

2006 CAMPUS ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT

CSU, Sacramento

October 20, 2006

Introduction.

The purpose of this report is to provide an assessment of whether we have or will meet our performance goals for 06/07 and to set new performance goals for 2008/09. In most areas we have also attempted to analyze historical trends and identify key factors that have contributed to or hindered our progress. This report has also been condensed to a two page summary for the C.O. The 'summary' is provided as Appendix A to this report.

1. Quality of Baccalaureate Degree Programs.

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.

Indicator 1.1 – GE Assessment - Sacramento State has 456 courses in the five General Education areas. The development of a useful, widely accepted and fair assessment program has taken six years. In 2000-2001 the Faculty Senate approved the creation of a task force to develop expected outcomes for each GE area. The Faculty Coordinator of Assessment convened the General Education Area Coordinator Task Force. The General Education Area Coordinator Task Force worked to develop outcomes for each of the General Education areas and for the Sacramento State graduation requirements. The faculty was 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 Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies. The format is not mandated, but sample assessment plans and sample report forms are provided to each Department. Departmental Program reviews include questions which draw on the data obtained from the assessment plans in each department. The University Assessment Coordinator summarizes the data from all departments in the various GE areas, and the General Education Policies/Graduation Requirements Committee draws conclusions and makes suggestions.

As of summer 2006, 71% 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 nine instances the assessment process found courses that were unable to demonstrate conformance with the expected General Education Learning Outcomes; these courses were removed from the program. Several courses required adjustments in order to accomplish the expected goals

One of the primary results of the assessment process has been to identify the need for clarification of our foreign language graduation requirement learning goals and the need to articulate information competency learning goals. Both of these areas have now been addressed. The learning goals for foreign language were the subject of substantial debate in the Faculty Senate and ultimately led to a reduction of the graduation requirement to two semesters of college language. The new information competency policy, similarly, led to debate. All majors have now reported that they are in compliance with the policy. These two new policies bring the General Education Program into alignment with our strategic plan. In general the process has significantly raised the campus awareness of and involvement in the General Education Program.

Indicator 1.2 – Major Program Assessment

As noted in our 2004 accountability report all departments have developed assessment plans. However, the sustainability of these assessment plans varies greatly. Departments with unwieldy plans are finding them difficult to implement. A review of assessment plans reveals that many have far more learning objectives than can be realistically and meaningfully evaluated by a program on an ongoing basis. In addition, changes in faculty who are responsible for assessment within each department means that often, faculty members spearheading assessment efforts are new to program assessment and unfamiliar with institutional requirements. For example, the assessment committee in one department designed an involved assessment plan that faculty refused to carry out. On the other hand, many departments have developed workable assessment plans that are sustainable and will yield meaningful information. These departments have either 1) limited the number of learning objectives identified or 2) focused on only a few critical objectives. Finally, departments with outside accrediting bodies are able to use the accrediting bodies' guidelines to direct their assessment activities thus facilitating the assessment process. Currently, 30 of our departments are accredited or seeking accreditation by outside agencies.

Results of program assessments

Departments are using such things as capstone courses, portfolios, pre test/post test, and surveys as methods for assessing student attainment of program learning objectives.

Some observations about the objectives, methods to attain them and outcomes are listed below.

- Assuring that transfer students are prepared for upper division study in a major.
 - Some departments have expressed ongoing concern that transfer students often come to Sacramento State unprepared for upper division study. One department has addressed this issue through the development of a pre-major requirement, which includes a set of courses that must be satisfactorily completed prior to entrance into the major.
- Students are achieving most targeted content learning goals in the majors.
 - Several departments use a capstone course as a means of assessing program and university learning objectives. Capstone courses are developed so that multiple sections have uniform content. Grading rubrics for a course project and pre-test, post-test were two of the methods used to assess student learning. Departments are also using portfolios and research papers as direct measures of student learning. Results indicate that students are meeting program objectives and competencies in most areas.
- Departments identify learning objectives requiring higher-level thinking and critical analysis as being more modestly met and as an area in which they are seeking improvement.
 - Departments identified areas of weakness as the ability to use critical analysis, focused and organized writing style, and integration of knowledge. One department noted that their students displayed “more interest in pragmatic courses than in the theoretical and intellectual aspects of the field.” Departments identifying these areas all have plans to meet with faculty in order to address these concerns. These plans include clarification of course assignments to ensure that competencies are addressed and assessed, re-organization of some courses and the use of exemplars of competent work.
- Students consistently give positive reports on their learning experiences.
 - Many departments use student or alumni surveys as indirect measure of attainment of learning objectives. These reports tend to be consistently favorable indicating that students feel they have mastered the learning objectives identified by their programs.

