

YEAR

CALIFORNIA

STATE

2000

UNIVERSITY

LONG **ACCOUNTABILITY**

BEACH

REPORT



OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH
1250 BELLFLOWER BOULEVARD
LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA 90840-0115
562/985-4121

July 27, 2000

Dr. David Spence
Executive Vice Chancellor
The California State University
401 Golden Shore
Long Beach, CA 90802-4210

Dear Dr. Spence:

I am happy to transmit to you the *Year 2000 Accountability Report* for California State University, Long Beach.

At Cal State Long Beach, we take accountability very seriously. This report was assembled by a broadly representative team of campus leaders organized by our campus accountability coordinator and Director of Strategic Planning, David Dowell. The report contains a thoughtful assessment of the available information. Although this report was prepared in response to an external mandate, we intend to utilize this information on campus to ensure the highest quality education for our diverse student population.

In recent years, Cal State Long Beach has invested in improving the availability of classes and the quality of support services for our students. The campus has also revised its General Education program and invested in faculty. We have also invested in a vigorous partnership with the surrounding public schools. The results of these investments are visible in improved student preparation, increased student retention, progress to degree and student satisfaction with the campus.

Cal State Long Beach is a healthy, thriving campus. We appreciate the opportunity to share our story with you. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Robert C. Maxson".

Robert C. Maxson
President

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

California State University, Long Beach has become one of the most sought-after campuses in the CSU system. A disproportionately large percentage of new applications to the CSU system is directed at the Long Beach campus.

In recent years, the campus has focused on fundamentals of quality. The General Education program has been completely reformed. CSULB has resequenced courses to ensure that students acquire skills and progress toward graduation in a timely manner. The campus has reallocated resources to deliver the courses that students need. Faculty have been introduced to academic assessment and supported for incorporating it into general education and into courses for their majors. Support programs for students have been strengthened, especially for first-year students and the campus has introduced a focus on customer service throughout campus services.

Many CSULB faculty, staff and administrators are involved in a vigorous partnership with surrounding school districts involving especially the large, diverse, urban Long Beach Unified School District. The partners have focused on improving student readiness for college and the data show evidence of improving student preparation. The campus has also focused on reforming elementary teacher preparation and expanding the flow of students through the pipeline of teacher preparation courses. This strategy will produce an increasing number of teacher credentials in the next few years.

Rapidly rising enrollment is a critical concern for Long Beach. The campus has implemented all available means of expanding capacity, including a revision to policies on course scheduling to more efficiently utilize facilities, especially for Friday classes. Despite these measures, enrollment is rapidly approaching campus physical capacity (and Master Plan maximum size). As a consequence, an enrollment management plan has been submitted to the Chancellor's Office.

CSULB's Graduate programs are healthy and well-functioning. The data show that students perform well and express satisfaction with the programs. Graduate programs have acquired many external commendations from accrediting bodies and other entities.

An aggressive advancement team works to support the University's continuing efforts and new initiatives, and to encourage lifelong participation and interest among alumni.

We have selected two areas of accountability beyond the minimum expectation for all campuses. We intend to report on: (1) key indicators of quality in undergraduate education; and (2) quality of services to students. The first of these focuses on academic quality and the second on quality of support services. Our voluntary inclusion of these indicators in this and future accountability reports will require considerable effort, but the campus intends to utilize these indicators to ensure that we are providing the highest possible quality of instruction and services.

California State University, Long Beach is a healthy, thriving campus that has become a magnet for students. Quality education is the "bottom line" for a university, and CSULB is proud of its achievements.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preamble	6
Indicator 1: Quality of Undergraduate Programs	6
Process and principles by which CSULB is establishing learning outcomes and assessment methods for both academic degree programs and general education	6
Methods by which CSULB is verifying and certifying that the learning outcomes and assessment methods for each program have been developed	8
Methods used to assure that students are achieving the core competencies or foundational skills of general education (e.g., written and oral communication, critical thinking, quantitative reasoning, information competence, etc.)	9
Timeline	10
Programs that have completed the process of developing learning outcomes and assessment methods	10
Indicator 2: Access	11
Indicator 2.1: The number of first-time freshman, upper-division community college transfer, and priority teacher preparation applicants who applied and were admitted to the university	11
Indicator 2.2a: The number of eligible first-time freshman, upper-division community college transfer, and priority teacher preparation applicants who applied to the university as their first choice during the opening filing period and were not admitted.....	11
Indicator 2.2b: The number of eligible first-time freshman, upper-division community college transfer, and priority teacher preparation applicants who applied to the university as their first choice during the open filing period and were not admitted to their first-choice university, but were admitted to another CSU university	11
Indicator 3: Progression to the Degree	12
Indicator 4: Persistence and Graduation	12
Indicator 5: Areas of Special State Need	13
Indicator 5.1: Critical need for qualified credentialed teachers	13
Indicator 6: Relations with K-12	14
Indicator 6.1: The number of CSU faculty and students, the number of high schools, and the number of high school students involved in outreach efforts.....	14
Indicator 6.2: Preparedness for college-level Mathematics and English.....	15
Indicator 7: Remediation	15
Indicator 7.1.1: Preparedness for college-level Mathematics and English at entry.....	15

Indicator 7.1.2: Preparedness for college-level Mathematics and English one year later 15

Indicator 8: Facilities Utilization 15

Indicator 8.1.1: Where and when instruction takes place, FTES 15

Indicator 8.1.2: Where and when instruction takes place, percent 15

Indicator 9: University Advancement 16

Indicator 9.1: An annual Voluntary Support Report with indicators for funds raised via alumni,
 parents, other individuals, foundations, corporations and other organizations 16

Indicator 9.2: An annual Special Revenue Report with indicators for funds raised via sponsorships, bequests,
 revocable trusts, pledges, contracts, grants, property transfers and endowment income 16

Indicator 9.3: An annual report on alumni participation as measured by formal membership
 in alumni associations and alumni program activity 17

Indicator 9.4: A goal to raise in private funds a sum equal to or greater than 10 percent
 of the university’s net general fund allocation 18

Indicator 10: Quality of Graduate and Post-baccalaureate Programs 19

State-supported Programs 19

Program Review and Accreditation 19

Academic Performance 19

Student Satisfaction 19

External Recognition 20

Self-support Programs 20

Campus Defined Indicators 21

Key Indicators of Quality in Undergraduate Education 21

Quality of Services to Students 22

SNAPS Findings 22

Quality Improvement 23

Summary and Conclusions 23

Appendix: Data provided by the Office of the Chancellor 24

Long Beach Indicator 2: Access to the CSU 24

Long Beach Indicator 3: Progression to the Degree 25

Long Beach Indicator 4: Persistence and Graduation 27

Long Beach Indicator 5: Areas of Special Need 32

Long Beach Indicator 6: Relations with K-12 33

Long Beach Indicator 7: Remediation 34

Long Beach Indicator 8: Facilities Utilization 36

PREAMBLE

Providing the highest quality education for a diverse student population is the primary goal for California State University, Long Beach and has been from our beginning. In recent years we have sought to develop better means of assessing progress toward our goal. At the same time, The California State University as a whole has, through the Cornerstones initiative, sought to define a broad set of goals for campuses which aimed at enhancing overall educational quality and student access.

Our first annual Accountability Report details the processes and principles that our university uses to assess its progress toward CSU and campus goals. As requested, we provide narratives regarding the first of the 10 indicators (quality of undergraduate degree programs) and the last (quality of graduate and post-baccalaureate programs). This provides an opportunity for us to detail the processes, principles, and evidence that we use to make quality assessments in these two critical areas.

For indicators 2 through 9, commentaries provide some contextual information about the indicator data furnished by the Chancellor's Office. The actual data furnished to the campus are attached as an appendix.

Two campus-specific areas are included in this report: (1) key indicators of quality in undergraduate education; and (2) quality of services to students. The first focuses on academic quality and the second focuses on quality of support services. In the process of setting three-year goals for campus this year, the Provost suggested the first area. The second area reflects a campus commitment to quality student services. Our voluntary inclusion of these indicators will require considerable effort, but we intend to use these to ensure that we are providing the highest possible quality of instruction and services.

This report was prepared by a group broadly representative of the campus including: Don Coan, Director of Institutional Research; Simeon Crowther, Chair of the Academic Senate; David Dowell, Director of Strategic Planning (campus accountability coordinator); Tom Enders, Assistant Vice President for Enrollment Services; Henry Fung, Dean for Graduate Studies and Research; Jean Houck, Dean of the College of Education; Margaret Merryfield, General Education Coordinator; Alan Nishio, Associate Vice President for Student Services; and Keith I. Polakoff, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Although this report is the result of an external mandate, we will use these indicators to monitor success in meeting our own goals. Moreover, the data will be used to support our application for continued accreditation through the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. Because it is our aim to continue to develop and refine the processes and measures that we use to assess our progress, we have made a substantial campus commitment to this effort. Thus, this Accountability Report is the beginning of a process and not the culmination.

INDICATOR 1: QUALITY OF UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

Process and principles by which CSULB is establishing learning outcomes and assessment methods for both academic degree programs and general education

The campus has three distinct but related policies that support identification of student learning outcomes and assessment methods. All have been developed or revised quite recently to reflect a heightened focus on assessment.

The first is the program review process. At CSULB, this process underwent major revision in 1994. At that time, a framework suggested by AAC in its publication, "Program Review and Educational Quality in the Major," replaced the old framework, which was a fairly traditional program audit. A task force of faculty and administrators chose this model because of its emphasis on the establishment of clear program goals and outcomes, as well as assessment of those outcomes.

At CSULB, the program review process begins with the department or program developing a self-study using the framework described above. To support programs in the process, the Office of Institutional Research provides assistance with an alumni survey whose questions have been aligned to the review framework. In addition, workshops (as well as individual assistance, if necessary) are offered to programs initiating a self-study to explain the goals and expectations of the process. Departments and programs are encouraged to engage their entire faculties in discussion of issues related to program goals, outcomes, and assessment.

When the self-study is complete, the department then receives external and internal reviews; the latter is conducted by a team of faculty from the Planning and Educational Policies Council (for undergraduate programs) or the Graduate Council (for graduate programs). These reviews are used to offer constructive suggestions to the department or program focused on program improvement. Following these reviews, representatives of the department or program meet with the dean as well as central academic administrators to discuss the findings and next steps.

In addition to traditional academic departments, a number of other academic programs are reviewed through this process. These programs include the Academic Advising Center, which serves as the main General Education advising unit for the campus and provides mandatory advising to freshmen; the University 100 program, which offers a freshman seminar to all students in the first year; and the Learning Assistance Center, which provides tutoring, study skills assistance, and supplemental instruction to the general student population. Thus, program review has the opportunity to influence the quality of the baccalaureate in several ways. At this point, the General Education program has not been defined as a program to be reviewed by this process; however, that will be one of the options explored as the campus considers how best to assess the General Education program.

The second policy in place for establishment of student learning outcomes and assessment is that for review and certification of courses for general education credit. The campus adopted a substantially revised general education policy in 1998. It went into effect with the fall 1999

semester. As a consequence, all general education courses are in the process of undergoing certification for compliance with the new policy. As a first step, course developers must identify a set of measurable course objectives and outcomes and describe the approaches that will be used to develop fundamental academic skills (such as oral and written communication, critical/analytical thinking, mathematical/quantitative reasoning) as well as to assess the course objectives. Courses in the General Education program are then reviewed at least every five years for recertification. At the time of review, the course developer will be expected to prepare a "course portfolio" that shows how the course objectives have been met.

The General Education program at CSULB now has a developmental focus; students are expected to complete coursework in mathematics, oral and written communication, and critical thinking (the "Foundation") within the first 36 units, with all subsequent general education building on these areas. During the past year, faculty teaching in the Foundation areas, in consultation with the General Education Governing Committee, have developed position papers that describe expectations for Foundation courses in each area, and have provided examples of assignments, activities, and exercises that general education courses beyond the Foundation can use to help students continue to develop these skills. The position papers have been distributed widely to faculty engaged in creating or redeveloping general education offerings.

