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Undergraduate Persistence at Cal State Northridge From 2000 Onwards

This report examines undergraduate persistence at Cal State Northridge (CSUN) for cohorts exiting the University during the 2000s. Three aspects of persistence are examined: the number of baccalaureate degree recipients and their time to degree, the one-year continuation rates of both first time freshmen and upper division transfer students, and, finally, the graduation rates of both types of entrants. In each case, separate persistence rates are presented for students from what are increasingly referred to as traditionally underserved backgrounds and for those from better served groups.\(^1\) Finally, changes in the recent persistence patterns of CSUN’s freshmen are considered in the context of one-year continuation rates on other CSU campuses.

In order to set the stage for the examination of persistence, the report begins with a review of a number of key characteristics of both entering and continuing undergraduates. Since consideration of graduation rates during the 2000s requires considering the experience of cohorts entering the university from the early 1990s onwards, the overview of student characteristics begins with Fall 1993 and ends with Fall 2013. To make the initial longitudinal review manageable, data are presented for alternate terms during the period considered. For each term, separate figures are presented for three groups of students: newly enrolled first time freshmen, newly enrolled upper division transfer students, and all enrolled undergraduates, be they new or continuing students.

Changes in the Character of CSUN’s New Undergraduates

During most of the twenty-year period under study here – Fall 1993 to Fall 2013 -- undergraduate enrollment at Cal State Northridge grew noticeably (see Figure 1 and the first section of Table 1). After a downturn in the immediate aftermath of the Northridge earthquake, early in 1994, undergraduate enrollment grew by 44% between Fall 1995 and Fall 2007, increasing from approximately 19,500

\(^1\) Traditionally underserved students include those stemming from American Indian, Pacific Islander, African American, and Latina/o backgrounds. All others are included in the “Better Served” grouping (i.e., Asian, White, Other, and Unknown). International students have been excluded from much of the data summarized here.
headcount students to just under 28,000. After further growth in Fall 2008, Fall 2009 saw a downturn in enrollment, thanks to a CSU mandate made necessitated by the severe economic downturn at the end of the preceding calendar year. From Fall 2009 onwards, CSUN’s undergraduate population has experienced additional growth, going from close to 27,500 headcount students to approximately 33,400 in Fall 2013, a gain of 21%.

The main engine of enrollment growth during the past twenty years has been a progressive increase in the number of first time freshmen and upper division transfer students entering the university each Fall (see Figure 2). Their numbers more than doubled during the period under consideration, with the freshmen numbers growing more strongly than the transfer numbers since the Fall of 1999 (by 126% vs. 107%). In that term, approximately equal numbers of freshmen and transfer students entered CSUN (close to 2,535 in each case). By Fall 2013, just over 5,800 first time freshmen enrolled at the university, compared to close to 5,200 new upper division transfers.²

The typical first time freshman entering CSUN in the early 1990s was 18 years of age, a women, and stemmed from a background well-represented in higher education (e.g., white or Asian). She was as likely as not to be receiving a Pell Grant, had a high school GPA of 2.90, on average, and needed remediation in both English and mathematics at entry. During her first semester at CSUN, this typical student attempted 12-14 units, on average, and was either undecided about her major or most likely to plan one housed in the College of Business and Economics.

By the time the freshman cohorts entering CSUN in the mid-2010s arrived on campus, the characteristics of the typical freshman had changed in several respects. She was still most likely to be a women, 18 years of age, and attempting 12-14 units, on average. Although the typical freshman was still likely to need some remediation at entry, she was more likely to arrive fully proficient in English and

² The Fall term comparison is somewhat misleading, since, during most past years, transfer students also entered in substantial numbers in the Spring (i.e., approximately 1,775, on average, during the early 2000s).
mathematics and with a stronger high school GPA (3.15 on average). Recent freshman have also shown interest in a greater array of potential majors, with Arts, Media, and Communication, Health and Human Development, and the Social and Behavioral Sciences joining Business as the favored choices. Further, today’s typical CSUN freshman is unlikely to have parents with four-year college degrees. Finally, the typical freshman background had shifted from one well-represented in higher education to one that is traditionally underserved, with Latina/o students accounting for the majority of all entering freshmen. Most such students rely on Pell Grants and are unlikely to be fully proficient in English and mathematics at entry.

In short, during the last twenty years, CSUN’s freshmen entrants have not only increased in number, but changed in character, with students from backgrounds traditionally underserved by higher education becoming increasingly numerous. This shift has been accompanied by an increase in the proportion of students receiving the Pell Grants reserved for students from low-income backgrounds. Although the proportion of students needing remediation at entry in both mathematics and English has tended to decline during the last twenty years, it has remained significantly higher for the increasing proportion of students from traditionally underserved backgrounds, most of whom are also Pell-Grant recipients. This shift has consequences for recent freshmen persistence patterns, as becomes evident below.

Like their freshman counterparts, the upper division transfer students entering CSUN in the early 1990s had a typical profile. The majority were women, white, and 27 years of age, on average. This typical student entered CSUN with a transfer GPA of 2.82, on average, and, in most cases, attempted 11-14 units during her first term. The most favored majors pursued were in Business and Economics or in the Social and Behavioral Sciences. In contrast to CSUN’s first time freshmen, this profile of the typical upper division transfer student still applies in most respects to the new students entering CSUN in the

---

3 Among recent freshman entry cohorts, close to three-quarters of the students from traditionally underserved backgrounds are Pell Grant recipients.
2010s. A few changes are evident: majors in Arts, Media, and Communication and Health and Human Development have joined those in the other two Colleges as favored areas of specialization and students’ transfer GPAs have increased somewhat, now hovering around 3.0. Although students from better served backgrounds still predominate among the new upper division transfer students, their dominance is less pronounced. The biggest change in the transfer student profile is probably in average age at entry, which has dropped from 27 years to 24 years, on average.

**Changes in Persistence Rates**

During the last decade, persistence and graduation rates have remained relatively unchanged among CSUN’s upper division transfer students. They performed well at the beginning of the period under study and have continued to do so. Although the number of degree recipients increased substantially between 2000-01 and 2012-13 (from approximately 2,750 to almost 4,000), the percentage of graduates from traditionally underserved groups changed relatively little, hovering around 26%-32% throughout the period considered. Graduates’ time-to-degree also held steady at 3.2 - 3.4 years, with, at most, a small difference between the degree times of students from traditionally underserved and better served backgrounds.

Largely the same can be said about the retention and graduation rates of upper division transfer students. The one-year continuation rate among cohorts entering during the Fall 2000-13 period ranged between 80% and 84%, with very little, if any, difference among students varying by racial and ethnic background. Three-year and likely graduation rates experienced three periods of growth among cohorts entering between Fall 1996 and Fall 2010. Despite some decline at other times, both rates showed net growth from the beginning to the end of the period under study. The three-year graduation rates grew from 38% to 64%, a gain of two-thirds, while the likely graduation rates increased by a more modest one-

---

4 “ Likely” graduates are those who have graduated within a set period – three years for transfer students and six years for first time freshmen – or are still enrolled at the university in the semester following the end of the period in question.
third (from 63% to 81%). The three-year graduation rates of traditionally underserved students modestly lagged those of better served students for most of the period considered, with the lag virtually disappearing for the two most recent cohorts considered. Throughout the period, the lag is generally less pronounced among likely graduates, suggesting that upper division transfer students from traditionally underserved backgrounds are as likely to graduate as students from other backgrounds; it just takes them a bit longer to complete their studies.

In contrast to transfer students, the persistence of CSUN’s first time freshmen has undergone several dramatic changes during the last 15 years. First, the number of baccalaureate degree recipients effectively doubled between 2000-01 and 2007-08, increasing from 1,040 to 2,074 degree recipients. At the same time, the percentage of traditionally underserved students among the degree recipients increased by 6 percentage points (from 38% to 44%). Although these students took approximately half a year longer to graduate than their better served counterparts throughout the 2000-07 period, the average time to degree fell by close to half a year for both groups: from 6.1 to 5.5 years for the graduates from better served backgrounds and from 6.5 to 6.1 years for the graduates from traditionally underserved backgrounds. Further, the gap in time to degree has virtually disappeared among the 2012-13 graduates, thanks to a steep decline during the 2008-13 period in the average time to degree of the freshmen from traditionally underserved backgrounds (from 6.1 to 5.6 years).

