University Snapshot

Total Headcount vs. Full-Time Equivalent Students

- Design Studies: 1405
- Psychology: 1383
- Kinesiology: 882
- Bus Admin/Marketing: 890
- Biological Sciences: 347

Degrees Awarded (includes self-support programs)

Bachelor's | Master's | Total
---|---|---
4,900 | 5,206 | 5,431 | 5,281 | 6,011
2,716 | 2,351 | 2,264 | 2,381 | 2,981

Enrollment Headcount by Ethnicity (fall 2016)

- Asian: 39.7%
- Hispanic: 28.4%
- White: 18.3%
- Other: 9.7%
- Black: 3.4%
- Pacific Islander: 0.4%
- Native American: 0.1%

Graduate/ Credential | Total
---|---
48.3% | 41.2%
15.2% | 19.3%
24.2% | -
10% | -
2% | -
0.2% | -
0.4% | -
0.1% | -

Applications and Admissions (fall 2016)

Freshmen
- Applied: 31,555
- Admitted: 16,862 (53%)
- Enrolled: 3,208 (19%)

Undergraduate Transfers
- Applied: 16,224
- Admitted: 9,657 (60%)
- Enrolled: 3,977 (41%)

Graduate Students
- Applied: 7,936
- Admitted: 3,074 (39%)

Enrollment by Local Origin (fall 2016)

- CA Resident Nonlocal: 15,078
- CA Resident Local: 12,887
- International: 3,174
- Domestic Nonresident: 410

Graduation Rates (entering cohorts)

- Undergrad Transfers: 80%
- Full-Time Freshmen: 70%

Gender Distribution by College (both undergraduate and graduate, fall 2016)

- Male: 23%
- Female: 49%
- Male: 77%
- Female: 57%
- Male: 45%
- Female: 42%
- Male: 43%
- Female: 43%
- Male: 43%
- Female: 43%
- Male: 36%
- Female: 81%
## University Student Enrollment by Gender and Ethnicity

### Fall Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
<th>Fall 2015</th>
<th>Fall 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AmInd</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4610</td>
<td>5155</td>
<td>9765</td>
<td>4710</td>
<td>5379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PacIs</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hisp</td>
<td>3730</td>
<td>2761</td>
<td>6491</td>
<td>3880</td>
<td>2978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>4704</td>
<td>3715</td>
<td>8419</td>
<td>3810</td>
<td>5656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>1095</td>
<td>1063</td>
<td>2158</td>
<td>1331</td>
<td>1359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1,559</td>
<td>1,322</td>
<td>2,881</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td>1,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15,758</td>
<td>14,690</td>
<td>30,448</td>
<td>15,865</td>
<td>15,413</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Spring Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Spring 2013</th>
<th>Spring 2014</th>
<th>Spring 2015</th>
<th>Spring 2016</th>
<th>Spring 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AmInd</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4083</td>
<td>4686</td>
<td>8769</td>
<td>4359</td>
<td>4918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PacIs</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hisp</td>
<td>3378</td>
<td>2499</td>
<td>5877</td>
<td>3606</td>
<td>2761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3358</td>
<td>3300</td>
<td>6658</td>
<td>3412</td>
<td>3364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>2069</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>1478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1461</td>
<td>1221</td>
<td>2682</td>
<td>1419</td>
<td>1273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14,166</td>
<td>13,337</td>
<td>27,503</td>
<td>14,762</td>
<td>14,402</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summer Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AmInd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Entering Cohort Sizes, Fall 2014 to Fall 2016

Headcount of new matriculated undergraduates by term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First-Time Frosh</th>
<th>Undergraduate Transfers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>1,057</td>
<td>1,067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Developmental Status of African American Frosh, Fall 2014 to Fall 2016

Percentage of incoming frosh by remedial status as of the fall census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
<th>Fall 2015</th>
<th>Fall 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developmental English</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Math</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Math and English</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passed/Exempt/Unknown</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Developmental Status of Latin@ Frosh, Fall 2014 to Fall 2016

