

**\$35 Million Graduation Initiative 2025 Funding
Accountability Metric
California State University, San Marcos
April 28, 2017**

Karen S. Haynes, Ph.D.
President

Campus Contact:
Dawn M. Formo, Ph.D.
Dean, Undergraduate Studies
dformo@csusm.edu

Executive Summary

Through cross-divisional partnerships, California State University San Marcos (CSUSM) is well on its way to realizing the short-, medium-, and long-term goals we articulated in our September 2016 Student Success Plan in support of the 2025 Graduation Initiative (GI). As this report makes clear, our plan to close achievement gaps, improve advisement, and optimize enrollment management is supported by engaged faculty, staff, student, administer committees and work groups focused on specific projects such as 1) shifting the schedule planning and building process, 2), increasing the unit-load norm by mitigating student and institutional barriers 3) expanding our analytic capabilities with Tableau, among other projects. In particular, the \$1.25 million 16/17 academic year (AY) Graduation Initiative allocation has provided necessary funds to expand our analytic capabilities so that we can more accurately identify our students' academic needs and then respond by providing course schedules to match those needs. You can be sure--CSUSM has developed a strategic vision and purposeful actions to ensure that we realize the bold goals of GI 2025.

CSUSM 2016/17 AY Graduation Initiative April Update

With this submission we are providing an update regarding our September 2016 Student Success Plan as outlined below.

Additional Detail on September 2016 Plan

A. Closing Achievement Gaps

1. Facilitate Shifting Unit-Load Norms from 12 to 15: Informed by CSUSM's Graduation Initiative Steering Committee's (GISC) review of national unit-load research and our own campus culture of unit-load, we have launched an initiative to shift the unit-load norm from 12 units to 15 units per semester. As a point of context, two-thirds of CSUSM students start their second year with freshman status (i.e. fewer than 30 collegiate units completed). Very few students enroll in 15 units in the first term, including fully proficient students. Our typical student enrolls in approximately 12.5 units each semester.¹ These three projects will facilitate this culture shift:

¹ Raising this average to 15 units amounts to an additional 2.5 units per student per semester. With our population of 12,500 students, and assuming 35 student sections, this would require an estimated 595 3-unit additional course sections per year. The cost of this project would be an estimated \$3.6 million at the minimum instructional replacement rate and \$19.6 million assuming current instructional costs per FTES, for which there is no apparent source.

a. CSUSM Unit-Load Research Project: The Vice Provost, Office of Undergraduate Studies (OUGS), and Institutional Planning & Analysis (IP&A) at CSUSM have launched an IRB-approved study to investigate how external commitments affect academic success for CSUSM students carrying specific academic workloads. Specifically,

- Is it advantageous (or not) for students who work 30 or more hours per week to enroll in 15 units per semester?
- Is it advantageous (or not) for students who arrive at CSUSM the least academically prepared (need remediation in math and English and graduated from a high school with an Academic Performance Index in the lowest quadrant) to enroll in 15 units per semester?

In effect, we are recreating the tests used by Attewell and Monaghan (2016)², who found that full-time unit-loads of 15 units were beneficial for almost all students, with the exception of those working at least 30 hours a week and those who arrive the least academically prepared. We hypothesize that a similar study at CSUSM will produce like results. This CSUSM-based study is important given our GI 2025 targets. Increasing student unit-loads has been identified in some research as a pathway to achieving that goal. Confirming our hypotheses could help us challenge campus norms that incoming freshmen should take 12 units as opposed to 15, a norm which has arisen due to the assumption that students should start more slowly--an assumption also challenged in the literature (Attewell, Heil, & Reisel, 2012³; Szafran, 2001⁴). We conducted the survey in fall 2016 and are currently analyzing the results. We will have initial results by the end of April.

b. Unit-load Steering Committee: This cross-divisional steering committee is identifying institutional barriers that may inhibit increased unit loads. The result of this work combined with the findings from the Unit-Load Research Project will inform the campus campaign to change the culture, messaging and expectations regarding students' unit loads. The campaign will launch in fall 2017.

c. Degree Planner Default: As we move forward with the unit-load research and campaign, we have also set the Degree Planner default at 15-units. Students can adjust the default, and in doing so, they will see visually that a 12-unit per semester plan will require five years of college. This simple visualization is serving an important educational piece. At the same time, for many of our students, a 5 year plan complements their work and family commitments.

