

Student Equity at Saddleback College

2014-2015 Academic Year Findings

S. Dean Crews Date Created: 7/1/2016 Last Updated: 7/27/2016

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to inform the Student Equity Team as to the core indicators and groups of interest in the planning of efforts to increase the equitability of outcomes for all groups of students at Saddleback College.

Intentionality of effort is a key to achieving the desired outcomes. Intentionality depends on an understanding of the areas where improvement needs to be our focus. While improving outcomes for all students will assist targeted groups because a "rising tide lifts all boats", we must be focused in our efforts to make improvements where they are most necessary.

Key Findings

The following table allows for the examination of outcomes from the perspective of both targeted groups and core indicators.

	Core Indicators							
	Access	Course Completion*	Basic Skills ESL	Basic Skills Math	Basic Skills English	Degree Completion	Certificate Completion	Transfer Velocity
Ethnic Groups								
American								
Indian/Alaska								
Native								
Asian								
Black or African American		336*		2	2			3
Hispanic		1695*	7	2	17	2	3	24
Native		8*						1
Hawaiian/Pacific								
Islander								
White							4	
Other					3	14	16	
More than One		140*		3	2			
Students with							4	22
Disabilities								
Economic		1435*			143		8	81
Disadvantage								
Veterans	270	258*		1			2	
Foster Youth		380*						

Summary Table Quantifying Disproportionate Impact by Target Groups

1

Note: Shaded cells indicate apparent disproportionate impact. The number quantifies the impact in terms of students "lost".

* denotes enrollments "lost", not students "lost"

The table will also serve to quantify the disproportionate impacts experienced by some groups of students in terms of the number of students (or enrollments) "lost". Conceptually this number represents the number of students (or enrollments) that need to be added in order to bring groups into parity with the overall Saddleback College student body

Caveats

With respect to the analysis of disparate impacts by groups of students (e.g. ethnic groups or students with disabilities) OPRA is constrained by four important caveats.

- Student privacy must be respected. It is often the case at Saddleback College that a subgroup of students having data on a specific achievement measure (e.g. successful completion for an ESL cohort student) is so small, generally less than 10 students, that reporting such data could serve to identify particular students. In such a case, the data – even when it is available – must be suppressed. In this case, the best option is generally to combine subgroups for analysis which subsequently informs action to address identified gaps in performance.
- 2. When performance gaps are based on small numbers of students, particularly when a very small group (e.g. Alaska Natives/American Indians) is compared to a very large group (e.g. White Non-Hispanic), the validity and reliability of the resulting analysis is questionable.
- 3. Long-term trends are as informative as are the results of year-over-year or term-overterm comparisons. Bahr, Hom, and Perry (2005) suggest that at least three unique cohorts of the same type (i.e., completion cohorts from 2006-2007, 2007-2008, and 2008-2009) be observed before generating conclusions because this reduces the possibility of identifying the college or program as "low performing" based on random variation in the behavior of a single cohort.
- 4. The unintended, but nevertheless very real, consequential aspects of conclusion validity must always be considered. Disaggregation can lead to erroneous conclusions by untrained consumers of reports. OPRA takes consequential validity very seriously, especially in Equity evaluations.

That said, OPRA does disaggregate data for groups where appropriate for the purpose of identifying gaps in achievement for particular groups of students. The appropriateness of any disaggregation is always considered on a case-by-case basis.

When gaps in achievement are identified for particular groups of students, steps are taken to skillfully report findings to all appropriate stakeholders. Decisions regarding resource allocation (which, of course, includes but is not restricted to HCM) can at this point be databased. Evaluation of outcomes related to resource allocation informs what then becomes an iterative process of improvement.

Introduction

Background, Legislative Purpose, Target Populations and Plan Requirements.

The California Legislature in 1991 charged all segments of public education with providing educational equity "through environments in which each person … has a reasonable chance to fully develop his or her potential" (Education Code §66010.2c). In keeping with this requirement, from 1992 through 2002, the California Community Colleges (CCC) Board of Governors (BOG) adopted a student equity policy and title 5 regulations and plan template to ensure that groups historically underrepresented in higher education have an equal opportunity for access, successful course completion, English as a Second Language (ESL) and basic skills completion, and completion of degrees, certificates and transfer to baccalaureate degree granting institutions.

The Governor and legislature created additional requirements in June 2014 (Education Code §78220 – 78221) specifying additional student populations that must be addressed in equity plans. At a minimum, colleges must address students in the following ethnic and racial categories, as defined by the US Census Bureau for the 2010 Census:

- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian
- Black or African American
- Hispanic or Latino
- Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
- White
- Some other race
- More than one race

In addition, plans must address students with the following characteristics:

Males
Students with disabilities

4

• Females

- Low-income students
- Current or former foster youth
- Veterans

Colleges *may* also conduct research and develop goals or activities for any of the racial groups above, foster youth, disabled or low income students, or veterans *by gender*, if data seems to indicate it would be beneficial to students. There is *no* requirement to address students by *age*.

Funding.

In June of 2014, in recognition and support of equity and success for all students, the State also provided \$70 million specifically earmarked to close achievement gaps in access and success for these student groups, as identified in local student equity plans. In June of 2015, the Governor and the legislature appropriated an additional \$70 million for student equity planning, bringing the total available statewide for equity implementation to \$140 million for 2015-16.

Coordination with Other Equity Related Programs and Services .

Since 2012, Education Code (Sec. 78216) created by the Student Success Act (SB 1456) has required colleges to coordinate the development of Student Success and Support Program (SSSP) plans with their Student Equity Plan to ensure that colleges identify strategies to monitor and address equity issues in the delivery of SSSP core services and attempt to mitigate any resulting disproportionate impacts on student access and achievement. Therefore, student equity plans should clearly identify strategies and criteria associated with SSSP. To the extent that data are available, colleges should research and report on the effect of the new SSSP requirements related to mandatory participation of new students in SSSP services and enrollment priority on student equity.

The State Budget Act (SB860) of 2014 also added new requirements related to coordinating with other programs. Colleges are now required to coordinate equity planning and activities with the following:

- Disabled Student Programs and Services (DSPS)
- Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS) and Special Services.
- Math, Engineering, Science Achievement (MESA), Puente and Middle College High School Programs
- Student Success and Support Program (SSSP)
- Programs for foster youth
- Programs for veterans
- California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs)
- Student Financial Aid Administration, Board Financial Assistance Program (BFAP)
- Basic Skills Initiative (BSI)

Although not required, the CCC Chancellor's Office (CCCCO) also strongly recommends that where possible colleges coordinate student equity planning with the CCC <u>Institutional</u> <u>Effectiveness</u> goal setting process and with the college and/or district accreditation, educational master planning, and program review processes. Doing so, will help colleges adopt an institution-wide, holistic approach to planning, budgeting, and delivery of instruction and services to support equity in student access and success.

Guidelines for Determining the Existence of Disproportionate Impacts

General Definition of Disproportionate Impact.

"Disproportionate impact" occurs when the percentage of persons from a particular racial, ethnic, gender, age or disability group who are directed to a particular service or placement based on an assessment instrument, method, or procedure is significantly different from the representation of that group in the population of persons being assessed, and that discrepancy is not justified by empirical evidence demonstrating that the assessment instrument, method or procedure is a valid and reliable predictor of performance in the relevant educational setting (California Community College Chancellor's Office, 2011b, p. 2.6).

Introduction and Regulatory and Statutory References.

This document presents three methodologies to measure disproportionate impact for disaggregated subgroups within the California Community Colleges (CCC) student population. The three methodologies will be demonstrated more fully using cohorts and outcomes from the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (CCCCO) Data Mart in Attachment A.