The one-year continuation rate of the first time freshmen entering CSUN during the Fall 1999-2008 period describes an arc that began at 70%, rose to 76% for the cohorts entering in the 2004-05 period, and then fell off relatively sharply, ending up at 71% for the Fall 2008 entry cohort. The rate bounced back to 74% for the Fall 2009 entry cohort, however, and rose by another 4% for the Fall 2012 entry cohort, thanks to the introduction of the Early Start Program. With the exception of the cohorts entering during the 2000-03 period, the continuation rate of freshmen from traditionally underserved backgrounds has lagged that of students from better served backgrounds by at least 6 points.
The drop-off in the overall one-year continuation rate during the 2004-08 period is largely due to the joint effect of two factors: a substantial increase in the size of the incoming freshman class, coupled with the increasing presence of traditionally underserved students, who are disproportionately likely to need remediation in mathematics and English at entry. Since the CSU requires entering freshmen to complete all remedial work within one year, this change in the composition of the freshman class has complicated efforts to maintain and improve one-year continuation rates.

In contrast to the one-year continuation rate, the six-year graduation rates of the freshman entry cohorts considered here have grown strongly for a sustained period, increasing from 25% for the Fall 1995 entrants to 40% for the Fall 2000 entrants, a gain of three-fifths. Although the six-year rates of traditionally underserved students lagged those of students from better served backgrounds throughout the period considered, the traditionally underserved graduation rate has grown disproportionately; the rate for such students in the Fall 2000 cohort is twice that of similar students in the Fall 1995 entry cohort (34% vs. 17%). As a result, the gap in the rates of the traditionally underserved and better served groups declined from 16 points for the 1995 cohort (17% vs. 33%) to 10 points for the 2000 cohort (34% vs. 44%). A similar, albeit more modest, pattern is evident for likely graduates. For the 1995-2000 entry cohorts, the overall rate increased by almost a third, increasing from 40% to 52%. During this same period, the likely graduation rates of traditionally underserved freshmen grew by two-fifths (from 33% to 47%), while the rate for freshmen from better served backgrounds grew by close to one-fifth (from 47% to 55%). Once again, therefore, the gap between the two declined (from 14% to 8%).

After a three-year period of relative stasis, during which the gap in the graduation rates of traditionally underserved and better served students opened up once more, graduation rates rose again among the freshmen in the Fall 2003 and Fall 2004 entry cohorts, rising from 40% to 47%. Since the traditionally underserved and better served six-year rates grew at approximately the same rate, the gap
between them held steady at 13 points. The overall six-year graduation rate has held relatively steady for the four most recent entry cohorts considered, fluctuating between 45% and 48%.

The progressive increase in the graduation rates of the 1995-2000 freshman entry cohorts is a consequence of a set of initiatives set in motion by the work of the campus’s Graduation Rates Taskforce, which was appointed in 2000; these appear to have run their course by the last few years of the 2000s, however.\(^5\) The more recent gains, therefore, are attributable to a new set of initiatives launched in 2008, with the aim of insuring that students were graduating in a timely way. They include efforts to encourage students with the necessary units to graduate in a timely way, to block them from changing majors at the last minute, and to prevent them from repeating an excessive number of courses.

Taken together, the data reviewed here, and in more detail below, indicate that, despite some leveling off in the upward trajectory, the first time freshmen graduating from CSUN during the 2000s have improved their persistence rates considerably, with traditionally underserved freshmen making particularly strong strides. Upper division transfer students completing their studies during the first years of the new century displayed a high level of performance, with underserved and better served students performing equally well. This pattern has persisted during the rest of the 2000s, with modest improvement in several areas of persistence.

**Proficiency at Entry and Subsequent College Success: the CSU Context**

In assessing the persistence of CSUN’s recent freshman cohorts, the focus of the CSU’s Graduation Rates Initiative, it is worth remembering that incoming students’ initial preparation for college work plays an important role in their subsequent college success of. Data discussed below (see Figures 30-34) detail the close relationship between proficiency in mathematics at entry and one-year continuation rates at various CSU semester campuses for two groups of freshman: those entering during the 2005-07 period.

---

\(^5\) The initiatives included significant improvement in the advising system, the development of term-by-term graduation plans, and the creation of electronic tools designed to help students track their progress.
and cohorts entering during the 2010-12 period. For the first, CSUN’s one-year continuation rate appears to be a bit above average, given the high proportion of freshmen who need remedial work in mathematics at entry, a gap in preparation that hinders progress for the largest proportion. During the second period considered, CSUN appears to have lost ground, primarily because the remedial needs of its freshmen have remained largely unchanged, while those of the newly enrolling freshman cohorts on other semester campuses have tended to decline, thanks to rigorous impaction at the freshman level.

These gains in proficiency at entry and persistence have come at the expense of diversity, however, since freshmen from traditionally underserved backgrounds are least likely to enter college proficient in mathematics. Equally important, the relative loss of diversity that has accompanied increasing impaction across the CSU has been masked on individual campuses, thanks to underlying demographic changes in the composition of the state’s high school graduates. Thus, during the period under study, the CSU campuses considered have universally experienced an increase in the proportion of traditionally underserved students within their freshman entry cohorts. As a result, the campuses achieving the greatest gains in proficiency have failed to notice that their gains in the enrollment of traditionally underserved students are below average. These findings suggest that as long as CSUN remains committed to access and diversity, the relative persistence of its freshmen is likely to continue lagging that of freshman cohorts on other CSU campuses that, during recent years, have worked to restrict their freshman classes to the fully prepared.
Review of Findings

Student Characteristics

Gender (Figure 3 and section 2 of Table 1)

- During the period under study, 55%-60% of the undergraduates enrolled at CSUN were women. The percentage of women in all but the earliest cohorts of newly enrolled freshmen and transfer students falls within this range as well.

- Although the percentage of women within the three student groups considered has fluctuated somewhat during the last twenty years, it has remained remarkably uniform from year to year.

Racial and Ethnic Background (Figures 4-6 and section 3 of Table 1)

- Current national initiatives designed to improve student persistence in and graduation from college have stressed the importance of narrowing the gap in the graduation rates of white students and those who have been traditionally underserved by higher education. These latter are generally said to include African American and Latina/o or Hispanic students, along with two native groupings (i.e., American Indians or Alaskan Natives and Native Hawaiians and other Pacific Islanders). Given this emphasis, it seemed reasonable to adopt the same approach here. Thus, persistence rates are shown separately for two groupings: traditionally underserved students and better served students (i.e., Asian, white, Other, and Unknown).

- During the period under study, the percentage of undergraduates from traditionally underserved backgrounds increased by three-fifths, growing from 27% to 47%. Much of this growth is due to the increasing presence of Latina/o students among CSUN’s undergraduates; by Fall 2013, they accounted for two-fifths of the total.

- Throughout the 1993-2013 period, the proportion of students from traditionally underserved backgrounds was consistently higher among the newly enrolling first time freshmen than among the newly enrolling upper division transfers. Nonetheless, their representation declined within the freshman cohorts entering during the last years of the 1990s. From Fall 1999 onwards, however, the percentage of traditionally underserved students within the new freshman cohorts grew strongly, increasing by two-fifths (from 42% to 60%). It was fueled largely by a three-fifths increase in the proportion of Latina/o students (rising from 30% to 53%).

- A similar pattern of steady, though less pronounced, growth is evident for the newly enrolling upper division transfer students; among them, the proportion of students from traditionally underserved backgrounds increased from 22% to 38% during the 1993-2013 period. Once again, the gains are largely due to growth in the representation of Latina/o students, which doubled.

- The shift in proportional representation has not, until recently, led to a decline in the numerical representation of the four major racial and ethnic groupings among CSUN’s entering students. As Figures 5 and 6 indicate, the number of African American, Latina/o, Asian, and White students entering CSUN as first time freshmen or upper division transfer students grew fairly steadily from Fall 1993 to Fall 2007.
● Among first time freshmen, Latina/o students predominated throughout the period, with their numbers, along with those of African American students, growing disproportionately between 1999 and 2007. Asian numbers grew least during this period, increasing by only 15%. A similar growth pattern is evident among the newly enrolling transfer students, though among them white students remained the largest grouping throughout the period. Once again, African American numbers more than doubled during the 1993-2007 period, while Latina/o numbers almost tripled.

● In Fall 2009, the CSU, following new federal requirements, introduced a radically different way of collecting information on students’ racial and ethnic background. The most important change involved placing all students claiming any Hispanic heritage into that grouping. Initially, it was hard to know whether the decline in the number of white, Asian, and African American students that followed in Fall 2009, along with the increase in the number of Latina/o students, reflected an actual change or nothing more than the new method of collecting information on students’ racial and ethnic backgrounds.

● In the meantime, it has become clear that the disproportionate growth in Latina/o numbers is very real, with the number of such new freshmen increasing by more than half during the Fall 2009-13 period. After the initial downturn, the number of new freshmen in the other three major racial and ethnic groupings has held relatively steady, with the number of Asian students increasing by two-fifths. Similar 2009-13 trends are evident for the new upper-division transfers, among whom white and Asian student numbers have also continued to grow.

Age at Entry (Figure 7 and section 4 of Table 1)

● Throughout the period under study, the average age of the first time freshmen entering CSUN remained 18 years.