2. Launch Academic Success Center: Funding received from the Governor's Innovation Award was used to develop our Academic Success Center. Opened in October 2016, this center, led by OUGS, provides academic coaching and discipline-based academic interventions. In phase I, the four staff in this center have launched three programs in Spring 2017: a) academic coaching for

² Attewell, P., & Monaghan, D. (2016). How Many Credits Should an Undergraduate Take? *Research in Higher Education*, 1-32.

³ Attewell, P., Heil, S., & Reisel, L. (2012). What is academic momentum? And does it matter? *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 34(1), 27-44.

⁴ Szafran, R. F. (2001). The effect of academic load on success for new college students: Is lighter better? *Research in Higher Education*, 42(1), 27-50.

all students with a particular focus on outreach to sophomores whose GPA has dropped by .375 in one semester but whose GPA is at 2.2 or above, b) academic coaching targeted towards first-year students enrolled in our award-winning first-year seminar with the goal of transitioning them successfully into their sophomore year; c) data-informed discipline-specific academic support programming for undeclared students and for students enrolled in math, science, arts, humanities, and social and behavioral science courses. These discipline-specific programs are being designed collaboratively by five faculty liaisons and the four ASC staff and will complement CSUSM's long-running high-impact practices. They will launch the data-informed discipline-specific interventions in fall 2017.

3. Scale-up Alliance to Accelerate Excellence in Higher Education: The Alliance includes CSUSM and its ten K-12 partner districts (covering 200,000 students) and is aimed at increasing the number of students who graduate from high school, are qualified for college admission, and are academically prepared for the rigor of university coursework. Administered through the division of Community Engagement, the faculty director is actively working with our K-12 and university partners to scale-up the support provided to Alliance students.

4. Improve Tenure Density: Validation theory makes clear that creating a more culturally diverse faculty contributes to student retention. Our campus is working to increase both our tenure-line faculty density and the diversity of all faculty including the tenure track. Over the past two years, we have made excellent progress in diversifying our faculty. Even more, our newly arrived Chief Diversity Officer is working with Faculty Affairs and the colleges to continue to increase the diversity of each tenure-track search.

B. Improving Advisement

1. See Above Academic Success Center

2. Facilitate Graduation for Nearly-Graduated Seniors—CSUSM Senior Success Project: Utilizing analytics, we have identified nearly-graduated seniors who, with careful advising for spring and summer 2017, could graduate by summer 2017. To do our best in reaching all nearly-graduated seniors and aware that data are dynamic, we developed a two-phased project as detailed below. Note: in our 2016 Student Success Plan, we anticipated piloting a graduation advisor model. Given the tight-schedule for this project, we have not yet piloted such a model. Instead, OUGS, in partnership with Instructional & Information Technology Services (IITS), IP&A, all of the colleges and advising units, is leading the Senior Success Project.

a. Senior Success Phase I—Outreach to Nearly-Graduated Seniors and Free Elective Intervention: The details of this phase are explained in our February report. Suffice it to say that between December and January, we reviewed 900 student records and contacted 700 seniors regarding their spring schedules.

b. Senior Success Phase II: Phase II of the Senior Success project focuses on students who, after the Spring 2017 semester will be within 6 units, or two courses, of completing their degrees. OUGS has worked in partnership with the Vice Provost's office, IP&A, IITS, all four colleges, and all advising units in Academic and Student Affairs plus Financial Aid and Extended Learning to identify possible pathways to graduation by Summer 2017.

Our most recent data indicate that 498 students fit into the requirements for Phase II, after updating the list to account for students who have since gotten on track, graduated, or been discontinued due to two or more semesters of non-enrollment. Of those 498, we have determined the following:

- 325 students have spring resolutions or have full summer course solutions available.
- 207 students in the “full solution” group are estimated to be eligible for State University Grants (SUGS), scholarships, Veteran benefits, or other need-based aid.

