

College of San Mateo
Student Equity Plan

November 2014

DRAFT

COLLEGE OF SAN MATEO STUDENT EQUITY PLAN

Table of Contents

Signature Page

Executive Summary

- Target Groups
- Goals
- Activities
- Resources
- Contact Person/Student Equity Coordinator

Campus-Based Research

- Overview
- Indicator Definitions and Data
 - Access
 - Course Completion (*Retention*)
 - ESL and Basic Skills Completion
 - Degree and Certificate Completion

Goals and Activities

- Access
- Course Completion (*Retention*)
- ESL and Basic Skills Completion
- Degree and Certificate Completion
- Transfer

Budget

- Sources of Funding

Evaluation Schedule and Process

Attachments (*Optional*)

***College of San Mateo
Student Equity Plan
Signature Page***

District: San Mateo County Community College District

Date Approved by Board of Trustees: _____

College President: Mr. Michael Claire

Vice President of Student Services: Ms. Jennifer Hughes

Vice President of Instruction: Dr. Sandra Stefani Comerford

Academic Senate President: Dr. David Laderman

Student Equity Coordinator/Contact Person: Dr. Henry Villareal

Executive Summary

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At the apex of College of San Mateo's planning process is its Mission Statement, which drives planning at both the institutional level and the program level and clearly puts student success at the center of the college's planning. The College's Diversity Statement calls out the college's policy of inclusiveness that recognizes values and reflects the diversity of the community the college serves.

To achieve its stated mission, the college has adopted the following Institutional Priorities:

Priority 1: Improve Student Success

Priority 2: Promote Academic Excellence

Priority 3: Develop Responsive, High-Quality Programs and Services

Priority 4: Support Professional Development

Priority 5: Implement the Integrated Planning Cycle and Ensure Fiscal Stability and the Efficient Use of Resources

Priority 6: Enhance Institutional Dialog

CSM's Institutional Priorities are reviewed each year by the Institutional Planning Committee (IPC), the body that has overarching stewardship for the ongoing implementation and assessment of College of San Mateo's institutional planning process. In addition, each year, IPC reviews the Educational Master Plan (EMP), a document based on quantitative and qualitative data and information that informs planning. The EMP includes extensive student achievement data. The Institutional Priorities and their associated objectives are reviewed annually by IPC. Based on a review of institutional data, objectives may be added or reviewed to assist the institution in achieving these Institutional Priorities.

In addition, the college has established a College Index, which identifies a number of key college indicators and is reviewed annually by IPC. Many of the college indicators are aligned with the indicators identified in the Student Equity Plan, as well as the statewide Scorecard, including student success, persistence, retention, and completion.

Finally, IPC reviews all departmental program reviews. As part of the program review process, the Office of Planning, Research, and Institutional Effectiveness provides each department with a variety of data and regarding their programs, including data and information about student demographics, program efficiency, and other student achievement data. Themes and trends identified through program review are forwarded to IPC as part of their institutional planning cycle and process.

One of the key institutional priorities is Improving Student Success. A number of collegewide initiatives have been developed and approved by IPC to improve the success of specific student populations, including, but not limited to the establishment of a Puente Program and an Umoja Program.

The preparation of the 1997 Student Equity Plan was the responsibility of the Student Equity Implementation Committee. The 2005 Student Equity Plan was developed by the Student Development Committee, a participatory committee established by IPC in the spring, 2014 semester. Many members of this task force also serve on the Diversity in Action Group, an institutional committee. The Student Equity Plan was approved by IPC at its September 19, 2014 meeting.

Details on the student equity goals and groups for whom the goals have been set, the activities, and selected resources to support accomplishing these goals are found in the following pages. Expected outcomes for each activity and the department/person responsible for implementing the activity are specified.

Based on the Task Force's review of data the majority of goals and activities focus on the following student populations/programs:

- Students aged 18-24, with special emphasis on high school graduates from feeder high schools
- African American, Latino, and Pacific Islander students
- Low income seniors
- Foster and incarcerated youth
- Veteran students
- AB 540 students
- ESL and basic skills students
- Probation students
- Revitalize CTE programs

College of San Mateo's local research has addressed and analyzed all components of the Student Equity reporting requirements. The starting point of CSM's equity data is access—the extent to which our student population reflects the larger demographic profile of San Mateo County. However, access alone is insufficient. CSM's equity data address student outcomes as well as access. The equity data provided examines the extent to which all various student populations are succeeding at equitable rates. The populations analyzed for disproportionate impact include ethnicity, gender, age, disability status, low-income status, foster youth status, and veterans' status. These various student populations are tracked to measure equitable outcomes on the following core measures of academic success: overall successful course completion; ESL, English, and Math basic skills course completion and subsequent progression to degree-applicable/transfer level coursework; degree and certificate completion of students with informed educational goals; transfer readiness and transfer; and various types of academic probation.

Campus-Based Research

CAMPUS-BASED RESEARCH

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

College of San Mateo's local research has identified the extent to which various groups residing in San Mateo County are underrepresented, overrepresented, or identical to CSM's student population who reside San Mateo County. Proportional representation rates (San Mateo County vs. CSM student population) are analyzed: ethnicity, gender, age, disability status, low-income economic status, foster youth, and veterans. In terms of ethnicity, the two most overrepresented populations are Pacific Islanders and Multi-racial students. As expected, students aged 20-24 are the most overrepresented and those aged 60 and older are the most underrepresented. Male and female students mirror their proportional representation in San Mateo County as a whole. CSM enrolls a greater proportion of disabled students than their presence in San Mateo County as a whole. Low income students 65 years or older are underrepresented in terms of their overall presence in San Mateo County. Foster youth and veteran students aged 18 – 54 are overrepresented in relation to their proportional representation in San Mateo County as a whole.

Data for CSM Student Equity Plan 2014



Indicator #1 Access

Access: Student Equity Plan Definition

The percentage of each population group that is enrolled compared to that group's representation in the adult population within the community served.

Data Included:

- Table 1: Comparison of CSM Students Residing in San Mateo County vs. San Mateo County Residents, by Ethnicity, Fall 2012 – Spring 2013
- Table 2: Comparison of CSM Students Residing in San Mateo County vs. San Mateo County Residents, by Gender, Fall 2012 – Spring 2013
- Table 3: Comparison of CSM Students Residing in San Mateo County vs. San Mateo County Residents, by Age, Fall 2012 – Spring 2013
- Table 4: Comparison of CSM Students Residing in San Mateo County vs. San Mateo County Residents, by Disability Status, Fall 2012 – Spring 2013
- Table 5: Comparison of CSM Students Residing in San Mateo County vs. San Mateo County Residents, by Economic Status, Fall 2012 – Spring 2013
- Table 6. Comparison of CSM Students Residing in San Mateo County vs. San Mateo County Residents, by Foster Youth Status, Fall 2012 – Spring 2013

- Table 7. Comparison of CSM Students Residing in San Mateo County vs. San Mateo County Residents, by Age and Veteran Status, Fall 2012 – Spring 2013

Key Findings:

- The proportional enrollment of all San Mateo County residents enrolling at CSM is presented in Tables 1-7. In accordance with the California Community College Chancellor's Office Student Equity Plan guidelines, the following populations are analyzed:
 1. Ethnicity
 2. Gender
 3. Age
 4. Disability status
 5. Low income economic status
 6. Foster Youth
 7. Veterans
- The key reference indicator for access is the "P Index", where a value of 1.00 = identical proportionality. That is, if a specific population comprised 10.0% of all San Mateo County residents and that same population comprised 10.0% of all CSM students, the P Index would = 1.00. In other words, the proportion of that population is equal. Any value less than 1.00 indicates that a specific San Mateo County population is under-represented in CSM's student body. Conversely, any value greater than 1.00 indicates that a group is over-represented.
- The proportionality metric is not intended to specify at which point a proportionality index should be considered as a "disproportionate impact." The designation of which disaggregated populations should be considered as disproportionately under-represented is based on local conditions and will rely on the judgment of the CSM Student Equity team. The data presented are intended to stimulate conversation and investigation into areas where disproportionality may be affecting student success.
- For example, the age data presented in Table 3 reveals varying degrees of both under- and over-representation for various age categories. These range from a P Index = 5.33 for CSM students aged 20 – 24 to a P Index = 0.15 for students 60 years or older. The proportional representation of these two groups is to be understood in terms of the larger context of CSM's programs, services, and the larger college participation rates of these 2 groups.

Table 1. Comparison of CSM Students Residing in San Mateo County vs. San Mateo County Residents, by Ethnicity, Fall 2012 – Spring 2013

	San Mateo County Residents	CSM Students Residing in San Mateo County		
		Count	Percent	P index
Total 15 years and older	603,865	9,655		
African American	2.7%	273	2.8%	1.04
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.2%	25	0.3%	1.56
Asian	26.4%	2,100	21.8%	0.82
Hispanic	23.3%	2,088	21.6%	0.93
Multi races	2.3%	1,393	14.4%	6.20
Pacific Islander	1.4%	235	2.4%	1.77
White	43.7%	3,541	36.7%	0.84
Other	0.0%	N/A	0.0%	---
Unknown	N/A	564	5.8%	---

Notes: P index = proportionality index, which is the percentage of the CSM subgroup divided by the percentage of the county subgroup (e.g., for Hispanics, the index is 21.6% divided by 23.3% = 0.93). A ratio of 1.0 indicates that a subgroup is present in both the college and the county at the same rate. A ratio of less than 1.0 indicates that the subgroup is less prevalent in the college than in the county. CSM data include only San Mateo County residents and do not include concurrently enrolled high school students. Census Bureau ethnic categories were adjusted to conform to CSM ethnic categories. "Asian" includes Filipino. Multi races include "Two or more races".

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, Annual County Resident Population Estimates by Age, Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2012 (CC-EST2012-ALLDATA- [ST [FIPS]]); SMCCCD Student Database, End of term.

Table 2. Comparison of CSM Students Residing in San Mateo County vs. San Mateo County Residents, by Gender, Fall 2012 – Spring 2013

	San Mateo County Residents		CSM Students Residing in San Mateo County		P Index
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	
Total 15 years and older	603,865		9,975		
Male	294,714	48.8	4,816	48.3	0.99
Female	309,151	51.2	5,159	51.7	1.01
Unrecorded	N/A	N/A	244	2.4	---

Notes: P index = proportionality index, which is the percentage of the CSM subgroup divided by the percentage of the county subgroup (e.g., for Females, the index is 51.7% divided by 51.2% = 1.01). A ratio of 1.0 indicates that a subgroup is present in both the college and the county at the same rate. A ratio of less than 1.0 indicates that the subgroup is less prevalent in the college than in the county. CSM data include only San Mateo County residents and do not include concurrently enrolled high school students. Census Bureau gender categories do not include "unrecorded".

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, Annual County Resident Population Estimates by Age, Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2012 (CC-EST2012-ALLDATA- [ST [FIPS]]); SMCCCD Student Database, End of term.

Table 3. Comparison of CSM Students Residing in San Mateo County vs. San Mateo County Residents, by Age, Fall 2012 – Spring 2013

	San Mateo County Residents		CSM Students Residing in San Mateo County		P Index
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	
Total 15 years and older	603,865		10,214		
15 to 19 years	41,228	6.8	1,898	18.6	2.72
20 to 24 years	41,027	6.8	3,701	36.2	5.33
25 to 29 years	49,479	8.2	1,442	14.1	1.72
30 to 39 years	106,371	17.6	1,363	13.3	0.76
40 to 49 years	112,080	18.6	828	8.1	0.44
50 to 59 years	106,298	17.6	619	6.1	0.34
60 years or older	147,382	24.4	363	3.6	0.15

Notes: P index = proportionality index, which is the percentage of the CSM subgroup divided by the percentage of the county subgroup (e.g., for those 15 to 19 years old, the index is 18.6% divided by 6.8% = 2.72). A ratio of 1.0 indicates that a subgroup is present in both the college and the county at the same rate. A ratio of less than 1.0 indicates that the subgroup is less prevalent in the college than in the county. CSM data include only San Mateo County residents and do not include concurrently enrolled high school students.

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, Annual County Resident Population Estimates by Age, Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2012 (CC-EST2012-ALLDATA-[ST[FIPS]]); SMCCCD Student Database, End of term.

Table 4. Comparison of CSM Students Residing in San Mateo County vs. San Mateo County Residents, by Disability Status, Fall 2012 – Spring 2013

	San Mateo County Residents			CSM Students Residing in San Mateo County			
	Total	With a disability	Pct with a disability	Total	With a disability	Pct with a disability	P Index
Persons 18 to 64 years	461,948	23,394	5.1%	10,001	871	8.7%	1.71
Persons 65 years and over	94,802	28,751	30.3%	213	88	41.3%	1.36

Notes: P index = proportionality index, which is the percentage of the CSM subgroup divided by the percentage of the county subgroup (e.g., for Persons 18 to 64 years, the index is 8.7% divided by 5.1% = 1.71). A ratio of 1.0 indicates that a subgroup is present in both the college and the county at the same rate. A ratio of less than 1.0 indicates that the subgroup is less prevalent in the college than in the county. CSM data include only San Mateo County residents and do not include concurrently enrolled high school students.

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2008-2012 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table S1810: Disability Characteristics; SMCCCD Student Database, End of term.

Table 5. Comparison of CSM Students Residing in San Mateo County vs. San Mateo County Residents, by Economic Status, Fall 2012 – Spring 2013

Population for whom poverty/economic status is determined	San Mateo County Residents			CSM Students Residing in San Mateo County			
	Total	With Low Income		Total	With Low Income		P Index
		Count	Percent		Count	Percent	
Total 18 years or older	556,133	69,626	12.5%	10,214	2,128	20.8%	1.66
18 to 64 years	461,331	56,852	12.3%	10,001	2,115	21.1%	1.72
65 years or older	94,802	12,774	13.5%	213	13	6.1%	0.45

Notes: P index = proportionality index, which is the percentage of the CSM subgroup divided by the percentage of the county subgroup (e.g., for Total 18 years or older, the index is 20.8% divided by 12.5% = 1.66). A ratio of 1.0 indicates that a subgroup is present in both the college and the county at the same rate. A ratio of less than 1.0 indicates that the subgroup is less prevalent in the college than in the county. CSM data include only San Mateo County residents with known age and do not include concurrently enrolled high school students. CSM student economic status determined by student receipt of financial aid awards for low-income students (e.g. BOG Fee Waivers A & B, Chafee Grant, etc.).

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2008-2012 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table B17024: Age by Ratio of Income to Poverty; SMCCCD Student Database, Financial Aid Awards.

Table 6. Comparison of CSM Students Residing in San Mateo County vs. San Mateo County Residents, by Foster Youth Status, Fall 2012 – Spring 2013

	Total Youth 16-20 Years	Foster Youth	
		Count	Row Pct
California	2,838,463	12,888	0.5
San Mateo County	44,947	130	0.3
CSM	3,075	43	1.4
P Index			4.67

Notes: P index = proportionality index, which is the percentage of the CSM subgroup divided by the percentage of the county subgroup (e.g., for foster youth 16 to 20 years old, the index is 1.4% divided by 0.3% = 4.67). A ratio of 1.0 indicates that a subgroup is present in both the college and the county at the same rate. A ratio of less than 1.0 indicates that the subgroup is less prevalent in the college than in the county. CSM data include only San Mateo County residents and do not include concurrently enrolled high school students.

Sources: Lucille Packard Foundation for Children's Health, kidsdata.org; State of California Department of Finance, Report P-3: State and County Population Projections by Race/Ethnicity, Detailed Age, and Gender, 2010-2060; SMCCCD Student Database, End of term.

