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## Executive Summary

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Foothill College is committed to assuring student equity in its instructional programs and support services. The college serves 13,184 students (fall 2014 census) and reaches these students through courses offered primarily at the main campus in Los Altos Hills and the Middlefield education center in Palo Alto, using face-to-face, hybrid and online formats. Per the college mission, the institution seeks to "offer educational excellence to diverse students seeking transfer, career preparation and enhancement and basic skills mastery." The Foothill College Student Equity Plan documents the efforts to provide a learning environment that is welcoming, supportive and accessible, and to ensure that all students have an equal opportunity to experience success in achieving their academic goals. One primary goals of the Student Equity Plan is to close performance gaps for targeted groups, thereby improving the overall success of all students at Foothill College.

Foothill's Student Equity Plan reviews five key indicators:

1) Access-The percentage of each population group that is enrolled compared to that group's representation in the adult population within the community served. This percentage is frequently calculated as a participation rate;
2) Course Completion (Retention)- The ratio of the number of credit courses that students, by population group, complete compared to the number of courses in which students in that group are enrolled on the census day of the term;
3) ESL and Basic Skills Completion- The ratio of the number of students by population group who complete a degree-applicable course after having completed the final ESL or basic skills course compared to the number of those students who complete such a final ESL or basic skills course;
4) Degree and Certificate Completion- The ratio of the number of students by population group who receive a degree or certificate to the number of students in that group with the same informed matriculation goal as documented in the student educational plan developed with a counselor/advisor; and
5) Transfer-The ratio of the number of students by population group who complete a minimum of 12 units and have attempted a transfer level course in mathematics or English, to the number of students in that group who actually transfer after one or more (up to six) years.

Upon review of data sources such as the Student Success Scorecard, DataMart, and Data on Demand, as well as local college data, these indicators are reviewed to determine whether disproportionate impact occurs, indicating whether certain student population groups experience different rates of success. Instances of disproportionate impact are reviewed and discussed to determine how to mitigate these gaps in outcomes achievement. Identification of activities and goals document the student equity objectives, and include performance measures for determining progress toward achieving the desired outcomes.

## Target Groups

Foothill College's current targeted groups, as identified in the college's Education Strategic Master Plan, are African-American, Hispanic/Latino, and Filipino/Pacific Islander students. The data analysis performed in the development of the 2014 Student Equity Plan confirmed the necessity of focusing on these ethnic groups as it revealed significant achievement gaps that particularly affect African-American, Hispanic/Latino, and Filipino/Pacific Islander students.

## Goals

While there is much work to be done in all areas, the Student Equity Workgroup has decided to focus its immediate attention on increasing course completion rates for these three ethnic groups and on collaborating with the Office of Institutional Research and Planning (IR\&P), and related departments to better understand how to improve sequence completion rates in ESL and Basic Skills English and Math. The expectation is that what is learned from the efforts to increase the success rates for these three ethnic groups can be applied to help all students in the future.

The Student Equity Workgroup proposes that in the first three-year period from 2014-2015 through 2016-2017, the entire campus will work to achieve a three-percentage point increase in course completion success rates for African American, Hispanic/Latino and Filipino/Pacific Islander students over fall 2013 figures.

Other high-priority goals in the Student Equity Plan focus on additional research and collaboration that is needed to inform future goals and implementation efforts. The primary research and collaborations goals are to: (1) coordinate with IR\&P to gather more data to better understand the course success rates and probation rates for African-American, Hispanic/Latino and Filipino/Pacific Islander students and explore possible causes and/or correlations for the disproportionate impacts; (2) coordinate with IR\&P to understand why males are more likely to end up on probation even though there is relative parity in the course success rates for males and females; (3) coordinate with IR\&P and other campus departments to identify possible reasons why African American, Hispanic/Latino, and Filipino/Pacific Islander students and students aged 20-24 experience disproportionate impact as they attempt to complete Basic Skills English and Math or ESL courses sequences; and (4) identify, support and build on efforts already being implemented to mitigate disproportionate impact in these programs.

The primary goal of increasing course completion success rates for these three ethnic groups will immediately and directly reduce the achievement gap and disproportionate impact on campus (as related to the indicators reviewed in this report). The research and collaboration goals will generate the information needed to develop and implement future plans and goals that will ultimately improve the completion rates in Basic Skills English, Math and ESL courses.

## Activities

ACTIVITY B.1: Course Completion

## Year 1

High Priority

- Identify specific activities that will increase the course success rates of AfricanAmerican, Hispanic/Latino and Filipino/Pacific Islander students by 3\% within three (3) years over fall 2013 figures.
- Collaborate with the Program Review Committee to identify programs/disciplines with low success rates for African-American, Hispanic/Latino, and Filipino/Pacific Islander students. Help program faculty, staff and administrators to identify potential interventions and create a plan for increasing the success of these students.
- Work with the President's Office to determine whether Foothill College can participate in the Student Equity Scorecard through the USC Center for Urban Excellence.
- Collaborate with IR\&P to formulate an equity research plan that will answer the following questions:
- What are the possible causes and/or correlations for the decreased course success and increased probation rates for African-American, Hispanic/Latino, Pacific Islander and Filipino students?
- What effect, if any, does course delivery modality (e.g. face-to-face, hybrid, online) have on these rates?
- What effect, if any, does the course discipline have on these rates?
- What effect, if any, does a student's completion of English or math have on these rates?
- What effect, if any, does the number of hours a student work have on these rates?
- Which courses, modalities and disciplines have high success rates? Which factors contribute to those success rates?
- What do students think will help them be more successful at Foothill College?
- Are there specific things that faculty, staff and administrators can do to support student success?
- Conduct a literature review to identify teaching and learning practices that promote course success. In particular, the Student Equity Workgroup will identify strategies that are feasible for short- and/or long-term piloting at Foothill.


## Medium Priority

- The Student Equity Workgroup may consider sending at least one representative to:
- the RP Group's (The Research \& Planning Group for California Community Colleges) Student Success Conference in October 2014
- the Association of American Colleges and Universities annual meeting


## Year 2

- Implement research agenda and then identify specific goals and activities based on new data.
- Implement activities to increase the course success rates of African-American, Hispanic/Latino and Filipino/Pacific Islander students by three-percentage points over fall 2013 figures.


## Year 3

- Start implementing new goals based on new data.
- Evaluate the effectiveness of activities designed to increase the course success rates of African-American, Hispanic/Latino and Filipino/Pacific Islander students by threepercentage points over fall 2013 figures.


## ACTIVITY C.1: ESL and Basic Skills Completion

Year 1

- Coordinate with IR\&P to develop a research project to understand why AfricanAmerican, Hispanic/Latino, Filipino/Pacific Islander students and students aged 20-24 experience disproportionate impact when attempting to complete ESL and Basic Skills course sequences.
- Collaborate with math, English and ESLL faculty to understand barriers to success in these programs, identify current intervention efforts, and identify how the Student Equity Workgroup can support and build on these efforts.


## Year 2

- Implement research agenda and then identify specific goals and activities based on new data.


## Year 3

- Start implementing new goals based on new data.
- Evaluate the effectiveness of activities selected in year 2.


## Resources

The Office of the President initially allocated $\$ 5,000$ to the Student Equity Workgroup at its inception (fall 2013) to assist with student equity initiatives. Governor Jerry Brown and the California State Legislature provided $\$ 70$ million in the 2014-15 Budget Act to establish the Student Equity program "in order to ensure equal educational opportunities and to promote student success for all students, regardless of race, gender, age, disability, or economic circumstances." Foothill College's allocation for 2014-15 will be $\$ 446,248$, to be spent on equity initiatives by the end of the first quarter of 2015-16. In addition, Basic Skills Initiative funding and Student Success and Support Program (SB1456) resources will be used in collaboration with the Student Equity allocation toward identified activities that support the Student Equity Plan goals.

## Contact Person/Student Equity Coordinator(s)

The Student Equity Workgroup tri-chairs, which include April Henderson (EOPS Services Coordinator), Hilda Fernandez (English Instructor) and Paul Starer (Dean of Language Arts \& the Learning Resource Center), along with Foothill College's Associate Vice President of Instruction, Andrew LaManque, serve as the primary contacts for the Student Equity Plan.

Contact information:
April Henderson (hendersonapril@fhda.edu)
Hilda Fernandez (fernandezhilda@fhda.edu)
Andrew LaManque (lamanqueandrew@fhda.edu)
Paul Starer (starerpaul@fhda.edu)

## Campus-Based Research

## CAMPUS-BASED RESEARCH

## Overview

"Success indicators" or metrics are used to identify and measure areas for which various student population groups may be impacted by issues of equal opportunity and disproportionate impact. In 2001, the Board of Governors identified the following five student equity success indicators:
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.

## Access: Data and Analysis by ETHNICITY

Figure A-1. Santa Clara County Adult Population and Foothill Students by Ethnicity, 2013


Source: CA Dept of Finance Population Projects, P-3 Report; FHDA IR\&P FH Fall 2013 Factsheet

## Analysis:

The percentage of Foothill students identifying as African-American and Native American is higher than the percentage of the Santa Clara County adult population. Asian/Filipino/Pacific Islander representation is equal to the county population while Hispanic/Latino and White representation is slightly lower than the corresponding adult population.

Table A-2. Foothill College Adult Population and Student Enrollment by Ethnicity, 2013

|  | Adult Count | Adult Rate | Student Count | Student Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African American | 38,070 | $2.77 \%$ | 770 | $6.17 \%$ |
| Asian/Filipino/PI | 464,553 | $33.76 \%$ | 4,252 | $34.07 \%$ |
| Latino/a | 352,509 | $25.62 \%$ | 2,921 | $23.41 \%$ |
| Native American | 3,283 | $0.24 \%$ | 102 | $0.82 \%$ |
| White | 517,436 | $37.61 \%$ | 4,435 | $35.54 \%$ |
| Total | $1,375,85 \mathrm{I}$ | $100.00 \%$ | 12,480 | $100.00 \%$ |

Note: Multi-ethnic and unknown/unreported not reported to maintain consistency between Santa Clara County and Foothill figures. Adult population is defined as age 18 and older.
Source: CA Dept of Finance Population Projects, P-3 Report; FHDA IR\&P FH Fall 2013 Factsheet

Table A-3. Foothill College Proportionality Index of Student Enrollment by Ethnicity, 2013

|  | Adult Count \% Student Count \% | Population <br> Proportionality |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African American | $2.77 \%$ | $6.17 \%$ | 2.23 |
| Asian/Filipino/PI | $33.76 \%$ | $34.07 \%$ | 1.01 |
| Latino/a | $25.62 \%$ | $23.41 \%$ | 0.91 |
| Native American | $0.24 \%$ | $0.82 \%$ | 3.43 |
| White | $37.61 \%$ | $35.54 \%$ | 0.94 |

Source: CA Dept of Finance Population Projects, P-3 Report; FHDA IR\&P FH Fall 2013 Factsheet

## Analysis:

The proportionality index shows that while African-American and Native American students are overrepresented with respect to the college service area, campus enrollment is mostly proportionate to the Santa Clara County population. The district service area includes Los Altos, Los Altos Hills, Mountain View, Palo Alto, Sunnyvale and Cupertino. Although Hispanic/Latino students are underrepresented in comparison to the Santa Clara County, they are slightly overrepresented compared to the district service area.

Table A-4. Foothill College Student Enrollment and 80\% Index by Ethnicity, 2012-13

|  | Adult Count | Student Rate | Population Rate | $80 \%$ index |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African American | $\mathbf{3 8 , 0 7 0}$ | 770 | $\mathbf{2 . 0 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ |
| Asian/Filipino/PI | 464,553 | 4,252 | $0.92 \%$ | 0.45 |
| Latino/a | 352,509 | 2,921 | $0.83 \%$ | 0.41 |
| White | 517,436 | 4,435 | $0.86 \%$ | 0.42 |

Note: Removed Native Americans as reference group because counts are small ( $\mathrm{FH} \mathrm{N}=102$ ).
Source: CA Dept of Finance Population Projects, P-3 Report; FHDA IR\&P FH Fall 2013 Factsheet

## Analysis:

Although the $80 \%$ index indicates that student enrollment by ethnicity is mostly proportionate to the service area, the $80 \%$ index may not be the best indicator here as the reference group is overrepresented by about $50 \%$ relative to its population in the county.

## Access: Data and Analysis by GENDER

Table A-5. Foothill College Enrollment and Financial Aid Counts and Percentages by Gender, 2012-13

|  | Student <br> Count | Student <br> Rate | Financial Aid <br> Count | Financial <br> Aid <br> Percent |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 14,273 | $52.67 \%$ | 3,921 | $58.33 \%$ |
| Male | 12,824 | $47.33 \%$ | 2,801 | $41.67 \%$ |
| Total | 27,097 | $100.00 \%$ | 6,722 | $100.00 \%$ |

Source: FHDA IR\&P, ODS

Table A-6. Foothill College Proportionality Index of Financial Aid Rates by Gender, 2012-13

|  | Student \% | Financial Aid \% | Financial Aid <br> Proportionality |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | $52.67 \%$ | $58.33 \%$ | I.II |
| Male | $47.33 \%$ | $41.67 \%$ | 0.88 |

Source: FHDA IR\&P, ODS

## Analysis:

The proportionality index shows that males are somewhat underrepresented among financial aid recipients.

Table A-7. Foothill College Financial Aid and 80\% Index by Gender, 2012-13

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Financial <br> Aid Count | Financial Aid <br> Rate | $80 \%$ index |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | $\mathbf{1 4 , 2 7 3}$ | $\mathbf{3 , 9 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ |
| Male | 12,824 | 2,801 | $71.44 \%$ | 0.71 |

Source: FHDA IR\&P, ODS

## Analysis:

The $80 \%$ index also shows that males are somewhat underrepresented among financial aid recipients. It is unclear whether this is an area of concern, however, as male students are not a historically underrepresented group and there are many external factors--such as parents' income--that determines financial aid eligibility.