Finally, the campus adopted an assessment policy in 1998. This established a campus Assessment Committee charged with facilitating faculty assessment efforts and supporting assessment activities, whether in particular majors or programs or across the University. The Assessment Committee includes faculty representatives as well as staff involved in assessment activities, including the Director of Institutional Research and the Director of Testing and Evaluation. The assessment policy explicitly identifies program review (as overseen by the Planning and Educational Policies Council and Graduate Council) and assessment of general education as key components of the campus assessment program.

In 1999, the Assessment Committee recommended to the Provost that a campus Assessment Coordinator be appointed. As a consequence, an Assessment Coordinator now works with the committee and facilitates numerous assessment activities. Among the most important activities of the committee is the administration of a small grants program. These grants provide opportunities for two kinds of activities: pilot projects that allow departments or cross-departmental teams to begin the process of developing student learning outcomes or conduct preliminary assessment activities, and assessment implementation grants that fund more fully developed or extensive projects. In fall 1998 four awards were made. In 1999 (fall and spring) nine awards were made, while 11 grants were awarded in spring 2000. The growth of the program is a consequence of a decision by the University to increase financial support to assessment activities.

The grants have gone to every College within the Division of Academic Affairs, including the Library (with a project focused on assessment of beginning information competency). The areas with the largest numbers of funded proposals are the Colleges of Health and Human Services (with eight) and Liberal Arts (with five). In addition, support has been provided for a number of faculty members to attend assessment conferences. Grant and travel award recipients are expected to share their findings and experiences with colleagues, and the grant recipients have been featured at campus-wide assessment retreats in spring 1999 and spring 2000.

In addition to the three policy areas described above, the campus has participated in other activities designed to develop consensus on student learning outcomes beyond this campus. In one such effort, a group of Southern California campuses including several CSU campuses, the University of California, and a number of community colleges have held "Presidential Summits" in specific disciplines to discuss core curricula and common student learning outcomes. Our campus has also actively participated in the series of disciplinary conferences sponsored by the CSU and focused on defining student learning outcomes in the targeted majors. In some (but not all) cases, departments have followed up on this activity with extensive local discussions. In support of general education, the campus sponsored the General Education Summer Institute and General Edu-

cation Winter Institute. These events, while not exclusively focused on assessment of student learning outcomes, each included several sessions with such a focus as well as sessions on teaching and assessment of core skills in oral and written communication, critical thinking, and information competency. Finally, the campus participated in the recent CSU-sponsored conference on assessment of student learning outcomes in general education, giving four presentations to attendees.

Methods by which CSULB is verifying and certifying that the learning outcomes and assessment methods for each program have been developed

Progress in certifying that learning outcomes and assessment methods have been developed is slower. However, a number of processes are now in place.

(1) Many CSULB programs are accredited by external agencies. The rigorous review required for successful accreditation often includes documentation regarding the attainment of standards in the field. The following programs are currently accredited:

- Art — National Association of Schools of Art and Design
- Business Administration — American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business
- Chemistry (undergraduate) — American Chemical Society, Committee on Professional Training
- Communicative Disorders (graduate) — American Speech-Language-Hearing Association, Council on Academic Accreditation
- Computer Science (undergraduate) — Computing Science Accreditation Board
- Construction Engineering Management — American Council for Construction Education
- Dance — National Association of Schools of Dance
- Design — National Association of Schools of Art and Design

- Engineering (undergraduate: Chemical, Civil, Computer, Electrical, Engineering Technology, Mechanical) — Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology, Inc.
- Family and Consumer Sciences — American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences, Council for Accreditation; and Commission on Accreditation/ Approval for Dietetics Education, American Dietetic Association
- Health Science (graduate) — Council on Education for Public Health
- Kinesiology and Physical Education: Athletic Training — Professional Education Committee, National Athletic Trainers Association, Inc.; and Kinesiotherapy — American Kinesiotherapy Association
- Music — National Association of Schools of Music
- Nursing — Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education
- Physical Therapy — Commission on Accreditation in Physical Therapy Education, American Physical Therapy Association
- Public Policy and Administration — National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration, Commission on Peer Review and Accreditation
- Radiation Therapy Technology — Joint Review Committee on Education in Radiologic Technology
- Recreation and Leisure Studies — National Recreation and Park Association, Council on Accreditation
- Social Work — Council on Social Work Education, Commission on Accreditation
- Theatre Arts — National Association of Schools of Theatre

(2) All programs must describe their assessment practices and results in periodic program reviews. Most programs are reviewed on a seven-year cycle. While this

policy has been in place for a number of years, many departments are still unfamiliar with assessment methods, and the University will need to continue to support faculty efforts to define and assess student learning outcomes.

(3) In the area of elementary school teacher preparation, collaboration involving the College of Education and the core academic disciplines has led to the creation of a standards-based integrated teacher preparation program. This program has been designed “from the ground up” to ensure that students master necessary content in each area, and that students achieve overall competency in areas that cut across academic disciplines, such as technological literacy. Each course identifies student learning outcomes (in most cases tied to state academic standards or standards for teacher credentialing) and includes assessments focused on these outcomes. This program’s first cohort has completed its first year.

Methods used to assure that students are achieving the core competencies or foundational skills of general education (e.g., written and oral communication, critical thinking, quantitative reasoning, information competence, etc.)

(1) The developmental approach of the CSULB General Education program is designed to give students the opportunity to continue to develop competency in each of the core areas listed above. In every General Education course beyond the Foundation, students continue to develop one or more of the foundation skills.

(2) In the recertification process, coordinators of each course will be expected to address the issue of how successfully students in that course are achieving the course’s stated objectives through preparation of a course “portfolio.” This process will not begin for several years, as the first certifications under the new policy were granted in 1999-2000, and the standard length of the recertification cycle is five years.

(3) The Capstone phase of the General Education process holds promise as a way to assure that students have attained core competencies. The Capstone consists of nine upper-division General Education units (three courses) that require that the student demonstrate advanced college skills, such as synthesis and application

of knowledge, analysis, critique, and research. Course developers are expected to include major integrative assignments to elicit such demonstrations; they are further encouraged to also include demonstration of information and technological competency, which is not a stand-alone goal of the General Education program but is encouraged throughout.

(4) Students must take the Writing Proficiency Exam by the time they complete 75 units and must pass the exam as a graduation requirement. The WPE was recently revised to require that the essays be more analytical.

At this time, the campus does not have formal assessments (outside of the graduation writing requirement) in place to determine whether students are achieving the core competencies of general education at a program level. A priority for the next two years will be to determine what, if any, such assessments should be undertaken, or what other approaches could be used.

TIMELINE

1999-2000: (a) Discussions involving the Assessment Coordinator and the Assessment Committee regarding their respective roles as well as ways to promote the campus assessment agenda. (b) General Education Governing Committee develops guidelines for certification of Capstone general education courses and begins process of certifying lower-division courses. (c) Position papers on development of Foundation skills in English composition, oral communication, critical thinking, and mathematics/quantitative reasoning are completed. (d) Discussions are held by Planning and Educational Policies Council regarding effectiveness of program review policy and suggestions for improvement. (e) Support is provided for faculty activities related to development of student learning outcomes and assessment: the Assessment Grants program, support for travel to assessment conferences, the Assessment retreat, the General Education Summer Institute, and the General Education Winter Institute. (f) Assessment Coordinator begins compiling a "talent bank" of faculty with expertise in various areas of assessment who can serve as consultants.

2000-2001: (a) Support for faculty-initiated activities continues (Assessment Grants, travel, use of consultants). (b) Workshops in support of assessment activities

(GESI, GEWI, etc.) are held. (c) Campus uses feedback from Councils and parties involved in program review to determine best way to improve the process, make the component focused on identification and assessment of student learning outcomes more successful, and provide appropriate support to departments in responding. (d) Campus considers how to assess the effectiveness of the general education program, especially in terms of its success in developing students' competency in core areas. The General Education policy calls for periodic review of the program but does not specify how that review should be accomplished; this question should be addressed. (e) Continue process of certifying individual courses for General Education, shifting focus to Capstone courses by year end.

2001-2002: (a) Continue to provide support as described above for faculty assessment activities. (b) Based on discussions in previous year, implement, as necessary, any recommended modifications to the program review policy to make sure that assessment of student learning outcomes is adequately addressed. (c) Based on discussions in the previous year, begin to implement assessment recommendations for the general education program. This process is unlikely to be completed in a single year. (d) Continue the process of review of individual general education courses; the goal will be to complete review of all courses that were previously certified for general education credit under the old policy and are seeking continued certification by the end of this academic year. (e) Elaborate the process by which courses will be recertified, including the kinds of documentation that must be provided to demonstrate that student learning outcomes are being achieved.

Programs that have completed the process of developing learning outcomes and assessment methods

No programs can be said to have "completed" this process, but many have begun. At the 2000 assessment retreat, reports were received from the departments of History, Kinesiology and Physical Education, and Biological Sciences. In each case the department described student learning outcomes and an assessment plan or tools for a component of the program. As described above, 24 grants have been awarded to various departments over the past two years for such activities. The section below describes some of the progress made.

Progress made in 1999-2000

(a) Faculty development activities designed to increase our capacity for assessment:

Assessment Retreat (attended by approximately 100 faculty).

Two workshops for preparation of assessment proposals (most attendees submitted proposals, and the majority were funded).

General Education Summer Institute (two days) and General Education Winter Institute (one day) with assessment topics. Approximately 70 to 80 faculty members participated in each day of each institute.

Two program review workshops. Approximately 15 faculty attended these workshops from departments or programs entering the review cycle, as well as faculty on the Councils with responsibility for review.

(b) Small grants and travel awards for assessment. These are enumerated above.

(c) Teacher preparation. The first group of students entered the standards-based integrated teacher preparation program, which will lead to a degree in Liberal Studies along with a preliminary Multiple Subjects teaching credential.

(d) General education. The General Education Governing Committee reviewed approximately 75 lower-division courses for certification under the new General Education policy. Position statements describing approaches to skill development in the areas of English composition, oral communication, critical thinking, and mathematics/quantitative reasoning were completed and made available to faculty developing general education courses. Guidelines for Capstone courses (the most advanced component of the General Education program and the piece that will be taken by community college transfers who complete a certified lower division general education program) were approved. (Guidelines for other general education courses were adopted in 1998-99).

INDICATOR 2: ACCESS

Indicator 2.1: The number of first-time freshman, upper-division community college transfer, and priority teacher preparation applicants who applied and were admitted to the university.

Indicator 2.2a: The number of eligible first-time freshman, upper-division community college transfer, and priority teacher preparation applicants who applied to the university as their first choice during the opening filing period and were not admitted.

Indicator 2.2b: The number of eligible first-time freshman, upper-division community college transfer, and priority teacher preparation applicants who applied to the university as their first choice during the open filing period and were not admitted to their first choice university, but were admitted to another CSU university.

Despite the increased popularity of the campus and the considerable growth in enrollment, CSULB has been able to offer admission to all fully eligible undergraduate and teacher education applicants who filed within the established deadlines. Despite progressively earlier deadlines, the freshman applicant pool grew 37% between fall 1997 and fall 1999. This resulted in a corresponding growth in the freshman class of 32% to almost 3,500 students. As a result, prospective freshmen for fall 2000 were required to apply during the initial filing period (November 1-30, 1999). The campus has also experienced a strong increase in upper division transfers with the size of the entering class increasing by 15% between fall 1997 and fall 1999. The growing entering class combined with increasing continuation rates resulted in a fall 1999 headcount of over 30,000 students.