Table 7. Comparison of CSM Students Residing in San Mateo County vs. San Mateo County Residents, by Age and Veteran Status, Fall 2012 – Spring 2013

	Total San Mateo County Residents	San Mateo County Veterans		Total CSM Students	CSM Students Residing in San Mateo County		
		Count	Row Pct		Count	Row Pct	P Index
Civilian population 18 years and older	561,621	33,337	5.9	10,182	243	2.4	0.40
18 to 34 years	155,569	2,034	1.3	7,847	160	2.0	1.56
35 to 54	219,032	6,334	2.9	1,702	57	3.3	1.16
55 to 64	89,859	7,467	8.3	420	16	3.8	0.46
65 to 74	51,108	7,034	13.8	156	8	5.1	0.37
75 years and over	46,615	10,501	22.5	57	2	3.5	0.16

Notes: P index = proportionality index, which is the percentage of the CSM subgroup divided by the percentage of the county subgroup (e.g., for those 18 to 34 years old, the index is 2.0% divided by 1.3% = 1.56). A ratio of 1.0 indicates that a subgroup is present in both the college and the county at the same rate. A ratio of less than 1.0 indicates that the subgroup is less prevalent in the college than in the county. CSM data include only San Mateo County residents and do not include concurrently enrolled high school students.

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2008-2012 American Community Survey (S2101 Veteran Status); SMCCCD Student Database, End of term.

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.

Successful course completion of the following populations is analyzed: ethnicity, gender, age, disability status, low-income economic status, academic standing, foster youth, and veterans. In terms of the primary Student Equity Plan reference point—the “80% Index” standard—the following disaggregated sub-populations were experiencing disproportionate impact in terms of successful course completion rates: African Americans and students younger than 20 years of age. As expected, all student sub-populations who were placed on Probation 1, Probation 2, and Dismissed academic status experienced major disproportionate impact. When assessing disproportionate impact, caution is advised with low subgroup counts ($n < 50$). The CSM Equity Committee will also closely examine other disparities and gaps in successful course completion rates that fall within the 80% Index standard.

Data for CSM Student Equity Plan 2014 Indicator #2 Course Completion



Course Completion: Student Equity Plan Definition

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. “Course Completion” means the successful completion of a credit course for which a student receives a recorded grade of A, B, C, or Credit.

Data Included:

- Table 1: Successful Course Completion, Fall 2012 – Spring 2013

Key Findings:

- Table 1 displays successful course completion rates of CSM students enrolled in Fall 2012 and Spring 2013, combined. Successful course completion = earning a grade of A, B, C, P, or CR. The data presented are counts of all courses attempted/completed—not student headcount.
- In accordance with the California Community College Chancellor’s Office Student Equity Plan guidelines, the successful course completion rates of the following populations are analyzed:
 8. Ethnicity

9. Gender
10. Age
11. Disability status
12. Low income economic status
13. Academic standing (Probation 1, Probation 2, and Dismissed)
14. Foster Youth
15. Veterans

- The primary Student Equity Plan reference point is the “80% Index”. This methodology compares the percentage of each disaggregated population to the percentage attained by a reference population. The ‘reference population’ is the specific population with the highest rate of success. The methodology is based on the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) 80% Rule, outlined in the 1978 Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures, and was used in Title VII enforcement by the U.S. Equal Opportunity Commission, Department of Labor, and the Department of Justice.
- The 80% Rule states that: “A selection rate for any race, sex, or ethnic group which is less than four-fifths (4/5) (or eighty percent) of the rate for the group with the highest rate will generally be regarded by the Federal enforcement agencies as evidence of adverse impact, while a greater than four-fifths rate will generally not be regarded by Federal enforcement agencies as evidence of adverse impact.” [Section 60-3, Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedure (1978); 43 FR 38295(August 25, 1978)] Any disaggregated group that is included in a desired outcome at less than 80%, when compared to a reference group, is considered to have suffered an adverse – or disproportionate - impact.
- Using this methodology, the 80% Index data column in Table 1 highlights the extent to which various populations’ successful course completion rates are within or outside of the 80% standard.
- Using age as an example. Students 60 years or older have the highest successful course completion rate: 83.2%. This group’s success rate becomes the reference group standard (100%) for evaluating the other age subgroups in term of the 80% Index. The success rate of students younger than 20 = 65.8%. This figure is 79.1% of the reference group’s success rate of 83.2%. Hence, their 80% Index = 79.1% and is below the 80% rule--and could be considered suffering disproportionate impact.
- The designation of which disaggregated populations should be considered as disproportionately impacted is based on local conditions and will rely on the judgment of the CSM Student Equity team. The 80% Index is a suggested guideline only. The data are intended to stimulate conversation and additional investigation into areas where disproportionate impact may be affecting student success.
- Care should be taken when interpreting results with low subgroup counts (n<50).

Table 1. Successful Course Completion, Fall 2012 – Spring 2013

		Enrollment Count (duplicated)	Successful Course Completion		
			Count	Rate	80% Index
Ethnicity	African American	2,066	1,221	59.1%	78.4%
	American Indian/Alaskan Native	93	58	62.4%	82.7%
	Asian	6,865	5,132	74.8%	99.1%
	Filipino	3,372	2,441	72.4%	96.0%
	Hispanic	9,532	6,087	63.9%	84.7%
	Multi Races	7,270	4,806	66.1%	87.7%
	Pacific Islander	1,290	803	62.2%	82.6%
	White	14,444	10,642	73.7%	97.7%
	<i>Unknown</i>	2,785	2,100	75.4%	100.0%
	Total	47,717	33,290	69.8%	92.5%
Gender	<i>Female</i>	22,525	15,954	70.8%	100.0%
	Male	24,123	16,601	68.8%	97.2%
	Not recorded	1,069	735	68.8%	97.1%
	Total	47,717	33,290	69.8%	98.5%
Age	Younger than 20 years	12,802	8,419	65.8%	79.1%
	20 – 24 years	19,103	13,025	68.2%	82.0%
	25 – 29 years	5,576	3,982	71.4%	85.9%
	30 – 39 years	4,860	3,662	75.3%	90.6%
	40 – 49 years	2,583	1,945	75.3%	90.5%
	50 – 59 years	1,693	1,347	79.6%	95.7%
	<i>60 years and older</i>	1,076	895	83.2%	100.0%
	Total	47,693	33,275	69.8%	83.9%
Disability Status	<i>Receives DSPS services</i>	4,764	3,341	70.1%	100.0%
	No DSPS services	42,953	29,949	69.7%	99.4%
	Total	47,717	33,290	69.8%	99.5%
Economic Status	Low income student	10,300	6,528	63.4%	88.6%
	<i>Not low income</i>	37,417	26,762	71.5%	100.0%
	Total	47,717	33,290	69.8%	97.5%
Academic Standing	<i>Good academic standing</i>	40,438	31,340	77.5%	100.0%
	Probation 1	3,918	959	24.5%	31.6%
	Probation 2	1,985	627	31.6%	40.8%
	Dismissed	1,376	364	26.5%	34.1%
	Total	47,717	33,290	69.8%	90.0%
Foster Youth	Foster youth	516	252	48.8%	69.7%
	<i>Not foster youth</i>	47,201	33,038	70.0%	100.0%
	Total	47,717	33,290	69.8%	99.7%
Veterans	Veteran	1,282	883	68.9%	98.7%
	<i>Not a veteran</i>	46,435	32,407	69.8%	100.0%
	Total	47,717	33,290	69.8%	99.7%

Notes: The 80% Index compares the percentage of each disaggregated subgroup attaining an outcome to the percentage attained by the subgroup with the highest rate (reference subgroup). Care must be taken when interpreting results with low subgroup counts (n<50). The methodology is based on the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) 80% Rule, outlined in the 1978 Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures, and was used in Title VII enforcement by the U.S. Equal Opportunity Commission, Department of Labor, and the Department of Justice. A result of less than 80 percent is considered evidence of a disproportionate impact. Reference subgroups are in *italics*. Subgroups suffering disproportionate impact are in **bold**. CSM course completion data include do not include 690 courses or concurrently enrolled high school students. Source: SMCCCD Student Database: Academic History, Term GPA, and Financial Aid Awards tables.

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.

CSM local research examined student progression in terms of various ‘starting points’ for basic skills and ESL students. Progression rates of the following populations are analyzed: ethnicity, gender, age, disability status, low-income economic status, academic standing, foster youth, and veterans. English basic skills students were tracked to enrollment in transfer level English. Higher-level ESL students were tracked to the final ESL course in the sequence. In addition, the highest-level ESL students were tracked to transfer level English. Elementary and Intermediate Algebra students were tracked separately into degree applicable and transfer level Math, respectively. Due to small ‘n’ sizes associated with many of the disaggregated populations identified for disproportionate impact analysis, several groups were identified for disproportionate impact. Caution is advised with low subgroup counts (n<50). Beyond the 80% Index standard, the CSM Equity Committee is concerned about the low rates of overall progression of basic skills and ESL students to both degree applicable and transfer level coursework.

Data for CSM Student Equity Plan 2014 Indicator #3 ESL and Basic Skills Completion



ESL and Basic Skills Completion: Student Equity Plan Definition

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.

Data Included:

1. ENGL 838/848 Student Progression to ENGL 100, 2010/11 – 2013/14
2. ESL 828 Student Progression to ESL 400, 2010/11 – 2013/14
3. ESL 400 Student Progression to ENGL 100, 2010/11 – 2013/14
4. MATH 110/112 Student Progression to MATH 120/122, 2010/11 – 2013/14
5. MATH 120/123 Student Progression to MATH 125+, 2010/11 – 2013/14

Key Findings:

- The data presented in Tables 1-5 tracks the progression of students who initially enroll in specified 'target' coursework during Academic Year 2010-11 (Summer-Fall-Spring) and who subsequently enroll in specified higher-level coursework within the discipline (e.g., ESL 828 ► ESL 400). All course outcomes are tracked through Spring 2014.
- In accordance with the California Community College Chancellor's Office Student Equity Plan guidelines, the ESL and basic skills course progression rates of the following populations are analyzed:
 16. Ethnicity
 17. Gender
 18. Age
 19. Disability status
 20. Low income economic status
 21. Academic standing (Probation 1, Probation 2, and Dismissed)
 22. Foster Youth
 23. Veterans
- The primary Student Equity Plan reference point is the "80% Index". This methodology compares the percentage of each disaggregated population to the percentage attained by a reference population. The 'reference population' is the specific population with the highest rate of success. The methodology is based on the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) 80% Rule, outlined in the 1978 Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures, and was used in Title VII enforcement by the U.S. Equal Opportunity Commission, Department of Labor, and the Department of Justice.
- The 80% Rule states that: "A selection rate for any race, sex, or ethnic group which is less than four-fifths (4/5) (or eighty percent) of the rate for the group with the highest rate will generally be regarded by the Federal enforcement agencies as evidence of adverse impact, while a greater than four-fifths rate will generally not be regarded by Federal enforcement agencies as evidence of adverse impact." [Section 60-3, Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedure (1978); 43 FR 38295(August 25, 1978)] Any disaggregated group that is included in a desired outcome at less than 80%, when compared to a reference group, is considered to have suffered an adverse - or disproportionate - impact.
- Using this methodology, the 80% Index data column in Tables 1 - 5 highlights the extent to which various populations' progression rates are within or outside of the 80% standard.
- Using Table 1 and age as an example. Students 40-49 have the highest successful ENGL 838/848 course progression rate: 45.0%. This group's success rate becomes the reference group standard (100%) for evaluating the other age subgroups in term of the 80% Index. The success rate of students 20-24 = 34.8%. This figure is 77.2% of the reference group's success rate of 45.0%. Hence, their 80% Index = 77.2% and is below the 80% rule--and could be considered suffering disproportionate impact.

- The designation of which disaggregated populations should be considered as disproportionately impacted is based on local conditions and will rely on the judgment of the CSM Student Equity team. The 80% Index is a suggested guideline only. The data are intended to stimulate conversation and additional investigation into areas where disproportionate impact may be affecting student success.
- Care should be taken when interpreting results with low subgroup counts ($n < 50$).

Table 1. ENGL 838/848 Student Progression to ENGL 100, 2010/11 – 2013/14

		Enrolled	Progressed to ENGL 100		
		ENGL 838/848 (unduplicated)	Count	Row N %	80% Index
Ethnicity	African American	63	28	44.4%	88.9%
	American Indian/Alaskan Native	**	**	**	100%
	Asian	150	67	44.7%	89.3%
	Filipino	124	48	38.7%	77.4%
	Hispanic	314	109	34.7%	69.4%
	Multi Races	170	55	32.4%	64.7%
	Pacific Islander	61	27	44.3%	88.5%
	White	307	101	32.9%	65.8%
	Unknown	**	**	**	70.4%
	Total	1,245	455	36.5%	73.1%
Gender	<i>Female</i>	518	196	37.8%	100.0%
	Male	698	251	36.0%	95.0%
	Not recorded	29	8	27.6%	72.9%
	Total	1,245	455	36.5%	96.6%
Age	Younger than 20	757	281	37.1%	82.5%
	20 - 24	328	114	34.8%	77.2%
	25 - 29	63	20	31.7%	70.5%
	30 - 39	43	18	41.9%	93.0%
	40 - 49	20	9	45.0%	100.0%
	50 - 59	**	**	**	79.4%
	60 and older	**	**	**	0.0%
	Total	1,227	447	36.4%	81.0%
Disability Status	<i>Receives DSPS services</i>	131	57	43.5%	100.0%
	No DSPS services	1,114	398	35.7%	82.1%
	Total	1,245	455	36.5%	84.0%
Economic Status	<i>Low income student</i>	510	198	38.8%	100.0%
	Not low income	735	257	35.0%	90.1%
	Total	1,245	455	36.5%	94.1%
Probation 1 Status AY10-11	On probation 1 status	353	121	34.3%	91.5%
	<i>Not on probation 1 status</i>	892	334	37.4%	100.0%
	Total	1,245	455	36.5%	97.6%
Probation 2 Status AY10-11	<i>On probation 2 status</i>	154	57	37.0%	100.0%
	Not on probation 2 status	1,091	398	36.5%	98.6%
	Total	1,245	455	36.5%	98.7%
Dismissal Status AY10-11	On dismissal status	78	13	16.7%	44.0%
	<i>Not on dismissal status</i>	1,167	442	37.9%	100.0%
	Total	1,245	455	36.5%	96.5%

		Enrolled ENGL 838/848 (unduplicated)	Progressed to ENGL 100		
			Count	Row N %	80% Index
Foster Youth	Foster youth	14	4	28.6%	78.1%
	<i>Not foster youth</i>	<i>1,231</i>	<i>451</i>	<i>36.6%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>
	Total	1,245	455	36.5%	99.7%
Veterans	Veteran	34	9	26.5%	72.0%
	<i>Not a veteran</i>	<i>1,211</i>	<i>446</i>	<i>36.8%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>
	Total	1,245	455	36.5%	50.5%

Notes: This table reports on students who were enrolled in ENGL 838/848 during AY2010-11 (Summer-Fall-Spring) and who subsequently enrolled in ENGL 100 through Spring 2014. The 80% Index compares the rate of each subgroup attaining an outcome to the rate attained by the subgroup with the highest rate (reference subgroup). Care must be taken when interpreting results with low subgroup counts ($n < 50$). A result of less than 80 percent is considered evidence of a disproportionate impact. Reference subgroups are in *italics*. Subgroups suffering disproportionate impact are in **bold**.

“***” indicates the suppression of results for subgroups with small counts ($n < 10$), with complementary suppression of at least one other subgroup, for privacy and data reliability concerns. For further discussion, see National Center for Education Statistics Technical Brief 2012-151, <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2012/2012151.pdf>.

Source: SMCCCD Student Database: Academic History, Term GPA, and Financial Aid Awards tables.