Colleges are directed to establish a program of institutional research for ongoing evaluation of its matriculation process to ensure compliance. Title 5 states that: " As part of this evaluation, all assessment instruments, methods or procedures shall be evaluated to ensure that they minimize or eliminate cultural or linguistic bias and are being used in a valid manner. Based on this evaluation, districts shall determine whether any assessment instrument, method or procedure has a disproportionate impact on particular groups of students described in terms of ethnicity, gender, age or disability, as defined by the Chancellor. When there is a disproportionate impact on any such group of students, the district shall, in consultation with the Chancellor, develop and implement a plan setting forth the steps the district will take to correct the disproportionate impact." [Title 5 Section 55512(a)]

The California Community Colleges Student Success Task Force "recommends that system-wide accountability efforts be updated to include the collecting and reporting of both the outcomes and the progression measures for the system, and for each college. These measures will be disaggregated by race/ethnicity to aid the system in understanding how well it is performing in educating those historically disadvantaged populations whose educational success is vital to the future of the state." (California Community Colleges Student Success Task Force, 2012, p. 7)

Education Code, Article 1.5. Student Equity Plans

Section 78220. (a) As a condition for receiving Student Success and Support Program funding, and in order to ensure equal educational opportunities and to promote student success for all students, regardless of race, gender, age, disability, or economic circumstances, the governing

board of each community college district shall maintain a student equity plan that includes all of the following for each community college in the community college district:

(1) Campus-based research as to the extent of student equity by gender and for each of the following categories of students:

(A) Current or former foster youth.

(B) Students with disabilities.

(C) Low-income students.

(D) Veterans.

(E) Students in the following ethnic and racial categories, as they are defined by the United States Census Bureau for the 2010 Census for reporting purposes:

(i) American Indian or Alaska Native.

(ii) Asian.

- (iii) Black or African American.
- (iv) Hispanic or Latino.

(v) Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander.

- (vi) White.
- (vii) Some other race.

(viii) More than one race.

Demographic Composition of the Population within the Saddleback College Service Area

Determining Service Area Boundaries.

The South Orange County Community South Orange County Community College District's External Scan 2013 is the result of collaboration and research guided by the SOCCCCD District-wide Planning Council and the College Brain Trust during the spring of 2013. The External Scan 2013 created a comprehensive repost addressing Saddleback College, Irvine Valley College, and district-wide needs. The report focused on three areas: demographic analysis, enrollment trends, and labor market analysis. The External Scan 2013 analysis is used as the basis for determining the Saddleback College service area.

The Saddleback College service area encompasses the following zip codes and cities (College Brain Trust, 2013).

City	Zip Code	ZCTA
Mission Viejo	92690	
Mission Viejo	92691	92691
Mission Viejo	92692	92692
Trabuco Canyon, Dove Canyon, Coto de Caza	92678	92678
Trabuco Canyon, Dove Canyon, Coto de Caza	92679	92679
Rancho Santa Margarita	92688	92688
Laguna Hills	92653	92653
Laguna Hills	92654	
Laguna Woods	92637	92637
Aliso Viejo	92656	92656
Aliso Viejo	92698	
Dana Point	92629	92629
Capistrano Beach	92624	92624
San Juan Capistrano	92675	92675
San Juan Capistrano	92693	
San Clemente	92672	92672

Table 1. Saddleback College Service Area by City, Zip Code, and ZCTA

San Clemente			92673	92673
San Clemente			92674	
Ladera Ranch			92694	92694
Laguna Beach			92651	92651
Laguna Beach			92652	
Laguna Niguel			92607	
Laguna Niguel			92677	92677
-	,	 -		

Source: census.gov/acs and factfinder2.census.gov

Sources of Population Demographic Data.

American Community Survey 2014 Estimates.

Not all zip codes are included in the American Community Survey (ACS) 2014 estimates. Data for the "Zip Code Tabulation Areas" (ZCTA) referenced in the table is available from the ACS for the 2014 estimates. Zip code tabulation areas are statistical areas that generally correspond to the U.S. Postal Service's zip codes. Each ZCTA is created by aggregating 2010 Census blocks, where most addresses in the blocks use a given zip code. The most frequently occurring zip code becomes the ZCTA code for the statistical area. Some cities in the table are thus represented by one of their multiple zip codes, e.g. Laguna Niguel is represented by two zip codes but only one ZCTA.

Data from the ZCTAs were combined to ascertain the population demographics for the Saddleback College service area. All population demographic characteristics are expressed as percentages of the total.

2010 Census Data.

In those case of current or former foster status specific data was unavailable from the ACS 2014 estimates so data from the 2010 census was used to determine population.

Demographic Composition Tables.

Ethnicity.

Table 2. Ethnicity by ZCTA

Zip Code	(Not		Indian or						
Tabulation	Hispanic)	African	Alaska Native		Pacific		Two or More		Aggregated
Area	18+	American 18+	18+	Asian 18+	Islander18+	Other 18+	18 +	Hispanic 18+	Total
92624	4,361	87	28	130	0	430	64	718	
92629	17,625	105	107	898	0	1,397	456	3,244	
92637	13,081	132	0	2,181	14	89	114	741	
92651	17,411	134	14	834	54	343	330	1,140	
92653	14,813	292	142	3,371	114	2,153	615	4,090	
92656	23,716	1,218	181	6,441	2	1,963	1,206	5,517	
92672	19,074	163	114	957	76	2,816	724	5,480	
92673	16,366	361	18	951	216	998	760	2,464	
92675	16,054	50	280	997	104	5,234	472	9,149	
92677	36,267	1,185	210	4,763	18	2,564	1,805	7,083	
92678	294	0	0	16	0	5	16	5	
92679	18,270	295	72	2,345	50	596	977	2,358	
92688	20,873	529	61	4,148	83	1,638	803	5,620	
92691	26,555	628	147	3,071	98	1,807	1,183	6,871	
92692	28,322	633	100	3,612	22	1,039	1,166	4,392	
92694	10,120	217	0	2,168	35	331	376	2,035	
Sum of ZCTAs	283,202	6,029	1,474	36,883	886	23,403	11,067	60,907	423,851
% of Total	66.82%	1.42%	0.35%	8.70%	0.21%	5.52%	2.61%	14.37%	

Source: Table B03002, 2014 American Community Survey, US Census Bureau

Current or Former Foster Youths.

Determining the number of current and former foster youths in the Saddleback College service area has proven to be a difficult task. The 2014 ACS estimates and 2010 census data do not directly address this population subgroup. Searches of relevant databases given no indication of the number of former foster youths, and provide only aggregated data on the percentage of the population currently in foster placement on a county level.

Table 3. Number of Children in Foster Care in Representative Counties in California in 2014

	Total	Total Children	Children in Foster Care as Percentage of
Location	Population	in Foster Care	Population
California	38,066,920	62,097	0.16%
Alameda County	1,559,308	1,715	0.11%
Contra Costa County	1,081,232	1,175	0.11%
Fresno County	948,844	2,129	0.22%
Kern County	857,730	1,761	0.21%
Los Angeles County	9,974,203	20,651	0.21%
Orange County	3,086,331	2,389	0.08%
Riverside County	2,266,899	4,721	0.21%
Sacramento County	1,450,277	2,911	0.20%
San Bernardino County	2,078,586	4,869	0.23%
San Diego County	3,183,143	3,497	0.11%
Santa Clara County	1,841,569	1,376	0.07%

Source: http://www.kidsdata.org/topic/4/foster-care/summary

The number of foster placements in Orange County appears to be relatively stable over the long-term while the number of foster placements in California statewide is decreasing.

Chart 1. Number of Children in Foster Care 1998-2014



Definition: Number of children under age 21 in foster care as of July 1 of each year. Data Source: <u>As cited on kidsdata.org</u>, Webster, D., et al. California Child Welfare Indicators Project Reports, UC Berkeley Center for Social Services Research (May 2015); Child Trends, analysis of data from the Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System, as cited on KIDS COUNT (May 2015).

Persons with Disabilities.

ACS definitions of a disability include hearing difficulty, vision difficulty, cognitive difficulty, ambulatory difficulty, self-care difficulty, or an independent living difficulty.

Table 4. Non-Institutionalized Persons with Disabilities Aged 18-64

Zip Code Tabulation Area	Non-Institutionalized Persons with a Disability Age 18-64
92624	199
92629	900
92637	574
92651	534
92653	952
92656	1050
92672	1379
92673	875
92675	1334
92677	2073
92678	16
92679	714
92688	1068
92691	1548
92692	1567
92694	314
Sum of ZCTAs	15097
% of Total Population Age 18-64	4.71%

Source: Table S1801, 2014 American Community Survey, US Census Bureau

Poverty Status.

