



Institutional Effectiveness, Research & Planning

2017 STUDENT EQUITY DATA

Crafton Hills College

Prepared by Keith Wurtz
February 21, 2017
RRN: 1,568

2017 Student Equity Data

Crafton Hills College

Introduction

The purpose of this report is to provide Crafton Hills College with the data needed to inform the development of the Student Equity Plan and support the success of all Crafton students. The student equity data is based on the quantitative effectiveness indicators (QEI) found in the college's Educational Master Plan and also meets the requirements specified by Title 5 Education Code [§ 55512(a)]: access, course success, basic skills completion, degree and certificate completion, and transfer. Each outcome area will be examined for disproportionate impact and a plan for correcting disproportionate impact will be developed in the Study Equity Plan, if applicable. According to Title 5 Education Code [§ 55502(a)], 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.

Therefore, the following report examines access, course success, basic skills completion, degree and certificate completion, and transfer rate to determine if Crafton students were disproportionately impacted when analyzed by gender, ethnicity, age, disability status, economically disadvantaged status, foster youth status, veteran status, non-resident status, EOPS status, and AB540 status.

Executive Summary

Table 1 summarizes the results from the disproportionate impact study by protected status and outcome. The results indicated that African American, 20 – 24 year olds, and DSPS students were the groups most likely to be disproportionately impacted. African

American and 20 – 24 year old students were more likely to have substantially lower math and English throughput rates and lower degree/certificate and transfer rates. In addition, Hispanic students were more likely to have substantially lower degree/certificate completion rates and transfer rates. Compared to the [2014 disproportionate impact study](#), Crafton has reduced the number of disproportionate impacts from 32 to 28, even though three additional groups (i.e. non-residents, EOPS, and AB540) were added to the 2017 analysis (see Tables 1 and 1A).

Table 1: 2017 Summary of Disproportionate Impact by Protected Status and Outcome.

	Access	Course Success	Throughput Rate		Deg/Cert Completion Rate	Transfer Rate	# DP	# RG
			Math	English				
Gender								
Female	No	RG	RG	RG	RG	RG	0	4
Male	No	No	No	No	No	No	0	0
Ethnicity								
Asian	No	RG	No	No	RG	RG	0	3
African American	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	5	0
Hispanic	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	2	0
Native Americ.	No	No	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	0
Pacific Islander	Yes	No	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	0
Two or More Races	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	2	0
Caucasian	Yes	No	RG	RG	No	Yes	2	2
Unknown	No	No	NA	NA	Yes	Yes	2	0
Age								
19 or younger	No	No	RG	RG	RG	RG	0	4
20-24	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	4	0
25-29	No	No	Yes	No	NA	NA	1	0
30-34	Yes	No	No	NA	NA	NA	1	0
35-39	Yes	RG	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	1
40-49	Yes	No	No	NA	NA	NA	1	0
50 or older	Yes	No	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	0
Disability	Yes	No	RG	No	Yes	Yes	3	1
Economically Disadvantaged	No	No	No	RG	RG	No	0	2
Foster Youth	No	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	0
Veteran	Yes	No	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	0
Non-Resident	NA	No	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	0
EOPS	NA	RG	RG	RG	RG	RG	0	5
AB540	NA	No	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	0
Total DP	9	1	3	2	6	7	28	

Note: "DP" refers to Disproportionate Impact. "Yes" means that DP was present and "No" means that it was not present. "NA" refers to Not Applicable and refers to subgroups with the number of records below 30. The sub-group was not large enough for a methodological sound comparison. "RG" refers to the Reference Group, is the sub-group with the highest outcome rate, and the sub-group that all other sub-groups were compared to.

Table 1A: 2014 Summary of Disproportionate Impact by Protected Status and Outcome.

	Access	Course Success	Throughput Rate		Deg/Cert Completion Rate	Transfer Rate	# DP	# RG
			Math	English				
Gender								
Female	No	RG	RG	RG	RG	RG	0	5
Male	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	1	0
Ethnicity								
Asian	No	No	RG	RG	RG	RG	0	4
African American	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	4	0
Hispanic	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	3	0
Native American	Yes	No	NA	NA	Yes	No	2	0
Caucasian	Yes	RG	No	No	No	No	1	1
Two or More Races	No	No	No	No			0	0
Missing	No	No	No	NA	No	No	0	0
Age								
19 or younger	No	No	No	RG	No	RG	0	2
20-24	No	No	RG	No	Yes	Yes	2	1
25-29	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	2	0
30-34	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes	4	0
35-39	Yes	No	NA	NA	RG	Yes	2	1
40-49	Yes	No	NA	NA	No	Yes	2	0
50 or older	Yes	No	NA	NA	Yes	Yes	3	0
Disability	Yes	RG	RG	No	No	Yes	2	2
Economically Disadvantaged	No	No	Yes	No	RG	No	1	1
Foster Youth	No	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	0
Veteran	Yes	RG	No	NA	NA	NA	1	1
Total DP	9	1	3	2	8	9		

Note: "DP" refers to Disproportionate Impact. "Yes" means that DP was present and "No" means that it was not present. "NA" refers to Not Applicable and refers to subgroups with the number of records below 30. The sub-group was not large enough for a methodological sound comparison. "RG" refers to the Reference Group, is the sub-group with the highest outcome rate, and the sub-group that all other sub-groups were compared to.

Possible Implications

Access, the transfer rate, and the degree and certificate completion rate, were the three areas where disproportionate impact was most likely to occur. First, in order to increase the access of students who are 30 years old or older and African American students Crafton could offer sections and programs at non-traditional times: night, Friday, weekend, and online section offerings. In addition, Crafton can also use the information from the 2016 environmental scan to develop target marketing strategies. Another strategy would be for the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research, and Planning (OIERP) to complete a target marketing study and identify courses and programs that students 30 years old or older and African American students are most interested in and use the results from the study to direct a marketing message to these prospective students.

When examining student equity in 2014 African American students were not identified as being disproportionately impacted in terms of access. In 2017 African Americans consist of 5% of Crafton's primary service area and 4% of Crafton's student population. As a result, Crafton could focus recruiting among African Americans.

The other outcome areas most likely to result in disproportionate impact were the degree/certificate and transfer rates. In addition, on a smaller scale, the math throughput rate was also an outcome where disproportionate impact occurred. Past [research](#) at Crafton, has strongly indicated that the degree/certificate and transfer rates are impacted the most by completing transfer level math, or the math throughput rate. Accordingly, Crafton needs to continue to explore strategies for encouraging and/or requiring students to complete math and English first. For example, the Crafton Leading from the Middle group has developed possible strategies for increasing the number of students who complete math and English first. In addition, the SSEEM Committee has explored using priority registration as a strategy to encourage students to complete math and English first. The research conducted at Crafton has shown that completing transfer level math and transfer level English are the best predictors of transferring and earning a degree. In addition, the Statewide Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI) is adding the percent of students who complete math and English in the first and second year as additional IEPI outcome measures. Crafton needs to continue to explore and implement strategies that require students to complete transfer level English and math first.

From 2014 to 2017 there were also reductions in the number of outcome areas where groups were experiencing disproportionate impact (see Tables 1 and 1A).

- Males are no longer disproportionately impacted. In 2014 males were disproportionately less likely to earn in a degree or certificate. Conversely, in 2017 males were not disproportionately impacted in any outcome area.
- In 2014 Hispanic students were disproportionately impacted in the English throughput rate, degree/certificate rate, and transfer rate. In 2017 Hispanic students were only disproportionately impacted in the degree/certificate and transfer rates.
- EOPS students were not disproportionately impacted in any outcome area and are the reference group (i.e. have the highest rate) for course success, math and English throughput rates, degree/certificate rate, and transfer rate.

Methodology

Rather than using only one indicator to identify disproportionate impact, the OIERP used three indicators. In order to determine if disproportionate impact was present, two of the three measures had to substantially indicate that disproportionate impact occurred. The 80% Rule, proportionality index, and Cohen's d effect size were the three indices used to identify disproportionate impact. More than one measure was used to identify disproportionate impact because each measure has different strengths and weaknesses. For example, when a subgroup is compared to the reference group the subgroup may

exceed the 80% threshold, but have a substantially large effect size and a low proportionality index.

80% Rule

The 80% rule was used to identify disproportionate impact. The methodology is based on the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) 80% Rule and was used in Title VII enforcement by the US Equal Opportunity Commission, Department of Labor, and the Department of Justice (Michalowski, 2014). The 80% Rule states that:

A selection rate for any race, sex, or ethnic group which is less than four-fifths (4/5) (or eighty percent) of the rate for the group with the highest rate will generally be regarded by the Federal enforcement agencies as evidence of adverse impact, while a greater than four-fifths rate will generally not be regarded by Federal enforcement agencies as evidence of adverse impact. [Section 60-3, Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedure (1978); 43 FR 38295 (August 25, 1978)]

The 80% index is calculated by dividing the outcome rate (e.g.: success rate) of a non-reference subgroup into the outcome rate of the reference subgroup (Michalowski, 2014). A result of less than 80% is considered evidence of disproportionate impact. The subgroup with the highest outcome rate was chosen as the reference group. However, if the subgroup did not have the amount of cases needed for a statistically significant finding ($N = 30$), then the highest outcome rate with the amount of cases needed for a significant finding was selected as the reference group.

