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The Students Subcommittee is charged with preparing responses to the following questions: Who are we? Whom have we taught? Whom are we teaching? Whom will we teach? How many students will we teach?
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Question 1: Who are we?
Established in 1957, California State University, Fullerton is a public, regional comprehensive university with a primary mission to provide access to an affordable high-quality education to California residents. We aspire to combine the best qualities of teaching and research to create a safe and welcoming environment where all students have the opportunity to succeed. Our actively engaged students, faculty and staff work in close collaboration to expand knowledge. Through experiences in and out of the classroom, students develop the habits of intellectual inquiry and curiosity, prepare for challenging professions, strengthen relationships to their communities, and contribute meaningfully to society.

Question 2: Whom have we taught?

Q2.1. Enrollment
Notes: At three times enrollment has declined year over year or remained flat and all three times coincide with economic recessions in the state. This speaks to the enrollment driven funding formula that sees cuts in enrollment to correspond with cuts in state support. At each time in its history, institutional enrollment had regained its losses and continued its growth in the years following a recession.

Q2.2. Demographics/Diversity
Fullerton’s diverse student population mirrors its location and reinforces the University’s responsibility and mission to educate its local communities. Diversity provides us with a depth of experience and culture from which to continually benefit, but it also provides the state with an example of a university campus that has succeeded at achieving goals for racial and ethnic diversity.
Fall 1985

- White: 69%
- Asian/Pl: 12%
- Hispanic: 9%
- Black: 2%
- Amlnd: 1%
- Unknown: 6%

Fall 2015

- Hispanic: 37%
- White: 23%
- Asian/Pl: 21%
- Multi: 4%
- Amlnd: 0%
- Black: 2%
- Unknown: 4%

Men vs. Women

- Bar graph showing enrollment trends from fall 2001 to fall 2015 for men and women.
Q2.3. Degrees Awarded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>BACHELOR'S DEGREES</th>
<th>MASTER'S DEGREES</th>
<th>DOCTORAL DEGREES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>7725</td>
<td>1667</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>6481</td>
<td>1394</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>5761</td>
<td>1222</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>4522</td>
<td>889</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994-1995</td>
<td>3963</td>
<td>776</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-1990</td>
<td>3741</td>
<td>629</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-1985</td>
<td>3325</td>
<td>688</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-1980</td>
<td>2892</td>
<td>788</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-1975</td>
<td>3147</td>
<td>688</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-1970</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>419</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964-1965</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961-1962</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-1961</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL AWARDED</td>
<td>206763</td>
<td>43026</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FULLERTON
INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND ANALYTICAL STUDIES
TRENDS IN DEGREES AWARDED BY LEVEL: 1959 TO PRESENT
NOTE: In the charts below, the $x$ axis refers to the cohort.
Question 3: Who are we teaching?

Q3.1. Who comes here?
- Who (first-time freshmen, transfer students, entering post-baccalaureate and graduate students, first-generation college students, ethnicity, gender, parents’ income, eligibility for need-based aid/Pell eligibility)
- Where (service area, international students, previous institution)
- College readiness/academic performance prior to entering the CSU (GPA at previous institution, SAT/ACT, ELM/EPT, how many require developmental coursework?)

Q3.2. Who are our current students?
- Level/category (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior, graduate/post-baccalaureate, international). Important to include extended education students, especially those completing stateside programs (e.g., GS 700).
- Unit loads
- When do they take courses?
- Distribution across colleges (FTES/course enrollment, FTES generated by students in college X)
- First-generation college students
- Ethnicity
- Gender
- Parents’ income
- Eligibility for need-based aid/Pell eligibility/SUGs
- Where do they live? (On-campus, off-campus, with family, distance from campus)
- Outside employment/non-negotiable obligations (work, caring for family members, commuting)

Q3.3. Who haven’t we served?
- Undermatching
- CSU-eligible students that applied to CSUF going to more-expensive institutions
- CSU-eligible students that applied to CSUF going to institutions they are less likely to graduate from

Question 4: Whom will we teach?

Q4.1. At-a-Glance
- Undergraduate and post-baccalaureate students from local service area and beyond as space and funding allow
- SB 1440 undergraduates
- Non-traditional students
- Working students—part and full time
- Diverse underserved students
- Digital students
• Students who need alternatives to traditional classroom learning, including online/distance education
• Students who seek information in a variety of formats
• Students with an opinion, who are deeply invested in their education

Q4.2. Aspirational
We will continue to teach California residents seeking a high-quality degree that prepares them for flexible professional careers and/or advanced study, including an increasingly high percentage of historically underrepresented students, as well as both domestic non-resident students and international students. We work toward teaching the students of tomorrow, responsive to changing needs in careers, new technologies, and regional demands. Our students are future leaders, engaged socially, politically, and civically in their communities. We will remain committed to ensuring broad access to a CSUF education, to supporting students to timely completion (of their degrees), to maintaining high expectations for student academic performance, and to providing faculty with the resources needed to sustain high-quality and innovative instruction and pedagogy.

Q4.3. Challenges
• Local service area: Our local area is larger than most impacted if not all impacted CSU campuses.
• CSUF receives the least amount of funding per student from the CSU system.
• Maintaining a balance of a student body that contains first-time freshmen, transfer students, and post-baccalaureate students; all of these populations have unique needs.
• External conditions that may influence a demographic change in our student population; we are not the CSUF of 1957.
• Competing economic needs for the state and society’s priority of higher education.

Question 5: How many students will we teach?

Q5.1. At-a-Glance
• Fall 2015: 38,948 students
• Spring 2016 (projected): 38,261 students
• Fall 2016 (projected): 39,790

Q5.2. Aspirational (“As many as possible”)
CSUF has become a destination campus within the state of CA for many prospective students. However, as we become a “school of choice,” we should not neglect our mission as an engine of change for individual students, their families, and our society. We feel we can maintain our commitment to educational access by focusing resources to better support students and faculty in ways that will reduce time to degree while maintaining, or even increasing, the rigor and perceived value of a CSUF degree. By leveraging innovative approaches to teaching and student and faculty support, including new instructional modalities and pedagogies, we can preserve both access to higher education and student success. Rather than viewing our student body statically, we will view it dynamically, with an emphasis on supporting students toward successful completion of their degrees, rather than on the number of students enrolled at any single moment.
Q5.3. Challenges

- With close to 39,000 students it feels like we are at or a little over capacity for the facilities we have.
- We pride ourselves on being as inclusive as we can within the restrictions of the CO; however, our campus infrastructure has not kept up with the growth of our student populations. We need to find a manageable cap so that we can focus on improving our services and campus.
- Strategic enrollment management; increasingly becoming a first-choice campus and focusing on recruitment and yield in shaping our enrollment.
- Outcomes-based funding trends; how can we resist becoming a higher education mill of degrees vs. focusing on high-quality teaching? How can we increase the value of a CSUF degree and maintain or enhance our reputation as a rigorous institution?
- Changing state demographics, hiring trends and job market
- Increasing number of post-baccalaureate programs
- Lastly, we believe this question is very much interrelated to how will we teach (i.e., online education)