Table A-8. Foothill College Enrollment and Financial Aid Counts and Percentages by Ethnicity, 2012-13

|  | Student <br> Count | Student <br> Rate | Financial Aid Count | Financial Aid Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African American | 1470 | 5.42\% | 760 | 11.31\% |
| American Indian | 197 | 0.73\% | 57 | 0.85\% |
| Asian | 7,010 | 25.87\% | 1,536 | 22.85\% |
| Filipino | 1175 | 4.34\% | 372 | 5.53\% |
| Hispanic | 5,234 | 19.32\% | 2,007 | 29.86\% |
| Pacific Islander | 301 | 1.11\% | 136 | 2.02\% |
| White | 10,104 | 37.29\% | 1,635 | 24.32\% |
| Unknown | 1,606 | 5.93\% | 219 | 3.26\% |
| Total | 27,097 | 100.00\% | 6,722 | 100.00\% |

Source: FHDA IR\&P, ODS

Table A-9. Foothill College Proportionality Index of Financial Aid Rates by Ethnicity, 2012-13

|  | Student \% | Financial Ald \% | Financial Aid <br> Proportionality |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African American | $5.42 \%$ | $11.31 \%$ | 2.08 |
| American Indian | $0.73 \%$ | $0.85 \%$ | 1.17 |
| Asian | $25.87 \%$ | $22.85 \%$ | 0.88 |
| Filipino | $4.34 \%$ | $5.53 \%$ | 1.28 |
| Hispanic | $19.32 \%$ | $29.86 \%$ | 1.55 |
| Pacific Islander | $1.11 \%$ | $2.02 \%$ | 1.82 |
| White | $37.29 \%$ | $24.32 \%$ | 0.65 |
| Unknown | $5.93 \%$ | $3.26 \%$ | 0.55 |

Source: FHDA IR\&P, ODS

## Analysis:

The proportionality index shows that historically underrepresented groups are accessing financial aid at rates above their representation in the overall student population. Even though the proportionality index is below 1 for Asian, White and Unknown students, there most likely is not disproportionate impact occurring in this case because financial aid eligibility is determined by family income and citizenship status. Speculations about the differences in access to financial aid may reflect that many of the college's students--especially Hispanic/Latino and AfricanAmerican students--are coming from outside of the service area, which has a higher average income than many other cities in Santa Clara County.

Table A-10. Foothill College Financial Aid and 80\% Index by Ethnicity, 2012-13

|  | Student <br> Count | Financial Aid <br> Count | Financial Aid <br> Rate | 80\% index |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African American | 1470 | 760 | $\mathbf{5 1 . 7 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ |
| American Indian | 197 | 57 | $28.93 \%$ | 0.56 |
| Asian | 7,010 | 1,536 | $21.91 \%$ | 0.42 |
| Filipino | 1175 | 372 | $31.66 \%$ | 0.61 |
| Hispanic | 5,234 | 2,007 | $38.35 \%$ | 0.74 |
| Pacific Islander | 301 | 136 | $45.18 \%$ | 0.87 |
| White | 10,104 | 1,635 | $16.18 \%$ | 0.31 |
| Unknown | 1,606 | 219 | $13.64 \%$ | 0.26 |

Source: FHDA IR\&P, ODS


#### Abstract

Analysis: The $80 \%$ index shows that historically underrepresented groups are accessing financial aid at rates above their representation in the overall student population. However, this may not be an area of concern because financial aid eligibility is determined by family income and citizenship status.


## CAMPUS-BASED RESEARCH

B. COURSE COMPLETION. Ratio of the number of credit courses that students by population group actually complete by the end of the term compared to the number of courses in which students in that group are enrolled on the census day of the term.

## Course Completion: Data and Analysis by GENDER

Table B-1. Foothill College Cohort and Course Completion Counts and Percentages by Gender, Fall 2013

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Enrollment <br> Rate | Success Count | Success <br> Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 17,223 | $50.19 \%$ | 13,015 | $50.77 \%$ |
| Male | 16,842 | $49.08 \%$ | 12,414 | $48.42 \%$ |
| Unknown | 248 | $0.72 \%$ | 207 | $0.81 \%$ |
| Total | 34,313 | $100.00 \%$ | 25,636 | $100.00 \%$ |

Source: CCCCO Data Mart

Table B-2. Foothill College Proportionality Index of Course Completion Rates by Gender, Fall 2013
$\begin{array}{lcc}\text { Cohort \% Success \% } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Completion } \\ \text { Proportionality }\end{array}\end{array}$

| Female | $50.19 \%$ | $50.77 \%$ | 1.01 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | $49.08 \%$ | $48.42 \%$ | 0.99 |
| Unknown | $0.72 \%$ | $0.81 \%$ | 1.12 |

Source: CCCCO Data Mart

## Analysis:

While the proportionality index shows that those students with an Unknown gender are more likely to complete their course(s) compared to females and males, the rate of completion for all three groups are fairly comparable, suggesting that there is no disproportionate impact.

Table B-3. Foothill College Course Completion Rates and 80\% Index by Gender, Fall 2013

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Success <br> Count | Success Rate | 80\%index |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 17,223 | 13,015 | $75.57 \%$ | 0.91 |
| Male | 16,842 | 12,414 | $73.71 \%$ | 0.88 |
| Unknown | $\mathbf{2 4 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{8 3 . 4 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ |
| Source $\cdot$ CCCCO | Data Mart |  |  |  |

Source: CCCCO Data Mart

## Analysis:

The $80 \%$ index also shows that those students with an Unknown gender are more likely to complete their course(s) compared to females and males; hence, the unknown group serves as the reference group. In comparison to the reference group, both females and males met the $80 \%$ threshold, suggesting there is no disproportionate impact.

## Course Completion: Data and Analysis by ETHNICITY

Table B-4. Foothill College Course Completion Counts and Percentages by Ethnicity, Fall 2013

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Enrollment <br> Rate | Success Count | Success <br> Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African-American | 1,429 | $4.16 \%$ | 778 | $3.03 \%$ |
| American Indian | 78 | $0.23 \%$ | 63 | $0.25 \%$ |
| Asian | 9,229 | $26.90 \%$ | 7,269 | $28.35 \%$ |
| Hispanic | 7,697 | $22.43 \%$ | 5,121 | $19.98 \%$ |
| Multi-Ethnicity | 1,811 | $5.28 \%$ | 1,272 | $4.96 \%$ |
| Pacific Islander | 346 | $1.01 \%$ | 193 | $0.75 \%$ |
| Unknown | 2,572 | $7.50 \%$ | 2,149 | $8.38 \%$ |
| White Non-Hispanic | 11,151 | $32.50 \%$ | 8,791 | $34.29 \%$ |
| Total | 34,313 | $100.00 \%$ | 25,636 | $100.00 \%$ |

Source: CCCCO Data Mart

Table B-5. Foothill College Proportionality Index of Course Completion Rates by Ethnicity, Fall 2013

| Cohort \% | Success \% | Completion |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Proportionality |  |  |


| African-American | $4.16 \%$ | $3.03 \%$ | 0.73 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| American Indian | $0.23 \%$ | $0.25 \%$ | 1.08 |
| Asian | $26.90 \%$ | $28.35 \%$ | 1.05 |
| Hispanic | $22.43 \%$ | $19.98 \%$ | 0.89 |
| Multi-Ethnicity | $5.28 \%$ | $4.96 \%$ | 0.94 |
| Pacific Islander | $1.01 \%$ | $0.75 \%$ | 0.75 |
| Unknown | $7.50 \%$ | $8.38 \%$ | 1.12 |
| White Non-Hispanic | $32.50 \%$ | $34.29 \%$ | 1.06 |

Source: CCCCO Data Mart

## Analysis:

The proportionality index shows that students of African-American and Pacific Islander descent are significantly less likely to successfully complete their courses relative to students of other ethnicities. Hispanic/Latino students are also less likely to complete courses successfully with a proportionality rate of 0.89 . These data suggest that African-American and Pacific Islander students are being disproportionately impacted in a negative way, and that Hispanic/Latino students may be as well.

Students who identify themselves as American Indian, Asian, White or Unknown descent are slightly more likely to succeed; however, their rates are comparable suggesting no disproportionate impact among these four groups.

Table B-6. Foothill College Course Completion Rates and 80\% Index by Ethnicity, Fall 2013

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Success Count | Success Rate | 80\%index |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African-American | 1,429 | 778 | $54.44 \%$ | 0.65 |
| American Indian | 78 | 63 | $80.77 \%$ | 0.97 |
| Asian | 9,229 | 7,269 | $78.76 \%$ | 0.94 |
| Hispanic | 7,697 | 5,121 | $66.53 \%$ | 0.80 |
| Multi-Ethnicity | 1,811 | 1,272 | $70.24 \%$ | 0.84 |
| Pacific Islander | 346 | 193 | $55.78 \%$ | 0.67 |
| Unknown | $\mathbf{2 , 5 7 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 1 4 9}$ | $\mathbf{8 3 . 5 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ |
| White Non-Hispanic | 11,151 | 8,791 | $\mathbf{7 8 . 8 4 \%}$ | 0.94 |

Source: CCCCO Data Mart

## Analysis:

The $80 \%$ index shows that the course success rates by ethnicity are highest among the Unknown ethnicity and thus they serve as the reference group. African-American and Pacific Islander students fall well below the $80 \%$ marker at 0.65 and 0.67 , respectively. Hispanic/Latino students are at 0.80 , and should be included as one of the groups experiencing a disproportionate impact in course success.

## Course Completion: Data and Analysis by AGE

Table B-7. Foothill College Course Completion Counts and Percentages by Age, Fall 2013

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Enrollment <br> Rate | Success <br> Count | Success <br> Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19 and under | 9,833 | $28.66 \%$ | 7,469 | $29.13 \%$ |
| $20-24$ | 12,979 | $37.83 \%$ | 9,138 | $35.65 \%$ |
| $25-49$ | 10,269 | $29.93 \%$ | 8,022 | $31.29 \%$ |
| 50 and older | 1,232 | $3.59 \%$ | 1,007 | $3.93 \%$ |
| Total | 34,313 | $100.00 \%$ | 25,636 | $100.00 \%$ |

Source: CCCCO Data Mart

Table B-8. Foothill College Proportionality Index of Course Completion Rates by Age, Fall 2013

|  | Cohort \% | Success \% | Completion <br> Proportionality |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19 and under | $28.66 \%$ | $29.13 \%$ | 1.02 |
| $20-24$ | $37.83 \%$ | $35.65 \%$ | 0.94 |
| $25-49$ | $29.93 \%$ | $31.29 \%$ | 1.05 |
| 50 and older | $3.59 \%$ | $3.93 \%$ | 1.09 |

Source: CCCCO Data Mart

## Analysis:

The proportionality index indicates that all age cohorts have similar completion rates, suggesting that there is no disproportionate impact occurring.

Table B-9. Foothill College Course Completion Rates and 80\% Index by Age, Fall 2013

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Success Count | Success Rate | $80 \%$ index |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19 and under | 9,833 | 7,469 | $75.96 \%$ | 0.93 |
| $20-24$ | 12,979 | 9,138 | $70.41 \%$ | 0.86 |
| $25-49$ | 10,269 | 8,022 | $78.12 \%$ | 0.96 |
| 50 and older | 1,232 | 1,007 | $81.74 \%$ | 1.00 |
| Source: CCCCO Data Mart |  |  |  |  |

## Analysis:

Students in the 50+ age cohort have the highest success and thus serve as the reference group for the $80 \%$ index analysis. Although students ages 20-24 have a slightly lower success rate relative to the students in the other cohorts, their rate is still well above the $80 \%$ threshold at 0.86 . This is an area to watch moving forward, but as it does not appear to experience disproportionate impact, it does not seem warrant significant attention at this point.

## Probation: Data and Analysis by GENDER

Table B-10. Foothill College Enrollment and Probation Counts and Percentages by Gender, Fall 2013

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Enrollment <br> Rate | Probation Count | Probation <br> Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 7,242 | $54.31 \%$ | 248 | $46.01 \%$ |
| Male | 6,093 | $45.69 \%$ | 291 | $53.99 \%$ |
| Tota | 13,335 | $100.00 \%$ | 539 | $100.00 \%$ |

Source: FHDA IR\&P, ODS
Table B-11. Foothill College Proportionality Index of Probation Rates by Gender, Fall 2013

|  | Cohort \% | Probation \% | Probation <br> Proportionality |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | $54.31 \%$ | $46.01 \%$ | 0.85 |
| Male | $45.69 \%$ | $53.99 \%$ | 1.18 |

Source: FHDA IR\&P, ODS

## Analysis:

The proportionality index shows that male students are on probation at a rate significantly higher than that of female students.

Table B-12. Foothill College Probation Rates and 80\% Index by Gender, Fall 2013

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Probation <br> Count | Probation Rate | 80\%index |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Femde | 7,242 | 248 | $3.42 \%$ | 0.72 |
| Male | $\mathbf{6 , 0 9 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 9 1}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 7 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

Source: FHDA IR\&P, ODS

## Analysis:

As males have a higher rate of probation, they serve as the reference group for the $80 \%$ index analysis, indicating that female students are less likely on probation in comparison. This finding suggests that males are on probation at a rate disproportionately higher than are females. It is also interesting that this discrepancy was not as pronounced in the course success data.

Probation: Data and Analysis by ETHNICITY
Table B-13. Foothill College Enrollment and Probation Counts and Percentages by Ethnicity, Fall 2013

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Enrollment <br> Rate | Probation Count | Probation <br> Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African American | 770 | $5.77 \%$ | 56 | $10.39 \%$ |
| American Indian | 102 | $0.76 \%$ | 2 | $0.37 \%$ |
| Asian | 3,361 | $25.20 \%$ | 82 | $15.21 \%$ |
| Filipino | 699 | $5.24 \%$ | 37 | $6.86 \%$ |
| Hispanic | 2,922 | $21.91 \%$ | 198 | $36.73 \%$ |
| Pacific Islander | 192 | $1.44 \%$ | 17 | $3.15 \%$ |
| White | 4,430 | $33.22 \%$ | 125 | $23.19 \%$ |
| Unknown | 859 | $6.44 \%$ | 22 | $4.08 \%$ |
| Total | 13,335 | $100.00 \%$ | 539 | $100.00 \%$ |

Source: FHDA IR\&P, ODS

Table B-14. Foothill College Proportionality Index of Probation Rates by Ethnicity, Fall 2013

|  | Enrollment \% | Probation \% | Probation <br> Proportionality |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African American | $5.77 \%$ | $10.39 \%$ | 1.80 |
| American Indian | $0.76 \%$ | $0.37 \%$ | 0.49 |
| Asian | $25.20 \%$ | $15.21 \%$ | 0.60 |
| Filipino | $5.24 \%$ | $6.86 \%$ | 1.31 |
| Hispanic | $21.91 \%$ | $36.73 \%$ | 1.68 |
| Pacific Islander | $1.44 \%$ | $3.15 \%$ | 2.19 |
| White | $33.22 \%$ | $23.19 \%$ | 0.70 |
| Unknown | $6.44 \%$ | $4.08 \%$ | 0.63 |
| Source: FHDA IR\&P, ODS |  |  |  |

## Analysis:

The proportionality index reveals that Pacific Islander students are on probation far more than other groups. African-American and Hispanic/Latino students are also on probation at relatively higher rates, which indicates disproportionate impact. While Filipinos experience disproportionately higher rates of probation, this disparity is less pronounced compared the other two targeted student groups, but still warrants attention.

