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CSU Accountability

- Established in 1999
- Three Levels
  * Campus to Trustees
  * System (aggregated campuses) to Trustees
  * System to State Government (Partnership)
- Focus on Performance, Improvement Goals, and Progress over Time
CSU Accountability

- Biennial Reporting within the System
- Useful and Understandable Performance Indicators
  - Nine Common Performance Indicators and Measures
  - Five Campus-Based Indicators (Flexible Reporting)
Second Biennial Report to the Board of Trustees

- Campus Improvement Goals Set for 2002-2003 and 2004-2005
  * Individual Campus Reports
  * Systemwide Summary
Indicator 1

Program Quality: Outcomes and Assessment

- Cornerstones
- WASC Accreditation
- National Emphasis
  * ACE
  * Federal
  * Disciplines (Engineering, Business, Teacher)
Program Quality: CSU Progress

- Outcomes and Assessment Systems
  * Outcomes, assessments, assurance process by 2003
  * Variable progress to date
- CSU a National Leader
- Integrated into CSU Program Review
- GWAR (Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement)
Indicator 2

Access to the CSU

- Central CSU Mission
- Enrollment Pressure and Impaction
  * New Challenges for the CSU
  * Need for Enrollment Management
  * BoT Policies and Priorities Refined
    ~ Local Priority
    ~ Need for Inclusive and Timely System and Campus Management Policies
Access to the CSU

- Increased Need to Monitor Access
- Three CSU Indicators of Access – Revised to Include Impaction Indicators
  - Applicants Admitted
  - Eligible Applicants Not Admitted (Impaction)
  - Eligible Non-Admits who were Admitted to Another CSU Campus

- Freshman Admissions: 106,567
- Denied Eligible Freshman Applicants: 10,819
- Denied Eligible Freshman Applicants Admitted to Another CSU: 7,695

Upper-Division CCC Admissions: 54,884

- Denied Eligible Upper-Division CCC Applicants: 1,903
- Denied Eligible Upper-Division CCC Applicants Admitted to Another CSU: 700
Indicator 3

Progression to Degree

- Measures How Effectively Undergraduates Progress to Degree – Two Measures
  - **First Measure** -- Continuation from the First to the Second Year when Most Students Stay or Leave
  - **CSU Rates are Good** – Above National Rates for Comparable Institutions
Progression to Degree: First-Year Continuation Rates

Regularly-Admitted First-Time Freshmen
Regularly-Admitted CCC Transfers

- Fall 1998 to Fall 1999: 79% 83%
- Fall 1999 to Fall 2000: 77% 82%
- Fall 2000 to Fall 2001: 78% 84%
Progression to Degree: Units Completed By Upper-Division Students

- Second Measure – Units Completed by Upper-Division Students

- Ideally – the number of units would be half of the units required for the degree and would be similar among native and transfer students
Progression to Degree: Average Units Completed by Upper-Division Students as They Progressed to the Baccalaureate (Semester Units)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Baccalaureate Degree Recipients who Entered the CSU as Regularly-Admitted Junior CCC Transfer Students**
- **Baccalaureate Degree Recipients who Entered the CSU as Regularly-Admitted First-Time Freshmen**
Progression to Degree: Average Units Completed by Upper-Division Students as They Progressed to the Baccalaureate

- Actually – progress in reducing the gap between native freshmen and transfer students
- Actually – progress in reducing the units earned by native students
- But – units completed remain high
Indicator 4

Graduation Rates

- Improved Graduation Rates – A Top CSU Priority
- Two Ways to Measure Graduation Rates
  * All First-Time Freshmen (6 Years) and all Transfers (3 Years)
  * By Categories of Students and Their Workloads
Graduation Rates: Fall 1995 First-Time Freshmen

- 6-Year Graduation Rate at CSU Campus of Origin: 42%
- Graduation Rate at CSU Campus of Origin: 53%
- Graduation Rate within the CSU: 60%
Graduation Rates: Fall 1995
First-Time Freshmen