An additional 41 students have been partially resolved or have partial summer course solutions available. Although these students may not graduate, these solutions will help them in their progress toward graduation.⁵ College breakdown of students for whom we are offering full or partial graduation solutions are as follows:

- College of Education, Health, and Human Services (CEHHS):92
- College of Humanities, Arts, Behavioral and Social Sciences (CHABSS): 174
- College of Business Administration (COBA): 49
- College of Science and Mathematics (CSM): 10

We have developed a detailed plan in partnership with the units listed above to ensure a hybrid summer schedule that includes courses offered via Extended Learning and a stateside schedule that meets the needs of as many nearly-graduated seniors as possible. We are also working closely with departments. We provided them with data re: the academic needs of the nearly-graduated students in their departments and requested their suggestions for academic solutions for as many students as possible. The Financial Aid Office in Student Affairs has worked with us to review the aid eligibility of nearly-graduated seniors, and we are ensuring that the approximately 350 nearly-graduated seniors who are eligible for need-based summer scholarships receive them. Enrollment Management Services (EMS), in Student Affairs, in partnership with Financial Aid is currently meeting with every nearly-graduated senior for whom we have a full solution. Students are being enrolled in stateside summer courses as appropriate. Phase II is a carefully choreographed series of tasks that we believe will positively support our students’ graduation needs. As part of Phase II, we have also contacted all “**on track**” students (1157) to provide academic, co-curricular, and holistic support as they complete their final semester at CSUSM. In this group, 1118 students had applied for graduation and 41 had not.⁶

3. Create and launch Associate Degree Transfer (ADT) and California Promise Projects:

The following steps were taken in AY 16/17 at CSUSM with regards to ADTs and the California Promise.

- A working group was formed to develop a strategy to serve current and future ADT students. This group contains representation from EMS in Student Affairs, IITS, Advising in Academic and Student Affairs, and Academic Programs.
- Draft upper-division roadmaps were created for ADT students coming to CSUSM from our two main feeder community colleges—Palomar and Mira Costa. Each roadmap is

⁵ Note: 24 students in this “partial solution” group are estimated to be eligible for SUG, scholarship, Veteran benefits, or other need-based aid.

⁶ We identified a group of nearly-graduated seniors who had “not yet applied” for graduation, determined whether they should apply for graduation, and reached out accordingly. In this process, we also learned that 13 students have completed their requirements and are no longer enrolled at the university. We have graduated these students.

tailored to the major and the community college and maps-out the final 60 semester units for the student. The draft roadmaps were circulated to academic departments for approval. All roadmaps will be finalized by the end of spring 2017.

- An ADT Coordinator was hired in EMS to work with ADT prospects at community colleges in California throughout the admissions cycle. This is necessary as we will be admitting ADT students from community colleges other than our feeder colleges, each requiring a tailored 60-unit plan.
- Through the North County Higher Education Alliance (NCHEA), with representation from CSUSM, Palomar College, and Mira Costa College, two retreats were organized in January 2017 and February 2017 to address ADTs and transfer patterns in general. The January retreat was designed for senior leadership teams and included campus presidents; the February retreat was designed for department chairs. Smaller meetings between common departments on all 3 campuses are expected to ensue with funding from NCHEA.
- A website for the California Promise (2-year) was developed along with a pledge form (<http://www.csusm.edu/admissions/how-to-apply/transfer/capromise.html>)

C. Optimizing Enrollment Management

1. *See above* Facilitate Shifting Unit-Load Norms from 12 to 15

2. Implemented Degree, Set, Go!: CSUSM launched in fall 2016 an innovative plan, branded Degree, Set, Go! (DSG), to refine the class registration process and encourage students to follow the course roadmaps in Degree Planner. The premise behind this campaign is that a sub-optimal course schedule must not be a reason that contributes to a delay in students' paths to graduation. This campaign, led by the office of the Vice Provost in partnership with IITS, the Office of Communication, Student Affairs, OUGS, all advising units, and all four colleges, kicked-off with an informational training event for staff in August. Promoting the use of advising and registration technologies, namely Degree Planner (CSUSM's branding of Smart Planner), and Schedule Assistant (CSUSM's branding of College Scheduler), students are encouraged to set their future academic plan with enough lead time to allow colleges and departments to set a course schedule that meets student demand. Once the course schedule is published, students construct a schedule that best fits with time restrictions the student might have independent of course offerings. A corollary goal to DSG is to assign instructional resources to colleges in a way to meet student demand. The university is in its second semester implementing this allocation model.⁷