● Among the newly enrolling upper division transfer students, the average age at entry hovered around 26 during the 1995-2001 period. Thereafter, it declined fairly steadily, dropping to 24.6 years of age for the new transfer cohort entering CSUN in Fall 2007, where it has remained. As a result of this decline, the average age of all undergraduates also shows a gradual decline of close to two years during the 2001-13 period (from 24.2 to 22.5).

Pell Grant Status (Figures 8-10 and Sections 5-6 of Table 1)

● After declining in the late 1990s, the proportion of newly enrolling first time freshmen and upper division transfers receiving Pell Grants at CSUN entry held fairly steady among cohorts entering during the 1999-07 period; at close to half for the new freshmen and at close to one-third for the new upper division transfers. Since the economic downturn in late-2008, the proportion of incoming undergraduates with Pell Grants has risen sharply, going from 41% to 60% for the most recent freshman cohort, and from 32% to 55% for the newest upper division transfers.

● Among both new freshmen and upper division transfers, students from traditionally underserved backgrounds are consistently more likely than those from better served backgrounds to be Pell-Grant recipients. The disproportion is considerably more pronounced among the new freshmen. Among them, 70%-78% of the traditionally underserved received Pell Grants during the 2009-13 period compared to 32%-41% of the students from better served backgrounds.
First Generation College Students (Figure 11 and Section 7 of Table 1)

- For much of the period under study, a question about parental education was optional on the CSU application. As a result, the available CSUN data were quite spotty. In recent years, however, the question has become mandatory and, since Fall 2007, approximately nine in ten new undergraduates have provided the information. Thus, figures for the most recent entry cohorts have been provided in the seventh section of Table 1.

- In addition to being sparse, the data on first-generation status are challenging to interpret, since there are several ways to define the term. As Figure 11 indicates, the group can be confined to students whose parents have no more than a high school education (the green bars in the figure) or it can include everyone whose parents have no four-year college degree (the green and gold bars combined).

- The more inclusive definition is the one used by the federal government and suggests that well over half of the new freshmen or upper division transfers entering during the Fall 2011-13 period are first-generation college students. If one focuses on the narrower definition (parents with no more than a high school education), the first time freshmen entering CSUN during the 20011-13 period are more likely than the new upper division transfers to be first generation students (42%-44% vs. 30%-32%).

New Students’ High School/Community College GPAs (Figure 12 and section 8 of Table 1)

- For most of the period under study, the average community college GPA of newly enrolling upper division transfer students increased modestly, going from 2.82 in Fall 1993 to 3.00 in Fall 2005. Since then, the average transfer GPA has held fairly steady.

- Throughout the period under study, the average high school GPA of newly enrolling first time freshmen has been a bit higher than the average community college GPA of incoming transfer students. During the 1997-99 period, the average high school GPA of new first time freshmen rose fairly steadily, going from 2.88 to 3.06. After that, it remained largely unchanged until the Fall 2007 entry cohort, ranging between 3.05 and 3.10. The 2007-13 period saw another modest increase (from 3.08 to 3.18), perhaps a consequence of the new impaction criteria imposed on out-of area applicants in Fall 2009.

Freshmen Preparation for College Work (Figures 13-15 and sections 9-10 of Table 1)

- During the 1995-99 period, the percentage of first time freshmen entering CSUN fully proficient in mathematics and English, and therefore deemed ready for college work, doubled (from 12% to 25%), while the percentage needing remediation in both subjects decreased by a similar amount (from 62% to 46%). More likely than not, this substantial shift is a consequence of the new systemwide policy imposed during the second half of the 1990s, which required all incoming freshmen to be fully prepared for college work at the end of their first year of study.6

- During the first half of the 2000s, the percentage of freshmen fully proficient at entry grew from 23% to 28%, dropping off modestly thereafter. The percentage arriving with remedial needs in both English and mathematics also declined during the first half of the decade, dropping from 49% to 42%. Since then, however, the proportion proficient at entry has risen sharply (from 26% to 39%), while the

---

6 The new policy not only affected the way incoming students’ deficiencies were handled, but substantially improved record-keeping as well.
proportion needing remediation in both subjects has fallen equally sharply (from 46% to 39%). As a result, for the first time in many years, more of the freshmen in the very large Fall 2013 entry cohort entered fully proficient than needed remediation in both English and mathematics.

- Throughout the 2000s, first time freshmen from traditionally underserved backgrounds have been less likely than those from better served groups to enter CSUN fully proficient in English and mathematics, but more likely to enter needing remediation in both of these subjects.

- During the 1999-2009 period, the percentage of freshmen fully proficient at entry remained quite low among traditionally underserved students (around 15%), but rose fairly steadily among those from better served groups (see Figure 14). Among the latter, the percentage proficient increased from 33% in Fall 1999 to 42% in Fall 2009, a net increase of one-quarter. Since then, however, the proportion fully proficient at entry has risen sharply in both subgroups, though the gap between them has remained substantial.

- Until relatively recently, the percentage of traditionally underserved first time freshmen needing remediation at entry in both English and mathematics fluctuated some, but tended to hover around 60% (see Figure 15). Among freshmen from better served groups, in contrast, far fewer needed remediation in both subjects at the beginning of the decade, a proportion that declined by one-fifth between the Fall 1999 and Fall 2009 entry cohorts (from 33% to 26%). Since then, as noted above, the percentage needing remediation in English, as well as mathematics, has declined rather sharply in both subgroups.

- During the 1997-2005 period, the average composite SAT scores of CSUN’s incoming first time freshmen increased from 900 to 945 (see section 10 of Table 1). Since then, the average score has declined somewhat.

Students’ Planned Areas of Specialization (Figures 16-17 and section 11 of Table 1)

- Throughout the period under study, close to two-fifths of CSUN’s undergraduates were pursuing majors in two broad disciplinary areas: Business and Economics or Social and Behavioral Sciences. At the beginning of the period, the first was clearly dominant; by the end, the two were equivalent. Thus, the proportion of students majoring in Business and Economics has tended to decline during the last 20 years, while the proportion majoring in Behavioral and Social Science disciplines has tended to increase. In addition, the percentage of students pursuing majors in Health and Human Development has tended to increase as well, especially since Fall 2003.

- Close to one-fourth of the new upper division transfer students entering CSUN during the 1993-2009 period have consistently opted for majors in Business and Economics. More recently, however, this dominance has been challenged by two other disciplinary areas: Social and Behavioral Sciences and Arts, Media, and Communication, both of which went from accounting for 31% of all incoming transfer students to 40% of them in the Fall 2009 entry cohort. Since then, Health and Human Development has also become competitive, rising from attracting 14% of all new transfers to attracting 19%.

- Among the newly enrolling first time freshmen, the largest percentage entered CSUN undecided about their majors throughout the 1993-2013 period. The percentage has been dropping since 2001, however, going from 32% in that year to 20% in Fall 2013. In addition, there has been a clear shift in the majors that new freshmen with clear preferences are planning. Among the Fall 1993 freshman entrants, Business and Economics clearly stood out as the preferred disciplinary area. By the time the Fall 2013
freshmen entered, however, a quartet of expected majors had emerged: Social and Behavioral Sciences, Health and Human Development, Arts, Media, and Communication, and Business and Economics. This last went from claiming 18% of all freshman entrants in Fall 1993 to claiming 13% in Fall 2013, while the other three went from being favored by 10%, 7%, and 12% respectively to being favored by 13%-15% each.

**Units Attempted** (Figures 18-19 and section 12 of Table 1)

- Throughout the period under consideration, more than nine in ten of the newly enrolling first time freshmen attempted full-time loads (i.e., 12 or more units per term) during their term at CSUN. Consequently, their average unit loads have fluctuated very little, hovering very close to 13.5 units during most of the 1993-2013 period

- Newly enrolling upper division transfer students are not as ambitious as their freshman counterparts. For much of the period under study, the percentage attempting a full time load during their first semester hovered around 70%. Nonetheless, the percentage remains considerably higher than during the 1990s, when the percentage attempting a full-time load increased from 56% to 70% in a six-year period. Further, after dropping off a bit for the Fall 2007-09 entry cohorts, the proportion carrying full-time loads has risen fairly sharply, going from 66% to 75% for the Fall 2013 entry cohort. In keeping with these patterns, the average unit load of entering transfer students grew from 10.6 units to 11.6 units during the 1993-1999 period and hovered around 11.5 until 2007, when it again rose modestly for the most recent entry cohorts.

- Given the differing course taking patterns of entering students, it is not surprising that the percentage of all enrolled undergraduates attempting full time loads hovered around 70%-75% during most of the period under study, while the average unit load, after rising half a unit between 1993 and 1999 (from 11.5 to 12.1), remained very close to 12 units until Fall 2009. Since then, both the proportion of students attempting full-time loads and their average unit loads have risen noticeably.

