

CSU San Bernardino Delivery Plan

Goals

The goals of this delivery plan focus on improving graduation rates and eliminating the achievement gap for CSU San Bernardino. The specific objectives are:

- 1) To raise the overall six year graduation rate by six percentage points (from 43.7% in the 2002 cohort to 49.7% for the 2009 cohort).by 2015
- 2) To eliminate the achievement gap in six year graduation rates between under-represented minorities and other students by 2015.
- 3) To improve the four year graduation rate of CSUSB by two and a half percentage points (from 13.1% to 15.6%) between now and 2015.
- 4) To improve the three year transfer student graduation rate for under-represented minority students by 4.5% between now and 2015.
- 5) To improve the six year transfer student graduation rates by two percentage points by 2015 (from 77.2% to 79.2%).

Context and Analysis

CSU San Bernardino serves one of the most economically disadvantaged regions of the state and has one of the most diverse student bodies in the CSU system. CSU San Bernardino is a Hispanic Serving Institution. The university ranks among the top 25 in the country in the awarding of undergraduate degrees to Hispanic students and in the top 100 in African-American graduates. The incoming class of 2009, on which the success in meeting the first goal will be judged, included 46% Hispanic, 13% African American and 1% Native American students. On the basis of the data we were given, we already have achieved the initial goal of reaching the top quartile among institutions with similar demographic characteristics. We are a hair's breadth away from achieving the top decile in our peer group.

Six Year Graduation Rates: We currently rank 10th in overall six year graduation rates among CSU campuses, according to the data we received in October. The average six year rate for the period between 1995 and 2002 is 41.2%. The benchmark rate of 43.7% on which our improvement goal is founded is the second highest rate of graduation ever achieved by CSUSB, surpassed only by the cohort of 2000 and is almost five percentage points above the rate in the intervening year. This overall rate has trended upwards modestly over time.

In examining the different demographic components underlying the six year rates there are two notable features. The first is that the graduation rates for male students are notably lower than for females. The six year graduation rate for females is 44.1: the rate for males is 35.6 – an achievement gap of 8.5 percentage points. This is despite the higher academic qualifications for incoming male students, whose SAT scores averaged 60 points higher than their female counterparts in 2007. The achievement gap between

men and women is faithfully reflected throughout in the widening persistence rates of the two groups. The gap in first to second year retention is 4.2%, the difference in second to third year persistence rates rises to 4.8%, the gap widens to seven per cent among fourth year students and remains at that level through the sixth year.

The second principal feature is that African American students are markedly less successful than any other group. Their 4 year graduation rate averages 5.25%. This is well below half of the average for all other groups. Their six year graduation rate is 29% averaged over the eight years, fifteen percentage points short of the mean for all other students. There is no evidence of anything other than trendless fluctuation in six year persistence rates. African-American students show a greater propensity to persist into and beyond the sixth year, meaning their academic progress tends to be slower than for other groups in our population. As in all other categories, there has been an improvement in the year to year retention rate for African-American students, though first to second year retention rates have declined over the past three years for which data are available.

CSUSB is unusual in one important respect. It has an exceptionally high retention rate from first to second year, the more so because of the demographic characteristics of the incoming students. The average 80% rate places us in absolute terms among the top quartile of public comprehensives in the country and much higher if the figures were to take account of the great diversity in our intake. While the initial year's retention rate is high, the carry forward from second to third year is relatively poor. Typically, we lose 20% of our incoming cohort before the start of second year and an additional 13% before the start of the third year. This is an unusually high non-retention rate.

Our plan will include special measures to improve graduation rates in two lagging demographic groups and specific measures to increase second to third year retention, in addition to the more general goal of raising the overall six year graduation rate. .

Achievement Gap in Six Year Graduation Rates: The achievement gap between under-represented minority students and others at CSUSB is very small by either national or state standards. It is a mere 0.6% for the 2002 cohort, according to the data provided to us.

