

**California State University
Accountability
2004 Biennial Reporting**

Campus Summaries

2004

Sacramento								
Performance Area and Indicator††	Performance for 1998-99	Performance for 1999-00	Performance for 2000-01	Performance for 2001-02	Performance for 2002-03	Goals for CY 2002-03	Goals for CY 2004-05	Goals for CY 2006-07
6 Relations with K-12 (Some schools, students, and faculty may be involved in more than one program, and so they may be counted more than once)	CY 1999-2000	CY 1999-2000	CY 2000-2001	CY 2001-2002	CY 2002-2003			
6.1 The number of each of the following involved in outreach efforts								
(a) CSU faculty involved	63	63	20	6	17	85	Not applicable	Not applicable
(b) CSU students involved	156	156	473	553	596	475	Not applicable	Not applicable
(c) K-12 schools involved	201	201	474	309	506	240	Not applicable	Not applicable
(d) K-12 students involved	14,933	14,933	14,006	15,152	22,651	16,800	Not applicable	Not applicable
6.2 Fully prepared new freshmen**	Fall 1998 entering class	Fall 1999 entering class	Fall 2000 entering class	Fall 2001 entering class	Fall 2002 entering class			
(a) Mathematics	44.00%	45.00%	50.03%	47.62%	58.90%	52.00%	55.50%	58.00%
(b) English	58.00%	47.00%	48.83%	50.89%	45.10%	50.00%	45.50%	50.00%
7 Remediation	Fall 1998 to Fall 1999	Fall 1999 to Fall 2000	Fall 2000 to Fall 2001	Fall 2001 to Fall 2002	Fall 2002 to Fall 2003			
7.1 Remediated within 1 year**	84.00%	84.00%	84.00%	85.00%	86.00%	85.00%	87.00%	87.00%
8 Facilities utilization	CY 1998-1999	CY 1999-2000	CY 2000-2001	CY 2001-2002	CY 2002-2003			
8.1 State-supported course annual FTES occurring via the main campus:								
(a) Evenings (after 4 pm)	3,700.80	3,702.20	3,913.20	4,279.30	4,596.30	4,700.00	4,800.00	5,100.00
(b) Fridays	1,165.20	1,179.90	1,175.10	1,215.40	1,798.10	1,700.00	1,700.00	1,900.00
(c) Weekends and term breaks (except summer break)	130.3	178.6	232.6	598.4	367.6	240	300	315
(d) Summers	0	75.2	187.3	524.8	865.5	580	0	770
(e) Distance learning****	Not available	Not available	Not available	187.3	66.3	Not available	65	70
(f) Off-site (excludes CPEC approved off campus centers)	1,154.90	1,214.40	1,390.20	1,047.20	1,049.90	1,530.00	1,100.00	1,200.00
(g) Overall non-traditional course offerings (formula: Add sub-indicators a through f)	6,151.20	6,350.30	6,898.40	7,852.40	8,743.70	8,620.00	7,965.00	9,355.00
(h) Overall instruction in the college year	18,259.30	18,873.50	19,888.10	21,175.10	22,393.30	21,820.00	22,080.00	23,180.00
(i) Percentage of non-traditional instruction (formula: g divided by h)	34%	34%	35%	37%	39%	40%	36%	40%
(j) Number of CPEC-approved off-campus centers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8.2 State-supported course annual FTES occurring via CPEC-approved center [Specify name of and report each CPEC-approved center]	CY 1998-1999	CY 1999-2000	CY 2000-2001	CY 2001-2002	CY 2002-2003			
(a) Evenings (after 4 pm)	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
(b) Fridays	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
(c) Weekends and term breaks (except summer break)	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
(d) Summers	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
(e) Distance learning****	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
(f) Off-site (excludes CPEC approved off campus centers)	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
(g) Overall non-traditional course offerings (formula: Add sub-indicators a through f)	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
(h) Overall instruction in the college year	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
(i) Percentage of non-traditional instruction (formula: g divided by h)	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
9 University advancement	FY 1998-1999	FY 1999-2000	FY 2000-2001	FY 2001-2002	FY 2002-2003			
9.1 Charitable gifts	\$7,979,601	\$7,898,310	\$7,418,816	\$5,455,407	\$14,736,292	\$10,512,000	\$14,976,658	\$15,425,958
9.2 Special revenues	\$46,791,474	\$61,224,000	\$58,173,644	\$80,956,243	\$56,532,822	\$56,002,000	\$61,000,000	\$65,000,000
9.3 Alumni participation								
(a) Formal association membership***	4,452	4,452	4,394	4,690	4,692	5,989	4,935	5,280
(b) Total addressable alumni	115,267	114,615	131,443	135,104	141,600	134,000	150,779	155,302
(c) Total addressable graduates/credentials	110,738	139,936	125,648	129,330	136,102	128,000	145,173	149,528
9.4 Private fund goal	10.10%	9.00%	8.80%	7.00%	10.13%	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%
†† Performance data are provided by the Chancellor's Office, and each campus sets its own goals.								
* Data first reported for 2000-2001.								
** Regularly admitted students only.								
*** Base year data are CY 1999-2000; no prior data were collected.								
**** These data will first be available for CY 2001-2002								

2004 CAMPUS ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT

CSU, Sacramento

October 15, 2004

Introduction.

