MENDOCINO COLLEGE STUDENT EQUITY PLAN

Table of Contents

Mendocino College
Student Equity Plan
Signature Page

District: Mendocino-Lake Community College District

Date Approved by Board of Trustees: December 17, 2014

Mendocino College Superintendent/President:

J. Arturo Reyes

Vice President of Education and Student Services:

Virginia L. Guleff

Academic Senate President:

Reid Edelman, Professor, Theatre Arts

Student Equity Coordinator/Contact Persons:

Sarah Walsh, Professor, English as a Second Language

Ketmani Kouanchao, Dean of Student Services

Executive Summary

Section 1) Goals and Outcomes

Goals:

In order to address gaps in student success as a result of SSSP implementation, the Mendocino College Student Equity Committee was formed and the Mendocino College Student Equity Plan was developed.

Based on a review of campus data, the Mendocino College Student Equity Committee has identified three student populations who are experiencing greatest disproportionate impact. Those populations are: current and previous Foster Youth, African American students, and Native American students.

The Student Equity Committee has created multiple goals to address disproportionate impact using the five state mandated indicators for student success:

    A) Access
    B) Course Completion
    C) ESL/Basic Skills Completion
    D) Degree and Certificate Completion
    E) Transfer

The work of the Mendocino College Student Equity Committee has focused on an analysis of campus data and discussions of equitable practices to support student success for all Mendocino College students, with special focus on the targeted populations—Foster Youth, African American students, and Native American students. Both the Student Equity Committee and the District as a whole recognize that services developed to serve the targeted populations will also serve all Mendocino College students.

The five Mendocino College Student Equity Plan Goals are the following:

Goal A) Increase access to all college services and programs for all students with special focus on targeted populations—Foster Youth, African American students, and Native American students.

Goal B) Increase course completion rates for all students with special focus on targeted populations—Foster Youth, African American students, and Native American students.

Goal C) Increase success in Basic Skills courses for all students, with special focus on targeted populations—Foster Youth, African American students, and Native American students.

Goal D) Increase degree and certificate completion among all students with special focus on targeted populations—Foster Youth, African American students, and Native American students.

Goal E) Increase percentage of students who transfer to a four-year college or university for all students, with special focus on targeted populations—Foster Youth, African American students, and Native American students.

Outcomes:

The Student Equity Committee has created multiple predicted outcomes, which will be achieved when the above goals are reached. They include the following, divided by year of completion:

Student Equity Goals	Fall 2015 Outcomes	Fall 2016 Outcomes	Fall 2017 Outcomes
Goal A)	Mendocino College faculty and staff, including the Student Equity Committee, will have a more comprehensive understanding of equity issues for our college.	2% more students will integrate into college life through participation in cultural and campus-wide activities and be more aware of available college and community resources.	2% more students will score higher on placement exams and register as full-time students in the appropriate course by using priority registration.
Goal B)	Student Life Coordinator and Academic Advisor will be hired.	50% of students in targeted populations will utilize instructor sign-off pilot program. 3% of the targeted populations will be more successful in their classes. 3% more students in targeted populations will make connections early in their academic career by working with new Student Life Coordinator and new Academic Advisor.	1% of populations experiencing disproportionate impact will participate in mentoring program.

Student Equity Goals	Fall 2015 Outcomes	Fall 2016 Outcomes	Fall 2017 Outcomes
Goal C)	1% more students will enroll in Basic Skills/ESL classes. Students will demonstrate greater persistence in off-site ESL classes by 1%. ESL noncredit data will be generated and analyzed.	3% more students will utilize Learning Center services.	2% more students will meet with a counselor prior to class start.
Goal D)	Increase degree and certificate completion for all students by 2%, including targeted populations. ESL noncredit data will be generated and analyzed.	Increase the number of Native American students on campus from 6% to 8%. College employees will have a better understanding of topics related to multiculturalism, and the needs of populations experiencing disproportionate impact.	Increase the number of Native American students on campus from 8% to 10%. Provide Student Equity Committee with data regarding success of specialized student support programs.
Goal E)	3% more students will access Career-Transfer Center services including meeting with lead transfer counselor.	2% more students will transfer to four-year schools.	30% of Foster Youth, African American students, and Native American students will participate in peer mentor program.

Section 2) Activities and Actions

The Student Equity Committee has created multiple activities for each of the five student success indicators. Completion timelines for all activities can be found in the Goals and Activities Section of this document. A summary of all activities divided by indictors follows.

Access:
- Conduct University of Southern California Equity Scorecard
- Provide Orientations
- Develop Bridge Programs
- Provide Information on Housing
- Provide Evening and Off-Site Childcare Pilot Program
- Improve Access to Distance Education/Live Streaming

Course Completion:
- Create Student Life Coordinator Position
- Create Academic Advisor Position
- Create College-Wide Mentoring Program
- Create Instructor Grade Check Pilot Program

Success in Basic Skills and ESL:
- Connect Students to Learning Center Services
- Initiate Embedded Counseling Pilot Program
- Develop Supplemental Instruction Tutoring Pilot Program
- Provide Student "Starter Kit"
- Provide Evening and Off-Site Childcare
- Investigate ESL Noncredit Student Data Issues

Degree and Certificate Completion:
- Create Native American Education Specialist Position
- Create Professional Development Opportunities
- Support Student Leadership Activities
- Ensure Students Complete Education Plan
- Research Specialized Student Support Programs

Transfer to Four-Year Colleges and Universities
- Initiate Embedded Counseling
- Ensure Students Complete Education Plan
- Designate Lead Transfer Counselor
- Increase Transfer Day Activities
- Develop Peer Mentoring Program
- Support Student Visits to Four-Year Colleges and Universities

Section 3) Resources Budgeted
Primary funding for all activities will come from Student Equity Plan funding. Additional resources will come from the Student Success and Support Program (SSSP), the Basic Skills Initiative (BSI) and District funds.

Section 4) Contact Information
Student Equity Co-Chairs are Sarah Walsh, ESL Faculty/Basic Skills Coordinator and Ketmani Kouanchao, Dean of Student Services

Campus-Based Research

<u>Overview</u>

In order to identify and address any disproportionate impact as a result of the implementation of the Student Success and Support act, the Mendocino-Lake Community College District (MLCCD) has developed the District's Student Equity Plan. MLCCD has followed the data analysis methodologies as identified in the Student Equity Template and Guidelines, and applied them to each of the potential data sources identified for each performance indicator. In instances where it was observed that local or indicator specific sources would enhance the college's ability to assess disproportionate impact in a given performance area, the proportionality and 80% indices were also applied to local data sources.

While CCCCO data sources provided age, gender, ethnicity, disability, foster youth and veteran data sets for each of the student equity indicators, data was unavailable for the economically disadvantaged subgroup. Course retention and success rates for the economically disadvantaged subgroup, were sourced from the Mendocino College SQL server, along with ESL and remediation rates.

The DSPS, Foster Youth, Veteran and credit ESL student population sizes were too small to be statistically relevant in the areas of ESL, Remediation, Transfer and Degree Completion. However, this does not diminish the importance of completion rates for these subgroups. Mendocino College will explore future longitudinal studies to adequately track success among these groups.

<u>Measurement of Disproportionate Impact</u>

Disproportionate Impact: Per state requirement, disproportionate impact is calculated one or both of the following ways: **the 80% and proportionality indexes**.

• **The 80% Index:** Evidence of disparate impact occurs when any race, sex, or ethnic group experiences success rates less than four-fifths (4/5) (or 80%) of the rate for the group with the highest rate. The 80% Index is used in Title VII enforcement by federal government.

• **The Proportionality Index:** The CCCCO guidelines explain the proportionality index as follows: "The proportionality methodology compares the percentage of a disaggregated subgroup in an initial cohort to its own percentage in the resultant outcome group. The formula for proportionality is the percentage in the outcome group divided by the percentage in the original cohort."

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. Community demographics were sourced reflecting the 2010 U.S. Census for comparison to the Mendocino-Lake Community College District student population. The analysis consisted of reviewing demographics in the counties of Mendocino and Lake. Based on the college's examination of the data for Access, the following was observed:

Gender
In the 2013-2014 academic year, female students comprised 58.43% of Mendocino College's student population; male students comprised the remaining 41.51%. For adults residing in the Mendocino and Lake Counties, the population was almost evenly split, with slightly over 50.2% for females and 49.7% for males. Thus, compared to local residents, males were underrepresented in the MLCCD student population (see Table 1).