Proportionality Index

The proportionality index "...compares the percentage of a disaggregated subgroup in an initial cohort to its own percentage in the resultant outcome group" (Michalowski, 2014). The proportionality index is calculated by dividing the column percentage in the outcome group by the column percentage in the original cohort. A ratio of 1.0 indicates that the subgroup is present in the original cohort and in the outcome group at the same rate. A ratio less than 1.0 indicates that the subgroup is less prevalent in the outcome group, and a ratio greater than 1.0 indicates that the subgroup is more prevalent in the outcome group. Disproportionate impact may be present if the ratio is less than 1.0. Disproportionate impact was considered to be present if the ratio was less than .90.

Effect Size

The Cohen's d effect size statistic was used to indicate whether there was a substantial difference between the reference group and the subgroup being examined. The effect size is calculated by taking the difference in the rates divided by the pooled standard deviation. One method of interpreting effect size was developed by Jacob Cohen. Jacob Cohen defined "small," "medium," and "large" effect sizes. He explained that an effect size of .20 can be considered small, an effect size of .50 can be considered medium, and an effect size of .80 can be considered large. An effect size is considered

to be meaningful if it is .20 or higher, which usually indicates that the difference in the outcome rate is 10% or greater.

Definitions

Disability Status. Students who were in Crafton's Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSPS) were identified in this group. Specifically, DSPS students were students who had an SD01 coding that identified them as having one of the following disabilities: mobility impaired, visually impaired, hearing impaired, speech/language impaired, intellectual disability, acquired brain injury, learning disabled, mental health disability, Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD), Autism spectrum, and other disability.

Economically Disadvantaged Status. The Student Scorecard methodology was used to identify students who were economically disadvantaged for the basic skills, degree and certificate completion, and transfer outcomes. Students who met any of the following criteria were identified as economically disadvantaged:

- Student is a participant in the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) – SB26 in the Student Basic (SB) Data Record is equal to "J" and is located in the ST referential file.
- The student is an eligible participant in CalWORKs which is determined by having their eligibility status verified by the local County Welfare Department – SC01 in the Student CalWORKs (CW) Data Record is equal to 1, 2, 3, 4, or 6 and is located in the CWA referential file.
- The student received financial aid – SF21 in the Student Financial (SF) Aid Data Record is equal to BA, B1, B2, B3, BB, BC, F1, F2, F3, F4, F5, WC, WE, WF, or WU and is located in the FA annual referential file.
- A vocational student was identified as being economically disadvantaged – SV03 in the Student VTEA Data Record is equal to 1, 2, 3, or 4 and is located in the SV referential file.

When examining course success, students were identified as economically disadvantaged if they met any of the criteria specified above in Summer 2015, Fall 2015, or Spring 2016.

Foster Youth Status. Students identified as foster youth have, at one time, been in a court-ordered out-of-home placement. Crafton started tracking whether or not students were foster youth in 2012 and began reporting foster youth status to the CCCC in the Special Population (SG) Data Record MIS Referential file in the 2015-2016 academic year. Accordingly, the SG MIS Data Record was used to identify foster youth students for the access and course completion outcome measures. A student was identified as foster youth if SG03 was equal to 1. However, this was not possible for the basic skills throughput, degree and certificate completion, and transfer rate measures.

The following methodology was used to identify foster youth students for the degree and certificate completion, and transfer rate measures. Specifically, the following fields in Ellucian were used to identify foster youth status: S02.SSTU.FY.IND, S02.STU.FYC.IND, and S02.SSTU.FYM.IND. First, the field S02.SSTU.FY.IND indicates that the student is a

documented foster youth student. Second, the S02.STU.FYC.IND field indicates that Crafton has identified the student as a foster youth student, but the student is not considered an official foster youth student. Finally, the S02.SSTU.FYM.IND field indicates that the State would consider the student a foster youth student, is based on the student application, but the student is also not considered an official foster youth student.

Veteran Status. Students identified as a veteran were currently serving on active duty, a veteran, member of the Active Reserve, or a member of the National Guard. Veteran status is reported to the CCCCCO in the Special Population (SG) Data Record MIS Referential file where SG01 is equal to 1 in any of the four positions.

Non-Residents. Students were identified as non-residents if SB09 was equal to 600SS, 6XXXX, or 8XXXX. The 6 code refers to US citizens from a state other than California and an 8 code refers to students who are residents of a foreign country. Non-residents were not included in the examination of access.

AB540 Students. State law AB540 added a new section into California Education Code that created an exemption from the payment of non-resident tuition for certain non-resident students who have attended high school in California and received a high school diploma or its equivalent. AB540 students were identified by running the following Informer Report and merging a flag into the MIS database: [320 Report-AB540 Information by Funding Accounting Method](#).

Access Methodology

For primary service area census data, 5-year 2014 American Community Survey (ACS) estimates were used for Beaumont, Calimesa, and Mentone. Redlands and Yucaipa data was retrieved from the 2015 American Community Survey. Primary service area cities were selected if a majority of community college students within a city enrolled at Crafton Hills College; the primary service area cities were determined to be Redlands, Yucaipa, Mentone, Calimesa, and Beaumont. For Crafton student population, an unduplicated headcount of students earning a grade on record in academic year 2015-2016 (Summer 2015, Fall 2015, and Spring 2016) was merged with CCCCCO MIS data.

Gender. Using ACS Table B01001, the primary service area adult population by gender was calculated for persons who are 18 years old or older.

Age. Using ACS Table B01001, the primary service area adult population by age was calculated for persons who are 18 years old or older. Age of Crafton students was calculated as of the beginning of academic year 2015-2016.

Ethnicity. Using ACS Table B03002, the primary service area population by ethnicity was calculated. Persons identifying with a Hispanic ethnicity, except those selecting two or more races, were combined into the Hispanic category. Asian, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander races were combined in the Asian category. Two or more races from Hispanic and Not Hispanic categories were combined together.

Disability. Using ACS Table B18101, disability status for males and females in the age categories of 18 years and older were summed, then categorized respectively where “With a disability” was coded as Disability and “No disability” was coded in the same way. Students who were in Crafton’s Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSPS) were identified in this group. Specifically, DSPS students were students who had an SD01 coding that identified them as having one of the disabilities listed in the Definitions section.

Economically Disadvantaged. Using ACS Table B17001, the primary service area adult population was calculated for persons who are 18 years old or older and “Income in the past 12 months below poverty level” was coded as Poverty and “Income in the past 12 months at or above poverty level” was coded as Above Poverty. The Student Scorecard methodology was used to identify students who were economically disadvantaged which is explained in greater detail in the Definitions Section.

Foster Youth. Using ACS Table B09019, the primary service area foster youth population was calculated. Crafton Students identified as foster youth have, at one time, been in a court-ordered out-of-home placement.

Veterans. Using ACS Table S2101, the primary service area adult population was calculated by military veteran status. Veteran status is reported to the CCCCCO in the Special Population (SG) Data Record MIS Referential file where SG01 is equal to 1 in any of the four positions.

Campus-Based Research

A. ACCESS.

Compare the percentage of each population group that is enrolled to the percentage of each group in the adult population within the community served.

Table A1: 2015 – 2016 Unduplicated Crafton Students and Primary Service Area Population by Gender.

Gender	CHC Student Population		Primary Service Area Adult Population (18+)		Proportionality Index
	#	%	#	%	
Female	4,429	53.9	70,407	52.0	1.037
Male	3,764	45.8	65,081	48.0	0.954
Unknown	27	.3			
Total	8,220	100.0	135,488	100.0	

Table A2: 2015 – 2016 Unduplicated Crafton Students and Primary Service Area Population by Ethnicity.

Ethnicity	CHC Student Population		Primary Service Area Adult Population		Proportionality Index
	#	%	#	%	
Asian	529	6.4	10,545	5.8	1.103
African American	350	4.3	8,997	5.0	0.860
Hispanic	3,747	45.6	55,705	30.9	1.476
Native American	31	0.4	757	0.4	1.000
Pacific Islander	24	0.3	829	0.5	0.600
Two or More Races	426	5.2	3,615	2.0	2.600
Caucasian	3,091	37.6	99,932	55.3	0.680
Unknown	22	0.3	205	0.1	3.000
Total	8,220	100.0	180,585	100.0	

Table A3: 2015 – 2016 Unduplicated Crafton Students and Primary Service Area Population by Age.

Age	CHC Student Population		Primary Service Area Adult Population (18+)		Proportionality Index
	#	%	#	%	
18 – 19	2,158	26.3	4,959	3.7	7.108
20 – 24	3,410	41.5	12,768	9.4	4.415
25 – 29	1,217	14.8	11,478	8.5	1.741
30 – 34	587	7.1	12,447	9.2	0.772
35 – 39	336	4.1	11,219	8.3	0.494
40 – 49	300	3.6	23,577	17.4	0.207
50 or older	212	2.6	59,040	43.6	0.060
Total	8,220	100.0	135,488	100.0	

Table A4: 2015 – 2016 Unduplicated Crafton Students and Primary Service Area Population by Disability.

Disability	CHC Student Population		Primary Service Area Adult Population (18-64)		Proportionality Index
	#	%	#	%	
No	7,713	93.8	116,075	86.4	1.086
Yes	507	6.2	18,261	13.6	0.456
Total	8,220	100.0	134,336	100.0	

Table A5: 2015 – 2016 Unduplicated Crafton Students and Primary Service Area Population by Economic Status.