For the purpose of the current analysis, poverty was defined in consultation with the Student Equity team as less than 200% of the federally established poverty level. For a family of four this would be below an annual income of \$48,600.00. This level corresponds to the level of income that qualifies for federal education aid.

ACS data from table S1701 was modified to show the number of individuals from 18-64 at 200% of poverty level using the following formula,

 $Individuals at 200\% of poverty level = \frac{18 to 64 years}{Population for whome poverty status is determined} (All individuals below 200\% of poverty leve)$

The formula was applied to each ZCTA in the Saddleback College service area. Resulting ZCTA totals are reported in the following table.

Table 5. Individuals 18-65 below 200% of Federal Poverty Level by ZCTA

	Population 18-64 Below 200% of		% of Total Population 18- 64 Below 200% of
ZCTA	Poverty Level	Total Population 18-64	Poverty Level
92624	1,079		
92629	3,417		
92637	1,243		
92651	1,877		
92653	3,596		
92656	3,828		
92672	6,177		
92673	2,159		
92675	7,140		
92677	6,269		
92678	51		
92679	1,437		
92688	4,314		
92691	4,660		
92692	4,057		
92694	999		
Sum of ZCTAs	52,304	320,490	16.32%

Source: Table S1701, 2014 American Community Survey, US Census Bureau

Veterans.

Table 6 shows the number of veterans in the Saddleback College service area by ZCTA.

Table 6. Veterans 18-65 by ZCTA

		Percentage of Veterans 18-64 with Bachelor's Degree		Veterans as Percentage
ZCTA	Veterans 18-64	or Higher	Total Population 18-64	of Total Population 18-64
92624	466	63.6%		
92629	2,004	56.3%		
92637	2,767	48.2%		
92651	1,494	63.1%		
92653	1,644	28.3%		
92656	1,491	48.2%		
92672	2,178	53.9%		
92673	1,795	60.2%		
92675	2,037	54.5%		
92677	3,449	52.9%		
92678	35	31.4%		
92679	1,513	55.4%		
92688	1,522	38.8%		
92691	2,954	43.4%		
92692	3,218	46.1%		
92694	882	37.3%		
Sum of ZCTAs	29,449		320,490	9.19%

Source: Table B2101, 2014 American Community Survey, US Census Bureau

When considering the Veterans population in the Saddleback College service area, it is important to note the high percentage of Veterans who already have a Bachelor's Degree or higher (49.6% of all Veterans). This suggests that the percentage of Veterans as a percentage of the total population overstates the percentage that could be reasonably expected to attend Saddleback College if no disproportionality exists.

Gender.

Gender disproportionality alone is not a consideration in the development of Student Equity Plans, as outlined by the Education Code. Gender may be considered when the data indicates that it interacts with other disaggregated groups. Gender disparity was a part of earlier Student Equity Plans.

Age.

Disproportionate representation by age groups is not a consideration in the development of Student Equity Plans, as outlined by the Education Code. Age disparity was a part of earlier Student Equity Plans.

Disproportionate Impact on Targeted Groups by Indicators of Success

Disproportionate impact will be evaluated first based on the visual examination of graphed data. Only when the visual examination suggests disproportionality will the appropriate statistical analysis be used to quantify the disproportionality.

Targeted groups are those that have been traditionally underserved in higher education.

Ethnic Groups.

Disproportionate Impact in Access.

Chart 2 examines ethnic groups in terms of general course taking access at Saddleback College.



Chart 2. Ethnic Group Access

Source: College Ethnicity Profile on Data Mart

Visual analysis indicates no disproportionate impact in terms of the access indicator for any minority ethnic group.

Disproportionate Impact in Course Completion

Chart 3 documents disproportionate impact for some ethnic groups on the course completion indicator for the 2014-2015 Academic Year.



Chart 3. Rate of Course Completion for Minority Ethnic Groups

Visual analysis indicates disproportionate impact on the successful course completion rate for Pacific Islander, More than One Race, Hispanic, and African American groups.

This disproportionality is quantified using the Percentage Point Gap methodology in the following two tables. Table 7 calculates the comparison between the within-group success rates for the impacted ethnic groups compared to the entire Saddleback College student body, and Table 8 presents the comparison in terms of the number of enrollments "lost".

Table 7. Success Rate Comparison for Impacted Ethnic groups

Ethnic Group	The Number of Courses Students Enrolled In and Were Present In on Census Day in Base Year	The Number of Courses in which Students Earned an A, B. C. or Credit	The Percentage of Courses Passed	Comparison to All Student Average
Saddleback College Total	128,030	93,618	73.12%	
Pacific Islander	1,304	945	72.47%	-0.65%
More than One Race	6,217	4,406	70.87%	-2.25%
Hispanic	32,841	22,319	67.96%	-5.16%
African American	3,274	2,058	62.86%	-10.26%

Table 8. Calculation of the Number of Enrollments "Lost"

		The Number of Courses Students Enrolled In and Were Bresent In on	Number of
	Comparison	Consus Day in	Enrollments
Ethnic Group	Expressed as Decimal	Base Year	"Lost"
Pacific Islander	0.0065	1 304	8
More than One Bace	0.0225	6.217	140
Hispanic	0.0516	32 841	1 695
African American	0.1026	3 27/	336

The Hispanic group suffered greatest number of enrollments "lost" (1,695), the African American group "lost" the second highest number of enrollments (336).

Disproportionate Impact in ESL.

The 2009-2010 ESL cohort contains 165 individuals. Chart 4 shows the ethnic composition of the cohort.

Chart 4. Ethnic Composition of 2009-2010 Saddleback College ESL Cohort



Note: To preserve privacy, ethnic groups with less than 10 ESL cohort participants are excluded from further analysis. The suppressed groups are African American, American Indian / Alaska Native, Two or More Races, and Pacific Islander.

Chart 5 depicts the success rate for ethnic groups in the 2009-2010 ESL cohort and allows comparison with the overall success rate for the entire Saddleback College ESL cohort.

Chart 5. ESL Success Rate by Ethnic Groups



Only Hispanic students experience disproportionate impact in terms of ESL completion rates.

This disproportionality is quantified using the Percentage Point Gap methodology in the following two tables. Table 9 calculates the comparison between the within-group success rates for the impacted ethnic groups compared to the entire Saddleback College student body, and Table 10 presents the comparison in terms of the number of students "lost".

Table 9. Success Rate Comparison for Impacted Ethnic groups

			Percentage of	
			Students who	Comparison to
	Number of Students in the	Number of Successful	Successfully	All Student
Ethnic Group	ESL Cohort	Students	Completed	Average
Saddleback College Total	165	31	18.79%	
Unknown	13	2	15.38%	-3.41%
Hispanic	52	3	5.77%	-13.02%

Table 10. Calculation of the Number of Students "Lost"

			Number of
	Comparison Expressed as	Number of Students in	Students
Ethnic Group	Decimal	the ESL Cohort	"Lost"
Unknown	0.0341	13	0
Hispanic	0.1302	52	7

The Hispanic group "lost" 7 ESL cohort members, while the number of students lost in the Unknown ethnic group was less than 1 (due to the very small number of cohort members).

Disproportionate Impact in Basic Skills Math.

The 2009-2010 Basic Skills Math cohort contains 428 individuals. Chart 6 shows the ethnic composition of the cohort.



Chart 6. Ethnic Composition of the 2009-2010 Saddleback College Basic Skills Math Cohort

To preserve privacy, ethnic groups with less than 10 Basic Skills Math cohort participants are excluded from further analysis. The suppressed groups are American Indian / Alaska Native and Pacific Islander.

Chart 7 depicts the success rate for ethnic groups in the 2009-2010 Basic Skills Math cohort and allows comparison with the overall success rate for the entire Saddleback College Basic Skills Math cohort.