Our February report details the steps we have taken in relation to the above two goals. To help us better understand when, if, and under what conditions students followed the academic plans they developed using the Degree Planner, an IRB-approved focus-group study was designed and facilitated this spring. The results of this study will be submitted to our Vice Provost by the end of the academic year.

⁷ Note this innovative plan was presented at the Winter 2017 American Association of State Colleges and Universities to resounding praise from CSU and non-CSU university leaders from across the country.

Although it is too early to measure the effect of this initiative quantitatively, buy-in has been strong university-wide. The following data point is of interest: Before the beginning of the DSG campaign, 45 out of nearly 12,000 students had a schedule on the first day of classes that matched exactly the set of requirements indicated in their Degree Planner. The number of such students one semester into the campaign is nearly 1,500. Also encouraging is the fact that after only two semesters, 89.6% of students have accessed DSG. Note: We are currently working with the Degree Planner developers to add a visual progress meter that would give students immediate feedback regarding time to degree when they make changes via their individual Degree Planners.

3. Expand Analytic Capabilities– Tableau Enterprise: After piloting Tableau software for over a year within the IP&A and Business Intelligence (BI) teams, CSUSM has used GI 2025 and eAdvising funds to purchase an enterprise-wide server license that will enable campus-wide deployment of this software. CSUSM has also increased the number of licenses for Tableau Desktop (developer) software up to 30 seats with the goal of empowering self-service analytics. Although several Tableau dashboards have been created, the target audiences have not been able to view these reports because they lack access to the Tableau Server. The newly purchased Enterprise license will be integral to the campus’s vision for decision support and will substantially augment the campus’s capacity for data integration, analysis, reporting, and dissemination. As of April 2017, CSUSM has launched public-facing dashboards displaying student enrollment, application, and retention data, as well as internal dashboards focused on unit-load patterns and course completion/fail rates (DFWs). The IP&A and BI teams have several additional dashboards planned or in progress to examine course demand, diversity efforts, high-impact practices, and key student-level information that may offer opportunities for intrusive advising. In addition, Tableau software has now been licensed to multiple analysts and data users in other CSUSM departments so that they may use the tool to support their own internal analytic projects. For a sampling of newly-launched public facing dashboards see the following:

- Student Profile: <http://www.csusm.edu/ipa/student-profile>
- Applicant Profile: <http://www.csusm.edu/ipa/applicant-profile>
- Retention & Graduation: <http://www.csusm.edu/ipa/retention-graduation>

4. Strengthen Course Availability: Two key initiatives are improving course availability—the DSG initiative as explained earlier and the Student Access Initiative described below.

a. **Degree, Set, Go!:** As explained above, CSUSM is transitioning from a schedule-building process based on historical patterns and proportional, incremental distribution of growth resources to a process that is informed by analytics. The DSG campaign is providing timely data to guide our schedule-building process. With data from the Course Demand Report, this spring we added 67 courses. We will continue to improve course availability adding courses as data demand and funding provide.

b. **Student Access Initiative:** In addition to data-informed schedule-building, it is important to note that in fall 2016, we redesigned our course schedule calendar. We increased the number of course sections offered by modifying our course schedule. Notably, this initiative, which increased the number of MWF sections by 142 sections per week and dramatically increased the

number of Friday classes, was endorsed by both Associated Students Inc. (ASI) and the Academic Senate.

