCC transfers (light yellow lines). As you can see, transfer retention has been essentially flat—but at a high rate (between 82 and 84 percent), while freshman retention has shown a gradual upward trend—from 79 percent in 1998-1999 to 82 percent in 2004-2005.

### **Slide 14**

This table shows average units completed by freshmen and upper-division students, respectively, as they progress toward the baccalaureate. What it shows is that transfer students progress toward their degrees about as efficiently as do native first-time freshmen in the CSU. Still, as the report in your agenda points out, the absolute values of the indicators raise questions about whether both groups of students are progressing as quickly and efficiently as they might—since both groups average over 70 units to graduation in the last half of their baccalaureate program.

Even recognizing that changes of major and student choices to take minors and double majors may increase the number of units needed to graduate, this is an area that still merits attention on our campuses as we concern ourselves with measures of student success.

### **Slide 15**

Again, to summarize the CSU's performance on the indicator, Progress to Degree, there has been steady increase in retention/ continuation of first-time freshmen, which reflects the investments our campuses are making in dealing with their first-time students; flat—but high—rates of continuation for transfer students; a steady reduction in the average units completed by upper-division students—but still some room for improvement.

The Trustees' "Facilitating Graduation" initiative is designed to address this issue.

### **Slide 16**

Graduation Rates, our fourth indicator, has been a major focus of attention for the CSU as it has been nationally. Still, as context, we need to realize that in our system, the high number of part-time and non-traditional students will necessarily result in longer time-to-graduation than many universities should expect. Therefore, it makes sense to look at our performance with three different types of students: traditional, full-time students; persistent part-time students (who carry course loads over four years at a pace that should result in graduation in six years); and partial-load, stop-out students (whose pattern is sporadic, and thus who may be expected to take a longer time to graduate).

### **Slide 17**

First, though, let's look at the overall graduation rates for all types of freshmen and transfers.

This slide shows graduation rates for the most recent cohort of first-time freshmen, for which such rates can be calculated. 47 percent of this cohort graduated from the campus of origin with six years, and we estimate that 56 percent will graduate, eventually, from

their campus of origin (62 percent will eventually graduate from some campus in the CSU).

### ***Slide 18***

This table shows the six-year graduation rates for first-time freshmen, for cohorts beginning in fall 1993, through the most recent cohort, that of fall 1999. The 47 percent rate for the fall 1999 cohort clearly represents a gain—albeit a slow and steady one—over earlier freshman cohorts.

### ***Slide 19***

Similarly, the percentage of first-time freshmen who ultimately graduate from their campus of origin shows a generally upward trend, but very gradual, for freshmen entering between fall 1993 and fall 1999.

### ***Slide 20***

This next table shows the ultimate graduation rate of first-time freshmen from any campus within the CSU. As you can see, the figure has been fairly flat—rising from 59 percent for the entering class of 1993 to 62 percent for the most recent two freshman cohorts. While these figures are not cause for alarm, they do suggest that the “Facilitating Graduation” initiative is well-timed. The CSU’s graduation rates are not alarming when measured against peer institutions—but we need to do much better.

### ***Slide 21***

For transfer students, graduation rates are better than for CSU’s native freshmen. As this table shows, 53 percent graduate within three years, but a full 73% will eventually graduate from their campus of origin—a figure that is 17 percent higher than that for native CSU freshmen. Another 3 percent will graduate from some other CSU campus.

### ***Slide 22***

To summarize our progress on this important indicator, then: graduation rates for first-time freshmen range from 68 percent for those who are traditional full-time students (comparable to rates for the nation’s more selective public institutions) to a lower figure of 41 percent for persistent part-time students (this figure is comparable to other comprehensive institutions).

For community college transfers, who are much more likely than freshmen to take full-time loads, the graduation rate for full-time students is high: 71 percent. While it is lower (only 50 percent) for persistent part-time students, the overall, ultimate graduation rate for transfer students is a fairly healthy 71 percent.

### ***Slide 23***

This slide is here simply to make the point that the Trustees’ “Facilitating Graduation Initiative” is well designed to address these trends—including providing strong support for first-year students, roadmaps for their progress toward degree, and other supports that are likely to smooth the way to graduation. Our campuses remain focused, of course, on these actions to facilitate graduation—as a later report this morning will illuminate.

## **Slide 24**

We need not look today at Indicator 5, Areas of Special State Need. This is because the State's expectation for purposes of accountability was that the CSU increase the number of K-12 teachers prepared. This goal was met, and reported on, in the last biennial report.

Let's look at Indicators 6 and 7 together: Helping K-12 Students Enter the CSU Proficient in English and Math, and Remediation, respectively. Performance on these indicators needs to be considered within the context of the Board's stated goal that 90 percent of entering students will be proficient by fall 2007.