As the impact of our enrollment growth was primarily fueled by growth at the freshman level, the campus has been able to avoid impacting additional upper division majors. The campus did impact options in Kinesiology/Physical Education beginning in fall 1998 due to the conversion of the impacted undergraduate Physical Therapy program to a master's degree program. The campus promotes access by allowing CSU eligible applicants who do not meet the impacted program supplemental criteria admission in a non-impacted major or a pre-major.

While the campus is very proud of its increased popularity and reputation and the resulting increases in enrollment and academic quality, the campus is reaching its maximum capacity and is challenged to meet the academic and service needs of the growing student population. In fall 1998, President Maxson and the Chair of the Academic Senate formed a task force to plan for the predicted enrollment surge. The committee has worked with the campus administration and Academic Senate to look at means of increasing capacity, promoting quality, and managing enrollment. The campus and faculty have demonstrated a strong commitment to preserve and improve the quality of education and services while accommodating the increased student demand. The campus has and continues to implement measures to preserve access for freshmen, upper division transfer and teacher education students. These measures have included a dramatic reduction in special admissions and eliminating access to lower division transfers beginning spring 2001.

The campus is rapidly approaching its physical plant capacity and therefore continues to look at all options for controlling growth while attempting to expand capacity. As reaching physical capacity limits appears inevitable, the campus leadership with the endorsement of the Academic Senate has submitted a plan for future impaction of the freshman class in fall 2002.

INDICATOR 3: PROGRESSION TO THE DEGREE

CSULB has a comprehensive first-year experience program for first-time freshmen. The program is a cooperative effort among all of the campus' operating divisions and has been under continuous review and development since the early 1990s. It features mandatory academic advising, the development of learning communities, restructuring of General Education, and the scheduling of more sections of courses appropriate for entering students at varying levels of previous preparation. This significant investment of effort and resources has paid off in a slow but steady increase in first-year continuation rates, especially for first-time freshmen. Those rates are now about 10 points higher than they were a decade ago.

Until quite recently, CSULB enrolled many more community college transfer students than first-time freshmen. Accordingly, the campus has long been a leader in the development of comprehensive articulation agreements with California community colleges. More than 100 such agreements are now in effect. They govern both General Education courses and the lower-division courses in all majors that have lower-division requirements. The importance of articulation agreements to transfer students is plain from the accompanying data: they have actually been able to graduate from CSULB after taking on average slightly fewer units as upper division students than those who entered the campus as first-time freshmen. Furthermore, the data show that the typical graduate of CSULB completes all degree requirements with only 10 more units than the average presently required for all campus degree programs. This differential can easily be accounted for by students completing a double major, pursuing a minor, or changing majors relatively late in their careers.

INDICATOR 4: PERSISTENCE AND GRADUATION

The CSULB administration and faculty have long been concerned about the relatively low graduation rates of first-time freshmen, especially when measured by traditional criteria that use a five-year interval. There are some extenuating circumstances, however, that must be kept in mind. The campus is primarily a commuter institution with a high percentage of students who are working 30 hours or more per week to put themselves through college. It is significant that the data for the entering class of fall 1987 show that more first-time freshmen graduated in six to 10 years than in five years or less. Similarly, about the same number of upper division transfer students graduated in four to eight years as in three years or less. These data are more a commentary on the adequacy of financial aid than on anything the campus itself can control.

It should also be borne in mind that the early 1990s were years when severe state budget cuts made it impossible to provide students with all of the classes they wanted. This bitter reality was widely reported in the media. As a direct consequence, qualified students were more likely to

attend non-CSU institutions if they had other options available to them. The students who lacked such options were typically those in greatest financial need or least well-prepared.

Since the middle of the decade, the budget of CSULB has recovered. The class schedule has been carefully rebuilt around the classes most needed by incoming students, especially freshmen. The average level of prior preparation of matriculating students has improved impressively. And the percentage of first-time freshmen attending on a full-time basis has increased dramatically. Along with the improved continuation rates resulting from the first-year experience program, these factors should result in significant increases in both the graduation rate and the persistence rate in the years immediately ahead.

INDICATOR 5: AREAS OF SPECIAL STATE NEED

Indicator 5.1: Critical Need for Qualified Credentialed Teachers

The progress made by CSU campuses in responding to the special state needs for credential teachers has been measured by:

1. Increase in the number of credentials issued to candidates completing professional education requirements
2. Increase in the enrollment in teacher preparation courses/programs

At CSULB, our success in increasing enrollment has been noteworthy, and our record of increasing credential recommendations has shown a positive upward trend.

In 1996-1997, the total number of Multiple and Single Subject and Special Education credentials recommended from CSULB was 911 (Indicator 5.1.2.5). In the three-year period, 1997-2000, the average total number of credentials recommended was 986, a modest 8% increase over the baseline year of 1996-1997. Reviewing the year-by-year number of recommendations, there is a major in-

crease in 1997-1998 followed by a decline in 1998-1999. This apparent anomaly is due to students' hastening their programs to complete prior to the 1998 implementation of a performance assessment exam, RICA.

The smaller than anticipated increase in the number of credentials recommended by CSULB is due primarily to two factors: (1) We discovered in 1996-1997 that our efforts to recruit were hampered by the status of our Multiple Subject Credential Program as the most unit-intensive program of its kind in the Los Angeles Basin. We undertook a comprehensive curriculum redesign in collaboration with K-12 and faculty from the five colleges at the University participating in teacher preparation. The redesign was completed in fall 1999. The first candidates in the streamlined program will be student teaching in spring 2001. (2) We made a studied decision in 1997-1998 to focus many of our additional teacher education resources on the Liberal Studies Program and on strengthening the undergraduate preparation of teachers. Such a move represents a long-term solution rather than a "quick fix." The approach has resulted in noticeable enrollment increases already, and we anticipate by 2000-2001 that we will see a substantial increase in the number of credentials recommended.

Data supporting enrollment growth and the projection for a larger increase in credential recommendations in 2000-2001 are summarized below:

Academic Year	Liberal Studies Majors	Admissions to Multiple Subject Credential Program
1996-1997		387
1997-1998	1401	526
1998-1999	1588	444
1999-2000	1760	536

We have placed 210 Multiple Subject student teachers for fall 2000 – a 32% increase in the number of student teachers placed compared to fall 1996. Enrollment in the professional methods courses leads us to project a record high 453 Multiple Subject student teachers will be placed in 2000-2001.

The CSU System data on the number of credentials recommended by CSULB for 1996-99 correspond to our records. The totals, however, appear to include internship

credentials and could result in one new teacher appearing to be two new teachers, because he/she completed two teaching credentials. At CSULB our numbers have little such “double counting” as we have recommended a small number of internship credentials. We would recommend the System investigate the “double counting” practice to see the extent to which it may artificially inflate campuses’ credential recommendation data.

In summary, the data on CSULB’s response to the special state need for credential teachers show a positive upward trend in the number of credentials produced and an impressive increase in students’ enrollment in teacher preparation programs. We made a well-thought-out decision to focus on supporting and strengthening the Liberal Studies undergraduate preparation of teachers and look forward to that long-term investment of resources showing valuable returns in the future when CSULB recommends increased numbers of well-prepared teachers.

INDICATOR 6: RELATIONS WITH K-12

Indicator 6.1: The number of CSU faculty and students, the number of high schools, and the number of high school students involved in outreach efforts

The “Long Beach Education Partnership” involving CSULB, Long Beach Unified Schools and Long Beach City College has earned national distinction as a model for outstanding K-16 collaboration. U.S. Secretary of Education Dr. Richard Riley gave the 1999 State of American Education speech on the CSULB campus, publicly praising Long Beach’s “Seamless Education.” Long Beach hosted the June 2000 conference “California K-16 Partnership and Student Success,” bringing together nearly 800 people to discuss effective K-16 collaboration. Faculty, administrators, and staff at CSULB follow the lead of our “Education President,” Dr. Robert Maxson, in enthusiastically engaging in cooperative activities with K-12.

An illustration of the K-12 relations is the campus activity in the system initiative, the Precollegiate Academic Development Program (PAD). We take a K-12 developmental approach to providing writing, literacy, and math tutoring/support for public school students. The following data are from one summer, 2000 annual PAD report.

Precollegiate Academic Development Activities

University Participation		Public school Students	
		Served in 1999-2000	
Faculty	26	High School	745
CSULB students	916	Middle School	923
		Elementary School	6403

CSULB is host to a California Academic Partnership Project (CAPP) with Lakewood High School involving about 200 students and a California Academic Partnership Initiative (CAPI) project with six area high schools involving about 600 students.

The campus hosts a number of summer programs for school-age youth. The South Basin Writers Camp and South Basin Readers Camp bring onto campus hundreds of elementary and high school children every summer for four-week academic camps. This summer for the first time, CSULB ran an algebra camp for middle-school youth funded by the Long Beach Unified federal GEAR UP grant. The campus also operates a “Science at the Beach” camp for school-age youth in the summer.

CSULB hosts a number of professional development activities for teachers in the summer months. The South Basin Writing Institute brings hundreds of elementary and high school teachers onto the Long Beach campus for professional development activities focused on writing. This summer, the Writing Institute also hosted several sessions of professional development funded by the Governor’s Special Initiative in Reading and Writing, bringing about 120 teachers onto campus. In collaboration with Long Beach Unified schools, CSULB is hosting a week-long institute for math teachers and another for English teachers supported by California Academic Partnership Initiative (CAPI) funds.

Additionally, CSULB faculty, staff and campus leadership will participate in a three-day retreat hosted by Long Beach Unified Schools focused on high school reform in August 2000.

Of course, the campus has a large and active traditional outreach program with college staff visiting high schools and middle schools to provide college preparatory information to counselors, students, parents and teachers.

Our vigorous outreach efforts are improving K-12 students' reading, writing, and math skills, as well as increasing students' readiness to enter college at CSULB, another CSU campus, or a community college.

Indicator 6.2: Preparedness for College-Level Mathematics and English

Three-year rates of preparation for college in mathematics and English, as measured by the entry placement examinations, show improvement each year in each area for the CSULB campus.

For several years, CSULB has worked intensively with Long Beach Unified School District on standards for mathematics and English. CSULB has been placing college students as tutors in high school classrooms in mathematics and English with support from Precollegiate Academic Development funds. Starting in 1999-2000, CSULB has been working intensively with six area high schools on student preparation in mathematics and English with University faculty members co-teaching college preparation courses on the high school campuses. With this recent intensification of CSULB working with area high schools, we expect further improvements in the rates at which students are prepared for college-level academic work in years to come.

INDICATOR 7: REMEDICATION

Indicator 7.1.1: Preparedness for College-Level Mathematics and English at Entry

CSULB experienced a 28% increase in the number of regularly admitted first-time freshmen entering fall 1999 compared to fall 1998 (3,308 to 2,590). Despite this significant increase, there was a 5% increase in the proportion of entering students fully prepared in English and Mathematics at entry (31% to 26%). Thus, a greater percentage of first-time freshmen entering in fall 1999 were more fully prepared in English and Mathematics and required no remediation assistance.

Indicator 7.1.2: Preparedness for College-Level Mathematics and English One Year Later

93% of the fall 1998 regularly admitted first-time freshmen who re-enrolled in fall 1999 no longer required any further remediation. Of the remaining 7% (153) who continued to require remediation, all of these students were allowed to enroll because they had made significant progress toward completing their remediation and had developed approved learning contracts to enable the completion of their remediation by the end of their second year of enrollment.

The University continues to offer programs to assist students in completing their remediation within the required time frame. These programs include summer English and Mathematics classes for both entering students as well as students who have not completed their remediation during their first year of enrollment. In addition, a Chancellor's Office grant has enabled the University to offer English and Mathematics instruction and tutorial support to prospective CSU students attending six area high schools targeted for precollegiate academic support.