5. Block Enrollment

For several years, we have block-enrolled newly matriculated EOP, TRIO/SSS, and CAMP students (underserved student groups supported by a range grant-funded projects). This ensures that these students start their academic tenures at CSUSM enrolled in specific courses they need on their path to graduation. Given the success of this model for unique student groups, effective with the incoming 2017 cohort of first-year students, our enrollment management leadership in partnership with the colleges has developed a plan to block-enroll all first-time freshmen in 2-4 courses that match the major-specific, academic roadmaps faculty have created. We have also developed a block-enrollment plan for undeclared majors. When first-year students arrive for orientation this summer, they will have the opportunity to complete their registration by adding and adjusting courses as needed. We are still analyzing the feasibility of implementing an analogous plan for first-time transfer students. If successful, this enrollment pilot will increase the number of students following the faculty-designed academic roadmaps for their majors and undeclared students, reduce “wasted” units, and likely increase unit-load norms for the campus.

Communication Plan

Student Success Team(s)

1. Graduation Initiative Steering Committee (GISC)

A. Charge/Approaches/Outcomes

Charge: GISC continues to lead in ensuring that the Campus makes progress towards and ultimately meets the **revised 2025** goals set by the Chancellor’s Office August 2016.

Sub-focus established 15/16: Sophomore Success with attention also paid to closing the gender gap

Sub-focus established 16/17: Graduating seniors from the 2013 FTF cohort and those from the 2015 Transfer cohort.

Approaches: GISC is a brainstorming workgroup that collaborates with individuals and groups across the campus and in the local community to do the following—

- Identify, research, implement, and track specific high impact practices, initiatives, interventions, and/or long-term strategies to improve the retention of students at all levels.
- Identify, research, implement, and track specific high impact practices, initiatives, interventions, and/or long-term strategies to improve the graduation rates for all students.
- Use data analytics, including the CSU Student Data Dashboard, to monitor and track trends and progress towards the campus goals.

B. List of members and campus affiliation

Louis Adamsel, ASI Student Representative

Bridget Blanshan, Associate Vice President for Student Engagement & Equity/Title IX
Coordinator Student Development Services, Student Affairs

Lorena Checa, Vice President, Student Affairs

Geoffrey Gilmore, Associate Vice President, Associate Vice President, Student Academic Support Services,
Student Affairs

Scott Gross, Associate Vice President, Associate Vice President, Community Partner Engagement

Elisa Grant-Vallone, Professor and Faculty Center Director

Jennifer Fabbi, Dean, University Library

Dawn Formo (Chair), Dean, Office of Undergraduate Studies

Karen Glover, Associate Professor, At-large member

Michael McDuffie, Associate Professor and Chair of the Academic Senate

Bianca Mothè, Associate Dean, Office of Undergraduate Studies

Graham Oberem, Provost and Vice President, Academic Affairs
 Rebecca Ortego, ASI Student Representative
 Diane Petersen, Executive Director, IITS
 Cameron Stevenson, Assistant Director, Institutional Planning & Analysis
 Adam Petersen, Student Services Professional, Office of Undergraduate Studies

C. Frequency of Meetings: Monthly during the AY

2. Degree, Set, Go! Planning Group

A. Goals/Principles

Goals:

- Measuring student course demand accurately, and offering course schedules that are optimal in meeting student demand.
- Consequently, assigning instructional resources to colleges (FTES and dollars) in a way to meet student demand.

Principles:

- Preserving the student's choice to deviate from the default academic plan in ways that still ensure optimal graduation time.
- Packaging Degree Planner, Schedule Assistant, and Registration into a unified advising and registration experience.
- Aligning DSG with the GI 2025, initiated by the CSU system leadership in response to the state legislature. The GI provides set measurable 2025 goals for each campus and funding contingent on progress towards those goals.

B. Expected Outcomes

- Improve graduation rate measures (in relation to the GI goals).
- Better course availability for students.
- Clearer academic plans.
- Streamlined registration process.
- Transparent and methodical process for resource allocation.

