

Graduation Initiative 2025 Campus Plans
Cal State East Bay
April 28, 2017

As with other campuses, Cal State East Bay is employing multiple strategies to achieve the goals outlined in the Graduation Initiative 2025 (GI 2025). We are emphasizing with faculty and staff the need for students to see academic advisors, to increase average unit loads, and to enhance the support services that will help them graduate in a timely manner. This year, we added capacity and in both general education courses (particularly English) and courses needed to complete some of our high demand majors (such as Health Sciences). We have used data to better target advising, develop Supplemental Instruction (SI) programming, and identify roadblocks.

Our challenge next year will be the transition from quarters to semesters. Semester conversion provides a more seamless and speedier path to graduation for our transfer students, recognizing that most of our transfer students are from two-year college campuses that are on semesters. However, in the short run, it creates challenges in developing individualized advisement plans for all students and “bridge courses” to avoid disruption in planned graduation goals. Deliberate, proactive advising will be particularly important in this process. The transition also has meant redesigning our articulation agreements, providing training programs for faculty advisors, and the implementation of degree audits.

Several tools were brought on-line this year to support the GI 2025 initiative. These included adding new communication strategies to remind students of important dates and services. We used registration “Holds” to compel students to complete the University Writing Skills Requirement. And, we developed a much stronger tutoring program in critical areas where students tend to struggle (particularly the sciences).

1. Additional Detail on September 2016 Plan

- **Closing Achievement Gaps**

Currently, our achievement gaps are 14% for underrepresented minorities and 2% for Pell students. We are concentrating our efforts in the following areas:

Bay Advisor (EAB Student Success Collaborative). This is one of the primary tools, besides the degree audit report, that faculty and staff are using for proactive and targeted academic advising. Currently, we are piloting the Bay Advisor to conduct campaigns to targeted students in Spring 2017 (student-athletes, EOP and non-EOP African American students). This program will expand next quarter to include first-time freshmen who are in developmental math and English courses. To date, faculty are responding promptly and helping identify students who are struggling so that they can be connected more deliberately with support resources.

Incoming Students. Our mathematics faculty are engaging in a pilot with the Oakland high schools to help improve the math readiness of students who will be taking the ELM with the goal of decreasing the numbers of these students who may fall into a remedial track. For new transfer students, we initiated two programs: 1) the University Ambassadors, which pairs URM students from Cal State East Bay with students from partner community colleges and, 2) Entry Academics Supporting Transfers (EAST) which creates three cohorts of transfer students who

will complete all their upper division general education together in the first quarter and receive supplemental advising and mentoring to support a successful transition. We are using the Ambassadors to find likely EAST participants and so far, students are enthusiastic about both programs. Looking forward, the connections developed in these programs will support the transfer success rates.

Supplemental Instruction (SI). We doubled the number of SI sections offered this academic year and project that we will have created capacity for more than 1,600 students by the end of Spring 2017 term. Last year, we served about 600 students, so we have almost tripled our capacity for SI. To date, our data indicate that students in SI sections are three times less likely to receive a DFW.

Within the SI sections, usage was largely in keeping with our overall numbers of URM students, in that 9% of SI participants were African-American and 22% were Latinx. As we grow our capacity, we will be able to increase services in critical courses and provide additional services such as embedded STEM and English peer tutors.

Book Vouchers. We distributed book vouchers to students who had a likelihood of graduating by June 2017. Our analysis showed that we had approximately 520 native freshmen and 1,500 transfer students who had sufficient units to graduate. We contacted these students during the Fall and Winter quarters—reminding them of deadlines to take the Writing Skills Test (WST), file for graduation, and see their major and General Education academic advisors. We believe that because of these consistent reminders, our applications for graduation rose by more than 6%, advising appointments increased by more than 400 during Winter quarter, and the number of students taking the WST doubled.

- **Improving Advisement**

Our strategy has been to provide consistent reminders, face-to-face and mediated advising, and connect with students where they are as often as possible. This is particularly important as part of our transition to semesters and ensuring that every student has a clear understanding of their program through the process. Specific programs include the following:

Individualized Advisement Plans. We have contacted students who have earned 120 or more units to arrange appointments to develop Individualized Advisement Plans for graduating by Spring 2018 before semester conversion. Training sessions and materials have been provided for faculty and staff academic advisors.

Faculty Advising Fellows. This summer, six faculty from each of our largest majors will receive special training so that they can become “master advisors” equipped to triage student needs, align services to support students in their areas, and be empowered to make appropriate substitutions and changes in a student’s program. These Fellows will also collect, analyze and establish base-line GI 2025 data for their departments and colleges. They will train other faculty advisors in using advising tools, familiarity with services available on campus (tutoring, health, food, financial aid), and helping students avoid pitfalls (taking too few units, working too many hours, failing to see a professor when in doubt over course content). The goal is for large programs to have at least one Faculty Advising Fellow.