Percentage of incoming frosh by remedial status as of the fall census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
<th>Fall 2015</th>
<th>Fall 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developmental English</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Math</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Math and English</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passed/Exempt/Unknown</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin@ Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Top Local Origins of African Americans, Fall 2014 to Fall 2016

Headcount of new matriculated undergraduates (frosh and transfer)

- Santa Clara: 201
- Los Angeles: 112
- Alameda: 77
- Sacramento: 46
- Contra Costa: 45
- Riverside: 36
- San Joaquin: 28
- San Diego: 27
- San Bernardino: 20
- US Out of State: 20

### Top Local Origins of Latin@s, Fall 2014 to Fall 2016

Headcount of new matriculated undergraduates (frosh and transfer)

- Santa Clara: 2,691
- Los Angeles: 520
- Alameda: 517
- Monterey: 325
- San Mateo: 276
- Contra Costa: 232
- Santa Cruz: 228
- San Joaquin: 220
- San Diego: 138
- Riverside: 129
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### Top 10 Majors of African American Undergraduates, Fall 2016
Unduplicated headcount by program, including second majors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeclared</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Studies</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinesiology</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice Studies</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Admin/Marketing</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Top 10 Majors of Latin@ Undergraduates, Fall 2016
Unduplicated headcount by program, including second majors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeclared</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice Studies</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Studies</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinesiology</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child and Adolescent Development</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Studies</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Admin/Management</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Top 20 High Schools of African American Frosh, Fall 2014 to Fall 2016**
Headcount of new matriculated undergraduates by prior institution

- Franklin High School: 9
- Polytechnic High: 7
- Muir High: 6
- Santa Clara High: 6
- Santiago High: 6
- Milpitas High: 5
- Oak Grove High: 5
- Prospect High: 5
- Antelope High: 4
- Dorey (Susan Miller) Senior H: 4
- Eleanor Roosevelt High: 4
- Juniopero Serra High: 4
- Narbonne (Nathaniel) Senior Hi: 4
- San Leandro High: 4
- Texas: 4
- Bear Creek High: 3
- California Academy of Mathematics &.: 3
- Cesar Chavez High: 3
- Cosumnes Oaks High: 3
- Cupertino High: 3

**Top 20 Colleges of African American Transfers, Fall 2014 to Fall 2016**
Headcount of new matriculated undergraduates by prior institution

- De Anza Community College: 52
- San Jose City College: 40
- Evergreen Valley College: 14
- Chabot College: 13
- Foothill College: 10
- West Valley College: 10
- Laney College: 9
- Contra Costa College: 8
- Mission College: 8
- City College of San Francisco: 7
- Diablo Valley College: 7
- Ohlone College: 7
- Los Medanos College: 6
- College of Alameda: 5
- Gavilan College: 5
- San Joaquin Delta College: 5
- American River College: 4
- Canada College: 3
- Las Positas College: 3
- Merritt College: 3

**Top 20 High Schools of Latin@ Frosh, Fall 2014 to Fall 2016**
Headcount of new matriculated undergraduates by prior institution

- Lincoln (Abraham) High: 73
- KIPP San Jose Collegiate: 69
- Mt. Pleasant High: 54
- San Jose High Academy: 42
- Christopher High: 39
- Overfelt (William C.) High: 39
- Pioneer High: 36
- Willow Glen High: 34
- Santa Teresa High: 33
- Downtown College Prep: 32
- Independence High: 31
- Silver Creek High: 31
- Hill (Andrew P.) High: 29
- Latino College Preparatory Ac.: 27
- Yerba Buena High: 25
- Ann Sobrato High: 24
- Archbishop Mitty High: 24
- Live Oak High: 24
- San Benito High: 24
- Lick (James) High: 23

**Top 20 Colleges of Latin@ Transfers, Fall 2014 to Fall 2016**
Headcount of new matriculated undergraduates by prior institution