Table 2. ESL 828 Student Progression to ESL 400, 2010/11 – 2013/14

		Enrolled ESL 828 (unduplicated)	Progressed to ESL 400		
			Count	Row N %	80% Index
Ethnicity	African American	**	**	**	0.0%
	American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	0	---	---
	<i>Asian</i>	60	30	50.0%	100.0%
	Filipino	**	**	**	75.0%
	Hispanic	40	12	30.0%	60.0%
	Multi Races	**	**	**	100.0%
	Pacific Islander	0	0	---	---
	White	14	6	42.9%	85.7%
	Unknown	**	**	**	72.2%
	Total	167	68	40.7%	81.4%
Gender	Female	84	33	39.3%	83.8%
	<i>Male</i>	64	30	46.9%	100.0%
	Not recorded	19	5	26.3%	56.1%
	Total	167	68	40.7%	86.9%
Age	Younger than 20	17	10	58.8%	58.8%
	20 - 24	40	20	50.0%	50.0%
	25 - 29	27	9	33.3%	33.3%
	30 - 39	30	10	33.3%	33.3%
	40 - 49	**	**	**	31.6%
	50 - 59	**	**	**	25.0%
	<i>60 and older</i>	**	**	**	100.0%
	Total	139	58	41.7%	41.7%
Disability Status	<i>Receives DSPS services</i>	**	**	**	100.0%
	No DSPS services	**	**	**	80.7%
	Total	167	68	40.7%	81.4%
Economic Status	<i>Low income student</i>	86	39	45.3%	100.0%
	Not low income	81	29	35.8%	78.9%
	Total	167	68	40.7%	89.8%
Probation 1 Status AY10-11	On probation 1 status	16	5	31.3%	74.9%
	<i>Not on probation 1 status</i>	151	63	41.7%	100.0%
	Total	167	68	40.7%	97.6%
Probation 2 Status AY10-11	On probation 2 status	**	**	**	91.7%
	<i>Not on probation 2 status</i>	**	**	**	100.0%
	Total	167	68	40.7%	99.6%
Dismissal Status AY10-11	On dismissal status	**	**	**	91.7%
	<i>Not on dismissal status</i>	**	**	**	100.0%
	Total	167	68	40.7%	99.6%

		Enrolled ESL 828 (unduplicated)	Progressed to ESL 400		
			Count	Row N %	80% Index
Foster Youth	Foster youth	0	---	---	---
	<i>Not foster youth</i>	167	68	40.7%	100.0%
	Total	167	68	40.7%	99.6%
Veterans	Veteran	**	**	**	0.0%
	<i>Not a veteran</i>	**	**	**	100.0%
	Total	**	**	40.7%	99.6%

Notes: This table reports on students who were enrolled in ESL 828 during AY2010-11 (Summer-Fall-Spring) and who subsequently enrolled in ESL 400 through Spring 2014. The 80% Index compares the percentage of each disaggregated subgroup attaining an outcome to the percentage attained by the subgroup with the highest rate (reference subgroup). Care must be taken when interpreting results with low subgroup counts ($n < 50$). A result of less than 80 percent is considered evidence of a disproportionate impact. Reference subgroups are in *italics*. Subgroups suffering disproportionate impact are in **bold**.

“***” indicates the suppression of results for subgroups with small counts ($n < 10$), with complementary suppression of at least one other subgroup, for privacy and data reliability concerns. For further discussion, see National Center for Education Statistics Technical Brief 2012-151, <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2012/2012151.pdf>.

Source: SMCCCD Student Database: Academic History, Term GPA, and Financial Aid Awards tables.

Table 3. ESL 400 Student Progression to ENGL 100, 2010/11 – 2013/14

		Enrolled ESL 400 (unduplicated)	Progressed to ENGL 100		
			Count	Row N %	80% Index
Ethnicity	African American	0	0	---	---
	American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	0	---	---
	Asian	61	30	49.2%	49.2%
	<i>Filipino</i>	**	**	**	100.0%
	Hispanic	46	14	30.4%	30.4%
	Multi Races	**	**	**	20.0%
	Pacific Islander	**	**	**	0.0%
	White	**	**	**	25.0%
	Unknown	**	**	**	62.1%
	Total	152	67	44.1%	44.1%
Gender	Female	81	29	35.8%	53.7%
	Male	53	26	49.1%	73.6%
	<i>Not recorded</i>	18	12	66.7%	100.0%
	Total	152	67	44.1%	66.1%
Age	<i>Younger than 20</i>	**	**	**	100.0%
	20 - 24	34	14	41.2%	41.2%
	25 - 29	**	**	**	42.9%
	30 - 39	34	14	41.2%	41.2%
	40 - 49	16	2	12.5%	12.5%
	50 - 59	**	**	**	33.3%
	60 and older	**	**	**	0.0%
	Total	128	51	39.8%	39.8%
Disability Status	Receives DSPS services	**	**	**	56.1%
	<i>No DSPS services</i>	148	66	44.6%	100.0%
	Total	152	67	44.1%	98.8%
Economic Status	Low income student	66	26	39.4%	82.6%
	<i>Not low income</i>	86	41	47.7%	100.0%
	Total	152	67	44.1%	92.5%
Probation 1 Status AY10-11	On probation 1 status	**	**	**	74.5%
	<i>Not on probation 1 status</i>	**	**	**	100.0%
	Total	152	67	44.1%	98.5%
Probation 2 Status AY10-11	On probation 2 status	**	**	**	75.3%
	<i>Not on probation 2 status</i>	**	**	**	100.0%
	Total	152	67	44.1%	99.5%
Dismissal Status AY10-11	<i>On dismissal status</i>	**	**	**	100.0%
	Not on dismissal status	**	**	**	72.6%
	Total	152	67	44.1%	73.5%
Foster	Foster youth	0	---	---	---

		Enrolled ESL 400 (unduplicated)	Progressed to ENGL 100		
			Count	Row N %	80% Index
Youth	<i>Not foster youth</i>	152	67	44.1%	100.0%
	Total	152	67	44.1%	100.0%
Veterans	<i>Veteran</i>	**	**	**	<i>100.0%</i>
	Not a veteran	**	**	**	65.4%
	Total	152	67	44.1%	66.1%

Notes: This table reports on students who were enrolled in ESL 400 during AY2010-11 (Summer-Fall-Spring) and who subsequently enrolled in ENGL 100 through Spring 2014. The 80% Index compares the percentage of each subgroup attaining an outcome to the percentage attained by the subgroup with the highest rate (reference subgroup). Care must be taken when interpreting results with low subgroup counts ($n < 50$). A result of less than 80 percent is considered evidence of a disproportionate impact. Reference subgroups are in *italics*. Subgroups suffering disproportionate impact are in **bold**.

“**” indicates the suppression of results for subgroups with small counts ($n < 10$), with complementary suppression of at least one other subgroup, for privacy and data reliability concerns. For further discussion, see National Center for Education Statistics Technical Brief 2012-151, <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2012/2012151.pdf>.

Source: SMCCCD Student Database: Academic History, Term GPA, and Financial Aid Awards tables.

Table 4. MATH 110/112 Student Progression to MATH 120/122, 2010/11 – 2013/14

		Enrolled MATH 110/112 (unduplicated)	Progressed to MATH 120/122		
			Count	Row N %	80% Index
Ethnicity	African American	43	15	34.9%	80.1%
	American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	0	---	---
	Asian	53	17	32.1%	73.7%
	<i>Filipino</i>	62	27	43.5%	100.0%
	Hispanic	229	90	39.3%	90.2%
	Multi Races	100	42	42.0%	96.4%
	Pacific Islander	34	13	38.2%	87.8%
	White	252	97	38.5%	88.4%
	Unknown	53	22	41.5%	95.3%
	Total	826	323	39.1%	89.8%
Gender	<i>Female</i>	402	163	40.5%	100.0%
	Male	407	158	38.8%	95.7%
	Not recorded	17	2	11.8%	29.0%
	Total	826	323	39.1%	96.4%
Age	Younger than 20	332	152	45.8%	91.6%
	20 - 24	261	92	35.2%	70.5%
	25 - 29	86	27	31.4%	62.8%
	30 - 39	79	28	35.4%	70.9%
	40 - 49	**	**	**	70.6%
	<i>50 - 59</i>	20	10	50.0%	100.0%
	60 and older	**	**	**	0.0%
	Total	813	321	39.5%	79.0%
Disability Status	Receives DSPS services	93	35	37.6%	95.8%
	<i>No DSPS services</i>	733	288	39.3%	100.0%
	Total	826	323	39.1%	99.5%
Economic Status	<i>Low income student</i>	341	146	42.8%	100.0%
	Not low income	485	177	36.5%	85.2%
	Total	826	323	39.1%	91.3%
Probation 1 Status AY10-11	On probation 1 status	180	61	33.9%	83.6%
	<i>Not on probation 1 status</i>	646	262	40.6%	100.0%
	Total	826	323	39.1%	96.4%
Probation 2 Status AY10-11	On probation 2 status	96	28	29.2%	72.2%
	<i>Not on probation 2 status</i>	730	295	40.4%	100.0%
	Total	826	323	39.1%	96.8%
Dismissal Status AY10-11	On dismissal status	60	10	16.7%	40.8%
	<i>Not on dismissal status</i>	766	313	40.9%	100.0%
	Total	826	323	39.1%	95.7%
Foster	Foster youth	**	**	**	51.0%

		Enrolled MATH 110/112 (unduplicated)	Progressed to MATH 120/122		
			Count	Row N %	80% Index
Youth	<i>Not foster youth</i>	**	**	**	<i>100.0%</i>
	Total	826	323	39.1%	99.7%
Veterans	<i>Veteran</i>	38	10	26.3%	66.2%
	Not a veteran	788	313	39.7%	<i>100.0%</i>
	Total	826	323	39.1%	98.5%

Notes: This table reports on students who were enrolled in MATH 110/112 during AY2010-11 (Summer-Fall-Spring) and who subsequently enrolled in MATH 120/122 through Spring 2014. The 80% Index compares the rate of each subgroup attaining an outcome to the rate attained by the subgroup with the highest rate (reference subgroup). Care must be taken when interpreting results with low subgroup counts ($n < 50$). A result of less than 80 percent is considered evidence of a disproportionate impact. Reference subgroups are in *italics*. Subgroups suffering disproportionate impact are in **bold**.

“**” indicates the suppression of results for subgroups with small counts ($n < 10$), with complementary suppression of at least one other subgroup, for privacy and data reliability concerns. For further discussion, see National Center for Education Statistics Technical Brief 2012-151, <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2012/2012151.pdf>.

Source: SMCCCD Student Database: Academic History, Term GPA, and Financial Aid Awards tables.

Table 5. MATH 120/123 Student Progression to MATH 125+, 2010/11 – 2013/14

		Enrolled MATH 120/123 (unduplicated)	Progressed to MATH 125+		
			Count	Row N %	80% Index
Ethnicity	African American	50	17	34.0%	72.2%
	American Indian/Alaskan Native	**	**	**	35.4%
	<i>Asian</i>	104	49	47.1%	100.0%
	Filipino	80	36	45.0%	95.5%
	Hispanic	265	116	43.8%	92.9%
	Multi Races	98	45	45.9%	97.5%
	Pacific Islander	29	7	24.1%	51.2%
	White	329	136	41.3%	87.7%
	Unknown	**	**	**	81.6%
	Total	1,026	432	42.1%	89.4%
Gender	<i>Female</i>	469	200	42.6%	100.0%
	Male	527	223	42.3%	99.2%
	Not recorded	30	9	30.0%	70.4%
	Total	1,026	432	42.1%	98.7%
Age	<i>Younger than 20</i>	382	185	48.4%	100.0%
	20 - 24	375	148	39.5%	81.5%
	25 - 29	106	46	43.4%	89.6%
	30 - 39	88	30	34.1%	70.4%
	40 - 49	41	12	29.3%	60.4%
	50 - 59	**	**	**	41.3%
	60 and older	**	**	**	0.0
	Total	1,005	423	42.1%	86.9%
Disability Status	<i>Receives DSPS services</i>	100	53	53.0%	100.0%
	No DSPS services	926	379	40.9%	77.2%
	Total	1,026	432	42.1%	79.4%
Economic Status	<i>Low income student</i>	390	168	43.1%	100.0%
	Not low income	636	264	41.5%	96.4%
	Total	1,026	432	42.1%	97.7%
Probation 1 Status AY10-11	On probation 1 status	180	62	34.4%	78.8%
	<i>Not on probation 1 status</i>	846	370	43.7%	100.0%
	Total	1,026	432	42.1%	96.3%
Probation 2 Status AY10-11	On probation 2 status	90	26	28.9%	66.6%
	<i>Not on probation 2 status</i>	936	406	43.4%	100.0%
	Total	1,026	432	42.1%	97.1%
Dismissal Status AY10-11	On dismissal status	47	7	14.9%	34.3%
	<i>Not on dismissal status</i>	979	425	43.4%	100.0%
	Total	1,026	432	42.1%	97.0%

		Enrolled MATH 120/123 (unduplicated)	Progressed to MATH 125+		
			Count	Row N %	80% Index
Foster Youth	<i>Foster youth</i>	**	**	**	<i>100.0%</i>
	Not foster youth	**	**	**	98.1%
	Total	1,026	432	42.1%	98.1%
Veterans	Veteran	**	**	**	94.8%
	<i>Not a veteran</i>	**	**	**	<i>100.0%</i>
	Total	1,026	432	42.1%	99.8%

Notes: This table reports on students who were enrolled in MATH 120/123 during AY2010-11 (Summer-Fall-Spring) and who subsequently enrolled in MATH 125/130/145/200/241 through Spring 2014. The 80% Index compares the rate of each subgroup attaining an outcome to the rate attained by the subgroup with the highest rate (reference subgroup). Care must be taken when interpreting results with low subgroup counts (n<50). A result of less than 80 percent is considered evidence of a disproportionate impact. Reference subgroups are in *italics*. Subgroups suffering disproportionate impact are in **bold**.

“**” indicates the suppression of results for subgroups with small counts (n<10), with complementary suppression of at least one other subgroup, for privacy and data reliability concerns. For further discussion, see National Center for Education Statistics Technical Brief 2012-151, <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2012/2012151.pdf>.

Source: SMCCCD Student Database: Academic History, Term GPA, and Financial Aid Awards tables.

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.

CSM local research tracked students who met with counselors for Student Education Plan (SEP) reasons during AY2010-11 (Summer-Fall-Spring) and indicated an educational goal of obtaining an Associate Degree or Certificate. Students' academic history was analyzed in terms of the rate at which those students subsequently earned any Degree or Certificate through Spring 2014. Degree and Certificate completion rates of the following populations are analyzed: ethnicity, gender, age, disability status, low-income economic status, foster youth, and veterans. Both Certificates of Achievement and Certificates of Specialization are counted. Due to small 'n' sizes associated with many of the disaggregated populations identified for disproportionate impact analysis, several groups were identified for disproportionate impact. Caution is advised with low subgroup counts (n<50). Beyond the 80% Index standard, the CSM Equity Committee is concerned about increasing the rate at which all students earn degrees and certificates.

Data for CSM Student Equity Plan 2014 Indicator #4 Degree and Certificate Completion



Degree and Certificate Completion: Student Equity Plan Definition

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.

Data Included:

- Table 1: Degree and Certificate Completion of Degree-Seeking Students, Fall 2010 – Spring 2014
- Table 2: Degree Completion of Degree-Seeking Students, Fall 2010 – Spring 2014
- Table 3: Degree and Certificate Completion of Certificate-Seeking Students, Fall 2010 – Spring 2014
- Table 4: Certificate Completion of Certificate-Seeking Students, Fall 2010 – Spring 2014

Key Findings:

- The data presented in Tables 1 - 4 track students who both met with counselors for Student Education Plan (SEP) reasons during AY2010-11 (Summer-Fall-Spring) and

indicated an educational goal of obtaining an Associate Degree or Certificate, and reports on the rate at which those students subsequently earned any Degree or Certificate through Spring 2014. Both Certificates of Achievement and Certificates of Specialization are counted.