2. Access to the CSU

2.1 Admits.

- (a) The number of first-time freshmen admitted to Sacramento State has increased steadily since 2000/01 to 7,654 in 2005/06. Preliminary data for Fall 06 indicates another substantial increase to about 9,600. The increases come largely from significant increases in first-time freshmen applications and increased use of self-reported data in CSUMentor (i.e., high school subjects completed or in progress, GPA, test score), which automates the admission process. Based on the data for F'06 and estimates for S'07, we will significantly exceed the goal for 2006/07. The goal for 2008/09 has been set at 10,100. The goal for 08/09 assumes continued use of self-reported data from CSUMentor and a 2% annual increase.
- (b) Preliminary data for Fall 06 indicate about 3,700 upper division CCC transfer admits. Assuming a normal Spring 07 admission cycle, we expect to exceed our original goal for 06/07. Assuming annual increases of 3%, we have set our goal for 08/09 at 5,700.

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 retention rates for regularly admitted first-time freshmen (FTF) exceeded our goal for the F04 cohort (F04 continuing in F05) by about two percentage points. The rate from F04 to F05 was 80.3%. Unfortunately, the preliminary data for the F05 cohort shows a drop in the first year rate to 76.4%. We suspect that the lower completion rate for remedial students is one of the main reasons for the decline in the first-year continuation rate. We will retain our goal of 78% for 06/07 for the F06 cohort and feel confident that we can achieve the goal. We have set a goal of 80% for 08/09. We have implemented a number of strategies to improve retention (e.g., mandatory freshmen orientation, mandatory freshmen advising, freshmen honors program, expanded availability of freshmen learning communities and expansion of freshmen seminar opportunities). We believe the cumulative impact will be increased freshmen retention.
- (b) Preliminary data for the F05 cohort indicates a first-year retention rate of 82.1%, a slight decrease from F04. The five-year trend shows a drop of 3.6 percentage points from the F01 cohort to the F05 cohort. Because of this observed trend, we expect to be slightly under our goal for 06/07 of 85%. One key to transfer

retention is the timely delivery of transfer credit evaluations. A number of steps have been taken to improve this process. We expect it to have a positive impact on the F06 cohort as well as future cohorts. With the implementation of CMS in Fall 07, we expect to see further improvement in the delivery of transfer credit evaluations and improved advising. Accordingly, we have set our goal for 08/09 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. Data for the 2005/06 graduates shows 77 units, which is the same as the 2004/05 graduates. We expect to achieve the goal of 76 units for the 06/07 graduates. We have set the goal for 08/09 at 76 also.
- (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. Data for the 2005/06 graduates shows 75 units, a slight decrease from the 2004/05 group. We expect to achieve the goal of 75 units for the 2006/07 graduates. We have set the goal for 08/09 at 75 also.

4. Persistence and Graduation

4.1 Graduation rates from the campus of origin.

- (a) The estimate of regularly admitted first-time freshmen that will eventually graduate from our campus has varied from 52.3% to 55.3% with no clear trend. Preliminary data for the F00 cohort indicates a rate of only 52.3%, well below the goal of 58% we set for 06/07 (F01 cohort). Although many retention strategies have been implemented, these are more likely to impact more recent cohorts. Given the recent trends, we expect to fall a little short of our goal of 58% for the F01 cohort. We have set our goal for 08/09 at 57%.
- (b) The estimate of upper division CCC transfers who will eventually graduate from our campus has varied from a high of 74.2% for the F99 cohort to a preliminary estimate of 69.1% for the F03 cohort. The rate has fluctuated with no clear trend. However, the preliminary results for the F03 cohort indicates that we are likely to be short of the goal we had set for 06/07 (F04 cohort). As with the freshmen cohorts, the implementation of recent retention strategies will have more impact on later cohorts. Accordingly, we have set the goal for 08/09 at 74%.

6. Relations with K-12

6.2 Fully prepared new freshmen.

- (a) We exceeded our goal of 55.5% math proficiency for the Fall 04 cohort with 56.6% proficient in math. However, the proficiency rate for the Fall 05 cohort

slipped to 53.2%. Upon further analysis, we discovered that 123 of the Fall 05 freshmen had been identified as ‘not proficient’, because their EAP conditional exemption status was not properly reflected in our ERSS report. Had these students be correctly coded as ‘proficient’, the proficiency rate for the Fall 05 cohort would have been 58.6%. This problem has been corrected for future ERSS reports. However, preliminary data for our Fall 06 cohort indicates a proficiency rate of only 55.2%, which means we have not achieved the goal for 06/07 (58%). Given where the rate is for the current year, we have set a more realistic goal of 58% math proficiency for 08/09. The goal for 08/09 anticipates continued positive impact of the CSU Early Assessment Program (EAP).

- (b) Although we did not achieve our English proficiency goal of 45.5% for the Fall 04 cohort, the Fall 05 cohort did show improvement (44.9% in F04 to 46.5% in F05). Preliminary data for our Fall 06 cohort indicates further improvement to a proficiency rate of 47.7%. However, the improvement is still not enough to achieve the goal for 06/07 (50%). The most recent three-year trend shows more than one percentage point growth in the rate each year. Assuming this trend continues and we see continued positive impact from EAP and implementation of the 12th grade writing curriculum, we expect more rapid improvement in English proficiency. We have set our goal for 08/09 at 52%

7. Remediation

7.1 Remediated within one year.

Our excellent record of moving our students through remediation within their first year (87% for the Fall 03 and Fall 04 cohorts) has taken a slight dip for the Fall 05 cohort (down to 84.2%). We attribute the lower completion rate to a larger portion of students placing in the lowest level of remediation (i.e., requiring a two-semester remedial course sequence). Although the completion rate from 05 to 06 dropped slightly we believe this can be improved and feel confident that we can achieve the goal for 06/07 (87%). The goal for 08/09 will also be 87%.