Chart 7. Basic Skills Math Success Rate by Ethnic Groups



Hispanic, African American, and students of Two or More Races experience disproportionate impact in terms of Basic Skills Math completion rates.

The disproportionality is quantified using the Percentage Point Gap methodology in the following two tables. Table 11 calculates the comparison between the within-group success rates for the impacted ethnic groups compared to the entire Saddleback College cohort, and table 12 presents the comparison in terms of the number of students "lost".

Table 11. Success Rate Comparison for Impacted Ethnic Groups

			Percentage of	
			Students who	Comparison to
	Number of Students in the	Number of Successful	Successfully	All Student
Ethnic Group	Basic Skills Math Cohort	Students	Completed	Average
Saddleback College Total	428	146	34.11%	
Hispanic	96	31	32.29%	-1.82%
African American	20	5	25.00%	-9.11%
Two or More Races	15	2	13.33%	-20.78%

Table 12. Calculation of the Number of Students "Lost"

Ethnic Group	Comparison Expressed as	Number of Students in the Basic Skills Math Cohort	Number of Students "Lost"
Hispanic	0.0182	96	2
African American	0.0911	20	2
Two or More Races	0.2079	15	3

The Hispanic and African American groups each "lost" 2 Basic Skills Math cohort members, while the number of students "lost" in the group of students of two or More Races was 3.

Disproportionate Impact in Basic Skills English.

The 2009-200 Basic Skills English cohort contains 1,730 individuals. Chart 8 shows the ethnic composition of the cohort.

Chart 8. Ethnic Composition of the Saddleback College Basic Skills English Cohort



Note: To preserve privacy, ethnic groups with less than 10 participants or less than 10 completers are excluded from further analysis. The suppressed groups are American Indian/Alaska Native and Pacific Islanders.

Chart 9 depicts the success rate for ethnic groups in the 2009-2010 Basic Skills English cohort and allows comparison with the overall success rate for the entire Saddleback College Basic Skills English cohort.



Chart 9. Basic Skills English Success Rate by Ethnic Groups

Hispanic students, African American students, students of two or more races, and students of unknown race experience disproportionate impact in terms of Basic Skills English completion rates.

This disproportionality is quantified using the Percentage Point Gap methodology in the following two tables. Table 13 calculates the comparison between the within-group success rates for the impacted ethnic groups compared to the entire Saddleback College cohort, and table 14 presents the comparison in terms of the number of students "lost".

Table 13. Success Rate Comparison for Impacted Ethnic Groups

Ethnic Group	Number of Students in the Basic Skills English Cohort	Number of Successful Students	Percentage of Students who Successfully Completed	Comparison to All Student Average
Saddleback College Total	1,730	1,090	63.01%	
Two or More Races	57	34	59.65%	-3.36%
Unknown	86	51	59.30%	-3.71
Hispanic	389	228	58.61%	-4.40%
African American	41	24	58.54%	-4.47%

Table 14. Calculation of the Number of Students "Lost"

		Number of Students in	Number of
	Comparison Expressed as	the Basic Skills English	Students
Ethnic Group	Decimal	Cohort	"Lost"
Two or More Races	0.0336	57	2
Unknown	0.0371	86	3
Hispanic	0.044	389	17
African American	0.045	41	2

A total of 40 students were "lost"; 2 African American students, 17 Hispanic students, 3 students of Unknown ethnicity, and 2 students of two or more races.

Disproportionate Impact in Degree and Certificate Completion and Transfer.

The 2009-2010 Saddleback College Degree and Certificate cohort contains 2,877 individuals. Chart 10 shows the ethnic composition of the cohort.

Chart 12. Ethnic Composition of the 2009-2010 Saddleback College Degree/Certificate Completion

Cohort_year 🖓



Note: To preserve privacy, ethnic groups with less than 10 cohort participants are excluded from further analysis. The suppressed group is the American Indian/Alaska Native group.

Chart 13 depicts the success rate for ethnic groups in the 2009-2010 Saddleback College Certificate and Degree Completion cohort and allows comparison with the overall success rate for the entire Saddleback College cohort. Success is defined as earning either a degree or certificate, achieving "transfer prepared" status (successfully completing 60 UC/CSU transferable units with a GPA equal to or greater than 2.0), or transferring to a four-year institution.

Chart 13 Degree/Certificate Success Rate by Ethnic Group



The disproportionality is quantified using the Percentage Point Gap methodology in the following two tables. Table 17 calculated the comparison between the within-group success rates for the impacted groups compared to the entire Saddleback Degree/Certificate Completion cohort, and table 18 presents the comparison in terms of the number of students "lost".

Table 17. Success Rate Comparison for Impacted Groups

			Percentage of	
	Number of Students in the		Students who	Comparison to
	Degree/Certificate	Number of Successful	Successfully	All Student
Ethnic Group	Completion Cohort	Students	Completed	Average
Saddleback College Total	2,877	1,519	52.80%	
Unknown	90	43	47.78%	-5.02%
Hispanic	596	274	45.97%	-6.83
Pacific Islander	16	6	37.50%	-15.30%
African American	46	14	30.43%	-22.37%

Table 18. Calculation of the Number of Students "Lost"

	Comparison Expressed as	Number of Students in the Degree/Certificate	Number of Students
Ethnic Group	Decimal	Completion Cohort	"Lost"
Unknown	0.0503	90	5
Hispanic	0.0683	596	41
Pacific Islander	0.153	16	2
African American	0.2237	46	10

A total of 58 students were "lost"; 41 Hispanic students, 10 African American students, 5 students of unknown race, and 2 Pacific Islander students.

Disproportionate Impact in Degrees Earned.

Chart 12 has already described the ethnic composition of the cohort that serves as the basis for this specific analysis of those students for whom success is defined only as earning a Degree of any kind.

Chart 14 depicts the success rate (earning a degree) for the ethnic groups in the 2009-2010 Saddleback College Degree and Certificate cohort, and allows comparison with the overall Saddleback College cohort.



Chart 14. Degree Earned Success Rate by Ethnic Groups

Note: The African American, American Indian/Alaska Native, Pacific Islander, and Unknown ethnic groups are combined for analysis in to the "Other" group in order to protect privacy dues to small cell sizes.

The "Other" ethnic combination and the Hispanic group experience disproportionate impact in terms of Degree earned success.

The disproportionality is quantified using the Percentage Point Gap methodology in the following two tables. Table 19 calculates the comparison between the within-group success rates for the impacted ethnic groups compared to the entire Saddleback College cohort and table 20 presents the comparison in terms of students "lost".

Table 19. Success Rate Comparison for Impacted Groups

			Percentage of	
	Number of Students in the		Students who	Comparison to
	Degree/Certificate	Number of Successful	Successfully	All Student
Ethnic Group	Completion Cohort	Students	Completed	Average
Saddleback College Total	2,877	589	20.42%	
Hispanic	596	120	20.13%	-0.29%
Other	160	19	11.88%	-8.54%

Table 20. Calculation of the Number of Students "Lost"

	Comparison Expressed as	Number of Students in the Degree/Certificate	Number of Students
Ethnic Group	Decimal	Completion Cohort	"Lost"
Hispanic	0.0029	596	2
Other	0.0854	160	14

Note: The "Other" group includes African American, American Indian/Alaska Natives, Pacific Islander, and Unknown ethnic groups.

Disproportionate Impact in Certificates Earned.

Chart 12 has already described the ethnic composition of the cohort that serves as the basis for this specific analysis of those students for whom success is defined only as earning a Certificate of any kind.

Chart 15 depicts the success rate (earning a certificate) for the ethnic groups in the 2009-2010 Saddleback College Degree and Certificate cohort, and allows comparison with the overall Saddleback College cohort.



Chart 15. Certificate Earned Success Rate by Ethnic Groups

Note: The African American, American Indian/Alaska Native, and Pacific Islander, ethnic groups are combined for analysis in to the "Other" group in order to protect privacy dues to small cell sizes.

The "Other" ethnic combination and the Hispanic group experience disproportionate impact in terms of Certificate earned success.