Our plan will be to erase that modest gap and reach a position where the rates for under-represented minority students are equal to those of the remainder of our student population

Four Year Graduation Rates: Four year graduation rates were unfortunately not incorporated in the discussion of improvements in the efficiency of the system. These graduation rates among almost all CSU campuses are disappointingly low and CSUSB is no exception. Our rates were as low as 7.1% for the 1995 cohort and have risen quite

consistently to reach 13% for the last two cohorts (2003 and 2004). Not surprisingly, in light of the foregoing discussion, 4 year graduation rates are higher for female students. (14.1%) in the latest cohort than for males (10.9%), though the male rate is at an historical high. The overall average also conceals wide variations across ethnic groups. For the most recent cohort the four year graduation rates for white students are 19.7%. For African-American students they are 7.8%, while those for Hispanic students are 10.4% and those for Asian-Pacific Islanders are 13.6%. The rate for the latter group may be somewhat deceptive because the number of students in the cohort is relatively small and thus tends to magnify outcomes.

Improving these rates is a critical part of the pipeline issue. Simply put, the quicker we move students through to completion, the more spaces we can generate for new students, whether first-time first year students or upper division transfers. Improving four year graduation rates also allows us multiple opportunities to adjust for the 2015 target date, rather than trying to ameliorate the rates for a single six year cohort already in residence.

Our plan will include measures to increase the four year graduation rates for the incoming cohorts of 2010 and 2011.

Three Year Transfer Graduation Rates: We were not directed to consider three year transfer student graduation rates, but attention needs to be given to improving the success of transfer students; within three years of their arrival, assuming that the students come in with an A.A. degree. This is again a matter of improving the efficiency of the system by allowing more students to progress more quickly to degree completion. The three year graduation rates, in aggregate, have remained remarkably stable at CSUSB over the past decade. For the period from 2000-2005, the rates have ranged from 53.4% in 2001 to 60% in 2002, with an average of 56% completing their programs within the relevant three year frame. That stability occurs despite the fact that an increasing proportion of transfer students are part-time. In contrast to the findings for first-time first year students, for transfer students there is very little differential in progress of male and female students. The 9 percentage point gap that existed in three year graduation rates in 2000 has been steadily whittled down, so that by 2005 it was only 1.7%. There is, however, a very large achievement gap between white and under-represented minority students. The rates for graduation for white students have occupied a very narrow and consistent range around 60%. The rates for under-represented groups vary considerably, both across groups and over time. Hispanic transfer students' three year graduate rates have been relatively stable, but average 4.5% below white students. The gap is much larger for African American students, though their rates have trended up dramatically, leaping from 26.3% in 2000 to 52.1% in 2004, before dropping to 41.1% in the most recent year of record.

These differences suggest that the primary focus for increasing three year transfer rates should be on closing the achievement gap and our plan will incorporate specific actions to reduce these gaps in three year graduation rates.

Six Year Transfer Graduation Rates: Subsequent to the initial meeting with the Blair Delivery Team, we were provided information on six year graduation rates for transfer students. CSUSB fares very well on this measure. We rank fifth in the system with a transfer graduation rate of 77.2% for the most recent (2002) cohort. No comparative information was provided to allow us to place these in a national context. Male and female rates are similar, with male rates converging with female rates over time. The gaps noted above in under-represented minority graduation rates also tend to be much smaller after six years than after three. Hispanic rates are actually higher (81.3%) than for whites (77.4%) in the most recent cohort. Comparable rates for African-Americans are 62.1%, for Asian Pacific Islanders, 74.6% and for Native Americans, with a very small sample size, 71.4%. All of these rates, except for whites, have been tending to rise over time.

Comparing the six and three year graduation rates for community college transfers suggests that ethnic minority students take longer to progress towards their degree completion, but over time the achievement gap progressively diminishes. Our plan will focus on ways in which we can accelerate the progress of under-represented minority transfer students between now and 2015.

Action Plan

Each element of the action plan outlined below is designed to address the general goal of increasing the rates of progression and success at CSUSB. Many are targeted or potentially targeted at particular sub-groups within the student population. For each action we identify whether specific action has already been implemented, whether particular actions are under discussion or whether we are examining options for possible implementation. Each action identifies also the person responsible for the action, the date of implementation (if known) and the anticipated effect on continuation or graduation rates. Finally, we identify those actions that require or would be facilitated by action from the Chancellor's office.