Economically Disadvantaged	CHC Student Population		Primary Service Area Adult Population (18+)		Proportionality Index
	#	%	#	%	
No	3,921	47.7	117,290	88.4	0.592
Yes	4,299	52.3	15,445	11.6	4.112
Total	8,220	100.0	132,735	100.0	

Table A6: 2015 – 2016 Unduplicated Crafton Students and Primary Service Area Population by Foster Status.

Foster Youth	CHC Student Population		Primary Service Area Population		Proportionality Index
	#	%	#	%	
No	8,164	99.3	179,186	99.9	0.994
Yes	56	0.7	158	0.1	7.000
Total	8,220	100.0	179,344	100.0	

Table A7: 2015 – 2016 Unduplicated Crafton Students and Primary Service Area Population by Veteran Status.

Veteran	CHC Student Population		Primary Service Area Adult Population (18+)		Proportionality Index
	#	%	#	%	
No	7,929	96.5	121,614	91.2	1.058
Yes	291	3.5	11,663	8.8	0.398
Total	8,220	100.0	133,277	100.0	

Table A8: 2015 – 2016 Unduplicated Crafton Students and Primary Service Area Population by Residency Status.

Non-Resident	CHC Student Population		Primary Service Area Adult Population (18+)		Proportionality Index
	#	%	#	%	
No	7,992	97.2	Not Available	NA	
Yes	228	2.8	Not Available	NA	
Total	8,220	100.0	Not Available	NA	

Table A9: 2015 – 2016 Unduplicated Crafton Students and Primary Service Area Population by EOPS Status.

EOPS	CHC Student Population		Primary Service Area Adult Population (18+)		Proportionality Index
	#	%	#	%	
No	7,783	94.7	Not Available	NA	
Yes	437	5.3	Not Available	NA	
Total	8,220	100.0	Not Available	NA	

Table A10: 2015 – 2016 Unduplicated Crafton Students and Primary Service Area Population by AB540 Status.

AB540	CHC Student Population		Primary Service Area Adult Population (18+)		Proportionality Index
	#	%	#	%	
No	8,035	97.7	Not Available	NA	
Yes	185	2.3	Not Available	NA	
Total	8,220	100.0	Not Available	NA	

Analysis

Gender: Crafton Hills College (CHC) serves approximately the same proportion of females and males in comparison to the representation in the primary service area adult population.

Ethnicity: Crafton serves a higher proportion of Asian, Hispanic, and two or more race students in comparison to the representation in the primary service area population. Conversely, Crafton serves a lower proportion of Caucasian and Pacific Islander students in comparison to the representation in the primary service area population. In addition, CHC also serves a nominally lower percentage of African American students in comparison to the representation in the primary service area population.

Age: Crafton Hills College serves a higher proportion of students who are 18-29 years old and a lower proportion of students who are 30 years old or older.

Disability: Crafton Hills College serves a lower proportion of students with disabilities in comparison to the representation in the primary service area population.

Economically Disadvantaged: Crafton Hills College serves a much higher proportion of students who are economically disadvantaged in comparison to the representation in the primary service area population.

Foster Youth: Crafton Hills College serves a higher proportion of students who are foster youth in comparison to the representation in the primary service area population.

Veterans: Crafton Hills College serves a lower proportion of students who are military veterans in comparison to the representation in the primary service area population. Further analysis reveals that 77.7% of military veterans in the primary service area population are veterans of the Vietnam era, Korean War, and World War II, which is related to the proportional age differences analyzed above.

Non-Residents, EOPS Students, and AB540 Students: The US Census does not collect data on non-residents, EOPS students, and AB540 students as defined by Crafton Hills College. However, the unduplicated number and percent of these student groups are included in Tables A8-A10 to help inform the discussion of disproportionate impact for these groups in the other outcomes examined.

B. COURSE COMPLETION (SUCCESS).

Ratio of the number of credit courses that students by population group actually complete with an A, B, C, or P by the end of the term compared to the number of courses in which students in that group are enrolled (i.e. A, B, C, D, F, I, P, NP, or W) on the census day of the term.

Table B1: 2015 – 2016 Course Success by Gender, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.

Gender	# Successful	# GOR	Success Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
Female	14,043	19,009	73.9%	Reference Group	
Male	12,000	16,587	72.3%	97.8	-.03
Unknown	64	86	74.4%		
Total	26,107	35,682	73.2%		

Table B1.A: 2015 – 2016 Proportion of Grades on Record and Successful Course Completions by Gender and Proportionality Index.

Gender	Grades on Record		Successful Course Completions		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
Female	19,009	53.3	14,043	53.8	1.009
Male	16,587	46.5	12,000	46.0	0.983
Unknown	86	0.2	64	0.2	
Total	35,682	100.0	26,107	100.0	

Table B2: 2015 – 2016 Course Success by Ethnicity, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.

Ethnicity	# Successful	# GOR	Success Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
Asian	1,607	2,020	79.6%	Reference Group	
African American	949	1,436	66.1%	83.1	-.31
Hispanic	11,743	16,784	70.0%	87.9	-.21
Native American	91	122	74.6%	93.8	-.12
Pacific Islander	74	102	72.5%	91.2	-.17
Two or More Races	1,334	1,825	73.1%	91.9	-.15
Caucasian	10,226	13,287	77.0%	96.7	-.06
Unknown	83	106	78.3%	98.4	-.03
Total	26,107	35,682	73.2%		

Table B2.A: 2015 – 2016 Proportion of Grades on Record and Successful Course Completions by Ethnicity and Proportionality Index.

Ethnicity	Grades on Record		Successful Course Completions		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
Asian	2,020	5.7%	1,607	6.2%	1.087
African American	1,436	4.0%	949	3.6%	0.903
Hispanic	16,784	47.0%	11,743	45.0%	0.956
Native American	122	0.3%	91	0.3%	1.019
Pacific Islander	102	0.3%	74	0.3%	0.992
Two or More Races	1,825	5.1%	1,334	5.1%	0.999
Caucasian	13,287	37.2%	10,226	39.2%	1.052
Unknown	106	0.3%	83	0.3%	1.070
Total	35,682	100.0%	26,107	100.0%	

Table B3: 2015 – 2016 Course Success by Age, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.

Age	# Successful	# GOR	Success Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
19 or younger	8227	11484	71.6%	89.7	-.18
20-24	10980	15168	72.4%	90.6	-.17
25-29	3287	4394	74.8%	93.7	-.12
30-34	1595	2100	76.0%	95.1	-.09
35-39	897	1123	79.9%	Reference Group	
40-49	769	963	79.9%	99.9	-.00
50 and above	352	450	78.2%	97.9	-.04
Total	26107	35682	73.2%		

Table B3.A: 2015 – 2016 Proportion of Grades on Record and Successful Course Completions by Age and Proportionality Index.

Age	Grades on Record		Successful Course Completions		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
19 or younger	11484	32.2%	8227	31.5%	0.979
20-24	15168	42.5%	10980	42.1%	0.989
25-29	4394	12.3%	3287	12.6%	1.022
30-34	2100	5.9%	1595	6.1%	1.038
35-39	1123	3.1%	897	3.4%	1.092
40-49	963	2.7%	769	2.9%	1.091
50 and above	450	1.3%	352	1.3%	1.069
Total	35,682	100.0%	26,107	100.0%	

Table B4: 2015 – 2016 Course Success by Disability Status, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.

Disability Status	# Successful	# GOR	Success Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
No	24,409	33,259	73.4%	Reference Group	
Yes	1,698	2,423	70.1%	95.5	-.07
Total	26,107	35,682	73.2%		

Table B4.A: 2015 – 2016 Proportion of Grades on Record and Successful Course Completions by Disability Status and Proportionality Index.

Disability Status	Grades on Record		Successful Course Completions		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
No	33,259	93.2%	24,409	93.5%	1.003
Yes	2,423	6.8%	1,698	6.5%	0.958
Total	35,682	100.0%	26,107	100.0%	

Table B5: 2015 – 2016 Course Success by Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS), 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.

EOPS Status	# Successful	# GOR	Success Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
No	23,625	32,353	73.0	97.9	-.03
Yes	2,482	3,329	74.6	Reference Group	
Total	26,107	35,682	73.2		

Table B5.A: 2015 – 2016 Proportion of Grades on Record and Successful Course Completions by Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS) and Proportionality Index.

EOPS Status	Grades on Record		Successful Course Completions		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
No	32,353	90.7	23,625	90.5	1.00
Yes	3,329	9.3	2,482	9.5	1.02
Total	35,682	100.0	26,107	100.0	

Table B6: 2015 – 2016 Course Success by Economic Status, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.

Economically Disadvantaged	# Successful	# GOR	Success Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
No	10,128	13,463	75.2%	Reference Group	
Yes	15,979	22,219	71.9%	95.6	-.07
Total	26,107	35,682	73.2%		

Table B6.A: 2015 – 2016 Proportion of Grades on Record and Successful Course Completions by Economic Status and Proportionality Index.