INDICATOR 8. FACILITIES UTILIZATION

Indicator 8.1.1: Where and When Instruction Takes Place, FTES

Indicator 8.1.2: Where and When Instruction Takes Place, Percent

CSULB has long had an Academic Senate-approved policy on class scheduling. During the early 1990s, when budget cuts resulted in significant reductions in enrollment demand, the campus stopped enforcing the provisions of the policy that required classes scheduled on Mondays and Wednesdays prior to 11:00 a.m. to meet also on Fridays. That is the explanation of why Friday accounted for only 4.3 percent of the FTES generated in 1998-1999.

During fall 1999, recognizing that increasing enrollment demand again required the use of campus facilities on more than four days per week, the Academic Senate revised the previous policy statement on class scheduling. Beginning with the fall 2000 term, classes scheduled prior to 2:00 p.m. on Mondays and Wednesdays will either have to meet on Fridays as well or be balanced with Friday-only classes. The 2000–2001 academic year, therefore, will show a significant increase in Friday utilization.

Independent of the issue of Friday scheduling, the number of professional programs scheduling upper-division and graduate classes on Saturdays and Sundays has been growing each year. These classes appeal especially to older students who are working full time and also have family responsibilities. There is as yet no indication that week-end classes will appeal to more traditional undergraduate students, especially while still in lower-division status.

INDICATOR 9: UNIVERSITY ADVANCEMENT

Indicator 9.1: For each university, an annual Voluntary Support Report with indicators for funds raised via alumni, parents, other individuals, foundations, corporations and other organizations

Indicator 9.2: For each university, an annual Special Revenue Report with indicators for funds raised via sponsorships, bequests, revocable trusts, pledges, contracts, grants, property transfers, and endowment income

The Division of University Relations and Development at CSULB has enjoyed another year of growth and prosperity. Exceeding its goal by raising a total of \$24.5 million, CSULB emerged as a national leader in fund raising and earned significant cash and in-kind gifts in support of its academic units and programs. The University also recorded \$10 million in planned gifts, which was 106 percent over its goal for the year.

The 1999-2000 fiscal year was especially noteworthy since the division increased its cash gifts for the second consecutive year, with a record-breaking 44 percent of

the year's total credited to cash donations. Earning \$10.6 million, the University received strong support from alumni, friends and loyal corporate and foundation benefactors. Contributing to the overall goal was \$13.5 million in in-kind donations.

The Annual Giving Program realized over \$1.5 million in cash gifts. This success can be attributed to the use of updated promotional tools targeted to non-donors through a direct mail program. Of the 16,700 Annual Fund donors, 2,500 were first-time donors to the University. Additionally, the Annual Fund Phonathon kicked off a "Second-Ask" campaign directed to donors that resulted in 74 percent of those contacted giving a second gift for the year.

The primary mission of the CSULB Alumni Association is to assist and advance the University. Financial contributions to various departments and programs have increased dramatically over the last few years. In total, the Association contributed over \$220,000 directly back to the University this year including:

- President's Scholars Program: An additional \$150,000 was contributed to the CSULB Alumni Association President's Scholars Founding Endowment.
- Alumni Grants Program: The Alumni Grants Program awarded \$25,000 to 10 campus entities which increased the awareness of the Association among constituency groups, particularly students and faculty, and will benefit more than 6,000 students.
- Odyssey: Through the Alumni Major Gifts program, \$10,000 was contributed to sponsor speakers for this interdisciplinary campus-wide program.
- Learning Alliance: An additional \$15,000 was contributed through the Alumni Major Gifts program to Learning Alliance, which increases student retention by assisting students both academically and personally.
- Distinguished Artists Alumni Lecture Series: Contributing \$5,000, the Association is co-sponsor of this annual event along with the College of the Arts.

Significant gifts were also received throughout the year, with two standout gifts received from The Boeing Company and Hewlett-Packard Corporation. The College of Engineering concluded a \$2.2 million agreement with Boeing to establish the Center for Advanced Technology Support for Aerospace Industries, with \$1.15 million directed toward an endowed professorship in manufacturing engineering and scholarships for President's Scholars majoring in engineering. The Hewlett-Packard Corporation gave more than \$400,000 for the Interdisciplinary Learning Laboratory Project, a joint effort of the Colleges of Business Administration and Engineering.

The following figures are preliminary and will not be official until the necessary reporting to the Council for Aid to Education is completed. However, they do provide reasonably well the figures representing 1999/2000 fund raising for the campus.

Constituent Type	Total Giving	Percentage of Total Giving
Alumni	\$1,894,945	7.7%
Corporate Foundations	690,073	2.8%
Corporations	10,761,635	43.9%
Foundations	5,126,273	20.9%
Friends	5,389,836	22.0%
Organizations	434,794	1.8%
Parents	234,417	1.0%
Total	\$24,531,973	100%

Indicator 9.3: For each university, an annual report on alumni participation as measured by formal membership in alumni associations and alumni program activity

CSULB Alumni Relations, in conjunction with the Alumni Records Office, continued its ongoing effort to update and maintain the alumni database. Of the 180,114 Long Beach alumni, 145,727 are addressable, 82,931 have phone numbers, and 94,633 have full or partial business information on record.

Membership in the Association exceeded the 24,000 alumni mark, with over 900 new members joining this year. The current membership policy is a one-time \$25 fee for graduates and an annual \$25 fee for associate members (alumni who have not graduated). The success

of the membership program is based on Alumni Relations' philosophy of servicing and cultivating alumni and treating them as members of the University family. This is reflected in our alumni giving history: 47 percent of the Association's members have donated to the University, as compared to only 23 percent who are non-members.

In addition to long-standing traditions, the Association has created new activities to cater to our diverse alumni. Over 235 volunteers were enlisted throughout the year to assist with planning and implementing these programs and activities. The Association serviced 15 active alumni chapters, two regional clubs, and three affiliate groups (Association of Emeriti Faculty, Staff Emeriti and the Student Alumni Association). Association chapters boast 1,200 active members, with 100 chapter meetings and 52 chapter events held throughout the year.

Highlights of the year's alumni programs and activities include:

- **Concerts in the Grove:** The 23rd Annual Concerts in the Grove program entertained over 1,700 alumni and community friends during a series of five concerts held on campus, making over \$8,000.
- **Celebrating Teachers:** In conjunction with the College of Education, 700 alumni and students attended seven programs including lectures, receptions and a tea highlighting the teaching profession and teacher training.
- **Fall Event:** "50th Anniversary Picnic" was this year's theme for the annual Fall Event, held outside the CSULB Alumni Association entrance to The Pyramid, that attracted over 400 alumni and friends.
- **Kaleidoscope:** Represented under nine different tents at the Alumni Brick Plaza, our alumni chapters head a major presence at the University's annual open house that drew a crowd in excess of 22,000 to the campus.
- **Alumni Awards Banquet:** Our gala event had over 460 guests and honored 23 recipients including alumni, students, professors and community members.

- Homecoming: Our collaborative effort with Homecoming 2000 included the Associated Students, Inc., Athletics, Office of the President, Administration and Finance, and Student Services, and paid off with over 1,200 in attendance.
- Commencement Flowers: The Association had a 28 percent increase in net profits this year (\$18,000) at Commencement flower sales thanks to 80 volunteers who assisted throughout the nine ceremonies.
- Volunteer Recognition Night: Volunteers were honored with a special evening including dinner, awards and activities to thank them for their efforts throughout the year.
- Outdoor Adventures Program: This program, which sells out within the first week of advertising the events, was developed to expand services to a diverse alumni constituency. More than 100 participants joined these events, the majority of whom had yet to take part in Alumni events since they graduated.
- Distinguished Artists Alumni Lecture Series: Two lectures by alumni who are experts and veterans in the entertainment industry discussed their professions and careers with 700 alumni, students and community members. The series is co-sponsored by the College of the Arts.
- Student Film Makers Showcase: Over 200 alumni in the entertainment industry and students majoring in Film and Electronic Arts attended a reception and viewed films produced by CSULB students at the Directors Guild of America in Hollywood. This event was also co-sponsored by the College of the Arts.
- Bookstore Open House: Some 600 guests attended the annual evening event where alumni, faculty and staff mingled and holiday shopped for CSULB emblematic gifts. Sponsored by the Bookstore with major support from the Alumni Association, the event featured holiday foods and live entertainment.
- Getty Museum Trip: Two buses of alumni and emeriti faculty met on campus for brunch, a university update and live entertainment prior to traveling to the Getty Museum.
- Alumni Brick Plaza: 161 alumni joined 2,000 fellow alumni in leaving their legacy at a prominent campus location, raising funds for alumni programming.
- Commencement: Alumni Association board members presented the Distinguished Alumnus and Outstanding Student awards at nine commencement ceremonies and welcomed more than 6,000 graduates to the alumni family.
- SOAR: The Association helped organize and conduct SOAR (Student Orientation, Advising and Registration) workshops for over 2,000 incoming freshman and transfer students, explaining what it means to be a CSULB alum and how to tap into the networking and other resources available through the Association.
- Teamwork: The Association took an active role in planning and facilitating Teamwork, a weekend leadership retreat for over 100 student leaders.
- Grad Fair: Approximately 1,500 graduating seniors attended a fair to acquire information about graduation and purchase or rent graduation merchandise. They also were able to join the Alumni Association. This event was sponsored by the Bookstore.

Indicator 9.4: For each university, a goal to raise in private funds a sum equal to or greater than 10 percent of the university's net general fund allocation

University Relations and Development has set an ambitious goal of \$25.2 million for 2000-2001, with a cash goal representing 40 percent of that total.

CSULB's shift in focus to maximize potential endowment-directed gifts has proven thus far to be highly successful. The division will enter the second year of a five-year campaign to put into place an inventory of endowment-directed gifts which, when they mature, will triple the size of the University's current endowment. Looking to the future, the division has determined to invest in the additional resources required to expand estate planning. During the past year, Estate Planning and Gifts raised \$10,632,000 in endowment-directed commitments. Although gifts toward endowment are not readily available, they ensure a future of financial stability for a variety of important university programs.

INDICATOR 10: QUALITY OF GRADUATE AND POST-BACCALAUREATE PROGRAMS

STATE-SUPPORTED PROGRAMS

Program Review and Accreditation

California State University, Long Beach offers 61 master's degrees (or a total of 88 programs with all the different options included). The graduate population is approximately 5,700 students including individuals who are seeking a second baccalaureate degree. To date, more than 30,310 master's degrees have been earned from this campus.

Each academic year, a number of graduate degrees undergo the program review process. In the last three academic years (1997-98, 1998-99, and 1999-00), 14 graduate degree programs have been reviewed. These are:

Programs Reviewed 1997-2000	
1997-98	M.A. in Occupational Studies M.A. in Communication Studies (aka Speech Communication) M.S. in Biology M.S. in Microbiology M.S. in Criminology M.S. in Kinesiology M.S. in Mathematics
1998-99	M.A. in Economics M.S. in Aerospace Engineering M.S. in Health Care Administration M.S. in Recreation Administration
1999-00	M.A. in Family and Consumer Sciences M.A./M.S. in Interdisciplinary Studies M.S. in Nursing

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

The mean grade point averages for the graduate majors at the conclusion of the last four spring semesters are as follows:

Spring Program	1997	1998	1999	2000
	Mean GPA			
Occupational Studies	3.84	3.68	3.71	3.68
Communication Studies	3.51	3.46	3.27	3.33
Biology	3.67	3.74	3.63	3.63
Microbiology	3.43	3.64	3.53	3.76
Criminology	3.61	3.36	3.68	3.66
Kinesiology	3.28	3.41	3.44	3.36
Mathematics	3.41	3.61	3.61	3.57
Economics	3.53	3.35	3.17	3.45
A Engineering	3.58	3.56	3.54	3.54
Health Care Admin	3.60	3.56	3.50	3.48
Recreation Admin	3.54	3.69	3.44	3.30
Family/Consumer Science	3.50	3.53	3.58	3.49
Interdisciplinary Studies	3.58	3.48	3.62	3.66
Nursing	3.68	3.73	3.76	3.75
University Wide	3.58	3.58	3.59	3.59

Student Satisfaction

Graduate students who are CSULB alumni represent only a small fraction of the students enrolled and approximate the number of international students earning graduate degrees. The majority of graduate students responding to an alumni survey indicated that they were:

- very satisfied/satisfied with their graduate experience at CSULB.
- strongly agree/agree that their graduate education helped to relate to real world issues.
- very satisfied/satisfied with contribution of courses to academic/intellectual development.
- very satisfied/satisfied with the attitude of faculty toward students.
- strongly agree/agree with preparation for employment in their field.
- strongly agree/agree are working in major/related field.