- In accordance with the California Community College Chancellor's Office Student Equity Plan guidelines, the Degree and Certificate completion rates of the following populations are analyzed:
 24. Ethnicity
 25. Gender
 26. Age
 27. Disability status
 28. Low income economic status
 29. Foster Youth
 30. Veterans
- The primary Student Equity Plan reference point is the "80% Index". This methodology compares the percentage of each disaggregated population to the percentage attained by a reference population. The 'reference population' is the specific population with the highest rate of success. The methodology is based on the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) 80% Rule, outlined in the 1978 Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures, and was used in Title VII enforcement by the U.S. Equal Opportunity Commission, Department of Labor, and the Department of Justice.
- The 80% Rule states that: "A selection rate for any race, sex, or ethnic group which is less than four-fifths (4/5) (or eighty percent) of the rate for the group with the highest rate will generally be regarded by the Federal enforcement agencies as evidence of adverse impact, while a greater than four-fifths rate will generally not be regarded by Federal enforcement agencies as evidence of adverse impact." [Section 60-3, Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedure (1978); 43 FR 38295(August 25, 1978)] Any disaggregated group that is included in a desired outcome at less than 80%, when compared to a reference group, is considered to have suffered an adverse - or disproportionate - impact.
- Using this methodology, the 80% Index data column in Tables 1 - 4 highlights the extent to which various populations' degree and certificate completion rates are within or outside of the 80% standard.
- Using Table 1 and age as an example. Students 40-49 have the highest successful Degree and Certificate completion rate: 46.4%. This group's completion rate becomes the reference group standard (100%) for evaluating the other age subgroups in term of the 80% Index. The completion rate of students 25-29 = 26.7%. This figure is 57.5% of the reference group's success rate of 46.4%. Hence, their 80% Index = 57.5% and is below the 80% rule--and could be considered suffering disproportionate impact.

- The designation of which disaggregated populations should be considered as disproportionately impacted is based on local conditions and will rely on the judgment of the CSM Student Equity team. The 80% Index is a suggested guideline only. The data are intended to stimulate conversation and additional investigation into areas where disproportionate impact may be affecting student success.
- Care should be taken when interpreting results with low subgroup counts ($n < 50$).

Table 1. Degree and Certificate Completion of Degree-Seeking Students, Fall 2010 – Spring 2014

		Headcount (unduplicated)	Any Award Completion		
			Count	Rate	80% Index
Ethnicity	African American	54	16	29.6%	79.0%
	<i>American Indian/Alaskan Native</i>	**	**	**	100.0%
	Asian	187	64	34.2%	91.3%
	Filipino	124	30	24.2%	64.5%
	Hispanic	342	106	31.0%	82.7%
	Multi Races	129	25	19.4%	51.7%
	Pacific Islander	45	10	22.2%	59.3%
	White	409	116	28.4%	75.6%
	Unknown	**	**	**	67.1%
	Total	1,407	395	28.1%	74.9%
Gender	<i>Female</i>	664	228	34.3%	100.0%
	Male	686	160	23.3%	67.9%
	Not recorded	111	23	20.7%	60.3%
	Total	1,461	411	28.1%	81.9%
Age	Younger than 20 years	390	79	20.3%	43.7%
	20 – 24 years	541	171	31.6%	68.2%
	25 – 29 years	180	48	26.7%	57.5%
	30 – 39 years	140	46	32.9%	70.8%
	<i>40 – 49 years</i>	69	32	46.4%	100.0%
	<i>50 – 59 years</i>	**	**	**	86.3%
	60 years and older	**	**	**	27.0
	Total	1,368	393	28.7%	61.9%
Disability Status	Receives DSPTS services	147	41	27.9%	99.1%
	<i>No DSPTS services</i>	1314	370	28.2%	100.0%
	Total	1,461	411	28.1%	99.9%
Economic Status	<i>Low income student</i>	596	184	30.9%	100.0%
	Not low income	865	227	26.2%	85.0%
	Total	1,461	411	28.1%	91.1%
Foster Youth	Foster youth	12	1	8.3%	29.3%
	<i>Not foster youth</i>	1,449	410	28.3%	100.0%
	Total	1,461	411	28.1%	99.3%
Veterans	<i>Veteran</i>	79	24	30.4%	100.0%
	Not a veteran	1,382	387	28.0%	92.1%
	Total	1,461	411	28.1%	92.4%

Notes: This table tracks students who both met with counselors for Student Education Plan (SEP) reasons during AY2010-11 (Summer-Fall-Spring) and indicated an educational goal of obtaining an associate degree, and reports on whether or not those students subsequently earned any degree or certificate through Spring 2014. The 80% Index compares the percentage of each disaggregated subgroup attaining an outcome to the percentage attained by the subgroup with the highest rate (reference subgroup). Care must be taken when interpreting results with low subgroup counts (n<50). The methodology is based on the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) 80% Rule, outlined in the 1978 Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection

Procedures, and was used in Title VII enforcement by the U.S. Equal Opportunity Commission, Department of Labor, and the Department of Justice. A result of less than 80 percent is considered evidence of a disproportionate impact. Reference subgroups are in *italics*. Subgroups suffering disproportionate impact are in **bold**.

“**” indicates the suppression of results for subgroups with small counts ($n < 10$), with complementary suppression of at least one other subgroup, for privacy and data reliability concerns. For further discussion, see National Center for Education Statistics Technical Brief 2012-151, <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2012/2012151.pdf>.

Source: SMCCCD Student Database: Academic History, Term GPA, and Financial Aid Awards tables.

Table 2. Degree Completion (only) of Degree-Seeking Students, Fall 2010 – Spring 2014

		Headcount (unduplicated)	Degree Completion Only		
			Count	Rate	80% Index
Ethnicity	<i>African American</i>	54	15	27.8%	100.0%
	American Indian/Alaskan Native	**	**	**	90.0%
	Asian	187	49	26.2%	94.3%
	Filipino	124	26	21.0%	75.5%
	Hispanic	342	89	26.0%	93.7%
	Multi Races	129	20	15.5%	55.8%
	Pacific Islander	45	9	20.0%	72.0%
	White	409	91	22.2%	80.1%
	Unknown	**	**	**	72.9%
	Total	1,407	319	22.7%	81.6%
Gender	<i>Female</i>	664	191	28.8%	100.0%
	Male	686	128	18.7%	64.9%
	Not recorded	111	15	13.5%	47.0%
	Total	1,461	334	22.9%	79.5%
	Younger than 20 years	390	66	16.9%	44.9%
	20 – 24 years	541	145	26.8%	71.1%
	25 – 29 years	180	38	21.1%	56.0%
	30 – 39 years	140	36	25.7%	68.2%
	<i>40 – 49 years</i>	69	26	37.7%	100.0%
	50 – 59 years	**	**	**	73.0%
	60 years and older	**	**	**	33.2%
	Total	1,368	323	23.6%	62.7%
Disability Status	Receives DSPS services	147	28	19.0%	81.8%
	<i>No DSPS services</i>	1314	306	23.3%	100.0%
	Total	1,461	334	22.9%	98.2%
Economic Status	<i>Low income student</i>	596	146	24.5%	100.0%
	Not low income	865	188	21.7%	88.7%
	Total	1,461	334	22.9%	93.3%
Foster Youth	Foster youth	12	1	8.3%	36.1%
	<i>Not foster youth</i>	1,449	333	23.0%	100.0%
	Total	1,461	334	22.9%	99.6%
Veterans	<i>Veteran</i>	79	19	24.1%	100.0%
	Not a veteran	1,382	315	22.8%	94.6%
	Total	1,461	334	22.9%	95.0%

Notes: This table tracks students who met with counselors for Student Education Plan (SEP) reasons during AY2010-11 (Summer-Fall-Spring) and indicated an educational goal of obtaining an associate degree, and reports on whether or not those students subsequently earned any degree through Spring 2014. The 80% Index compares the percentage of each disaggregated subgroup attaining an outcome to the percentage attained by the subgroup with the highest rate (reference subgroup). Care must be taken when interpreting results with low subgroup counts (n<50). The methodology is based on the Equal Employment

Opportunity Commission (EEOC) 80% Rule, outlined in the 1978 Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures, and was used in Title VII enforcement by the U.S. Equal Opportunity Commission, Department of Labor, and the Department of Justice. A result of less than 80 percent is considered evidence of a disproportionate impact. Reference subgroups are in *italics*. Subgroups suffering disproportionate impact are in **bold**.

“**” indicates the suppression of results for subgroups with small counts ($n < 10$), with complementary suppression of at least one other subgroup, for privacy and data reliability concerns. For further discussion, see National Center for Education Statistics Technical Brief 2012-151, <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2012/2012151.pdf>.

Source: SMCCCD Student Database: Academic History, Term GPA, and Financial Aid Awards tables.

Table 3. Degree and Certificate Completion of Certificate-Seeking Students, Fall 2010 – Spring 2014

		Headcount (unduplicated)	Any Award Completion		
			Count	Rate	80% Index
Ethnicity	African American	**	**	**	0.0%
	American Indian/Alaskan Native	**	**	**	0.0%
	Asian	**	**	**	22.2%
	Filipino	**	**	**	0.0%
	Hispanic	**	**	**	25.0%
	<i>Multi Races</i>	**	**	**	<i>100.0%</i>
	Pacific Islander	0	0	---	---
	<i>White</i>	21	9	42.9%	85.7%
	<i>Unknown</i>	**	**	**	<i>100.0%</i>
	Total	49	14	28.6%	57.1%
Gender	Female	**	**	**	52.2%
	Male	24	7	29.2%	58.3%
	<i>Not recorded</i>	**	**	**	<i>100.0%</i>
	Total	49	14	28.6%	57.1%
Age	<i>Younger than 20 years</i>	**	**	**	<i>100.0%</i>
	20 – 24 years	11	2	18.2%	36.4%
	25 – 29 years	**	**	**	0.0%
	30 – 39 years	11	5	45.5%	90.9%
	40 – 49 years	**	**	**	54.5%
	50 – 59 years	10	2	20.0%	40.0%
	60 years and older	0	0	---	---
	Total	48	13	27.1%	54.2%
Disability Status	<i>Receives DSPS services</i>	**	**	**	<i>100.0%</i>
	<i>No DSPS services</i>	**	**	**	<i>100.0%</i>
	Total	49	14	28.6%	100.0%
Economic Status	Low income student	21	5	23.8%	74.1%
	<i>Not low income</i>	28	9	32.1%	<i>100.0%</i>
	Total	49	14	28.6%	88.9%
Foster Youth	Foster youth	0	---	---	---
	Not foster youth	49	14	28.6%	100.0%
	Total	49	14	28.6%	100.0%
Veterans	<i>Veteran</i>	**	**	**	<i>100.0%</i>
	Not a veteran	**	**	**	68.3%
	Total	49	14	28.6%	71.5%

Notes: This table tracks students who met with counselors for Student Education Plan (SEP) reasons during AY2010-11 (Summer-Fall-Spring) and indicated an educational goal of obtaining a vocational certificate, and reports on whether or not those students subsequently earned any degree or certificate through Spring 2014. The 80% Index compares the percentage of each disaggregated subgroup attaining an outcome to the percentage attained by the subgroup with the highest rate (reference subgroup). Care must be taken when interpreting results with low subgroup counts (n<50). The methodology is based on the Equal

Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) 80% Rule, outlined in the 1978 Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures, and was used in Title VII enforcement by the U.S. Equal Opportunity Commission, Department of Labor, and the Department of Justice. A result of less than 80 percent is considered evidence of a disproportionate impact. Reference subgroups are in *italics*. Subgroups suffering disproportionate impact are in **bold**.

“**” indicates the suppression of results for subgroups with small counts ($n < 10$), with complementary suppression of at least one other subgroup, for privacy and data reliability concerns. For further discussion, see National Center for Education Statistics Technical Brief 2012-151, <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2012/2012151.pdf>.

Source: SMCCCD Student Database: Academic History, Term GPA, and Financial Aid Awards tables.

Table 4. Certificate Completion (only) of Certificate-Seeking Students, Fall 2010 – Spring 2014

		Headcount (unduplicated)	Certificate Completion Only		
			Count	Rate	80% Index
Ethnicity	African American	**	**	**	0.0%
	American Indian/Alaskan Native	**	**	**	0.0%
	Asian	**	**	**	22.2%
	Filipino	**	**	**	0.0%
	Hispanic	**	**	**	25.0%
	Multi Races	**	**	**	50.0%
	Pacific Islander	0	0	---	---
	White	21	8	38.1%	76.2%
	<i>Unknown</i>	**	**	**	<i>100.0%</i>
	Total	49	12	24.5%	49.0%
Gender	Female	23	6	26.1%	52.2%
	Male	**	**	**	41.7%
	<i>Not recorded</i>	**	**	**	<i>100.0%</i>
	Total	49	12	24.5%	49.0%
Age	<i>Younger than 20 years</i>	**	**	**	<i>100.0%</i>
	20 – 24 years	11	1	9.1%	18.2%
	25 – 29 years	**	**	**	0.0%
	30 – 39 years	11	4	36.4%	72.7%
	40 – 49 years	11	3	27.3%	54.5%
	50 – 59 years	**	**	**	40.0%
	60 years and older	0	0	---	---
	Total	48	11	22.9%	45.8%
Disability Status	<i>Receives DSPS services</i>	**	**	**	<i>100.0%</i>
	No DSPS services	**	**	**	83.3%
	Total	49	12	24.5%	85.7%
Economic Status	Low income student	21	3	14.3%	44.4%
	<i>Not low income</i>	28	9	<i>32.1%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>
	Total	49	12	24.5%	76.2%
Foster Youth	Foster youth	0	---	---	---
	Not foster youth	49	12	24.5%	100.0%
	Total	49	12	24.5%	100.0%
Veterans	<i>Veteran</i>	**	**	**	80.0%
	Not a veteran	**	**	**	<i>100.0%</i>
	Total	49	12	24.5%	98.0%

Notes: This table tracks students who met with counselors for Student Education Plan (SEP) reasons during AY2010-11 (Summer-Fall-Spring) and indicated an educational goal of obtaining a vocational certificate, and reports on whether or not those students subsequently earned any certificate through Spring 2014. The 80% Index compares the percentage of each disaggregated

subgroup attaining an outcome to the percentage attained by the subgroup with the highest rate (reference subgroup). Care must be taken when interpreting results with low subgroup counts ($n < 50$). The methodology is based on the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) 80% Rule, outlined in the 1978 Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures, and was used in Title VII enforcement by the U.S. Equal Opportunity Commission, Department of Labor, and the Department of Justice. A result of less than 80 percent is considered evidence of a disproportionate impact. Reference subgroups are in *italics*. Subgroups suffering disproportionate impact are in **bold**.

“**” indicates the suppression of results for subgroups with small counts ($n < 10$), with complementary suppression of at least one other subgroup, for privacy and data reliability concerns. For further discussion, see National Center for Education Statistics Technical Brief 2012-151, <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2012/2012151.pdf>.

Source: SMCCCD Student Database: Academic History, Term GPA, and Financial Aid Awards tables.

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.

CSM local research obtained transfer data from a match of CSM student Social Security Numbers with the national database of students enrolled in four-year colleges available from the National Student Clearinghouse (NSC). The NSC is the closest thing the US has to a national student-level record system. However, the NSC database is limited by FERPA-suppressed student records and matching errors due to typographic inaccuracies in student names. Reliable estimates indicated that approximately 25% of students are omitted from the NSC database. Research reports on first-time students in AY 2008 - 2009 (Summer-Fall-Spring) who were enrolled in at least 12 units and who enrolled in any transfer-level Mathematics or English course and tracks their completion (transfer or degree/certificate) through 2013-14.