The purpose of this report is to provide revised performance goals for 2004/05 and new performance goals for 2006/07, along with brief rationales for those goals. In most areas we have also attempted to analyze historical trends and identify key factors that have contributed to or hindered our progress.

1. Quality of Baccalaureate Degree Programs.

Indicator 1.2: A brief summary of campus academic program reviews, broadly characterizing assessment results and describing how those results have been used to improve teaching, learning, and the programs that were reviewed.

General Education

California State University has over 400 courses in the five General Education areas. The development of a useful, widely accepted and fair assessment program has taken four years. In 2000-2001 the Faculty Senate approved the creation of a task force to develop expected outcomes for each GE area. The General Education Area Coordinator Task Force was convened by the Faculty Coordinator of Assessment. The General Education Area Coordinator Task Force worked to develop outcomes for each of the General Education areas and for the CSUS graduation requirements. Faculty were widely consulted to encourage ownership and acceptance of draft outcomes. Pilot studies were conducted in each area to test the assessment of area outcomes. In spring, 2002, the General Education Policies/Graduation Requirements Committee and the Faculty Senate approved the outcomes.

The Faculty Senate approved General Education "Assessment Policy and Procedures" in April of 2002 and these were modified by Senate vote in May of 2004. Departments must submit a course syllabus and an assessment plan which describes the strategies used to assess each outcome or group of outcomes for the GE Area, to the Director of General Education. The format is not mandated, but sample assessment plans and sample reporting forms are provided to each Department. Departmental Program reviews will include questions which draw on the data obtained from the assessment plans in each department. The data from all departments in the various GE areas will be summarized by the Director of General Education, and the General Education Policies/Graduation Requirements Committee will draw conclusions and make suggestions.

As of summer 2004, more than half of the courses offered in the General Education Program have approved assessment plans and are collecting data. Most of the departments involved report that the process of developing plans has drawn the department faculty into many productive discussions. Some departments had not discussed the learning outcomes expected in their classes for many years. Departments found that multi-section courses needed to be better monitored for compliance to standard goals. Some departments took specific steps to improve coordination between multi-section GE class and the campus expectations. In 6 instances the assessment process found courses that were unable to show conformance with the expected General Education Learning Outcomes; these courses were removed from the program. Several courses needed to be adjusted in order to accomplish the expected goals. In general the process has significantly raised the campus awareness of and involvement in the General Education Program.

Majors

In February 2004, the CSUS Faculty Senate approved program review self-study guidelines for program assessment. These guidelines require program self-studies to include three levels of assessment: 1) a statement of mission, goals, and learning objectives; 2) two indirect and one direct measure of the learning objectives; and 3) reflection, discussion, and conclusions based on assessment results. Currently, all CSUS departments have an assessment plan, although the degree to which the plans have been implemented varies. During the 2003-2004 Academic Year, the entire College of Engineering received re-accreditation from ABET, and the Department of Graphic Design was reaccredited by NASAD. An additional 28 of our departments are also accredited by external agencies.

In addition to program review assessment, all departments are asked to submit an annual assessment report to Academic Affairs. Beginning in 2002-2003, a summary of these reports was posted to the Academic Affairs website and can be accessed at www.csus.edu/acaf/Assessment/why.stm. In 2002-2003, all but six of our 50 departments filed reports. In 2003-2004 all but two departments submitted a report.

Because most of our programs are finally drawing data and reporting results, we are beginning to aggregate the results and observe some trends both within and across colleges. The following conclusions represent our most apparent trends:

- Graduating students excel in some or most content areas in their major.

Almost all departments report a satisfactory level of achievement in learning outcomes related to the content of the major. In addition, most departments report that students excel in at least one or two of the department's content-specific learning outcomes.

- Students' writing improves over their academic career, but not enough.

Across the disciplines, writing emerges as a universal topic of concern. Almost all departments are working on this area in one way or another. For example, some have sought help from our

Reading and Writing Coordinator for their faculty; others have developed peer tutoring programs. In general, most departments report that student writing improves over a student's college experience. However, many students continue to have problems with writing even up to the time of graduation. There is a general sense that students need focused work on the practical application of writing, particularly writing in a specific discipline.