**Baccalaureate Degree Recipients and Time to Degree**

**Number of Degree Recipients** (Figures 20-21 and Table 2)

- The number of baccalaureate degree recipients grew substantially and relatively steadily during the 1999-2008 period, as the bottom section of Table 2 and Figure 20 indicate. During the following three academic years, the number of degree recipients leveled off, before rising again during the 2009-13 period. A healthy majority of the degree recipients considered entered CSUN as transfer students; throughout the last decade, at least 63% of all baccalaureate degree recipients were transfer entrants.  

- The number of degree recipients entering CSUN as first time freshmen grew more rapidly during the 2000-08 period than did the number of graduates entering as upper division transfer students. The number of degrees received by freshman entrants grew fairly steadily, effectively doubling between the beginning and end of this period: from 1,040 degrees to 2,074 degrees granted. After several years of

---

7 Table 2 does not include all baccalaureate degrees granted. Those earned by undergraduates entering as lower division transfer students are excluded for the sake of year-to-year consistency and because their longer tenure at CSUN would distort the time to degree figures.
stasis, the freshman numbers grew again, rising from just under 2000 degree recipients during 2009-10 to almost 2,300 in 2012-13, a gain of 15%

- Among the transfer degree recipients, growth was more episodic, occurring primarily at the beginning and end of the period considered, though there was a spurt in 2007-08. As a result, the net gain in degrees granted was a more modest, though still a substantial 45%. (going from 2,749 to approximately 4,000 degrees granted) Again, these increases in degree production are congruent with the growth in the size of the undergraduate entry cohorts reviewed earlier (see Figure 2 and section 1 of Table 1).

- Among both the freshman and transfer degree recipients, the percentage of students from traditionally underserved backgrounds grew modestly between 2000-01 and 2012-13, though they remained in a minority (see Figure 21 and the top section of Table 2). During the 2000-08 period, their representation grew by eight percentage points among the freshman entrants and by four points among the transfer entrants (from 38% to 44% and from 26% to 30%). After a three-year decline, renewed growth in the proportion of degree recipients from traditionally underserved backgrounds has been evident again, more than making up for the declines during the 2007-10 period.

**Time to Degree (Figures 22-23 and Table 3)**

- Figure 22 and the top section of Table 3 indicate that the average time to degree of baccalaureate degree recipients entering as first time freshman declined fairly steadily between 2001-02 and 2005-06, dropping from 6.2 years to 5.8 years. After holding steadily for several years, time to degree dropped again between 2008-09 and 2011-12 (from 5.8 to 5.5 years).\(^8\)

- Average time to degree has been falling fairly steadily since 2004-05 among traditionally underserved freshman degree recipients, going from 6.4 years to 5.6 years for the most recent graduates considered. Among students from better served backgrounds, the sharpest declines in time to degree occurred during the 2000-03 period, with the figure dropping from 6.1 to 5.7 years. Since then, the average time to degree has remained largely unchanged, with the effect that the gap in time to degree for traditionally underserved and better served freshmen has virtually disappeared for the most recent graduates.

- Figure 17 and the bottom section of Table 3 show average times to degree for baccalaureate degree recipients entering as upper division transfer students. The average time to degree for all transfer degree recipients has remained almost constant throughout the period considered, fluctuating slightly between 3.2 years and 3.4 years. Likewise, any difference in the average time to degree of traditionally underserved and better served transfer entrants is quite small. Regardless of background, average time to degree has ranged between 3.1 to 3.4 years throughout the period.

\(^8\) For the purposes of the figures presented here, time to degree has been calculated by subtracting students’ entry term from their graduation term and then dividing by two to arrive at the number of years between entry and exit. This approach has the effect of inflating time to degree somewhat because it ignores stop-outs. Since most undergraduates who persist to graduation attend continuously, the resulting distortion is not great.
Persistence Among Upper Division Transfer Entrants

One-Year Continuation Rates (Figure 24-25 and Table 4)

- During the last 15 years, between three-quarters and four-fifths of the upper division transfer students enrolling at CSUN persisted into a second year of study. Their one-year continuation rate grew modestly between the Fall 1999 entry cohort and the Fall 2002 entry cohort (from 78% to 83%), holding fairly steady thereafter, despite some fluctuation (see Figure 24).

- The one-year continuation rates of traditionally underserved and better served transfer students have tended to grow in tandem, increasing from 77%-78% for the Fall 1999 entry cohort to 84%-85% for the Fall 2007 entry cohort, an overall gain of just under one-tenth for each (see Figure 25). With the exception of the 2004 and 2005 entry cohorts, when the continuation rate of the traditionally underserved group fell off a bit, the one-year continuation rates of the two groups were no more than 2 points apart during the 1999-2007 period. Since then, the rates of the two subgroups have been largely identical, though a small gap has opened up for the two most recent entry cohorts shown.

Three-Year Graduation Rates (Figures 24 & 26 and Table 5)

- Overall, the three-year graduation rate of CSUN’s upper division transfer students is considerably higher for the most recent entry cohort considered than it was for the earliest. Growth in the rates has been episodic, however.

- During the Fall 1996-98 period, the three-year graduation rate increased from 38% to 51% (see Figure 24). From 1998 onwards, it held steady at around 51% until the Fall 2001 entrants arrived. Thereafter, the three-year rate rose again, climbing to 60% for the Fall 2004 entry cohort. Finally, it fell once more during the Fall 2004-06 period, before rising once more for the three most recent entry cohorts considered (going from 54% to 64%).

- The ebb and flow in the three-year graduation rate just outlined is evident for both traditionally underserved and better served transfer students, as Figure 26 indicates. Each grouping experienced three periods of growth – 1996-98, 2001-04, and 2007-10 – interspersed with periods of stasis or decline. The traditionally underserved transfer entrants experienced disproportionate growth during the 1996-2004 and 2007-10 periods, along with a disproportionate decline in between.

- For much of the period considered, the three-year graduation rates of traditionally underserved transfer students were somewhat lower than those of the better served students, lagging them by 2-9 percentage points. The gap has been steadily narrowing since the Fall 2007 entry cohort exited, however, and has largely disappeared for the two most recent entry cohorts considered.

Likely Graduation Rates (Figures 24 & 27 and Table 5)

- The “likely” graduation rates of the upper division transfer entrants under consideration are considerably higher than their three-year graduation rates (see Figure 24). Among such students, “likely” graduates are those who have graduated within three years of entry or are still enrolled at the beginning of the fourth year after entry. After this considerable period of persistence, these last are deemed likely to eventually graduate, and therefore, included among the likely graduates. The hills and valleys in the trend lines for both the three-year and likely graduates are largely the same: growth during the 1996-99,
For the five cohorts entering CSUN prior to the Fall 2001 transfer cohort, the likely graduation rates of the traditionally underserved and better served student groupings are virtually indistinguishable (see Figure 27). Thereafter, the likely graduation rates of the traditionally underserved upper division transfer students have fluctuated more than those of students from better served racial and ethnic backgrounds. As a result, the likely graduation rate of the former has tended to lag the latter for the cohorts entering during the 2001-07 period, with the amount of lag varying considerably (i.e., from 1 to 7 points). Since the Fall 2008 entry cohort, however, the gap between the two subgroups has virtually disappeared.

A comparison of Figures 26 and 27 indicates that the gap in the graduation rates of traditionally underserved and better served students entering CSUN during the period under consideration is smaller for the likely graduates than for the three-year graduates. This suggests that the main difference between upper division transfer students from traditionally underserved and better served backgrounds is in time to degree, with the traditionally underserved taking a bit longer than others to obtain their baccalaureate degrees.

Persistence Among First Time Freshman Entrants

One-Year Continuation Rates (Figure 28 and Table 6)

Among the first time freshmen entering CSUN during the 1999-2008 period, one-year continuation rates are curvilinear, ending up pretty much where they started. For the cohorts entering during the 1999-2004 period, the one-year continuation rate rose fairly steadily, increasing from 70% to 76%. Thereafter, it held steady for one additional entry cohort, before dropping off again between 2005 and 2008. For the next three entry cohorts, the overall continuation rate bounced back to 74%, rising further for the two most recent entry cohorts considered. These shifts are in keeping with fluctuations in the need for remediation at entry, which declined modestly during the 1999-2005 period and increased modestly among several subsequent entry cohorts, before falling again (see section 9 of Table 1 and Figure 13).

Within the first three entry cohorts considered, the percentage of traditionally underserved freshmen continuing into a second year of study rose sharply, while the one-year continuation rate held fairly constant among better served freshman entrants. As a result, the two rates were almost equivalent.