Table 1 MLCCD Students and Adult Residents in Mendocino and Lake Counties by Gender

Gender	MLCCD		Mendocino and Lake Counties		Difference
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	% Points
Female	3,628	58.48%	60,031	50.2%	8.28%
Male	2,575	41.51%	59,342	49.7%	-8.19%
Unknown	1	0.02%	0	0.0%	
Total	6,204	100%	119,373	100%	0.0%

Ethnicity

The two largest ethnic groups represented among 2013-2014 MLCCD students were White students (56.83%) and Hispanic students (30.09%), followed by Native American students (4.66%) and African American students (3.16%). Among Mendocino/Lake residents (including college and non-college aged residents); the largest ethnic groups were White (58%), Latino (20%), and Unknown (10%). Hispanic students had a greater representation in the MLCCD student population than in the Mendocino/Lake population; however, this included all residents including non-college aged students. White, Multi-Ethnic and Unreported students had a lower representation among MLCCD students than in the Mendocino/Lake population; however this included all residents including non-college aged students. African American, Asian and Pacific Islander students also had a slightly greater representation in the MLCCD student population than in the Mendocino/Lake population; however this included all residents including non-college aged students (see Table 2).

Table 2 MLCCD Students and Residents in Mendocino and Lake Counties by Ethnicity

Ethnicity	MLCCD		Mendocino and Lake Counties		Difference
	Number	**Percent**	**Number**	**Percent**	**% Points**
African American	196	3.16%	1,854	1.2%	1.96%
Native American	289	4.66%	6,326	4.1%	0.56%
Asian	200	3.22%	2,174	1.4%	1.82%
Hispanic	1,867	30.09%	30,593	20%	10.09%
Multi-Ethnicity	39	0.63%	7,034	4.6%	-3.97%
Pacific Islander	26	0.42%	227	0.14%	0.28%
Unknown	61	0.98%	15,640	10.2%	-9.22%
White	3,526	56.83%	88,658	58.1%	-1.27%
Total	6,204	100%	152,506		

Age
53.26% of all 2013-2014 MLCCD students were in the traditional college student age range (between the ages of 18 and 24). Another 11.85% were ages 25 to 29, and 14% were between ages 30 and 39. By comparison, 23.76% of Mendocino/Lake residents were between 18 and 24 years of age. Thus, this age group had far greater representation among MLCCD students. Among Mendocino/Lake adults, 5.7% were between the ages of 25 and 29, and 10.9% were between 30 and 39. 53.4% all Mendocino/Lake residents were age 40 or over. This age group had a much lower representation in the MLCCD student population than in the Mendocino/Lake adult population (see Table 3). These differences are fairly intuitive, given that ages 18 to 24 years represent the traditional ages at which students enter college (see Table 3).

Table 3 MLCCD Students and Residents in Mendocino and Lake Counties by Age

Age	MLCCD		Mendocino and Lake Counties		Difference
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	% Points
19 or Less	1,897	30.58%	36,894	24.1%	6.48%
20-24	1,407	22.68%	8,236	5.4%	17.28%
25-29	735	11.85%	8,831	5.7%	6.15%
30-34	522	8.41%	8,476	5.5%	2.91%
35-39	347	5.59%	8,352	5.4%	0.19%
40-49	549	8.85%	19,495	12.7%	-3.85%
50+	746	12.02%	62,222	40.7%	-28.68%
Unknown	1	0.02%	0	0.00%	
Total	6,204	100%	152,506		

Veteran Status
In the 2013-2014 academic year, 2.9% of all MLCCD students were veterans. Data on veteran status for Mendocino/Lake residents was available only as 2012 estimates from the American Community Survey from the U.S. Census. Based on these estimates, 12.1% of Mendocino/Lake adults were veterans. Thus, when comparing 2013-2014 MLCCD figures to 2012 Mendocino/Lake adult population figures, veterans were underrepresented among the MLCCD student population (see Table 4).

Table 4 MLCCD Students & Adult Residents in Mendocino/Lake Counties by Veteran Status

Veteran Status	MLCCD		Mendocino and Lake Counties		Difference
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	% Points
Veteran	182	2.9%	14,443	12.1%	-9.2%
Non-Veteran	6,022	97.1%	104,930	87.9%	9.2
Total	6,204	100%	119,373	100%	

Foster Youth
In 2013-2014, foster youth accounted for 1.4% of the MLCCD student population. Comparison data for Mendocino/Lake residents was not available (see Table 5).

Table 5 MLCCD Students & Adult Residents in Mendocino/Lake Counties by Foster Status

Foster Youth Status	MLCCD		Mendocino and Lake Counties		Difference
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	% Points
Foster Youth	89	1.4%			
Non-Foster	6,115	98.6%	------------------	Not Available	--------------------
Total	6,204	100%			

DSPS Status
In 2013-2014, DSPS status students accounted for 5.2% of the MLCCD student population. Comparison data for Mendocino/Lake counties was available from a 2005-2007 data sample. According to this data DSPS Mendocino/Lake residents are experiencing disproportionate impact when compared to MLCCD DSPS students. However, the data does not supply the type of disability status, which may or may not preclude a person to attend college (see Table 6).

Table 6 MLCCD Students & Adult Residents in Mendocino/Lake Counties by DSPS Status

DSPS Status	MLCCD		Mendocino and Lake Counties		Difference
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	% Points
DSPS	323	5.2%	18,860	19.3%	-14.1%
Non-DSPS	5,881	94.8%	78,720	80.7%	14.1
Total	6,204	100%	97,580	100%	

Low-Income Status

To determine low-income status, students BOGW waiver status was utilized. Based on these BOGW eligibility 55% of the 2013-2014 student population came from low income households. Comparable data for Mendocino/Lake adults was available only as percentage of families with incomes below the national poverty level via the American Community Survey 2008-2012 estimates. Based on 2012 estimates, 21% of the population for Mendocino/Lake Counties fellow below the poverty level according to U.S. Federal Poverty guidelines. There appears to be an underrepresentation of people above the poverty level, however, this includes residents of all ages (see Tables 7 and 8).

Table 7 Low Income Status

Low Income Status	MLCCD		Mendocino and Lake Counties		Difference
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	% Points
Low-Income	3,390	55%	32,050	21%	34%
Not Low Income	2,841	45%	119,002	79%	-34%
Total	6,204	100%	151,052	100%	

Table 8 U.S. Federal Poverty Guidelines 2013

Household Size	100% of Poverty Level	150% of Poverty Level
1	$11,490	$17,505
2	$15,510	$23,595
3	$19,530	$29,295
4	$23,550	$35325
5	$27,570	$41,355
6	$31,590	$47,385
7	$35,610	$53,415
8	$39,630	$59,445

B. COURSE COMPLETION

Course completion is the 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.

For the 2013-2014 academic year, there were a total of 19,797 enrollments in credit courses. The overall retention rate for the College, which is defined as the number of students who remained in the class with final grades of A, B, C, D, F, P, NP, I, or RD, divided by the total number of enrollments at census, was 89%. The overall success rate, defined as the total number of successful or passing grades (A, B, C, or P) divided by the total number of enrollments at census, was 74%.

Retention and Success by Gender
The retention rates for male and female students were relatively similar for the 2013-2014 academic year; however, success rates were slightly greater for female students than male students. However, there was no evidence of disproportionate impact (see Tables 9a, 9b, and 9c).