Transfer rates of the following populations are analyzed: ethnicity, gender, age, disability status, low-income economic status, academic standing, foster youth, and veterans. Due to small 'n' sizes associated with many of the disaggregated populations identified for disproportionate impact analysis, several groups were identified for disproportionate impact. Caution is advised with low subgroup counts (n<50). Beyond the 80% Index standard, the CSM Equity Committee is concerned about increasing the rate at which all students transfer.

Data for CSM Student Equity Plan 2014



Indicator #5 Transfer

Transfer: Student Equity Plan Definition

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.

Data Included:

6. Completion Rates of First-time Full-time Transfer-level Ready Students (including ENGL 100), 2008/09 – 2013/14
7. Completion Rates of First-time Full-time Transfer-level Delayed Students (including ENGL 100), 2008/09 – 2013/14

8. Completion Rates of First-time Full-time Transfer-plus Ready Students (minimum ENGL 110/165), 2008/09 – 2013/14
9. Completion Rates of First-time Full-time Transfer-plus Delayed Students (minimum ENGL 110/165), 2008/09 – 2013/14

Key Findings:

- The data in Tables 1 – 2 reports on first-time students in AY 2008 - 2009 (Summer-Fall-Spring) who were enrolled in at least 12 units and who enrolled in any transfer-level Mathematics or English course (including ENGL 100) and tracks their completion (transfer or degree/certificate) through 2013-14. Table 1 reports on students enrolling in ENGL 100 their first year (“Transfer Ready”). Table 2 reports on students enrolling ENGL 100 after their first year (“Transfer Delayed”).
- Tables 3 - 4 reports on first-time students in AY 2008 - 2009 (Summer-Fall-Spring) who were enrolled in at least 12 units and who enrolled in any transfer-level Mathematics or English course (including ENGL 110/165) and tracks their completion (transfer or degree/certificate) through 2013-14. Table 3 reports on students enrolling in ENGL 100 their first year (“Transfer-plus Ready”). Table 2 reports on students enrolling ENGL 100 after their first year (“Transfer-plus Delayed”).
- In addition to tracking students who transfer, the data in Tables 1 – 4 also includes data for students who completed an AA/AS Degree or Certificate but did not transfer—“**Total Completion**”. These students should also be considered as “successful completers” even if they did not transfer.
- Note: Transfer data is obtained from a match of CSM student Social Security Numbers with the national database of students enrolled in four-year colleges available from the National Student Clearinghouse (NSC). The NSC is the closest thing the US has to a national student-level record system. However, the NSC database is limited by FERPA-suppressed student records and matching errors due to typographic inaccuracies in student names. Reliable estimates indicated that approximately 25% of students are omitted from the NSC database.
- In accordance with the California Community College Chancellor’s Office Student Equity Plan guidelines, the Total Completion rates of the following populations are analyzed:
 31. Ethnicity
 32. Gender
 33. Age
 34. Disability status
 35. Low income economic status
 36. Academic standing (Probation 1, Probation 2, and Dismissed)
 37. Foster Youth
 38. Veterans

- The primary Student Equity Plan reference point is the “80% Index”. This methodology compares the percentage of each disaggregated population to the percentage attained by a reference population. The ‘reference population’ is the specific population with the highest rate of success. The methodology is based on the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) 80% Rule, outlined in the 1978 Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures, and was used in Title VII enforcement by the U.S. Equal Opportunity Commission, Department of Labor, and the Department of Justice.
- The 80% Rule states that: “A selection rate for any race, sex, or ethnic group which is less than four-fifths (4/5) (or eighty percent) of the rate for the group with the highest rate will generally be regarded by the Federal enforcement agencies as evidence of adverse impact, while a greater than four-fifths rate will generally not be regarded by Federal enforcement agencies as evidence of adverse impact.” [Section 60-3, Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedure (1978); 43 FR 38295(August 25, 1978)] Any disaggregated group that is included in a desired outcome at less than 80%, when compared to a reference group, is considered to have suffered an adverse – or disproportionate - impact.
- Using this methodology, the 80% Index data column in Tables 1 - 4 highlights the extent to which various populations’ “Total Completion” rates are within or outside of the 80% standard.
- Using Table 1 and age as an example. Students 20-24 have the highest Total Completion rate: 81.8%. This group’s completion rate becomes the reference group standard (100%) for evaluating the other age subgroups in term of the 80% Index. The completion rate of students 25-29 = 60.0%. This figure is 73.3% of the reference group’s Total Completion rate of 81.8%. Hence, their 80% Index = 73.3% and is below the 80% rule--and could be considered suffering disproportionate impact.
- The designation of which disaggregated populations should be considered as disproportionately impacted is based on local conditions and will rely on the judgment of the CSM Student Equity team. The 80% Index is a suggested guideline only. The data are intended to stimulate conversation and additional investigation into areas where disproportionate impact may be affecting student success.
- Care should be taken when interpreting results with low subgroup counts (n<50).

Table 1. Completion Rates of First-time Full-time Transfer-level Ready Students (including ENGL 100), 2008/09 – 2013/14

		Head-count	Transferred to 4-year		Degree/Certificate with No Transfer		Total Completion		
			Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	80% Index
Ethnicity	African American	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	96.0%
	American Indian/Alaska Native	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	60.0%
	Asian	58	45	77.6%	1	1.7%	46	79.3%	95.2%
	Filipino	23	12	52.2%	5	21.7%	17	73.9%	88.7%
	Hispanic	48	24	50.0%	11	22.9%	35	72.9%	87.5%
	<i>Multi Races</i>	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	120.0%
	<i>Pacific Islander</i>	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	120.0%
	White	99	71	71.7%	10	10.1%	81	81.8%	98.2%
	<i>Unknown</i>	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	100.0%
		Total	276	187	67.8%	32	11.6%	219	79.3%
Gender	<i>Female</i>	153	109	71.2%	16	10.5%	125	81.7%	100.0%
	Male	115	74	64.3%	14	12.2%	88	76.5%	93.7%
	Not recorded	8	4	50.0%	2	25.0%	6	75.0%	91.8%
	Total	276	187	67.8%	32	11.6%	219	79.3%	97.1%
Age	Younger than 20	254	173	68.1%	29	11.4%	202	79.5%	97.2%
	20 - 24	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	100.0%
	25 - 29	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	73.3%
	30 - 39	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	81.5%
	40 - 49	0	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	50 - 59	0	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	Total	273	184	67.4%	32	11.7%	216	79.1%	96.7%
Disability Status	Receives DSPS services	16	11	68.8%	0	0.0%	11	68.8%	85.9%
	<i>No DSPS services</i>	260	176	67.7%	32	12.3%	208	80.0%	100.0%
	Total	276	187	67.8%	32	11.6%	219	79.3%	99.2%
Economic Status	<i>Low income student</i>	66	44	66.7%	9	13.6%	53	80.3%	100.0%
	Not low income	210	143	68.1%	23	11.0%	166	79.0%	98.4%
	Total	276	187	67.8%	32	11.6%	219	79.3%	98.8%
Probation 1 Status	On probation 1 status	48	21	43.8%	4	8.3%	25	52.1%	61.2%

		Head- count	Transferred to 4-year		Degree/Certificate with No Transfer		Total Completion		
			Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	80% Index
AY08-09	<i>Not on probation 1 status</i>	228	166	72.8%	28	12.3%	194	85.1%	100.0%
	Total	276	187	67.8%	32	11.6%	219	79.3%	93.3%
Probation 2 Status AY08-09	On probation 2 status	27	8	29.6%	2	7.4%	10	37.0%	44.1%
	<i>Not on probation 2 status</i>	249	179	71.9%	30	12.0%	209	83.9%	100.0%
	Total	276	187	67.8%	32	11.6%	219	79.3%	94.5%
Dismissal Status AY08-09	On dismissal status	11	3	27.3%	0	0.0%	3	27.3%	33.5%
	<i>Not on dismissal status</i>	265	184	69.4%	32	12.1%	216	81.5%	100.0%
	Total	276	187	67.8%	32	11.6%	219	79.3%	97.3%
Foster Youth	<i>**Too few to report</i>								
Veterans	<i>**Too few to report</i>								

Notes: This table reports on first-time students in AY2008-09 (Summer-Fall-Spring) who were enrolled in at least 12 units and who enrolled in any transfer-level Mathematics or English course (including ENGL 100) in their first year, and tracks their completion (transfer or degree/certificate) through 2013-14. The 80% Index compares the rate of each subgroup attaining an outcome to the rate attained by the subgroup with the highest rate (reference subgroup). Care must be taken when interpreting results with low subgroup counts (n<50). A result of less than 80 percent is considered evidence of a disproportionate impact. Reference subgroups are in *italics*.

“***” indicates the suppression of results for subgroups with small counts (n<10), with complementary suppression of at least one other subgroup, for privacy and data reliability concerns. For further discussion, see National Center for Education Statistics Technical Brief 2012-151, <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2012/2012151.pdf>.

Source: National Student Clearinghouse and SMCCCD Student Database: Academic History, Term Degrees Certificates, Term GPA, and Financial Aid Awards tables.

Table 2. Completion Rates of First-time Full-time Transfer-Delayed Students (including ENGL 100), 2008/09 – 2013/14

		Head-count	Transferred to 4-year		Degree/Certificate with No Transfer		Total Completion		
			Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	80% Index
Ethnicity	African American	15	9	60.0%	3	20.0%	12	80.0%	100.0%
	American Indian/Alaska Native	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	125.0%
	Asian	70	50	71.4%	3	4.3%	53	75.7%	94.6%
	Filipino	35	17	48.6%	6	17.1%	23	65.7%	82.1%
	Hispanic	70	31	44.3%	16	22.9%	47	67.1%	83.9%
	Multi Races	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	62.5%
	Pacific Islander	12	9	75.0%	0	0.0%	9	75.0%	93.8%
	White	128	78	60.9%	11	8.6%	89	69.5%	86.9%
	Unknown	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	92.4%
	Total	379	223	58.8%	46	12.1%	269	71.0%	88.7%
Gender	Female	194	113	58.2%	21	10.8%	134	69.1%	77.7%
	Male	176	104	59.1%	23	13.1%	127	72.2%	81.2%
	Not recorded	9	6	66.7%	2	22.2%	8	88.9%	100.0%
	Total	379	223	58.8%	46	12.1%	269	71.0%	79.8%
Age	Younger than 20	349	204	58.5%	41	11.7%	245	70.2%	81.0%
	20 - 24	15	10	66.7%	3	20.0%	13	86.7%	100.0%
	25 - 29	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	57.7%
	30 - 39	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	76.9%
	40 - 49	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	115.4%
	50 - 59	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	115.4%
	Total	375	219	58.4%	46	12.3%	265	70.7%	81.5%
Disability Status	Receives DSPS services	26	14	53.8%	2	7.7%	16	61.5%	85.9%
	No DSPS services	353	209	59.2%	44	12.5%	253	71.7%	100.0%
	Total	379	223	58.8%	46	12.1%	269	71.0%	99.0%
Economic Status	Low income student	106	64	60.4%	14	13.2%	78	73.6%	100.0%
	Not low income	273	159	58.2%	32	11.7%	191	70.0%	95.1%
	Total	379	223	58.8%	46	12.1%	269	71.0%	96.5%
Probation 1 Status	On probation 1 status	117	45	38.5%	12	10.3%	57	48.7%	60.2%

		Head- count	Transferred to 4-year		Degree/Certificate with No Transfer		Total Completion		
			Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	80% Index
AY08-09	<i>Not on probation 1 status</i>	262	178	67.9%	34	13.0%	212	80.9%	100.0%
	Total	379	223	58.8%	46	12.1%	269	71.0%	87.7%
Probation 2 Status AY08-09	On probation 2 status	84	23	27.4%	9	10.7%	32	38.1%	47.4%
	<i>Not on probation 2 status</i>	295	200	67.8%	37	12.5%	237	80.3%	100.0%
	Total	379	223	58.8%	46	12.1%	269	71.0%	88.3%
Dismissal Status AY08-09	On dismissal status	45	10	22.2%	3	6.7%	13	28.9%	37.7%
	<i>Not on dismissal status</i>	334	213	63.8%	43	12.9%	256	76.6%	100.0%
	Total	379	223	58.8%	46	12.1%	269	71.0%	92.6%
Foster Youth	<i>**Too few to report</i>								
Veterans	<i>**Too few to report</i>								

Notes: This table reports on first-time students in AY2008-09 (Summer-Fall-Spring) who were enrolled in at least 12 units and who enrolled in any transfer-level Mathematics or English course (including ENGL 100) after their first year, and tracks their completion (transfer or degree/certificate) through 2013-14. The 80% Index compares the rate of each subgroup attaining an outcome to the rate attained by the subgroup with the highest rate (reference subgroup). Care must be taken when interpreting results with low subgroup counts (n<50). A result of less than 80 percent is considered evidence of a disproportionate impact. Reference subgroups are in *italics*.

“***” indicates the suppression of results for subgroups with small counts (n<10), with complementary suppression of at least one other subgroup, for privacy and data reliability concerns. For further discussion, see National Center for Education Statistics Technical Brief 2012-151, <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2012/2012151.pdf>.

Source: National Student Clearinghouse and SMCCCD Student Database: Academic History, Term Degrees Certificates, Term GPA, and Financial Aid Awards tables.

Table 3. Completion Rates of First-time Full-time Transfer-plus Ready Students (minimum ENGL 110/165), 2008/09 – 2013/14

		Head-count	Transferred to 4-year		Degree/Certificate with No Transfer		Total Completion		
			Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	80% Index
Ethnicity	<i>African American</i>	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	115.7%
	<i>American Indian/Alaska Native</i>	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	115.7%
	Asian	50	40	80.0%	0	0.0%	40	80.0%	92.5%
	Filipino	17	12	70.6%	2	11.8%	14	82.4%	95.3%
	Hispanic	30	15	50.0%	9	30.0%	24	80.0%	92.5%
	<i>Multi Races</i>	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	115.7%
	<i>Pacific Islander</i>	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	115.7%
	White	59	48	81.4%	3	5.1%	51	86.4%	100.0%
	Unknown	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	87.9%
	Total	187	139	74.3%	15	8.0%	154	82.4%	95.3%
Gender	<i>Female</i>	101	78	77.2%	8	7.9%	86	85.1%	100.0%
	Male	79	57	72.2%	6	7.6%	63	79.7%	93.7%
	Not recorded	7	4	57.1%	1	14.3%	5	71.4%	83.9%
	Total	187	139	74.3%	15	8.0%	154	82.4%	96.7%
Age	<i>Younger than 20</i>	170	128	75.3%	13	7.6%	141	82.9%	100.0%
	20 - 24	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	93.8%
	25 - 29	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	90.4%
	30 - 39	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	0.0%
	40 - 49	0	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	50 - 59	0	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	Total	184	136	73.9%	15	8.2%	151	82.1%	98.9%
Disability Status	Receives DSPS services	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	80.4%
	<i>No DSPS services</i>	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	100.0%
	Total	187	139	74.3%	15	8.0%	154	82.4%	99.4%
Economic Status	<i>Low income student</i>	51	35	68.6%	7	13.7%	42	82.4%	100.0%
	<i>Not low income</i>	136	104	76.5%	8	5.9%	112	82.4%	100.0%
	Total	187	139	74.3%	15	8.0%	154	82.4%	100.0%
Probation 1 Status	On probation 1 status	28	14	50.0%	1	3.6%	15	53.6%	61.3%

		Head- count	Transferred to 4-year		Degree/Certificate with No Transfer		Total Completion		
			Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	80% Index
AY08-09	<i>Not on probation 1 status</i>	159	125	78.6%	14	8.8%	139	87.4%	100.0%
	Total	187	139	74.3%	15	8.0%	154	82.4%	94.2%
Probation 2 Status AY08-09	On probation 2 status	16	7	43.8%	0	0.0%	7	43.8%	50.9%
	<i>Not on probation 2 status</i>	171	132	77.2%	15	8.8%	147	86.0%	100.0%
	Total	187	139	74.3%	15	8.0%	154	82.4%	95.8%
Dismissal Status AY08-09	On dismissal status	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	39.7%
	<i>Not on dismissal status</i>	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	100.0%
	Total	187	139	74.3%	15	8.0%	154	82.4%	98.1%
Foster Youth	<i>**Too few to report</i>								
Veterans	<i>**Too few to report</i>								

Notes: This table reports on first-time students in AY2008-09 (Summer-Fall-Spring) who were enrolled in at least 12 units and who enrolled in any transfer-level Mathematics or English course (minimum ENGL 110/165) in their first year, and tracks their completion (transfer or degree/certificate) through 2013-14. The 80% Index compares the rate of each subgroup attaining an outcome to the rate attained by the subgroup with the highest rate (reference subgroup). Care must be taken when interpreting results with low subgroup counts (n<50). A result of less than 80 percent is considered evidence of a disproportionate impact. Reference subgroups are in *italics*.