Graduate programs are a combination of course work and independent research. Graduate courses provide students with greater breadth and depth in the knowledge they acquired as undergraduates.

External Recognition

All graduate programs are recognized by the regional accreditation agency, Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). In addition, some programs have earned recognition from their professional groups, when available. Among programs reviewed recently, recognitions were earned by the following:

M.A. in Family and Consumer Sciences — American Dietetics Association Dietetic Internship

M.S. in Health Care Administration — Accrediting Commission for Education in Health Services Administration (ACEHSA)

M.S. in Nursing — American Association of Colleges of Nursing, California Board of Registered Nursing, National League of Nursing

Many of our programs have advisory boards composed of practitioners in the greater community. These board members share information about developing trends in their disciplines and their potential impact on academic programs, prospective sites for internships and employment, and/or development opportunities. Most students recognize the relationship between the faculty scholarship, teaching, and student learning. Alliances formed with the community favor student success in securing employment during or following degree completion. In programs with a thesis option, faculty members mentor their research students and these efforts often result in peer-reviewed presentations before appropriate national/regional professional societies and/or publications in scholarly journals. Programs that have tracked their graduates closely can readily report on doctoral degrees earned, employment in the chosen profession, or in teaching in the chosen discipline.

Faculty receive reports on their graduates through correspondence, professional meetings, and inquiries from doctoral programs and employers about availability of additional graduates from the CSULB programs.

SELF-SUPPORT PROGRAMS

In addition to state-supported programs recently reviewed, our University College and Extension Services (UCES) offers a number of graduate programs on a self-support basis. Among these are the Fully Employed Master of Business Administration (FEMBA), Master of Public Administration (MPA), and Master of Social Work (MSW).

The Master of Public Administration (MPA) Degree Program is supported and endorsed by the Orange County Transportation Authority, Long Beach Police Department, and the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works. Many police officers completing the MPA have earned promotions and salary increases.

The Master of Social Work (MSW) is ranked in the U.S. News and World Report Guide to America's Best Colleges as a "Distinctive Academic Program."

These graduate programs are also evaluated to improve the degree programs so UCES can continue to offer programs of the highest quality. Information obtained in the evaluation includes program delivery methodology and quality of student services and instruction. This information is shared with all parties involved in delivery of a program.

UCES also offers more than 50 non-credit certificate programs and a wide variety of short courses and professional designation programs which feature practical hands-on applications of skills needed to succeed in today's complex job market. Programs such as Human Resources Management, Global Logistics Specialist, Computer Graphic Design, Microsoft Networks Specialist, and state-of-the-art 3D Computer Animation are designed to provide the competitive edge for working adults with busy schedules.

In the 3D Computer Animation training, UCES serves as registered provider of American Institute of Architects; authorized Discreet Training Center and authorized NewTek Lightwave Training Center; and educational partners with SoftImage and Alias/Wavefront. Our Advanced Media Production group has provided quality training for many of the biggest names in animation and visualization, including NBC, CBS, Hughes, NASA, Digital Equipment Corporation, SEGA, Digital Domain, JPL, and Boss Film Studio.

In the American Institute for Philanthropic Studies (AIPS), students have been awarded employment positions due to completion of the Nonprofit and Public Organization Marketing and Fund-raising courses and the Certificate Program. This information is from alumni testimonials received following completion of the Certified Specialist in Planned Giving (CSPG) and Nonprofit Public Organization Marketing and Fund-raising Certificate Program.

The Center for International Trade and Transportation (CITT) is supported by the City of Long Beach, the Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles, and business leaders in the region. The Port of Long Beach made a \$10,000 contribution toward publicity and marketing of the Global Logistics Specialist (GLS) program. The GLS professional designation program attracts a wide array of executives from international trading companies (e.g., Dayton Hudson), leading aerospace companies (e.g., Northrop-Grumman and Boeing), and has prompted inquiries for in-house training from the largest global transportation companies (e.g., American President Lines, Maersk, Sea-Lan, and Hanjin). Over 20 local and national trade and transportation associations have endorsed the GLS program. More than 300 individuals, representing all industries of intermodal transportation and international trade, have attended GLS classes — a remarkable number for an industry with no culture of formal training and education and employees averaging 50-hour workweeks. The Harbor Transportation Club committed its entire scholarship fund toward CITT transportation programs, and five instructors donated a total of \$2,000 of their honoraria back into the program. The Los Angeles Transportation Club granted the association's entire scholarship fund of \$2,000 to the GLS program.

Science and Technology Professional Development programs have been developed through UCES partnerships. With Boeing, UCES offers programs specially tailored to Boeing employees. UCES participates in Microsoft Corporation's Authorized Academic Training Program (AATP), is included in their AATP database, and is listed as a training provider on Microsoft's web site. Student testimonials from employees of Boeing, Northrop-Grumman, the City of Long Beach, and the City of Newport Beach endorse and confirm the quality of the Science and Technology programs.

Systems and Software Engineering Forum for Training (SSEFT) has been supported by three of the largest software companies in Southern California: The Boeing Company, Northrop-Grumman, and TRW Systems and Information Technology Group.

Student evaluation of non-credit courses is an important part of maintaining the high quality of UCES non-credit courses. Program administrators, coordinators, and staff use data acquired from student evaluations to assess effectiveness in conveying course content and to evaluate the delivery of other support services to students. Each student's evaluation is important in the assessment of a course.

CAMPUS-DEFINED INDICATORS

CSULB has chosen to include campus-defined indicators in two areas: (1) "key indicators of quality" in undergraduate education; and (2) quality of services to students. The first of these focuses on core, academic quality and the second on quality of support services. In January 2000, the Provost suggested the first of these areas in the process of setting three-year goals for campus this year. The second reflects a campus commitment of several years' standing to student services. Our voluntary inclusion of these indicators in our accountability reports will require considerable effort, but the campus intends to utilize these indicators to ensure that we are providing the highest quality instruction and services possible.

KEY INDICATORS OF QUALITY IN UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

In the course of extending its ongoing efforts in strategic planning, the campus has initiated a wide-ranging discussion of ways to measure the overall quality of its students' experiences. The quinquennial SNAPS survey and various benchmarking efforts have shown that it is possible to measure specific services to students as well as students' satisfaction with those services. The campus would like to develop comparably effective measurements for its overall academic performance and for specific factors with a direct bearing on that performance. Examples of the questions we have in mind include: the extent to which students are successfully taking advantage of the modernization of library collections and methods of access; the extent to which the campus achieves the optimal balance between access to

computing resources and the provision of assistance in learning how to utilize those resources; the extent to which General Education and students' specific majors, taken together, constitute an integrated educational experience; the extent to which curricular and co-curricular activities reinforce each other to advance student learning; and similar questions. The definition of such indicators and the development of the measures themselves will extend over the next two to three years. When this process is complete, the campus should have a wealth of new information to guide it in making further improvements in the quality of the educational experience it provides for its students.

QUALITY OF SERVICES TO STUDENTS

For several years CSULB has had a focus on improving the quality of services to students. With presidential leadership, the campus has set a goal of being a "campus of choice," and an essential part of fulfilling that goal is ensuring high quality student services.

SNAPS Findings

Results of the 1999 system-wide Student Needs and Preferences Survey (SNAPS) demonstrate that Long Beach has greatly improved its quality of services to students and that the campus is now perceived by students as among the best in the CSU system in quality of services. As a result of dissatisfaction with the outcomes reflected in the 1994 SNAPS survey, the University President convened a high-level Blue Ribbon Task Force on Services to Students. This committee reviewed a variety of student services and issued a comprehensive report to the President containing a number of recommendations for service improvement. The President endorsed the report, and it served as a blueprint for directing considerable resources toward implementing the recommendations contained in the report. During each budget cycle, priority has been given to instructional and services initiatives that have placed a priority on meeting student needs.

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH

Student Services Quality Indicators: 1999 vs. 1994 SNAPS Results *

Indicator	1994	1999	Difference
Bookstore	69.8	72.0	2.2
Admissions services	35.8	59.1	23.3
Records or registration services	NA	62.5	NA
Testing services (e.g., EPT, ELM, upper division writing requirement)	NA	58.7	NA
Financial aid services	38.6	63.3	24.7
Student health services	66.3	73.5	7.2
Career center services	45.3	62.9	17.6
Food services	47.5	64.6	17.1
Advising from administrative or program staff (e.g., EOP, Adult Re-entry, Services to Students with Disabilities, Financial Aid)	46.9	64.0	17.1
New student orientation	55.8	66.7	10.9
Advising from university orientation office	NA	60.0	NA
Student clubs and organizations	50.9	65.4	14.5
Services to students with disabilities	48.4	71.5	23.1
Cultural activities	45.9	55.6	9.7
Educational equity programs (e.g., EOP, Summer Bridge)	50.8	67.8	17.0
Recreation programs and activities	44.8	61.6	16.8
Psychological counseling	44.8	58.8	14.0
Student Union activities	53.2	62.7	9.5
Intercollegiate athletic programs	41.4	64.6	23.2
Campus housing	39.4	46.8	7.4
Campus child care	41.1	54.2	13.1
Associated students programs and activities	NA	55.3	NA
Adult re-entry services	NA	56.4	NA
Fraternities and sororities	NA	48.2	NA

* Percent who found Quality "Good" or "Excellent"

**Student Services Quality Indicators:
System vs. CSULB 1999 SNAPS Results**

Indicator	System	CSULB	Difference
Bookstore	62.4	72.0	9.6
Admissions services	54.1	59.1	5.0
Records or registration services	53.1	62.5	9.4
Testing services (e.g., EPT, ELM, upper division writing requirement)	49.3	58.7	9.4
Financial aid services	62.0	63.3	1.3
Student health services	70.8	73.5	2.7
Career center services	56.5	62.9	6.4
Food services	46.6	64.6	18.0
Advising from administrative/ program staff (e.g., EOP, Adult Re-entry, Services to Students with Disabilities, Financial Aid)	57.0	64.0	7.0
New student orientation	60.8	66.7	5.9
Advising from university orientation office	54.4	60.0	5.6
Student clubs and organizations	56.0	65.4	9.4
Services to students with disabilities	60.7	71.5	10.8
Cultural activities	49.8	55.6	5.8
Educational equity programs (e.g., EOP, Summer Bridge)	58.2	67.8	9.6
Recreation programs and activities	55.3	61.6	6.3
Psychological counseling	53.2	58.8	5.6
Student Union activities	52.0	62.7	10.7
Intercollegiate athletic programs	46.2	64.6	18.4
Campus housing	44.9	46.8	1.9
Campus child care	47.3	54.2	6.9
Associated students programs and activities	49.0	55.3	6.3
Adult re-entry services	47.7	56.4	8.7
Fraternities and sororities	44.9	48.2	3.3

* Percent who found Quality "Good" or "Excellent"

Quality Improvement

CSULB has also been an active participant in the Quality Improvement (QI) initiative supported by the CSU Chancellor's Office. As a part of this initiative, several student customer satisfaction surveys were conducted of selected campus academic and administrative support services. These surveys assessed a wide range of services including Admissions and Records, Student Accounts Receivable, Library Services, Career Development Center, Financial Aid, Student Health Services, Parking Services, and University Police Services. The results of these surveys (and those conducted with faculty and staff) have been widely reported across the campus. These customer assessments provide a potential set of core student service quality indicators that the campus is evaluating with the intent to select those that can be best used for campus planning and campus accountability reporting.