Economically Disadvantaged	Grades on Record		Successful Course Completions		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
No	13,463	37.7%	10,128	38.8%	1.028
Yes	22,219	62.3%	15,979	61.2%	0.983
Total	35,682	100.0%	26,107	100.0%	

Table B7: 2015 – 2016 Course Success by Foster Youth Status, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.

Foster Youth	# Successful	# GOR	Success Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
No	25,955	35,406	73.3%	Reference Group	
Yes	152	276	55.1%	75.1	-.41
Total	26,107	35,682	73.2%		

Table B7.A: 2015 – 2016 Proportion of Grades on Record and Successful Course Completions by Foster Youth Status and Proportionality Index.

Foster Youth	Grades on Record		Successful Course Completions		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
No	35,406	99.2%	25,955	99.4%	1.002
Yes	276	0.8%	152	0.6%	0.753
Total	35,682	100.0%	26,107	100.0%	

Table B8: 2015 – 2016 Course Success by Veteran Status, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.

Veteran	# Successful	# GOR	Success Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
No	25,184	34,399	73.2%	Reference Group	
Yes	923	1,283	71.9%	98.3	-.03
Total	26,107	35,682	73.2%		

Table B8.A: 2015 – 2016 Proportion of Grades on Record and Successful Course Completions by Veteran Status and Proportionality Index.

Veteran	Grades on Record		Successful Course Completions		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
No	34,399	96.4%	25,184	96.5%	1.001
Yes	1,283	3.6%	923	3.5%	0.983
Total	35,682	100.0%	26,107	100.0%	

Table B9: 2015 – 2016 Course Success by Non-Resident Status, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.

Non-Resident	# Successful	# GOR	Success Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
No	25,429	34,731	73.2	Reference Group	
Yes	678	951	71.3	97.4	-.04
Total	26,107	35,682	73.2		

Table B9.A: 2015 – 2016 Proportion of Grades on Record and Successful Course Completions by Non-Resident Status and Proportionality Index.

Non-Resident	Grades on Record		Successful Course Completions		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
No	25,429	97.4	34,731	97.3	0.999
Yes	678	2.6	951	2.7	1.026
Total	26,107	100.0	35,682	100.0	

Table B10: 2015 – 2016 Course Success by AB540 Status, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.

AB540	# Successful	# GOR	Success Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
No	25,442	34,744	73.2	Reference Group	
Yes	665	938	70.9	96.8	-.05
Total	26,107	35,682	73.2		

Table B10.A: 2015 – 2016 Proportion of Grades on Record and Successful Course Completions by AB540 Status and Proportionality Index.

AB540	Grades on Record		Successful Course Completions		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
No	25,442	97.5	34,744	97.4	0.999
Yes	665	2.5	938	2.6	1.032
Total	26,107	100.0	35,682	100.0	

Analysis

Gender: The course success rate was slightly higher for females (74%) than males (72%). However, the difference was not substantial as indicated by the 80% rule, effect size, and proportionality index.

Ethnicity: Asian students had the highest success rate (80%) and were the reference group. Students are not disproportionately impacted on course success by ethnicity. At the same time, African American (66%) and Hispanic (70%) students had a substantially (Cohen's $d > .20$) lower success rate than Asian (80%) students.

Age: Students who were 35 – 39 years old had the highest success rate (80%) and were the reference group. When comparing the age groups to students 35 – 39 years old, none of the age groups had a substantially lower success rate in two or more of the indices. Students are not disproportionately impacted on course success by age. At the same time, students 19 years old or younger (72%), 20 – 24 years old (72%), and 25 – 29 years old (75%) all had a lower success rate than students 35-39 years old.

Disability: The course success rate was slightly higher for students not identified as having a disability (73%) than for students with a disability (70%). However, the difference was not substantial as indicated by the 80% rule, effect size, and proportionality index.

EOPS: The course success rate was higher for EOPS students (75%) than for students who are not EOPS students (73%). The difference was not substantial as indicated by the 80% rule, effect size, and proportionality index.

Economically Disadvantaged: The course success rate was higher for students who were not identified as being economically disadvantaged (75%) than for students who were economically disadvantaged (72%). However, the difference was not substantial as indicated by the 80% rule, effect size, and proportionality index.

Foster Youth: Foster youth students appear to be disproportionately impacted on course success. All three indices indicated that foster youth students are substantially less likely to complete their courses (55%) than students not identified as foster youth students (73%).

Veterans: The course success rate was slightly higher for students who were not veterans (73%) than for student veterans (72%). However, the difference was not substantial as indicated by the 80% rule, effect size, and proportionality index.

Non-Residents: The course success rate was slightly higher for students who were California residents (73%) than for non-residents (71%). However, the difference was not substantial as indicated by the 80% rule, effect size, and proportionality index.

AB540: The course success rate was slightly higher for students who were not AB540 students (73%) than for AB540 students (71%). However, the difference was not substantial as indicated by the 80% rule, effect size, and proportionality index.

C. BASIC SKILLS and DEVELOPMENTAL COMPLETION (THROUGHPUT RATE).

CCCCO Basic Skills Throughput Rate: Ratio of the number of students by population group who complete a transfer level course within three years after having completed their first developmental math or English course at Crafton compared to the number of those students who complete such a final course. Foster youth, veteran, non-resident, and AB540 status was not available for the basic skills throughput rate.

Math Basic Skills Throughput Rate

Table C1: 2013 – 2014 to 2015 – 2016 Basic Skills Three-Year Math Throughput Rate by Gender, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.

Gender	# Successful	Cohort #	Throughput Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
Female	191	708	27.0%	Reference Group	
Male	149	630	23.7%	87.8	-.08
Unknown	3	4	75.0%	277.8	1.08
Total	343	1,342	25.6%		

Table C1.A: 2013 – 2014 to 2015 – 2016 Proportion of the Number in the Math Cohort and Throughput Number by Gender and Proportionality Index.

Gender	Cohort		Throughput		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
Female	708	52.8	191	55.7	1.06
Male	630	46.9	149	43.4	0.93
Unknown	4	0.3	3	0.9	2.93
Total	1,342	100.0	343	100.0	

Table C2: 2013 – 2014 to 2015 – 2016 Basic Skills Three-Year Math Throughput Rate by Ethnicity, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.

Ethnicity	# Successful	Cohort #	Throughput Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
Asian	14	58	24.1%	78.0	-.15
African American	12	75	16.0%	51.8	-.33
Hispanic	156	659	23.7%	76.7	-.16
Native American	1	2	50.0%	1.62	.41
Pacific Islander	1	3	33.3%	1.08	.05
Two or More Races	12	54	22.2%	71.8	.19
Caucasian	147	475	30.9%	Reference Group	
Unknown	0	16	0.0%	NA	-.68
Total	343	1,342	25.6%		

Table C2.A: 2013 – 2014 to 2015 – 2016 Proportion of the Number in the Math Cohort and Throughput Number by Ethnicity and Proportionality Index.

Ethnicity	Cohort		Throughput		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
Asian	58	4.3	14	4.1	0.94
African American	75	5.6	12	3.5	0.63
Hispanic	659	49.1	156	45.5	0.93
Native American	2	0.1	1	0.3	1.96
Pacific Islander	3	0.2	1	0.3	1.30
Two or More Races	54	4.0	12	3.5	0.87
Caucasian	475	35.4	147	42.9	1.21
Unknown	16	1.2	0	0.0	0.00
Total	1,342	100.0	343	100.0	

Table C3: 2013 – 2014 to 2015 – 2016 Basic Skills Three-Year Math Throughput Rate by Age, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.

Age	# Successful	Cohort #	Throughput Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
19 or younger	223	790	28.2%	Reference Group	
20-24	78	358	21.8%	77.2	-.15
25-29	17	80	21.3%	75.3	-.16
30-34	11	48	22.9%	81.2	-.12
35-39	3	23	13.0%	46.2	-.34
40-49	8	30	26.7%	94.5	-.03
50 and above	3	13	23.1%	81.8	-.11
Total	343	1,342	25.6%		

Table C3.A: 2013 – 2014 to 2015 – 2016 Proportion of the Number in the Math Cohort and Throughput Number by Age and Proportionality Index.

Age	Cohort		Throughput		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
19 or younger	790	58.9	223	65.0	1.104
20-24	358	26.7	78	22.7	0.852
25-29	80	6.0	17	5.0	0.831
30-34	48	3.6	11	3.2	0.897
35-39	23	1.7	3	0.9	0.510
40-49	30	2.2	8	2.3	1.043
50 and above	13	1.0	3	0.9	0.903
Total	1,342	100.0	343	100.0	

Table C4: 2013 – 2014 to 2015 – 2016 Basic Skills Three-Year Math Throughput Rate by Disability Status, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.

Disability Status	# Successful	Cohort #	Throughput Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
No	320	1,252	25.2%	100.0	.00
Yes	23	90	25.6%	Reference Group	
Total	343	1,342	25.6%		

Table C4.A: 2013 – 2014 to 2015 – 2016 Proportion of the Number in the Math Cohort and Throughput Number by Disability Status and Proportionality Index.

Disability Status	Cohort		Throughput		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
No	1,252	93.3	320	93.3	1.000
Yes	90	6.7	23	6.7	1.000
Total	1,342	100.0	343	100.0	

Table C5: 2013 – 2014 to 2015 – 2016 Basic Skills Three-Year Math Throughput Rate by Economically Disadvantaged Status (BOG Fee Waiver), 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.