Table 9a Course Completion Rate by Gender

Gender	Enrolled	Retained	Retention Rate	Successful	Success Rate
Female	11,389	10,167	89%	8,619	76%
Male	8,405	7,430	88%	5,964	71%
Unreported	3	3	100%	3	100%
Total	19,797	17,600	89%	14,586	74%

Table 9b Course Retention by Gender Proportionality

Gender	Enrolled	% of Enrollment	Retained	Percentage of Retained	Proportionality Index
Female	11,389	57.5%	10,167	57.7%	1.003
Male	8,405	42.4%	7,430	42.2%	.995
Unreported	3	0.01%	3	0.01%	1
Total	19,797		17,600		

Table 9c Course Success by Gender Proportionality

Gender	Enrolled	% of Enrollment	Successful	Percentage of Retained	Proportionality Index
Female	11,389	57.5%	8,619	59.1 %	1.027
Male	8,405	42.4%	5,964	40.8%	.962
Unreported	3	0.01%	3	0.01%	1
Total	19,797		14,586		

Retention and Success by Ethnicity

Retention rates ranged from 86% for Native American students to 91% for Pacific Islander students for the 2013-2014 academic year; however, there was no evidence of disproportionate impact for retention (see Tables 8a and 8b). Success rates also varied somewhat by ethnicity, ranging from 62% for African American students to 79% for Asian students. Utilizing the proportionality index, there was evidence of disproportionate impact for success among African American and Native American students. There was also some evidence of disproportionate impact for Multi-Ethnic students; however, the sample size proved to be too small to be statistically significant (see Tables 10a, 10b and 10c).

Table 10a Course Completion Rate by Ethnicity

Ethnicity	Enrolled	Retained	Retention Rate	Success	Success Rate
African American	944	836	88.5%	589	62.3%
Native American	1,122	973	86.7%	757	67.4%
Asian	554	498	89.8%	441	79.6%
Hispanic	5,291	4,737	89.5%	3,887	73.4%
Multi-Ethnicity	22	20	90.9%	16	72.7%
Pacific Islander	104	95	91.3%	75	72.1%
Unknown	125	110	88%	91	72.8%
White	11,635	10,331	88.7%	8,730	75%
Total	19,797	17,600	88.9%	14,586	73.6%

Table 10b Course Retention by Ethnicity Proportionality Indices

Ethnicity	Enrolled	%of Enrollment	Retained	Percentage of Retained	Proportionality Index
African American	944	4.7%	836	4.7%	1
Native American	1,122	5.6%	973	5.5%	.982
Asian	554	2.7%	498	2.8%	1.03
Hispanic	5,291	26.7%	4,737	26.9%	1.007
Multi-Ethnicity	22	.11%	20	.11%	1
Pacific Islander	104	.53%	95	.53%	1
Unknown	125	.62%	110	.62%	1
White	11,635	58.7%	10,331	58.6%	.998
Total	19,797		17,600		

Table 10c Course Success by Ethnicity Proportionality Indices

Ethnicity	Enrolled	%of Enrollment	Successful	Percentage of Successful	Proportionality Index
African American	944	4.7%	589	4%	.851
Native American	1,122	5.6%	757	5.1%	.910
Asian	554	2.7%	441	3%	1.11
Hispanic	5,291	26.7%	3,887	26.6%	.996
Multi-Ethnicity	22	.11%	16	.10%	.909
Pacific Islander	104	.53%	75	.51%	.962
Unknown	125	.62%	91	.62%	1
White	11,635	58.7%	8,730	59.8%	1.01
Total	19,797		14,586		

Retention and Success by Age

Retention rates were relatively similar across all age groups in the 2013-2014 academic year. Students under age 20 had a retention rate of 90%, while all other age groups had retention rate average of 87.6%. Proportionality index scores were above .97 for all groups for retention; thus, there was no evidence of disproportionate impact in retention. Success rates were also relatively similar across age groups, ranging from 71.9% for students between the ages of 20-24 to 76.6% for students ages 50 and over. Utilizing the proportionality index, there was no evidence of disproportionate impact (see Tables 11a, 11b, and 11c).

Table 11a Course Completion Rate by Age

Age	Enrolled	Retained	Retention Rate	Success	Success Rate
Under 18	996	898	90.1%	722	72.4%
18-19	5,138	4,664	90.7%	3,778	73.5%
20-24	5,869	5,175	88.1%	4,222	71.9%
25-29	2,244	1,952	86.9%	1,660	73.9%
30-34	1,467	1,288	87.7%	1,126	76.7%
35-39	1,050	934	88.9%	793	75.5%
40-49	1,470	1,295	88%	1,087	73.9%
50+	1,563	1,394	89.1%	1,198	76.6%
Total	19,797	17,600	88.9%	14,586	73.6%

Table 11b Course Retention by Age Proportionality Indices

Age	Enrolled	% of Enrollment	Retained	Percentage of Retained	Proportionality Index
Under 18	996	5%	898	5.1%	1.02
18-19	5,138	25.9%	4,664	26.5%	1.02
20-24	5,869	29.6%	5,175	29.4%	.993
25-29	2,244	11.3%	1,952	11%	.973
30-34	1,467	7.4%	1,288	7.3%	.986
35-39	1,050	5.3%	934	5.3%	1
40-49	1,470	7.4%	1,295	7.3%	.986
50+	1,563	7.8%	1,394	7.9%	1.01
Total	19,797		17,600		

Table 11c Course Success by Age Proportionality Indices

Age	Enrolled	% of Enrollment	Successful	Percentage of Successful	Proportionality Index
Under 18	996	5%	722	4.9%	.98
18-19	5,138	25.9%	3,778	25.9%	1
20-24	5,869	29.6%	4,222	28.9%	.976
25-29	2,244	11.3%	1,660	11.3%	1
30-34	1,467	7.4%	1,126	7.7%	1.04
35-39	1,050	5.3%	793	5.4%	1.01
40-49	1,470	7.4%	1,087	7.4%	1
50+	1,563	7.8%	1,198	8.2%	1.05
Total	19,797		14,586		

Retention and Success by DSPS Status

Retention rates for were relatively similar across all DSPS and Non-DSPS students in the 2013-2014 academic year. Utilizing the proportionality index, there was no evidence of disproportionate impact as both groups were above .96 (see Tables 12a, 12b and 12c).

Table 12a Course Completion Rate by DSPS Status

DSPS Status	Enrolled	Retained	Retention Rate	Success	Success Rate
DSPS Student	922	807	87.5%	660	71.5%
Non-DSPS	18,875	16,793	88.9%	13,926	73.7%
Total	19,797	17,600	88.9%	14,586	73.6%

Table 12b Course Retention by DSPS Status Proportionality Index

DSPS Status	Enrolled	% of Enrollment	Retained	Percentage of Retained	Proportionality Index
DSPS Student	922	4.6%	807	4.5%	.978
Non-DSPS	18,875	95.3%	16,793	95.4%	1.001
Total	19,797		17,600		

Table 12c Course Success by DSPS Status Proportionality Index

DSPS Status	Enrolled	% of Enrollment	Successful	Percentage of Successful	Proportionality Index
DSPS Student	922	4.6%	660	4.5%	.978
Non-DSPS	18,875	95.3%	13,926	95.4%	1.001
Total	19,797		14,586		

Retention and Success by Veteran Status

Retention and success rates were fairly equal for veterans than non-veterans enrolled in the 2013-2014 academic year. Veterans had a retention rate of 89.8%, compared to 88.8% for non-veterans. Moreover, veterans had a success rate of 72.8%, versus 73.7% for non-veterans. Utilizing the proportionality index, there was no evidence of disproportionate impact as both groups were above .96 (see Tables 13a, 13b, and 13c).

Table 13a Course Completion Rate by Veteran Status

Veteran Status	Enrolled	Retained	Retention Rate	Success	Success Rate
Veteran	560	503	89.8%	408	72.8%
Non-Veteran	19,237	17,097	88.8%	14,178	73.7%
Total	19,797	17,600	88.9%	14,586	

Table 13b Course Retention by Veteran Status Proportionality Indices

Veteran Status	Enrolled	% of Enrollment	Retained	Percentage of Retained	Proportionality Index
Veteran	560	2.8%	503	2.8%	1
Non-Veteran	19,237	97.1%	17,097	97.1%	1
Total	19,797		17,600		

Table 13c Course Success by Veteran Status Proportionality Indices

Veteran Status	Enrolled	% of Enrollment	Successful	Percentage of Successful	Proportionality Index
Veteran	560	2.8%	408	2.7%	.964
Non-Veteran	19,237	97.1%	14,178	97.2%	1.001
Total	19,797		14,586		

Retention and Success by Foster Youth Status
Retention rates were slightly lower for foster youth than for non-foster youth. Specifically, foster youth had a retention rate of 85.8%, compared to 88.9% for non-foster youth. In addition, foster youth had a success rate of 29%, compared to 83.7% for non-foster youth. The proportionality index for success rates among foster youth was .343, which indicates evidence of disproportionate impact (see Tables 14a, 14b, and 14c).