- De Anza Community College: 431
- Evergreen Valley College: 358
- San Jose City College: 244
- West Valley College: 197
- Cabrillo College: 176
- Hartnell Community College: 160
- Gavilan College: 146
- Foothill College: 96
- Ohlone College: 93
- Mission College: 83
- Canada College: 73
- National Hispanic University: 69
- San Joaquin Delta College: 68
- Las Positas College: 52
- Chabot College: 51
- Diablo Valley College: 45
- Monterey Peninsula College: 45
- College of San Mateo: 39
- Modesto Junior College: 36
- Allan Hancock College: 35
First-Time Frosh Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester of Entry</th>
<th>Cohort Size</th>
<th>Contin. after 1 term</th>
<th>Contin. after 2 years</th>
<th>Contin. after 3 years</th>
<th>Degree within 4 years</th>
<th>Degree within 5 years</th>
<th>Degree within 6 years</th>
<th>Contin. after 7 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2002</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>93.6%</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
<td>67.8%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>95.1%</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>97.9%</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>98.4%</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>96.2%</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All figures are for fall, full-time entering cohorts. Annual continuing (still enrolled) rate is the share of cohort members enrolling in classes in the subsequent fall term. Students have until the trailing summer of their 4th, 5th, etc. years to be included in the graduation rate for that year. College and department are based on the first major at entry.
All figures are for fall entering cohorts, both full- and part-time, who transferred from a California community college and entered at the junior or senior level. Annual continuing (still enrolled) rate is the share of cohort members enrolling in classes in the subsequent fall term. Students have until the trailing summer of their 4th, 5th, etc. years to be included in the graduation rate for that year. College and department are based on the first major at entry. SAT scores are usually not available for transfers and are not shown here.
First-Time Frosh Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester of Entry</th>
<th>Cohort Size</th>
<th>Contin. after 1 term</th>
<th>Contin. after 1 year</th>
<th>Contin. after 2 years</th>
<th>Degree within 4 years</th>
<th>Contin. after 4 years</th>
<th>Degree within 5 years</th>
<th>Contin. after 5 years</th>
<th>Degree within 6 years</th>
<th>Contin. after 6 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2002</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>92.1%</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>92.1%</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>92.1%</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>94.2%</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>96.2%</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>1,072</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>95.1%</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>1,055</td>
<td>95.4%</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>1,034</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
<td>81.4%</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>1,019</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
<td>1,047</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All figures are for fall, full-time entering cohorts. Annual continuing (still enrolled) rate is the share of cohort members enrolling in classes in the subsequent fall term. Students have until the trailing summer of their 4th, 5th, etc. years to be included in the graduation rate for that year. College and department are based on the first major at entry.
Transfer Trends

Degree within 4 years
71.3%

Contin. after 1 term
94%

Contin. after 1 year
86%

Contin. after 2 years
54%

Transfer 4-Year Graduation Goal

Degree within 2 years
25.4%

Transfer 2-Year Graduation Goal

Detail for Upper Division Transfers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester of Entry</th>
<th>Cohort Size</th>
<th>Contin. after 1 term</th>
<th>Contin. after 1 year</th>
<th>Degree within 2 years</th>
<th>Contin. after 2 years</th>
<th>Degree within 3 years</th>
<th>Contin. after 3 years</th>
<th>Degree within 4 years</th>
<th>Contin. after 4 years</th>
<th>Degree within 5 years</th>
<th>Contin. after 5 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2002</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>91.6%</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>90.7%</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>92.4%</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>89.2%</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>91.6%</td>
<td>81.9%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>91.6%</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>67.8%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>1,001</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>84.1%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>1,011</td>
<td>94.0%</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
<td>1,158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All figures are for fall entering cohorts, both full- and part-time, who transferred from a California community college and entered at the junior or senior level. Annual continuing (still enrolled) rate is the share of cohort members enrolling in classes in the subsequent fall term. Students have until the trailing summer of their 4th, 5th, etc. years to be included in the graduation rate for that year. College and department are based on the first major at entry. SAT scores are usually not available for transfers and are not shown here.
These Bay Area colleges drive the most social mobility

Jan 24, 2017, 1:29pm PST Updated: Jan 24, 2017, 1:29pm PST

Higher education has often been touted as the method through which people can climb the social and economic ladder.