C. List of members and campus affiliation

Kamel Haddad (chair), Vice Provost, Academic Affairs
 David McMartin, Director, Undergraduate Advising, Student Affairs, plus three college-based advisors
 Scott Hagg, AVP, Enrollment Management Services, Student Affairs
 Diane Petersen, Executive Director, IITS
 Dawn Formo, Dean, Office of Undergraduate Studies
 Input from Scheduling Office, Associate Deans, Communications. Endorsement of Student Body

D. Frequency of Meetings: Weekly

3. Senior Success Team

A. Charge: Design and facilitate the 16/17 state-funded initiative to reduce time to graduation for nearly-graduated seniors, paying careful attention to first-time freshmen from the 2013 cohort and transfer students from the 2015 cohort

B. Expected Outcomes: Increase CSUSM's graduation rates

C. List of members and campus affiliation

Dawn Formo, Dean, Office of Undergraduate Studies
 Kamel Haddad, Vice Provost, Academic Affairs
 Scott Hagg, AVP, Enrollment Management Services, Student Affairs

Adam Petersen, Student Services Professional, Office of Undergraduate Studies
 Cameron Stevenson, Assistant Director, Institutional Planning & Analysis
 Partnership with Extended Learning, Financial Aid, Scheduling Office, Associate Deans, Department
 Chairs, Undergraduate Advising in Academic and Student Affairs

D. Frequency of Meetings: Weekly

4. Unit-load Steering Committee

A. Charge/Task

Charge: To lead the campus in shifting the unit-load norm from 12 units per semester to 15 units. Campaign launch goal—fall 2017

Tasks: The unit-load steering committee is a leadership team that will guide the campus in realizing charge by doing the following:

- Create an implementation and communication plan with timelines and measurable benchmarks
- Select and assign implementation team(s) based on phases or tasks.

B. Expected Outcomes: By 2025 approximately 30% of CSUSM students will complete 30 units per AY.

C. List of members and campus affiliation

Jacqueline Catechis, ASI Student Representative
 Margaret Chantung, Interim Associate Vice President for Communications
 Dawn Formo (Chair), Dean, Undergraduate Studies
 Geoffrey Gilmore, Associate Vice President, Associate Vice President, Student Academic Support Services, Student Affairs
 Kamel Haddad, Vice Provost, Academic Affairs
 Martha Stoddard Holmes, Associate Dean, CHABSS
 Scott Hagg, AVP, Enrollment Management Services, Student Affairs
 Michael McDuffie, Associate Professor and Chair of the Academic Senate
 David McMartin, Director, Undergraduate Advising, Student Affairs
 Rebecca Ortego, ASI Student Representative
 Adam Petersen, Student Services Professional, Office of Undergraduate Studies
 Cameron Stevenson, Assistant Director, Institutional Planning & Analysis

D. Frequency of Meetings: Every other week

5. High-Impact Steering Committee

- A. Charge:** Facilitate undergraduate students' mastery of critical skills and advocate the use of HIPs that support achievement of undergraduate learning outcomes across the colleges. In order for this group to help facilitate this objective and the outcomes below, this cross-divisional group provides guidance in scaling-up CSUSM HIP tracking. This committee will
- Establish benchmarks regarding student participation in HIPs at CSUSM.
 - Increase student participation in the CSUSM HIPs identified as trackable.

B. Expected Outcomes: Increase student participation in HIPs.

C. List of members and campus affiliation

Matt Atherton, Associate Professor and Faculty Center Associate Director
 Bridget Blanshan, Associate Vice President for Student Engagement & Equity/Title IX
 Coordinator Student Development Services, Student Affairs
 Alan Brian, Director of Planning, Assessment and Professional Development, Student Affairs

Dawn Formo (Chair), Dean, Office of Undergraduate Studies
 Geoff Gilmore, Associate Vice President, Associate Vice President, Student Academic Support Services, Student Affairs
 Elisa Grant-Vallone, Professor and Faculty Center Director
 Scott Gross, Associate Vice President, Associate Vice President, Community Partner Engagement
 Martha Stoddard Holmes, Associate Dean, College of Humanities, Arts, Behavioral and Social Sciences
 Cheryl Landin, Decision Support Analyst, Community Engagement
 Danielle McMartin, Associate Director & International Student and Scholar Advisor, Global Education
 Leo Melena, Director, Student Success, College of Humanities, Arts, Behavioral and Social Sciences
 Bianca Mothé, Associate Dean, Undergraduate Studies
 Joanne Pedersen, Director, First-Year Programs, Academic Affairs
 Diane Petersen, Executive Director, IITS
 Adam Petersen, Student Services Professional, Office of Undergraduate Studies
 Betsy Read, Professor, Biological Sciences and Faculty Liaison for Undergraduate Research
 Patricia Reily, Director, Veterans Services, Student Affairs
 Kendra Rivera, Associate Professor, Communication and Faculty Liaison for Service Learning
 Cameron Stevenson, Assistant Director, Institutional Planning & Analysis
 Sarah Villarreal, Associate Vice President, Community Engagement