Table 14a Course Completion Rate by Foster Youth Status

Foster Youth Status	Enrolled	Retained	Retention Rate	Success	Success Rate
Foster Youth	325	279	85.8%	81	29%
Non-Foster Youth	19,472	17,321	88.9%	14,505	83.7%
Total	19,797	17,600	88.9%	14,586	73.6%

Table 14b Course Retention by Foster Youth Proportionality Indices

Foster Youth Status	Enrolled	% of Enrollment	Retained	Percentage of Retained	Proportionality Index
Foster Youth	325	1.6%	279	1.58%	.987
Non-Foster Youth	19,472	98.3%	17,321	98.4%	1.001
Total	19,797		17,600		

Table 14c Course Success by Foster Youth Proportionality Indices

Foster Youth Status	Enrolled	% of Enrollment	Retained	Percentage of Retained	Proportionality Index
Foster Youth	325	1.6%	81	.55%	.343
Non-Foster Youth	19,472	98.3%	14,505	99.4%	1.01
Total	19,797		14,586		

Retention and Success by Low-Income Status

Retention and success rates were compared for low-income students and students who were not from low-income households. Overall, low-income students had slightly lower retention and success rates (64.3% and 49.4%, respectively) than students who were not from low-income households (64.5% and 51.8%, respectively). Proportionality index scores for retention were 1.00 for low-income students and 1.00 for students who were not from low-income households. Proportionality index scores for success were .975 for low income students and 1.00 for students who were not from low-income households. There was no evidence of disproportionate impact (see Tables 15a, 15b and 15c).

Table 15a Course Completion Rate by Low-Income Status

Low Income Status	Enrollments	Retained	Retention Rate	Success	Success Rate
Low Income	9,553	6,145	64.3%	4,723	49.4%
Not Low Income	11,851	7,642	64.5%	6,133	51.8%
Total	*21,404	*13,787	*64.4%	*10,856	*50.7%

*Numbers provided by Datamart differ by 1,607 enrollments as a result of attrition

Table 15b Course Retention by Low Income Status Proportionality Indices

Low Income Status	Enrollments	% of Enrollment	Retained	Percentage of Retained	Proportionality Index
Low Income	9,553	44.6%	6,145	44.6%	1
Not Low Income	11,851	55.4%	7,642	55.4%	1
Total	*21,404	100%	*13,787	100%	

*Numbers provided by Datamart differ by 1,607 enrollments as a result of attrition

Table 15c Course Success by Low Income Status Proportionality Indices

Low Income Status	Enrollments	% of Enrollment	Successful	Percentage of Successful	Proportionality Index
Low Income	9,553	44.6%	4,723	43.5%	.975
Not Low Income	11,851	55.4%	6,133	56.5%	1.01
Total	*21,404	100%	*10,856	100%	

*Numbers provided by Datamart differ by 1,607 enrollments as a result of attrition

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.

In order to assess basic skills English student progression to and completion of transfer-level English, Student Success Scorecard data were obtained via the Chancellor's Office Data on Demand for the 2007-2008 cohort. Students who enrolled in and successfully completed a transfer-level English course within six years were counted as "completers." In 2007-2008, a total of 1,408 students enrolled in an English course below college or transfer level. Of these, just over half (52%) went on to complete a transfer-level English course. The original basic skills English cohort and the group of completers were disaggregated by student gender, ethnicity, age, DSPS, low-income status, and veteran status. The demographic characteristics of the original cohort and completers were compared, and proportionality indices were calculated for each subpopulation.

Basic Skills English Student Progress by Gender
Among students in the original cohort, the majority (53%) was female, and the remaining 47% were male. Female students (33.9%) completed a college- or transfer-level English course at a greater rate than male students (31.7%). There was slight evidence of disproportionate impact as males had a lower index of .965 (see Tables 16a and 16b).

Table 16a Basic Skills English Progress Rate by Gender

Gender	Starting Cohort	Completed Degree Applicable English Course	Completion Rate
Female	277	94	33.9%
Male	246	78	31.7%
Total	523	172	32.9%

Table 16b Basic Skills English Progress by Gender Proportionality Indices

Gender	Starting Cohort	Percentage of Cohort	Completed Degree Applicable English Course	Percentage of Completers	Proportionality Index
Female	277	53%	94	54.6%	1.03
Male	246	47%	78	45.4%	.965
Total	523	100%	172	100%	

Basic Skills English Student Progress by Ethnicity
54.4% of students in the original 2007-2008 basic skills English cohort were White, and 28.6% were Hispanic. Another 8.2% were Native American, 3.8% were Asian, 2.8% were African American and 1.9% was Pacific Islander. Completion rates ranged from 36.4% for White students to 18.6% for Native American students. There was some evidence of disproportionate impact for Native American, Asian, African American and Pacific Islander students using the proportionality index; however, the sample sizes were very small (see Tables 17a and 17b).

Table 17a Basic Skills English Progress Rate by Ethnicity

Ethnicity	Starting Cohort	Completed Degree Applicable English Course	Completion Rate
African American	15	4	26.7%
Native American	43	8	18.6%
Asian	20	6	20%
Hispanic	150	49	32.7%
Pacific Islander	10	2	20%
White	285	103	36.4%
Total	523	172	

Table 17b Basic Skills English Progress Rate by Ethnicity Proportionality Indices

Ethnicity	Starting Cohort	Percentage of Cohort	Completed Degree Applicable English Course	Percentage of Completers	Proportionality Index
African American	15	2.8%	4	2.3%	.821
Native American	43	8.2%	8	4.6%	.560
Asian	20	3.8%	6	3.4%	.894
Hispanic	150	28.6%	49	28.4%	.993
Pacific Islander	10	1.9%	2	1.1%	.578
White	285	54.4%	103	59.8%	1.09
Total	523		172		

Basic Skills English Student Progress by Age

Students ages 19 and under comprised the majority of students (61.1%) in the original basic skills English cohort, followed by students ages 25 to 39 (16.6%). Students' ages 20 to 24 comprised 14.7% of the cohort, and students ages 40 and over comprised 7.4% of the cohort. Students ages 19 and under had the highest completion rate (39.1%), followed by students ages 40 and over (28.2%). Students' ages 20-24 had the lowest completion rate (20.8%) among the different age groups. Students ages 25 to 39 had a completion rate of 23%. There was some evidence of disproportionate impact among students ages 20 and over, however the sample sizes were very small (see Tables 18a and 18b).

Table 18a Basic Skills English Progress Rate by Age

Age	Starting Cohort	Completed Degree Applicable English Course	Completion Rate
Under 20	320	125	39.1%
20-24	77	16	20.8%
25-39	87	20	23%
40+	39	11	28.2%
Total	523	172	

Table 18b Basic Skills English Progress Rate by Age Proportionality Indices

Age	Starting Cohort	Percentage of Cohort	Completed Degree Applicable English Course	Percentage of Completers	Proportionality Index
Under 20	320	61.1%	125	72.6%	1.18
20-24	77	14.7%	16	9.3%	.632
25-39	87	16.6%	20	11.6%	.698
40+	39	7.4%	11	6.3%	.851
Total	523		172		

Basic Skills English Student Progress by DSPS Status
Just 7% of students in the original basic skills English cohort were DSPS participants. The remaining 93% did not receive DSPS services. Proportionality index scores indicated a lower index for DSPS students; however, the sample size is very small (see Tables 19a and 19b).

Table 19a Basic Skills English Progress Rate by DSPS Status

DSPS Status	Starting Cohort	Completed Degree Applicable English Course	Completion Rate
DSPS	37	7	8.1%
Non DSPS	486	165	33.9%
Total	523	172	

Table 19b Basic Skills English Progress Rate by DSPS Status Proportionality Indices

DSPS Status	Starting Cohort	Percentage of Cohort	Completed Degree Applicable English Course	Percentage of Completers	Proportionality Index
DSPS	37	7%	7	4%	.571
Non DSPS	486	93%	165	96%	1.03
Total	523		172		

Basic Skills English Student Progress by Veteran Status
It proved difficult to quantify Veteran Basic English Skills progress as a result of the small sample size; the Veteran student population accounts for 2.8% of enrollments. Although too small to provide any comparable data, Mendocino College foresees completing internal longitudinal studies on the veteran population.