- Student deficiencies in math have a great impact on performance in the major and progress toward graduation in engineering and scientific fields.

Many departments report that transfer students often enter CSUS with deficiencies in math. When these students go into scientific fields their time to degree is greatly increased because of the need for remediation. Also, it appears that the math preparation of native students is significantly better than that of transfer students.

- Students have difficulty integrating what they have learned within and across disciplines.

Across the disciplines many departments report that students have difficulty integrating knowledge. The sciences report that students have trouble using their mathematical knowledge to solve problems in their scientific field. A number of departments also report that students have difficulties in integrating the knowledge from one course in a major to another course in the same major. This finding indicates a need for general discussions on both instruction and curricular organization.

2. Access to the CSU

2.1 Admits.

- (a) The number of first-time freshmen admitted to CSU, Sacramento has increased steadily from 3,988 in 2000/01 to an estimated 5,900 in 2003/04, mainly because of the increasing number of CSU-eligible high school graduates in the Sacramento area. Based on numbers for F'04 and estimates for S'05, the goal for 2004/05 has been revised to 6,500. The goal for 2006/07 has been set at 6,700. This is based on the assumption of no growth in 2005/06 because of the return of summer from self-support to state-support, followed by 2.5% growth in 2006/07.
- (b) The number of CCC transfers admitted to CSU, Sacramento remained relatively flat (between 4,200 and 4,600) from 2000/01 and 2003/04. The late increase in the 2004/05 campus enrollment target has caused increased recruitment efforts for S'05, with the result that the goal for 2004/05 has been revised upward to 5,725. The expectation of a more normal admission cycle and the return of summer to state-support, noted above, yield a goal for 2006/07 of 5,125 admits.

2.2 Impacted/not admitted.

CSU, Sacramento is not an impacted campus. Our only impacted programs are Clinical Nursing and Graphic Design at the upper division, but we have no record of whether any applicants for whom CSU, Sacramento was their first choice were denied admission to these programs.

3. Progression to Degree

3.1 First-year continuation rates.

- (a) The first-year continuation rates for first-time freshmen (FTF) decreased slightly from 77.2% for F'00 to F'01 to 76.3% for F'02 to F'03. Based on the efforts of our Graduation Initiative Committee and the freshman seminar program to improve FTF retention, we have set the goals for 2004/05 and 2006/07 at 78%.
- (b) The Continuation rates for CCC transfers increased from 82.6% for F'00 to F'01 to 85.0% for F'02 to F'03. Since we do not expect the effects of the new 45-15 transfer pattern to be fully realized by 2006/07, the goals for both 2004/05 and 2006/07 have been set at 85%.

3.2 Upper-division units.

- (a) The number of upper-division units completed by CCC transfers has fluctuated between 76 and 78 over the past several years, with no clear trend observed. Based on past performance, the goal for 2004/05 has been set at 77. In the hope that the 45-15 initiative will begin to have an effect on units transferred, the goal for 2006/07 has been set at 76.
- (b) The number of upper-division units completed by native FTF has fluctuated between 75 and 77 over the past several years, again with no clear trend observed. Based on past performance, the goal for 2004/05 has been set at 76. Since our major programs are continuing their efforts to streamline the curriculum, the goal for 2006/07 has been set at 75.

4. Persistence and Graduation

4.1 Graduation rates from the campus of origin.

- (a) The estimate of first-time freshmen who will eventually graduate has varied from 50.9% to 58.4% over the past five years, with no clear trend. Modest improvement is anticipated from the 54.5% observed in 2002-03, based largely on requests for proposals to improve retention of FTF from our Graduation Initiative Committee. Accordingly, the goal for 2004/05 has been set at 57% and the goal for 2006/07 at 59%.

- (b) After peaking at 74.4% in 2000-01, the estimate of CCC transfers who will eventually graduate declined slightly to 72.0% in 2002-03. The goal of 72% for 2004-05 does not anticipate improvement, but the effects of the 45-15 transfer pattern should result in modest improvement for a goal of 73% in 2006/07.

5. Areas of Special Need

5.1 First time, new-type credentials recommended by the university (excluding interns).

Based on numbers of students currently enrolled in various stages of our credential programs, the goals have been set as follows:

Area	02-03 Performance	04-05 Goals	06-07 Goals
Multiple subject	378	297	303
Single subject	148	175	175
Special education	120	160	160

The goals for multiple-subject credentials reflect a decline in enrollment from 2002/03, when 378 credentials were granted. The goals in the other two years represent significant increases from 2002/03.