Economically Disadvantaged	# Successful	Cohort #	Throughput Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
No	104	386	26.9%	Reference Group	
Yes	236	951	24.8%	92.1	-.05
Total	340	1,337	25.4%		

Table C5.A: 2013 – 2014 to 2015 – 2016 Proportion of the Number in the Math Cohort and Throughput Number by Economically Disadvantaged Status (BOG Fee Waiver) and Proportionality Index.

Economically Disadvantaged	Cohort		Throughput		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
No	386	28.9	104	30.6	1.059
Yes	951	71.1	236	69.4	0.976
Total	1,337	100.0	340	100.0	

Table C5.B: 2013 – 2014 to 2015 – 2016 Basic Skills Three-Year Math Throughput Rate by Economically Disadvantaged Status (Cal B or C, CARE, Pell, or SEOG), 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.

Economically Disadvantaged	# Successful	Cohort #	Throughput Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
No	104	386	26.9%	92.2	-.05
Yes	149	510	29.2%	Reference Group	
Total	253	896	28.2%		

Table C5.C: 2013 – 2014 to 2015 – 2016 Proportion of the Number in the Math Cohort and Throughput Number by Economically Disadvantaged Status (Cal B or C, CARE, Pell, or SEOG) and Proportionality Index.

Economically Disadvantaged	Cohort		Throughput		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
No	386	43.1	104	41.1	0.954
Yes	510	56.9	149	58.9	1.035
Total	896	100.0	253	100.0	

Table C5.D: 2013 – 2014 to 2015 – 2016 Basic Skills Three-Year Math Throughput Rate by Economically Disadvantaged Status (Scholarship), 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.

Economically Disadvantaged	# Successful	Cohort #	Throughput Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
No	104	386	26.9%	68.6	-.28
Yes	11	28	39.3%	Reference Group	
Total	115	414	27.8%		

Table C5.E: 2013 – 2014 to 2015 – 2016 Proportion of the Number in the Math Cohort and Throughput Number by Economically Disadvantaged Status (Scholarship) and Proportionality Index.

Economically Disadvantaged	Cohort		Throughput		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
No	386	93.2	104	90.4	0.970
Yes	28	6.8	11	9.6	1.414
Total	414	100.0	115	100.0	

Table C5.F: 2013 – 2014 to 2015 – 2016 Basic Skills Three-Year Math Throughput Rate by Economically Disadvantaged Status (Work Study Student), 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.

Economically Disadvantaged	# Successful	Cohort #	Throughput Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
No	104	386	26.9%	Reference Group	
Yes	2	9	22.2%	82.5	-.11
Total	106	395	26.8%		

Table C5.G: 2013 – 2014 to 2015 – 2016 Proportion of the Number in the Math Cohort and Throughput Number by Economically Disadvantaged Status (Work Study Student) and Proportionality Index.

Economically Disadvantaged	Cohort		Throughput		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
No	386	97.7	104	98.1	1.004
Yes	9	2.3	2	1.9	0.828
Total	395	100.0	106	100.0	

Table C6: 2013 – 2014 to 2015 – 2016 Basic Skills Three-Year Math Throughput Rate by EOPS Status, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.

EOPS Status	# Successful	Cohort #	Throughput Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
No	288	1,155	24.9%	84.8	-.10
Yes	55	187	29.4%	Reference Group	
Total	343	1,342	25.6%		

Table C6.A: 2013 – 2014 to 2015 – 2016 Proportion of the Number in the Math Cohort and Throughput Number by EOPS Status and Proportionality Index.

EOPS Status	Cohort		Throughput		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
No	1,155	86.1	288	84.0	0.976
Yes	187	13.9	55	16.0	1.151
Total	1,342	100.0	343	100.0	

English Basic Skills Throughput Rate

Table C8: 2013 – 2014 to 2015 – 2016 Basic Skills Three-Year English Throughput Rate by Gender, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.

Gender	# Successful	Cohort #	Throughput Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
Female	284	569	49.9%	Reference Group	
Male	203	486	41.8%	83.7	-.16
Unknown	2	3	66.7%	1.34	.33
Total	489	1,058	46.2%		

Table C8.A: 2013 – 2014 to 2015 – 2016 Proportion of the Number in the English Cohort and Throughput Number by Gender and Proportionality Index.

Gender	Cohort		Throughput		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
Female	569	53.8	284	58.1	1.080
Male	486	45.9	203	41.5	0.904
Unknown	3	0.3	2	0.4	1.442
Total	1,058	100.0	489	100.0	

Table C9: 2013 – 2014 to 2015 – 2016 Basic Skills Three-Year English Throughput Rate by Ethnicity, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.

Ethnicity	# Successful	Cohort #	Throughput Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
Asian	24	59	40.7%	84.5	-.15
African American	20	55	36.4%	75.5	-.24
Hispanic	261	563	46.4%	96.3	-.04
Native American	1	1	100.0%	207.5	1.04
Pacific Islander	1	1	100.0%	207.5	1.04
Two or More Races	24	51	47.1%	97.7	-.02
Caucasian	157	326	48.2%	Reference Group	
Unknown	1	2	50.0%	103.7	.04
Total	489	1,058	46.2%		

Note: Groups chosen as the reference group had to have 50 or more cases in the cohort and be the highest rate.

Table C9.A: 2013 – 2014 to 2015 – 2016 Proportion of the Number in the English Cohort and Throughput Number by Ethnicity and Proportionality Index.

Ethnicity	Cohort		Throughput		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
Asian	59	5.6	24	4.9	0.880
African American	55	5.2	20	4.1	0.787
Hispanic	563	53.2	261	53.4	1.003
Native American	1	0.1	1	0.2	2.164
Pacific Islander	1	0.1	1	0.2	2.164
Two or More Races	51	4.8	24	4.9	1.018
Caucasian	326	30.8	157	32.1	1.042
Unknown	2	0.2	1	0.2	1.082
Total	1,058	100.0	489	100.0	

Table C10: 2013 – 2014 to 2015 – 2016 Basic Skills Three-Year English Throughput Rate by Age, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.

Age	# Successful	Cohort #	Throughput Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
19 or younger	336	675	49.8%	Reference Group	
20-24	101	268	37.7%	75.7	-.24
25-29	24	57	42.1%	84.6	-.15
30-34	13	24	54.2%	108.8	.09
35-39	8	14	57.1%	114.8	.15
40-49	4	12	33.3%	67.0	-.33
50 and above	3	8	37.5%	75.3	-.25
Total	489	1,058	46.2%		

Table C10.A: 2013 – 2014 to 2015 – 2016 Proportion of the Number in the English Cohort and Throughput Number by Age and Proportionality Index.

Age	Cohort		Throughput		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
19 or younger	675	63.8	336	68.7	1.077
20-24	268	25.3	101	20.7	0.815
25-29	57	5.4	24	4.9	0.911
30-34	24	2.3	13	2.7	1.172
35-39	14	1.3	8	1.6	1.236
40-49	12	1.1	4	0.8	0.721
50 and above	8	0.8	3	0.6	0.811
Total	1,058	100.0	489	100.0	

Table C11: 2013 – 2014 to 2015 – 2016 Basic Skills Three-Year English Throughput Rate by Disability Status, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.

Disability Status	# Successful	Cohort #	Throughput Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
No	441	952	46.3%	Reference Group	
Yes	48	106	45.3%	97.8	-.02
Total	489	1,058	46.2%		

Table C11.A: 2013 – 2014 to 2015 – 2016 Proportion of the Number in the English Cohort and Throughput Number by Disability Status and Proportionality Index.

Disability Status	Cohort		Throughput		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
No	952	90.0	441	90.2	1.002
Yes	106	10.0	48	9.8	0.980
Total	1,058	100.0	489	100.0	

Table C12: 2013 – 2014 to 2015 – 2016 Basic Skills Three-Year English Throughput Rate by Economically Disadvantaged Status (BOG Fee Waiver), 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.

Economically Disadvantaged	# Successful	Cohort #	Throughput Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
No	109	239	45.6%	98.5	-.01
Yes	377	814	46.3%	Reference Group	
Total	486	1053	46.2%		

Table C12.A: 2013 – 2014 to 2015 – 2016 Proportion of the Number in the English Cohort and Throughput Number by Economically Disadvantaged Status (BOG Fee Waiver) and Proportionality Index.

Economically Disadvantaged	Cohort		Throughput		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
No	239	22.7	109	22.4	0.988
Yes	814	77.3	377	77.6	1.003
Total	1053	100.0	486	100.0	

Table C12.B: 2013 – 2014 to 2015 – 2016 Basic Skills Three-Year English Throughput Rate by Economically Disadvantaged Status (Cal B or C, CARE, Pell, or SEOG), 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.

Economically Disadvantaged	# Successful	Cohort #	Throughput Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
No	109	239	45.6%	88.3	-.12
Yes	236	457	51.6%	Reference Group	
Total	345	696	49.6%		

Table C12.C: 2013 – 2014 to 2015 – 2016 Proportion of the Number in the English Cohort and Throughput Number by Economically Disadvantaged Status (Cal B or C, CARE, Pell, or SEOG) and Proportionality Index.