Basic Skills English Student Progress by Foster Youth Status
It proved difficult to quantify Foster Youth Basic English Skills progress as a result of the small sample size; the Foster Youth student population accounts for 1.6% of enrollments. Although too small to provide any comparable data, Mendocino College foresees completing internal longitudinal studies on the foster youth population.

Basic Skills English Student Progress by Low-Income Status

Low-income students represented 49% students in the original basic skills English cohort; the remaining 51% were students who were not from low-income households. Completion rates were lower for low-income students (29.8%) than for students who were not from low-income households (37.9%). There was slight evidence of disproportionate impact for low-income students (see Tables 20a and 20b).

Table 20a Basic Skills English Progress Rate by Low Income Status

Low Income Status	Starting Cohort	Completed Degree Applicable English Course	Completion Rate
Low Income	257	76	29.8%
Not Low Income	266	100	37.9%
Total	523	*176	32.9%

*Numbers provided by Datamart differ by 4 students as a result of attrition

Table 20b Basic Skills English Progress Rate by Low Income Status Proportionality Indices

Low Income Status	Starting Cohort	Percentage of Cohort	Completed Degree Applicable English Course	Percentage of Completers	Proportionality Index
Low Income	257	49%	76	43%	.877
Not Low Income	266	51%	100	57%	1.11
Total	523	100%	*176	100%	

*Numbers provided by Datamart differ by 4 students as a result of attrition

BASIC SKILLS MATH COMPLETION

In order to assess basic skills math student progression to and completion of college- or transfer-level math, Student Success Scorecard data were obtained via the Chancellor's Office Data on Demand for the 2007-2008 cohort. Students who enrolled in and successfully completed a college- or transfer-level math course within six years were counted as "completers." In 2007-2008, a total of 678 students enrolled in a math course below college level. Of these, only 26.8% went on to complete a college- or transfer-level math course. The original basic skills math cohort and the group of completers were disaggregated by student gender, ethnicity, age, DSPS, low-income status, and veteran status. The demographic characteristics of the original cohort and completers were compared, and proportionality indices were calculated for each subpopulation.

Basic Skills Math Student Progress by Gender
Female students represented the majority of the original basic skills math cohort (59.3%), with males comprising 40.7% of the cohort. Female students had a higher completion rate (29.9%) than male students (22.5%). There was evidence of disproportionate impact for male students (see Tables 21a and 21b).

Table 21a Basic Skills Math Progress Rate by Gender

Gender	Starting Cohort	Completed Degree Applicable Math Course	Completion Rate
Female	402	120	29.9%
Male	276	62	22.5%
Total	678	182	26.8%

Table 21b Basic Skills Math Progress by Gender Proportionality Indices

Gender	Starting Cohort	Percentage of Cohort	Completed Degree Applicable Math Course	Percentage of Completers	Proportionality Index
Female	402	59.3%	120	65.9%	1.11
Male	276	40.7%	62	34.1%	.837
Total	678	100%	182	100%	

Basic Skills Math Student Progress by Ethnicity
White students represented 64% of the original basic skills math cohort, and Hispanic students accounted for 20.2% of the cohort. Native American students comprised 8.2% of the cohort, and African American students comprised 3.1% of the cohort. Completion rates were greatest for Asian students (50%) and Hispanic (28.5%). Completion rates were lowest for Native American students (14.3%) and African American students (19%). There was clear evidence of disproportionate impact for African American, Native American and Pacific Islander students; although the sample sizes are small (see Tables 22a and 22b).

Table 22a Basic Skills Math Progress Rate by Ethnicity

Ethnicity	Starting Cohort	Completed Degree Applicable Math Course	Completion Rate
African American	21	3	19%
Native American	56	8	14.3%
Asian	20	10	50%
Hispanic	137	39	28.5%
Pacific Islander	10	2	20%
White	434	120	27.8%
Total	678	182	

Table 22b Basic Skills Math Progress Rate by Ethnicity Proportionality Indices

Ethnicity	Starting Cohort	Percentage of Cohort	Completed Degree Applicable Math Course	Percentage of Completers	Proportionality Index
African American	21	3.1%	3	1.6%	.516
Native American	56	8.2%	8	4.3%	.524
Asian	20	2.9%	10	5.4%	1.86
Hispanic	137	20.2%	39	21.4%	1.05
Pacific Islander	10	1.4%	2	1.1%	.785
White	434	64%	120	65.9%	1.02
Total	678		182		

This page intentionally left blank.

Basic Skills Math Student Progress by Age

56.9% of the students in the original cohort were 19 years of age or under, and 17.1% were 25 to 39 years of age. 16.9% were ages 25 to 49 years old, and 8.9% were over age 40. Students ages 19 and under had the highest completion rate of the four age groups (31.1%), followed by students ages 20 to 24 (24.3%). Students ages 40 and over had the lowest completion rate (14.8%). There was evidence of disproportionate impact for students ages 25 and over, although the sample sizes are small (see Tables 23a and 23b).

Table 23a Basic Skills Math Progress Rate by Age

Age	Starting Cohort	Completed Degree Applicable Math Course	Completion Rate
Under 20	386	120	31.1%
20-24	115	28	24.3%
25-39	116	25	21.6%
40+	61	9	14.8%
Total	678	182	100%

Table 23b Basic Skills Math Progress Rate by Age Proportionality Indices

Age	Starting Cohort	Percentage of Cohort	Completed Degree Applicable Math Course	Percentage of Completers	Proportionality Index
Under 20	386	56.9%	120	65.9%	1.15
20-24	115	16.9%	28	15.3%	.905
25-39	116	17.1%	25	13.7%	.801
40+	61	8.9%	9	4.9%	.550
Total	678		182		

Basic Skills Math Student Progress by DSPS Status
Just 7.9% students in the original basic skills math student cohort was a DSPS participant. The remaining 92.1% of students were non-DSPS students. Completion rates for DSPS students (26.5%) were similar to those of other, non-DSPS students (26.9%). There was no clear evidence of disproportionate impact for DSPS students. (See Tables 24a and 24b)

Table 24a Basic Skills Math Progress Rate by DSPS Status

DSPS Status	Starting Cohort	Completed Degree Applicable Math Course	Completion Rate
DSPS	54	14	26.5%
Non DSPS	624	168	26.9%
Total	678	182	26.8%

Table 24b Basic Skills Math Progress Rate by DSPS Status Proportionality Indices

DSPS Status	Starting Cohort	Percentage of Cohort	Completed Degree Applicable Math Course	Percentage of Completers	Proportionality Index
DSPS	54	7.9%	14	7.7%	.974
Non DSPS	624	92.1%	168	92.3%	1.002
Total	678	100%	182	100%	

Basic Skills Math Student Progress by Veteran Status
It proved difficult to quantify Veteran Basic Math Skills progress as a result of the small sample size; Veteran student population accounts for 2.8% of enrollments. Although too small to provide any comparable data, Mendocino College foresees completing internal longitudinal studies on the veteran population.

Basic Skills Math Student Progress by Foster Youth Status
It proved difficult to quantify Foster Youth Basic Math Skills progress as a result of the small sample size; Foster Youth student population accounts for 1.6% of enrollments. Although too small to provide any comparable data, Mendocino College foresees completing internal longitudinal studies on the foster youth population.

Basic Skills Math Student Progress by Low-Income Status

Among the original cohort of basic skills math students, the majority (55%) came from low-income households. The remaining 45% did not come from low-income households. The completion rate for low-income students (26.5%) was slightly lower than the completion rate for students who were not from low-income households (27.4%). There was no clear evidence of disproportionate impact. (See Tables 25a and 25b)

Table 25a Basic Skills Math Progress Rate by Low Income Status

Low Income Status	Starting Cohort	Completed Degree Applicable Math Course	Completion Rate
Low Income	373	99	26.5%
Not Low Income	305	83	27.4%
Total	678	182	

Table 25b Basic Skills Math Progress Rate by Low Income Status Proportionality Indices

Low Income Status	Starting Cohort	Percentage of Cohort	Completed Degree Applicable Math Course	Percentage of Completers	Proportionality Index
Low Income	373	55%	99	54%	.981
Not Low Income	305	45%	83	46%	1.02
Total	678	100%	182	100%	

BASIC SKILLS ESL COMPLETION

In order to assess basic skills ESL student progression to and completion of college- or transfer-level math, Student Success Scorecard data were obtained via the Chancellor's Office Data on Demand for the 2007-2008 cohort. Students who enrolled in and successfully completed a transfer-level English or ESL course within six years were counted as "completers". The original basic skills ESL cohort and the group of completers were disaggregated by student gender, ethnicity, age, DSPS, low-income status, and veteran status. The demographic characteristics of the original cohort and completers were compared, and proportionality indices were calculated for each subpopulation.