Academic Advising Workshops. Especially with the transition to semesters, academic advising has taken on a particularly important role to ensure our advisors are equipped to help students and that any challenges that students face are quickly addressed. We have worked to ramp up the number of workshops offered in preparation for semester conversion to ensure that students who can are able to complete by Summer 2018. Academic Advising Workshops focus on graduation requirements and new semester academic policies (such as probation and disqualification). Because so many academic policies have changed as part of the conversion, we are offering multiple workshops for faculty and staff advisors.

Advising at East Bay takes many forms including GE advising, specialized programs for URM students, major advising, and program-specific advising. This year, for the first time a listserv was created for all “advisors” in whatever role they play, so that time sensitive information could be widely disseminated. All staff and faculty advisors receive regular updates and reminders to share with students and departments.

In February 2017, an Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) Advisor was hired to support ADT students, oversee their roadmaps, and work with regional community colleges to streamline transitions and processes. This advisor is already working with ADT students who may crosswalk from quarter to semesters to ensure that this cohort will graduate in 60 semester units.

Registration “holds” for students who need to take the Writing Skills Test (WST), who were no-shows for the WST, and for undeclared students are being used to connected students with advising resources. And, our Academic Advising & Career Education (AAE) center is reaching out to seniors who have the potential to graduate as soon as they are able.

Engagement Practices. As part of our retention efforts, we are working to provide all students with experiential and engagement opportunities including student faculty research, service learning, and internships. We have grown both our service learning and student research areas this year and we are in the process of hiring an Internship Coordinator for the campus. We recognize these as high impact practices with the potential to better retain our students.

- **Optimizing Enrollment Management**

As Cal State East Bay’s student body continues to grow, careful management of resources becomes particularly important to ensure sufficient capacity. Enrollment management is critical in helping balance graduation rates, retention efforts, and admissions. Our focus areas include:

Adding Sections. This year we opened sections across the curriculum once demand hit thresholds established by Academic Affairs. Generally, once capacity in a required or “bottleneck” area reached 90% fill rate, additional capacity was added to alleviate course demand. Compared with AY 15-16, this meant that we added more than 100 sections and increase existing section capacity to allow for 8% more FTES to be enrolled.

Strategic Enrollment Management Plan. Our Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM) Committee worked hard to design and develop approaches for ensuring that enrollment does not outstrip resources. Two pieces were most important in this effort. First, Cal State East Bay applied for and was granted status as an impacted campus allowing us to better manage the total student body size. And, second, after an extended search, we are in the process of hiring

an Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management to manage, assess, and focus our enrollment efforts. This position will oversee the SEM plan to help us meet and stay within targets as well as focus recruiting in areas where we have capacity.

- **Rethinking the Support and Delivery of Developmental Education**

Math Preparation. Cal State East Bay is partnering with the Peralta Community College District (PCCD), the Oakland Unified School District, and Berkeley Unified School District to:

1. To increase the number of students who, upon graduation from high school, will enroll and be successful in college transfer level mathematics.
2. To redefine and implement new math pathways (grades 6-16) in a Linked Learning context.
3. To develop and pilot innovative practices, track and measure the impact of those pilots, and to create a body of evidence that can lead to more widespread adoption of promising practices for improving student outcomes.

We anticipate that this grant will reduce the number of incoming freshmen who need math developmental education.

Course Redesign. Resources have been allocated to support faculty-led course redesign to support key focal areas of the GI 2025. Meetings with math and English departments are underway to design curricular programs with assessable outcomes aligned to this initiative.

Curriculum/Program Changes. Math developed a proposal for developmental/foundation math to be piloted next year. English developed a stretch program to commence with semesters. Both are intended to support student developmental needs while earning units toward their degree.

Data Systems. We are coordinating our data systems (Bay Advisor, Pyramid Analytics, Data Warehouse) to identify at-risk students, students who will not meet the requirements for EO 665, and those who need proactive advising interventions to reduce the chance they will have to leave CSUEB. Our goal is to provide advising and support services in time to help students pass their courses, limit repeats, and ensure they are making timely progress toward degree.

2. Communication Plan

Student Success Team. Our Student Success Team consists of the Deans of Undergraduate Studies and the Libraries (to whom tutoring reports), the Associate Deans of all four Colleges (Business and Economics, Letters/Arts/Social Sciences, Education and Allied Studies, Science), the Senior Director of Online Education, the Director of Institutional Research, the Director of Advising, and the Executive Director for Transfer from Student Affairs. The team meets every two weeks and is chaired by the Associate Provost. It is charged with identifying strategies to improve results, initiatives and programs designed to support outcomes (including both administrative and curricular changes), aligning resources to support initiatives, and assessing outcomes. This group as looked at which majors and programs need additional sections or

additional tutoring, where added emphasis is needed in messaging, policies, or outreach, and what metrics should be used to show success.