Since Fall 2001, however, the gap in the continuation rates of the two groups has remained stubbornly large, thanks to their differing continuation rates. Among the traditionally underserved, the one-year continuation rate remained largely unchanged for freshmen entering during the 2001-05 period, hovering between 72% and 73%. Thereafter, the rate dropped off until 2008, bouncing back to 70%-71% for the next three cohorts and then to 73%-75% for the two most recent cohorts considered. A similar pattern is evident among better served freshman entrants: their one-year continuation rate grew for the cohorts entering during the 2001-05 period, rising from 74% to 80%. Thereafter, it dropped off for two years before rebounding to 83% for the two most recent cohorts considered.

The decrease in the overall continuation rate of CSUN’s first time freshmen during the Fall 2005-08 period is a consequence of the interaction of two trends described above: growth in the size of the
freshman class and the increasing representation of traditionally underserved students among CSUN’s entering freshmen. As was noted earlier, these students are considerably more likely than better served students to need remediation at entry, and therefore, in keeping with a CSU mandate that all remedial work be completed within one year, less likely to be able to persist into the second year of college (see Figure 2, Figure 4, section 9 of Table 1, and Figures 14-15).

Six-Year Graduation Rates (Figure 29 and Table 7)

- During the period under study, the six-year graduation rate of CSUN’s first time freshmen grew fairly steadily for cohorts entering during the 1995-2000 Fall terms, increasing from 25% to 40%, a gain of three-fifths. After three years of relative stasis, the six-year graduation rate again increased strongly for the Fall 2002-04 entry cohorts, rising from 40% to 47%. Since then it has remained relatively flat.

- During the Fall 1995-2001 period, the graduation rate of the traditionally underserved students in various entry cohorts doubled, increasing from 17% to 35%. Gains are also evident among the better served freshmen, but they are more modest; their graduation rates increased from 33% to 43% between 1995 and 2001, a proportional gain of almost a third.

- Given these differential gains, it is not surprising that the gap in the six-year graduation rates of the traditionally underserved and better served CSUN freshmen was cut in half during the 1995-2001 period, going from 16 points to eight points. Since the Fall 2001 entry cohort, however, the gap has increased again, as the six-year graduation rates of the better served freshmen increased more sharply than those of the traditionally underserved during the 2002-04 period (a gain of 10 percentage points vs. a gain of five percentage points).

Likely Graduation Rates (Figure 30 and Table 7)

Table 7a and Figure 30 show the “likely” graduation rates for freshmen cohorts entering CSUN during the 1993-2008 period. Like the six-year rates, the likely graduation rates of CSUN’s first time freshmen increased during the 1995-2000 period, albeit more modestly. Thereafter, they also leveled off and then increased again for the 2002-04 entry cohorts before leveling off once more for the most recent entry cohorts considered.

- Among the freshman cohorts entering during the Fall 1993-2000 period, the likely graduation rate grew from 40% to 52%, for a gain of almost a third. Although the rate increased among both the traditionally underserved and better served groups, it grew more strongly among the traditionally underserved.

- Among the traditionally underserved freshmen enrolling at CSUN in cohorts entering during the 1995-2001 period, the likely graduation rate increased by almost half, rising from 33% to 48%. In the subsequent two entry cohorts considered, the likely graduation rate dropped off slightly, but rebounded for the 2003 and 2004 entry cohorts. Since then, it has ranged from 47% to 49%.

---

9 Most of the students entering during the Fall 1995-2000 period and graduating within six years, graduated during the 2000-06 period.

10 As noted above, “likely” graduates are those who have graduated in a set period of time – six years in the case of first time freshmen – or who are still enrolled at the university at the end of that period.
● The likely graduation rate of better served freshmen grew fairly consistently during the 1995-2000 period, increasing from 47% to 54%. This amounts to a proportional gain of 15%, which is more modest than the gains among traditionally underserved students. After holding more or less steady for two years, the likely graduation rate of the better served students continued to climb. Thus, it was 6 points higher for the 2004 entry cohort than it had been for the 2002 entry cohort. The likely graduation rate has dropped off since then, however, hovering between 55% and 56% for the three most recent entry cohorts considered.

● In keeping with these differing growth patterns, the gap in the likely graduation rates of traditionally underserved and better served freshman entrants dropped by more than half during the 1995-2001 period, declining from 14% to 6%. Since then it has opened up again, much as it has for the six-year rates.

Persistence and Preparation for College Work: A CSU Perspective (Table 8 and Figures 31-34)

● Preceding discussion has elucidated the close interplay between changes in the size and composition of CSUN’s freshman entry cohorts and students’ subsequent ability to persist in college. Given the importance for freshman persistence of entering proficient in mathematics, in particular, the one-year continuation rates of CSUN’s freshmen have tended to lag other large CSU campuses that have used impaction to enhance the entry-level proficiency of their incoming freshman cohorts.

● Figure 31 relies on freshman cohorts entering during the 2005-07 period to show the close relationship between average proficiency in mathematics at entry and average one-year continuation rates at CSU semester campuses. In this context, CSUN’s one-year continuation rate is a bit above average, given the relatively large proportion of freshmen who need remedial work in mathematics, the deficit most likely to hinder student progress.

● The picture has changed during more recent years, as Figure 32 indicates. The averages for the 2010-12 period show an even stronger relationship between proficiency in mathematics at entry and students’ ability to persist into a second year of study. And, because the remedial needs of CSUN’s students have remained largely unchanged, while those of students on other semester campuses have tended to decline, CSUN’s average continuation rate now lags that of other semester campuses.

● Figure 33 lays out the change graphically, showing that increases in entry-level proficiency in mathematics between the 2005-07 and the 2010-12 periods has typically given rise to similar gains in the one-year continuation rate. The other three large southern campuses (Long Beach, Fullerton, and San Diego) are among those that have most strongly reduced the proportion of freshmen needing remediation in mathematics at entry, thanks to the introduction of impaction at the program level, though the resulting gains in the one-year continuation rate have varied.

---

11 Multi-year averages are relied upon for the discussion in this section to avoid undue reliance on what may be a temporary gain or loss during a single year.

12 Similar patterns are evident if one focuses on the proportion of freshmen needing remediation in English at entry, but the relationships are weaker.
These gains in proficiency at entry and subsequent persistence have come at the expense of diversity, however. As is evident from Figure 34, there is a negative relationship between gains in the representation of freshmen from traditionally underserved backgrounds and proficiency in mathematics at entry, which, in turn, helps determine the one-year continuation rate, as Figure 33 indicated. The relative loss of diversity that impaction has given rise to has been masked on individual campuses, however, thanks to underlying demographic changes in the composition of the state’s high school graduates. Thus, during the period under study, the proportion of traditionally underserved students within freshman entry cohorts has increased on all CSU campuses. The campuses achieving the greatest gains in entry-level proficiency, however, have generally registered below-average gains in enrollment of freshmen from traditionally underserved backgrounds (e.g., Fullerton, San Jose, and San Diego).13

13 The location of Dominguez Hills in Figures 33 and 34 (e.g., low gains in diversity and high gains in both proficiency and persistence) is misleading because the campus has always had far and away the largest proportion of freshmen from traditionally underserved backgrounds.
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Table 1. Characteristics of Undergraduate CSUN Students by Student Level and Fall Term (Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1993</th>
<th>1995</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Overall Enrollment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New First Time Freshmen</td>
<td>1,723</td>
<td>2,075</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td>2,575</td>
<td>3,226</td>
<td>3,489</td>
<td>3,598</td>
<td>3,981</td>
<td>4,056</td>
<td>5,269</td>
<td>5,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Upper Division Transfer Students</td>
<td>1,527</td>
<td>1,831</td>
<td>2,575</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,597</td>
<td>2,421</td>
<td>2,985</td>
<td>3,327</td>
<td>3,348</td>
<td>4,835</td>
<td>5,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Undergraduate Students</td>
<td>20,824</td>
<td>19,440</td>
<td>21,127</td>
<td>20,885</td>
<td>23,594</td>
<td>24,636</td>
<td>25,481</td>
<td>27,944</td>
<td>27,561</td>
<td>31,504</td>
<td>33,398</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| **2. Gender** |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| New First Time Freshmen     |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| Women                     | 52.6  | 56.0  | 57.3  | 57.1  | 57.7  | 58.0  | 59.8  | 57.0  | 57.6  | 54.5  | 56.8  |
| Men                       | 47.4  | 44.0  | 42.7  | 42.9  | 42.3  | 42.0  | 40.2  | 43.0  | 42.4  | 45.5  | 43.2  |
| Total                     | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| (Number of Students)       | (1,723) | (2,075) | (2,550) | (2,575) | (3,226) | (3,489) | (3,598) | (3,981) | (4,056) | (5,269) | (5,818) |
| New Upper Division Transfer Students |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| Women                     | 54.3  | 55.5  | 60.3  | 60.3  | 58.7  | 58.4  | 59.2  | 57.3  | 57.3  | 57.3  | 57.3  |
| Men                       | 45.7  | 44.5  | 39.7  | 39.7  | 41.3  | 41.6  | 40.8  | 42.7  | 42.7  | 46.2  | 45.0  |
| Total                     | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| (Number of Students)       | (1,527) | (1,831) | (2,575) | (2,500) | (2,597) | (2,421) | (2,985) | (3,327) | (3,348) | (4,835) | (5,164) |
| All Undergraduate Students |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| Women                     | 55.4  | 55.1  | 56.9  | 58.0  | 59.1  | 59.0  | 59.0  | 57.0  | 57.0  | 55.4  | 54.5  |
| Men                       | 44.6  | 44.9  | 43.1  | 42.0  | 40.9  | 41.0  | 41.0  | 42.0  | 42.0  | 44.6  | 45.5  |
| Total                     | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| (Number of Students)       | (20,824) | (19,440) | (21,127) | (20,885) | (23,594) | (24,636) | (25,481) | (27,944) | (27,561) | (31,504) | (33,398) |