- Fall 95 Cohort Rate 42% -- Increase from Fall 93 Cohort Rate of 39%
- Estimate 53% will Graduate from Campus of Origin
- Estimate 60% will Graduate from CSU
Graduation Rates: Fall 1995 First-Time Freshmen – Rates by Workload Categories

Traditional Full-Time (24% of FTF)

*30% in four years
*66% in six years
*70% from original campus and 77% from CSU
*Compared with public selective 6-year rates
*But, why only 30% in four years?
Graduation Rates: Fall 1995 First-Time Freshmen – Rates by Workload Categories

Persistent Part-Time (69% of FTF)

* 38% in six years
* Similar to other comprehensive universities
* 49% from original campus and 57% from CSU
* Why are many taking longer than six years?
Graduation Rates: Fall 1995 First-Time Freshmen – Rates by Workload Categories

- Partial Load/ Stop Out (7% of FTF)
  - *5% in six years
  - *25% from original campus and 30% from CSU
Graduation Rates: Fall 1998
CCC Junior Transfers

- 3-Year Graduation Rate at Campus of Origin: 51%
- Graduation Rate at Campus of Origin: 73%
- Graduation Rate within the CSU: 76%
Graduation Rates: Fall 1998 CCC Junior Transfers – Rates by Workload Categories

- Traditional Full-Time (38% of CCC)
  * 39% in two years
  * 70% within three years

- Persistent Part-Time (47% of CCC)
  * 50% within three years
  * Up from 46% from fall 1996 baseline cohort

- Partial Load/Stop Out (15% of CCC)
  * 10% within three years
  * Up from 8% from fall 1996 baseline cohort
Indicator 5
Special State Needs – Teacher Preparation

- The CSU Prepares 56% of Annual New Teachers
- Partnership Goal Established in 1999
  Baseline 1998-1999 – 8,754 credentials
  2002-2003 Goal – 11,461 credentials
Special State Needs – Teacher Preparation

- On Track to Meet Goal
- Differential Expectations of Campuses

### Indicator 6
#### Relations with K-12: Number of Persons Involved in CSU Outreach Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-12 Students</td>
<td>562,306</td>
<td>459,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12 Teachers</td>
<td>6,145</td>
<td>9,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Students</td>
<td>6,274</td>
<td>6,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Faculty</td>
<td>1,176</td>
<td>794</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relations with K-12: Outreach Outcomes – Helping K-12 Students Enter CSU Proficient in English and in Mathematics

- Collaborative Academic Preparation Initiative (CAPI)
- Reading Initiatives
- Early Assessment
Indicator 7
Remediation: Successful Remediation – within One Year – of Students who were Not Fully Prepared in English and Mathematics at Entry

- Fall 2000 – 20,890 Freshmen Needed Remediation
- Fall 2001 – 16,959 (81%) Fully Remediated
Indicator 8
Facilities Utilization: CSU Goal – Expand Capacity by Using Existing Facilities More Effectively


- Off-site (excludes CPEC approved off campus centers)
- Distance Learning
- Summer Annualized FTES
- Weekends and Term Breaks AY FTES (except Summer Break)
- Friday AY Lecture/Lab AY FTES
- Monday-Thursday AY Lecture/Lab Facilities FTES after 4 p.m.
Facilities Utilization

- From 1998-1999 to 2000-2001 – Non-Traditional Instruction Rose from 102,566 FTES to 113,032 FTES
- Non-Traditional Instruction Grew as a Percentage of Overall Instruction from 38% to 40% Over Same Period
- Most Increase – Evenings, Fridays, Weekends and Term Breaks
- In Future – Major Increase in Summer Instruction (Most Campuses Converted to State Support in Summer 2001)
Indicator 9

University Advancement

四 Performance Indicators:
- Voluntary Support
- Special Revenues
- Membership in Alumni/ae Associations
- Private Fundraising Goals

Report to University Advancement Committee in January 2002