6. Relations with K-12

6.2 Fully prepared new freshmen.

- (a) The level of preparation in mathematics peaked at 58.9% in fall, 2002, largely because the ELM was re-normed immediately prior to that year. Unofficial data for fall, 2003 show a decline to 55.4%, and this is reflected in the goal of 55.5% for 2004-05. The 2006-07 goal of 58.0% anticipates the impact of the CSU Early Assessment Program (EAP).
- (b) The level of preparation in English has remained in the mid-to-upper 40% range for the past four years, and the unofficial performance for fall, 2003 was 45.3%. The goal of 45.5% for 2004/05 is based on these historical trends, but anticipating the impact of the EAP, the goal for 2006/07 has been increased to 50.0%.

7. Remediation

7.1 Remediated within one year.

Because of our extensive efforts in advising and tracking EO-665 students, the rate for remediation within one year has gradually improved from 84% for F'00 to F'01 to 86% for F'02 to F'03. We expect further improvement to achieve a goal of 87% for F'04 to F'05. Since further improvement is unlikely, the goal remains at 87% for F'06 to F'07.

8. Facilities Utilization

8.1 State-supported course annual FTES occurring via the main campus. The table below contains FTES data for 2002-03 and goals for 2004-05 and 2006-07.

Area	2002-03 Performance	04-05 Goal	06-07 Goal
(a) Evening	4,596	4,800	5,100
(b) Friday	1,798	1,700	1,900
(c) Weekend	368	300	315
(d) Summer	606	0	770
(e) Distance	66	65	70
(f) Off-site	1050	1,100	1,200

- (a) Evening enrollments have trended steadily upward, since 1999-2000, mainly because of increasing overall student demand. The goals above project a continuation of these trends over the next three years.
- (b) After several years of slow growth, Friday enrollment took a sudden jump upward in fall, 2002. This was the direct result of a change in scheduling policy that took effect this fall, namely, that all three-unit lecture classes meeting in the morning must be scheduled in the three-day MWF pattern. Although official figures for 2003-04 are unavailable, a decline to 1,650 FTES was observed in fall, 2003, most likely the result of budget-related enrollment controls. The goal for fall, 2004-05 anticipates a modest recovery, followed by projected growth over the next two years.
- (c) Enrollment on weekends/term breaks increased from 233 FTES in 2000-01 to 368 FTES in 2002-03. Unofficial figures for 2003-04 show a decline to 302 FTES. The goals above anticipate a modest recovery over the next three years as enrollment growth resumes.
- (d) Enrollment in state-supported summer grew dramatically to 606 FTES in summer, 2002 and peaked at 760 FTES in summer, 2003. (Counting additional classes offered under self-support, those enrollments were 865 and 911 FTES.) Because of the budget reductions in 2004-05, all summer classes at CSUS were returned to self-support, hence the goal of zero.

(Self-support enrollment was 759 FTES.) The goal for 2006/07 assumes a return of summer to state support and modest growth.

- (e) Unofficial figures show that distance learning enrollment declined from 66 FTES in 2002-03 to 62 FTES in 2003-04. The goals above anticipate a slight recovery in 2004-05. With the increased capacity to support distance offerings provided by the opening of the new Academic Information Resources Center later this year, modest enrollment growth is projected by 2006-07.
- (f) Unofficial figures for 2003-04 indicate continued growth in off-site enrollment to 1,098 FTES. The goals above project a continuation of this trend over the next three years.

9. University Advancement

The data presented below include actual performance for 2002-03 and goals for 2004-05 and 2006-07:

Area	2002/03	04/05 goal	06/07 goal
1. Voluntary support	\$14.7 m	\$15.0 m	\$15.4 m
2. Special revenues	\$56.5 m	\$61 m	\$65 m
3. Alumni participation			
(a) Formal members	4,692	4,935	5,280
(b) Address. alums	141,600	150,799	155,302
(c) Address. grads	136,102	145,173	149,528
4. % private funds	10.1%	10.0%	10.0%

The level of voluntary support actually exceeded the CSU's stated goal of 10% of General Fund revenues in 2002/03. The goals for 2004-05 and 2006-07 are based on the assumption that the campus budget will grow in each of those years. Special revenues are somewhat unpredictable, having varied with no apparent trend from \$46.8 million to \$81.0 million over the past five years. The goals anticipate a modest increase in these revenues over the next three years. (Note: Information received from the CSUS Advancement Office indicates that special revenues will not be tracked as part of the CSU accountability process after this year.) The increases projected for alumni participation are based on a major push by Alumni Affairs to increase contact with our alumni.