“**” indicates the suppression of results for subgroups with small counts (n<10), with complementary suppression of at least one other subgroup, for privacy and data reliability concerns. For further discussion, see National Center for Education Statistics Technical Brief 2012-151, <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2012/2012151.pdf>.

Source: National Student Clearinghouse and SMCCCD Student Database: Academic History, Term Degrees Certificates, Term GPA, and Financial Aid Awards tables.

Table 4. Completion Rates of First-time Full-time Transfer-plus Delayed Students (minimum ENGL 110/165), 2008/09 – 2013/14

		Head-count	Transferred to 4-year		Degree/Certificate with No Transfer		Total Completion		
			Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	80% Index
Ethnicity	African American	14	8	57.1%	3	21.4%	11	78.6%	98.2%
	American Indian/Alaska Native	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	125.0%
	Asian	65	49	75.4%	3	4.6%	52	80.0%	100.0%
	Filipino	33	16	48.5%	6	18.2%	22	66.7%	83.3%
	Hispanic	59	29	49.2%	12	20.3%	41	69.5%	86.9%
	Multi Races	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	0.0%
	Pacific Islander	11	8	72.7%	0	0.0%	8	72.7%	90.9%
	White	115	77	67.0%	10	8.7%	87	75.7%	94.6%
	Unknown	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	97.6%
	Total	340	214	62.9%	40	11.8%	254	74.7%	93.4%
Gender	Female	174	110	63.2%	17	9.8%	127	73.0%	83.4%
	Male	158	99	62.7%	21	13.3%	120	75.9%	86.8%
	Not recorded	8	5	62.5%	2	25.0%	7	87.5%	100.0%
	Total	340	214	62.9%	40	11.8%	254	74.7%	85.4%
Age	Younger than 20	314	197	62.7%	35	11.1%	232	73.9%	79.6%
	20 - 24	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	100.0%
	25 - 29	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	64.6%
	30 - 39	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	71.8%
	40 - 49	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	107.7%
	50 - 59	0	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	Total	337	211	62.6%	40	11.9%	251	74.5%	80.2%
Disability Status	Receives DSPS services	20	12	60.0%	1	5.0%	13	65.0%	86.3%
	No DSPS services	320	202	63.1%	39	12.2%	241	75.3%	100.0%
	Total	340	214	62.9%	40	11.8%	254	74.7%	99.2%
Economic Status	Low income student	96	63	65.6%	12	12.5%	75	78.1%	100.0%
	Not low income	244	151	61.9%	28	11.5%	179	73.4%	93.9%
	Total	340	214	62.9%	40	11.8%	254	74.7%	95.6%
Probation 1 Status	On probation 1 status	101	43	42.6%	10	9.9%	53	52.5%	62.4%

		Head- count	Transferred to 4-year		Degree/Certificate with No Transfer		Total Completion		
			Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	80% Index
AY08-09	<i>Not on probation 1 status</i>	239	171	71.5%	30	12.6%	201	84.1%	100.0%
	Total	340	214	62.9%	40	11.8%	254	74.7%	88.8%
Probation 2 Status AY08-09	On probation 2 status	70	22	31.4%	9	12.9%	31	44.3%	53.6%
	<i>Not on probation 2 status</i>	270	192	71.1%	31	11.5%	223	82.6%	100.0%
	Total	340	214	62.9%	40	11.8%	254	74.7%	90.5%
Dismissal Status AY08-09	On dismissal status	33	9	27.3%	3	9.1%	12	36.4%	46.1%
	<i>Not on dismissal status</i>	307	205	66.8%	37	12.1%	242	78.8%	100.0%
	Total	340	214	62.9%	40	11.8%	254	74.7%	94.8%
Foster Youth	<i>**Too few to report</i>								
Veterans	<i>**Too few to report</i>								

Notes: This table reports on first-time students in AY2008-09 (Summer-Fall-Spring) who were enrolled in at least 12 units and who enrolled in any transfer-level Mathematics or English course (minimum ENGL 110/165) after their first year, and tracks their completion (transfer or degree/certificate) through 2013-14. The 80% Index compares the rate of each subgroup attaining an outcome to the rate attained by the subgroup with the highest rate (reference subgroup). Care must be taken when interpreting results with low subgroup counts (n<50). A result of less than 80 percent is considered evidence of a disproportionate impact. Reference subgroups are in *italics*.

“***” indicates the suppression of results for subgroups with small counts (n<10), with complementary suppression of at least one other subgroup, for privacy and data reliability concerns. For further discussion, see National Center for Education Statistics Technical Brief 2012-151, <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2012/2012151.pdf>.

Source: National Student Clearinghouse and SMCCCD Student Database: Academic History, Term Degrees Certificates, Term GPA, and Financial Aid Awards tables.

CAMPUS-BASED RESEARCH

F. Academic Standing—Probation and Dismissal Status

Colleges should report on the academic/progress probation and disqualification data of their students. The report should include the college's organized effort in dealing with this matter to assist students in improving their academic/progress probation and disqualification rate/s.

CSM local research provides an overall profile of students' academic standing—Probation 1, Probation 2, and Dismissal status. Rates of being placed on the 3 types of academic probation or dismissal are analyzed: ethnicity, gender, age, disability status, low-income economic status, foster youth, and veterans. Due to small 'n' sizes associated with many of the disaggregated populations identified for disproportionate impact analysis, several groups were identified for disproportionate impact. Caution is advised with low subgroup counts (n<50). Beyond the 80% Index standard, the CSM Equity Committee is concerned about reducing the number of students who experience academic difficulty.

Data for CSM Student Equity Plan 2014



Academic Standing--Probation and Dismissal Status

Academic Standing—Probation and Dismissal Status: Student Equity Plan Definition

Colleges should report on the academic/progress probation and disqualification data of their students. The report should include the college's organized effort in dealing with this matter to assist students in improving their academic/progress probation and disqualification rate/s.

Data Included:

- Table 1: Academic Standing, Fall 2012 – Spring 2013
- Table 2: Probation 1 Status, Fall 2012 – Spring 2013
- Table 3: Probation 2 Status, Fall 2012 – Spring 2013
- Table 4: Dismissal Status, Fall 2012 – Spring 2013

Key Findings:

- Table 1 provides an overall profile of students' academic standing—Probation 1, Probation 2, and Dismissal status. Because the data reported is for 2 academic

semesters, some students may be included in multiple academic standing categories.

- Table 2 – 4 examines the student characteristics for each type of academic standing status.
- In accordance with the California Community College Chancellor's Office Student Equity Plan guidelines, the successful course completion rates of the following populations are analyzed:
 - 39. Ethnicity
 - 40. Gender
 - 41. Age
 - 42. Disability status
 - 43. Low income economic status
 - 44. Foster Youth
 - 45. Veterans
- The primary Student Equity Plan reference point is the "80% Index". This methodology compares the percentage of each disaggregated population to the percentage attained by a reference population. The 'reference population' is the specific population with the highest rate of success. The methodology is based on the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) 80% Rule, outlined in the 1978 Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures, and was used in Title VII enforcement by the U.S. Equal Opportunity Commission, Department of Labor, and the Department of Justice.
- The 80% Rule states that: "A selection rate for any race, sex, or ethnic group which is less than four-fifths (4/5) (or eighty percent) of the rate for the group with the highest rate will generally be regarded by the Federal enforcement agencies as evidence of adverse impact, while a greater than four-fifths rate will generally not be regarded by Federal enforcement agencies as evidence of adverse impact." [Section 60-3, Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedure (1978); 43 FR 38295(August 25, 1978)] Any disaggregated group that is included in a desired outcome at less than 80%, when compared to a reference group, is considered to have suffered an adverse – or disproportionate - impact.
- Using this methodology, the 80% Index data column highlights the extent to which various populations' academic standing status rates are within or outside of the 80% standard.
- NOTE: The 80% Index data for Academic Standing is presented in terms of "**Not** On Probation 1/2/Dismissal Status". This reversal allows for a consistent application of the 80% Index when applied to probation and dismissal data.
- Using age (Table 2) as an example. Students 60 years or older have the highest "Not on Probation 1 Status" rate: 99.0%. This group's success rate becomes the reference group standard (100%) for evaluating the other age subgroups in term of the 80%

Index. The success rate of students younger than 20 = 76.1%. This figure is 76.8% of the reference group's success rate of 99.0%. Hence, their 80% Index = 76.8% and is below the 80% rule--and could be considered suffering disproportionate impact.

- The designation of which disaggregated populations should be considered as disproportionately impacted is based on local conditions and will rely on the judgment of the CSM Student Equity team. The 80% Index is a suggested guideline only. The data are intended to stimulate conversation and additional investigation into areas where disproportionate impact may be affecting student success.
- Care should be taken when interpreting results with low subgroup counts ($n < 50$).

Table 1. Academic Standing, Fall 2012 – Spring 2013

	Total Headcount (unduplicated)	Probation 1		Probation 2		Dismissal		
		Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	
Ethnicity	African American	479	64	13.4%	42	8.8%	30	6.3%
	American Indian/ Alaskan Native	27	4	14.8%	1	3.7%	1	3.7%
	Asian	1,924	126	6.5%	72	3.7%	55	2.9%
	Filipino	886	68	7.7%	42	4.7%	44	5.0%
	Hispanic	2,478	324	13.1%	182	7.3%	163	6.6%
	Multi Races	1,772	245	13.8%	138	7.8%	107	6.0%
	Pacific Islander	293	43	14.7%	25	8.5%	20	6.8%
	White	4,274	320	7.5%	185	4.3%	160	3.7%
	Unknown	731	49	6.7%	32	4.4%	22	3.0%
	Total	12,864	1,243	9.7%	719	5.6%	602	4.7%
Gender	Female	6,325	568	9.0%	307	4.9%	282	4.5%
	Male	6,217	637	10.2%	392	6.3%	303	4.9%
	Not recorded	322	35	11.7%	19	6.4%	17	5.7%
	Total	12,864	1,243	9.7%	719	5.6%	602	4.7%
Age	Younger than 20	2,299	550	23.9%	247	10.7%	93	4.0%
	20 - 24	4,580	452	9.9%	321	7.0%	346	7.6%
	25 - 29	1,980	95	4.8%	77	3.9%	67	3.4%
	30 - 39	1,843	84	4.6%	43	2.3%	65	3.5%
	40 - 49	1,023	37	3.6%	17	1.7%	17	1.7%
	50 - 59	712	19	2.7%	9	1.3%	10	1.4%
	60 and older	417	4	1.0%	5	1.2%	4	1.0%
	Total	12,854	1,241	9.7%	719	5.6%	602	4.7%
Disability Status	Receives DSPS services	1,057	99	9.4%	61	5.8%	61	5.8%
	No DSPS services	11,807	1,144	9.7%	658	5.6%	541	4.6%
	Total	12,864	1,243	9.7%	719	5.6%	602	4.7%
Economic Status	Low income student	2,664	347	13.0%	190	7.1%	150	5.6%
	Not low income	10,200	896	8.8%	529	5.2%	452	4.4%
	Total	12,864	1,243	9.7%	719	5.6%	602	4.7%
Foster Youth	Foster youth	126	27	21.4%	10	7.9%	11	8.7%
	Not foster youth	12,738	1,216	9.5%	709	5.6%	591	4.6%
	Total	12,864	1,243	9.7%	719	5.6%	602	4.7%
Veterans	Veteran	342	36	10.5%	23	6.7%	9	2.6%
	Not a veteran	12,522	1,207	9.6%	696	5.6%	593	4.7%
	Total	12,864	1,243	9.7%	719	5.6%	602	4.7%

Notes: Headcounts are unduplicated within each academic standing category; however, a student may be counted in more than one category (e.g., a student may be counted once in both the Probation 1 and Probation 2 columns).

Source: SMCCCD Student Database: Academic History, Term GPA, and Financial Aid Awards tables.

Table 2. Probation 1 Status, Fall 2012 – Spring 2013

		Total Headcount (unduplicated)	NOT on Probation 1 status		
			Count	Row N %	80% Index
Ethnicity	African American	479	415	86.6%	92.7%
	American Indian/Alaskan Native	27	23	85.2%	91.2%
	<i>Asian</i>	1,924	1,798	93.5%	100.0%
	Filipino	886	818	92.3%	98.8%
	Hispanic	2,478	2,154	86.9%	93.0%
	Multi Races	1,772	1,527	86.2%	92.2%
	Pacific Islander	293	250	85.3%	91.3%
	White	4,274	3,954	92.5%	99.0%
	Unknown	731	682	93.3%	99.8%
	Total	12,864	11,621	90.3%	96.7%
Gender	<i>Female</i>	6,325	5,757	91.0%	100.0%
	Male	6,217	5,580	89.8%	98.6%
	Not recorded	322	284	88.2%	96.9%
	Total	12,864	11,621	90.3%	99.3%
Age	Younger than 20	2,299	1,749	76.1%	76.8%
	20 - 24	4,580	4,128	90.1%	91.0%
	25 - 29	1,980	1,885	95.2%	96.1%
	30 - 39	1,843	1,759	95.4%	96.4%
	40 - 49	1,023	986	96.4%	97.3%
	50 - 59	712	693	97.3%	98.3%
	<i>60 and older</i>	417	413	99.0%	100.0%
	Total	12,854	11,613	90.3%	91.2%
Disability Status	<i>Receives DSPS services</i>	1,057	958	90.6%	100.0%
	No DSPS services	11,807	10,663	90.3%	99.6%
	Total	12,864	11,621	90.3%	99.7%
Economic Status	Low income student	2,664	2,317	87.0%	95.4%
	<i>Not low income</i>	10,200	9,304	91.2%	100.0%
	Total	12,864	11,621	90.3%	99.0%
Foster Youth	Foster youth	126	99	78.6%	86.9%
	<i>Not foster youth</i>	12,738	11,522	90.5%	100.0%
	Total	12,864	11,621	90.3%	99.8%
Veterans	Veteran	342	306	89.5%	99.0%
	<i>Not a veteran</i>	12,522	11,315	90.4%	100.0%
	Total	12,864	11,621	90.3%	99.9%

Notes: The 80% Index compares the percentage of each disaggregated subgroup attaining an outcome to the percentage attained by the subgroup with the highest rate (reference subgroup). Care must be taken when interpreting results with low subgroup counts (n<50). The methodology is based on the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) 80% Rule, outlined in the 1978 Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures, and was used in Title VII enforcement by the U.S. Equal Opportunity Commission, Department of Labor, and the Department of Justice. A result of less than 80 percent is considered

evidence of a disproportionate impact. Because the 80% Index methodology references the subgroup with the *highest* rate, this table compares the rates of subgroups who were *not* on probation. Reference subgroups are in *italics*. Subgroups suffering disproportionate impact are in **bold**.