The idea being that access to a good college – along with some hard work – can lead to a good career and ultimately more wealth and opportunity. But how well do the numbers prove that story out?

Check out our slideshow to see what Bay Area colleges ranked the best for economic mobility. >>>

Researchers at Stanford, Harvard and Brown Universities examined more than 30 million anonymous tax records that sketch out the income earnings of American college students and graduates from the early 2000s across time. They then tabulated the data in a variety of different methods to determine a social mobility report card for universities, namely by highlighting statistics for student access and economic mobility.

To determine access for low income students, the researchers looked at the percentage of students with parents in the lowest quartile of income distribution. Student "mobility rates," were calculated by what percentage of students from the lowest income bracket were able to make it to the top income bracket, essentially which poor students became rich adults.

On the whole, Bay Area colleges did quite well when compared to the national average mobility rate of 2 percent. According to the data, 21 regional colleges and universities beat that number, with the top school, San Jose State University, more than doubling it with a mobility rate with 5.4 percent. Coming in at second place was the California Maritime Academy, which had a 5 percent mobility rate, driven by the school's strong focus on nautical business and engineering.

Trending: These are the 25 highest Yelp-ranked restaurants in the Bay Area

Here are the best and worst Bay Area cities for families, new study says

Nationally speaking, the top college in the country by mobility rate was California State University, Los Angeles, which saw nearly 10 percent of its low-income students move upward to become rich adults. Generally the researchers found that universities with the highest upward mobility rates are “typically mid-tier public schools that have both large numbers of low-income students and very good outcomes.”

Ironically enough, the researchers’ home universities didn’t rank that highly in the study when considering economic mobility. Stanford, Harvard and Brown scored 2.2 percent, 1.8 percent and 1.5 percent, respectively on the report’s mobility rate.

See the full data set from the researchers here.

Join the conversation: Follow @SFBusinessTimes on Twitter, "Like" us on Facebook and sign up for our free email newsletters.

Kevin Truong
Multimedia producer
San Francisco Business Times
Faculty Affairs Recruitment Procedures
With an Eye to Diversity Hiring
A Workshop for SJSU Faculty Recruitment Committees

Presented by the Office of Faculty Affairs and Office of Diversity, Equity, & Inclusion

FALL 2019

SJSU

Workshop Agenda

- Welcome and Introductions
- Guidelines and best practices for all the stages of the search process
- SJSU: A dynamic institution
- Wrap-up and additional resources

Introductions

- Name, title, department
- What is the area of specialization and level (assistant, associate, etc) of your search?
- Any topics/questions you would like to see addressed today?
Approval to Recruit
First Steps

- Submit your recruitment request into eRecruit
- Send the position number by email to avp-facultyaffairs@sjsu.edu
- Submit your diversity and outreach plan to CDO & AVP FA
- Submit a final draft for Announcement of Position Availability to:
  - Faculty Affairs (AVP-facultyaffairs@sjsu.edu) Federal, state, CSU system, degree requirements campus requirements and general content
  - Kathy WongLau (kathy.wonglau@sjsu.edu) diversity content, inclusive language

Crafting the Position Announcement

- Include a statement of degree requirements, qualifications, required areas of knowledge, preferred areas of interest, application deadline and submission instructions
- Strong statement on demonstrated experience working with URM students and inclusive teaching
  - Difference between demonstrated and aspirational experience
- We strongly urge you to request a diversity statement and teaching philosophy
- "Crafting the short "ad"

Crafting the Position Announcement

- Assess department and student needs and disciplinary trends
  - Move past the mindset of "replacing" departing faculty member
- Use inclusive language
  - Listing sub-disciplinary areas of interest on diverse populations
- Include language about SJSU's status as a diverse, first-generation-serving campus
- Identify essential and desired qualifications but don't be too restrictive.
Diversity Plan: Formal Outreach

- Faculty Affairs places ads in Chronicle of Higher Ed
- Additional funds for each search from Office of the Provost and ODEI will be available to place ads in approved targeted venues
  - National venues: Inside Higher Ed and Diverse Issues in Higher Ed
  - Targeted venue: National Society of Black Engineers, 30-day job posting is $250