Communication Strategies. Our Success Team, Deans' Council, Associated Students, and Council of Chairs contributed many approaches for messaging and engaging our primary constituent groups. Our common message has been that each of us is responsible to "Make every class count." Multiple media approaches have been used including our success website (<http://www.csueastbay.edu/about/institutional-effectiveness/ssac/ssac-ees/ssac-gradinitiative/>), email, myCSUEB messaging, campus billboards, campus signage, face-to-face, print articles, among others (See Attachment 1). Based on our experiences and successes, we will continue to develop, refine, and use the following strategies:

Students. We implemented *PeopleSoft's* messaging module to ensure that critical messages reached students. Our read rate with this module has been exceptional and has successfully communicated the use of holds for the Writing Skills Test, advising sessions, and graduation workshops. A communication sub-committee is working to help the campus effectively and strategically message students regarding academic issues through this messaging module.

Faculty. Academic Advising listserv was updated to include all faculty and staff advisors, as well as others who are interested in academic advising, so that the campus would have a common forum to ensure that policies, procedures, and questions are disseminated and addressed in a timely way. The Deans' Council had a retreat focusing on aligning resources to GI 2025. The Council of Chairs met for discussions to contribute their ideas. The MPP retreat held in January focused on the GI 2025. There will be an Administrative Assistant's breakfast in June that will focus on the Graduation Initiative 2025 as well.

Campus Community. We are utilizing various media across campus to reinforce specific messages. For instance, face-to-face workshops have been held to disseminate information, gather ideas, and assess progress. Signs, ads in the student newspaper, e-mail have been used. Four Student Success Forums were held talking about the Graduation Initiative, soliciting ideas, and asking for feedback. These involved students, staff, faculty and administrators from across the campus. The forums will continue monthly throughout the GI 2025.

Greater Community. As part of the impaction process, we held three community meetings (one on our Hayward campus, one at Hayward High School, and one at Diablo Valley College) to talk about enrollment strategies and the Graduation Initiative. President Morishita held four meetings with regional community college presidents and chancellors to discuss ADT and AA transfer processes and our focus on their success and the Graduation Initiative.

- **Input and Feedback**

Intentionality. Our communication strategy was intended to engage the University's primary constituents in an on-going, two-way conversation both mediated and face-to-face to provide information, solicit feedback, and generate ideas. Throughout our process of gathering feedback and ideas on our website, town halls, group meetings, constituent discussion, and e-mail (among others), four common themes emerged:

Availability of Sections. Most students were concerned about the availability of classes and the times they were offered. Our data show there are certain “bottlenecks” both with availability and timing. Faculty member echoed this and offered that part of the problem is with the number of qualified faculty members able to teach some of the critical courses. We are working to develop hiring plans to address this issue.

Administrative Barriers. Some university practices create enrollment barriers for students. These include payment deadlines before financial aid is awarded, transcript evaluation timing, and the lack of prerequisite enforcement that may lead students to enroll in courses they before they are sufficiently prepared. We have been working to audit our processes and procedures to identify barrier and develop alternatives that will not hinder student success.

Supplemental Instruction (SI). In each forum, the importance of SI and tutoring was stressed. Although we have worked to increase the number and array of SI sections, the level of continued demand is clear and we are working to address demand by hiring and training additional teachers and provide extended hours for instruction. Similarly, embedded tutoring was discussed to support efforts with success rates in upper division general education and major courses. We have had success with our English courses and we are now building capacity in STEM fields.

Proactive Advising. While students have access to “walk up” advising centers and faculty advisors, there are students who are at risk and do not seek advising. They may stop out, drop out, or fail their courses. The results have been low retention rates and high course repeat rates. We are working to use our data systems to identify students who are at risk or otherwise under stress. We have had success with students who have stopped out in helping them to enroll and complete their degree at Cal State East Bay. Also, we have been reaching out to an increasing number of students who may be struggling.

Each of these has been assigned to the unit or units responsible for overseeing their implementation, assessment, and revision.

Moving to Action. There are two primary approaches we have used to motivate and evaluate change and programs.

Budget Alignment. The University budget has been built on a capacity basis designed to ensure that enough seats were offered. While capacity is important, making it the primary variable for resources creates an incentive to grow (because growth equals resources) but not an incentive to streamline and make progress toward degree timely. We are shifting the allocation model to support retention (resources aligned to college programs designed to retain such as declaration of major, high impact practices) and completion (resources aligned to a college completion rate, time to degree, and units to degree).

Institutional Research. Institutional research plays a critical role in helping programs assess the effectiveness of student success initiatives as well as providing data to identify students who are close to completion, students who are at risk, and projecting capacity needs based on enrollment and admissions trends. This is an area we will continue to build but will provide a strong basis for resource decisions, hiring, program development, and enrollment.

How to engage our campus community with GI 2025?

Individuals will have many opportunities through Provost's Student Success Forums to learn more about the GI 2025 initiative and to provide feedback. These monthly forums are open to the campus and will be widely advertised to the campus community. Orientations programs for new faculty, staff and students will describe the initiative and how these cohorts can get involved. For example, faculty can remind students of the importance of meeting with their major and General Education advisors and meeting academic deadlines, such as add and drop deadlines. Staff members can also remind students on these issues. Peer leaders, such as tutors, can help make sure students understand the resources and strategies on how to succeed at Cal State East Bay.