Implemented

- Strict adherence to existing academic dismissal for low scholarship. (Fall 2009)

Impact: Negative. Enforcing existing policy will reduce persistence rates for the incoming first-time first year cohort, with effects as early as Spring Quarter, 2010. The impact will be monitored quarterly (Dean of Undergraduate Studies, Office of Records, Registration and Evaluation, and Institutional Research)

- Strict adherence to existing academic dismissal for failure to complete remediation (Fall 2009)

Impact: Negative. Enforcing the system requirements will slightly reduce continuation rates of the Fall 2009 incoming first year cohort, starting in Fall Quarter, 2010. The impact will be monitored quarterly (Dean of Undergraduate Studies, Office of Records, Registration and Evaluation, and Institutional Research)

- Enforced Graduation of Super Seniors (Fall 2009)

Impact: Small Positive. The enforced graduation of students who have completed their degree programs has begun and will continue to have a small positive impact on 6 year graduation rates (Dean of Undergraduate Studies)

- Declaration of Institutional Impaction (December 2009)

Effect: Moderate Positive. The declaration of institutional impaction will allow supplemental admission criteria to be applied to students from outside the newly designated local area. The attendant increase in selectivity is expected to have a modest, positive effect on persistence rates for the cohort starting in Fall 2010, affecting 4 year graduation rates in 2014 and 2015 and 6 year graduation rates in 2016 and beyond. (Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management, Institutional Research)

Under Discussion – Local Action

- Improve Second Year Advising and Support Services (Spring 2010)

Effect: Moderate to Large Positive. One of the critical weaknesses identified in the earlier analysis is the relatively poor retention rate from second to third year, compared to the outstanding first to second year retention. Under discussion are ways in which we can improve student services and advising for students beyond the first year, particularly for undeclared students. We have in place some successful examples of peer advising and we will likely extend that to other areas of the university. Implementing a set of measures in 2011 will provide a potentially critical element in improving continuation and six year graduation rates for 2015. (Dean of Undergraduate Studies, College Deans and Associate Deans)

- Change the rules governing the timing of major declaration (Fall 2010)

Effect: Positive, small. Students have had wide discretion, up until this year, on the timing of their major or minor declarations. We have been discussing new and more restrictive rules on the timing of such changes, with an eye to speeding progress towards degree completion. A first draft proposal has been circulated. (Dean of Undergraduate Studies)

- Improve Roadmaps for Majors (Winter 2011)

Effect: Positive, small. We will review all of the materials providing students with information about navigating through their chosen major and revise as necessary. This will assist both transfer and native students and will improve progression towards degree completion. (Associate Provost for Academic Programs)

- Identify ways in which Retention of Male Students can be improved (ongoing)

Effect: Positive, moderate. One of the target populations of critical importance to improving our persistence and graduation rates is the incoming first year cohort of male students. We will examine ways in which the retention of male students can be improved. This will help close one of the two large achievement gaps. (Dean of Undergraduate Studies, Vice President for Student Affairs)

- Identify ways in which Retention of African-American Students can be improved (ongoing)

Effect: Moderate, positive. The second key target population in improving continuation and graduation rates is African American students. We will examine ways in which the persistence of African-American students can be improved. (Dean of Undergraduate Studies, Vice President for Student Affairs)

- Improve the articulation and advising of community college transfer students (ongoing)

Effect: Small, positive. One of the areas identified in discussion with the leadership in local community colleges that might be improved is the quality of information and advice available to potential transfer students. Discussion has already been initiated with the President of Riverside Community College about the possibility of a grant-funded transfer advisor position on their campus. A permanent solution, should this be initiated, would require an additional commitment of resources. (Provost)

- Block Scheduling of First Quarter courses (Fall 2011)