Diversity Plan: Informal Outreach

- Find diverse applicant pools in your field via women and underrepresented scholar registries, databanks and directories
- Encourage faculty, particularly those who are members of underrepresented groups, to help identify peer networks, applicants, listservs, etc.
- Network at conferences: attend panels featuring underrepresented scholars and connect with target caucuses
- Reaching out to "diverse candidates who are prepared to work with a diverse student population"

Next Steps

- OFA will issue a JOID (Job ID)
- OFA will create an Interfolio url for the position
- OFA will send you an authorized position announcement for your use. (Do not begin recruitment before receiving this approved announcement)
Why Diversify the Faculty?
"Faculty of Color" v Historically Underrepresented
d
Fall 2016 Headcount of Under-Represented Minority (URM) Faculty

Assembling the Recruitment Committee

- Election of committee/technical policies: Must be by secret ballot
  - Elected by tenure/tenure track faculty
  - Notify OPA of the composition of the committee
    - Probability faculty and FEBP Faculty may serve with official approval
      (submitted by chair via the Dean) from the OPA
    - Cannot make up more than 50% of the committee
  - Assistant Prof cannot serve if hiring for Associate/Full with Tenure
  - Dept. Chairs normally chair the committee but it's not required

Recruitment Committee

- Broaden your expertise with a diversity consultant ($15-6 3.7)
  - If the department lacks diversity among its eligible committee members, it may be appropriate to supplement the committee's membership...by electing tenured or probationary faculty member from related fields to serve as full voting members of the committee, or by inviting people to serve as nonvoting and consulting member of the committee.
  - (Non-voting consultants may review CVs only)®
Recruitment Committees

- At least one member from each committee must attend recruitment training sessions (all are invited)
- The Dean charges the recruitment committee and ensures that everyone involved in the search maintains confidentiality
- Everyone must sign the Confidentiality Statement at this time.
- Conflicts of interest must be reported to the Dean

Hiring Myths: Faculty Affairs

Myth: "We can't hire ABDs."
Reality: As long as we have official confirmation that all degree requirements have been completed by the appointment start date, we can hire them.

Myth: "We can't communicate with candidates at conferences or conventions."
Reality: You can network and recruit but not conduct formal interview

Hiring Myths: Diversity

Myth: "There aren't enough qualified candidates of color or women for our open positions."
Reality: Although availabilities differ, in most cases universities are not hiring faculty anywhere close to the proportion that are available.

Myth: "We can't compete in the bidding war for faculty of color."
Reality: Studies show that many highly qualified minority postdoctoral scholars were not actively recruited by academic institutions—in one study, only 11% of scholars of color were sought after.
Hiring Myths: Diversity

Myth: "A highly qualified underrepresented candidate would never consider SJSU."

Reality: Candidates base their choices on the environment in which they wish to live, a desire to teach a diverse student body, and interest in institutions with missions related to their professional goals.

---

Hiring Myths: Diversity

Myth: "A candidate who is not from a top-tier university is not a highly-qualified candidate."

Reality: We should aim to hire for skills sets rather than prestige. Candidates from mid- and low-tier universities tend to be more diverse and pedagogically sensitive to the needs of diverse students.

Myth: "Focusing on diversity will require lowering our standards."

Reality: Quality increases by recruiting a pool that reflects the availability of candidates from all groups and ensuring that we do not use criteria that may adversely impact women or minority candidates.

---

Advertising and Outreach

- Advertise broadly
- Advertise in venues that target URM and faculty of color
- Contact individuals/department chair/and other professional contacts
- Informal discussions with potential candidates at conferences
Reviewing Initial Pool of Applicants After the First Consideration Date

- Only authorized personnel can access Interfolio applications
- Do not proceed until the applicant pool report is reviewed and approved by the Dean, the AVP for Faculty Affairs and the Chief Diversity Officer
- Spreadsheet listing the names, terminal degree held, degree institution, current employment setting, summary of advertising venues and diversity outreach strategies.