3. College-Level Goals (See Attachment 2)

4. Success Metrics

Our success metrics are tied to retention, graduation rates, and the reduction of achievement gaps as outlined in the following sections:

Average Unit Load (See Attachment 3). The average unit load for first-time, full-time freshmen for Fall 2016 is at 13.55, down from Fall 2012 when it was at 13.96. To achieve our graduation goals, we project that we will need to increase the number of full-time students (20% are part-time), improve retention rates to 86%, and have an average unit load of 14.0-14.2.

For full-time transfer students, the average unit load is 13.57 down slightly from the Fall 2012 level of 13.6. However, many transfer students are part time and for them, the average unit load is 7.18. To meet our completion goals for transfer students, we project that increasing the number of full-time students taking 14.1-14.2 units with a retention rate of 88% will work.

Retention Rates (See Attachments 4 and 5). Retention rates have been inconsistent and are currently at 76.6% down from 80.0% from last year. The advising and support strategies outlined above are designed to improve these. To meet our goals, we project we will need to increase the first to second year retention rate to 86%. Transfer retention rates, however, have improved in recent years and is now almost 83% first to second year. We project we will need to increase this rate to 85% to reach our GI 2025 goals.

Course Sections (See Attachment 6). We developed a threshold for opening additional sections based on demand and assessing critical areas. In many cases, we could open capacity within existing courses. The result was added capacity for 1,016 students representing an 8.9% increase in FTES production.

Impact (See Attachment 7). So far, and one of the best indicators we have, is that the number of students who are eligible to graduate in four years are up 9.3% from last year. For transfer students, those eligible to graduate within two years are up 5.5% over this time last year. Overall, 7% more students have filed for graduation than this time last year. Students who are close to graduating have been contacted and advised how to complete their programs. These steps appear to have helped.

Strategies to Reduce Time to Degree. Bay Advisor (EAB Student Success Collaborative) will be used to determine cohorts and create watch lists. Degree audit report will monitor progress to degree. At various advising check-points, faculty and staff advisors will also check for any financial issues or other issues that could prevent students from graduating in a timely manner. Professional development workshops will be provided for all advisors involved in advising this cohort.

Five Strategies to help students graduate in 4.0 years instead of 4.5 years (freshmen):

1. Identify students who have earned 30 baccalaureate units after their first year at CSUEB and determine the common characteristics that define this cohort (HS GPA, SAT/ACT scores, GE patterns).
2. Provide proactive advising during the third quarter/second semester to check in regarding progress to degree, major selection confirmation and courses for second year.
3. At the end of the second year, determine those students who are on track to graduate in 4.0 years and 4.5 years. For those who are on track for 4.5 years, suggest summer course work to bring them in line for 4.0 years. Also, check to make sure all lower division General Education coursework is completed and students are transitioning to upper division coursework.
4. Continue to monitor progress towards degree throughout the junior year. If students are projected to earn under 135 quarter units/90 semester units by the end of the junior year, summer coursework should be recommended. Students in this cohort should apply for graduation by the end of the junior year.
5. During the first quarter or first semester of the senior year, final coursework should be determined and the degree audit report checked to verify the coursework.

Five Strategies to help students graduate in 2.0 years instead of 2.5 years (transfers):

1. Identify students who have earned 15 units after their first quarter/semester at CSUEB and determine common characteristics that define this cohort (transfer GPA, ADT, upper division coursework, etc.). Academic advisors and faculty will provide high impact practice opportunities to this cohort and check transition to CSUEB.
2. Provide proactive advising during the third quarter/second semester to check in regarding progress to degree, major selection confirmation, ADT track and courses for second year.
3. Determine students who are on track to graduate in 2.0 years and 2.5 years. For those who are on track to graduate in 2.5 years, suggest summer course work to bring them in line to graduate in 2.0 years.
4. At the end of the first year, students should apply for graduation and determine coursework for their second year.

5. At the end of the third semester or fourth quarter, final coursework should be determined and the degree audit report checked to verify the coursework.

POSTED APRIL 17, 2017

Students First: Cal State East Bay Working to Increase Graduation Rates

The university is seeking input on measures it could employ to help students graduate

At a recent town hall on the Cal State East Bay Concord campus, Provost Edward Inch listened as students shared the challenges they face when trying to graduate in four, or even six years.

One mentioned the availability of classes, another a need for more advisors. Still another spoke about the cost of tuition plus books and other supplies.

The forum, one of several held at the Hayward and Concord campuses since January, was initiated by Dr. Inch, so that he could receive input from faculty, staff and students on measures Cal State East Bay might employ to help students graduate. The overall effort, which is being implemented at all 23 CSU campuses, is called Graduation Initiative 2025, and it provides funding to create programs and services geared toward improving graduation rates for the system's 475,000 students.



According to Linda Dobb, associate provost, Cal State East Bay's goal is for students to have access to the courses, services and support they need to graduate, with an overall goal of improving the four-year graduation rate from 10 percent to 35 percent, and the six-year rate from 45 percent to 62 percent. For transfer students, the goal is to increase the two-year graduation rate from 37 percent to 49 percent, and the four-year rate from 73 percent to 83 percent.

continued

In addition, the university is working to eliminate the “achievement gap,” a term that refers to the educational disparity between groups of students, particularly those defined by socioeconomic status, race, ethnicity and gender. Cal State East Bay’s current achievement gap is 14 percent.

