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**CSU Accountability**

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

- Biennial Reporting within the System
- Useful and Understandable Performance Indicators – Nine Common Indicators across Campuses
Third Biennial Report to the Board of Trustees

- September 2000 (1998-1999 Data)
Indicator 1

Program Quality: Outcomes and Assessment

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

- CSU a National Leader
- Integrated into CSU Program Review
- Outcomes and Assessment Systems
  * 95% of baccalaureate programs have established student learning outcomes
  * 64% have completed a direct measure of, at least, one student learning outcome and have information available.
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

Upper-Division CCC Admissions

- 2000-2001: 54,884
- 2001-2002: 60,057
- 2002-2003: 59,735

Denied Eligible Upper-Division CCC Applicants

- 2000-2001: 3,250
- 2001-2002: 2,070
- 2002-2003: 1,903

Denied Eligible Upper-Division CCC Applicants Admitted to Another CSU

- 2000-2001: 1,061
- 2001-2002: 708
- 2002-2003: 676
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Regularly-Admitted First-Time Freshmen</th>
<th>Regularly-Admitted CCC Transfers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1998 to Fall 1999</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1999 to Fall 2000</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2000 to Fall 2001</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2001 to Fall 2002</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2002 to Fall 2003</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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)

- 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

- Average Units Completed by Upper-Division Students – About the Same for Transfer and Native Students
- But Units Completed Remain High
- Initiatives to Facilitate Graduation
- Compact with State on Excess Units
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 1997
First-Time Freshmen

6-Year Graduation Rate at CSU Campus of Origin: 45%
Graduation Rate at CSU Campus of Origin: 55%
Graduation Rate within the CSU: 61%
Trend of First-Time Freshman 6-Year Graduation

Fall 1993: 42%
Fall 1994: 41%
Fall 1995: 42%
Fall 1996: 44%
Fall 1997: 45%
Trend of First-Time Freshman Graduation from Campus of Origin

- Fall 1993: 53%
- Fall 1994: 52%
- Fall 1995: 53%
- Fall 1996: 54%
- Fall 1997: 55%
Trend of First-Time Freshman Graduation from the System

- Fall 1993: 59%
- Fall 1994: 58%
- Fall 1995: 60%
- Fall 1996: 60%
- Fall 1997: 61%
Graduation Rates: Fall 1997 First-Time Freshmen – Rates by Workload Categories

Traditional Full-Time (26% of FTF)
* 33% in four years – up from 28% for fall 1993 counterparts
* 69% in six years – up from 64% for fall 1993 counterparts
* 73% from original campus – up from 68% for fall 1993 counterparts
* Compares with public selective 6-year rates
* But why only 33% in four years?
Graduation Rates: Fall 1997 First-Time Freshmen – Rates by Workload Categories

 Persistent Part-Time (67% of FTF)

*39% in six years – no change from fall 1993
*Similar to other comprehensive universities
*50% from original campus -- no change from fall 1993
*Why are many taking longer than six years?
Graduation Rates: Fall 1997 First-Time Freshmen – Rates by Workload Categories

- Partial Load/ Stop Out (7% of FTF)
  - *5% in six years – no change from fall 1993
  - *25% from original campus – no change from fall 1993
Graduation Rates: Fall 2000
CCC Junior Transfers

- 3-Year Graduation Rate at Campus of Origin: 52%
- Graduation Rate at Campus of Origin: 73%
- Graduation Rate within the CSU: 76%
Graduation Rates: Fall 2000 CCC Junior Transfers – Rates by Workload Categories

✦ Traditional Full-Time (40% of CCC)
  * 39% in two years – up from 37% with 1996 counterparts
  * 73% within three years – up from 68% with 1996 counterparts

✦ Persistent Part-Time (45% of CCC)
  * 47% within three years
  * No change with 1996 counterparts

✦ Partial Load/Stop Out (15% of CCC)
  * 9% within three years
  * Up from 8% with 1996 counterparts
Facilitating Graduation

- Roadmaps to degree for students progressing at different paces
- Courses scheduled at paces preferred
- Progress-to-degree audits to improve effectiveness and efficiency
- Advisement and counseling
Indicator 5
Special State Needs – Teacher Preparation

- The CSU Prepares 59% of Annual New Teachers
- Partnership Goal Established in 1999
  - Baseline 1998-1999 – 8,745 credentials
  - 2002-2003 Goal – 11,456 credentials
Teacher Preparation – Met Goal

![Graph showing teacher preparation metrics by year and subject]
Indicator 6.1
Relations with K-12: Number of Persons Involved in CSU Outreach Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-12 Students</td>
<td>562,470</td>
<td>459,056</td>
<td>566,068</td>
<td>588,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12 Schools</td>
<td>6,145</td>
<td>5,368</td>
<td>5,719</td>
<td>7,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Students</td>
<td>7,447</td>
<td>6,257</td>
<td>7,513</td>
<td>8,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Faculty</td>
<td>1,704*</td>
<td>1,226*</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>753</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 6.2: Helping K-12 Students Enter CSU Proficient in English and in Mathematics

Percentage of Regularly-Admitted First-Time Freshmen Prepared in Mathematics
Percentage of Regularly-Admitted First-Time Freshmen Prepared in English
Trustee Fall 2004 Mathematics Goal
Trustee Fall 2004 English Goal
Trustee Fall 2007 Mathematics Goal
Trustee Fall 2007 English Goal
Relations with K-12: Early Assessment Program

- End-of-Junior-Year Assessment of Readiness for College English and Mathematics
- K-12 Professional Development in Critical Reading/Writing and Mathematics
- Senior Year Experiences in English and Mathematics
Indicator 7

Successful Remediation – within One Year – of Students who were Not Fully Prepared in English and Mathematics at Entry

- Fall 2002 – 22,278 Freshmen Needed Remediation
- Fall 2003 – 18,177 (82%) Fully Remediated

![Bar chart showing remediation rates over time]
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

- Evenings, Fridays, Weekends and Term Breaks – 52% of the Increase
- State Supported Summers – 40% of the Increase
- Technology-mediated Instruction Still Developing (2%)
Indicator 9

University Advancement

Four Performance Indicators:
* Voluntary Support – over $300 million
* Special Revenues – over $530 million
* Membership in Alumni/ae Associations
* Private Fundraising Goal – 11.9%

http://www.calstate.edu/UA/0203externalreport/index.shtml
CSU Accountability

Copies of this Powerpoint handout; the Third Biennial CSU Systemwide Accountability Report; the report of campus-specific accountability summaries, indicators & goals; and other materials related to the CSU Accountability Process are available at the following URL:

http://www.calstate.edu/AcadAff/accountability