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|                |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| <strong>3. Racial and Ethnic Background</strong> |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| New First Time Freshmen     |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| Traditionally Underserved   | 44.7  | 49.3  | 46.1  | 42.3  | 44.6  | 48.1  | 51.1  | 53.4  | 59.3  | 60.3  | 60.5  |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native | 0.3  | 0.9  | 0.7  | 0.8  | 0.5  | 0.5  | 0.4  | 0.6  | 0.2  | 0.1  | 0.1  |
| Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders | 0.2  | 0.4  | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.3  | 0.4  | 0.5  | 0.5  | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.2  |
| African American           | 11.5  | 12.1  | 13.6  | 11.6  | 12.9  | 13.1  | 13.7  | 15.5  | 10.7  | 8.4  | 7.5  |
| Latino/a                   | 32.6  | 35.9  | 31.5  | 29.7  | 30.9  | 34.0  | 36.5  | 36.8  | 48.2  | 51.6  | 52.7  |
| Better Served              |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| Asian American             | 21.8  | 18.0  | 16.3  | 16.3  | 14.5  | 13.2  | 13.1  | 12.2  | 10.9  | 11.3  | 10.8  |
| White                      | 25.8  | 22.6  | 22.0  | 26.4  | 25.7  | 25.9  | 24.5  | 24.8  | 20.9  | 17.1  | 15.6  |
| Unknown (includes Other)   | 7.7   | 10.1  | 15.6  | 15.0  | 15.2  | 12.7  | 11.3  | 9.6   | 8.9   | 6.3   | 5.7   |
| International (i.e., non-resident alien) |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| Total                      | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| (Number of Students)       | (1,723) | (2,075) | (2,550) | (2,575) | (3,226) | (3,489) | (3,598) | (3,981) | (3,981) | (4,056) | (5,269) | (5,818) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1993</th>
<th>1995</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Racial and Ethnic Background (cont’d.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Upper Division Transfer Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditionally Underserved</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/a</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Served</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown (includes Other)</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International (i.e., non-resident alien)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Number of Students)</td>
<td>(1,527)</td>
<td>(1,831)</td>
<td>(2,575)</td>
<td>(2,500)</td>
<td>(2,597)</td>
<td>(2,421)</td>
<td>(2,985)</td>
<td>(3,327)</td>
<td>(3,348)</td>
<td>(4,835)</td>
<td>(5,164)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Undergraduate Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditionally Underserved</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/a</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Served</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown (includes Other)</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International (i.e., non-resident alien)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Number of Students)</td>
<td>(20,824)</td>
<td>(19,440)</td>
<td>(21,127)</td>
<td>(20,885)</td>
<td>(23,594)</td>
<td>(24,636)</td>
<td>(25,481)</td>
<td>(27,944)</td>
<td>(27,561)</td>
<td>(31,504)</td>
<td>(33,398)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Mean Age at Entry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Student</th>
<th>1993</th>
<th>1995</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New First Time Freshmen</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(no. of students on which mean based)</td>
<td>(1,723)</td>
<td>(2,075)</td>
<td>(2,550)</td>
<td>(2,575)</td>
<td>(3,226)</td>
<td>(3,489)</td>
<td>(3,598)</td>
<td>(3,981)</td>
<td>(4,056)</td>
<td>(5,269)</td>
<td>(5,818)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Upper Division Transfer Students</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(no. of students on which mean based)</td>
<td>(1,527)</td>
<td>(1,831)</td>
<td>(2,575)</td>
<td>(2,500)</td>
<td>(2,597)</td>
<td>(2,421)</td>
<td>(2,985)</td>
<td>(3,327)</td>
<td>(3,348)</td>
<td>(4,835)</td>
<td>(4,614)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Undergraduate Students</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(no. of students on which mean based)</td>
<td>(20,824)</td>
<td>(19,440)</td>
<td>(21,127)</td>
<td>(20,885)</td>
<td>(23,594)</td>
<td>(24,636)</td>
<td>(25,481)</td>
<td>(27,944)</td>
<td>(27,561)</td>
<td>(31,504)</td>
<td>(33,398)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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5. Pell Grant Status *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1993</th>
<th>1995</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New First Time Freshmen</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pell Grant recipient</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Pell Grant</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Number of Students)</td>
<td>(1,825)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>(2,596)</td>
<td>(2,625)</td>
<td>(3,302)</td>
<td>(3,610)</td>
<td>(3,720)</td>
<td>(4,130)</td>
<td>(4,203)</td>
<td>(5,269)</td>
<td>(5,818)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Upper Division Transfer Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pell Grant recipient</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Pell Grant</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Number of Students)</td>
<td>(1,575)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>(2,700)</td>
<td>(2,623)</td>
<td>(2,791)</td>
<td>(2,641)</td>
<td>(3,273)</td>
<td>(3,590)</td>
<td>(3,616)</td>
<td>(4,835)</td>
<td>(5,164)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Undergraduate Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pell Grant recipient</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Pell Grant</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Number of Students)</td>
<td>(953)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>(1,375)</td>
<td>(1,487)</td>
<td>(1,786)</td>
<td>(1,810)</td>
<td>(1,759)</td>
<td>(1,855)</td>
<td>(1,651)</td>
<td>(1,822)</td>
<td>(1,864)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Pell Grant Recipients Among

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1993</th>
<th>1995</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New First Time Freshmen Who Stem From</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditionally Underserved Groups</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( no. of students on which percent based)</td>
<td>(770)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>(1,175)</td>
<td>(1,088)</td>
<td>(1,440)</td>
<td>(1,679)</td>
<td>(1,839)</td>
<td>(2,126)</td>
<td>(2,405)</td>
<td>(3,179)</td>
<td>(3,517)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Served Groups</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( no. of students on which percent based)</td>
<td>(953)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>(1,375)</td>
<td>(1,487)</td>
<td>(1,786)</td>
<td>(1,810)</td>
<td>(1,759)</td>
<td>(1,855)</td>
<td>(1,651)</td>
<td>(1,822)</td>
<td>(1,864)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Upper Division Transfer Students Who Stem From</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditionally Underserved Groups</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( no. of students on which percent based)</td>
<td>(335)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>(659)</td>
<td>(689)</td>
<td>(780)</td>
<td>(702)</td>
<td>(963)</td>
<td>(1,061)</td>
<td>(1,072)</td>
<td>(1,677)</td>
<td>(1,954)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Served Groups</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( no. of students on which percent based)</td>
<td>(1,192)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>(1,916)</td>
<td>(1,811)</td>
<td>(1,817)</td>
<td>(1,719)</td>
<td>(2,022)</td>
<td>(2,266)</td>
<td>(2,276)</td>
<td>(2,808)</td>
<td>(2,855)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Undergraduate Students Who Stem From</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditionally Underserved Groups</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( no. of students on which percent based)</td>
<td>(5,701)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>(7,252)</td>
<td>(7,374)</td>
<td>(8,601)</td>
<td>(9,456)</td>
<td>(10,014)</td>
<td>(11,420)</td>
<td>(11,854)</td>
<td>(14,018)</td>
<td>(15,722)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Served Groups</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( no. of students on which percent based)</td>
<td>(15,123)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>(13,875)</td>
<td>(13,511)</td>
<td>(14,993)</td>
<td>(15,180)</td>
<td>(15,467)</td>
<td>(16,524)</td>
<td>(15,707)</td>
<td>(15,509)</td>
<td>(15,206)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Parental Education (indicator of First-Generation College Status)</th>
<th>1993</th>
<th>1995</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New First Time Freshmen</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both parents: high school or less</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or both parents: some college</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or both parents: four-year degree</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Number of Students)</td>
<td>(4,130)</td>
<td>(4,203)</td>
<td>(5,269)</td>
<td>(5,818)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Upper Division Transfer Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both parents: high school or less</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or both parents: some college</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or both parents: four-year degree</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Number of Students)</td>
<td>(3,590)</td>
<td>(3,616)</td>
<td>(4,835)</td>
<td>(5,164)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Undergraduate Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both parents: high school or less</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or both parents: some college</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or both parents: four-year degree</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Number of Students)</td>
<td>(29,484)</td>
<td>(29,275)</td>
<td>(31,504)</td>
<td>(33,398)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Mean High School/Transfer GPA at Entry