The disproportionality is quantified using the Percentage Point Gap methodology in the following two tables. Table 21 calculates the comparison between the within-group success rates for the impacted ethnic groups compared to the entire Saddleback College cohort and table 22 presents the comparison in terms of students "lost".

Table 21. Success Rate Comparison for Impacted Groups

Ethnic Group	Number of Students in the Degree/Certificate Completion Cohort	Number of Successful Students	Percentage of Students who Successfully Completed	Comparison to All Student Average
Saddleback College Total	2,877	764	26.56%	_
White Non-Hispanic	1,775	467	26.31%	-0.25%
Hispanic	596	155	26.01%	-0.55%
Other	70	12	17.14%	-9.42%
Unknown	90	15	16.67%	-9.89%

Table 22. Calculation of the Number of Students "Lost"

Ethnic Group	Comparison Expressed as Decimal	Number of Students in the Degree/Certificate Completion Cohort	Number of Students "Lost"
White Non-Hispanic	0.0025	1,775	4
Hispanic	0.0055	596	3
Other	0.0942	70	7
Unknown	0.0989	90	9

Note: The "Other" group includes African American, American Indian/Alaska Natives, and Pacific Islander ethnic groups.

Disproportionate Impact in Transfer Velocity

The 2008-2009 Saddleback College transfer velocity cohort contains 2344 individuals. This cohort differs from the Completion cohort. Chart 16 describes the ethnic composition of the cohort.

Chart 16. Ethnic Composition of the Saddleback College 2008-2009 Transfer Velocity Cohort



Note: To preserve privacy, ethnic groups with less than 10 cohort participants are excluded from further analysis. The data for students of mixed ethnicity is suppressed.

Success was measured as those students who transferred the within 5 years. The five year period represents 200% of expected time to transfer (earning 60 credits) for a full-time student. Chart 17 depicts the success rate for ethnic groups in the 2008-2009 cohort, and allows comparison with the overall success rate for the entire Saddleback Cohort.

Chart 17. Transfer Velocity Success Rates by Ethnic Groups



Pacific Islander, Hispanic, and African American students experience disproportionate impact in terms of 5-year transfer velocity rates.

The disproportionality is quantified using the Percentage Point Gap methodology in the following two tables. Table 23 calculates the comparison between the within-group success rates for the impacted ethnic groups compared to the entire Saddleback College cohort, and table 24 presents the comparison in terms of the number of students "lost".

			Percentage of	
			Students who	Comparison
	Number of Students in the	Number of Successful	Successfully	to All Student
Ethnic Group	Transfer Velocity Cohort	Students	Transferred	Average
Saddleback College Total	2,344	1,052	44.88%	
Pacific Islander	17	7	41.18%	-3.70%
Hispanic	367	141	38.42%	-6.46%
African American	44	17	38.64%	-6.24%

Table 23 Transfer Velocity Success Rate Comparison for Impacted Ethnic Groups

Table 24. Calculation of the Number of Students "Lost"

	Comparison Expressed as	Number of Students in	Number of
Ethnic Group	Decimal	Cohort	Students "Lost"
Pacific Islander	0.0370	17	1
Hispanic	0.0646	367	24
African American	0.0624	44	3

The Hispanic group "lost"24 cohort members, the African American group "lost" 3, and because the number of Pacific Islanders in the transfer velocity cohort is so small, the calculation indicates that 1 student was "lost" in this group.

Veterans

Disproportionate Impact in Access

Chart 18 examines the veterans group in terms of general course taking access at Saddleback College.

Chart 18. Veterans Access



Visual analysis indicates a disproportionate impact in terms of the access indicator for veterans. When considering the Veterans population in the Saddleback College service area, it is important to note the high percentage of Veterans who already have a Bachelor's Degree or higher (49.6% of all Veterans). Conversations with Terence Nelson, VETS Program Coordinator, additionally reveal that many veterans are seeking additional training beyond or in addition to their Bachelor's Degree. This suggests that the percentage of Veterans as a percentage of the total population is a less than perfect measure of the percentage that could be reasonably expected to attend Saddleback College if no disproportionality exists. It may be profitable to look to the new Skills Builder metric for more information on veterans returning to Saddleback College to improve specific job-related skills.

The apparent disproportionality is quantified using the Percentage Point Gap methodology in the following two tables. Table 25 calculates the comparison between the within-group access rate for Veterans compared to the entire Saddleback College student body, and table 26 presents the comparison in terms of the number of students "lost".

Table 25. Access Rate Comparison for Veterans

				Comparison to
	Total Population	Number of Veterans	Percentage of	All Student
	(18-65 years)	(18-65 years)	Veterans	Average
Service Area	423,851	12,627	2.97%	
Saddleback College	39,143	891	2.28%	0.69%

Table 26. Calculation of the number of Veterans "Lost"

			Number of
	Comparison Expressed as	Number of Student	Students
	Decimal	Veterans	"Lost"
Veterans	0.0069	39,143	270

Disproportionate Impact in Course Completion

Table 27 documents disproportionate impact for veterans on the course completion indicator for the 2014-2015 Academic Year.

Table 27. Success Rate Comparison for Veterans

	The Number of Courses Students Enrolled In and Were Present In on Census Day in Base Year	The Number of Courses in which Students Earned an A, B, C, or Credit	The Percentage of Courses Passed	Comparison to All Student Average
Saddleback College Total	128,030	93,618	73.12%	
Veterans	3,874	2,575	66.47%	-6.65%

Note: There were a total of 9 "Military Withdrawals" in the 2014-2015 Academic Year.

Table 28 calculates the number of enrollments "lost".

Table 28. Calculation of the Number of Enrollments "Lost"

		The Number	
		of Courses	
		Students	
		Enrolled In	
		and Were	
		Present In on	Number of
	Comparison	Census Day in	Enrollments
	Expressed as Decimal	Base Year	"Lost"
Veterans	0.0665	3,874	258

Veterans "lost" 258 enrollments.

Disproportionate Impact in ESL

There were no identified veterans included in the 2009-2010 ESL cohort at Saddleback College.

Disproportionate Impact in Basic Skills Math.

Of the 428 students in the 2009-2010 Basic Skills Math cohort, 15 were identified as Veterans.

Chart 19 depicts the success rate for Veterans and allows comparison with the overall success rate for the entire Saddleback College Basic Skills Math cohort.

Chart 19. Basic Skills Math Success Rate for Veterans



The apparent disproportionality is quantified using the Percentage Point Gap Methodology in the following two tables. Table 29 calculates the comparison between the success rate for Veterans compared to the entire Saddleback College Basic Math Skills cohort, and table 30 presents the comparison in terms of the number of students "lost".

Table 29. Success Rate Comparison for Veterans

			Percentage of	
			Students who	Comparison to
	Number of Students in the	Number of Successful	Successfully	All Student
	Basic Skills Math Cohort	Students	Completed	Average
Saddleback College Total	428	146	34.11%	
Veterans	15	4	26.67%	-7.44%

Table 30. Calculation of the Number of Students "Lost"

		Number of Students in	Number of
	Comparison Expressed as	the Basic Skills Math	Students
	Decimal	Cohort	"Lost"
Veterans	0.0744	15	1

The Veterans group "lost" 1 student. The low number is due to the low number of Veterans in the cohort.

Disproportionate Impact in Basic Skills English

The 2009-2010 Basic Skills English Cohort contains 1,730 individuals. Of this total, 29 were identified as Veterans.

Chart 20 depicts the success rate for Veterans and allows comparison with the overall success rate for the entire Saddleback College Basic Skills English cohort.

Chart 20. Basic Skills English Success Rate for Veterans



Visual analysis reveals no disproportionate impact for Veterans on the Basic Skills English indicator.

Disproportionate Impact in Degree and Certificate Completion and Transfer

The Saddleback College Degree and Certificate completion cohort contains 2,877 individuals. Of that group, 48 individuals were identified as Veterans.

Chart 21 depicts the success rate for Veterans in the 2009-2010 Saddleback College cohort and allows comparison with the overall success rate for the entire Saddleback College cohort. Success is defined as earning a Degree.