Economically Disadvantaged	Cohort		Throughput		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
No	239	34.3	109	31.6	0.920
Yes	457	65.7	236	68.4	1.042
Total	696	100.0	345	100.0	

Table C12.D: 2013 – 2014 to 2015 – 2016 Basic Skills Three-Year English Throughput Rate by Economically Disadvantaged Status (Scholarship), 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.

Economically Disadvantaged	# Successful	Cohort #	Throughput Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
No	109	239	45.6%	58.0	-.66
Yes	22	28	78.6%	Reference Group	
Total	131	267	49.1%		

Table C12.E: 2013 – 2014 to 2015 – 2016 Proportion of the Number in the English Cohort and Throughput Number by Economically Disadvantaged Status (Scholarship) and Proportionality Index.

Economically Disadvantaged	Cohort		Throughput		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
No	239	89.5	109	83.2	0.930
Yes	28	10.5	22	16.8	1.601
Total	267	100.0	131	100.0	

Table C12.F: 2013 – 2014 to 2015 – 2016 Basic Skills Three-Year English Throughput Rate by Economically Disadvantaged Status (Work Study Student), 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.

Economically Disadvantaged	# Successful	Cohort #	Throughput Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
No	109	239	45.6%	50.2	-.91
Yes	10	11	90.9%	Reference Group	
Total	119	250	47.6%		

Table C12.G: 2013 – 2014 to 2015 – 2016 Proportion of the Number in the English Cohort and Throughput Number by Economically Disadvantaged Status (Work Study Student) and Proportionality Index.

Economically Disadvantaged	Cohort		Throughput		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
No	239	95.6	109	91.6	0.958
Yes	11	4.4	10	8.4	1.910
Total	250	100.0	119	100.0	

Table C12.F: 2013 – 2014 to 2015 – 2016 Basic Skills Three-Year English Throughput Rate by EOPS Status, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.

EOPS Status	# Successful	Cohort #	Throughput Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
No	379	861	44.0%	78.8	-.24
Yes	110	197	55.8%	Reference Group	
Total	489	1,058	46.2%		

Table C12.G: 2013 – 2014 to 2015 – 2016 Proportion of the Number in the English Cohort and Throughput Number by EOPS Status and Proportionality Index.

EOPS Status	Cohort		Throughput		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
No	861	81.4	379	77.5	0.952
Yes	197	18.6	110	22.5	1.208
Total	1,058	100.0	489	100.0	

Analysis

Gender: The math and English throughput rates were slightly higher for females (27% and 50%, respectively) than the male throughput rates (24% and 42% respectively). However, the differences were not substantial as indicated by the 80% rule, effect size, and proportionality index. At the same time, males had a lower (Cohen's $d = -.16$) English throughput rate (42%) than females (50%).

Ethnicity: The ethnic group with the highest math (31%) and English (48%) throughput rates were Caucasian students. Three of the ethnic groups had less than 30 students and were excluded from the disproportionate impact analysis for both math and English (Native American, Pacific Islander, and Unknown). African American students were disproportionately impacted for both the math (16%) and English (36%) throughput rates when compared to the Caucasian reference group. At the same time, Hispanic students almost had a substantially (Cohen's $d = -.16$) lower math throughput rate (24%) than Caucasian students (31%). In addition, in 2014 Asian students were the reference group; however, in 2017 Asian students almost had substantially (Cohen's $d = -.15$) lower math (24%) and English (41%) throughput rates than Caucasian students.

Age: Students 19 years old or younger had the highest math throughput rate (28%) and were the reference group. Two of the age groups had less than 30 students and were excluded from the disproportionate impact analysis (35-39 and 50 years or older). Two indices indicated that 20 – 24 and 25 – 29 year old students were disproportionately impacted on the math throughput rate. Specifically, 20 – 24 (22%) and 25 – 29 (21%) year old students had lower success rates than students who were 19 years old or younger (28%).

Students 19 years old or younger had the highest English throughput rate (50%) and were the reference group. Four of the age groups had less than 30 students and were excluded from the disproportionate impact analysis (30-34, 35-39, 40-49 and 50 years or older). The remaining age group, 25 – 29 year old students, were not disproportionately impacted; however, 25 – 29 year old students almost had a substantially (Cohen's $d = -.15$) lower English throughput rate (38%) than students who were 19 years old or younger (50%).

Disability: The math throughput rate was slightly higher for students identified with a disability (26%) than for students not identified as having a disability (25%). Students identified as having a disability were the reference group.

The English throughput rate was slightly higher for students not identified as having a disability (46%) than for students identified with a disability (45%). All three indices indicated that students identified with a disability did not experience disproportionate impact on the English throughput rate outcome measure.

Economically Disadvantaged: The number of students in each economically disadvantaged cohort was large enough to examine disproportionate impact for students who received a BOG Fee Waiver or students who received a Cal B or C, CARE,

Pell, or SEOG financial aid award. All three indices indicated that students who received a BOG Fee Waiver or students who received a Cal B or C, CARE, Pell, or SEOG financial aid award were not disproportionately impacted on the math throughput rate.

All three indices indicated that disproportionate impact did not occur for the English throughput rate by economically disadvantaged status. In fact, students who received a BOG Fee Waiver or students who received a Cal B or C, CARE, Pell, or SEOG financial aid were the reference group and had higher English throughput rates than students who were not identified as economically disadvantaged.

Foster Youth: Foster youth status is not identified in the CCCC Basic Skills Throughput Rate Data Mart. In addition, there were not enough foster youth students identified to examine disproportionate impact.

Veterans: Veteran status is not identified in the CCCC Basic Skills Throughput Rate Data Mart. In addition, there were not enough Veteran students identified to examine disproportionate impact.

Non-Residents: Non-Residents were not identified in the CCCC Basic Skills Throughput Rate Data Mart. In addition, there were not enough Non-Resident students enrolling in their first math or English course in the initial cohort year to examine disproportionate impact.

EOPS: The math throughput rate was higher for EOPS students (29%) than for non-EOPS students (25%). EOPS Students were the reference group.

The English throughput rate was substantially (Cohen's $d = -.24$) higher for EOPS students (56%) than for non-EOPS students (44%). EOPS Students were the reference group.

AB540: AB540 status is not identified in the CCCC Basic Skills Throughput Rate Data Mart. In addition, there were not enough AB540 students identified to examine disproportionate impact.

D. DEGREE and CERTIFICATE COMPLETION.

Student Scorecard Measure: The percentage of first-time degree and/or transfer-seeking students (i.e. minimum of 6 units earned who attempted any math or English in the first three years) tracked for six years from 2007-08 to 2012-13 who completed a degree or certificate. Foster youth, veteran, and AB540 status was not available for the basic skills throughput rate.

Table D1: 2009 – 2010 To 2014 – 2015 Six Year Degree/Certificate Completion Rate by Gender, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.

Gender	# Earned Deg/Cert	# in Cohort	Completion Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
Female	110	550	20.0	Reference Group	
Male	110	586	18.8	94.0	-.03
Unknown	1	6	16.7	83.5	-.08
Total	221	1,142	19.4		

Table D1.A: 2009 – 2010 To 2014 – 2015 Proportion of Students in the Degree/Certificate Completion Cohort and Degree/Certificate Completions by Gender and Proportionality Index.

Gender	Degree/Certificate Cohort		Earned Degree/Certificate		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
Female	550	48.2%	110	49.8%	1.03
Male	586	51.3%	110	49.8%	0.97
Unknown	6	0.5%	1	0.5%	0.86
Total	1,142	100.0%	221	100.0%	

Table D2: 2009 – 2010 To 2014 – 2015 Six Year Degree/Certificate Completion Rate by Ethnicity, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.

Ethnicity	# Earned Deg/Cert	# in Cohort	Completion Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
Asian	14	51	27.5%	Reference Group	
African American	7	40	17.5%	63.8	-.23
Hispanic	71	404	17.6%	64.0	-.25
Native American	2	12	16.7%	60.7	-.25
Pacific Islander	1	3	33.3%	1.2	13
Two or More Races	5	41	12.2%	44.4	-.37
Caucasian	115	557	20.6%	75.2	-.17
Unknown	6	34	17.6%	64.3	-.23
Total	221	1,142	19.4%		

Table D2.A: 2009 – 2010 To 2014 – 2015 Proportion of Students in the Degree/Certificate Completion Cohort and Degree/Certificate Completions by Ethnicity and Proportionality Index.

Ethnicity	Degree/Certificate Cohort		Earned Degree/Certificate		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
Asian	51	4.5	14	6.3	1.419
African American	40	3.5	7	3.2	0.904
Hispanic	404	35.4	71	32.1	0.908
Native American	12	1.1	2	0.9	0.861
Pacific Islander	3	0.3	1	0.5	1.722
Two or More Races	41	3.6	5	2.3	0.630
Caucasian	557	48.8	115	52.0	1.067
Unknown	34	3.0	6	2.7	0.912
Total	1,142	100.0	221	100.0	

Table D3: 2009 – 2010 To 2014 – 2015 Six Year Degree/Certificate Completion Rate by Age, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.

Age	# Earned Deg/Cert	# in Cohort	Completion Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
19 or younger	189	920	20.5	Reference Group	
20-24	13	121	10.7	52.3	-.25
25-29	6	27	22.2	1.08	.04
30-34	3	28	10.7	52.2	-.24
35-39	3	11	27.3	1.33	-.17
40-49	6	24	25.0	1.22	-.11
50 and above	1	11	9.1	44.3	-.28
Total	221	1,142	19.4		

Table D3.A: 2009 – 2010 To 2014 – 2015 Proportion of Students in the Degree/Certificate Completion Cohort and Degree/Certificate Completions by Age and Proportionality Index.