<p>| New First Time Freshmen | 2.91 | 2.88 | 2.98 | 3.06 | 3.05 | 3.08 | 3.10 | 3.08 | 3.13 | 3.15 | 3.18 |
| (no. of students on which mean based) | (1,723) | (2,075) | (2,550) | (2,575) | (3,226) | (3,489) | (3,598) | (3,981) | (4,056) | (5,237) | (5,778) |
| New Upper Division Transfer Students | 2.82 | 2.83 | 2.89 | 2.92 | 2.94 | 2.99 | 3.00 | 2.96 | 3.00 | 2.99 | 3.00 |
| (no. of students on which mean based) | (1,527) | (1,831) | (2,575) | (2,500) | (2,597) | (2,421) | (2,985) | (3,327) | (3,348) | (4,833) | (5,162) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1993</th>
<th>1995</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All First Time Freshmen</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully Proficient at Entry</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Remediation at Entry in</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English Only</strong></td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mathematics Only</strong></td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Both Subjects</strong></td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traditionally Underserved Freshmen</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully Proficient at Entry</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Remediation at Entry in</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English Only</strong></td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mathematics Only</strong></td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Both Subjects</strong></td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Better Served Freshmen</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully Proficient at Entry</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Remediation at Entry in</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English Only</strong></td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mathematics Only</strong></td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Both Subjects</strong></td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Number of Students)</td>
<td>(2,075)</td>
<td>(2,550)</td>
<td>(2,575)</td>
<td>(3,226)</td>
<td>(3,489)</td>
<td>(3,598)</td>
<td>(3,981)</td>
<td>(4,056)</td>
<td>(5,269)</td>
<td>(5,818)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10. Average SAT Scores of First Time Freshmen</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean composite score ^</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>900.2</td>
<td>918.3</td>
<td>929.4</td>
<td>935.8</td>
<td>945.3</td>
<td>935.7</td>
<td>937.2</td>
<td>928.4</td>
<td>924.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 11. Colleges Housing Students' Majors

#### New First Time Freshmen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>1993</th>
<th>1995</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Media, &amp; Communication</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Economics</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Computer Science</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Human Development</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science &amp; Mathematics</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeclared</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Number of Students)</td>
<td>(1,723)</td>
<td>(2,075)</td>
<td>(2,550)</td>
<td>(2,575)</td>
<td>(3,226)</td>
<td>(3,489)</td>
<td>(3,598)</td>
<td>(3,981)</td>
<td>(4,056)</td>
<td>(5,269)</td>
<td>(5,818)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### New Upper Division Transfer Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>1993</th>
<th>1995</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Media, &amp; Communication</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Economics</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Computer Science</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Human Development</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science &amp; Mathematics</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeclared</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Number of Students)</td>
<td>(1,527)</td>
<td>(1,831)</td>
<td>(2,550)</td>
<td>(2,500)</td>
<td>(2,597)</td>
<td>(2,421)</td>
<td>(2,985)</td>
<td>(3,327)</td>
<td>(3,348)</td>
<td>(4,835)</td>
<td>(6,164)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### All Undergraduate Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>1993</th>
<th>1995</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Media, &amp; Communication</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Economics</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Computer Science</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Human Development</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science &amp; Mathematics</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeclared</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Number of Students)</td>
<td>(20,824)</td>
<td>(19,440)</td>
<td>(21,127)</td>
<td>(20,885)</td>
<td>(23,594)</td>
<td>(24,636)</td>
<td>(25,481)</td>
<td>(27,944)</td>
<td>(27,561)</td>
<td>(31,504)</td>
<td>(33,398)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12. Units Attempted</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New First Time Freshmen</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 or fewer units</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 11 units</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 14 units</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>89.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 or more units</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Number of Students)</td>
<td>(1,723)</td>
<td>(2,075)</td>
<td>(2,550)</td>
<td>(2,575)</td>
<td>(3,226)</td>
<td>(3,489)</td>
<td>(3,598)</td>
<td>(3,981)</td>
<td>(4,056)</td>
<td>(5,269)</td>
<td>(5,818)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean units attempted</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Upper Division Transfer Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 or fewer units</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 11 units</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 14 units</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>69.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 or more units</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Number of Students)</td>
<td>(1,527)</td>
<td>(1,831)</td>
<td>(2,575)</td>
<td>(2,500)</td>
<td>(2,957)</td>
<td>(2,421)</td>
<td>(2,985)</td>
<td>(3,327)</td>
<td>(3,348)</td>
<td>(4,835)</td>
<td>(6,164)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean units attempted</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Undergraduate Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 or fewer units</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 11 units</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 14 units</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>73.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 or more units</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Number of Students)</td>
<td>(20,824)</td>
<td>(19,440)</td>
<td>(21,127)</td>
<td>(20,885)</td>
<td>(23,594)</td>
<td>(24,636)</td>
<td>(25,481)</td>
<td>(27,944)</td>
<td>(27,561)</td>
<td>(31,504)</td>
<td>(33,398)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean units attempted</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** International students, a category that includes all students classified as non-resident aliens, have been excluded from all figures shown for the 1993-2009 period.

* No Pell-Grant figures are available for Fall 1995. As a result of the Northridge earthquake, the relevant data could not be collected during that term.