So far in 2017, to align with the Graduation 2025 Initiative, Cal State East Bay’s own Student Success Initiative will focus on seven key areas:

- Improving access to high-needs sections: Each college has been asked to provide a list of courses that traditionally have long wait lists but are vital to graduate. Approximately \$100,000 has been spent to provide additional sections of those courses to make sure that students have access and can complete their programs of study.
- Increased tutoring, supplemental instruction and advising: During the winter quarter, the university added 13 supplemental instruction sections, five tutors for science and increased its emphasis on advising. Similarly, for the spring quarter, additional sections and support services are being offered.
- Reducing costs: Since many students at Cal State East Bay balance work, families and school, one of the key factors in keeping students at the university is cost. As a result, the university is increasing the number of textbook and Writing Skills Test vouchers available, and in summer 2017 will offer \$1,000 scholarships to students who, by taking summer work, could graduate.
- Creating new outreach programs: The university has designed four new programs to increase its reach in offering students services to help support them both financially and academically. In addition, Cal State East Bay recently partnered with the top four feeder community colleges (Chabot, Diablo Valley, Ohlone and Las Positas) to pilot a program that pairs underserved, nontraditional community college students with a university transfer ambassador who will serve as a mentor.
- Communication: Through events like the town hall forums and a website called “The Pioneer Path to Student Success,” which outlines the initiative, Cal State East Bay’s Academic Affairs hopes to keep faculty and students aware of the steps being taken to help in helping more students graduate in a timely manner.
- Setting goals for colleges, majors and programs: Dr. Inch and the college deans are working to create goals and align resources to improve passing rates and to cut achievement gaps.
- Reexamining metrics and creating dashboards for 2025 goals: The Office of the Provost has divided its metrics into sections including Demand Trends (such as growth/reduction trends), Resource Utilization (such as space utilization) and Effectiveness (such as graduation rates and retention) to assist in the CSU-wide Graduation Initiative 2025.

To learn more about Cal State East Bay’s Student Success Initiative, visit the [Academic Affairs](#) website.

Attachment 2

Cal State East Bay

<- Please add campus name here

Please fill in college names below

		CBE	CEAS	CLASS	CSCI	College 5	College 6	College 7	College 8	
First-Time Full-Time Freshmen Goals										
4-year graduation rate										
Cohort Year	Graduation Year	Current Grad Rate	Current Grad Rate	Current Grad Rate	Current Grad Rate	Current Grad Rate	Current Grad Rate	Current Grad Rate	Current Grad Rate	Current Grad Rate
2011	2015	15.7	8.9	11.4	8.7					(*Actual Value)
Cohort Year	Graduation Year	Goal Grad Rate	Goal Grad Rate	Goal Grad Rate	Goal Grad Rate	Goal Grad Rate	Goal Grad Rate	Goal Grad Rate	Goal Grad Rate	Goal Grad Rate
2021	2025	40	40	38	32					
6-year graduation rate										
Cohort Year	Graduation Year	Current Grad Rate	Current Grad Rate	Current Grad Rate	Current Grad Rate	Current Grad Rate	Current Grad Rate	Current Grad Rate	Current Grad Rate	Current Grad Rate
2009	2015	56.3	48.4	43.8	49.0					(*Actual Value)
Cohort Year	Graduation Year	Goal Grad Rate	Goal Grad Rate	Goal Grad Rate	Goal Grad Rate	Goal Grad Rate	Goal Grad Rate	Goal Grad Rate	Goal Grad Rate	Goal Grad Rate
2019	2025	72	70	60	64					
Transfer Student Goals										
2-year graduation rate										
Cohort Year	Graduation Year	Current Grad Rate	Current Grad Rate	Current Grad Rate	Current Grad Rate	Current Grad Rate	Current Grad Rate	Current Grad Rate	Current Grad Rate	Current Grad Rate
2013	2015	35.5	20.2	45.5	36.8					(*Actual Value)
Cohort Year	Graduation Year	Goal Grad Rate	Goal Grad Rate	Goal Grad Rate	Goal Grad Rate	Goal Grad Rate	Goal Grad Rate	Goal Grad Rate	Goal Grad Rate	Goal Grad Rate
2023	2025	55	48	53	45					
4-year graduation rate										
Cohort Year	Graduation Year	Current Grad Rate	Current Grad Rate	Current Grad Rate	Current Grad Rate	Current Grad Rate	Current Grad Rate	Current Grad Rate	Current Grad Rate	Current Grad Rate
2011	2015	76.5	68.8	69.0	70.0					(*Actual Value)
Cohort Year	Graduation Year	Goal Grad Rate	Goal Grad Rate	Goal Grad Rate	Goal Grad Rate	Goal Grad Rate	Goal Grad Rate	Goal Grad Rate	Goal Grad Rate	Goal Grad Rate
2021	2025	89	84	82	82					

We looked at trend data from most successful three-year spans and extrapolated to 2025. The trend analysis, however, did not get us to the GI 2025 Goals. After conversations with the deans as well as our student support services professionals, and looking to where we can best focus resources we identified areas where supplemental instruction, tutoring, expanded proactive advising, improved roadmaps and degree audits under semesters (among others) could make a meaningful difference and built those into the projections. CSCI and CLASS are the largest colleges with the most difficult "lifts" in the process. However, focused efforts in these areas should improve success rates for the campus considerably. Much of the success of any college toward reaching these goals is dependent on the infrastructures built outside them that undergird the systems they put in place.