As was indicated in the last regular report to the Board on remediation—in March 2006—we are not going to achieve this ambitious goal, for many reasons with which we're all familiar.

## **Slide 25**

This table repeats data presented to the Board last March, showing that by fall 2004, we were already significantly behind the Board's goals for both Math and English proficiency—and the 90 percent goal in each for fall 2007 appears to be out of reach.

## **Slide 26**

To repeat the data shared with the Board in that last report on Remediation, figures for first-time freshman proficiency in English have risen only very gradually—from 53 percent for the class entering in 1998, to 55 percent in fall 2005. In Math, the figures show a sharper rise—from 46 percent in 1998 to 64 percent in 2005—but this includes a revision of "Math proficiency" in 2002 that was more realistic, and more achievable, by entering freshmen.

## **Slide 27**

As members of the Board well know, the CSU is actively engaged with K-12 to address the problem of too-few students being proficient in English and Math. The key initiative in this regard is the Early Assessment Program (EAP).

This is an opportune moment to catch the Board up on the final results of the 2006 administration of the EAP in English and Math. As these figures show, more and more students are taking advantage of this opportunity to receive an "early signal" on their college-readiness. In 2006, 210,000—about 50 percent of all juniors who took the CST—received scores on the English EAP—up about 15 percent from one year ago. Similarly, the numbers of students taking and receiving scores on EAP Math were up by about 12 percent—from 119,000 in 2005 to 134,000 (about 70 percent of eligible students) in 2006.

The proficiency rate in English remained low—about 23% (compared to 23.5 percent a year earlier). In Math, the rate is far better—but remember, these are the students who have completed Algebra II: 55 percent demonstrated proficiency in 2006, compared to 55 percent in 2005.

To remind you, the “early signal” allows students to take advantage of one or more paths to preparation in their senior year: either the Expository Reading and Writing Course or “English Success” web site in English, or the “Math Success” website in Math.

### **Slide 28**

As this slide shows—and again, repeating information shared with the Board last March—the CSU is doing a very good job of remediating those students who enter as non-proficient: a full 84 percent of freshmen who entered in fall 2004 needing remediation were successfully remediated within one year.

Again, if the 12<sup>th</sup> grade experiences that are being designed for students who don’t demonstrate proficiency on the EAP at the end of their 11<sup>th</sup> grade work as well as we hope, perhaps we can replicate this rate of success in preparing students in the 12<sup>th</sup> grade to be college-ready.

### **Slide 29**

Indicator 8, Facilities Utilization, is related to the goal of access—designed at a time when “Tidal Wave II” predictions suggested that the CSU would not have room for the eligible students who would be seeking admission unless we made better use of our facilities. By “better use” was meant: stretching out schedules to include Fridays and weekends; going to state-supported summer terms, or what we call YRO; engaging in more off-site instruction; and increasing the use of technology in instruction.

### **Slide 30**

While not as much progress has been made in some of these areas as we might have hoped—particularly in the area of technology-mediated instruction and “flexible scheduling” through the seven-day week—still, “non-traditional” instruction, as measured in FTES, increased between 1998-1999 and 2004-2005, by about 24 percent.

Most of this increase was because of more frequent offering of courses in the evening, and on Fridays and weekends and during term breaks; another 20 percent was due to the initiation of state-supported summer instruction, or YRO.

Campuses continue to expand into these “non-traditional” areas and modes of instruction. This year, for example, we will be moving far more energetically into the area of on-line course and degree development. Such ventures may well produce further gains in the area of “non-traditional” instruction.

### **Slide 31**

This table summarizes progress in these areas.

### **Slide 32**

Indicator 9, Advancement, has become even more important over the years since adoption of Cornerstones. Our compacts with successive governors have resulted in more stable funding expectations, but have essentially funded only enrollment growth and compensation. Many other high-priority needs, such as libraries, technology, and deferred maintenance, have also been funded, but not sufficiently. What is clear is that

any “margin of excellence” that the CSU seeks to achieve will not be achieved by state funds alone; advancement, therefore, is a key to the CSU’s achieving its academic goals.

### ***Slide 33***

As noted in the report in the agenda, the CSU has met its goal of achieving a level of private giving that is equal to 10 percent or more of state funding in every year since adoption of the Accountability Process. Over \$200 million per year has been coming into our campuses over this period.

Importantly—and as a suggestion of future potential in this area—alumni involvement has also been steadily increasing. Formal membership in alumni associations has grown by almost 30 percent in these years, and the numbers of “addressable alumni” has risen to over 2.1 million—a 45 percent increase from the base year. These are very positive indicators.

More detailed information on external support may be found at the System website:

<http://www.calstate.edu/UA>

### ***Slide 34***

This concludes the fourth biennial Accountability report. As already mentioned, campus-level data may be found in the accompanying Campus Accountability report. Full supporting information can be found on the website indicated here.