Table B-15. Foothill College Probation Rates and 80\% Index by Ethnicity, Fall 2013

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Probation <br> Count | Probation Rate | 80\%index |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African American | 770 | 56 | $7.27 \%$ | 0.82 |
| American Indian | 102 | 2 | $1.96 \%$ | 0.22 |
| Asian | 3,361 | 82 | $2.44 \%$ | 0.28 |
| Filipino | 699 | 37 | $5.29 \%$ | 0.60 |
| Hispanic | 2,922 | 198 | $6.78 \%$ | 0.77 |
| Pacific Islander | 192 | $\mathbf{1 7}$ | $\mathbf{8 . 8 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |
| White | 4,430 | 125 | $2.82 \%$ | 0.32 |
| Unknown | 859 | 22 | $2.56 \%$ | 0.29 |
| Source: FHDA IR\&P, ODS |  |  |  |  |

## Analysis:

The $80 \%$ index also reveals that Pacific Islander students are on probation far more than other groups while African-American and Hispanic/Latino students are also on probation at relatively higher rates, which indicates disproportionate impact. While Filipinos experience disproportionately higher rates of probation, this disparity is less pronounced compared the other targeted student groups, but still warrants attention.

## CAMPUS-BASED RESEARCH

C. ESL and BASIC SKILLS COMPLETION. Ratio of the number of students by population group who complete a degree-applicable course after having completed the final ESL or basic skills course compared to the number of those students who complete such a final course.

## ESL Completion: Data and Analysis by GENDER

Table C-1. Foothill College ESL Cohort and Completion Counts and Percentages by Gender

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Enrollment <br> Rate | Success Count | Success <br> Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 220 | $60.27 \%$ | 94 | $63.51 \%$ |
| Male | 145 | $39.73 \%$ | 54 | $36.49 \%$ |
| Tota | 365 | $100.00 \%$ | 148 | $100.00 \%$ |

Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)

Table C-2. Foothill College Proportionality Index of ESL Completion Rates by Gender

|  | Cohort \% | Success \% | Completion <br> Proportionality |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | $60.27 \%$ | $63.51 \%$ | 1.05 |
| Male | $39.73 \%$ | $36.49 \%$ | 0.92 |
| Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort) |  |  |  |

## Analysis:

The proportionality index shows that the rate of ESL course completion for both genders is comparable, which suggests there is no disproportionate impact.

Table C-3. Foothill College ESL Completion Rates and 80\% Index by Gender

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Success <br> Count | Success Rate | 80\%index |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | $\mathbf{2 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{9 4}$ | $\mathbf{4 2 . 7 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |
| Made | 145 | 54 | $37.24 \%$ | 0.87 |
| Source: 2013 Student Suceess Scorecard (2006-07 cohort) |  |  |  |  |

## Analysis:

The $80 \%$ index also shows that the rate of ESL course completion for both genders is comparable, which suggests there is no disproportionate impact.

## ESL Completion: Data and Analysis by ETHNICITY

Table C-4. Foothill College ESL Cohort and Completion Counts and Percentages by Ethnicity

|  | Enrollment |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Count | Enrollment <br> Rate | Success Count | Success <br> Rate |
| African American | 4 | $1.10 \%$ | 1 | $0.68 \%$ |
| American Indian | 1 | $0.27 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Asian | 148 | $40.55 \%$ | 89 | $60.14 \%$ |
| Filipino | 2 | $0.55 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Hispanic | 134 | $36.71 \%$ | 31 | $20.95 \%$ |
| Pacific Islander | 2 | $0.55 \%$ | 1 | $0.68 \%$ |
| White | 52 | $14.25 \%$ | 18 | $12.16 \%$ |
| Unknown | 22 | $6.03 \%$ | 8 | $5.41 \%$ |
| Total | 365 | $100.00 \%$ | 148 | $100.00 \%$ |
| Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort) |  |  |  |  |

Table C-5. Foothill College Proportionality Index of ESL Completion Rates by Ethnicity

|  | Cohort \% | Success \% | Completion <br> Proportionality |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African American | $1.10 \%$ | $0.68 \%$ | 0.62 |
| American Indian | $0.27 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | 0.00 |
| Asian | $40.55 \%$ | $60.14 \%$ | 1.48 |
| Filipino | $0.55 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | 0.00 |
| Hispanic | $36.71 \%$ | $20.95 \%$ | 0.57 |
| Pacific Islander | $0.55 \%$ | $0.68 \%$ | 1.23 |
| White | $14.25 \%$ | $12.16 \%$ | 0.85 |
| Unknown | $6.03 \%$ | $5.41 \%$ | 0.90 |

Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)

## Analysis:

The proportionality index shows that the rate of completion for Asian, White and Unknown students are more likely to successfully complete ESL courses while all other ethnic groups are well below .80 ; this finding suggests there is a disproportionate impact.

Table C-6. Foothill College ESL Completion Rates and 80\% Index by Ethnicity

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Success <br> Count | Success Rate | 80\%index |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African American | 4 | 1 | $25.00 \%$ | 0.42 |
| American Indian | $\mathbf{1}$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.00 |
| Asian | $\mathbf{1 4 8}$ | $\mathbf{8 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 . 1 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ |
| Filipino | 2 | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.00 |
| Hispanic | 134 | 31 | $23.13 \%$ | 0.38 |
| Pacific Islander | 2 | 1 | $50.00 \%$ | 0.83 |
| White | 52 | 18 | $34.62 \%$ | 0.58 |
| Unknown | 22 | 8 | $36.36 \%$ | 0.60 |
| Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort) |  |  |  |  |

## Analysis:

The $80 \%$ index shows that in comparison to the reference group, Asian students serves as the reference group, indicating there is significant disproportionate impact for African-American, Hispanic/Latino, White and Unknown students, as they do not meet the $80 \%$ threshold.

## ESL Completion: Data and Analysis by AGE

Table C-7. Foothill College ESL Cohort and Completion Counts and Percentages by Age

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Enrollment <br> Rate | Success Count | Success <br> Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19 and under | 86 | $23.56 \%$ | 63 | $42.57 \%$ |
| $20-24$ | 92 | $25.21 \%$ | 45 | $30.41 \%$ |
| $25-49$ | 168 | $46.03 \%$ | 40 | $27.03 \%$ |
| 50 and older | 19 | $5.21 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Tota | 365 | $100.00 \%$ | 148 | $100.00 \%$ |

Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)
Table C-8. Foothill College Proportionality Index of ESL Completion Rates by Age

|  | Cohort \% | Success \% | Completion <br> Proportiondity |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19 and under | $23.56 \%$ | $42.57 \%$ | 1.81 |
| $20-24$ | $25.21 \%$ | $30.41 \%$ | 1.21 |
| $25-49$ | $46.03 \%$ | $27.03 \%$ | 0.59 |
| 50 and older | $5.21 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | 0.00 |

Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)

## Analysis:

The proportionality index shows that students in the 25-49 age group are less likely to complete their course(s) compared to the other age groups, suggesting there is a disproportionate impact.

Table C-9. Foothill College ESL Completion Rates and 80\% Index by Age

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Success <br> Count | Success Rate | 80\%index |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 9}$ and under | 86 | 63 | $\mathbf{7 3 . 2 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ |
| $20-24$ | 92 | 45 | $48.91 \%$ | 0.67 |
| $25-49$ | 168 | 40 | $23.81 \%$ | 0.33 |
| 50 and older | 19 | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.00 |
| Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort) |  |  |  |  |

## Analysis:

The $80 \%$ index shows that those students who are 19 and under are more likely to complete their course(s) compared to the other age groups; hence, the 19 and under group serves as the reference group. In comparison to the reference group, no other age group meets the $80 \%$ threshold, indicating there is significant disproportionate impact for all other students.

## ESL Completion: Data and Analysis by DISABILITY STATUS

Table C-10. Foothill College ESL Cohort and Completion Counts and Percentages by Disability Status

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Enrollment <br> Rate | Success Count | Success <br> Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 5 | $1.37 \%$ | 2 | $1.35 \%$ |
| No | 360 | $98.63 \%$ | 146 | $98.65 \%$ |
| Total | 365 | $100.00 \%$ | 148 | $100.00 \%$ |

Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)

Table C-11. Foothill College Proportionality Index of ESL Completion Rates by Disability Status

|  | Cohort \% | Success \% | Completion <br> Proportionality |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | $1.37 \%$ | $1.35 \%$ | 0.99 |
| No | $98.63 \%$ | $98.65 \%$ | 1.00 |
| Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort) |  |  |  |

## Analysis:

The proportionality index shows that there is no disproportionate impact by disability status.

Table C-12. Foothill College ESL Completion Rates and 80\% Index by Disability Status

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Success <br> Count | Success Rate | 80\%index |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 5 | 2 | $40.00 \%$ | 0.99 |
| No | $\mathbf{3 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 6}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 . 5 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |
| Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort) |  |  |  |  |

## Analysis:

The $80 \%$ index indicates that there is no disproportionate impact by disability status.

## ESL Completion: Data and Analysis by ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STATUS

Table C-13. Foothill College ESL Cohort and Completion Counts and Percentages by Economically Disadvantaged Status

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Enrollment <br> Rate | Success Count | Success <br> Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 105 | $28.77 \%$ | 35 | $23.65 \%$ |
| No | 260 | $71.23 \%$ | 113 | $76.35 \%$ |
| Tota | 365 | $100.00 \%$ | 148 | $100.00 \%$ |

Note: Economically Disadvantaged is defined as a recipient of CalWORKIS/TANF/AFDC, SSI, BOG fee waiver, Pell grant, Workforce Investment Act (WIA).
Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)

Table C-14. Foothill College Proportionality Index of ESL Completion Rates by Economically Disadvantaged Status

|  | Cohort \% | Success \% | Completion <br> Proportiondity |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | $28.77 \%$ | $23.65 \%$ | 0.82 |
| No | $71.23 \%$ | $76.35 \%$ | 1.07 |

Note: Economically Disadvantaged is defined as a recipient of CalWORKIS/TANF/AFDC, SSI, BOG fee waiver, Pell grant, Workforce Investment Act (WIA). Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)

## Analysis:

The proportionality index shows that economically disadvantaged students are less likely to complete ESL courses and thus experience a disproportionate impact compared to other students.

Table C-15. Foothill College ESL Completion Rate and 80\% Index
by Economically Disadvantaged Status

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Success <br> Count | Success Rate | 80\%index |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 105 | 35 | $33.33 \%$ | 0.77 |
| No | $\mathbf{2 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{4 3 . 4 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

Note: Economically Disadvantaged is defined as a recipient of CalWORKIS/TANF/AFDC, SSI, BOG fee waiver, Pell grant, Workforce Investment Act (WIA).
Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)

## Analysis:

The $80 \%$ index also shows that non-economically disadvantaged students are more likely to complete their course(s) compared to economically disadvantaged students; hence, those students who do not receive aid serve as the reference group. Students receiving aid do not meet the $80 \%$ threshold, indicating there is a slight disproportionate impact among this population.

## Basic Skills Math Completion: Data and Analysis by Gender

Table C-16. Foothill College Math Cohort and Completion Counts and Percentages by Gender

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Enrollment <br> Rate | Success Count | Success <br> Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 305 | $51.26 \%$ | 152 | $55.27 \%$ |
| Male | 290 | $48.74 \%$ | 123 | $44.73 \%$ |
| Tota | 595 | $100.00 \%$ | 275 | $100.00 \%$ |
| Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort) |  |  |  |  |

Table C-17. Foothill College Proportionality Index of Math Completion Rates by Gender

|  | Cohort \% | Success \% | Completion <br> Proportionality |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | $51.26 \%$ | $55.27 \%$ | 1.08 |
| Male | $48.74 \%$ | $44.73 \%$ | 0.92 |
| Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort) |  |  |  |

Analysis:
The proportionality index suggests that there is no disproportionate impact on basic skills math completion by gender.

Table C-18. Foothill College Math Completion Rates and 80\% Index by Gender

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Success <br> Count | Success Rate | 80\%index |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | $\mathbf{3 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 2}$ | $\mathbf{4 9 . 8 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ |
| Male | 290 | 123 | $42.41 \%$ | 0.85 |
| Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort) |  |  |  |  |

## Analysis:

The $80 \%$ index suggests that there is no disproportionate impact on basic skills math completion by gender.

## Basic Skills Math Completion: Data and Analysis by ETHNICITY

Table C-19. Foothill College Math Cohort and Completion Counts and Percentages by Ethnicity

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Enrollment <br> Rate | Success Count | Success <br> Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African American | 55 | $9.24 \%$ | 19 | $6.91 \%$ |
| American Indian | 5 | $0.84 \%$ | 1 | $0.36 \%$ |
| Asian | 41 | $6.89 \%$ | 25 | $9.09 \%$ |
| Filipino | 32 | $5.38 \%$ | 11 | $4.00 \%$ |
| Hispanic | 150 | $25.21 \%$ | 64 | $23.27 \%$ |
| Pacific Islander | 21 | $3.53 \%$ | 4 | $1.45 \%$ |
| White | 231 | $38.82 \%$ | 125 | $45.45 \%$ |
| Unknown | 60 | $10.08 \%$ | 26 | $9.45 \%$ |
| Tota | 595 | $100.00 \%$ | 275 | $100.00 \%$ |

Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)

Table C-20. Foothill College Proportionality Index of Math Completion Rates by Ethnicity

|  | Cohort \% | Success \% | Completion <br> Proportiondity |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African American | $9.24 \%$ | $6.91 \%$ | 0.75 |
| American Indian | $0.84 \%$ | $0.36 \%$ | 0.43 |
| Asian | $6.89 \%$ | $9.09 \%$ | 1.32 |
| Filipino | $5.38 \%$ | $4.00 \%$ | 0.74 |
| Hispanic | $25.21 \%$ | $23.27 \%$ | 0.92 |
| Pacific Islander | $3.53 \%$ | $1.45 \%$ | 0.41 |
| White | $38.82 \%$ | $45.45 \%$ | 1.17 |
| Unknown | $10.08 \%$ | $9.45 \%$ | 0.94 |

Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)

## Analysis:

The proportionality index suggests there is a disproportionate impact for African-American, American Indian, Filipino, Hispanic/Latino, Pacific Islander and Unknown students in Basic Skills math completion since all groups are below .80. However, the disproportionate impact on Hispanic/Latino and Unknown students is very slight.

Table C-21. Foothill College Math Completion Rates and 80\% Index by Ethnicity

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Success <br> Count | Success Rate | 80\%index |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African American | 55 | 19 | $34.55 \%$ | 0.57 |
| American Indian | 5 | 1 | $20.00 \%$ | 0.33 |
| Asian | $\mathbf{4 1}$ | 25 | $\mathbf{6 0 . 9 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ |
| Filipino | 32 | 11 | $34.38 \%$ | 0.56 |
| Hispanic | 150 | 64 | $42.67 \%$ | 0.70 |
| Pacific Islander | 21 | 4 | $19.05 \%$ | 0.31 |
| White | 231 | 125 | $54.11 \%$ | 0.89 |
| Unknown | 60 | 26 | $43.33 \%$ | 0.71 |
| Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort) |  |  |  |  |

## Analysis:

The $80 \%$ index shows that in comparison to the reference group, Asian and White students do exceed the $80 \%$ threshold, indicating there is significant disproportionate impact for African American, American Indian, Filipino, Hispanic, Pacific Islander and Unknown students who attempt to complete Basic Skills math courses.