Attachment 3**First-time Freshmen Average Units Load**

	Mean Unit Load				
	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016
STATUS					
Full-time	13.96	13.81	13.75	13.63	13.55
Part-time	9.7	9.57	9.81	10.19	10.33
Total	13.89	13.71	13.67	13.52	13.52

First-time Transfer Average Units Load

	Mean Unit Load				
	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016
STATUS					
Full-time	13.6	13.61	13.49	13.45	13.57
Part-time	7.2	7.17	7.25	7.17	7.18
Total	12.61	12.6	12.57	12.23	12.47

Attachment 4

California State University, East Bay
ANNUAL RETENTION AND GRADUATION RATES FOR FIRST-TIME FULL-TIME FRESHMEN
FALL 2005 - FALL 2016 COHORTS ENROLLED AS OF Fall 2016

Fall Cohort	Yr1 Fall		Yr2 Fall		Yr3 Fall		Yr4 Fall		Yr5 Fall		Yr6 Fall		Grad Year 4		Grad Year 5		Grad Year 6		Grad Year 7		Grad Year 8		Grad Year 9		Grad Year 10+	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Fall 2005	686	80.3	551	65.7	451	53.5	406	49.7	249	30.2	95	11.7	110	13.5	241	29.5	297	36.7	324	40.0	342	42.5	351	43.7	357	44.3
Fall 2006	874	75.9	663	61.3	536	49.8	459	42.5	310	28.5	130	12.0	127	12.0	282	26.5	357	32.8	388	35.2	403	37.0	416	38.5	425	39.5
Fall 2007	1019	73.7	751	58.8	599	46.0	509	39.1	372	28.6	152	11.6	107	8.1	298	22.4	384	29.7	432	33.6	449	34.2	461	35.4		
Fall 2008	1343	71.2	956	53.5	719	40.1	667	34.8	500	26.8	215	11.6	135	6.3	390	21.6	510	28.3	548	30.0	573	32.2				
Fall 2009	1420	74.2	1053	61.5	873	47.4	811	43.0	604	32.0	263	13.6	176	8.9	474	26.3	638	34.4	699	39.3						
Fall 2010	1192	76.4	911	65.9	786	57.6	735	53.3	525	39.0	220	16.7	168	12.4	440	32.7	575	43.2								
Fall 2011	1210	75.1	909	64.0	775	55.8	716	51.3	539	39.6	234	17.7	125	9.5	380	28.2										
Fall 2012	1549	77.5	1201	68.4	1059	68.4	956	61.8	740	47.8			166	10.7												
Fall 2013	1476	80.6	1190	68.6	1013	68.6	909	61.6																		
Fall 2014	1431	80.0	1145	66.9	957	66.9																				
Fall 2015	1730	76.6	1326																							
Fall 2016	1584																									

Source: CSU ERSS Statistical Extract; Source: CSU ERSD Statistical Extract

CSU System undergraduate full-time are students attempting 12 or more hours in a term

Office of Institutional Research, Analysis & Decision Support | Cal State East Bay

California State University, East Bay
TIME TO DEGREE FOR FIRST-TIME FULL-TIME FRESHMEN
FALL 2005 - FALL 2016 COHORTS ENROLLED AS OF Fall 2016

Fall Cohort	Graduated Total	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10 and more
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Fall 2005	355	0.6	2.5	27.9	36.6	15.8	7.6	5.1	2.5	1.4
Fall 2006	416		2.9	27.6	37.3	18.0	7.5	3.6	3.1	
Fall 2007	449	0.2	2.0	21.6	42.5	19.2	10.7	3.8		
Fall 2008	548	0.2	1.6	22.8	46.5	21.9	6.9			
Fall 2009	638		1.6	26.0	46.7	25.7				
Fall 2010	440	0.2	0.9	37.0	61.8					
Fall 2011	125		3.2	96.8						
Fall 2012	5		100.0							
Fall 2013										
Fall 2014										
Fall 2015										

Source: CSU ERSS Statistical Extract; Source: CSU ERSD Statistical Extract

CSU System undergraduate full-time are students attempting 12 or more hours in a term

Office of Institutional Research, Analysis & Decision Support | Cal State East Bay