8. Facilities Utilization

8.1 State-supported course annual FTES occurring via the main campus. The table below contains FTES data for 2005-06, preliminary data for F06, goals for 2006-07 and 2008-09.

Area	2005-06 Performance	F06 Est.	06-07 Goal	08-09 Goal
(a) Evening	4,555	4,464	5,100	4,400
(b) Friday	1,765	1,783	1,900	1,750
(c) Weekend	127	111	315	102
(d) Summer	696	677	770	715

(e) Distance	301	360	70	400
(f) Off-site	606	445	1,200	550

- (a) Evening enrollments were trending upward until 2004-05 when the trend started to reverse itself. Preliminary 05/06 and F06 data indicates a further decline. We believe that some of the reduction in evening FTES is a direct result of student demand. Evening courses are often cancelled because of low enrollment. Some evening sections have been combined with sections that meet at more popular times to maximize the FTES we generate and accommodate the largest number of students. We have also seen a decline in teacher education credential programs and other post-baccalaureate enrollment, which has reduced the number of evening courses offered. Based on preliminary data for F06, we clearly will not achieve our goal of 5,100 FTES for 06/07. We have set our 08/09 at 4,400, corresponding to about a 2% enrollment growth from our estimate for 06/07.
- (b) Although preliminary 05/06 and F06 data indicates a jump in Friday utilization from the prior year, we will fall short of the goal of 1,900 FTES for 06/07. We have set our 08/09 goal at 1,750 to reflect a 2% enrollment growth. Expansion of Friday utilization will be necessary as classroom facilities are virtually maxed out during 'prime time' hours.
- (c) Preliminary 05/06 and F06 data indicates a substantial decline in weekend/ FTES. Some of this decline may be a result of decreased enrollment in teacher credential and other post-baccalaureate programs where many of the weekend courses were offered. It's clear that we will not achieve the goal for 06/07. Accordingly, we have set our goal for 08/09 at 102, corresponding to a 2% enrollment growth from what we expect generate in 06/07.
- (d) Actual Summer 06 enrollment was 677 FTES, a decline of about 20 FTES from Summer 2005. We clearly have not achieved the goal of 770 for 06/07. Most of the decline has been at the graduate level in the college of education. We anticipate no growth in Summer 07 and modest growth for Summer 08. We have set a goal of 715 FTES for 08/09.
- (e) Preliminary figures for 05/06 and F06 show a significant increase in distance learning enrollment. Some of the increase is due to expanded capabilities to offer distance education courses coming from our new Academic Information Resource Center. However, other changes come from more accurate identification of the distance education courses. Because of the substantial growth, we expect to significantly exceed our goal for 06/07. Accordingly, we have set our 08/09 goal at 400.
- (f) Preliminary data for 05/06 and F06 indicate a significant decline in off-site courses. We believe that some of this decline is attributable to more accurate identification of the distance education courses noted above. In other words, courses that used to be flagged as off-site are now being correctly flagged as distance education. However, the further decline in F06 may result from decreases in teacher credential course offerings, many of which had been offered at off-site locations. Based on the changes in how the courses are identified and the real decreases in offerings, we be well short of the goal for 06/07. We have set our goal for 08/09 at 550 in recognition of the recent reductions and with anticipation of more course offerings in the Placer county area.

9. University Advancement

Since there have been some changes to the performance measures for this section, we have included data for actual performance in 04/05 and 05/06, and goals for 06/07 and 08/09 that reflect the new accountability indicators.

Area	04/05	05/06	06/07 goal	08/09 goal
9.1 Charitable Gift Receipts	\$6.48 m	\$9.64 m	N/A	N/A
9.1.1 Charitable Gift Commitments	\$7.29 m	\$16.24 m	\$14.8 m	\$15.5 m
9.2 Alumni participation				
(a) Alumni Assoc. Members	4,532	4,751	5,000	5,500
(b) Addressable Alumni	153,594	157,259	161,997	178,579
9.3 Individual Donors	27,785	29,511	30,987	34,163
9.4 Private Support Goal (% of GF Budget)	5.0%	10.9%	9%	10%

Sacramento State's total philanthropic productivity goal exceeded the CSU stated goal during the reporting period. The goals for FY 2006-07 and FY2008-09 are based on the assumptions that the campus general fund budget will increase in each of those years and an optimistic projection that the development unit will keep pace with the increased philanthropic productivity goals. The increases projected for alumni participation are based on enhanced programming that will allow for increased contact and engagement by the Alumni Relations office with alumni in the region and beyond.