

## \$35 Million Graduation Initiative 2025 Funding Accountability Framework

### Overview

As a condition for receiving the \$35 million in one-time student success funds, the budget bill required the campuses and system to submit plans detailing strategies for achieving the new 2025 targets. These plans were approved by the Board of Trustees at their September 20, 2016 meeting. As a part of this process we are asking campuses to provide data related to several accountability metrics. The purpose of this effort is to assist us in demonstrating that campuses are making progress in **implementing their short-term strategies** as outlined in their student success plans.

Campuses are asked to gather data for accountability metrics related to initiatives to improve four-year freshman and two-year transfer completion rates and close achievement gaps that have been (or will be) launched with funds allocated from the \$35 million. **Please submit preliminary outcomes data to Ed Sullivan ([esullivan@calstate.edu](mailto:esullivan@calstate.edu)), Assistant Vice Chancellor of Academic Research, by Friday, February 24, 2017.**

### Suggested Metrics

Accountability metrics will allow the CSU to demonstrate purposeful campus efforts resulting from the one-time funding and assist us in demonstrating which campuses are making progress as outlined in their student success plans. These metrics will also be used to build a compelling case for how the CSU effectively expended the \$35 million in one-time funding during 2016-17 to improve four-year freshman and two-year transfer completion rates. This is a necessary first step that will position us to make additional requests for recurring student success funds.

Due to the delay in our receipt of the \$35 million in one-time funding, we understand that your related initiatives are just getting started and that you may not expend all of the funds by the end of the fiscal year. Nevertheless, we are requesting that you take account of your **current and planned expenditures**, and more importantly, gather **early indicators** of their impact.

Below are suggestions for how data can be used to inform campus efforts:

- Identify majors with highest 4-year freshman graduation rates and 2-year transfer graduation rates using historical data. Compile a list of the top ten majors in each category, including their graduation rates and the number of students who graduate within this timeframe. Identify any changes in trends. **Were any changes a result of your purposeful efforts?**
- Identify majors with the highest number of 4.5-year freshman graduates and 2.5-year transfer graduates using historical data. Compile a list of the top ten majors in each category, including their graduation rates and the number of students who graduate within this timeframe. Identify any changes in trends. **Were any changes a result of your purposeful efforts?**

- Identify any key initiatives that are being implemented to improve 4-year freshman and 2-year transfer completion rates, and/or gap closing goals this year. Below are some metrics that might be considered.
  - Compare the average unit load for each cohort with the previous year's cohort. There should be an increase in average unit load if strategies have worked. For example, compare the 2014 freshman cohort average unit load for spring 2017 with the 2013 freshman cohort for spring 2016.
  - Review and report degree candidacy and conferral data:
    - Compare the 2012 and 2013 freshman cohorts for how many students who were slated to graduate (candidates for fall term degree) in 4.5 years were able to graduate in 4 years. **What are the top 5 things that the campus can/will do to facilitate shortening time to degree by a term or more?**
    - Compare the 2014 and 2015 transfer cohorts for how many students who were slated to graduate (candidates for fall term degree) in 2.5 years were able to graduate in 2 years. **What are the top 5 things that the campus can/will do to facilitate shortening time to degree by a term or more?**
  - Compare the number of course sections and enrolled seats available in lower-division and upper-division core courses including capstone courses, with previous years (spring to spring trend comparison by college offering courses). **Did the campus incentivize offering additional core and capstone seats?** A more focused metric would be the annual number of seats planned in each UD required course for a program as compared to the number of UD declared majors in the program, which might indicate some large bottlenecks. A similar focused metric would apply the same logic to LD pre-requisite seats and LD pre-majors or majors.