Attachment 5

California State University, East Bay

RETENTION AND GRADUATION RATES FOR FIRST-TIME UPPER DIVISION TRANSFERS

FALL 2003 - FALL 2016 COHORTS ENROLLED AS OF FALL 2016

ANNUAL RETENTION AND GRADUATION

Fall Cohort	Yr1 Fall N	Avg 1st Fall GPA	Yr2 Fall		Yr3 Fall		Yr4 Fall		Yr5 Fall		Yr6 Fall		Yr7 Fall		Yr8 Fall		Grad Year 1		Grad Year 2		Grad Year 3		Grad Year 4		Grad Year 5		Grad Year 6		Grad Year 7		Grad Year 8+		
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Fall 2005	Full-time	1012	2.81	830	82.0	409	40.4	95	9.4	32	3.2	13	1.3	13	1.3	9	0.9	11	1.1	326	32.2	613	60.6	690	68.2	716	70.8	725	71.6	732	72.3	754	74.5
	Part-time	246	2.72	164	66.7	118	48.0	43	17.5	20	8.1	7	2.8	6	2.4	5	2.0	1	0.4	36	14.6	96	39.0	121	49.2	134	54.5	138	56.1	145	58.9	153	62.2
	Total	1258	2.80	994	79.0	527	41.9	138	11.0	52	4.1	20	1.6	19	1.5	14	1.1	12	1.0	362	28.8	709	56.4	811	64.5	850	67.6	863	68.6	877	69.7	907	72.1
Fall 2006	Full-time	1120	2.87	898	80.2	436	38.9	128	11.4	35	3.1	18	1.6	10	0.9	6	0.5	9	0.8	368	32.9	655	58.5	741	66.2	770	68.8	791	70.6	800	71.4	822	73.4
	Part-time	245	2.84	159	64.9	113	46.1	55	22.4	20	8.2	9	3.7	9	3.7	6	2.4	2	0.8	31	12.7	83	33.9	113	46.1	125	51.0	130	53.1	133	54.3	138	56.3
	Total	1365	2.87	1057	77.4	549	40.2	183	13.4	55	4.0	27	2.0	19	1.4	12	0.9	11	0.8	399	29.2	738	54.1	854	62.6	895	65.6	921	67.5	933	68.4	960	70.3
Fall 2007	Full-time	1032	2.85	824	79.8	433	42.0	103	10.0	44	4.3	17	1.6	12	1.2	12	1.2	9	0.9	334	32.4	632	61.2	707	68.5	751	72.8	764	74.0	773	74.9	784	76.0
	Part-time	222	2.89	143	64.4	100	45.0	49	22.1	20	9.0	6	2.7	7	3.2	3	1.4	3	1.4	33	14.9	75	33.8	101	45.5	117	52.7	121	54.5	124	55.9	127	57.2
	Total	1254	2.85	967	77.1	533	42.5	152	12.1	64	5.1	23	1.8	19	1.5	15	1.2	12	1.0	367	29.3	707	56.4	808	64.4	868	69.2	885	70.6	897	71.5	911	72.6
Fall 2008	Full-time	1240	2.89	977	78.8	456	36.8	130	10.5	43	3.5	14	1.1	11	0.9	11	0.9	19	1.5	384	31.0	709	57.2	809	65.2	846	68.2	860	69.4	869	70.1	877	70.7
	Part-time	287	2.90	179	62.4	123	42.9	53	18.5	30	10.5	16	5.6	7	2.4	5	1.7			32	11.1	87	30.3	119	41.5	132	46.0	141	49.1	146	50.9	149	51.9
	Total	1527	2.89	1156	75.7	579	37.9	183	12.0	73	4.8	30	2.0	18	1.2	16	1.0	19	1.2	416	27.2	796	52.1	928	60.8	978	64.0	1001	65.6	1015	66.5	1026	67.2
Fall 2009	Full-time	1312	2.90	1048	79.9	545	41.5	127	9.7	33	2.5	14	1.1	6	0.5	7	0.5	33	2.5	438	33.4	842	64.2	953	72.6	982	74.8	995	75.8	1003	76.4		
	Part-time	315	2.70	211	67.0	142	45.1	68	21.6	30	9.5	16	5.1	11	3.5	5	1.6	3	1.0	46	14.6	112	35.6	150	47.6	166	52.7	177	56.2	182	57.8		
	Total	1627	2.87	1259	77.4	687	42.2	195	12.0	63	3.9	30	1.8	17	1.0	12	0.7	36	2.2	484	29.7	954	58.6	1103	67.8	1148	70.6	1172	72.0	1185	72.8		