## Basic Skills Math Completion: Data and Analysis by AGE

Table C-22. Foothill College Math Cohort and Completion Counts and Percentages by Age

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Enrollment <br> Rate | Success Count | Success <br> Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19 and under | 322 | $54.30 \%$ | 151 | $55.11 \%$ |
| $20-24$ | 149 | $25.13 \%$ | 72 | $26.28 \%$ |
| $25-49$ | 116 | $19.56 \%$ | 50 | $18.25 \%$ |
| 50 and older | 6 | $1.01 \%$ | 1 | $0.36 \%$ |
| Total | 593 | $100.00 \%$ | 274 | $100.00 \%$ |

Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)

Table C-23. Foothill College Proportionality Index of Math Completion Rates by Age

|  | Cohort \% | Success \% | Completion <br> Proportionality |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19 and under | $54.30 \%$ | $55.11 \%$ | 1.01 |
| $20-24$ | $25.13 \%$ | $26.28 \%$ | 1.05 |
| $25-49$ | $19.56 \%$ | $18.25 \%$ | 0.93 |
| 50 and older | $1.01 \%$ | $0.36 \%$ | 0.36 |
| Sol |  |  |  |

## Analysis:

The proportionality index suggests there is a slight disproportionate impact for students ages 2549 , but it is so slight that while it should be monitored, it does not warrant additional action at this time. While there appears to be significant disproportionate impact for students 50 and older, the small number of students in this cohort is not statistically significant and thus does not warrant additional action.

Table C-24. Foothill College Math Completion Rates and 80\% Index by Age

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Success <br> Count | Success Rate | 80\%index |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19 and under | 322 | 151 | $46.89 \%$ | 0.97 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 - 2 4}$ | 149 | $\mathbf{7 2}$ | $\mathbf{4 8 . 3 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ |
| $25-49$ | 116 | 50 | $43.10 \%$ | 0.89 |
| 50 and older | 6 | 1 | $16.67 \%$ | 0.34 |
| Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort) |  |  |  |  |

## Analysis:

The $80 \%$ index suggests there is a disproportionate impact for students 50 and older; however, the number of students in this age group is not statistically significant.

## Basic Skills Math Completion: Data and Analysis by DISABILITY STATUS

Table C-25. Foothill College Math Cohort and Completion Counts and Percentages by Disability Status

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Enrollment <br> Rate | Success Count | Success <br> Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 66 | $11.09 \%$ | 29 | $10.55 \%$ |
| No | 529 | $88.91 \%$ | 246 | $89.45 \%$ |
| Tota | 595 | $100.00 \%$ | 275 | $100.00 \%$ |

Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)

Table C-26. Foothill College Proportionality Index of Math Completion Rate by Disability Status

|  | Cohort \% | Success \% | Completion <br> Proportionality |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | $11.09 \%$ | $10.55 \%$ | 0.95 |
| No | $88.91 \%$ | $89.45 \%$ | 1.01 |
| S |  |  |  |

Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)

## Analysis:

The proportionality index suggests no disproportionate impact in Basic Skills math completion rates by disability status.

Table C-27. Foothill College Math Completion Rates and 80\% Index by Disability Status

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Success <br> Count | Success Rate | 80\%index |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 66 | 29 | $\mathbf{4 3 . 9 4 \%}$ | 0.94 |
| No | $\mathbf{5 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 6}$ | $\mathbf{4 6 . 5 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)

## Analysis:

The $80 \%$ index suggests no disproportionate impact in Basic Skills math completion rates by disability status.

## Basic Skills Math Completion: Data and Analysis by ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STATUS

| Table C-28. Foothill College Math Cohort and Completion Counts and Percentages |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| by Economically Disadvantaged Status |  |  |  |  |
| Enrollment |  |  |  |  |
|  | Count | Enrollment <br> Rate | Success Count | Success |
| Rate |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | 187 | $31.43 \%$ | 74 | $26.91 \%$ |
| No | 408 | $68.57 \%$ | 201 | $73.09 \%$ |
| Tota | 595 | $100.00 \%$ | 275 | $100.00 \%$ |

Note: Economically Disadvantaged is defined as a recipient of CalWORKIS/TANF/AFDC, SSI, BOG fee waiver, Pell grant, Workforce Investment Act (WIA).
Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)

## Table C-29. Foothill College Proportionality Index of Math Completion Rates by Economically Disadvantaged Status

|  | Cohort \% | Success \% | Completion <br> Proportionality |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | $31.43 \%$ | $26.91 \%$ | 0.86 |
| No | $68.57 \%$ | $73.09 \%$ | 1.07 |

Note: Economically Disadvantaged is defined as a recipient of CalWORKIS/TANF/AFDC, SSI, BOG fee waiver, Pell grant, Workforce Investment Act (WIA). Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)

## Analysis:

The proportionality index suggests that economically disadvantaged status experience a disproportionate impact in Basic Skills math completion rates.

Table C-30. Foothill College Math Completion Rates and 80\% Index by Economically Disadvantaged Status

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Success <br> Count | Success Rate | 80\%index |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 187 | 74 | $39.57 \%$ | 0.80 |
| No | $\mathbf{4 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{4 9 . 2 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

Note: Economically Disadvantaged is defined as a recipient of CalWORKIS/TANF/AFDC, SSI, BOG fee waiver, Pell grant, Workforce Investment Act (WIA).
Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)

## Analysis:

The $80 \%$ index suggests that there is no disproportionate impact in Basic Skills math completion rates for economically disadvantaged students.

## Basic Skills English Completion: Data and Analysis by GENDER

Table C-31. Foothill College English Cohort and Completion Counts and Percentages by Gender

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Enrollment <br> Rate | Success Count | Success <br> Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 298 | $46.56 \%$ | 169 | $51.68 \%$ |
| Male | 342 | $53.44 \%$ | 158 | $48.32 \%$ |
| Total | 640 | $100.00 \%$ | 327 | $100.00 \%$ |

Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)

Table C-32. Foothill College Proportionality Index of English Completion Rates by Gender

|  | Cohort \% | Success \% | Completion <br> Proportionality |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Femde | $46.56 \%$ | $51.68 \%$ | 1.11 |
| Male | $53.44 \%$ | $48.32 \%$ | 0.90 |
| Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort) |  |  |  |

## Analysis:

The proportionality index suggests that there is no disproportionate impact in English completion rates by gender.

Table C-33. Foothill College English Completion Rates and 80\% Index by Gender

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Success <br> Count | Success Rate | 80\%index |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | $\mathbf{2 9 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 9}$ | $\mathbf{5 6 . 7 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |
| Male | 342 | 158 | $46.20 \%$ | 0.81 |
| Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort) |  |  |  |  |

## Analysis:

The $80 \%$ index suggests that there is no disproportionate impact in Basic Skills English course completion rates by gender.

## Basic Skills English Completion: Data and Analysis by ETHNICITY

Table C-34. Foothill College English Cohort and Completion Counts and Percentages by Ethnicity

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Enrollment <br> Rate | Success Count | Success <br> Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African American | 64 | $10.00 \%$ | 26 | $7.95 \%$ |
| American Indian | 4 | $0.63 \%$ | 4 | $1.22 \%$ |
| Asian | 69 | $10.78 \%$ | 46 | $14.07 \%$ |
| Filipino | 30 | $4.69 \%$ | 13 | $3.98 \%$ |
| Hispanic | 171 | $26.72 \%$ | 78 | $23.85 \%$ |
| Pacific Islander | 28 | $4.38 \%$ | 10 | $3.06 \%$ |
| White | 217 | $33.91 \%$ | 121 | $37.00 \%$ |
| Unknown | 57 | $8.91 \%$ | 29 | $8.87 \%$ |
| Total | 640 | $100.00 \%$ | 327 | $100.00 \%$ |
| Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort) |  |  |  |  |

Table C-35. Foothill College Proportionality Index of English Completion Rates by Ethnicity

|  | Cohort \% | Success \% | Completion <br> Proportionality |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African American | $10.00 \%$ | $7.95 \%$ | 0.80 |
| American Indian | $0.63 \%$ | $1.22 \%$ | 1.96 |
| Asian | $10.78 \%$ | $14.07 \%$ | 1.30 |
| Filipino | $4.69 \%$ | $3.98 \%$ | 0.85 |
| Hispanic | $26.72 \%$ | $23.85 \%$ | 0.89 |
| Pacific Islander | $4.38 \%$ | $3.06 \%$ | 0.70 |
| White | $33.91 \%$ | $37.00 \%$ | 1.09 |
| Unknown | $8.91 \%$ | $8.87 \%$ | 1.00 |

Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)

## Analysis:

The proportionality index shows that African-American, Filipino, Hispanic/Latino and Pacific Islander students experience a disproportionate impact in the rate of completion for Basic Skills English courses.

Table C-36. Foothill College English Completion Rates and 80\% Index by Ethnicity

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Success <br> Count | Success Rate | 80\%index |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African American | 64 | 26 | $40.63 \%$ | 0.61 |
| American Indian | 4 | 4 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.00 |
| Asian | 69 | 46 | $\mathbf{6 6 . 6 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ |
| Filipino | 30 | 13 | $43.33 \%$ | 0.65 |
| Hispanic | 171 | 78 | $45.61 \%$ | 0.68 |
| Pacific Islander | 28 | 10 | $35.71 \%$ | 0.54 |
| White | 217 | 121 | $55.76 \%$ | 0.84 |
| Unknown | 57 | 29 | $50.88 \%$ | 0.76 |
| Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort) |  |  |  |  |

## Analysis:

The $80 \%$ index also shows that in comparison to the reference group (Asian students), all other ethnicities except White students do not meet the $80 \%$ threshold, indicating there is a significant disproportionate impact for African-American, American Indian, Filipino, Hispanic/Latino, Pacific Islander and Unknown students.

## Basic Skills English Completion: Data and Analysis by AGE

Table C-37. Foothill College English Cohort and Completion Counts and Percentages by Age

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Enrollment <br> Rate | Success Count | Success <br> Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19 and under | 429 | $67.03 \%$ | 237 | $72.48 \%$ |
| $20-24$ | 143 | $22.34 \%$ | 59 | $18.04 \%$ |
| $25-49$ | 62 | $9.69 \%$ | 28 | $8.56 \%$ |
| 50 and older | 6 | $0.94 \%$ | 3 | $0.92 \%$ |
| Tota | 640 | $100.00 \%$ | 327 | $100.00 \%$ |
| Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort) |  |  |  |  |

Table C-38. Foothill College Proportionality Index of English Completion Rates by Age

|  | Cohort \% | Success \% | Completion <br> Proportiondity |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19 and under | $67.03 \%$ | $72.48 \%$ | 1.08 |
| $20-24$ | $22.34 \%$ | $18.04 \%$ | 0.81 |
| $25-49$ | $9.69 \%$ | $8.56 \%$ | 0.88 |
| 50 and older | $0.94 \%$ | $0.92 \%$ | 0.98 |
| S $20 \%$ |  |  |  |

## Analysis:

The proportionality index shows that students ages 20-24 and 25-49 experience a disproportionate impact by Basic Skills English completion rates while students ages 50 and older experience a very slight disproportionate impact. Given the small size of the 25-49 cohort and the extremely small size of the 50 and older cohort, this is an area to watch but does not currently warrant further action without additional information.

Table C-39. Foothill College English Completion Rates and 80\% Index by Age

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Success <br> Count | Success Rate | 80\%index |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 9}$ and under | $\mathbf{4 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 7}$ | $\mathbf{5 5 . 2 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ |
| $20-24$ | 143 | 59 | $41.26 \%$ | 0.75 |
| $25-49$ | 62 | 28 | $45.16 \%$ | 0.82 |
| 50 and older | 6 | 3 | $50.00 \%$ | 0.91 |
| Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort) |  |  |  |  |

## Analysis:

The $80 \%$ index analysis suggests no disproportionate impact in Basic Skills English completion rates by for students ages 50 and older or 25-49. However, students ages 20-24 appear to experience disproportionate impact. Since this age group is where the college is currently experiencing growth, this area warrants further attention.

## Basic Skills English Completion: Data and Analysis by DISABILITY STATUS

Table C-40. Foothill College English Cohort and Completion Counts and Percentages by Disability

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Enrollment <br> Rate | Success Count | Success <br> Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 71 | $11.09 \%$ | 33 | $10.09 \%$ |
| No | 569 | $88.91 \%$ | 294 | $89.91 \%$ |
| Tota | 640 | $100.00 \%$ | 327 | $100.00 \%$ |

Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)
Table C-41. Foothill College Proportionality Index of English Completion Rates by Disability Status

|  | Cohort \% | Success \% | Completion <br> Proportionality |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | $11.09 \%$ | $10.09 \%$ | 0.91 |
| No | $88.91 \%$ | $89.91 \%$ | 1.01 |

## Analysis:

Students with a disability experience a slight disproportionate impact in Basic Skills English completion rates.

Table C-42. Foothill College English Completion Rates and 80\% Index by Disability Status

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Success <br> Count | Success Rate | 80\%index |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 71 | 33 | $46.48 \%$ | 0.90 |
| No | $\mathbf{5 6 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 9 4}$ | $\mathbf{5 1 . 6 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)

## Analysis:

The $80 \%$ index suggests that there is no disproportionate impact for students with disabilities in Basic Skills English completion rates.

## Basic Skills English Completion: Data and Analysis by ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STATUS

Table C-43. Foothill College English Cohort and Completion Counts and Percentages by Economically Disadvantaged Status

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Enrollment <br> Rate | Success Count | Success <br> Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 189 | $29.53 \%$ | 100 | $30.58 \%$ |
| No | 451 | $70.47 \%$ | 227 | $69.42 \%$ |
| Tota | 640 | $100.00 \%$ | 327 | $100.00 \%$ |

Note: Economically Disadvantaged is defined as a recipient of CalWORKIS/TANF/AFDC, SSI, BOG fee waiver, Pell grant, Workforce Investment Act (WIA).
Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)
Table C-44. Foothill College Proportionality Index of English Completion Rates by Economically Disadvantaged Status

|  | Cohort \% | Success \% | Completion <br> Proportiondity |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | $29.53 \%$ | $30.58 \%$ | 1.04 |
| No | $70.47 \%$ | $69.42 \%$ | 0.99 |

Note: Economically Disadvantaged is defined as a recipient of CalWORKIS/TANF/AFDC, SSI, BOG fee waiver, Pell grant, Workforce Investment Act (WIA). Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)

## Analysis:

The proportionality index suggests that there is no disproportionate impact in Basic Skills English completion rates by economically disadvantaged status.

Table C-45. Foothill College English Completion Rates and 80\% Index by Economically Disadvantaged Status

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Success <br> Count | Success Rate | 80\%index |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | $\mathbf{1 8 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 2 . 9 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |
| No | 451 | 227 | $50.33 \%$ | 0.95 |

Note: Economically Disadvantaged is defined as a recipient of CalWORKIS/TANF/AFDC, SSI, BOG fee waiver, Pell grant, Workforce Investment Act (WIA).
Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)


#### Abstract

Analysis: The $80 \%$ index suggests that there is no disproportionate impact in Basic Skills English completion rates by economically disadvantaged status.