Source: SMCCCD Student Database: Academic History, Term GPA, and Financial Aid Awards tables.

Table 3. Probation 2 Status, Fall 2012 – Spring 2013

		Total Headcount (unduplicated)	NOT on Probation 2 status		
			Count	Row N %	80% Index
Ethnicity	African American	479	437	91.2%	94.7%
	<i>American Indian/Alaskan Native</i>	27	26	96.3%	100.0%
	<i>Asian</i>	1,924	1,852	96.3%	100.0%
	Filipino	886	844	95.3%	98.9%
	Hispanic	2,478	2,296	92.7%	96.2%
	Multi Races	1,772	1,634	92.2%	95.8%
	Pacific Islander	293	268	91.5%	95.0%
	White	4,274	4,089	95.7%	99.4%
	Unknown	731	699	95.6%	99.3%
	Total	12,864	12,145	94.4%	98.0%
Gender	<i>Female</i>	6,325	6,018	95.1%	100.0%
	Male	6,217	5,825	93.7%	98.5%
	Not recorded	322	302	93.8%	98.6%
	Total	12,864	12,145	94.4%	99.2%
Age	Younger than 20	2,299	2,052	89.3%	90.3%
	20 - 24	4,580	4,259	93.0%	94.1%
	25 - 29	1,980	1,903	96.1%	97.3%
	30 - 39	1,843	1,800	97.7%	98.9%
	40 - 49	1,023	1,006	98.3%	99.5%
	50 - 59	712	703	98.7%	99.9%
	<i>60 and older</i>	417	412	98.8%	100.0%
	Total	12,854	12,135	94.4%	95.6%
Disability Status	Receives DSPS services	1,057	996	94.2%	99.8%
	<i>No DSPS services</i>	11,807	11,149	94.4%	100.0%
	Total	12,864	12,145	94.4%	100.0%
Economic Status	Low income student	2,664	2,474	92.9%	97.9%
	<i>Not low income</i>	10,200	9,671	94.8%	100.0%
	Total	12,864	12,145	94.4%	99.6%
Foster youth	Foster youth	126	116	92.1%	97.6%
	<i>Not foster youth</i>	12,738	12,029	94.4%	100.0%
	Total	12,864	12,145	94.4%	100.0%
Veterans	Veteran	342	319	93.3%	98.8%
	<i>Not a veteran</i>	12,522	11,826	94.4%	100.0%
	Total	12,864	12,145	94.4%	100.0%

Notes: The 80% Index compares the percentage of each disaggregated subgroup attaining an outcome to the percentage attained by the subgroup with the highest rate (reference subgroup). Care must be taken when interpreting results with low subgroup counts (n<50). The methodology is based on the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) 80% Rule, outlined in the 1978 Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures, and was used in Title VII enforcement by the U.S. Equal Opportunity Commission, Department of Labor, and the Department of Justice. A result of less than 80 percent is considered evidence of a disproportionate impact. Because the 80% Index methodology references the subgroup with the highest rate, this

table compares the rates of subgroups who were *not* on probation. Reference subgroups are in *italics*. Subgroups suffering disproportionate impact are in **bold**.
Source: SMCCCD Student Database: Academic History, Term GPA, and Financial Aid Awards tables.

Table 4. Dismissal Status, Fall 2012 – Spring 2013

		Total Headcount (unduplicated)	NOT on Dismissal status		
			Count	Row N %	80% Index
Ethnicity	African American	479	449	93.7%	96.5%
	American Indian/Alaskan Native	27	26	96.3%	99.1%
	<i>Asian</i>	1,924	1,869	97.1%	100.0%
	Filipino	886	842	95.0%	97.8%
	Hispanic	2,478	2,315	93.4%	96.2%
	Multi Races	1,772	1,665	94.0%	96.7%
	Pacific Islander	293	273	93.2%	95.9%
	White	4,274	4,114	96.3%	99.1%
	Unknown	731	709	97.0%	99.8%
	Total	12,864	12,262	95.3%	98.1%
Gender	<i>Female</i>	6,325	6,043	95.5%	100.0%
	Male	6,217	5,914	95.1%	99.6%
	Not recorded	322	305	94.7%	99.1%
	Total	12,864	12,262	95.3%	99.8%
Age	Younger than 20	2,299	2,206	96.0%	96.9%
	20 - 24	4,580	4,234	92.4%	93.3%
	25 - 29	1,980	1,913	96.6%	97.6%
	30 - 39	1,843	1,778	96.5%	97.4%
	40 - 49	1,023	1,006	98.3%	99.3%
	50 - 59	712	702	98.6%	99.6%
	<i>60 and older</i>	417	413	99.0%	100.0%
	Total	12,854	12,252	95.3%	96.2%
Disability Status	Receives DSPS services	1,057	996	94.2%	98.8%
	<i>No DSPS services</i>	11,807	11,266	95.4%	100.0%
	Total	12,864	12,262	95.3%	99.9%
Economic Status	Low income student	2,664	2,514	94.4%	98.7%
	<i>Not low income</i>	10,200	9,748	95.6%	100.0%
	Total	12,864	12,262	95.3%	99.7%
Foster Youth	Foster youth	126	115	91.3%	95.7%
	<i>Not foster youth</i>	12,738	12,147	95.4%	100.0%
	Total	12,864	12,262	95.3%	99.7%
Veterans	<i>Veteran</i>	342	333	97.4%	100.0%
	Not a veteran	12,522	11,929	95.3%	97.8%
	Total	12,864	12,262	95.3%	97.8%

Notes: The 80% Index compares the percentage of each disaggregated subgroup attaining an outcome to the percentage attained by the subgroup with the highest rate (reference subgroup). Care must be taken when interpreting results with low subgroup counts (n<50). The methodology is based on the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) 80% Rule, outlined in the 1978 Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures, and was used in Title VII enforcement by the U.S. Equal Opportunity Commission, Department of Labor, and the Department of Justice. A result of less than 80 percent is considered

evidence of a disproportionate impact. Because the 80% Index methodology references the subgroup with the *highest* rate, this table compares the rates of subgroups who were *not* in dismissal. Reference subgroups are in *italics*. Subgroups suffering disproportionate impact are in **bold**.

Source: SMCCCD Student Database: Academic History, Term GPA, and Financial Aid Awards tables.

Goals and Activities

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.

The overall goal based on the student success indicator for access is to increase enrollment of students ages 30 and older and those senior citizens with low income. In addition, we intend to increase outreach to additional student populations with barriers—disconnected youth (incarcerated youth and foster youth) and ESL population.

ACTIVITY A.1 (Please include the target date in chronological order and identify the responsible person/group for each activity)

Activity Identifier	Activity	Responsible person/group	Target date
A.1	Re-examine existing CTE offerings to better meet student needs, particularly reentry students and those returning for retraining.	CTE Dean	Fall 2015
A.2	Increase CTE offerings in high demand jobs specific to our community.	CTE Dean	Fall 2016
A.3	Increase collaboration with SMAC to generate community awareness of CSM college course offerings.	Dean of Kinesiology, Vice Chancellor for Auxiliary Services	Spring 2015
A.4	Implement Project Change to serve the needs of court-involved youth.	Dean of Language Arts, Dean of ASLT, Project Change Coordinator	Fall 2014
A.5	Increase collaboration of ESL course offerings and pedagogy between college and San Mateo Adult School to increase awareness among older students.	Dean of ASLT, ESL faculty	Fall 2014
A.6	Increase information sharing between college and adult school.	ESL faculty	Fall 2014
A.7	Continue to provide monthly workshops to foster youth regarding college opportunities.	Director of Student Support Services	Fall 2014

A.8	Continue to offer Dreamer Workshops for AB540 students.	Multicultural Center counselor, FA staff, EOPS and Puente staff	Fall 2014 – Spring 2017
A.9	Increase collaboration between high schools and CSM to identify AB 540 students.	Director of Student Support Services; CRM Director	Spring 2015
A.10	Continue to host annual Mana Conference to increase awareness of postsecondary opportunities for Pacific Islander students.	Dean of Enrollment Services	Spring 2015
A.11	Implement components of FYE (e.g. early assessment) to attract high school students.	Dean of Language Arts, Dean of Math/Science, Dean of Counseling	Fall 2015
A.12	Continue to provide outreach to targeted populations via EOPS outreach to students that meet the education and eligibility criteria.	EOPS Staff	Fall 2014
A.13	Examine District policies and procedures that may impact access (e.g. drop for non-payment; CCC Apply application).	Dean of Enrollment Services	Spring 2015
A.14	Continue to foster partnerships and collaborations with state and county organizations that serve veterans students, including non-profit NPower.	Dean of Enrollment Services	2014-2017
A.15	Provide ongoing professional development activities for faculty and staff to promote strategies for serving veteran students and Foster Youth.	Dean of ASLT, Dean of Enrollment Services, Director of Student Support Services, Professional Development Coordinator	
A.16	Continue partnership with Jeramiah’s Promise to coordinate outreach to Foster Youth.	Director of Student Support Services	2014-2017

EXPECTED OUTCOME A.1.1

Activity Identifier	Expected Outcome
A.1.1	Recommendations to reconfigure existing CTE programs, modify CTE course scheduling, or redesign existing CTE programs and/or course offerings.
A.2.1	Offer CTE programs leading to certificate or degree based on needs assessment of “high demand” areas.
A.3.1	2% increase in enrollment of students age 30 and above.
A.4.1	Expand Project Change based on results of pilot year and identified need.
A.5.1 & A.6.1	Improved alignment of Adult School and CSM course offerings and scheduling sequence.
A.7.1	2% increase in retention and success rates of Foster Youth.
A.8.1	3% increase in enrollment of AB540 students.
A.9.1	3% increase in enrollment of AB540 students.
A.10.1	150 high students participating in Mana Conference.
A.11.1	Early assessment piloted at selected high schools.
A.12.1	2% increase in EOPS applicants.
A.13.1	Reduction by 2% the number of students dropped for non-payment.
A.14.1	4% increase in veteran students.
A.15.1	40 faculty and staff participate in professional development activity.
A.16.1	2% increase in Foster Youth enrollments at the college.

GOAL A. *(Continued)*

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.

The overall goal of student success indicator for course completion is an increase course completion rates for African-American students, Pacific Islander students, and those younger than 20 years old.

ACTIVITY B.1 (Please include the target date in chronological order and identify the responsible person/group for each activity)

Activity Identifier	Activity	Responsible person/group	Target date
B.1	Implement Umoja Learning Community to increase success and retention of African-American students in the English cohort section.	Umoja faculty and coordinators, Dean of ASLT	Fall 2014
B.2	Continue to offer the Writing in the End Zone Learning Community to maintain success of African-American and Pacific Islander male athletes.	Dean of Language Arts, Dean of Kinesiology, Dean of ASLT	Fall 2014
B.3	Research and develop an FYE plan with selected feeder high schools bridging the high school to college experience which will include outreach, early placement, bridge, peer mentoring, and data sharing.	FYE Taskforce	Fall 2014-Spring 2015
B.4	Implement the FYE plan.	FYE Taskforce	Fall 2015-Spring 2016
B.5	Assess FYE plan end of Spring 2016 and revise accordingly.	FYE Taskforce	Spring 2016
B.6	Expand FYE plan to additional feeder high schools.	FYE Taskforce	2016-17
B. 7	Develop probation workshop for students younger than 20 who are placed on Probation 1	Dean of ASLT, Dean	2014-15

	status.	of Counseling	
B.8	Offer probation workshops, with emphasis on importance of meeting with counselor and developing SEP, for students younger than 20 who are placed on Probation 1 status.	Dean of ASLT, Dean of Counseling	2015-16
B.9	Explore effectiveness of Early Alert system; provide professional development activities for faculty to encourage early in the semester information to students of their status and to increase the intervention by instructional and student services faculty.	Profession Development Coordinator, Dean of ASLT, Dean of Counseling	Spring 2015
B.10	Require orientation for all non-exempt students as outlined in SSSP Plan.	Dean of Counseling	Spring 2015 - 2017
B.11	Provide Professional Development activities for faculty to apply Habits of Mind strategies, mental health referrals, Indaba principles, and counseling workshops to increase awareness of support services.	Professional Development coordinator, Dean of ASLT, CSM Cares	Spring 2015
B.12	Analyze high school transcript data from research exploring alternative assessment for English and math placement.	PRIE, Dean of Language Arts, Dean of Math/Science, appointed English and Math faculty	Fall 2014- Spring 2015
B.13	Provide faculty workshop regarding SSSP regulations, specifically students' academic status and its effect on BOG eligibility and priority registration.	Professional Development coordinator, Dean of Counseling, Dean of ASLT, VPSS	Fall 2014
B.14	Continue to outreach to Latino students about the Puente Program.		Fall 2014- Spring, 2017
B.15	Collaborate with programs to identify and overcome current teaching and learning obstacles including addressing the achievement gaps of underrepresented and low-performing students.	Dean of ASLT, Professional Development Coordinator	Spring 2015
B.16	Offer workshops and presentations for students and faculty each semester to promote mental health emphasizing its impact on student success and retention.	CSM Cares Team	Fall 2014- Spring 2017

B.17	Continue to revise Program Review document and process to ensure that a robust dialogue occurs at the department level to analyze student achievement data and make program revisions based on identified gaps.	All deans, instructional and student services faculty and staff	2014-2017
------	---	---	-----------

EXPECTED OUTCOME B.1.1

Activity Identifier	Expected Outcome
B.1.1	Umoja Learning Community expected enrollment in English cohort for first year 2014-15 is 30 students.
B.1.2	10% higher completion rate of students participating in Umoja Learning Community English cohort as compared to students enrolled in non-Umoja English courses.
B.1.3	10% higher retention and success rates of students participating in Umoja Learning Community English cohort as compared to students enrolled in non-Umoja English courses.
B.2.1	Maintain student success and completion rates for Writing in the End Zone students and continue to identify needs to help support the program.
B.3.1	Complete FYE Plan for 2 feeder high schools by end of Spring 2015.
B.4.1	Implement FYE pilot in 2 feeder high schools.
B.5.1	Collect and analyze of data of first year FYE pilot.
B.6.1	Implement FYE Project with addition feeder high schools.
B.7.1	Components and detailed outline of Probation Workshop developed.
B.8.1	Reduction by 4% of the number of students younger than 20 who continue to Probation 2 status.
B.9.1	Reduction by 4% of the number of students younger than 20 who are placed on Probationary 1 status.
B.10.1	Increase student persistence rate from 42.5% to 46%.
B.11.1	35 faculty members participating in identified Professional Development activities.
B.12.1	Approve and implement alternative assessment for English and math placement.
B.13.1	25 faculty members participating in workshop regarding SSSP.
B.14.1	Ensure Puente Program remains at maximum enrollment.
B.15.1	40 faculty participating in professional development workshops.
B.16.1	50 students and 20 faculty will attend workshops and presentations per semester.
B.17.1	Improved data analysis and action plans in Program Review for addressing identified needs.

GOAL B. *(Continued)*

GOALS AND ACTIVITIES

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 overall goal of student success indicator for ESL and Basic Skills completion is the increase success and progress in Basic Skills English and math.