Basic Skills ESL Progress by Gender
Among the basic skills ESL cohort students, the majority (58.8%) was female, and the remaining 41.1% were male. Completion rates were higher for female students (20%) than for female students (0%). There is some disproportionate impact among male students, though the sample size is very small (see Tables 26a and 26b).

Table 26a Basic Skills ESL Progress Rate by Gender

Gender	Starting Cohort	Completed Degree Applicable ESL Course	Completion Rate
Female	20	4	20%
Male	14	0	0%
Total	34	4	11.8%

Table 26b Basic Skills ESL Progress by Gender Proportionality Indices

Gender	Starting Cohort	Percentage of Cohort	Completed Degree Applicable ESL Course	Percentage of Completers	Proportionality Index
Female	20	58.8%	4	100%	1.70
Male	14	41.1%	0	0%	0
Total	34		4		

Basic Skills ESL Student Progress by Ethnicity

Among the basic skills ESL students, several subgroups had student counts that were particularly small. Hispanic students comprised the majority of the starting cohort (91.2%), followed by Asian students (8.2%). Asian students had the highest rate of transfer-level ESL or English completion. There was evidence of disproportionate impact for Hispanic students, however the numbers are too small (see Tables 27a and 27b).

Table 27a Basic Skills ESL Progress Rate by Ethnicity

Ethnicity	Starting Cohort	Completed Degree Applicable ESL Course	Completion Rate
African American	0	0	0%
Native American	0	0	0%
Asian	3	1	33.3%
Hispanic	31	3	9.7%
Pacific Islander	0	0	0%
White	0	0	0%
Total	34	4	

Table 27b Basic Skills ESL Progress Rate by Ethnicity Proportionality Indices

Ethnicity	Starting Cohort	Percentage of Cohort	Completed Degree Applicable ESL Course	Percentage of Completers	Proportionality Index
African American	0	0%	0	0%	0
Native American	0	0%	0	0%	0
Asian	3	8.8%	1	25%	2.84
Hispanic	31	91.2%	3	75%	.822
Pacific Islander	0	0%	0	0%	0
White	0	0%	0	0%	0
Total	34	100%	4	100%	

Basic Skills ESL Course Progress by Age

Among basic skills ESL students, half (50%) were between 25 and 39 years of age. Another 17% over 40, 14.7% were ages 20-24, and just 11.7% were age 19 and under. Students ages 19 and under had the highest rate of completion (66.7%), followed by students ages 20 to 24. Students' ages 25 to 49 had a completion rate of just 5.9% and among the small number of students age 40 and over, no students completed a transfer-level ESL or English course. There was evidence of disproportionate impact among students ages 25 to 39 however the size of this group was particularly small (see Tables 28a and 28b).

Table 28a Basic Skills ESL Progress Rate by Age

Age	Starting Cohort	Completed Degree Applicable ESL Course	Completion Rate
Under 20	4	2	66.7%
20-24	5	1	20%
25-39	17	1	5.9%
40+	6	0	0%
Total	34	4	

Table 28b Basic Skills ESL Progress Rate by Age Proportionality Indices

Age	Starting Cohort	Percentage of Cohort	Completed Degree Applicable ESL Course	Percentage of Completers	Proportionality Index
Under 20	4	11.7%	2	50%	4.27
20-24	5	14.7%	1	25%	1.70
25-39	17	50%	1	25%	.500
40+	6	17.6%	0	0%	0
Total	34		4		

Basic Skills ESL Course Progress by DSPS Status

Among basic skills ESL students, 0% participated in the DSPS program. No data is available for this group using the Student Success Scorecard Metrics from the Chancellor's office. (See Tables 29a and 29b)

Table 29a Basic Skills ESL Progress Rate by DSPS Status

DSPS Status	Starting Cohort	Completed Degree Applicable ESL Course	Completion Rate
DSPS	0	0	0
Non DSPS	34	4	11.8%
Total	34	4	

Table 29b Basic Skills ESL Progress Rate by DSPS Status Proportionality Indices

DSPS Status	Starting Cohort	Percentage of Cohort	Completed Degree Applicable ESL Course	Percentage of Completers	Proportionality Index
DSPS	0	0	0	0	0
Non DSPS	34	100%	4	100%	1
Total	34		4		

Basic Skills ESL Student Progress by Veteran Status

It proved difficult to quantify Veteran Basic ESL Skills progress as a result of the small sample size; Veteran student population accounts for 2.8% of enrollments. Although too small to provide any comparable data, Mendocino College foresees completing internal longitudinal studies on the veteran population.

Basic Skills ESL Student Progress by Foster Youth Status

It proved difficult to quantify Foster Youth Basic ESL Skills progress as a result of the small sample size; Foster Youth student population accounts for 1.6% of enrollments. Although too small to provide any comparable data, Mendocino College foresees completing internal longitudinal studies on the foster youth population.

Basic Skills ESL Student Progress by Low-Income Status
Among the original cohort of basic skills math students, the majority (64.7%) came from low-income households. The remaining 35.3% did not come from low-income households. The completion rate for low-income students (10%) was slightly lower than the completion rate for students who were not from low-income households (14.3%). Based on the College's criteria, there was evidence of disproportionate impact for Low-Income students; however, the sample size was very small. (See Tables 30a and 30b)

Table 30a Basic Skills ESL Progress Rate by Low Income Status

Low Income Status	Starting Cohort	Completed Degree Applicable ESL Course	Completion Rate
Low Income	22	2	10%
Not Low Income	12	2	14.3%
Total	34	4	

Table 30b Basic Skills ESL Progress Rate by Low Income Status Proportionality Indices

Low Income Status	Starting Cohort	Percentage of Cohort	Completed Degree Applicable ESL Course	Percentage of Completers	Proportionality Index
Low Income	22	64.7%	2	50%	.772
Not Low Income	12	35.3%	2	50%	1.41
Total	34		4		

D. DEGREE and CERTIFICATE COMPLETION

Degree and certificate completion is 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.

In order to assess student progress and achievement of long-term educational outcomes, Student Success Scorecard data were obtained via the Chancellor's Office Data on Demand for the 2007-2008 cohort. Students who earned an associate degree or certificate within six years were counted as "completers." A total of 450 first-time students in 2007-2008 qualified for the cohort (i.e., completed six or more units and attempted a math or English course within their first three years). Of these, just 38% went on to earn an associate degree or certificate. The original first-time cohort and the group of completers were disaggregated by student gender, ethnicity, age, DSPS, low-income status, and veteran status. The demographic characteristics of the original cohort and completers were compared, and proportionality indices were calculated for each subpopulation.

Degree or Certificate Completion by Gender
Females students comprised over half (57%) of the first-time student cohort, and males comprised the remaining 43% of the cohort. Degree or certificate completion rates were higher for female students than for male students (40.1% versus 34.9%); however, based on the College's criteria, there was no evidence of disproportionate impact. (See Tables 31a and 31b)

Table 31a Degree/Certificate Completion by Gender

Gender	Starting Cohort	Completed Degree/Certificate	Completion Rate
Female	257	103	40.1%
Male	193	67	34.9%
Total	450	170	38%

Table 31b Degree/Certificate Completion Rate by Gender Proportionality Indices

Gender	Starting Cohort	Percentage of Cohort	Completed Degree/Certificate	Percentage of Completers	Proportionality Index
Female	257	57%	103	60%	1.05
Male	192	43%	67	40%	.930
Total	450		170		

Degree or Certificate Completion by Ethnicity

White students comprised the largest percentage (63.1%) of the starting cohort, followed by Hispanic students (21.7%), and Native American students (5.3%). Asian students accounted for 4.4% of the first-time student cohort, and African American students accounted for 3.1% of the starting cohort. African American students had the highest degree or certificate completion rates (57.1%); however, this group was particularly small, and the data for this group should be interpreted with caution. There was evidence of disproportionate impact for Native American, Asian and Hispanic students; however the sample size is very small. (See Tables 32a and 32b)