Age	Degree/Certificate Cohort		Earned Degree/Certificate		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
19 or younger	920	80.6	189	85.5	1.062
20-24	121	10.6	13	5.9	0.555
25-29	27	2.4	6	2.7	1.148
30-34	28	2.5	3	1.4	0.554
35-39	11	1.0	3	1.4	1.409
40-49	24	2.1	6	2.7	1.292
50 and above	11	1.0	1	0.5	0.470
Total	1,142	100.0	221	100.0	

Table D4: 2009 – 2010 To 2014 – 2015 Six Year Degree/Certificate Completion Rate by Disability Status, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.

Disability Status	# Earned Deg/Cert	# in Cohort	Completion Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
No	214	1,090	19.6	Reference Group	
Yes	7	52	13.5	68.6	-.16
Total	221	1,142	19.4		

Table D4.A: 2009 – 2010 To 2014 – 2015 Proportion of Students in the Degree/Certificate Completion Cohort and Degree/Certificate Completions by Disability Status and Proportionality Index.

Disability Status	Degree/Certificate Cohort		Earned Degree/Certificate		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
No	1,090	95.4	214	96.8	1.015
Yes	52	4.6	7	3.2	0.696
Total	1,142	100.0	221	100.0	

Table D5: 2009 – 2010 To 2014 – 2015 Six Year Degree/Certificate Completion Rate by Economic Status, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.

Economically Disadvantaged	# Earned Deg/Cert	# in Cohort	Completion Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
No	80	459	17.4	84.4	-.08
Yes	141	683	20.6	Reference Group	
Total	221	1,142	19.4		

Table D5.A: 2009 – 2010 To 2014 – 2015 Proportion of Students in the Degree/Certificate Completion Cohort and Degree/Certificate Completions by Economic Status and Proportionality Index.

Economically Disadvantaged	Degree/Certificate Cohort		Earned Degree/Certificate		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
No	459	40.2	80	36.2	0.901
Yes	683	59.8	141	63.8	1.067
Total	1,142	100.0	221	100.0	

Table D6: 2009 – 2010 To 2014 – 2015 Six Year Degree/Certificate Completion Rate by Foster Youth Status, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.

Foster Youth	# Earned Deg/Cert	# in Cohort	Completion Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
No	220	1,137	19.3	96.7	-.02
Yes	1	5	20.0	Reference Group	
Total	221	1,142	19.4		

Table D6.A: 2009 – 2010 To 2014 – 2015 Proportion of Students in the Degree/Certificate Completion Cohort and Degree/Certificate Completions by Foster Youth Status and Proportionality Index.

Foster Youth	Degree/Certificate Cohort		Earned Degree/Certificate		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
No	1,137	99.6	220	99.5	1.000
Yes	5	0.4	1	0.5	1.033
Total	1,142	100.0	221	100.0	

Table D7: 2009 – 2010 To 2014 – 2015 Six Year Degree/Certificate Completion Rate by Veteran Status, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.

Veteran	# Earned Deg/Cert	# in Cohort	Completion Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
No	212	1,117	19.0	52.7	-.43
Yes	9	25	36.0	Reference Group	
Total	221	1,142	19.4		

Table D7.A: 2009 – 2010 To 2014 – 2015 Proportion of Students in the Degree/Certificate Completion Cohort and Degree/Certificate Completions by Veteran Status and Proportionality Index.

Veteran	Degree/Certificate Cohort		Earned Degree/Certificate		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
No	1,117	97.8	212	95.9	0.981
Yes	25	2.2	9	4.1	1.860
Total	1,142	100.0	221	100.0	

Table D8: 2009 – 2010 To 2014 – 2015 Six Year Degree/Certificate Completion Rate by Non-Resident Status, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.

Non-Resident	# Earned Deg/Cert	# in Cohort	Completion Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
No	216	1,113	19.4	Reference Group	
Yes	5	29	17.2	88.8	-.05
Total	221	1,142	19.4		

Table D8.A: 2009 – 2010 To 2014 – 2015 Proportion of Students in the Degree/Certificate Completion Cohort and Degree/Certificate Completions by Non-Resident Status and Proportionality Index.

Non-Resident	Degree/Certificate Cohort		Earned Degree/Certificate		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
No	1,113	97.5	216	97.7	1.003
Yes	29	2.5	5	2.3	0.891
Total	1,142	100.0	221	100.0	

Table D9: 2009 – 2010 To 2014 – 2015 Six Year Degree/Certificate Completion Rate by EOPS Status, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.

EOPS	# Earned Deg/Cert	# in Cohort	Completion Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
No	195	1,037	18.8	75.9	-.15
Yes	26	105	24.8	Reference Group	
Total	221	1,142	19.4		

Table D9.A: 2009 – 2010 To 2014 – 2015 Proportion of Students in the Degree/Certificate Completion Cohort and Degree/Certificate Completions by EOPS Status and Proportionality Index.

EOPS	Degree/Certificate Cohort		Earned Degree/Certificate		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
No	1,037	90.8	195	88.2	0.972
Yes	105	9.2	26	11.8	1.280
Total	1,142	100.0	221	100.0	

Table D10: 2009 – 2010 To 2014 – 2015 Six Year Degree/Certificate Completion Rate by AB540 Status, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.

AB540	# Earned Deg/Cert	# in Cohort	Completion Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
No	220	1,137	19.3	96.7	-.02
Yes	1	5	20.0	Reference Group	
Total	221	1,142	19.4		

Table D10.A: 2009 – 2010 To 2014 – 2015 Proportion of Students in the Degree/Certificate Completion Cohort and Degree/Certificate Completions by AB540 Status and Proportionality Index.

AB540	Degree/Certificate Cohort		Earned Degree/Certificate		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
No	1,137	99.6	220	99.5	1.000
Yes	5	0.4	1	0.5	1.033
Total	1,142	100.0	221	100.0	

Analysis

Gender: The degree and certificate completion rate was higher for females (20%) than males (19%). However, the difference was not substantial as indicated by the 80% rule, effect size, and proportionality index.

Ethnicity: Asian students had the highest degree and certificate completion rate (28%) and were the reference group. When comparing all of the other ethnic groups to Asians, African American (18%), Hispanic (18%), two or more races (12%), and Unknown (18%) students appear to be disproportionately impacted.

Age: Students 19 years old or younger had the highest degree and certificate completion rate (21%) and were the reference group. When comparing the age groups to students 20 – 24 years old (11%) all three indices indicated that these students were disproportionately impacted when compared to students 19 years old or younger. The students 25 years old or older did not meet the 30 or larger cohort requirement and were not included in the disproportionate impact analysis.

Disability: The degree and certificate completion rate was higher for students not identified as having a disability (20%) than for students identified as having a disability (14%). The 80% rule and proportionality index indicated that students identified with a disability were disproportionately less likely to earn a degree or certificate.

Economically Disadvantaged: The degree and certificate completion rate was higher for students who were identified as being economically disadvantaged (21%) than for students who were not identified as being economically disadvantaged (17%). However, the difference was not substantial as indicated by the 80% rule, effect size, and proportionality index.

Foster Youth: It wasn't possible to identify a large enough sample of foster youth students to analyze disproportionate impact on the degree and certificate completion rate outcome.

Veterans: The degree and certificate completion rate was substantially (Cohen's $d = .43$) higher for students identified as veterans (36%) than for students who were not identified as veterans (19%). However, only 25 veterans were included in the cohort.

Non-Residents: It wasn't possible to identify a large enough sample of non-resident students to analyze disproportionate impact on the degree and certificate completion rate outcome.

EOPS: The degree and certificate completion rate was higher for EOPS students (25%) than for non-EOPS students (19%). EOPS students were identified as the reference group.

AB540: It was not possible to identify a large enough sample of AB540 students to analyze disproportionate impact on the degree and certificate completion rate outcome.

E. TRANSFER

Student Scorecard Measure: The percentage of first-time degree and/or transfer-seeking students (i.e. minimum of 6 units earned who attempted any math or English in the first three years) tracked for six years from 2007-08 to 2012-13 who transferred to a four-year institution.

Table E1: 2009 – 2010 To 2014 – 2015 Six Year Transfer Rate by Gender, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.

Gender	# Transferred	# in Cohort	Transfer Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
Female	158	550	28.7	Reference Group	
Male	160	586	27.3	95.0	-.03
Unknown	2	6	33.3	1.16	.10
Total	320	1,142	28.0		

Table E1.A: 2009 – 2010 To 2014 – 2015 Proportion of Students in the Transfer Cohort and Transfers by Gender and Proportionality Index.

Gender	Transfer Cohort		Transferred		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
Female	550	48.2	158	49.4	1.025
Male	586	51.3	160	50.0	0.974
Unknown	6	0.5	2	0.6	1.190
Total	1,142	100.0	320	100.0	

Table E2: 2009 – 2010 To 2014 – 2015 Six Year Transfer Rate by Ethnicity, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.