Planning is currently underway to build a preliminary set of student service indicators that would be applicable to a broad range of student service areas. These preliminary indicators will be shared with relevant campus constituencies for review with the expectation that a final set of indicators will be available in fall 2000.

The customer survey information collected will serve as a baseline for future comparisons. It is expected that the student services indicators developed will be utilized in the spring 2001 cycle of CSU system-wide customer satisfaction surveys. The data from these surveys will be used in future reporting on accountability in regard to quality of services to students.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

California State University Long Beach is a healthy, thriving campus that has become a magnet for students. In recent years, the campus has paid attention to quality. Curriculum has been reformed and resources have been redirected to support quality. Vigorous efforts have been made to work with our K-12 partners and strengthen the preparation of prospective students. These changes have improved the quality of the student experience and strengthened the quality of the education provided to our diverse students. Working in support of this commitment is an aggressive university advancement team. Quality education is the "bottom line" for a university, and CSULB is proud of its achievements.

**APPENDIX:
DATA PROVIDED BY THE OFFICE
OF THE CHANCELLOR**

Indicators 2 - 8 for California State University, Long Beach Provided by the Office of the Chancellor of the CSU System Note: The following data were provided to the campus as Internet pages. Although the formatting for printed copy is not ideal, they are provided here for two reasons. First, readers may wish to refer to the data. Second, there are numerous technical notes attached that are relevant to interpretation of the data.

LONG BEACH INDICATOR 2:

Access to the CSU

“The CSU is committed to providing all eligible first-time freshman, upper-division California Community College transfer, and priority teacher preparation applicants with admission to a CSU campus. While these applicants may not be admitted to their first-choice CSU campus or their first-choice program, eligible applicants are guaranteed admission to some CSU campus.

“Indicator 2.1: For each university, the number of first-time freshman, upper-division community college transfer, and priority teacher preparation applicants who applied and were admitted to the university.

“Indicator 2.2a: (For campuses which had impacted programs or had campus-wide impactation.) The number of eligible first-time freshman, upper-division community college transfer, and priority teacher preparation applicants who applied to the university as their first choice during the opening filing period and were not admitted.

“Indicator 2.2b: (For campuses which had impacted programs or had campus-wide impactation.) The number of eligible first-time freshman, upper-division community college transfer, and priority teacher preparation applicants who applied to the university as their first choice during the open filing period and were not admitted to their first-choice university, but were admitted to another CSU university.”

The Enrollment Reporting System (ERS) data file on the admission of applicants has been revised to enable CSU to provide indicators to support Accountability Area 2, Access to the CSU, effective summer 2000 with term submissions for college year 2000-2001 due on June 21, 2001. Results based on these revisions will be available for the next accountability reporting cycle. For this cycle, basic application cycle information is provided to support campus background discussions on the extent to which access has been provided to eligible students.

ACCESS: OPEN, IMPACTED BY PROGRAM, IMPACTED CAMPUSWIDE

Campus: Long Beach

	Fall 1997	Fall 1998	Fall 1999	Fall 2000	Fall 2001
Open: <i>Did not use impactation for enrollment management</i>	X	X	X	X	–
Impacted by Program: <i>Declared impactation by program, developed and promulgated supplemental criteria.</i>	Graphic Design/ Applied Art Health Sciences Nursing Psychology Radio, TV & Film Social Work	Graphic Design/ Applied Art Health Sciences Kinesiology/Phys Ed Nursing Psychology Radio, TV & Film Social Work	Graphic Design/ Applied Art Health Sciences Kinesiology/Phys Ed Nursing Psychology Radio, TV & Film Social Work	Graphic Design/ Applied Art Health Sciences Kinesiology/Phys Ed Nursing Psychology Radio, TV & Film Social Work	–
Impacted Campuswide: <i>Declared that supplemental criteria would be used for admission across academic programs.</i>	–	–	–	–	–
Closing Dates for: <i>First-time Freshmen Lower Division Transfers Upper Division Transfers</i>	5/31/97 7/15/97 7/15/97	3/15/98 3/15/98 5/31/98	3/15/99 11/30/98 4/9/99	11/30/99 11/30/99 3/31/00	

LONG BEACH INDICATOR 3:

Progression to the degree

“The CSU will provide clear paths to the baccalaureate degree for first-time freshmen and transfer students. The goal is that the number of units completed towards the degree, in both general education (GE) and the major, is comparable for students who entered as freshmen and for students who entered as transfer students.

“Indicator 3.1: For each university, the percentage of students, both first-time freshmen and upper-division California Community College transfer students, who progress from the first year of enrollment to second.

“Indicator 3.2: For each university, the number of units completed by upper-division California Community College transfer students who are graduated as compared to the number of units completed by upper-division students who also are graduated but entered the CSU as first-time freshmen.”

INDICATOR 3.1

First-Year Retention

To assist the accountability coordinators in developing their reports, the Chancellor’s Office prepared campus-specific accountability indicator tables for each campus. Access to campus-specific indicator tables has been permitted only to the campus institutional researcher along with other technical documentation and materials. In addition, it may be useful to note for context that research has shown that the extent to which a university retains new students during their first-year is the critical indicator in progression to the degree. New student orientation, Summer Bridge, and first-year programs are intended to strengthen first-year retention. Under state law (Chapter 741 of the Statutes of 1991), The California State University (CSU) system currently provides the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) with one-year continuation rates. The indicators provided by the CSU system to the campus in this section are consistent with the fall-to-fall, one-year continuation rates for first-time freshmen and CCC transfers by regular and exception — as supplied to CPEC and also presented in the CSU Statistical Abstract. One IMPORTANT note of caution: During the spring, Analytic Studies staff found on reviewing the CSU Statistical Abstract and CPEC indicators that “canned” menus that have

generated indicators by admission basis have been inaccurate. Analytic Studies staff will be replacing inaccurate CSU Statistical Abstract and CPEC indicators in future editions. Indicator 3.1.3 — one-year continuation rates for students admitted by exception (aka special admits) — bounce around a lot for many campuses — no doubt related to the absolute numbers of specially-admitted first-time freshmen and lower-division community college transfer students enrolled in fall 1996, fall 1997, and fall 1998. You may wish to supply your accountability report coordinator with Ns to help in clarifying the indicator trends. In addition, contextual information about enrollment management issues and decisions during those years may be useful in explaining unusual or notable year-to-year fluctuations.

INDICATOR 3.1.1

One-Year Continuation Rates for First-Time Freshmen and California Community College Transfer Students — All Admission Bases

	Fall 1996 to Fall 1997	Fall 1997 to Fall 1998	Fall 1998 to Fall 1999
First-Time Freshmen	79	80	83
CCC Transfers	81	82	83

INDICATOR 3.1.2

One-Year Continuation Rates for First-Time Freshmen and California Community College Transfer Students — Regularly Admitted

	Fall 1996 to Fall 1997	Fall 1997 to Fall 1998	Fall 1998 to Fall 1999
First-Time Freshmen	80	81	83
CCC Transfers	82	84	84

INDICATOR 3.1.3

One-Year Continuation Rates for First-Time Freshmen and California Community College Transfer Students — Admitted by Exception

	Fall 1996 to Fall 1997	Fall 1997 to Fall 1998	Fall 1998 to Fall 1999
First-Time Freshmen	74	77	79
CCC Transfers	56	85	73

INDICATOR 3.2

Units to Degree

There is interest in tracking the extent to which upper-division California Community College (CCC) transfer students progress to degree as efficiently as California State University (CSU) students who entered the CSU as first-time freshmen.

The indicators in this section compare the units earned by CCC junior transfer students as they made their way to the baccalaureate degree with the units earned by first-time freshmen from analogous junior status to degree.

Indicator 3.2.1 provides an overall perspective, while indicator 3.2.2 focuses on those upper-division CCC transfer students and first-time freshmen who were regularly-admitted. Regularly admitted students should be more likely to make efficient progress to degree than underprepared counterparts.

A difference of a few student credit units between native and CCC transfer students on indicator 3.2.1 — average total units completed by upper-division students to degree — is no major cause for alarm.

Some naïve observers might expect an upper-division student to earn only 60 semester or 90 quarter units to the baccalaureate degree — 30 semester/45 quarter units per upper-division year. Others, recognizing students’ developmental needs, priorities to gain additional skills and knowledge in minor areas et cetera, may understand that earning up to 30 percent more units is, in fact, a reasonable expectation and certainly sensible from the student perspective. The “30 % benchmark” is 78 semester units or 117 quarter units. The difference between a traditional expectation and this benchmark is 18 semester units or 27 quarter units — an extra term or two.

It is altogether possible that upper-division students at your campus, on average, are earning somewhat more than the “30% benchmark to degree.” This occurs, we believe, in large measure, because the campus average (of total units completed by upper-division students) reflects the campus distribution of degree type and major degree program, which themselves drive a wide range of minimum units to degree. You may wish to do additional analysis by degree type or major degree program to facilitate a deeper understanding of campus indicator trends. It also probably is worth recalling that there isn’t general agreement about the 30% benchmark; some have suggested 20% above the minimum units to degree.

INDICATOR 3.2.1

Average Total Units Completed by Students in the Upper Division as They Progressed to the Baccalaureate

	CY 1996-97	CY 1997-98	CY 1998-99
Baccalaureate degree recipients who entered the CSU as junior CCC transfer students	76	74	75
Baccalaureate degree recipients who entered the CSU as first-time freshmen	76	76	76

INDICATOR 3.2.2

Average Total Units Completed by Students in the Upper Division as They Progressed to the Baccalaureate— Regularly Admitted Students

	CY 1996-97	CY 1997-98	CY 1998-99
Baccalaureate degree recipients who entered the CSU as upper-division CCC transfer students— regularly admitted	74	73	74
Baccalaureate degree recipients who entered the CSU as first-time freshmen— regularly admitted	77	76	76

LONG BEACH INDICATOR 4:

Persistence and Graduation

“The CSU, through clear statements of graduation requirements, effective advising, and effective access to courses, will assist students to achieve their degree objectives.

“Indicator 4.1: For each university, student graduation rates, disaggregated by relevant subpopulations (first-time freshmen, lower-division transfer students, upper-division transfer students) and by key student characteristics (full- and part-time attendance, etc.).”

INDICATOR 4.1

Persistence and Graduation

To assist the accountability coordinators in developing their reports, the Chancellor’s Office prepared campus-specific accountability indicator tables for each campus. Access to campus-specific indicator tables has been permitted only to the campus institutional researcher along with other technical documentation and materials.

In addition, it may be useful to note for context that there are several forms of graduation rate reporting that have common currency in the public arena. The CSU system will supply to each campus several indicators regarding persistence and graduation for the campus to review and to consider for use in the campus’ annual accountability report.

The National Collegiate Athletics Association (NCAA) has agreed to use the methodology developed by the National Center for Education Statistics and required in the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System — Graduation Reporting System (IPEDS-GRS) for its annual reporting. NCAA/IPEDS-GRS graduation rates are received by NCES and NCAA on March 2-3 each year and are promulgated by the association as well as published annually by the Chronicle of Higher Education.

IPEDS-GRS graduation rates are supplied as Indicator 4.1.1.