## CAMPUS-BASED RESEARCH

D. DEGREE and CERTIFICATE COMPLETION. Ratio of the number of students by population group who receive a degree or certificate to the number of students in that group with the same informed matriculation goal.

## Degree and Certificate Completion: Data and Analysis by GENDER

Table D-1. Foothill College Cohort and Completion Counts and Percentages of Student Progress and Attainment Rate (SPAR) by Gender

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Enrollment <br> Rate | Success Count | Success <br> Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 453 | $46.99 \%$ | 315 | $49.68 \%$ |
| Male | 510 | $52.90 \%$ | 318 | $50.16 \%$ |
| Unknown | 1 | $0.10 \%$ | 1 | $0.16 \%$ |
| Total | 964 | $100.00 \%$ | 634 | $100.00 \%$ |

Note: SPAR is defined as having earned an AA/A, Certificate of Achievement, transfer to a four-year institution or completion of $60 \mathrm{UC} / \mathrm{CSU}$ transferable units with a GPA of 2.0 or higher.
Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort: first-time credit students earning $>=6$ units and attempting a Math or English course during the first three years who are tracked for six years)

Table D-2. Foothill College Proportionality Index of Student Progress and Attainment Rate (SPAR) by Gender

|  | Cohort\% | Success \% | Completion <br> Proportiondity |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | $46.99 \%$ | $49.68 \%$ | 1.06 |
| Made | $52.90 \%$ | $50.16 \%$ | 0.95 |
| Unknown | $0.10 \%$ | $0.16 \%$ | 1.52 |

Note: SPAR is defined as having earned an AA/A, Certificate of Achievement, transfer to a four-year institution or completion of $60 \mathrm{UC} / \mathrm{CSU}$ transferable units with a GPA of 2.0 or higher. Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)

## Analysis:

The proportionality index shows that there is only a statistically negligible difference in completion rates and thus no disproportionate impact for degree or certificate completion by gender.

Table D-3. Foothill College Student Progress and Attainment Rate (SPAR) and 80\% Index by Gender

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Success <br> Count | Success Rate | 80\%index |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 453 | 315 | $69.54 \%$ | 0.70 |
| Male | 510 | 318 | $62.35 \%$ | 0.62 |
| Unknown | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ |

Note: SPAR is defined as having earned an AA/A, Certificate of Achievement, transfer to a four-year institution or completion of $60 \mathrm{UC} / \mathrm{CSU}$ transferable units with a GPA of 2.0 or higher. Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)

## Analysis:

While the one Unknown student is the reference group, the $80 \%$ index shows that there is only a statistically negligible difference in completion rates between males and females and thus no disproportionate impact for degree or certificate completion by gender.

## Degree and Certificate Completion: Data and Analysis by ETHNICITY

Table D-4. Foothill College Cohort and Completion Counts and Percentages of Student Progress and Attainment Rate (SPAR) by Ethnicity

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Enrollment <br> Rate | Success Count | Success <br> Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African American | 48 | $4.98 \%$ | 25 | $3.94 \%$ |
| American Indian | 3 | $0.31 \%$ | 1 | $0.16 \%$ |
| Asian | 240 | $24.90 \%$ | 212 | $33.44 \%$ |
| Filipino | 27 | $2.80 \%$ | 16 | $2.52 \%$ |
| Hispanic | 158 | $16.39 \%$ | 74 | $11.67 \%$ |
| Pacific Islander | 16 | $1.66 \%$ | 10 | $1.58 \%$ |
| White | 376 | $39.00 \%$ | 237 | $37.38 \%$ |
| Unknown | 96 | $9.96 \%$ | 59 | $9.31 \%$ |
| Tota | 964 | $100.00 \%$ | 634 | $100.00 \%$ |

[^0]Table D-5. Foothill College Proportionality Index of Student Progress and Attainment Rate (SPAR) by Ethnicity

|  | Cohort \% | Success \% | Completion <br> Proportiondity |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African American | $4.98 \%$ | $3.94 \%$ | 0.79 |
| American Indian | $0.31 \%$ | $0.16 \%$ | 0.51 |
| Asian | $24.90 \%$ | $33.44 \%$ | 1.34 |
| Filipino | $2.80 \%$ | $2.52 \%$ | 0.90 |
| Hispanic | $16.39 \%$ | $11.67 \%$ | 0.71 |
| Pacific Islander | $1.66 \%$ | $1.58 \%$ | 0.95 |
| White | $39.00 \%$ | $37.38 \%$ | 0.96 |
| Unknown | $9.96 \%$ | $9.31 \%$ | 0.93 |

Note: SPAR is defined as having earned an AA/A, Certificate of Achievement, transfer to a four-year institution or completion of $60 \mathrm{UC} / \mathrm{CSU}$ transferable units with a GPA of 2.0 or higher. Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)

## Analysis:

The proportionality index suggests that African-American, American Indian, and Hispanic/Latino students experience a disproportionate impact when comparing degree and certificate completion rates. In addition, Filipino, Pacific Islander, White and Unknown students experience a slight yet statistically negligible disproportionate impact.

Table D-6. Foothill College Student Progress and Attainment Rate (SPAR) and 80\% Index by Ethnicity

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Success <br> Count | Success Rate | 80\%index |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African American | 48 | 25 | $52.08 \%$ | 0.59 |
| American Indian | 3 | 1 | $33.33 \%$ | 0.38 |
| Asian | $\mathbf{2 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{8 8 . 3 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ |
| Filipino | 27 | 16 | $59.26 \%$ | 0.67 |
| Hispanic | 158 | 74 | $46.84 \%$ | 0.53 |
| Pacific Islander | 16 | 10 | $62.50 \%$ | 0.71 |
| White | 376 | 237 | $63.03 \%$ | 0.71 |
| Unknown | 96 | 59 | $61.46 \%$ | 0.70 |

Note: SPAR is defined as having earned an AA/A, Certificate of Achievement, transfer to a four-year institution or completion of $60 \mathrm{UC} / \mathrm{CSU}$ transferable units with a GPA of 2.0 or higher.
Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)

## Analysis:

The $80 \%$ index suggests that all groups experience a disproportionate impact in comparison to the reference group (Asian students).

## Degree and Certificate Completion: Data and Analysis by AGE

## Table D-7. Foothill College Cohort and Completion Counts and Percentages of Student Progress and Attainment Rate (SPAR) by Age

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Enrollment <br> Rate | Success Count | Success <br> Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19 and under | 814 | $84.44 \%$ | 553 | $87.22 \%$ |
| $20-24$ | 88 | $9.13 \%$ | 47 | $7.41 \%$ |
| $25-49$ | 53 | $5.50 \%$ | 28 | $4.42 \%$ |
| 50 and older | 5 | $0.52 \%$ | 3 | $0.47 \%$ |
| Unknown | 4 | $0.41 \%$ | 3 | $0.47 \%$ |
| Tota | 964 | $100.00 \%$ | 634 | $100.00 \%$ |

Note: SPAR is defined as having earned an AA/A, Certificate of Achievement, transfer to a four-year institution or completion of $60 \mathrm{UC} / \mathrm{CSU}$ transferable units with a GPA of 2.0 or higher.
Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)

Table D-8. Foothill College Proportionality Index of Student Progress and Attainment Rate (SPAR) by Age

|  | Cohort \% | Success \% | Completion <br> Proportionality |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19 and under | $84.44 \%$ | $87.22 \%$ | 1.03 |
| $20-24$ | $9.13 \%$ | $7.41 \%$ | 0.81 |
| $25-49$ | $5.50 \%$ | $4.42 \%$ | 0.80 |
| 50 and older | $0.52 \%$ | $0.47 \%$ | 0.91 |
| Unknown | $0.41 \%$ | $0.47 \%$ | 1.14 |

Note: SPAR is defined as having earned an AA/A, Certificate of Achievement, transfer to a four-year institution or completion of $60 \mathrm{UC} / \mathrm{CSU}$ transferable units with a GPA of 2.0 or higher. Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)

## Analysis:

The proportionality index suggests students ages $20-24,25-49$, and 50 and older experience a disproportionate impact when comparing degree and certificate completion rates. However, the size of the 50 and older cohort is extremely small, which makes it difficult to formulate conclusions.

Table D-9. Foothill College Student Progress and Attainment Rate (SPAR) and 80\% Index by Age

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Success <br> Count | Success Rate | 80\%index |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19 and under | 814 | 553 | $67.94 \%$ | 0.91 |
| $20-24$ | 88 | 47 | $53.41 \%$ | 0.71 |
| $25-49$ | 53 | 28 | $52.83 \%$ | 0.70 |
| 50 and older | 5 | 3 | $60.00 \%$ | 0.80 |
| Unknown | 4 | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 . 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ |

Note: SPAR is defined as having earned an AA/A, Certificate of Achievement, transfer to a four-year institution or completion of $60 \mathrm{UC} / \mathrm{CSU}$ transferable units with a GPA of 2.0 or higher.
Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)

## Analysis:

The $80 \%$ index suggests students ages $20-24,25-49$, and 50 and older experience a disproportionate impact when comparing degree and certificate completion rates. Although it appears that the 19 and under cohort experiences a slight disproportionate impact, this only in comparison to the anomalous and tiny Unknown cohort ( $\mathrm{n}=4$ ).

## Degree and Certificate Completion: Data and Analysis by DISABILITY STATUS

Table D-10. Foothill College Cohort and Completion Counts and Percentages of Student Progress and Attainment Rate (SPAR) by Disability Status

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Enrollment <br> Rate | Success Count | Success <br> Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 73 | $7.57 \%$ | 29 | $4.57 \%$ |
| No | 891 | $92.43 \%$ | 605 | $95.43 \%$ |
| Tota | 964 | $100.00 \%$ | 634 | $100.00 \%$ |

Note: SPAR is defined as having earned an AA/A, Certificate of Achievement, transfer to a four-year institution or completion of $60 \mathrm{UC} / \mathrm{CSU}$ transferable units with a GPA of 2.0 or higher.
Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)

Table D-11. Foothill College Proportionality Index of Student Progress and Attainment Rate (SPAR) by Disability Status

|  | Cohort \% | Success \% | Completion <br> Proportionality |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | $7.57 \%$ | $4.57 \%$ | 0.60 |
| No | $92.43 \%$ | $95.43 \%$ | 1.03 |

Note: SPAR is defined as having earned an AA/A, Certificate of Achievement, transfer to a four-year institution or completion of $60 \mathrm{UC} / \mathrm{CSU}$ transferable units with a GPA of 2.0 or higher.
Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)

## Analysis:

The proportionality index suggests students with disabilities experience a disproportionate impact when comparing degree and certificate completion rates. However, the small size of the cohort as well as student goals could affect these data. More research needs to be done.

## Table D-12. Foothill College Student Progress and Attainment Rate (SPAR) and 80\% Index by Disability Status

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Success <br> Count | Success Rate | 80\%index |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 73 | 29 | $39.73 \%$ | 0.59 |
| No | 891 | $\mathbf{6 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{6 7 . 9 0} \%$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ |

Note: SPAR is defined as having earned an AA/A, Certificate of Achievement, transfer to a four-year institution or completion of $60 \mathrm{UC} / \mathrm{CSU}$ transferable units with a GPA of 2.0 or higher.
Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)

## Analysis:

The $80 \%$ index suggests students with disabilities experience a disproportionate impact when comparing degree and certificate completion rates.

## Degree and Certificate Completion: Data and Analysis by ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STATUS

Table D-13. Foothill College Cohort and Completion Counts and Percentages of Student Progress and Attainment Rate (SPAR) by Economically Disadvantaged Status

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Enrollment <br> Rate | Success Count | Success <br> Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 305 | $31.64 \%$ | 175 | $27.60 \%$ |
| No | 659 | $68.36 \%$ | 459 | $72.40 \%$ |
| Tota | 964 | $100.00 \%$ | 634 | $100.00 \%$ |

Note: SPAR is defined as having earned an AA/A, Certificate of Achievement, transfer to a four-year institution or completion of $60 \mathrm{UC} / \mathrm{CSU}$ transferable units with a GPA of 2.0 or higher.
Note: Economically Disadvantaged is defined as a recipient of CalWORKIS/TANF/AFDC, SSI, BOG fee waiver, Pell grant, Workforce Investment Act (WIA).
Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)

Table D-14. Foothill College Proportionality Index of Student Progress and Attainment Rate (SPAR) by Economically Disadvantaged Status

|  | Cohort \% | Success \% | Completion <br> Proportionality |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | $31.64 \%$ | $27.60 \%$ | 0.87 |
| No | $68.36 \%$ | $72.40 \%$ | 1.06 |

Note: SPAR is defined as having earned an AA/A, Certificate of Achievement, transfer to a four-year institution or completion of $60 \mathrm{UC} / \mathrm{CSU}$ transferable units with a GPA of 2.0 or higher.
Note: Economically Disadvantaged is defined as a recipient of CalWORKIS/TANF/AFDC, SSI, BOG fee waiver, Pell grant, Workforce Investment Act (WIA).
Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)

## Analysis:

The proportionality index suggests that economically disadvantaged students experience a disproportionate impact when comparing degree and certificate completion rates (0.87).

Table D-15. Foothill College Student Progress and Attainment Rate (SPAR) and 80\% Index by Economically Disadvantaged Status

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Success <br> Count | Success Rate | 80\%index |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 305 | 175 | $57.38 \%$ | 0.82 |
| No | 659 | $\mathbf{4 5 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 9 . 6 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ |

Note: SPAR is defined as having earned an AA/A, Certificate of Achievement, transfer to a four-year institution or completion of $60 \mathrm{UC} / \mathrm{CSU}$ transferable units with a GPA of 2.0 or higher.
Note: Economically Disadvantaged is defined as a recipient of CalWORKIS/TANF/AFDC, SSI, BOG fee waiver, Pell grant, Workforce Investment Act (WIA).
Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)

## Analysis:

The $80 \%$ index suggests that there is no disproportionate impact for economically disadvantaged students when comparing degree and certificate completion rates.

## Percentages of Persistence: Data and Analysis by GENDER

Table D-16. Foothill College Cohort and Completion Counts and Percentages of Persistence Rate by Gender

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Enrollment <br> Rate | Success Count | Success <br> Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 453 | $46.99 \%$ | 315 | $47.80 \%$ |
| Male | 510 | $52.90 \%$ | 344 | $52.20 \%$ |
| Unknown | 1 | $0.10 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Tota | 964 | $100.00 \%$ | 659 | $100.00 \%$ |

Note: Persistence is defined as enrollment in first four consecutive quarter terms.
Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)

Table D-17. Foothill College Proportionality Index of Persistence Rates by Gender

|  | Cohort \% | Success \% | Completion <br> Proportiondity |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | $46.99 \%$ | $47.80 \%$ | 1.02 |
| Male | $52.90 \%$ | $52.20 \%$ | 0.99 |
| Unknown | $0.10 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | 0.00 |

Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)

## Analysis:

The proportionality index suggests no disproportionate impact by gender when comparing persistence rates.