Effect: Positive, small. More widespread use of block scheduling would better inculcate incoming first year students with a sense of their place in the university and they would enjoy the potential benefits of small group interactions with peers. Anticipated benefit would be an increase in persistence rates. (Dean of Undergraduate Studies, Associate Provost for Academic Programs)

- Improved support for High-Risk Courses (Spring 2010)

Effect: Small, positive. We can readily identify the set of courses where students experience the greatest difficulty in achieving academic success. Discussion is underway on how we can provide increased support for students in these courses. The expected result would be a small increase in persistence, coupled with a reduction in the need for repetition of courses (see below). (Dean of Undergraduate Studies, College Deans and Associate Deans)

- Earlier Action on Remediation (ongoing)

Effect: Moderate, positive. The university commits significant resources to the remediation of students whose performance in Mathematics and English is below the levels required to assure success. Moving remediation earlier in a student's career would yield some benefits in terms of persistence and graduation. This may be offset by the potential to preclude some lower-income and particularly under-represented minority students from applying if it becomes a condition of admission or is moved into the summer. broad change would require system action (see below) (Dean of Undergraduate Studies)

- Revision of Policy on Repeating Courses (Fall 2009, continuing)

Effect: Moderate, positive. We have recently revised our policy to bring CSUSB into compliancy with Executive Order 1037. The current policy on repeating course is extremely generous to students. They may repeat a maximum of 24 units of work for grade forgiveness (the first course grade is ignored) and a further 18 units where the grades for the first and subsequent attempts are averaged. This means that potentially 42 of a 180 unit program could be repeated (23.3%). This is almost the equivalent of a full year of courses at normal load. We will examine whether to make the policy more restrictive in order to improve progress towards degree completion. One important caveat in the upcoming review is that we believe such a change will disproportionately affect under-represented minority students. It would be better if this were to be reviewed system-wide. (Dean of Undergraduate Studies). (Chancellor, Board of Trustees).

Under Discussion – Requiring System Action

- Revision of General Education Requirements (Fall 2009, continuing)

Effect: Large positive (with system action): Small positive (without system action). We have already initiated a review of our general education curriculum. Ideally, we would like to streamline and reduce the size and complexity of our general education

curriculum. The current general education requirements consume 78-82 hours of a student's program, 70-74 in lower division courses. Given that the parameters for general education are established by the system, the volume of change we can make independent of system action is limited. There is potentially large positive effect associated with system action, but we cannot benefit fully unless the system initiates action. Any impact would be expected to affect the incoming cohort of first year students in 2012 at the earliest. (Associate Provost for Academic Programs, Special Assistant to the Associate Provost for Academic Programs). (Chancellor, Board of Trustees)

- Revision of Policies on Remedial Course Work (Fall 2009, continuing)

Effect: Moderate positive (with system action). Moving the majority of the remedial work into the summer or making a level of proficiency in English and Mathematics a condition of admission would yield potentially significant benefits in terms of academic progress and degree completion. The university has no authority to execute such changes and is thus reliant on appropriate system action. We are, however, examining ways in which we can reduce the amount of remediation (changing cut-off scores) and examining the format in which remediation is offered (more concentrated sessions) (Chancellor, Board of Trustees)

- Revision of Policies on Student Support for Excess Hours (Fall 2009, continuing)

Effect: Small to Moderate positive (with system action) None (without system action). The university does not have the authority to change the cost of attendance for students who have exceeded some reasonable limit on the numbers of credits they have accumulated. The state places no limitation on the number of hours it will subsidize. There is no incentive within the current system for students to limit the number of hours, other than the action already in place on super seniors. Alternative policies that would allow students to be charged at a much higher rate for excess hours or that would withdraw the state subsidy from students after a particular number of hours would potentially improve flow through the system and reduce time to degree. (Chancellor, Board of Trustees)

Delivery Trajectory

Please see Appendix I (attached)

CSUSB Delivery Team

Andy Bodman, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Frank Rincon, Vice President for Student Affairs
Milton Clark, Dean of Undergraduate Studies
Jenny Zorn, Associate Provost for Academic Programs
Risa Dickson, Special Assistant to the President