Screening Approaches: Faculty Affairs

- Create a screening matrix charting each applicant's qualifications re: required and desired qualifications.
- Assess ways the applicants will bring rich experiences and diverse backgrounds and ideology to the campus
- Identify an initial semi-finalist pool
- Consider phone/Skype interviews to create a finalist pool to bring to campus (all questions to all candidates)

Crafting Strong Questions

- Avoid affective and aspirational questions
- Avoid vague questions that do not tie into SJSU's mission
- Instead pose questions that assess a candidate's existing experience and questions that are specific and link to SJSU's values
The Campus Visit

- Have your admin work with the candidate on travel arrangements
- Meet for breakfast/pick them up at their hotel
- Escort the candidate from place to place–ideally by someone who understands federal and state prohibitions on asking protected status identity
  - "Do you have children?" and "What church do you attend?"
- Properly introduce the candidate
- Announce the visit with enough lead time to ensure maximum participation of interested groups.
- If the candidate is teaching a class arrange ahead of time

Organizing the Campus Visit: Faculty Affairs

- Core elements of a typical visit must be identical for all candidates
  - Entrance interview (all questions to all candidates)
  - Open forum research presentation and/or teaching demonstration
  - Meetings with faculty and Dean (and students?)
  - Campus tour
  - Exit Interview
- Provide all candidates with option to customize their visit to meet with different faculty/student groups, offices, and organizations on campus to support diversity goals

Conducting the Campus Visit/Interview

- Reminders of what you can and cannot ask candidates
  - DO NOT ask about: Age, nationality, marital status, medical conditions, childcare accommodations, religion, sexual orientation, politics
  - Craft effective questions to assess cultural competence
  - Signaling a commitment to diversity in the department
  - Knowing your numbers
- Make sure you get the signed Release Authorizing Reference Check Form
- Do not negotiate with the candidate–Deans only.
Unintended Signals

- Remember that you are always "on," there is no "informal" part of the interview
  - Small talk at airport, meals, walking to next meeting
  - "We're colorblind"
  - "We're really friendly to young children here"
  - "You have an interesting accent! Where are you from?"
  - "I love Life of Pi" and "Narcos is such a great show!"

Recruitment Committee Rule

All members of the committee must be present at the scheduled recruitment committee interviews with each of the candidates. If a committee member misses a meeting s/he may confer with the committee when deciding on the finalists but may not vote on them.

(Record that committee member as absent)

Evaluation of Final Candidates: Faculty Affairs

- Faculty Affairs guidelines/steps
- Check references—Generally done by the Committee Chair
  (Consult with your Dean or AVPFA if something sensitive emerges)
- Committee should meet as soon as possible after the final candidate visits the campus
- Collect and review all evaluations
- Committee members can vote only if they've attend all formal interviews
Recruitment Report: Faculty Affairs

- Required by S 15-6
- Rank the finalists and explain and justify the rankings
- Candidates either "exceeds," "meets," or "does not meet" criteria
- Clearly differentiate between those candidates the department would like to hire (could be all, some, or none)
- Detailed interview notes
- You must be able to clearly justify the selection of finalists

Considerations

- Position rank must be the one authorized by the Provost
- Advanced rank or tenure: The Dept. RTP committee must review candidate materials and recommend tenure and rank.
- Items negotiated with the Dean:
  - Rank and salary
  - Moving expense reimbursement
  - Start-up funds/space
  - Probationary credit

Making an Official Offer

- The Dean must get approval from the AVPFA before a formal offer is made to a candidate
- The offer letter must be approved in final form before the offer can be made.
- Dean's office forward the official signed offer letter to the AVPFA
- Prepare the appointment packet
SJSU: A Dynamic Institution

- Ranked #6 of Western master's-level public universities by U.S. News & World Report
  - Ranked #1 by USNews & World Report for best public universities for veterans
- Ranked 8 nationally in increasing student upward mobility
- 40% first-generation students
- 38% Pell-qualified
- National leader of graduating URMI students
- HSI and AANAPISI status

Wrap-up and Additional Resources

- Questions and comments
- Additional resources:
  - Refresher Workshop on Best Practices
  - Offered monthly from October to March