Table D-18. Foothill College Persistence Rates and 80\% Index by Gender

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Success <br> Count | Success Rate | 80\%index |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | $\mathbf{4 5 3}$ | $\mathbf{3 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{6 9 . 5 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |
| Male | 510 | 344 | $67.45 \%$ | 0.97 |
| Unknown | 1 | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.00 |

Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)

## Analysis:

The $80 \%$ index suggests no disproportionate impact by gender when comparing persistence rates.

## Percentages of Persistence: Data and Analysis by ETHNICITY

Table D-19. Foothill College Cohort and Completion Counts and Percentages of Persistence Rates by Ethnicity

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Enrollment <br> Rate | Success Count | Success <br> Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African American | 48 | $4.98 \%$ | 32 | $4.86 \%$ |
| American Indian | 3 | $0.31 \%$ | 2 | $0.30 \%$ |
| Asian | 240 | $24.90 \%$ | 190 | $28.83 \%$ |
| Filipino | 27 | $2.80 \%$ | 21 | $3.19 \%$ |
| Hispanic | 158 | $16.39 \%$ | 98 | $14.87 \%$ |
| Pacific Islander | 16 | $1.66 \%$ | 9 | $1.37 \%$ |
| White | 376 | $39.00 \%$ | 244 | $37.03 \%$ |
| Unknown | 96 | $9.96 \%$ | 63 | $9.56 \%$ |
| Total | 964 | $100.00 \%$ | 659 | $100.00 \%$ |

Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)
Table D-20. Foothill College Proportionality Index of Persistence Rates by Ethnicity

|  | Cohort \% | Success \% | Completion <br> Proportiondity |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African American | $4.98 \%$ | $4.86 \%$ | 0.98 |
| American Indian | $0.31 \%$ | $0.30 \%$ | 0.98 |
| Asian | $24.90 \%$ | $28.83 \%$ | 1.16 |
| Filipino | $2.80 \%$ | $3.19 \%$ | 1.14 |
| Hispanic | $16.39 \%$ | $14.87 \%$ | 0.91 |
| Pacific Islander | $1.66 \%$ | $1.37 \%$ | 0.82 |
| White | $39.00 \%$ | $37.03 \%$ | 0.95 |
| Unknown | $9.96 \%$ | $9.56 \%$ | 0.96 |

Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)

## Analysis:

The proportionality index suggests that Pacific Islanders experience a disproportionate impact in persistence rates. In addition, African-American, American Indian, Hispanic/Latino, White and Unknown students experience a slight disproportionate impact.

Table D-21. Foothill College Persistence Rates and 80\% Index by Ethnicity

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Success <br> Count | Success Rate | 80\%index |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African American | 48 | 32 | $66.67 \%$ | 0.84 |
| American Indian | 3 | 2 | $66.67 \%$ | 0.84 |
| Asian | $\mathbf{2 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{7 9 . 1 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ |
| Filipino | 27 | 21 | $77.78 \%$ | 0.98 |
| Hispanic | 158 | 98 | $62.03 \%$ | 0.78 |
| Pacific Islander | 16 | 9 | $56.25 \%$ | 0.71 |
| White | 376 | 244 | $64.89 \%$ | 0.82 |
| Unknown | 96 | 63 | $65.63 \%$ | 0.83 |
| Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort) |  |  |  |  |

## Analysis:

The $80 \%$ index suggests that Pacific Islander and Hispanic/Latino students experience a disproportionate impact in persistence rates.

## Percentages of Persistence: Data and Analysis by AGE

Table D-22. Foothill College Cohort and Completion Counts and Percentages of Persistence Rates by Age

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Enrollment <br> Rate | Success Count | Success <br> Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19 and under | 814 | $84.44 \%$ | 563 | $85.43 \%$ |
| $20-24$ | 88 | $9.13 \%$ | 54 | $8.19 \%$ |
| $25-49$ | 53 | $5.50 \%$ | 37 | $5.61 \%$ |
| 50 and older | 5 | $0.52 \%$ | 3 | $0.46 \%$ |
| Unknown | 4 | $0.41 \%$ | 2 | $0.30 \%$ |
| Tota | 964 | $100.00 \%$ | 659 | $100.00 \%$ |
| Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort) |  |  |  |  |

Table D-23. Foothill College Proportionality Index of Persistence Rates by Age

|  | Cohort \% | Success \% | Completion <br> Proportionality |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19 and under | $84.44 \%$ | $85.43 \%$ | 1.01 |
| $20-24$ | $9.13 \%$ | $8.19 \%$ | 0.90 |
| $25-49$ | $5.50 \%$ | $5.61 \%$ | 1.02 |
| 50 and older | $0.52 \%$ | $0.46 \%$ | 0.88 |
| 50 and older | $0.41 \%$ | $0.30 \%$ | 0.73 |

Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)

## Analysis:

The proportionality index suggests that students ages 20-24 and 50 and older experience a slight disproportionate impact in persistence rates.

Table D-24. Foothill College Persistence Rates and 80\% Index by Age

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Success <br> Count | Success Rate | 80\%index |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19 and under | 814 | 563 | $69.16 \%$ | 0.99 |
| $20-24$ | 88 | 54 | $61.36 \%$ | 0.88 |
| $\mathbf{2 5 - 4 9}$ | $\mathbf{5 3}$ | $\mathbf{3 7}$ | $\mathbf{6 9 . 8 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ |
| 50 and older | 5 | 3 | $60.00 \%$ | 0.86 |
| Unknown | 4 | 2 | $50.00 \%$ | 0.72 |
| Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort) |  |  |  |  |

## Analysis:

The $80 \%$ index suggests that there is no disproportionate impact in persistence rates. However, there is disproportionate impact for Unknown students, but the cohort size is too small to draw meaningful conclusions from.

## Percentages of Persistence: Data and Analysis by DISABILITY STATUS

Table D-25. Foothill College Cohort and Completion Counts and Percentages of Persistence Rates by Disability Status

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Enrollment <br> Rate | Success Count | Success <br> Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 73 | $7.57 \%$ | 52 | $7.89 \%$ |
| No | 891 | $92.43 \%$ | 607 | $92.11 \%$ |
| Tota | 964 | $100.00 \%$ | 659 | $100.00 \%$ |

Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)
Table D-26. Foothill College Proportionality Index of Persistence Rates by Disability Status

|  | Cohort \% | Success \% | Completion <br> Proportionality |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | $7.57 \%$ | $7.89 \%$ | 1.04 |
| No | $92.43 \%$ | $92.11 \%$ | 1.00 |
| Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort) |  |  |  |

## Analysis:

The proportionality index suggests there is no disproportionate impact for students with disabilities in persistence rates.

Table D-27. Foothill College Persistence Rates and 80\% Index by Disability Status

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Success <br> Count | Success Rate | 80\%index |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | $\mathbf{7 3}$ | $\mathbf{5 2}$ | $\mathbf{7 1 . 2 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |
| No | 891 | 607 | $68.13 \%$ | 0.96 |
| Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort) |  |  |  |  |

## Analysis:

The $80 \%$ index suggests no disproportionate impact for students with disabilities in persistence rates.

## Percentages of Persistence: Data and Analysis by ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STATUS

Table D-28. Foothill College Cohort and Completion Counts and Percentages of Persistence Rates by Economically Disadvantaged Status

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Enrollment <br> Rate | Success Count | Success <br> Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 305 | $31.64 \%$ | 193 | $29.29 \%$ |
| No | 659 | $68.36 \%$ | 466 | $70.71 \%$ |
| Tota | 964 | $100.00 \%$ | 659 | $100.00 \%$ |

Note: Economically Disadvantaged is defined as a recipient of CalWORKIS/TANF/AFDC, SSI, BOG fee waiver, Pell grant, Workforce Investment Act (WIA).
Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)
Table D-29. Foothill College Proportionality Index of Persistence Rates by Economically Disadvantaged Status

|  | Cohort \% | Success \% | Completion <br> Proportionality |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | $31.64 \%$ | $29.29 \%$ | 0.93 |
| No | $68.36 \%$ | $70.71 \%$ | 1.03 |

Note: Economically Disadvantaged is defined as a recipient of CalWORKIS/TANF/AFDC, SSI, BOG fee waiver, Pell grant, Workforce Investment Act (WIA). Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)

## Analysis:

The proportionality index suggests there is a slight disproportionate impact for economically disadvantaged students in persistence rates.

Table D-30. Foothill College Persistence Rates and 80\% Index by Economically Disadvantaged Status

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Success <br> Count | Success Rate | 80\%index |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 305 | 193 | $63.28 \%$ | 0.89 |
| No | 659 | 466 | $\mathbf{7 0 . 7 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ |

Note: Economically Disadvantaged is defined as a recipient of CalWORKIS/TANF/AFDC, SSI, BOG fee waiver, Pell grant, Workforce Investment Act (WIA).
Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)

## Analysis:

The $80 \%$ index suggests there is no disproportionate impact for economically disadvantaged students in persistence rates.

## 30 Units Attainment: Data and Analysis by GENDER

Table D-31. Foothill College Cohort and Completion Counts and Percentages of 30 Units Attainment Rate by Gender

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Enrollment <br> Rate | Success Count | Success <br> Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 453 | $46.99 \%$ | 341 | $48.37 \%$ |
| Male | 510 | $52.90 \%$ | 364 | $51.63 \%$ |
| Unknowr | 1 | $0.10 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Total | 964 | $100.00 \%$ | 705 | $100.00 \%$ |
| Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort) |  |  |  |  |

Table D-32. Foothill College Proportionality Index of 30 Units Attainment Rates by Gender

|  | Cohort \% | Success \% | Completion <br> Proportiondity |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | $46.99 \%$ | $48.37 \%$ | 1.03 |
| Male | $52.90 \%$ | $51.63 \%$ | 0.98 |
| Unknowr | $0.10 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | 0.00 |
| Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort) |  |  |  |

## Analysis:

The proportionality index shows virtually no disproportionate impact by gender in the attainment of 30 units.

Table D-33. Foothill College 30 Unit Attainment Rate and 80\% Index by Gender

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Success <br> Count | Success Rate | 80\%index |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | $\mathbf{4 5 3}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 1}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 . 2 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ |
| Male | 510 | 364 | $71.37 \%$ | 0.95 |
| Unknowr | 1 | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.00 |
| Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort) |  |  |  |  |

## Analysis:

The $80 \%$ index suggests that there is no disproportionate impact by gender in the attainment of 30 units.

## 30 Units Attainment: Data and Analysis by ETHNICITY

Table D-34. Foothill College Cohort and Completion Counts and Percentages of $\mathbf{3 0}$ Units Attainment Rates by Ethnicity

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Enrollment <br> Rate | Success Count | Success <br> Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African American | 48 | $4.98 \%$ | 30 | $4.26 \%$ |
| American Indian | 3 | $0.31 \%$ | 2 | $0.28 \%$ |
| Asian | 240 | $24.90 \%$ | 201 | $28.51 \%$ |
| Filipino | 27 | $2.80 \%$ | 19 | $2.70 \%$ |
| Hispanic | 158 | $16.39 \%$ | 107 | $15.18 \%$ |
| Pacific Islander | 16 | $1.66 \%$ | 12 | $1.70 \%$ |
| White | 376 | $39.00 \%$ | 262 | $37.16 \%$ |
| Unknown | 96 | $9.96 \%$ | 72 | $10.21 \%$ |
| Total | 964 | $100.00 \%$ | 705 | $100.00 \%$ |
| Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort) |  |  |  |  |

Table D-35. Foothill College Proportionality Index of 30 Units Attainment Rates by Ethnicity

|  | Cohort \% | Success \% | Completion <br> Proportionality |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African American | $4.98 \%$ | $4.26 \%$ | 0.85 |
| American Indian | $0.31 \%$ | $0.28 \%$ | 0.91 |
| Asian | $24.90 \%$ | $28.51 \%$ | 1.15 |
| Filipino | $2.80 \%$ | $2.70 \%$ | 0.96 |
| Hispanic | $16.39 \%$ | $15.18 \%$ | 0.93 |
| Pacific Islander | $1.66 \%$ | $1.70 \%$ | 1.03 |
| White | $39.00 \%$ | $37.16 \%$ | 0.95 |
| Unknown | $9.96 \%$ | $10.21 \%$ | 1.03 |

Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)

## Analysis:

The proportionality index suggests that African-Americans experience disproportionate impact and is less likely to attain 30 units.

Table D-36. Foothill College 30 Unit Attainment Rates and 80\% Index by Ethnicity

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Success <br> Count | Success Rate | 80\%index |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African American | 48 | 30 | $62.50 \%$ | 0.75 |
| American Indian | 3 | 2 | $66.67 \%$ | 0.80 |
| Asian | $\mathbf{2 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{8 3 . 7 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ |
| Filipino | 27 | 19 | $70.37 \%$ | 0.84 |
| Hispanic | 158 | 107 | $67.72 \%$ | 0.81 |
| Pacific Islander | 16 | 12 | $75.00 \%$ | 0.90 |
| White | 376 | 262 | $69.68 \%$ | 0.83 |
| Unknown | 96 | 72 | $75.00 \%$ | 0.90 |
| Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort) |  |  |  |  |

## Analysis:

The $80 \%$ index also shows that African-Americans experience a disproportionate impact and are less likely to attain 30 units.

## 30 Units Attainment: Data and Analysis by AGE

Table D-37. Foothill College Cohort and Completion Counts and Percentages of 30 Units Attainment Rates by Age

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Enrollment <br> Rate | Success Count | Success <br> Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19 and under | 814 | $84.44 \%$ | 598 | $84.82 \%$ |
| $20-24$ | 88 | $9.13 \%$ | 65 | $9.22 \%$ |
| $25-49$ | 53 | $5.50 \%$ | 36 | $5.11 \%$ |
| 50 and older | 5 | $0.52 \%$ | 4 | $0.57 \%$ |
| Unknown | 4 | $0.41 \%$ | 2 | $0.28 \%$ |
| Tota | 964 | $100.00 \%$ | 705 | $100.00 \%$ |
| Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort) |  |  |  |  |

Table D-38. Foothill College Proportionality Index of 30 Units Attainment Rates by Age

|  | Cohort \% | Success \% | Completion <br> Proportionality |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19 and under | $84.44 \%$ | $84.82 \%$ | 1.00 |
| $20-24$ | $9.13 \%$ | $9.22 \%$ | 1.01 |
| $25-49$ | $5.50 \%$ | $5.11 \%$ | 0.93 |
| 50 and older | $0.52 \%$ | $0.57 \%$ | 1.09 |
| Unknown | $0.41 \%$ | $0.28 \%$ | 0.68 |

Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)

## Analysis:

The proportionality index suggests that there is no disproportionate impact by gender in attaining 30 units. Although Unknown students experience a disproportionate impact, the population size is so small $(\mathrm{n}=4)$ that is hard to draw meaningful conclusions.