Ethnicity	# Transferred	# in Cohort	Transfer Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
Asian	23	51	45.1%	Reference Group	
African American	11	40	27.5%	61.0	-.36
Hispanic	99	404	24.5%	54.3	-.46
Native American	2	12	16.7%	37.0	-.58
Pacific Islander	1	3	33.3%	73.9	-.23
Two or More Races	13	41	31.7%	70.3	-.27
Caucasian	165	557	29.6%	65.7	-.33
Unknown	6	34	17.6%	39.1	-.58
Total	320	1,142	28.0%		

Table E2.A: 2009 – 2010 To 2014 – 2015 Proportion of Students in the Transfer Cohort and Transfers by Ethnicity and Proportionality Index.

Ethnicity	Transfer Cohort		Transferred		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
Asian	51	4.5	23	7.2	1.609
African American	40	3.5	11	3.4	0.981
Hispanic	404	35.4	99	30.9	0.875
Native American	12	1.1	2	0.6	0.595
Pacific Islander	3	0.3	1	0.3	1.190
Two or More Races	41	3.6	13	4.1	1.132
Caucasian	557	48.8	165	51.6	1.057
Unknown	34	3.0	6	1.9	0.630
Total	1,142	100.0	320	100.0	

Table E3: 2009 – 2010 To 2014 – 2015 Six Year Transfer Rate by Age, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.

Age	# Transferred	# in Cohort	Transfer Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
19 or younger	280	920	30.4%	Reference Group	
20-24	26	121	21.5%	70.6	-20
25-29	5	27	18.5%	60.8	-.26
30-34	3	28	10.7%	35.2	-.43
35-39	1	11	9.1%	29.9	-.46
40-49	4	24	16.7%	54.8	-.30
50 and above	1	11	9.1%	29.9	-.46
Total	320	1,142	28.0%		

Table E3.A: 2009 – 2010 To 2014 – 2015 Proportion of Students in the Transfer Cohort and Transfers by Age and Proportionality Index.

Age	Transfer Cohort		Transferred		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
19 or younger	920	80.6	280	87.5	1.086
20-24	121	10.6	26	8.1	0.767
25-29	27	2.4	5	1.6	0.661
30-34	28	2.5	3	0.9	0.382
35-39	11	1.0	1	0.3	0.324
40-49	24	2.1	4	1.3	0.595
50 and above	11	1.0	1	0.3	0.324
Total	1,142	100.0	320	100.0	

Table E4: 2009 – 2010 To 2014 – 2015 Six Year Transfer Rate by Disability Status, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.

Disability Status	# Transferred	# in Cohort	Transfer Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
No	314	1,090	28.8%	Reference Group	
Yes	6	52	11.5%	40.1	-.38
Total	320	1,142	28.0%		

Table E4.A: 2009 – 2010 To 2014 – 2015 Proportion of Students in the Transfer Cohort and Transfers by Disability Status and Proportionality Index.

Disability Status	Transfer Cohort		Transferred		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
No	1,090	95.4	314	98.1	1.028
Yes	52	4.6	6	1.9	0.412
Total	1,142	100.0	320	100.0	

Table D5: 2009 – 2010 To 2014 – 2015 Six Year Transfer Rate by Economic Status, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.

Economically Disadvantaged	# Transferred	# in Cohort	Transfer Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
No	146	459	31.8%	Reference Group	
Yes	174	683	25.5%	80.1	-.14
Total	320	1,142	28.0%		

Table D5.A: 2009 – 2010 To 2014 – 2015 Proportion of Students in the Transfer Cohort and Transfers by Economic Status and Proportionality Index.

Economically Disadvantaged	Transfer Cohort		Transferred		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
No	459	40.2	146	45.6	1.135
Yes	683	59.8	174	54.4	0.909
Total	1,142	100.0	320	100.0	

Table D6: 2009 – 2010 To 2014 – 2015 Six Year Transfer Rate by Foster Youth Status, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.

Foster Youth	# Transferred	# in Cohort	Transfer Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
No	319	1,137	28.1%	Reference Group	
Yes	1	5	20.0%	71.3	-.18
Total	320	1,142	28.0%		

Table D6.A: 2009 – 2010 To 2014 – 2015 Proportion of Students in the Transfer Cohort and Transfers by Foster Youth Status and Proportionality Index.

Foster Youth	Transfer Cohort		Transferred		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
No	1,137	99.6	319	99.7	1.001
Yes	5	0.4	1	0.3	0.714
Total	1,142	100.0	320	100.0	

Table D7: 2009 – 2010 To 2014 – 2015 Six Year Transfer Rate by Veteran Status, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.

Veteran	# Transferred	# in Cohort	Transfer Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
No	311	1,117	27.8%	77.3	-.18
Yes	9	25	36.0%	Reference Group	
Total	320	1,142	28.0%		

Table D7.A: 2009 – 2010 To 2014 – 2015 Proportion of Students in the Transfer Cohort and Transfers by Veteran Status and Proportionality Index.

Veteran	Transfer Cohort		Transferred		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
No	1,117	97.8	311	97.2	0.994
Yes	25	2.2	9	2.8	1.285
Total	1,142	100.0	320	100.0	

Table D8: 2009 – 2010 To 2014 – 2015 Six Year Transfer Rate by Non-Resident Status, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.

Non-Resident	# Transferred	# in Cohort	Transfer Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
No	303	1,113	27.2%	46.4	-.70
Yes	17	29	58.6%	Reference Group	
Total	320	1,142	28.0%		

Table D8.A: 2009 – 2010 To 2014 – 2015 Proportion of Students in the Transfer Cohort and Transfers by Non-Resident Status and Proportionality Index.

Non-Resident	Transfer Cohort		Transferred		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
No	1,113	97.5	303	94.7	0.972
Yes	29	2.5	17	5.3	2.092
Total	1,142	100.0	320	100.0	

Table D9: 2009 – 2010 To 2014 – 2015 Six Year Transfer Rate by EOPS Status, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.

EOPS	# Transferred	# in Cohort	Transfer Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
No	287	1,037	27.7%	88.1	-.08
Yes	33	105	31.4%	Reference Group	
Total	320	1,142	28.0%		

Table D9.A: 2009 – 2010 To 2014 – 2015 Proportion of Students in the Transfer Cohort and Transfers by EOPS Status and Proportionality Index.

EOPS	Transfer Cohort		Transferred		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
No	1,037	90.8	287	89.7	0.988
Yes	105	9.2	33	10.3	1.122
Total	1,142	100.0	320	100.0	

Table D10: 2009 – 2010 To 2014 – Six Year Transfer Rate by AB540 Status, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.

AB540	# Transferred	# in Cohort	Transfer Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
No	317	1,137	27.9%	46.5	-.71
Yes	3	5	60.0%	Reference Group	
Total	320	1,142	28.0%		

Table D10.A: 2009 – 2010 To 2014 – 2015 Proportion of Students in the Transfer Cohort and Transfers by AB540 Status and Proportionality Index.

AB540	Transfer Cohort		Transferred		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
No	1,137	99.6	317	99.1	0.995
Yes	5	0.4	3	0.9	2.141
Total	1,142	100.0	320	100.0	

Analysis

Gender: The transfer rate was higher for females (29%) than males (27%). However, the difference was not substantial as indicated by the 80% rule, effect size, and proportionality index.

Ethnicity: Asian students had the highest transfer rate (45%) and were the reference group. When comparing all of the other ethnic groups to Asians, African American (28%), Hispanic (25%), Two or More Races (32%), Caucasian (30%), and Unknown (18%) students appear to be disproportionately impacted according to both the 80% rule ratio and the effect size index.

Age: Students 19 years old or younger had the highest transfer rate (30%) and were the reference group. When comparing the other age groups to the reference group all three indices indicated that students who were 20 – 24 years old were disproportionately impacted. However, students 19 years old or younger may be more likely to have an educational goal of transfer than students who are 20 – 24 years. The cohorts for students 25 years old or older were not large enough to examine disproportionate impact.

Disability: The transfer rate was substantially higher for students not identified as having a disability (29%) than for students identified as having a disability (12%). All three indices indicated that the difference was substantial.

Economically Disadvantaged: The transfer rate was higher for students who were not identified as being economically disadvantaged (32%) than for students who were identified as being economically disadvantaged (26%). However, the difference was not substantial as indicated by the 80% rule, effect size, and proportionality index.

Foster Youth: It wasn't possible to identify a large enough sample of foster youth students to analyze disproportionate impact on the transfer rate outcome.

Veterans: It wasn't possible to identify a large enough sample of foster youth students to analyze disproportionate impact on the transfer rate outcome. However, the transfer rate was higher for students who were identified as veterans (36%) than for students who were identified as not being a veteran (28%).

Non-Residents: It wasn't possible to identify a large enough sample of non-resident students to analyze disproportionate impact on the transfer rate outcome. However, the transfer rate was substantially (Cohen's $d = .70$) higher for non-residents (59%) than for residents (27%).

EOPS: The transfer rate was higher for EOPS students (31%) than for non-EOPS students (28%). EOPS students were identified as the reference group.

AB540: It wasn't possible to identify a large enough sample of AB540 students to analyze disproportionate impact on the transfer rate outcome. However, the transfer rate was substantially (Cohen's $d = .71$) higher for AB540 students (60%) than for students who were not identified as AB540 students (28%).

References

Michalowski, L. (2014). *Updated student equity plan*. California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (CCCCO).