D. Frequency of Meetings: Monthly

6. Communication Strategies and Intentionality of Communication Plan Efforts

CSUSM's Graduation Initiative Steering Committee (GISC), a cross-divisional group of faculty, staff, students, and administrators, provides campus leadership in facilitating the bold goals of the initiative. The other work groups and steering committees noted above are also cross-divisional work-groups that focus on specific components of our graduation plan. The cross-divisional teams of each work-group and of GISC itself are central to CSUSM's collaborative effort. We develop ownership by design—by intentionally designing work groups that cross divisions, especially between Academic and Student Affairs. These teams are instrumental in designing communications (websites, emails and the like) to support specific audiences (e.g., students, faculty, staff, parents/guardian). Ultimately, CSUSM's graduation rates will indicate the success of these committees. We will continue to develop intermediate evaluation plans. As an example of how we are assessing our various efforts, in the case of DSG, we have an IRB-approved focus group underway with a report due to the Vice Provost in May. The findings in this study will inform our next steps. Details regarding the intentional strategies used to move any of the initiatives noted above forward are available upon request. Know that any one communication plan has required careful choreography across at least two divisions and multiple units within each division. Although there is broad-based engagement for 2025 GI, one of the intentional new goals of OUGS is to review the communication strategies employed by GISC and the other committees and work groups noted above to develop a campus-wide 2025 GI communication plan.

College-Level Goals

See attached Excel file.

Success Metrics

Full-time, First-time Freshman Graduation Rate Goals				
	Historical Context			Goal
	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2021
4-Year Graduation Rate	13.6%	13.5%	15.7%	30%
	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2019
6-Year Graduation rate	48.4%	51.4%	52.2%	61%

	Fall 2006	Fall 2007	Fall 2008	Fall 2017
Avg. Years to Degree [^]	4.96	5.03	4.95	Improvement

Source: ERS Data Warehouse maintained by Institutional Planning & Analysis

[^]Subject to change if additional students from the cohort graduate.

CA Community College Transfer Graduation Rate Goals				
	Historical Context			Goal
	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2023
2-Year Graduation Rate	28.9%	28.0%	29.8%	40%
	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2021
4-Year Graduation rate	69.3%	67.5%	69.1%	77%
	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2019
Avg. Years to Degree [^]	2.85	2.90	2.75	Improvement

Source: ERS Data Warehouse maintained by Institutional Planning & Analysis

[^]Subject to change if additional students from the cohort graduate.

Equity Goals – Full-time, First-time Freshman Students				
	Historical Context			Goal
	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2019
6-Year Gap – URM/Non URM [^]	-3.8%	-1.9%	-9.4%	0%
	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2019
6-Year Gap – Pell/Non-Pell [^]	-3.7%	1.9%	-5.6%	0%
	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2019
6-Year Gap – First Generation/Not First Generation [^]	-6.1%	-3.2%	-12.6%	Improvement
	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2019
6-Year Gap – Male/Female	-9.9%	-10.0%	-7.4%	Improvement

[^]Categories reflect data definitions outlined in the GI 2025 Data Definitions memo dated 10/19/16.