Table D-39. Foothill College 30 Units Attainment Rates and 80\% Index by Age

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Success <br> Count | Success Rate | 80\%index |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19 and under | 814 | 598 | $73.46 \%$ | 0.92 |
| $20-24$ | 88 | 65 | $73.86 \%$ | 0.92 |
| $25-49$ | 53 | 36 | $67.92 \%$ | 0.85 |
| 50 and older | $\mathbf{5}$ | 4 | $\mathbf{8 0 . 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ |
| Unknown | 4 | 2 | $50.00 \%$ | 0.63 |
| Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort) |  |  |  |  |

## Analysis:

The $80 \%$ index also suggests that there is no disproportionate impact by gender in attaining 30 units--with the exception of Unknown students.

## 30 Units Attainment: Data and Analysis by DISABILITY STATUS

Table D-40. Foothill College Cohort and Completion Counts and Percentages of 30 Units Attainment Rates by Disability Status

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Enrollment <br> Rate | Success Count | Success <br> Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 73 | $7.57 \%$ | 53 | $7.52 \%$ |
| No | 891 | $92.43 \%$ | 652 | $92.48 \%$ |
| Tota | 964 | $100.00 \%$ | 705 | $100.00 \%$ |

Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)

Table D-41. Foothill College Proportionality Index of 30 Units Attainment Rates by Disability Status

|  | Cohort \% | Success \% | Completion <br> Proportionality |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | $7.57 \%$ | $7.52 \%$ | 0.99 |
| No | $92.43 \%$ | $92.48 \%$ | 1.00 |
| Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard 2006-07 cohort) |  |  |  |

## Analysis:

The proportionality index suggests that there is no disproportionate impact by disability status in attaining 30 units.

Table D-42. Foothill College 30 Units Attainment Rates and 80\% Index by Disability Status

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Success <br> Count | Success Rate | 80\%index |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 73 | 53 | $72.60 \%$ | 0.99 |
| No | $\mathbf{8 9 1}$ | 652 | $\mathbf{7 3 . 1 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ |
| Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort) |  |  |  |  |

Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)

## Analysis:

The $80 \%$ index suggests that there is no disproportionate impact by disability status in attaining 30 units.

30 Units Attainment: Data and Analysis by ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STATUS

Table D-43. Foothill College Cohort and Completion Counts and Percentages of 30 Units Attainment Rates by Economically Disadvantaged Status

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Enrollment <br> Rate | Success Count | Success <br> Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 305 | $31.64 \%$ | 231 | $32.77 \%$ |
| No | 659 | $68.36 \%$ | 474 | $67.23 \%$ |
| Tota | 964 | $100.00 \%$ | 705 | $100.00 \%$ |

Note: Economically Disadvantaged is defined as a recipient of CalWORKIS/TANF/AFDC, SSI, BOG fee waiver, Pell grant, Workforce Investment Act (WIA).
Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)

## Table D-44. Foothill College Proportionality Index of 30 Units Attainment Rates

 by Economically Disadvantaged Status|  | Cohort\% | Success \% | Completion <br> Proportionality |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | $31.64 \%$ | $32.77 \%$ | 1.04 |
| No | $68.36 \%$ | $67.23 \%$ | 0.98 |

Note: Economically Disadvantaged is defined as a recipient of CalWORKIS/TANF/AFDC, SSI, BOG fee waiver, Pell grant, Workforce Investment Act (WIA). Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)

## Analysis:

The proportionality index shows virtually no disproportionate impact by economically disadvantaged status in attaining 30 units.

Table D-45. Foothill College 30 Units Attainment Rates and 80\% Index by Economically Disadvantaged Status

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Success <br> Count | Success Rate | 80\%index |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | $\mathbf{3 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 1}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 . 7 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ |
| No | 659 | 474 | $\mathbf{7 1 . 9 3 \%}$ | 0.95 |

Note: Economically Disadvantaged is defined as a recipient of CalWORKIS/TANF/AFDC, SSI, BOG fee waiver, Pell grant, Workforce Investment Act (WIA).
Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)

## Analysis:

The $80 \%$ index also suggests that there is no disproportionate impact by economically disadvantaged status in attaining 30 units.

## CAMPUS-BASED RESEARCH

E. TRANSFER. Ratio of the number of students by population group who complete a minimum of 12 units and have attempted a transfer level course in mathematics or English to the number of students in that group who actually transfer after one or more (up to six) years.

## Transfer: Data and Analysis by GENDER

Table E-1. Foothill College Cohort and Completion Counts and Percentages of Transfer Rates by Gender

|  | Enrollment Count | Enrollment Rate | Success Count | Success <br> Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 438 | $49.05 \%$ | 255 | $50.30 \%$ |
| Male | 455 | $50.95 \%$ | 252 | $49.70 \%$ |
| Total | 893 | $100.00 \%$ | 507 | $100.00 \%$ |

Source: Transfer Velocity Project (2006-07 cohort), CCCCO Data Mart
Table E-2. Foothill College Proportionality Index of Transfer Rates by Gender

|  | Cohort \% | Success \% | Completion <br> Proportionality |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | $49.05 \%$ | $50.30 \%$ | 1.03 |
| Male | $50.95 \%$ | $49.70 \%$ | 0.98 |
| Source: Transfer Velocity Project (2006-07 cohort) | Cccco |  |  |

Source: Transfer Velocity Project (2006-07 cohort), CCCCO Data Mart

## Analysis:

The proportionality index suggests that there is no disproportionate impact when evaluating the transfer rates of males and females.

Table E-3. Foothill College Transfer Rates and 80\% Index by Gender

|  | Enrollment Count | Success Count | Success Rate | 80\%index |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | $\mathbf{4 3 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 5}$ | $\mathbf{5 8 . 2 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ |
| Male | 455 | 252 | $55.38 \%$ | 0.95 |

Source: Transfer Velocity Project (2006-07 cohort), CCCCO Data Mart

## Analysis:

The $80 \%$ index suggests that there is no disproportionate impact when evaluating the transfer rates of males and females.

## Transfer: Data and Analysis by ETHNICITY

Table E-4. Foothill College Cohort and Completion Counts and Percentages of Transfer Rates by Ethnicity

|  | Enrollment Count | Enrollment Rate | Success Count | Success <br> Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African-American | 37 | $4.14 \%$ | 19 | $3.75 \%$ |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native | 3 | $0.34 \%$ | 1 | $0.20 \%$ |
| Asian | 248 | $27.77 \%$ | 177 | $34.91 \%$ |
| Filipino | 25 | $2.80 \%$ | 12 | $2.37 \%$ |
| Hispanic | 124 | $13.89 \%$ | 50 | $9.86 \%$ |
| Pacific Islander | 13 | $1.46 \%$ | 6 | $1.18 \%$ |
| Unknown | 91 | $10.19 \%$ | 50 | $9.86 \%$ |
| White Non-Hispanic | 352 | $39.42 \%$ | 192 | $37.87 \%$ |
| Total | 893 | $100.00 \%$ | 507 | $100.00 \%$ |

Source: Transfer Velocity Project (2006-07 cohort), CCCCO Data Mart
Table E-5. Foothill College Proportionality Index of Transfer Rates by Ethnicity

|  | Cohort \% | Success \% | Completion <br> Proportiondity |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African-American | $4.14 \%$ | $3.75 \%$ | 0.90 |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native | $0.34 \%$ | $0.20 \%$ | 0.59 |
| Asian | $27.77 \%$ | $34.91 \%$ | 1.26 |
| Filipino | $2.80 \%$ | $2.37 \%$ | 0.85 |
| Hispanic | $13.89 \%$ | $9.86 \%$ | 0.71 |
| Pacific Islander | $1.46 \%$ | $1.18 \%$ | 0.81 |
| Unknown | $10.19 \%$ | $9.86 \%$ | 0.97 |
| White Non-Hispanic | $39.42 \%$ | $37.87 \%$ | 0.96 |

Source: Transfer Velocity Project (2006-07 cohort), CCCCO Data Mart

## Analysis:

The proportionality index shows that every group except for Asian students experiences a disproportionate impact when comparing transfer rates. The most alarming disproportionate impact affects Hispanic/Latino, Pacific Islander and Filipino students. Although AfricanAmerican and White students experience disproportionate impact, the impact is marginally less severe than that experienced by other populations. While American Indian students technically experience the most severe disproportionate impact, the small size of the American Indian population in this demographic makes it hard to make larger conclusions.

Table E-6. Foothill College Transfer Rates and 80\% Index by Ethnicity

|  | Enrollment Count | Success Count | Success Rate | 80\%index |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African-American | 37 | 19 | $51.35 \%$ | 0.72 |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native | 3 | 1 | $33.33 \%$ | 0.47 |
| Asian | $\mathbf{2 4 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 7}$ | $\mathbf{7 1 . 3 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |
| Filipino | 25 | 12 | $48.00 \%$ | 0.67 |
| Hispanic | 124 | 50 | $40.32 \%$ | 0.56 |
| Pacific Islander | 13 | 6 | $46.15 \%$ | 0.65 |
| Unknown | 91 | 50 | $54.95 \%$ | 0.77 |
| White Non-Hispanic | 352 | 192 | $54.55 \%$ | 0.76 |

Source: Transfer Velocity Project (2006-07 cohort), CCCCO Data Mart

## Analysis:

The $80 \%$ index suggests that every group experiences disproportionate impact in comparison to the reference group (Asian students) when comparing transfer rates. The greatest disproportionate impact affects Hispanic/Latino, Pacific Islander and Filipino students. Although African-American and White students experience disproportionate impact, it is marginally less severe than that experienced by other populations. While American Indian students technically experience the most severe disproportionate impact, the small size of the American Indian population in this demographic makes it hard to make larger conclusions.

## Transfer: Data and Analysis by AGE

Table E-7. Foothill College Cohort and Completion Counts and Percentages of Transfer Rates by Age

|  | Enrollment Count | Enrollment Rate | Success Count | Success Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19 and under | 755 | $84.55 \%$ | 459 | $90.53 \%$ |
| $20-24$ | 73 | $8.17 \%$ | 33 | $6.51 \%$ |
| $25-49$ | 47 | $5.26 \%$ | 12 | $2.37 \%$ |
| 50 and older | 4 | $0.45 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Unknown | 14 | $1.57 \%$ | 3 | $0.59 \%$ |
| Total | 893 | $100.00 \%$ | 507 | $100.00 \%$ |

[^1]Table E-8. Foothill College Proportionality Index of Transfer Rates by Age

|  | Cohort <br> $\%$ | Success \% | Completion <br> Proportionality |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19 and under | $84.55 \%$ | $90.53 \%$ | 1.07 |
| $20-24$ | $8.17 \%$ | $6.51 \%$ | 0.80 |
| $25-49$ | $5.26 \%$ | $2.37 \%$ | 0.45 |
| 50 and older | $0.45 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | 0.00 |
| Unknown | $1.57 \%$ | $0.59 \%$ | 0.38 |

Source: Transfer Velocity Project (2006-07 cohort), CCCCO Data Mart

## Analysis:

The proportionality index suggests that students ages 20-24, 25-49 and 50 and older experience disproportionate impact when comparing transfer rates. More research needs to be done to determine whether the disproportionate impact experienced by students ages 25-49 and 50 and older is actually of concern because they may have different career goals or apply for entry into career technical education programs at higher rates.

Table E-9. Foothill College Transfer Rates and 80\% Index by Age

|  | Enrollment <br> Count | Success Count | Success Rate | $80 \%$ index |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19 and under | 755 | 459 | $60.79 \%$ | 1.00 |
| $20-24$ | 73 | 33 | $45.21 \%$ | 0.74 |
| $25-49$ | 47 | 12 | $25.53 \%$ | 0.42 |
| 50 and older | 4 | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.00 |
| Unknown | 14 | 3 | $21.43 \%$ | 0.35 |
| Source: Transfer Velocity Project (2006-07 cohort), CCCCO Data Mart |  |  |  |  |

## Analysis:

The $80 \%$ index also suggests that students ages 20-24, 25-49 and 50 and older experience disproportionate impact when comparing transfer rates. Although students ages 25-49 and 50 and older experience disproportionate impact at a higher rate, these initial numbers may not be quite so concerning because there could be a number of reasons why these students do not transfer. For instance, it would be helpful to know many students over the age of 25 want to transfer and identify that as a goal. Another possibility is that students over 25 may have different career goals or plan to go into career technical education programs with course requirements that include completion of transfer-level English or math classes. More research
needs to be done to know whether older students are not reaching their goal of transferring or if there are other important factors--such as educational and career goals--that need to be considered. As the 20-24 aged student population continues to grow, this will be an area to be watched closely.

## Transfer: Data and Analysis by DISABILITY STATUS

Table E-10. Foothill College Cohort and Completion Counts and Percentages of Transfer Rates by Disability Status

|  | Enrollment Count | Enrollment Rate | Success Count | Success <br> Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 47 | $5.26 \%$ | 19 | $3.75 \%$ |
| No | 846 | $94.74 \%$ | 488 | $96.25 \%$ |
| Total | 893 | $100.00 \%$ | 507 | $100.00 \%$ |

Source: Transfer Velocity Project (2006-07 cohort), CCCCO Data Mart

Table E-11. Foothill College Proportionality Index of Transfer Rates by Disability Status
Completion
Cohort \% Success \%
Proportionality

| Yes | $5.26 \%$ | $3.75 \%$ | 0.71 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No | $94.74 \%$ | $96.25 \%$ | 1.02 |

Source: Transfer Velocity Project (2006-07 cohort), CCCCO Data Mart

## Analysis:

The proportionality index suggests that students with a disability experience a disproportionate impact when comparing transfer rates. However, the small size of the disabled student population makes it difficult to draw conclusions. This will be another area to monitor.

Table E-12. Foothill College Transfer Rates and 80\% Index by Disability Status

|  | Enrollment Count | Success Count | Success Rate | 80\%index |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 47 | 19 | $40.43 \%$ | 0.70 |
| No | $\mathbf{8 4 6}$ | $\mathbf{4 8 8}$ | $57.68 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ |

Source: Transfer Velocity Project (2006-07 cohort), CCCCO Data Mart

## Analysis:

The $80 \%$ index suggests that students with a disability experience a disproportionate impact when comparing transfer rates. However, more research needs to be done to determine the causes and possible interventions. For instance, does the type of disability, date of diagnosis or some other factor affect these numbers? It is plausible that if there is a disparity in the transfer rates of
students with learning and physical disabilities that the types of interventions would vary dramatically--such as additional tutorial support or additional physical accommodations on campus.

## Transfer: Data and Analysis by CalWORKs

Table E-13. Foothill College Cohort and Completion Counts and Percentages of Transfer Rates by CalWORKs

|  | Enrollment Count | Enrollment Rate | Success Count | Success <br> Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 2 | $0.22 \%$ | 1 | $0.20 \%$ |
| No | 891 | $99.78 \%$ | 506 | $99.80 \%$ |
| Tota | 893 | $100.00 \%$ | 507 | $100.00 \%$ |

Source: Transfer Velocity Project (2006-07 cohort), CCCCO Data Mart
Table E-14. Foothill College Proportionality Index of Transfer Rates by CalWORKs

|  | Cohort \% | Success \% | Completion <br> Proportionality |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | $0.22 \%$ | $0.20 \%$ | 0.88 |
| No | $99.78 \%$ | $99.80 \%$ | 1.00 |

Analysis:
The proportionality index suggests that CalWORKs students experience a disproportionate impact when comparing transfer rates. However, the extremely small size of the CalWORKs cohort is statistically insignificant.