** Proficiency at entry could not be assessed for the first time freshmen entering in Fall 1993.

^ Not all freshmen enrolling at CSUN submitted SAT scores during the 1997-2009 period; none are available for the earlier years shown.
Table 2. Number and Percentage of Baccalaureate Degree Recipients Enrolled at CSUN by Entry Status, Racial and Ethnic Background, and Degree Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentages</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Time Freshmen Entrants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditionally Underserved *</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Served</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upper Division Transfer Entrants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditionally Underserved</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Served</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Numbers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Time Freshmen Entrants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditionally Underserved *</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>1,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Served</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>1,022</td>
<td>1,071</td>
<td>1,167</td>
<td>1,207</td>
<td>1,304</td>
<td>1,285</td>
<td>1,267</td>
<td>1,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>1,235</td>
<td>1,349</td>
<td>1,282</td>
<td>1,555</td>
<td>1,715</td>
<td>1,838</td>
<td>2,074</td>
<td>2,010</td>
<td>1,987</td>
<td>2,217</td>
<td>2,209</td>
<td>2,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upper Division Transfer Entrants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditionally Underserved *</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>1,132</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>1,182</td>
<td>1,219</td>
<td>1,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Served</td>
<td>2,042</td>
<td>2,217</td>
<td>2,235</td>
<td>2,219</td>
<td>2,342</td>
<td>2,210</td>
<td>2,271</td>
<td>2,615</td>
<td>2,668</td>
<td>2,843</td>
<td>2,845</td>
<td>2,521</td>
<td>2,705</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Traditionally underserved students are those from the following backgrounds: American Indians/Alaskan Natives, Native Hawaiians/Pacific Islanders, African American, and Latina/o. The "Better Served" grouping includes all others, except international students.
Table 3. Mean Time to Degree of CSUN Baccalaureate Degree Recipients by Entry Status, Racial and Ethnic Background, and Degree Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Time Freshmen Entrants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditionally Underserved *</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(no. of students on which mean based)</td>
<td>(396)</td>
<td>(474)</td>
<td>(520)</td>
<td>(529)</td>
<td>(635)</td>
<td>(693)</td>
<td>(767)</td>
<td>(907)</td>
<td>(803)</td>
<td>(683)</td>
<td>(932)</td>
<td>(942)</td>
<td>(1,043)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Served</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(no. of students on which mean based)</td>
<td>(844)</td>
<td>(761)</td>
<td>(829)</td>
<td>(753)</td>
<td>(920)</td>
<td>(1,022)</td>
<td>(1,071)</td>
<td>(1,167)</td>
<td>(1,207)</td>
<td>(1,304)</td>
<td>(1,285)</td>
<td>(1,267)</td>
<td>(1,245)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Degree Recipients</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(no. of students on which mean based)</td>
<td>(1,040)</td>
<td>(1,235)</td>
<td>(1,349)</td>
<td>(1,282)</td>
<td>(1,555)</td>
<td>(1,715)</td>
<td>(1,838)</td>
<td>(2,074)</td>
<td>(2,010)</td>
<td>(1,987)</td>
<td>(1,291)</td>
<td>(1,273)</td>
<td>(1,251)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Division Transfer Entrants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditionally Underserved *</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(no. of students on which mean based)</td>
<td>(707)</td>
<td>(807)</td>
<td>(868)</td>
<td>(839)</td>
<td>(942)</td>
<td>(964)</td>
<td>(913)</td>
<td>(1,132)</td>
<td>(993)</td>
<td>(970)</td>
<td>(1,182)</td>
<td>(1,219)</td>
<td>(1,292)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Served</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(no. of students on which mean based)</td>
<td>(2,042)</td>
<td>(2,217)</td>
<td>(2,235)</td>
<td>(2,219)</td>
<td>(2,342)</td>
<td>(2,210)</td>
<td>(2,271)</td>
<td>(2,615)</td>
<td>(2,668)</td>
<td>(2,643)</td>
<td>(2,845)</td>
<td>(2,521)</td>
<td>(2,705)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Degree Recipients</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(no. of students on which mean based)</td>
<td>(2,749)</td>
<td>(3,024)</td>
<td>(3,103)</td>
<td>(3,058)</td>
<td>(3,284)</td>
<td>(3,174)</td>
<td>(3,184)</td>
<td>(3,747)</td>
<td>(3,661)</td>
<td>(3,613)</td>
<td>(4,027)</td>
<td>(3,740)</td>
<td>(3,997)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Traditionally underserved students are those from the following backgrounds: American Indians/Alaskan Natives, Native Hawaiians/Pacific Islanders, African American, and Latina/o. The "Better Served" grouping includes all others, except international students.
### Table 4. One-Year Continuation Rates of Upper Division Transfer Students Entering CSUN During the 1999-2009 Period by Racial and Ethnic Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry Term</th>
<th>Continuation Rates</th>
<th>All Students</th>
<th>Traditionally Underserved *</th>
<th>Better Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditionally</td>
<td>Size of</td>
<td>Size of</td>
<td>Size of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>Enrolled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Entry Term</td>
<td>One Year</td>
<td>Entry Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Cohort</td>
<td>One Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Under-</td>
<td>Later</td>
<td>Later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>served *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Served</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1999</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>1,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>1,938</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>1,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2000</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>2,597</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>1,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>2,096</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>1,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2001</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>2,597</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>1,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>2,150</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>1,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2002</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>2,421</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>1,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>2,001</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>1,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>1,992</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>1,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>1,649</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>1,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>2,985</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>2,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>2,515</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>1,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>3,415</td>
<td>1,098</td>
<td>2,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>2,856</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>1,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>3,327</td>
<td>1,061</td>
<td>2,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>2,805</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>1,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>3,160</td>
<td>1,044</td>
<td>2,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>2,542</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>1,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>3,348</td>
<td>1,072</td>
<td>2,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>2,746</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>1,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>4,387</td>
<td>1,404</td>
<td>2,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>3,649</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>2,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>4,835</td>
<td>1,677</td>
<td>3,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>3,929</td>
<td>1,351</td>
<td>2,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>3,840</td>
<td>1,337</td>
<td>2,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>3,202</td>
<td>1,096</td>
<td>2,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>5,164</td>
<td>1,954</td>
<td>3,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>4,309</td>
<td>1,582</td>
<td>2,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Traditionally underserved students are those from the following backgrounds: American Indians/Alaskan Natives, Native Hawaiians/Pacific Islanders, African American, and Latina/o. The "Better Served" grouping includes all others, except international students.
Table 5a. Three-Year and Likely Graduation Rates of Upper Division Transfer Students Entering CSUN During the 1996-2006 Period by Racial and Ethnic Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry Term</th>
<th>Three-Year Graduation Rates</th>
<th>Likely Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditionally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>Under-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>served *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1996</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1997</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1998</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1999</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2000</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2001</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2002</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>55.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>59.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011 (prelim.)</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Traditionally underserved students are those from the following backgrounds: American Indians/Alaskan Natives, Native Hawaiians/Pacific Islanders, African American, and Latina/o. The "Better Served" grouping includes all others, except international students.
Table 5b. Number of Upper Division Transfer Students Entering CSUN During the 1996-2006 Period Who Graduated within Three Years or Are Still Enrolled at the Beginning of the Fourth Year Since Entry by Racial and Ethnic Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry Term</th>
<th>All Students</th>
<th>Traditionally Underserved *</th>
<th>Better Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Size of Entry Cohort</td>
<td>Graduated at CSUN</td>
<td>Size of Entry Cohort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1996</td>
<td>1,982</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1997</td>
<td>2,575</td>
<td>1,143</td>
<td>565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1998</td>
<td>2,283</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1999</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>1,266</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2000</td>
<td>2,507</td>
<td>1,267</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2001</td>
<td>2,597</td>
<td>1,319</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2002</td>
<td>2,597</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
<td>2,421</td>
<td>1,342</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
<td>2,985</td>
<td>1,188</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>3,415</td>
<td>1,830</td>
<td>597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>3,327</td>
<td>1,801</td>
<td>595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>3,327</td>
<td>1,801</td>
<td>595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>3445</td>
<td>2030</td>
<td>665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>3616</td>
<td>2172</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>4387</td>
<td>2815</td>
<td>726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011 (prelim.)</td>
<td>4835</td>
<td>2836</td>
<td>985</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Traditionally underserved students are those from the following backgrounds: American Indians/Alaskan Natives, Native Hawaiians/Pacific Islanders, African American, and Latina/o. The "Better Served" grouping includes all others, except international students.
Table 6. One-Year Continuation Rates of First Time Freshmen Entering CSUN During the 1999-2009 Period by Racial and Ethnic Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry Term</th>
<th>Traditionally Underserved *</th>
<th>All Students</th>
<th>Traditionally Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuation Rates</td>
<td>Size of Enrolled Entry</td>
<td>One Year Later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>Entry</td>
<td>One Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under-served</td>
<td>Entry</td>
<td>One Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1999</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>73.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2000</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>75.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2001</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2002</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>77.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>79.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>76.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>76.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>78.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>82.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Traditionally underserved students are those from the following backgrounds: American Indians/Alaskan Natives, Native Hawaiians/Pacific Islanders, African American, and Latina/o. The "Better Served" grouping includes all others, except international students.
Table 7a. Six-Year and Likely Graduation Rates of First Time Freshmen Entering CSUN During the 1993-2003 Period by Racial and Ethnic Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry Term</th>
<th>Six-Year Graduation Rates</th>
<th>Likely Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditionally</td>
<td>Traditionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>Under-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ished *</td>
<td>Served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1993</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1994</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1995</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1996</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1997</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1998</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1999</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2000</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2001</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2002</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008 (prelim.)</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Traditionally underserved students are those from the following backgrounds: American Indians/Alaskan Natives, Native Hawaiians/Pacific Islanders, African American, and Latina/o. The "Better Served" grouping includes all others, except international students.
### Table 7b. Number of First Time Freshmen Entering CSUN During the 1993-2003 Period Who Graduated within Six Years or Are Still Enrolled at the Beginning of the Seventh Year Since Entry by Racial and Ethnic Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry Term</th>
<th>All Students</th>
<th>Traditionally Underserved *</th>
<th>Better Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Size of Entry Cohort</td>
<td>Graduated</td>
<td>Still Enrolled at CSUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1993</td>
<td>1,723</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1994</td>
<td>1,763</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1995</td>
<td>2,075</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1996</td>
<td>2,641</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1997</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1998</td>
<td>2,260</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1999</td>
<td>2,575</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2000</td>
<td>2,790</td>
<td>1,107</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2001</td>
<td>3,226</td>
<td>1,279</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2002</td>
<td>3,566</td>
<td>1,431</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
<td>3,489</td>
<td>1,506</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
<td>2,894</td>
<td>1,360</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>3,720</td>
<td>1,699</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>3,695</td>
<td>1,762</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>4,130</td>
<td>1,861</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008 (prelim.)</td>
<td>4,625</td>
<td>2,071</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Traditionally underserved students are those from the following backgrounds: American Indians/Alaskan Natives, Native Hawaiians/Pacific Islanders, African American, and Latina/o. The "Better Served" grouping includes all others, except international students.
Table 8. Change During the Mid- and Late-2000s in Selected Student Entry Characteristics and One-Year Continuation Rates at CSU Semester Campuses (Three-Year Averages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSU Campus</th>
<th>Three-Year Averages (2005-07)</th>
<th>Three-Year Averages (2010-12)</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>79.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>80.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>80.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>75.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>76.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>77.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>75.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Bay</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>67.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>81.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northridge</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>75.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominguez Hills</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>62.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All campuses 36.4 45.5 9.1

= Proficiency gains at the expense of access.

**Correlation Coefficients [R]**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005-07 Averages</th>
<th>2010-12 Averages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math Proficiency at Entry &amp; Traditionally Underserved</td>
<td>-0.816</td>
<td>-0.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; Continuation Rate</td>
<td>0.685</td>
<td>0.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditionally Underserved &amp; Continuation Rate</td>
<td>-0.533</td>
<td>-0.406</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>