Chart 21. Degree Success Rate by Veteran Status

Visual Analysis reveals no disproportionate impact for Veterans on the Degree Completion indicator.

Chart 22 shows the success rate for Veterans in the 2009-2010 Saddleback College cohort and allows comparison with the overall success rate for the entire Saddleback College cohort. Success is defined as earning a Certificate.

Chart 22. Certificate Success Rate by Veteran Status



The disproportionality is quantified using the Percentage Point Gap methodology in the following two tables. Table 31 calculates the comparison between Veteran Certificate success rate compared to the entire Saddleback College cohort, and table 32 presents the comparison in terms of the number of students "lost".

Table 31. Certificate Success Rate Comparison for Veterans

			Percentage of	
	Number of Students in the		Students who	Comparison to
	Degree/Certificate	Number of Successful	Successfully	All Student
	Completion Cohort	Students	Completed	Average
Saddleback College Total	2,877	761	26.45%	
Veterans	48	11	22.92%	-3.53%

Table 32. Calculation of the Number of Students "Lost"

		Number of Students in	Number of
	Comparison Expressed as	the Degree/Certificate	Students
	Decimal	Completion Conort	"LOST"
Veterans	0.0353	48	2

Disproportionate Impact in Transfer Velocity

Veterans are not reported specifically in the Data on Demand transfer velocity data. This precluded analysis of Veterans on this indicator.

Current or Former Foster Youths.

Disproportionate Impact in Access

It is difficult to determine the number of current or former foster youths in the Saddleback College service area. Data previously cited indicates that 0.08% of children are in foster care in Orange County. If that figure is applied to the total population in the Saddleback College service area between 18 and 65 years of age, this would suggest that the number of former or current foster youths is around 340 individuals. During the 2014-2015 Academic year, 489 individuals were identified as current or former foster youths attending Saddleback College. This indicates that there is no disproportionate impact in terms of the access indicator.

Disproportionate Impact in Course Completion

Chart 23 documents disproportionate impact for current or former foster youths on the course completion indicator for the 2014-2015 Academic year.



Chart 23. Rate of Course Completion for Current or Former Foster Youths

Visual analysis indicates disproportionate impact on the successful course completion rate for foster youths.

This disproportionality is quantified using the Percentage Point Gap methodology in the following two tables. Table 33 calculates the comparison between the foster youth's success rate compared to the entire Saddleback College student body. Table 34 presents the comparison In terms of the number of enrollments "lost".

Table 33. Success Rate Comparison for Foster Youths

	The Number of Courses Students Enrolled In and Were Present In on Census Day in Base Year	The Number of Courses in which Students Earned an A, B, C, or Credit	The Percentage of Courses Passed	Comparison to All Student Average
Saddleback College Total	128,030	93,618	73.12%	
Current or Former Foster Students	2,151	1,195	55.56%	-17.56%

Table 34. Calculation of the Number of Enrollments "Lost"

		The Number	
		of Courses	
		Students	
		Enrolled In	
		and Were	
		Present In on	Number of
	Comparison	Census Day in	Enrollments
	Expressed as Decimal	Base Year	"Lost"
Current or Former Foster Students	0.1765	2,151	380

Disproportionate Impact in ESL

The 2009-2010 ESL Cohort contains 165 individuals. There were no students in the cohort identified as current or former foster youths.

Disproportionate Impact in Basic Skills Math

The 2009-2010 Basic Skills Math cohort contains 428 individuals. There were no students in the cohort identified as current or former foster youths.

Disproportionate Impact in Basic Skills English

The 2009-2010 Basic Skills English cohort contains 1,730 individuals. 5 individuals in this cohort were identified as current or former foster students. In order to preserve privacy, when the group contains less than 10 individuals, the data must be suppressed. The foster youths are excluded from further analysis on this indicator.

Disproportionate Impact in Degree Completion

The 2009-2010 Saddleback College Degree and Certificate cohort contains 2,877 individuals. Only 12 individuals within this cohort were identified as current or former foster youths and less than 5 earned a degree. In order to preserve privacy, when the group contains less than 10 individuals, the data must be suppressed. Thus foster youths are excluded from further analysis on this indicator.

Disproportionate Impact in Certificate Completion

The 2009-2010 Saddleback College Degree and Certificate cohort contains 2,877 individuals. Only 12 individuals within this cohort were identified as current or former foster youths and less than 5 earned a certificate. In order to preserve privacy, when the group contains less than 10 individuals, the data must be suppressed. Thus foster youths are excluded from further analysis on this indicator.

Disproportionate Impact in Transfer Velocity

Foster youths are not reported specifically in the Data on Demand transfer velocity data. This precluded analysis of foster youths on this indicator.

Economically Disadvantaged Students

Disproportionate Impact in Access

For the purpose of the current analysis, poverty was defined in consultation with the Student Equity team as less than 200% of the federally established poverty level. For a family of four this would be below an annual income of \$48,600.00. This level corresponds to the level of income that qualifies for federal education aid. As shown in Table 5 there are approximately 52,304 individuals in the Saddleback College service area between 18 and 65 years of age earning less than 200% of the federal poverty level (16.32% of population).

The CCCCO defines students who are "economically disadvantaged" as those who:

- Received a Board of Governor's Waiver,
- Received a Pell Grant,
- Are a CalWorks or Workforce Investment Act participant, or
- Are a Department of Social Services client.

The DataMart indicates that 11,227 Saddleback College students received a BOG Waiver in the 2014-2015 Academic year. The breakdown by financial aid type is reflected in table 35.

Table 35. Financial Aid Summary Report

		Annual 2014-2015
		Student Count
Sad	dleback Total	11,441
	Board of Governors (BOG) Enrollment Fee Waiver Total	11,227
	BOGW - Method A-? (unknown base)	176
	BOGW - Method B based on income standards	1,928
	BOGW - Method C based on financial need	9,123
	Grants Total	3,833
	Cal Grant B	488
	Cal Grant C	54
	CARE Grant	8
	Chafee Grant	5
	EOPS Grant	18
	Other grant: non-institutional source	2
	Pell Grant	3,819
	SEOG (Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant)	442
	Loans Total	442
	Federal Direct Student Loan - subsidized	405
	Federal Direct Student Loan - unsubsidized	350
	Perkins Loan	1
	Scholarship Total	373
	Scholarship: institutional source	239
	Scholarship: non-institutional source	57
	Scholarship: Osher Scholarship	99
	Work Study Total	104
	Federal Work Study (FWS) (Federal share)	102
	Other Work Study and matching funds	2

Chart 24 compares the service area economically disadvantaged population percentages to the Saddleback College student body percentages.

Chart 24. Percentage of Economically Disadvantaged Population



Saddleback College evinces no disproportionate impact in terms of access for economically disadvantaged students.

Disproportionate Impact in Course Completion

Chart 26 shows success rates by economically disadvantaged status.

Chart 26. Success Rates by Economically Disadvantaged Status



Visual analysis indicates a disproportionate impact for economically disadvantaged students. The magnitude of the disproportionality is quantified using the Percentage Point Gap methodology in the following two tables. Table 36 calculates the comparison between the success rate for economically disadvantaged students compared to the entire Saddleback College student body, and Table 37 presents the comparison in terms of the number of enrollments "lost".

	Number of Courses Students Enrolled in and Were Present in on Census Day	Number of Courses in which Students Earned an A, B, C, or Credit	Percentage of Courses Passed	Comparison to All Student
Saddleback College Total	128,030	93,618	73.12%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	54,373	38,321	70.48%	-2.64%

Table 36. Success Rate Comparison by Economically Disadvantaged Status

Table 37. Calculation of the Number of Enrollments "Lost"

	Comparison Expressed as Decimal	Number of Courses Students Enrolled in and Were Present in on Census Day	Number of Enrollments "Lost"
Economically Disadvantaged Students	0.0264	54,373	1,435

Disproportionate Impact in Basic Skills Math

The 2009-2010 Basic Skills Math cohort contains 428 individuals. Of that group 154 individual students were economically disadvantaged. Chart 27 depicts the success rate for economically disadvantaged students in the 2009-2010 Basic Skills Math cohort and allows comparison with the overall success rate for the entire Saddleback College cohort.