Source: ERS Data Warehouse maintained by Institutional Planning & Analysis

Strategy: Shift Unit Load Norms from 12 to 15⁸				
	Historical Context			Goal
	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Fall 2017
Avg. Units Attempted by Undergraduates	12.6	12.6	12.5	Improvement
	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Fall 2017
% of Undergraduates Enrolled in 15+ Units	24.2%	26.1%	23.0%	Improvement
	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Fall 2017
% of Proficient New FTF Enrolled in 15+	12.8%	12.1%	12.9%	Improvement

⁸ We will be determining the magnitude of the increase in average unit-load necessary to meet our goals. Before we determine these numbers, it is important to note the following-- A CSUSM unit-load study is underway. Based on our findings in this campus study, we will set targets that are appropriate for specific target groups. There is an overall funding problem for this initiative, which is mentioned in footnote 1. At this point, we anticipate that our study will guide us in identifying whether enrolling in 15 units per semester disadvantages (or not)

- students who work/care for family/otherwise committed 30 or more hours per week
- students who arrive at CSUSM the least academically prepared (e.g., need remediation in math and English and graduated from a high school with an accountability performance index in the lowest quartile.

	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Avg. Units Completed	<i>Developing methodology</i>			

Source: ERS Data Warehouse maintained by Institutional Planning & Analysis

Strategy: Improve Sophomore Success				
	Historical Context			
	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	
% of Second Years at Sophomore Level	34.3%	34.9%	37.7%	
	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	
FTF Continuation Rate from Second to Third Year [^]	86.5%	85.0%	83.5%	

[^]Proportion of full-time, first-time freshman students enrolled as of third term who returned for their fifth term.

Source: ERS Data Warehouse maintained by Institutional Planning & Analysis

Strategy: Increase Proficiency				
	Historical Context			
	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	
% of FTF Proficient at Entry [^]	53.1%	56.1%	61.4%	
	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	
1-Year Remediation Rate (FTF)*	86.9%	78.9%	82.1%	
	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	
% of FTF who enter through Alliance MOU**	5.1%	9.7%	10.0%	

[^]Includes students who cleared proficiency requirements over the summer.

Source: ERS Data Warehouse maintained by Institutional Planning & Analysis

*Source: Chancellor's Office Final ERE Follow-up Files

**Source: ERS Data Warehouse maintained by Institutional Planning & Analysis and PeopleSoft Query

Strategy: Degree-Set-Go & Improved Course Availability				
	Historical Context			
	<i>Not available</i>	<i>Not available</i>	Spring 2017	
% of Undergraduate Students Accessing Degree Planner	<i>Not available</i>	<i>Not available</i>	89.6%	
	<i>Not available</i>	<i>Not available</i>	Spring 2017	
Difference in Actual vs. Degree Planner Projected Avg. Undergraduate Unit Load*	<i>Not available</i>	<i>Not available</i>	-0.1	
	<i>Not available</i>	<i>Not available</i>	Spring 2017	
% of Undergraduate Students whose Degree Planners 100% Matched Schedule*	<i>Not available</i>	<i>Not available</i>	12.3%	

Source: Degree Planner frozen data maintained by Planning & Academic Resources

*Source: Degree Planner frozen data maintained by Planning & Academic Resources and PeopleSoft query

Strategy: High Impact Practices				
	Historical Context			
	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	
% of New FTF Taking First Year Seminar	81.9%	83.4%	88.4%	
	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	

% of New FTF in First-Year Learning Community	19.4%	25.4%	28.4%
	<i>Not available</i>	Spring 2014	Spring 2016
% of Graduating Seniors who completed 2+ HIPs (NSSE)*	<i>Not available</i>	63%	75%

Source: ERS Data Warehouse maintained by Institutional Planning & Analysis & PeopleSoft Extracurricular Table Query

*Source: National Survey of Student Engagement Results

Closing Comment

Without question, CSUSM is moving forward with a strategic vision and purposeful actions in support of the bold 2025 Graduation Initiative (GI) goals. As our plan makes clear, our campus community is working together across divisions to identify institutional limitations and develop solutions to systemic and individual student barriers. The 2016/17 \$1.25 allocation to CSUSM has made possible programmatic and digital infrastructure improvements that are essential as we strive to realize the GI goals. We are confident that the strategies described above will ensure more CSUSM students graduate in a timely way beginning Spring 2017. We look forward to sharing our 2017 graduation rates later this year and annually henceforth. Designated GI funding in support of the 2025 goals will help to ensure that we can continue to build and maintain institutional systems that support and promote student success and timely graduation.