ACTIVITY C.1 (Please include the target date in chronological order and identify the responsible person/group for each activity)

Activity Identifier	Activity	Responsible person/group	Target date
C.1	Fund the SI Project in Basic Skills English courses, ESL courses, and Basic Skills math courses.	VPI, VPSS, LC Manager, Dean of ASLT	Fall 2014-Spring 2015
C.2	Increase funding for SI Project to provide support in additional Basic Skills English, ESL, and math courses.	VPI, Dean of ASLT, faculty in Math, English, and ESL	2014-15
C.3	Offer professional development activities that specifically address Basic Skills English instruction and infuse Indaba principles where appropriate.	Professional Development Coordinator, Basic Skills Coordinator	Once a semester beginning Spring 2015
C.4	Identified counselor will work with Basic Skills English, ESL, and math faculty to conduct registration for subsequent English and math courses.	Basic Skills Coordinator, MCC Counselor, Dean of Counseling	Once a semester beginning Spring 2015
C.5	Develop comprehensive Student Educational Plan for all Basic Skills FYE students, based on their identified educational goal.	Basic Skills Counselor	2015-16

C.6	Develop a math acceleration path for Basic Skills students which may include adoption of Math Jam.	Math faculty, Dean of Math/Science, Basic Skills Coordinator	2014-15
C.7	Implement math acceleration courses.	Math faculty, Basic Skills Coordinator, Dean of Math/Science	2015-16
C.8	Assess math acceleration courses for retention and completion.	Math faculty, Basic Skills Coordinator, Dean of Math/Science	2016-17
C.9	Expand assistance to ESL students in the Learning Center, with the possibility of ESL tutoring and peer mentoring.	Dean of Language Arts, Learning Center Manager, ESL faculty, Basic Skills Coordinator	2014-15
C.10	Investigate offering ESL 400 and/or a Grammar Jam in the summer to help student accelerate.	ESL faculty & Dean of ASLT & Dean of Research	Spring 2015
C.11	Track the effectiveness of the established Adult School to ESL Pathway and revise as appropriate.	PRIE, Dean of Language Arts	Spring 2015-Spring 2017
C.12	Explore and develop plan for implementing bridge program linking Adult Education offerings to credit course offerings at CSM (ACCEL program).	Dean of ASLT, appropriate Instructional Dean, Director of San Mateo Adult School	2014-2017
C.13	Explore scheduling options to provide additional support for International Students enrolled in Basic Skills and ESL courses.	Director of International Students Program, Dean of Language	2014-2017

		Arts, selected faculty	
C.14	Examine feasibility for accelerating English 838/848 and ESL sequences.	Dean of Language Arts, Basic Skills Coordinator, selected faculty	Fall 2015
C.15	Continue implementation of the Math 811 project.	Dean of Counseling, Basic Skills Coordinator, Math faculty	2014 -2017
C.16	Explore the development of a cohort program for Basic Skills students, including Learning Communities for ESL.	Dean of Language Arts, Dean of Math/Science, Dean of Counseling, selected faculty	Fall 2016
C.17	Collaborate with programs to identify and overcome current teaching and learning obstacles including addressing the achievement gaps of underrepresented and low-performing students.	Dean of ASLT, Professional Development Coordinator	Spring 2015
C.18	Offer workshops and presentations for students and faculty each semester to promote mental health and emphasize its impact on student success and retention.	CSM Cares Team	Fall 2014- Spring 2017

EXPECTED OUTCOME C.1.1

Activity Identifier	Expected Outcome
C.1.1	Provide \$65K to fund SI Project in Basic Skills English and Basic Skills math course for 2014-15.
C.2.1	Provide funds to SI Project in Basic Skills English and Basic Skills math courses for 2015-16.
C.3.1	50% of all Basic Skills English and Basic Skills math faculty will attend professional development activities.
C.4.1	80% of all Basic Skills English and Basic Skills math students are registered by their priority registration date.
C.5.1	95% of all Basic Skills FYE students will have developed a comprehensive SEP.
C.6.1	Completed math acceleration path.
C.7.1	Implement math acceleration path beginning in 2016/17.

C.8.1	10% higher retention rates of students enrolled in accelerated math courses as compared to students enrolled in traditional length courses.
C.9.1	Add a weekly Grammar and Editing Workshop in the Learning Center to expand the workshops already offered now through the Writing Center. Implement additional ESL tutoring option in the Learning Center.
C.10.1	Complete and analyze results of data from ESL 828 and ESL 400 survey. Offer ESL Grammar Jam or ESL 400 in the summer, if appropriate.
C.11.1	Complete the analysis of data and make modifications as deemed appropriate.
C.12.1	Bridge, as appropriate, is established and assessed.
C.13.1	Increase course completion and retention rate of International Students in their English and ESL courses by 5%.
C.14.1	Reduce or modify the number of courses needed to complete the English and ESL sequence.
C.15.1	Monitor effectiveness of Math 811 project and provide additional counseling resources based on identified need.
C.16.1	Cohort model identified and implemented for 2016/17 academic year.
C.17.1	40 faculty per year participate in professional development activities.
C.18.1	50 students and 20 faculty will attend workshops and presentations per semester.

District : _____

College : _____

GOAL C. *(Continued)*

District : _____

College : _____

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.

The overall goal of student success indicator for degree and certificate completion is the increase in the number of degree and certificate completers.

ACTIVITY D.1 (Please include the target date in chronological order and identify the responsible person/group for each activity)

Activity Identifier	Activity	Responsible person/group	Target date
D.1	Extract from DegreeWorks those students who have earned degrees or certificates but have not applied to receive them.	A&R Staff	Fall 2014
D.2	Schedule two DegreeWorks workshops each semester to instruct students in how to best search for degrees and certificated by catalog year and various majors.	Dean of Counseling	Spring 2015-Spring 2017
D.3	Communicate with students who have reached key milestones progressing toward their degree and certificates.	A & R Staff	Spring 2015-Spring 2017
D.4	Revise local associate degree requirements to align with Title 5 requirements.	Dean of Counseling, COI	Fall 2016
D.5	Schedule joint faculty and counselor presentation in capstone course in certificate programs to promote degree and transfer opportunities.	Dean of Counseling, CTE Dean	Fall 2016
D.6	Communicate with students who do not register for the subsequent semester.	Dean of Research, Dean of Enrollment Services	Spring 2016
D.7	Provide professional development activities for faculty to encourage the use of Early Alert system early in the semester to inform students of their status and to increase the	Professional Development	Spring 2015

	intervention by instructional and student services faculty.	Coordinator	
D.8	Offer workshops and presentations for students, student leaders, staff and faculty each semester to promote mental health and emphasize its impact on student success and retention. (Emphasize to faculty regarding the benefit of bringing classes to mental health workshops/presentations)	CSM Cares Team	Fall 2014- Spring 2017
D.9	Explore offering financial incentive to students enrolled in proposed FYE Project.	Cabinet, IPC, FYE Task Force	2014-2015
D.10	Work with faculty coordinators from Umoja, Puente, WEZ, and Mana Learning Communities to implement special recognition of specific student populations.	Dean of ASLT, Faculty Coordinators	Spring 2015
D.11	Provide recognition ceremony for certificate recipients.	VPSS	Spring 2015
D.12	Provide workshops for students who have not identified an educational goal and course of study.	Dean of Counseling, Career Counselor	each semester, beginning Spring 2015
D.13	Implement Withdrawal survey; send survey to all students who withdraw from courses.	Dean of Enrollment Services, Dean of PRIE	Spring 2015
D.14	Continue to encourage students to enroll in CRER 120, 121, and 105.	Counseling faculty, Dean of Counseling, PSCs in Counseling	Fall 2014
D. 15	Incorporate the Information Competency requirement in all English 100 courses.	Dean of Language Arts, English faculty	Fall 2014
D. 16	Provide professional development activity during which faculty coordinators in learning communities (e.g. WEZ, Puente, Umoja) share with all faculty data and best practices for student retention and success.	Professional Development Coordinator, Dean of ASLT, Dean of PRIE	Spring 2015
D.17	Institutionalize CSM Cares Program.	Cabinet	Fall 2016
D.18	Collaborate with programs to identify and overcome current teaching and learning obstacles including addressing the achievement gaps of underrepresented and low-performing students.	Dean of ASLT, Professional Development	Fall 2015

		Coordinator	
D.19	Analyze data regarding the number of degrees and certificates awarded with a goal of reducing/eliminating programs in which there are few/no award earners.	VPI, instructional deans, Dean of Enrollment Services, Dean of Counseling	Spring, 2015

EXPECTED OUTCOME D.1.1

Activity Identifier	Expected Outcome
D.1.1	2% increase in the number of degrees and certificates for student who had not applied.
D.2.1	60 students per semester will attend DegreeWorks workshops.
D.3.1	2% increase in the number of degrees and certificates issued to students who received communication.
D.4.1	Streamlined local requirements for associate degree.
D.5.1	Increase by 5% the number of certificate recipients earning degrees and/or transferring.
D.6.1	Increase in 3% of students who received communication and registered for subsequent term.
D.7.1	Increase by 5% the number of students completing courses leading to degrees and certificates.
D.8.1	50 students and 20 faculty will attend workshops and presentations per semester.
D.9.1	Decision reached regarding financial incentives.
D.10.1	Recognition ceremonies implemented.
D.11.1	Recognition ceremony for certificate recipients.
D.12.1	Increase by 10% of students with an educational goal and course of study.
D.13.1	Analyze withdraw data for both online and traditional courses; share results with IPC and determine if retention strategies that might reduce withdrawal rates.
D.14.1	Increase enrollment in CRER classes by 5%.
D.15.1	Information competency incorporated into all English 100 classes.
D.16.1	Determine those best practices to incorporate into additional CSM courses and programs.
D.17.1	Complete institutionalization of CSM Cares Program.
D.18.1	40 faculty per year participate in professional development activities addressing achievement gaps of underrepresented and low-performing students.
D.19.1	Reduce programs in which there are few or no award earners.

GOAL D. *(Continued)*

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 actually transfer after one or more (up to six) years”

GOAL E.

The overall goal of student success indicator for transfer is an increase in the overall student transfer rate.

ACTIVITY E.1 (Please include the target date in chronological order and identify the responsible person/group for each activity)

Activity Identifier	Activity	Responsible person/group	Target date
E.1	Fund the SI Project for various math, English, other specifically identified courses.	VPI, VPSS	2015-16
E.2	Develop comprehensive SEP for all transfer students.	Dean of Counseling, Counseling Faculty	2015-2016
E.3	Develop a math acceleration path.	Dean of Math/Science, Math Faculty	2014-2015
E.4	Implement math acceleration courses.	Dean of Math/Science, Math Faculty	2015-16
E.5	Assess math acceleration courses for retention and completion.	Dean of Math/Science, Math Faculty, Dean of Research	2016-17
E.6	Email communications to students who have reached key milestones progressing toward transfer.	A&R Staff	Spring 2015-Spring 2017
E.7	Schedule joint faculty and counselor presentations in high demand transfer courses to promote transfer opportunities.	Dean of Counseling, Instructional Deans	Fall 2016

E.8	Research and develop an FYE plan with selected high schools bridging the high school-to-college experience which will include early placement, bridge, peer mentoring, and data sharing.	FYE Taskforce	Fall 2014-Spring 2015
E.9	Continue to offer a variety of transfer-related activities through the Transfer Center, including workshops, presentations, and college visits.	Transfer Center Coordinator	2014-2017
E.10	Schedule the annual Transfer Tribute ceremony.	Academic Senate	Spring 2015
E.11	Implement Transfer Week each semester.	Transfer Center Coordinator	Fall 2014
E.12	Continue development of AA/AS-Transfer degree pathways.	Dean of Counseling, Instructional Deans	2014-2016
E.13	Collaborate with programs to identify and overcome current teaching and learning obstacles including addressing the achievement gaps of underrepresented and low-performing students.	Dean of ASLT, Professional Development	Spring 2015
E.14	Offer workshops and presentations for students and faculty each semester to promote mental health and emphasize its impact on student success and retention.	CSM Cares Team	Fall 2014-Spring 2017

EXPECTED OUTCOME E.1.1

Activity Identifier	Expected Outcome
E.1.1	Provide \$65K to fund SI Project for 2014-15.
E.2.1	95% of all transfer students will have developed a comprehensive SEP.
E.3.1	Completed math acceleration pathway.
E.4.1	Offer math acceleration pathway.
E.5.1	A student rate of 70% completion in accelerated courses.
E.6.1	2% increase in number of transfers of those students who received communication.
E.7.1	Increase by 5% the number of transfer students.
E.8.1	Complete the FYE plan for 2 feeder high schools by the end of Spring 2015.
E.9.1	Continue to obtain student evaluation of Transfer Center activities and modify as needed.
E.10.1	Increase by 3% the number of transfer students attending Transfer Tribute.
E.11.1	Increase by 2% the number of students attending Transfer Week.

E.12.1	Approval and implementation of new AS/AS-Transfer degrees.
E.13.1	40 faculty per year participate in professional development activities.
E.14.1	50 students and 20 faculty will attend workshops and presentations per year.

District : _____

College : _____

GOAL E. *(Continued)*

GOALS AND ACTIVITIES

Budget

NOTE: Colleges just received notification on 9/2/14 regarding their Student Equity allocations. The details of the budget will be included in the near future.

SOURCES OF FUNDING

College of San Mateo plans to take an “all funds” approach to cover the costs for the activities outlined in the Student Equity Plan. This will include general funds and categorical funds (specifically SSSP funds for specific activities that align with the SSSP core services), and Student Equity and Basic Skills Initiative funds.

College of San Mateo has already allocated funds to implement a variety of programs, projects and initiatives to address the identified achievement gap. These include, but are not limited to:

Puente Project

CSM Umoja

Veterans Opportunity Resource Center (VROC)

Supplemental Instruction

S.M.A.R.T. (Student Mentoring)

Pathway to College

Professional Development (Center for Academic Excellence)

MANA

Evaluation Schedule and Process

College of San Mateo's Institutional Planning Committee (IPC) has oversight for all institutional planning and budgeting. This committee has representation from all constituent groups and is co-chaired by the President of the Academic Senate and the Vice President of Student Services. Chairs/Co-Chairs of all institutional planning committees, which report to IPC, are members of IPC. This committee structure ensures the integration of planning and budgeting at the institution.

The institutional planning committees include:

- Basic Skills Committee
- Distance Education and Educational Technology Committee (DEETC)
- Diversity in Action Group (DIAG)
- College Assessment Committee (Purview of Academic Senate)
- Committee on Instruction (Purview of Academic Senate)
- Library Advisory Committee (Purview of Academic Senate)

In spring, 2014, IPC established a Student Equity Task Force to develop the state-mandated Student Equity Plan. At its August 29, 2014 meeting, IPC approved the recommendation that the Diversity in Action Committee, an established institutional planning committee, be responsible for overseeing the implementation of the Student Equity Plan. The Diversity in Action Committee's mission is aligned with the many of the goals and intent of student equity. In fact, last spring, the Diversity in Action Committee developed a detailed achievement gap report based on data taken from the Educational Master Plan (EMP), a planning document developed by the Office of Planning, Research, and Institutional Effectiveness, which is reviewed each year by IPC. The Diversity in Action Group report, which examined data similar to that required of the Student Equity Plan, resulted in recommendations for college initiatives that would address the achievement gap of specific student populations. Thus, given the common scope of work, it was logical to house the oversight for the Student Equity Plan with the Diversity in Action Committee. In fact, many of the Student Equity Task Force members are currently serving on

the Diversity in Action Group. Additional faculty and staff will be appointed to the Diversity in Action Group to ensure the appropriate representation from student services and instruction.

As part of the institutional planning cycle designed to ensure the alignment of all planning activities, all institutional plans cover a three-year planning horizon and are updated each year. Committee chairs report to IPC annually on the status of their plan implementation. In the case of the Student Equity Plan, the annual review, along with IPC's review of institutional data and all program reviews, will ensure that the college is mitigating any disproportionate impact in the identified student equity indicators. In addition, the Diversity in Action Group and IPC will ensure compliance with statewide reporting requirements. It should be noted that the Chief Financial Officer for the San Mateo County Community College District (SMCCD) is a member of IPC. She will continue to provide information regarding Student Equity funding and guidelines for appropriate use. This also will ensure compliance with state regulations. The following chart provides more specific information regarding the evaluation process, as linked to the goals and budget sections of the plan. **(INSERT CHART)**

EVALUATION SCHEDULE AND PROCESS

Attachments

ATTACHMENTS