Table E-15. Foothill College Transfer Rates and 80\% Index by CalWORKs

|  | Enrollment Count | Success Count | Success Rate | 80\%index |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 2 | 1 | $50.00 \%$ | 0.88 |
| No | 891 | 506 | $56.79 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ |

Source: Transfer Velocity Project (2006-07 cohort), CCCCO Data Mart

## Analysis:

The $80 \%$ index suggests that there is no disproportionate impact for CalWORKs students when comparing transfer rates.

## Goals and Activities

## A. STUDENT SUCCESS INDICATOR FOR ACCESS

"Compare the percentage of each population group that is enrolled to the percentage of each group in the adult population within the community serve"

## GOAL A.

- There are no significant instances of disproportionate impact in enrollment and overall enrollment adequately reflects the district service area. While there are instances of disproportionate impact by ethnicity in the distribution of financial aid, there are a number of external factors that may affect this outcome. The Student Equity Workgroup will shares its findings with the Financial Aid Office to determine whether additional research or action is necessary and warranted. Given the more severe instances of disproportionate impact for other indicators that can be addressed by direct actions by college practices and policies, no access goals have been identified at this time.


## ACTIVITY A.1.

- No activities have been selected.


## EXPECTED OUTCOME A.1.1

- None


## GOALS AND ACTIVITIES

## B. STUDENT SUCCESS INDICATOR FOR COURSE COMPLETION

"Ratio of the number of credit courses that students by population group actually complete by the end of the term compared to the number of courses in which students in that group are enrolled on the census day of the term"

## GOAL B.

- Both the proportionality and $80 \%$ indices reveal disproportionate impacts for AfricanAmerican, Hispanic/Latino, and Filipino/Pacific Islander students in course completion and probation rates. Filipino students experience a disproportionate impact with respect to probation rates and may also experience a disproportionate impact in course success rates; additional research that disaggregates Filipino students from the larger Asian population is necessary to determine whether this is actually the case.
- Coordinate with the Office of Research to gather more data to better understand the course success rates and probation rates for African-American, Hispanic/Latino, and Filipino/Pacific Islander students and explore possible causes and/or correlations for the disproportionate impacts.
- Understand why males are more likely to end up on probation while there is relative parity in the course success rates for males and females.

ACTIVITY B.1. (Responsible Group: Student Equity Workgroup)

## Year 1

High Priority

- Identify specific activities that will increase the course success rates of AfricanAmerican, Hispanic/Latino and Pacific Islander students by three-percentage points within three (3) years over fall 2013 figures.
- Review Program Reviews (and collaborate with the Program Review Committee) to identify programs/disciplines with low success rates for African-American, Hispanic/Latino and Pacific Islander students and then create a plan for increasing the success of these students.
- Work with the President's Office to determine whether Foothill College can participate in the Student Equity Scorecard through the USC Center for Urban Excellence.
- Coordinate with the Office of Institutional Research \& Planning (IR\&P) to formulate an equity research plan that will answer the following questions:
- What are the possible causes and/or correlations for the decreased course success and increased probation rates for African-American, Hispanic/Latino and Filipino/Pacific Islander students?
- Does disaggregating international students from domestic students reveal any new information or insights about course success rates?
- What effect, if any, does course delivery modality (e.g. face-to-face, hybrid, online) have on these rates?
- What effect, if any, does the course discipline have on these rates?
- What effect, if any, does a student's completion of English or math have on these rates?
- What effect, if any, does the number of hours a student work have on these rates?
- Which courses, modalities and disciplines have high success rates? Which factors contribute to those success rates?
- Conduct a literature review to identify teaching and learning practices that promote course success. In particular, the Student Equity Workgroup will identify which strategies are feasible for short- and/or longer-term piloting at Foothill.


## Medium Priority

- The Student Equity Workgroup may consider sending at least one representative to:
- The RP Group's (The Research \& Planning Group for California Community Colleges) Student Success Conference in October 2014
- The Association of American Colleges and Universities annual meeting (http://www.aacu.org/)


## Year 2

High Priority

- Implement research agenda and then identify specific goals and activities based on new data.
- Implement activities to increase the course success rates of African-American, Hispanic/Latino and Pacific Islander students by three-percentage points within three (3) years over fall 2013 figures.


## Year 3

## High Priority

- Start implementing new goals based on new data.
- Evaluate the effectiveness of activities designed to increase the course success rates of African-American, Hispanic/Latino and Pacific Islander students by three-percentage points within three (3) years over fall 2013 rates.


## EXPECTED OUTCOME B.1.1

- By June 30, 2015, the Student Equity Workgroup will have identified at least two factors that may begin to explain the disproportionately lower success rates for AfricanAmerican, Hispanic/Latino and Filipino/Pacific Islander students.
- By June 30, 2016, the Student Equity Workgroup will have implemented at least one activity to increase the course success rates of African-American, Hispanic/Latino and Filipino/Pacific Islander students.
- By June 30, 2017, the Student Equity Workgroup will expect to see a three-percentage point increase in the course success rates of African-American, Hispanic/Latino and Filipino/Pacific Islander students over fall 2013 figures.


## C. STUDENT SUCCESS INDICATOR FOR ESL AND BASIC SKILLS COMPLETION

"Ratio of the number of students by population group who complete a degree-applicable course after having completed the final ESL or basic skills course to the number of those students who complete such a final course"

## GOAL C.

- The Student Equity Workgroup will collaborate with the Basic Skills Workgroup, departments of English, Math, ESLL, and the Office of Institutional Research \& Planning (IR\&P) to identify the reasons why African-Americans, Hispanics/Latinos, Filipinos/Pacific Islanders experience disproportionate impact as these students attempt to complete Basic Skills English, Math or ESL courses.
- The Student Equity Workgroup will also collaborate with the Basic Skills Workgroup, departments of English, Math, ESLL, and the Office of Institutional Research \& Planning to determine why students aged 20-24 and 25-49 experience disproportionate impact when attempting to complete Basic Skills English and ESL courses.


## ACTIVITY C.1. (Responsible Group: Student Equity Workgroup)

## Year 1

- Coordinate with IR\&P to develop a research project to understand why AfricanAmerican, Hispanic/Latino, Filipino/Pacific Islander students and students aged 20-24 and 25-49 experience disproportionate impacts when attempting to complete ESL and Basic Skills course sequences.
- Collaborate with Math, English and ESLL faculty to understand barriers to success in these programs, identify current intervention efforts, and identify how the Student Equity Workgroup can support and build on these efforts.


## Year 2

- Implement research agenda and then identify specific goals and activities based on new data.

Year 3

- Start implementing new goals based on new data.
- Evaluate the effectiveness of activities selected in year 2.


## EXPECTED OUTCOME C.1.1.

- By June 30, 2015, the Student Equity Workgroup will develop a research project and collaborated with Math, English and ESLL faculty to better understand why AfricanAmerican, Hispanic/Latino, Filipino/Pacific Islander students and students aged 20-24 and 25-49 experience disproportionate impact in ESL and Basic Skills sequence completion rates.
- By June 30, 2016, the Student Equity Workgroup will implement its research agenda and identify specific goals and activities to increase the sequence completion rates of AfricanAmerican, Hispanic/Latino, Filipino/Pacific Islander students and students aged 20-24 and 25-49 in ESL and Basic Skills.
- By June 30, 2017, the Student Equity Workgroup will implement at least one new activity designed to achieve one of the goals selected in year 2.


## GOALS AND ACTIVITIES

## D. STUDENT SUCCESS INDICATOR FOR DEGREE AND CERTIFICATE COMPLETION

"Ratio of the number of students by population group who receive a degree or certificate to the number of students in that group with the same informed matriculation goal"

## GOAL D.

- Although there are incidents of disproportionate impact by ethnicity and age, the Student Equity Workgroup has decided to focus on increasing course success rates with the expectation that the implementation of strategies that improve course success may also identify other methods that could increase the degree and certificate completion rates for the disproportionately impacted groups.


## ACTIVITY D.1.

- No activities have been selected.


## EXPECTED OUTCOME D.1.1.

- None.


## GOALS AND ACTIVITIES

## E. STUDENT SUCCESS INDICATOR FOR TRANSFER

"Ratio of the number of students by population group who complete a minimum of 12 units and have attempted a transfer level course in mathematics or English to the number of students in that group who transfer after one or more (up to six) years"

## GOAL E.

- Although there are incidents of disproportionate impact by ethnicity and age, the implementation of the ADT degrees, which is currently underway, will likely have a dramatic effect on the transfer rates in the near future. In light of these significant changes, the Student Equity Workgroup has not selected any transfer goals at this time. It is likely that more accurate information will be available in this upcoming three-year Student Equity Plan cycle that will enable the Student Equity Workgroup to develop goals addressing the expected changes in transfer rates.


## ACTIVITY E.1.

- No activities have been selected.


## EXPECTED OUTCOME E.1.1.

- None.


## Budget

## SOURCES OF FUNDING

President Miner allocated the Student Equity Workgroup from one-time college funds $\$ 5,000$ to establish and begin the implementation of the various activities necessary to achieve the goals outlined in the Student Equity Plan. Beyond those one-time funds, the Student Equity Workgroup will also have to identify additional resources--either through the campus-wide budget and resource allocation process or through other campus mission-based workgroups--to accomplish its goals.

The State of California has allocated $\$ 70$ million to the California Community College system to promote equity efforts. Foothill College's allocation will be $\$ 446,248$ for 2014-15. The Student Equity Workgroup will determine how to distribute the funds to support and achieve the goals and activities outlined in this Student Equity Plan by identifying projects and soliciting proposals from the campus community. While the Office of Instruction will oversee this funding, budgeting will be managed by the Student Equity Workgroup and documented for accountability purposes.

## Evaluation Schedule and Process

## EVALUATION SCHEDULE AND PROCESS

The Student Equity Workgroup reports its activities to the college's main shared governance body, the Planning and Resource Council (PARC), at least twice a year. As one of the five core mission workgroups (Basic Skills, Student Equity, Transfer, Workforce, Operations Planning Committee), these groups are headed by a tri-chair model with leadership from classified staff, faculty and administrators, all who make up the voting members of PaRC. At the beginning of the academic year, each workgroup creates and shares its objectives for the coming year and these objectives are reflected upon at the end of spring quarter.

As the Student Equity Plan is under the charge of the Student Equity Workgroup, the workgroup's objectives will mirror the goals and activities outlined for each year in the Student Equity Plan. As a result, the Student Equity Workgroup will evaluate whether the campus is making adequate progress to achieve the outlined goals when its annual reflection is released. By tying the evaluation schedule of the goals and activities identified in the Student Equity Plan to the existing campus governance structure, process and timeline, the Student Equity Workgroup will be required to update the campus regularly of the current student equity efforts as well as whether the campus is meeting the goals identified in the plan. The expectation is that building equity efforts into the campus governance structure will build in campus-wide accountability.

For 2014-15, the Student Equity Workgroup is collaborating with the Basic Skills Workgroup, who oversees the Basic Skills Initiative funding, to identify activities that would support the goals identified in the Student Equity Plan. A proposal template was created and both groups will review the proposals. Once the Student Equity Workgroup selects the proposals to fund, measurable targets and objectives will be identified and then tracked to determine whether these initiatives are making movement toward the goals identified in the Student Equity Plan. This process will include identifying baseline data, developing a methodology to track student outcomes and capturing data to demonstrate progress.

To help facilitate understanding about the potential impact of each initiative, equity funding will be used to fund a research analyst to support those classified staff, faculty and administrators involved in these student equity initiatives. This function will allow IR\&P and the Student Equity Workgroup to establish timelines and processes to ensure data collection and analysis occurs for each effort.

## Addendum

## Addendum

In summer 2014, additional requirements were identified that need to be addressed by the Student Equity Plan (for fall 2015). The passage of SB 860 stipulated the following:

1) Student populations need to be addressed by gender and as defined in the US 2010 census

- American Indians/Alaskan Natives
- Asian
- Black/African-American
- Hispanic/Latino
- Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander
- Whites
- Some other race
- More than one race
- Current/former foster youth
- Students with disabilities
- Low income students
- Veterans

The Plan:
The Office of Institutional Research \& Planning, in collaboration with the Student Equity Workgroup, Office of Instruction and Office of Student Services, will identify these student populations using the DataMart, CCCApply and local college data. These groups will be disaggregated by gender. Populations with 10 or fewer students will be indicated as such, especially as such small numbers make it difficult to come to definitive conclusions regarding disproportionate impact.
2) Activities designed to effectively meet goals include

- Adoption of evidence-based models of remediation
- Implementation of placement tests and policies that more accurately predict student success and identify their remedial needs
The Plan:
Proposals submitted to the Student Equity Workgroup will be encouraged to include existing research and documented practices to establish the potential impact initiative may have on student population groups, especially those who are high-need or traditionally disadvantaged. Instruction and Student Services have initiated efforts to collaborate and work more closely with the Assessment Office, Institutional Research \& Planning and the Student Equity Workgroup to validate cut scores, placement instruments and course outcomes.

3) Coordination with these categorical or campus-based programs

- DSPS
- EOPS
- Middle College High School
- Puente Project
- SSSP
- Programs for foster youth
- Programs for veterans
- CalWORKS
- Financial Aid
- Basic Skills Initiative

The Plan:
The Student Equity Workgroup has begun to identify other campus equity initiatives, especially those from the above-identified programs. Additionally, a template has been created to review proposals for equity initiatives. Recent efforts at standardizing the identification of foster youth and veterans as well as efforts to align assessment practices more closely with basic skills placement and outcomes demonstrate how the Student Equity Workgroup is beginning to work in coordination with other categorical or campus-based programs.
4) Detailed funding and budgeting

- Schedule and process for evaluation
- Detailed accounting of how funding was expended
- Assessment of the progress made in achieving the goals

The Plan:
The Student Equity Workgroup, along with the Office of Institutional Research \& Planning, will be responsible for ensuring that there is a data- or evidence-based process for all funded initiatives. Some of the equity funding will be allocated to ensure that there is adequate support for documentation and evaluation purposes. Detailed accounting of funding and assessment of progress toward goals will occur in future plan updates.
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[^0]:    Note: SPAR is defined as having earned an AA/A, Certificate of Achievement, transfer to a four-year institution or completion of $60 \mathrm{UC} / \mathrm{CSU}$ transferable units with a GPA of 2.0 or higher.
    Source: 2013 Student Success Scorecard (2006-07 cohort)

[^1]:    Source: Transfer Velocity Project (2006-07 cohort), CCCCO Data Mart