INDICATOR 4.1.1

Long Beach

IPEDS-GRS Graduation Rates: Six-Year Graduation Rates of Fall First-Time Freshmen Who Were Enrolled in at Least 12 Credit Units in the First Term of Enrollment

	Fall 1996 to Fall 1997	Fall 1997 to Fall 1998	Fall 1998 to Fall 1999
First-time freshmen who were enrolled in at least 12 credit units in the first term of enrollment	28	33	31

Under state law (Chapter 741 of the Statutes of 1991), The California State University (CSU) system currently provides the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) with five-year continuation and graduation rates. The state graduation and persistence indicators have characteristics that make them superior to the IPEDS-GRS indicator. Some of these characteristics are:

1. The state indicators include information about the continuation, graduation, and overall persistence of upper-division, community college transfer students.
2. The state indicators include both information about graduation and continued enrollment five-years out for native freshmen and three-years out for upper-division CCC transfer students. CSU research has shown that the five-year persistence rate for native freshmen and the three-year persistence rate for transfer students provide EXCELLENT predictors of the ultimate graduation rates for CSU students. CSU students are persistent, but they often find the need to stop out or to carry low course-loads in order to manage other life priorities.
3. The state indicators permit focused attention regarding continuation, graduation, and persistence of regularly admitted first-time freshmen and regularly-admitted upper-division community college transfer students — those students for whom the CSU is assigned responsibility under the California Master Plan for Higher Education. Prospective CSU students and their parents are better informed by persistence and graduation indicators regarding students who meet admission requirements.

4. In California, some first-time freshmen and lower-transfers are admitted by exception. In the California higher education performance report, continuation, graduation, and persistence rates for these students who need and receive additional assistance are tracked and reported annually. CPEC Continuation, Graduation and Persistence Rates are presented as Indicators 4.1.2.1 (Regularly-Admitted First-Time Freshmen), 4.1.2.2 (First-Time Freshmen Admitted by Exception), 4.1.2.3 (Regularly-Admitted Upper-Division CCC Transfers), and 4.1.2.4 (Lower-Division CCC Transfers Admitted by Exception).

One IMPORTANT note of caution: During the spring, Analytic Studies staff found on reviewing the CSU Statistical Abstract and CPEC indicators that “canned” menus that have generated indicators by admission basis have been inaccurate. Analytic Studies staff will be replacing inaccurate CSU Statistical Abstract and CPEC indicators in future editions. Generally, for regularly-admitted transfer students graduation and retention rates actually are higher than reported before because the selection criteria were NOT restricted to true regular admits. For specially-admitted transfer students graduation and retention rates actually are lower than reported before because selection criteria were NOT restricted to basis of admission codes T and U in addition to lower-division status.

INDICATOR 4.1.2.1 — LONG BEACH

CPEC Continuation, Graduation, and Persistence Rates:

Five-Year Persistence Rates of Fall First-Time Freshmen, Regularly Admitted

	Fall 1991 to Fall 1996	Fall 1992 to Fall 1997	Fall 1993 to Fall 1998	Fall 1994 to Fall 1999
Was graduated within 5 years	18	24	22	21
Still enrolled at 5 years	28	29	30	29
Graduation and continuation rates: Persistence rate	46	53	52	50

INDICATOR 4.1.2.2 — LONG BEACH

CPEC Continuation, Graduation, and Persistence Rates:

Five-Year Persistence Rates of Fall First-Time Freshmen, Admitted by Exception

	Fall 1991 to Fall 1996	Fall 1992 to Fall 1997	Fall 1993 to Fall 1998	Fall 1994 to Fall 1999
Was graduated within 5 years	5	7	7	7
Still enrolled at 5 years	30	25	30	24
Graduation and continuation rates: Persistence rate	35	32	37	31

INDICATOR 4.1.2.3 — LONG BEACH

CPEC Continuation, Graduation, and Persistence Rates:

Three-Year Persistence Rates of Fall Upper-Division California Community College Transfer Students, Regularly Admitted

	Fall 1991 to Fall 1994	Fall 1992 to Fall 1995	Fall 1993 to Fall 1996	Fall 1994 to Fall 1997	Fall 1995 to Fall 1998	Fall 1996 to Fall 1999
Was graduated within 3 years	39	41	37	40	38	39
Still enrolled at 3 years	29	27	29	30	30	28
Graduation and continuation rates: Persistence rate	68	68	66	70	68	67

INDICATOR 4.1.2.4 — LONG BEACH

CPEC Continuation, Graduation, and Persistence Rates:

Five-Year Persistence Rates of Fall Lower-Division California Community College Transfer Students, Admitted by Exception

	Fall 1991 to Fall 1996	Fall 1992 to Fall 1997	Fall 1993 to Fall 1998	Fall 1994 to Fall 1999
Was graduated within 5 years	32	24	29	39
Still enrolled at 5 years	16	9	25	3
Graduation and continuation rates: Persistence rate	48	33	54	42

The Joint Commission on Accountability Reporting (JCAR), a collaboration of the Association of American Community Colleges (AACCC), the Association of American State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC), developed the only other graduation rate methodology approved by the Secretary of Education for use in federal Student-Right-to-Know reporting.

Unlike any other graduation rate methodology, the JCAR methodology captures information about the pace at which students make progress to degree. The JCAR methodology recognizes that the number of credit units a student takes during the first term of enrollment may provide very little information about the actual pace and intensity at which a student makes progress to degree. Under the JCAR methodology, a student’s coursetaking pattern for a period of time (up to eight semesters or 12 quarters) is used to determine the student pacing.

College and university catalogs provide detailed information about degree programs and their requirements. From the catalog, students and their academic advisers develop multiyear plans to progress to degree, and most undergraduate degree programs are designed so that a first-time freshman is able to complete the baccalaureate degree in four years.

Under the federal Student-Right-to-Know law and subsequent discussions, there is a recognition that most undergraduates on financial aid need to work during the academic year to contribute financially to their college-going. As such, the federal standard of 150 percent of “catalog” time to degree was developed. If the

“traditional” undergraduate degree program is designed to be completed in four years of rigorous course work, then the typical 150 percent of “catalog” time is six years. That is, four times 1.5.

What does this mean for a student on financial aid? A “traditional” student, trying to complete a 120-unit, four-year major in four years, will take, on average, 15 semester units per term for eight semesters. A “typical full-time” student on financial aid will take, on average, 12 semester units per term for 10 semesters, or 5.5 years (about six years), to complete the same 120-unit, four-year program.

Under the JCAR methodology, in addition to identifying the pace at which each student has made progress to degree, the requirements of the degree program are taken into account, and students are sorted into three categories: “Traditional” students who took course-loads at a pace to complete their four-year degree program in four-years; “Typical financial aid” students who took courseloads at pace to complete their four-year degree programs in 150% of catalog time, that is, six years; and Students whose pace to degree was much less intense or more erratic than the first two categories of students.

Under the JCAR methodology, graduation rates are provided at four years, six years, and without consideration to length of time.

JCAR Graduation Rates are presented as Indicators 4.1.3.1 (All First-Time Freshmen), 4.1.3.2 (Regularly-Admitted First-Time Freshmen), and 4.1.3.3 (Regularly-Admitted Junior CCC Transfers).

INDICATOR 4.1.3.1 — LONG BEACH*JCAR Graduation Rates: Graduation Rates of Fall 1993 First-Time Freshmen*

	Cohort Size	Portion of Total Cohort	Graduated within 4 Years	Graduated within 6 Years	Graduated from the Campus
“Traditional” students carrying courseloads to complete a 4-year degree program within 4 years	224	12%	26%	68%	71%
Students carrying courseloads to complete a 4-year degree program in more than 4 years but by 6	1391	76%	1%	29%	48%
Students carrying partial courseloads	221	12%	0%	1%	33%
Total First-Time Freshmen	1836	100%	4%	31%	49%

INDICATOR 4.1.3.2 — LONG BEACH*JCAR Graduation Rates: Graduation Rates of Fall 1993 First-Time Freshmen — Regularly Admitted*

	Cohort Size	Portion of Total Cohort	Graduated within 4 Years	Graduated within 6 Years	Graduated from the Campus
“Traditional” students carrying courseloads to complete a 4-year degree program within 4 years	203	13%	27%	69%	72%
Students carrying courseloads to complete a 4-year degree program in more than 4 years but by 6	1130	73%	2%	35%	53%
Students carrying partial courseloads	217	14%	0%	1%	33%
Total First-Time Freshmen	1550	100%	5%	34%	53%

INDICATOR 4.1.3.3 — LONG BEACH*JCAR Graduation Rates: Graduation Rates of Fall 1996 First-Time Freshmen — Regularly Admitted*

	Cohort Size	Portion of Total Cohort	Graduated within 2 Years	Graduated within 3 Years	Graduated from the Campus
“Traditional” upper-division transfer students carrying courseloads to complete a 4-year degree program in 2 years	454	29%	27%	67%	80%
Upper-division transfer students carrying courseloads to complete a 4-year degree program in more than 2 years but by 3	628	41%	11%	47%	77%
Upper-division transfer students carrying partial loads	461	30%	0%	4%	53%
Total Regularly Admitted CCC UD Transfer Students	1543	100%	12%	40%	70%

The California State University annually publishes a graph and statistics regarding the advancement of regularly-admitted first-time freshmen and regularly-admitted upper-division California Community College transfer students that provides information about the persistence of CSU undergraduates to degree. The indicators provided in this section include the CSU students who transferred from one CSU campus to another and received a degree. In the long run, the CSU hopes to add information about the extent to which CSU undergraduates earned the degree after transferring to the UC and to other colleges and universities. The CSU Persistence Rates for Regularly-Admitted First-Time Freshmen and Regularly-Admitted Upper-Division CCC Transfer Students are presented as Indicators 4.1.4.1 (freshman) and 4.1.4.2 (transfer). One IMPORTANT note of caution: During the spring, Analytic Studies staff found on reviewing the CSU Statistical Abstract indicators that “canned” menus that have generated indicators for regular-admits have been inaccurate. Analytic Studies staff will be replacing inaccurate CSU Statistical Abstract indicators in future editions. Generally, for regularly-admitted upper-division CCCC transfer students graduation and retention rates actually are higher than reported system before because the selection criteria were NOT restricted to true regular admits and upper-division transfers.

INDICATOR 4.1.4.1 — LONG BEACH
CSU Persistence to Graduation: Fall 1987 Regularly-Admitted First-Time Freshmen

Fall	Enrolled	Earned a Degree at Campus of Entry	Earned a Degree at CSU Campus of Transfer	Persistence
1987	1.000	0.000	0.000	1.000
1988	0.751	0.000	0.000	0.751
1989	0.625	0.000	0.000	0.625
1990	0.572	0.001	0.000	0.573
1991	0.484	0.050	0.001	0.535
1992	0.261	0.243	0.015	0.519
1993	0.112	0.377	0.030	0.520
1994	0.053	0.438	0.040	0.531
1995	0.027	0.469	0.050	0.545
1996	0.022	0.488	0.057	0.567
1997	0.014	0.494	0.059	0.568
1998	0.009	0.502	0.063	0.573
1999	0.008	0.504	0.065	0.577

INDICATOR 4.1.4.2 — LONG BEACH
CSU Persistence to Graduation: Fall 1987 Regularly-Admitted Upper-Division California Community College Transfer Students

Fall	Enrolled	Earned a Degree at Campus of Entry	Earned a Degree at CSU Campus of Transfer	Persistence
1987	1.000	0.000	0.000	1.000
1988	0.780	0.002	0.001	0.782
1989	0.597	0.071	0.001	0.668
1990	0.317	0.283	0.003	0.604
1991	0.140	0.436	0.005	0.582
1992	0.069	0.495	0.011	0.575
1993	0.040	0.529	0.012	0.580
1994	0.029	0.548	0.012	0.589
1995	0.019	0.563	0.014	0.596
1996	0.014	0.573	0.014	0.602
1997	0.014	0.578	0.015	0.607
1998	0.007	0.585	0.016	0.607
1999	0.007	0.587	0.017	0.611

INDICATOR 5: — LONG BEACH

Areas of Special Need

“The CSU will make special efforts to respond to special state needs beyond our core mission of providing undergraduate education. At present, there is great need in many regions of California for credentialed teachers consistent with the requirements of K-12 education. In the future these needs might include such other professions as engineers, nurses, or social workers.