Fall Cohort	Yr1 Fall	Avg Fall GPA	Yr2 Fall		Yr3 Fall		Yr4 Fall		Yr5 Fall		Yr6 Fall		Yr7 Fall		Yr8 Fall		Grad Year 1		Grad Year 2		Grad Year 3		Grad Year 4		Grad Year 5		Grad Year 6		Grad Year 7		Grad Year 8+			
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Fall 2010	Full-time	1153	2.99	975	84.6	493	42.8	98	8.5	34	2.9	17	1.5	13	1.1			29	2.5	450	39.0	822	71.3	904	78.4	926	80.3	937	81.3					
	Part-time	213	2.83	159	74.6	105	49.3	39	18.3	17	8.0	5	2.3	3	1.4			1	0.5	38	17.8	99	46.5	123	57.7	138	64.8	141	66.2					
	Total	1366	2.97	1134	83.0	598	43.8	137	10.0	51	3.7	22	1.6	16	1.2			30	2.2	488	35.7	921	67.4	1027	75.2	1064	77.9	1078	78.9					
Fall 2011	Full-time	1280	3.04	1079	84.3	514	40.2	118	9.2	36	2.8	14	1.1					24	1.9	487	38.0	868	67.8	966	75.5	997	77.9							
	Part-time	194	2.88	143	73.7	109	56.2	40	20.6	19	9.8	7	3.6							24	12.4	87	44.8	106	54.6	117	60.3							
	Total	1474	3.02	1222	82.9	623	42.3	158	10.7	55	3.7	21	1.4					24	1.6	511	34.7	955	64.8	1072	72.7	1114	75.6							
Fall 2012	Full-time	1469	2.94	1197	81.5	591	40.2	164	11.2	46	3.1							32	2.2	521	35.5	932	63.4	1056	71.9									
	Part-time	272	2.82	193	71.0	132	48.5	55	20.2	23	8.5									37	13.6	107	39.3	148	54.4									
	Total	1741	2.93	1390	79.8	723	41.5	219	12.6	69	4.0							32	1.8	558	32.1	1039	59.7	1204	69.2									
Fall 2013	Full-time	1724	3.12	1431	83.0	674	39.1	143	8.3									56	3.2	695	40.3	1200	69.6											
	Part-time	318	3.06	237	74.5	158	49.7	65	20.4											61	19.2	142	44.7											
	Total	2042	3.11	1668	81.7	832	40.7	208	10.2									56	2.7	756	37.0	1342	65.7											
Fall 2014	Full-time	1817	3.06	1539	84.7	772	42.5											43	2.4	700	38.5													
	Part-time	316	2.93	221	69.9	163	51.6											1	0.3	41	13.0													
	Total	2133	3.05	1760	82.5	935	43.8											44	2.1	741	34.7													
Fall 2015	Full-time	1790	3.09	1518	84.8													42	2.3															
	Part-time	437	2.88	321	73.5																													
	Total	2227	3.05	1839	82.6													42	1.9															
Fall 2016	Full-time	1921																																
	Part-time	402																																
	Total	2323																																

Attachment 6

Enrollments in subjects corresponding to top Majors

Course Subject	AY 2015-16	AY 2016-17	Difference	% Change
Biology	156	149	-7	-4.5%
Business Admin*	420	410	-10	-2.4%
Communications	175	198	23	13.1%
Criminal Justice	85	105	20	23.5%
Computer Science	86	117	31	36.0%
Health Sciences	139	184	45	32.4%
Kinesiology	405	395	-10	-2.5%
Nursing**	120	122	2	1.7%
Psychology	129	125	-4	-3.1%
Sociology	130	149	19	14.6%
Grand Total	1845	1954	109	5.9%

*All courses in College of Business and Economics

** Top major is for Undeclared-Interest in Nursing

All General Education Course Sections

	AY 2015-16	AY 2016-17	Difference	% Change
Lower Division	1,474	1,454	-20	-1.4%
Upper Division	1,065	1,089	24	2.3%
Grand Total	2,539	2,543	4	0.2%

All Undergraduate Course Sections (1000-4999)

	AY 2015-16	AY 2016-17	Difference	% Change
Lower Division	2,002	2,006	4	0.2%
Upper Division	2,995	3,106	111	3.7%
Grand Total	4,997	5,112	115	2.3%

AY Annualized Headcount	12,304	13,320	1,016	8.3%
AY Annualized FTES	10,903	11,879	975	8.9%

Attachment 7

Entering Freshmen

Status	Fall 2012	% Cohort	Fall 2013	% Cohort	% Change
Entering cohort count	1,572	100.0%	1,511	100.0%	
Inactive	553	35.2%	525	34.7%	-0.4%
Not grad eligible active	525	33.4%	371	24.6%	-8.8%
Eligible to File	207	13.2%	303	20.1%	6.9%
Filed for Spr/Sum Grad	266	16.9%	292	19.3%	2.4%
Graduated (<4 yrs)	21	1.3%	20	1.3%	0.0%
Elig+Filed+Grad	494	31.4%	615	40.7%	9.3%

New Transfer

Status	Fall 2014	% Cohort	Fall 2015	% Cohort	% Change
Entering cohort count	2,151	100.0%	2,270	100.0%	
Inactive	250	11.6%	254	11.2%	-0.4%
Not grad eligible active	472	21.9%	383	16.9%	-5.1%
Eligible to File	386	17.9%	433	19.1%	1.1%
Filed for Spr/Sum Grad	887	41.2%	1,046	46.1%	4.8%
Graduated (<2 yrs)	156	7.3%	154	6.8%	-0.5%
Elig+Filed+Grad	1,429	66.4%	1,633	71.9%	5.5%