Table 32a Degree/Certificate Completion by Ethnicity

Ethnicity	Starting Cohort	Completed Degree/Certificate	Completion Rate
African American	14	8	57.1%
Native American	24	5	20.8%
Asian	20	6	25%
Hispanic	98	25	25.5%
Pacific Islander	10	5	50%
White	284	121	42.3%
Total	450	170	

Table 32b Degree/Certificate Completion Rate by Ethnicity Proportionality Indices

Ethnicity	Starting Cohort	Percentage of Cohort	Completed Degree/Certificate	Percentage of Completers	Proportionality Index
African American	14	3.1%	8	4.7%	1.51
Native American	24	5.3%	5	2.9%	.547
Asian	20	4.4%	6	3.5%	.795
Hispanic	98	21.7%	25	14.7%	.677
Pacific Islander	10	2.2%	5	2.9%	1.31
White	284	63.1%	121	71.1%	1.12
Total	450		170		

Degree or Certificate Completion by Age

The vast majority of students (79.7%) in the starting cohort were age 19 or under. Another 8.4% were ages 20 to 24, 7.5% were ages 25 to 39, and 4.2% were ages 40 and over. Degree or certificate completion rates were highest for students ages 50 and over (57.9%) and students ages 19 and under (39.6%), and lowest for students age 25-39 (20.6%). There was evidence of disproportionate impact; however the sample sizes are very small. (See Tables 33a and 33b)

Table 33a Degree/Certificate Completion by Age

Age	Starting Cohort	Completed Degree/Certificate	Completion Rate
Under 20	359	142	39.6%
20-24	38	10	28.9%
25-39	34	7	20.6%
40+	19	11	57.9%
Total	450	170	

Table 33b Degree/Certificate Completion Rate by Age Proportionality Indices

Age	Starting Cohort	Percentage of Cohort	Completed Degree/Certificate	Percentage of Completers	Proportionality Index
Under 20	359	79.7%	142	83.5%	1.04
20-24	38	8.4%	10	5.8%	.690
25-39	34	7.5%	7	4.1%	.546
40+	19	4.2%	11	6.4%	1.52
Total	450		170		

Degree or Certificate Completion by DSPS Status
DSPS students comprised just 9% of the first-time student cohort, and the remaining 91% of
cohort students did not receive DSPS services. Degree or certificate attainment rates were lower
for DSPS students (31.6%) and non-DSPS students (38.6%); thus, there was evidence of
disproportionate impact, but the sample sizes were very small. (See Tables 34a and 34b)

Table 34a Degree/Certificate Completion by DSPS Status

DSPS Status	Starting Cohort	Completed Degree/Certificate	Completion Rate
DSPS	41	13	31.6%
Non DSPS	409	157	38.6%
Total	450	170	

Table 34b Degree/Certificate Completion Rate by DSPS Proportionality Indices

DSPS Status	Starting Cohort	Percentage of Cohort	Completed Degree/Certificate	Percentage of Completers	Proportionality Index
DSPS	41	9%	13	7.6%	.844
Non DSPS	409	91%	157	92.4%	1.01
Total	450	100%	170	100%	

Degree/Certificate Progress by Veteran Status
It proved difficult to quantify Veteran Degree/Certificate progress as a result of the small sample
size; Veteran student population accounts for 2.8% of enrollments. Although too small to
provide any comparable data, Mendocino College foresees completing internal longitudinal
studies on the veteran population.

Degree/Certificate Progress by Foster Youth Status
It proved difficult to quantify Foster Youth Basic Degree/Certificate progress as a result of the
small sample size; Foster Youth student population accounts for 1.6% of enrollments. Although
too small to provide any comparable data, Mendocino College foresees completing internal
longitudinal studies on the foster youth population.

Degree/Certificate Completion by Low-Income Status

Low-income students comprised (35%) of the first-time student cohort. The remaining 65% of students did not come from low-income households. Low-income students had higher degree or certificate completion rates (40.3%) than students who did not come from low-income households (32.9%). There was evidence of disproportionate impact for students who did not come from low-income households. (See Tables 35a and 35b)

Table 35a Degree/Certificate Completion by Low Income Status

Low Income Status	Starting Cohort	Completed Degree/Certificate	Completion Rate
Low Income	169	68	40.3%
Not Low Income	310	102	32.9%
Total	*479	170	38%

*Numbers provided by Datamart differ by 29 students as a result of attrition

Table 35b Degree/Certificate Completion Rate by Low Income Proportionality Indices

DSPS Status	Starting Cohort	Percentage of Cohort	Completed Degree/Certificate	Percentage of Completers	Proportionality Index
Low Income	169	35%	68	40%	1.14
Not Low Income	310	65%	102	60%	.923
Total	*479	100%	170		

*Numbers provided by Datamart differ by 29 students as a result of attrition

E. TRANSFER

Transfer is 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.

In order to assess student progress and achievement of long-term educational outcomes, Student Success Scorecard data were obtained via the Chancellor's Office Data on Demand for the 2007-2008 cohort. Students who transferred within six years were counted as successful transfers. A total of 296 first-time students in 2007-2008 qualified for the cohort (i.e., completed six or more units and attempted a math or English course within their first three years). Of these, 23.6% went on to transfer to a four-year institution. The original first-time cohort and the group of completers were disaggregated by student gender, ethnicity, age, DSPS, low-income status, and veteran status. The demographic characteristics of the original cohort and completers were compared, and proportionality indices were calculated for each subpopulation.

Transfer by Gender
Among students in the starting cohort, over half were female (58.1%), and the remaining 41.9% were male. Male students had a higher transfer rate than female students (26.6% versus 21.5%). There was no evidence of disproportionate impact. (See Tables 36a and 36b)

Table 36a Transfer by Gender

Gender	Starting Cohort	Transfer	Transfer Rate
Female	172	37	21.5%
Male	124	33	26.6%
Total	296	70	23.6%

Table 36b Transfer Rate by Gender Proportionality Indices

Gender	Starting Cohort	Percentage of Cohort	Transfer	Percentage of Transfers	Proportionality Index
Female	172	58.1%	37	52.8%	.908
Male	124	41.9%	33	47.1%	1.12
Total	296	100%	70		

Transfer by Ethnicity

White students comprised the largest percentage (66.2%) of the starting cohort, followed by Hispanic students (21.6%), and Native American students (4.1%). African American students accounted for 1% of the first-time student cohort, Pacific Islander students accounted for less than 1% of the starting cohort and Unknown students accounted for 3.3%. Asian and African American students had the highest transfer rate of the different ethnic groups (100%), followed by Unknown students (40%). Hispanic (9.3%) and Asian students (20%) had the lowest transfer rates. There was evidence of disproportionate impact among Hispanic and Asian students; however the sample size was very small. (See Tables 37a and 37b)

Table 37a Transfer by Ethnicity

Ethnicity	Starting Cohort	Transfer	Transfer Rate
African American	3	3	100%
Native American	12	3	25%
Asian	10	2	20%
Hispanic	64	6	9.3%
Pacific Islander	1	1	100%
Unknown	10	4	40%
White	196	51	26%
Total	296	70	

Table 37b Transfer Rate by Ethnicity Proportionality Indices

Ethnicity	Starting Cohort	Percentage of Cohort	Transfer	Percentage of Transfers	Proportionality Index
African American	3	1%	3	4.2%	4.200
Native American	12	4.1%	3	4.2%	1.02
Asian	10	3.3%	2	2.8%	.848
Hispanic	64	21.6%	6	8.5%	.393
Pacific Islander	1	.33%	1	1.4%	4.242
Unknown	10	3.3%	4	5.7%	1.72
White	196	66.2%	51	72.8%	1.09
Total	296		70		

Transfer by Age

The vast majority of students in the starting cohort (47.1%) were age 17 or under. Another 37.1% were between 18-19 years, and 5.7% were age 20 to 24 years. While 51.4% of students age 19 and under transferred to a four-year institution, less than half of the students in the other age categories (48.6%) transferred. There was evidence of disproportionate impact for students age 20 to 49 however; the sample sizes were very small. (See Tables 38a and 38b)