Chart 27. Success Rate Basic Skills Math by Economically Disadvantaged Status

Visual analysis indicates no disproportionality for economically disadvantaged students in Basic Skills Math.

Disproportionate Impact in Basic Skills English

The 2009-2010 Basic Skills English cohort contains 1,730 individuals. Of that total 571 (33% of the total cohort) are identified as economically disadvantaged.



Chart 27 shows success rates by economically disadvantages status.

Visual analysis indicates a disproportionate impact for economically disadvantaged students. The magnitude of the disproportionality is quantified using the Percentage Point Gap methodology in the following two tables. Table 38 calculates the comparison between the success rate for economically disadvantaged students compared to the entire Saddleback College Basic Skills English Cohort, and Table 39 presents the comparison in terms of the number of students "lost".

Table 38. Success Rate Basic Skills English Comparison by Economically Disadvantaged Status

	Number of Students in the Basic Skills English	Number of Successful	Percentage of Students who Successfully	Comparison to All Student
	Cohort	Students	Completed	Average
Saddleback College Total	1,730	1,090	63.01%	
Economically Disadvantages	571	217	38.00%	-25.01%

	Table 39.	Calculation of	of the Number	of Students "Lost"
--	-----------	----------------	---------------	--------------------

		Number of	
		Students in the	
	Comparison Expressed	Basic Skills	Number of
	as Decimal	English Cohort	Students "Lost"
Economically Disadvantaged	0.2501	571	143

Disproportionate Impact in ESL

The 2009-2010 Basic Skills ESL cohort contains 165 individuals. Of that group 53 individual students were economically disadvantaged. Chart 28 depicts the success rate for economically disadvantaged students in the 2009-2010 Basic Skills ESL cohort and allows comparison with the overall success rate for the entire Saddleback College Basic Skills ESL cohort.



Chart 28. Success Rate Basic Skills ESL by Economically Disadvantaged Status

Visual analysis indicates no disproportionality for economically disadvantaged students in Basic Skills ESL Success Rate.

Disproportionate Impact in Degree Completion

The 2009-2010 Saddleback College Degree/Completion cohort contains 2,877 individuals. 1,246 individuals within this cohort were identified as economically disadvantaged, and 263 earned a degree. Chart 29 depicts the Degree Earned Success Rate for economically disadvantaged students in the 2009-2010 Degree/Certificate Completion cohort and allows

comparison with the overall success rate for the entire Saddleback College Degree/Completion cohort.



Chart 29. Percentage of Economically Disadvantaged Students Earning Degrees

Visual analysis indicates no disproportionate impact for economically disadvantaged students in terms of degree completion.

Disproportionate Impact in Certificate Completion

The 2009-2010 Saddleback College Degree and Certificate cohort contains 2,877 individuals. 1,246 individuals within this cohort were identified as economically disadvantaged and 323 earned a certificate. Chart 30 depicts the Certificate Earned Success Rate for economically disadvantaged students in the 2009-2010 Degree/Certificate Completion cohort and allows comparison with the overall success rate for the entire Saddleback College Degree/Completion cohort.

Chart 30. Certificate Earned Success Rate for Economically Disadvantaged Students



Visual analysis indicates a disproportionate impact for economically disadvantaged students in terms of Certificate Completion. The magnitude of the disproportionality is quantified using the Percentage Point Gap methodology in the following two tables. Table 40 calculates the comparison between the success rate for economically disadvantaged students compared to the entire Saddleback College Degree/Certificate Completion Cohort, and Table 41 presents the comparison in terms of the number of students "lost".

Table 40.	Success	Rate	Certificate	Compl	etion b	ov Ec	onomically	/ Disad	/antaged	Status
	0400000	nace	Certificate	00p.		~,	enenneang	Bibaa	ancabea	0.000

	Number of Students in the	Number of Conservation	Percentage of Students who	Comparison to
	Degree/Certificate	Number of Successful	Successfully	All Student
	Completion Cohort	Students	Completed	Average
Saddleback College Total	2,877	764	26.56%	
Economically Disadvantaged	1,246	323	25.92%	-0.64%

Table 41. Calculation of the Number of Students "Lost"

	Comparison Expressed as	Number of Students in the Degree/Certificate	Number of Students
	Decimal	Completion Cohort	"Lost"
Economically Disadvantaged	0.0064	1,246	8

Disproportionate Impact in Transfer Velocity

The 2008-2009 Saddleback College transfer velocity cohort contains 2344 individuals. This cohort differs from the Completion cohort. Success was measured as those students who transferred the within 5 years. The five year period represents 200% of expected time to transfer (earning 60 credits) for a full-time student. Chart 31 depicts the success rate for ethnic groups in the 2008-2009 cohort, and allows comparison with the overall success rate for the entire Saddleback Cohort.



Chart 31. Transfer Velocity Success Rates by Economically Disadvantaged Status

Visual analysis indicates disproportionate impact in terms of transfer velocity. The disproportionality is quantified using the Percentage Point Gap methodology in the following two tables. Table 42 calculates the comparison between the within-group success rates for economically disadvantaged students compared to the entire Saddleback College cohort, and table 43 presents the comparison in terms of the number of students "lost".

Table 42. Transfer Velocity Success Rate Comparison for Impacted Ethnic Groups

			Percentage of	Comparison to
	Number of Students in the	Number of Successful	Students who	All Student
	Transfer Velocity Cohort	Students	Transferred	Average
Saddleback College Total	2,344	1,052	44.88%	
Economically Disadvantaged	1,347	523	38.83%	-6.05%

Table 43. Calculation of the Number of Students "Lost"

		Number of Students in	Number of
	Comparison Expressed as	the Transfer Velocity	Students
	Decimal	Cohort	"Lost"
Economically Disadvantaged	0.0605	1,347	81

Students with Disabilities

Disproportionate Impact in Access

ACS data indicates that 4.71% of the total population between 18 and 65 years old in the Saddleback College service area experiences a disability (shown in table 4).

The Data Mart indicates that 1,650 students with disabilities (unduplicated headcount) attended Saddleback College in the Fall semester 2014 and 1,963 attended in Spring 2015. While it is unwarranted to add these semester enrollment numbers, it is reasonable to say that at least 1,963 distinct students with disabilities attended Saddleback College at some time during the 2014-2015 academic year. The total headcount at Saddleback College for the Spring 2015 semester from Data Mart reporting was 24,918. 7.88% of the Saddleback Student body experienced a disability.

Chart 32 examines students with disabilities in terms of credit course taking access at Saddleback College.



Chart 32. Percentage of Individuals with Disabilities

Visual analysis indicates no disproportionate impact for students with disabilities in terms of the access indicator.

Disproportionate Impact in Course Completion

Chart 33 examines the percentage of enrollments by students with disabilities resulting in successfully completed courses compared to enrollments for all Saddleback College students resulting in successfully completed courses.



Chart 33. Course Completion by Disability Status

Visual analysis indicates no disproportionate impact for students with disabilities in terms of course completion.

Disproportionate Impact in ESL

The 2009-2010 ESL Basic Skills ESL cohort contains 165 individuals. Only 8 students with disabilities were included in the cohort. In order to protect privacy because the number of students is so small, no further analysis of outcomes for students with disabilities can be conducted.

Disproportionate Impact in Basic Skills Math

The 2009-2010 ESL Basic Skills Math cohort contains 425 individuals. 68 individuals in the cohort were students with disabilities.

Chart 34. Basic Skills Math Success Rate by Disability Status



Visual analysis indicates no disproportionate impact for students with disabilities in success rates in Basic Skills Math.

Basic Skills English

The Saddleback College 2009-2010 Basic Skills English cohort contains 1,730 individuals. 181 of these students experienced a disability.

Chart 35. Basic Skills English Success Rate by Disability Status



Visual analysis indicates no disproportionate impact for students with disabilities in terms of Basic Skills English success rates.