“Indicator 5.1: For each university, the number of credentials issued by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing to candidates completing professional education requirements.”

INDICATOR 5.1:

Critical Need for Qualified Credentialed Teachers

To assist the accountability coordinators in developing their reports, the Chancellor’s Office prepared campus-specific accountability indicator tables for each campus. Access to campus-specific indicator tables has been permitted only to the campus institutional researcher along with other technical documentation and materials.

Presented below is a series of 10 campus-specific tables.

The source of data for Indicator 5.1 is the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC). Each CSU campus provides the CCTC with its recommendations during a fiscal year. The deadline for submitting 1998-1999 recommendations was October 1999. In May 2000, the CCTC staff members provided the CSU Chancellor’s Office staff members with the data file that it is using to inform its commissioners, institutions of higher education, and the public regarding credential production during 1998-1999. The data analysis specifications used in the following tables are those specified by CCTC data analysts.

Please carefully compare campus records on credential recommendations provided to CCTC with the following tables. If there are discrepancies between 1998-1999 campus recommendations for Multiple Subject, Single Subject, or Special Education credentials, or for first time/new type Multiple Subject, Single Subject, or Special Education credentials, the campus Institutional Research Director should contact Marsha Hirano-Nakanishi (mhirano-nakanishi@calstate.edu) and Marv Lindsey (mlindsey@calstate.edu) immediately.

INDICATOR 5.1.1

First Time/ New Type Credentials Issuances

INDICATOR 5.1.1.1 - LONG BEACH

First Time/ New Type Multiple Subject Credential Issuances from CCTC, Candidates Recommended by University

	CY 1996-1997	CY 1997-1998	CY 1998-1999
First Time/ New Type issuances, recommended by the university	302	370	336

INDICATOR 5.1.1.2 — LONG BEACH

First Time/ New Type Single Subject Credential Issuances from CCTC, Candidates Recommended by University

	CY 1996-1997	CY 1997-1998	CY 1998-1999
First Time/ New Type issuances, recommended by the university	206	212	186

INDICATOR 5.1.1.3 - LONG BEACH

First Time/ New Type Multiple and Single Subject Credential Issuances from CCTC, Candidates Recommended by University

	CY 1996-1997	CY 1997-1998	CY 1998-1999
First Time/ New Type issuances, recommended by the university	508	582	522

INDICATOR 5.1.1.4 — LONG BEACH

First Time/ New Type Special Education Credential Issuances from CCTC, Candidates Recommended by University

	CY 1996-1997	CY 1997-1998	CY 1998-1999
First Time/ New Type issuances, recommended by the university	80	64	80

INDICATOR 5.1.1.5 — LONG BEACH

First Time/ New Type Multiple & Single Subject and Special Education Credential Issuances from CCTC, Candidates Recommended by University

	CY 1996-1997	CY 1997-1998	CY 1998-1999
First Time/ New Type issuances, recommended by the university	588	646	602

INDICATOR 5.1.2*All Credential Issuances INDICATOR***5.1.2.1 — LONG BEACH***All Multiple Subject Credential Issuances from CCTC, Candidates Recommended by University*

	CY 1996-1997	CY 1997-1998	CY 1998-1999
All issuances, recommended by the university	507	595	558

INDICATOR 5.1.2.2 — LONG BEACH*All Single Subject Credential Issuances from CCTC, Candidates Recommended by University*

	CY 1996-1997	CY 1997-1998	CY 1998-1999
All issuances, recommended by the university	319	366	309

INDICATOR 5.1.2.3 — LONG BEACH*All Multiple and Single Subject Credential Issuances from CCTC, Candidates Recommended by University*

	CY 1996-1997	CY 1997-1998	CY 1998-1999
All issuances, recommended by the university	826	961	867

INDICATOR 5.1.2.4 — LONG BEACH*All Special Education Credential Issuances from CCTC, Candidates Recommended by University*

	CY 1996-1997	CY 1997-1998	CY 1998-1999
All issuances, recommended by the university	85	68	88

INDICATOR 5.1.2.5 — LONG BEACH*All Multiple & Single Subject and Special Education Credential Issuances from CCTC, Candidates Recommended by University*

	CY 1996-1997	CY 1997-1998	CY 1998-1999
All issuances, recommended by the university	911	1029	955

LONG BEACH INDICATOR 6:*Relations with K-12*

“In an effort to improve the academic preparation of entering students, the CSU will be responsive to the needs of K-12 education. Although the CSU cannot assume full control of the academic preparation of entering students, our universities can influence the level of preparation

“Indicator 6.2: For each university, the percentage of regularly eligible students who are fully prepared in mathematics and English composition.”

Indicator 6.2: Preparedness for College-Level Mathematics and English

To assist the accountability coordinators in developing their reports, the Chancellor's Office prepared campus-specific accountability indicator tables for each campus. Access to campus-specific indicator tables has been permitted only to the campus institutional researcher along with other technical documentation and materials.

In addition, it may be useful to note for context that The California State University (CSU) prepares an annual report regarding the preparedness of regularly-admitted first-time freshmen for college-level mathematics and English.

A systemwide report is prepared for the CSU trustees to review the extent to which collaborative efforts with K-12 are helping to improve the mathematics and English skills of college-bound high school students as they prepare to transition to college.

CSU faculty have been collaborating with high school teachers on expectations, diagnostic testing, and instructional approaches, as well as improving the quality of training provided to new K-12 school teachers in the state, and CSU students have been mentoring and tutoring students in K-12 using reports on the preparedness of students at particular high schools.

These reports are available on the CSU Analytic Studies website at: <http://www.asd.calstate.edu/performance/remediation.htm>

Trends in the preparedness of regularly-admitted first-time freshmen at the system level provide a simple reading for the Trustees to see if collaborative efforts throughout the state are making the differences to which we are committed.

Trends in the preparedness of regularly-admitted first-time freshmen attending a particular CSU campus are not as easy to interpret.

If the mathematics or English trend does not improve, this does not necessarily signal that the campus is failing in its collaborative efforts. It may well be doing an exemplary job in working with and serving local area K-12 schools, administrators, and students, but students may be electing to attend an out-of-region CSU campus, a UC campus, or a private college or university.

Recent immigrant students also may need more intensive, multiyear efforts in K-12 and college to attain college-level English literacy skills.

Indicators 6.2.1 and 6.2.2 present trends on preparedness for college-level mathematics and English. At <http://www.asd.calstate.edu/performance/remediation.htm> you will find more detailed, posted data on the need of regularly-admitted first-time freshmen in the system and at individual campuses for remediation — the inverse of preparedness. There also is more detailed, posted information about the extent to which students in need of remediation became proficient within one year.

INDICATOR 6.2.1 - LONG BEACH
Preparedness for College-Level Mathematics

	Fall 1997	Fall 1998	Fall 1999
Percentage of regularly-admitted first-time freshmen fully prepared in mathematics	41	41	46

INDICATOR 6.2.2 - LONG BEACH
Preparedness for College-Level English

	Fall 1997	Fall 1998	Fall 1999
Percentage of regularly-admitted first-time freshmen fully prepared in English	46	47	49

LONG BEACH INDICATOR 7:
Remediation

“The CSU will successfully remediate, within one year, students who are not fully prepared to begin college-level mathematics and English.

“Indicator 7.1: For each university, the percentage of students requiring remediation who complete remediation within one year.”

Indicator 7.1: Preparedness for College-Level Mathematics and English After One Year

To assist the accountability coordinators in developing their reports, the Chancellor’s Office prepared campus-specific accountability indicator tables for each campus. Access to campus-specific indicator tables has been permitted only to the campus institutional researcher along with other technical documentation and materials.

In addition, it may be useful to note for context that regularly-admitted first-time freshmen in The California State University (CSU) are recent high school graduates who completed a rigorous college-preparatory curriculum and achieved a grade point average of at least 3.0 or a mix of strong test scores and satisfactory grades. To benefit effectively from a college education, it is essential to enter college with basic skills in mathematics and especially in English.

Regularly-admitted first-time freshmen who lack basic skills in mathematics and English at entry have done everything the CSU has asked them to do in high school. The CSU believes that extra efforts in the first year should be sufficient to bring these students up to a basic level of preparedness in both English and mathematics after one year.

Indicator 7.1.1 provides a trendline on the preparedness of each fall class of regularly-admitted first-time freshmen at entry. Indicator 7.1.2 looks at preparedness of the fall regularly-admitted first-time freshmen — one year later — to assess student and institutional effectiveness in addressing baseline competencies. At <http://www.asd.calstate.edu/performance/remediation.htm> you will find more detailed, posted data on the extent to which students in need of remediation became proficient within one year, by system and by campus.

INDICATOR 7.1.1 — LONG BEACH

Preparedness for College-Level Mathematics and English at Entry

	Fall 1998 Number	Fall 1998 Percent	Fall 1999 Number	Fall 1999 Percent
Regularly-admitted first-time freshmen who were fully prepared in both English and mathematics at entry	677	26	1,021	31
Total regularly-admitted first-time freshmen	2,590	–	3,308	–

INDICATOR 7.1.2 - LONG BEACH

Preparedness for College-Level Mathematics and English One Year Later

	Fall 1998 to Fall 1999 Number	Fall 1998 to Fall 1999 Percent
Regularly-admitted first-time freshmen who were fully prepared in both English and mathematics at entry and also enrolled one year later	583	27
Regularly-admitted first-time freshmen requiring some remediation at entry who re-enrolled one year later and were remediated	1,412	66
Total regularly-admitted first-time freshmen who were fully prepared and enrolled one year later	1,995	93
Total regularly-admitted first-time freshmen enrolled one year later	2,148	–

LONG BEACH INDICATOR 8:
Facilities Utilization

“To meet growing enrollment pressure, the CSU will expand its capacity by using existing facilities more effectively. Strategies to accomplish this include the fuller use of yearly, monthly, and weekly calendars and schedules, and the use of on-line instruction where educationally and qualitatively appropriate. “Indicator 8.1: For each university, the percentages of course enrollments occurring on Fridays, weekends, and summers in ‘capacity’ main campus physical facilities and the percentage not requiring ‘capacity’ physical facilities.”

INDICATOR 8.1.1

Where and When Instruction Takes Place, FTES

	1998-99
Mon-Thur Main Campus Lecture/Lab AY FTES until 4 PM	1,2345.7
Mon-Thur Main Campus Lecture/Lab AY FTES after 4 PM	6,205.2
Friday Main Campus Lecture/Lab AY FTES	908.5
Sat/Sun Main Campus Lecture/Lab AY FTES	120.4
Other Main Campus Lecture/Lab AY FTES	0
Summer Annualized FTES (Main Campus and Off-Site)	0
Main Campus Other Non-Lecture Lab AY FTES	1,059.2
Off Site (Including Official Off-Campus Centers) AY FTES	280.3
Total College Year FTES	20,919.4

INDICATOR 8.1.2

Where and When Instruction Takes Place, Percent

	1998-99
Mon-Thur Main Campus Lecture/Lab AY FTES until 4 PM	59.0%
Mon-Thur Main Campus Lecture/Lab AY FTES after 4 PM	29.7%
Friday Main Campus Lecture/Lab AY FTES	4.3%
Sat/Sun Main Campus Lecture/Lab AY FTES	0.6%
Other Main Campus Lecture/Lab AY FTES	0.0%
Summer Annualized FTES (Main Campus and Off-Site)	0.0%
Main Campus Other Non-Lecture Lab AY FTES	5.1%
Off Site (Including Official Off-Campus Centers) AY FTES	1.3%
Total College Year FTES	100%