Disproportionate Impact in Degree Completion

The Saddleback College Degree and Certificate cohort contains 2,877 individuals. Of these 149 were students with disabilities. Chart 36 compares the rate at which students with disabilities were successful (earned a degree) to the overall rate for the entire Saddleback College cohort.



Chart 36. Percentage of Degree/Certificate Cohort Earning a Degree

Disproportionate Impact in Certificate Completion

The Saddleback College Degree and Certificate cohort contains 2,877 individuals. Of these 149 were students with disabilities. Chart 37 compares the rate at which students with disabilities were successful (earned a certificate) to the overall rate for the entire Saddleback College cohort.

Chart 37. Percentage of Degree/Certificate Cohort Earning a Certificate



Visual analysis indicates a disproportionate impact for students with disabilities in terms of the rate at which they are successful in earning a certificate.

The disproportionality is quantified using the Percentage Point Gap methodology in the following two tables. Table 44 calculates the comparison between the within-group success rates for students with disabilities compared to the entire Saddleback College cohort, and table 45 presents the comparison in terms of the number of students "lost".

Table 44. Certificate Completion Success Rate Comparison for Students with Disabilities

			Percentage of	
	Number of Students in the		Students who	Comparison to
	Degree/Certificate	Number of Successful	Successfully	All Student
	Completion Cohort	Students	Completed	Average
Saddleback College Total	2,877	762	26.49%	
Students with Disabilities	149	35	23.49%	3.00%

Table 45. Calculation of the Number of Students "Lost"

		Number of Students in	Number of
	Comparison Expressed as	the Degree/Certificate	Students
	Decimal	Completion Conort	"Lost"
Students with Disabilities	0.0300	149	4

Disproportionate Impact in Transfer Velocity

The 2008-2009 Saddleback College transfer velocity cohort contains 2,344 individuals. The cohort differs from the Degree/Certificate Completion cohort. Of the 2,344 individuals, 143 were students who experienced a disability.



Chart 38. Five Year Transfer Success Rate by Disability Status

Visual analysis indicates a disproportionate impact for students with disabilities in terms of transfer velocity.

The disproportionality is quantified using the Percentage Point Gap methodology in the following two tables. Table 46 calculates the comparison between the within-group success rates for students with disabilities compared to the entire Saddleback College cohort, and table 47 presents the comparison in terms of the number of students "lost".

Table 46. Transfer Velocity Success Rate Comparison for Students with Disabilities

			Percentage of	Comparison to
	Number of Students in the	Number of Successful	Students who	All Student
	Transfer Velocity Cohort	Students	Transferred	Average
Saddleback College Total	2,344	1,052	44.88%	
Students with Disabilities	143	42	29.37%	15.51%

Table 47. Calculation of the Number of Students "Lost"

		Number of Students in	
	Comparison Expressed as	the Transfer Velocity	Number of
	Decimal	Cohort	Students "Lost"
Students with Disabilities	0.1551	143	22

Attachment A

Percentage Point Gap Method

The percentage point gap methodology compares the percent of students in a disaggregated subgroup who succeed in an outcome with the percent of *all* students who succeed in the same outcome. Percentage point gap measurements are calculated by subtracting the all student average success rate (%) from the success rate (%) of a disaggregated subgroup in the same outcome. The resulting 'percentage point gap' will have a - / + designation that signals whether or not the disaggregated subgroup is experiencing a rate that is lower (-) or higher (+) than the all student average (*Quick note: The all student group rate is subtracted from the disaggregated subgroup to avoid outcomes in which positive values represent a gap and negative values represent equal or higher success).*

According to this methodology, a '-3 percentage point gap or greater' is evidence of a disproportionate impact. Though this, much like the 80% rule, is an arbitrary designation, it serves as a reasonable strategy for identifying unequal outcomes that would benefit from further discussion, which should include the following considerations. First, *the number of students impacted*: a campus may prioritize a smaller percentage point gap that is calculated for a student group with more than 100 students over a larger percentage point equity gap calculated for a student group with fewer than 10 students. This is because rates calculated using smaller numbers will be subject to greater variability and it may make sense to prioritize a gap that impacts a greater number of students. Second, *the disaggregated subgroup's proportion of the total population*: The larger the proportion a subgroup represents of the total population, the more similar their success rate will be to the all student average. In this instance, campuses should consider comparing the all student success rate (as well as the subgroup's) with the success rates at comparable institutions or systems.

The percentage point gap methodology is demonstrated below using transfer rate data disaggregated by ethnicity. Other percentage point gap calculations are performed similarly with the counts of subgroups in the cohort and outcome groups.

Transfer rates were obtained from the CCCCO Data Mart Transfer Velocity metric. Table One presents the counts and transfer percentages of the student cohorts beginning in Academic Year 2008-09 who were then tracked for six years.

Table One presents the results of a percentage point gap analysis. In the table, the counts in the column "Transfer Count" are the numbers of students who transferred to a fouryear institution anytime within those six years. Filipino counts are counted within the "Asian" ethnicity category.

Ethnicity		Cohort	Transfer	Transfer	
	Linnery	Count	Count	Percentage	
	African-American	7,490	2,566	34%	
Native	American Indian/Alaskan	1,079	314	29%	
	Asian	21,674	10,765	50%	
	Hispanic	43,329	12,662	29%	
	Multi-Ethnicity	29	12	41%	
	Pacific Islander	1,303	452	35%	
	Unknown	15,185	6,034	40%	
	White	48,671	19,828	41%	
	Total	138,760	52,633	38%	

Table 1. Transfer Rate Disaggregated by Ethnic Subgroup

Using this methodology, the percentage of each disaggregated subgroup attaining the desired outcome (i.e., transfer percentage) is calculated by dividing the transfer frequency into the cohort frequency (Table One). The second step of the methodology compares the transfer percentage of each non-reference disaggregated subgroup to the transfer percentage of all students.

The 'Percentage Point Gap' column is calculated by subtracting the transfer rate for all students (38%) from the transfer rate of each disaggregated subgroup. For example, the percentage point gap for Asians is calculated by subtracting 38 from 50, which equals +12. This indicates that Asians experience transfer rates that are 12 percentage points above the overall transfer rate for all students. In this example, African-Americans, American Indians/Alaskan Natives, Hispanics, and Pacific Islanders experience gaps that are 3 percentage points or more below the overall transfer rate for all students, indicating that there are disparities in this area.

Ethnicity	Cohort	Transfer	Transfer Percentage	Percenta ge Point Gap	
	Count	Count			
	African-American	7,490	2,566	34%	-4
Native	American Indian/Alaskan	1,079	314	29%	-9
	Asian	21,674	10,765	50%	+12
	Hispanic	43,329	12,662	29%	-9
	Multi-Ethnicity	29	12	41%	+3
	Pacific Islander	1,303	452	35%	-3
	Unknown	15,185	6,034	40%	+2
	White	48,671	19,828	41%	+3
	Total	138,76 0	52,633	38%	

Table 2. Transfer Rate Disaggregated by Ethnic Subgroup

A strength of the percentage point gap measurement is that it allows users to calculate and communicate the number of students 'lost' relative to the all student (or another group's) average. For example, percentage point gap measurements can be translated to, "this gap would not have existed if 8 additional African American students had persisted to basic skills MAT 55." This statement makes it easier for the average person to immediately comprehend the magnitude of the gap, which is in contrast to proportional index measurements that are communicated as "African American students have a proportionality index gap of 0.89 in MAT 55." * It is important to note that the former language should not be misunderstood as a quota or goal, as it is neither. Instead, this language is a description of past data ("If 5 additional African American students *had succeeded, we would have experienced* equity") that measures the size of the gap in terms of number of students rather than rates. Another way to think of it is that it's the use of a different *measure* to describe the same gap, like describing an amount of liquid using liters instead of ounces.

* As highlighted here, the Proportionality Index (and other proportionality or share based measurements) does not easily allow the translation to numbers as the math starts to get complicated and would require unrealistic assumptions (e.g., only one target group can see an increase in the outcome measure, so that the total number of students achieving the outcome only increases by the number of additional students in the one target population. Problems then emerge if following the same process with a different subgroup.)