Table 38a Transfer Completion by Age

Age	Starting Cohort	Transfers	Transfer Rate
17 or less	140	34	24.2%
18-19	110	30	27.2%
20-24	17	2	11.7%
25-29	6	1	16.6%
30-34	4	0	0%
35-39	6	1	16.6%
40-49	10	2	20%
50+	3	0	0%
Total	296	70	23.6%

Table 38b Transfer Completion Rate by Age Proportionality Indices

Age	Starting Cohort	Percentage of Cohort	Transfers	Percentage of Transfers	Proportionality Index
17 or less	140	47.2%	34	48.5%	1.02
18-19	110	37.1%	30	42.8%	1.15
20-24	17	5.7%	2	2.8%	.491
25-29	6	2%	1	1.4%	.700
30-34	4	1.3%	0	0%	0
35-39	6	2%	1	1.4%	.700
40-49	10	3.3%	2	2.8%	.848
50+	3	1%	0	0%	0
Total	296		70		

Transfer by DSPS Status

DSPS students comprised just 7.7% of the original cohort, and the remaining students (92.3%) were non-DSPS students. DSPS students had substantially lower transfer rates (8.6%) than non-DSPS students (22.9%). There was evidence of disproportionate impact among DSPS students, however; the sample size was very small. (See Tables 39a and 39b)

Table 39a Transfer by DSPS Status

DSPS Status	Starting Cohort	Transfers	Transfer Rate
DSPS	23	2	8.6%
Non DSPS	273	68	22.9%
Total	296	70	

Table 39b Degree/Certificate Completion Rate by DSPS Proportionality Indices

DSPS Status	Starting Cohort	Percentage of Cohort	Transfers	Percentage of Transfers	Proportionality Index
DSPS	23	7.7%	2	3%	.389
Non DSPS	273	92.3%	68	97%	1.05
Total	296	100%	70	100%	

Transfer Progress by Veteran Status

It proved difficult to quantify Veteran Transfer progress as a result of the small sample size; Veteran student population accounts for 2.8% of enrollments. Although too small to provide any comparable data, Mendocino College foresees completing internal longitudinal studies on the veteran population.

Transfer Progress by Foster Youth Status

It proved difficult to quantify Foster Youth Transfer progress as a result of the small sample size; Foster Youth student population accounts for 1.6% of enrollments. Although too small to provide any comparable data, Mendocino College foresees completing internal longitudinal studies on the foster youth population.

Transfer by Low-Income Status

Low-income students comprised the majority of the first-time student cohort (68.2%); the remaining 31.8% of the cohort students did not come from low-income households. Low-income students had transfer rates (20.2%) that were lower than those of students who did not come from low-income households (30.8%). Thus, there was evidence of disproportionate impact among low-income students, however; the sample size is very small. (See Tables 40a and 40b)

Table 40a Transfer Completion by Low Income Status

Low Income Status	Starting Cohort	Transfers	Transfer Rate
Low Income	202	41	20.2%
Not Low Income	94	29	30.8%
Total	296	70	

Table 40b Transfer Rate by Low Income Proportionality Indices

Low Income Status	Starting Cohort	Percentage of Cohort	Transfers	Percentage of Transfers	Proportionality Index
Low Income	202	68.2%	41	58.6%	.859
Not Low Income	94	31.8%	29	41.4%	1.30
Total	296	100%	70	100%	

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.

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

<table>
<tr>
<td colspan="6">GOAL A. Increase access to all college services and programs for all students with special focus on targeted populations—Native American students, African American students, and Foster Youth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Measureable Objective</th>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Participate in Center for Urban Education Equity Scorecard</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Invite USC Equity Scorecard group to campus to complete the Equity Scorecard and examine scorecard results for disproportionate impact</td>
<td>Institutional Researcher and Student Equity Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hire Student Equity Coordinator</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hire and train new Student Equity administrative support person</td>
<td>Dean of Student Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pilot childcare program at off-campus site</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Begin pilot program to provide childcare to students at Grace Hudson school site</td>
<td>Basic Skills Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Implement specific college orientations targeting Foster Youth, African American Students, and Native American Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide at least one orientation for each disproportionately impacted group during the 2015-2016 academic year</td>
<td>Dean of Student Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.   Provide housing information to students from outside the immediate area.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide at least one informational workshop on housing to students from outside the immediate area and create repository of housing information</td>
<td>Student Equity Coordinator</td>
</tr>
</table>

6. Maximize Distance Education and Live Streaming technology		X		Implement live streaming to at least one rural location to provide instructional opportunities to remote parts of the service area	Dean of Instruction
7. Provide summer bridge programs targeting Foster Youth, African American Students, and Native American Students			X	Provide targeted bridge programs during the Summer 2017 session	Dean of Instruction

EXPECTED OUTCOME A.1.1

Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Fall 2017
1. Mendocino College faculty and staff, including the Student Equity Committee, will have a more comprehensive understanding of equity issues for our college	1. 2% more students will integrate into college life through participation in cultural and campus-wide activities and be more aware of available college and community resources	1. 2% more students will score higher on placement exams and register as full-time students in the appropriate course by using priority registration

B.   STUDENT SUCCESS INDICATOR FOR COURSE COMPLETION

Ratio of the number of credit courses that student 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.

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

GOAL B. Increase course completion rates for all students with special focus on targeted populations—Native American students, African American students, and Foster Youth.					
Activities	**Year 1**	**Year 2**	**Year 3**	**Measurable Outcome**	**Person Responsible**
1. Hire Student Equity Coordinator	X			Hire and train new Student Equity administrative support person	Dean of Student Services
2. Create Instructor Sign-Off Pilot Program for Specialized Populations		X		Disproportionately impacted populations will use the instructor sign-off pilot program based on the EOPS model	Deans of Student Services,
3. Implement College-Wide Mentoring Program			X	Disproportionately impacted populations will participate in the Mentoring Program	Dean of Student Services

EXPECTED OUTCOME B.1.1

Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Fall 2017
1. Student Equity Coordinator hired	1. 50% of students in targeted populations will utilize instructor sign-off pilot program 2. 3% of the targeted populations will be more successful in their classes. 3. 3% more students in targeted populations will make connections early in their academic career through working with new Student Life Coordinator and Academic Advisor	1. 1% of populations experiencing disproportionate will participate in mentoring program

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.

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

GOAL C. Increase success in Basic Skills courses for all students, with special focus on targeted populations—Native American students, African American students, and Foster Youth.

Activities	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Measureable Outcome	Person Responsible
1. Provide embedded counseling services in the Basic Skills courses	X			Counselors will visit basic skills classrooms in the District four times during the semester	Dean of Student Services, Dean of Instruction
2. Pilot childcare program at off-campus site	X			Begin pilot program to provide childcare to students at Grace Hudson school site	Basic Skills Coordinator
3. Begin ESL noncredit Investigation	X			Use ESL data to review and potentially revise year two activities	Institutional Researcher, Student Equity Committee
4. Implement Supplemental Instruction Tutoring Pilot	X			Disproportionately impacted populations will participate in the Supplemental Instruction model in the Basic Skills courses. Coordination with the Foundation Skills Committee will occur	Basic Skills Coordinator, Learning Center Coordinator, Foundation Skills Committee, Student Equity Committee

5. Increase Learning Center Math and English labs, tutoring, and instructor office hours held in the learning center to strengthen Learning Center services		X		Disproportionately impacted populations will increase their use of the Learning Center	Dean of Instruction and Learning Center Coordinator
6. Create "Starter Kits" for first semester students			X	Identified disproportionately impacted student populations will receive Mendocino College "Starter Kit"	Student Equity Coordinator

EXPECTED OUTCOME C.1.1

Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Fall 2017
1. 1% more students will enroll in Basic Skills/ESL classes 2. Students will demonstrate greater persistence in off-site ESL classes by 1% 3. ESL data will be generated and analyzed	1. 3% more students will utilize Learning Center services	1. 2% more students will meet with a counselor prior to class start

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.

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

GOAL D. Completion of degrees and certificates will increase among all students with special focus on targeted populations—Native American students, African American students, and Foster Youth.

Activities	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Measurable Outcome	Person Responsible
1. Provide services for students to complete abbreviated and comprehensive Student Education Plans	X			Disproportionately impacted students will complete abbreviated and comprehensive Student Education Plans	Dean of Student Services
2. Compile ESL Non-Credit Course Completion Data	X			Use of ESL non-credit course completion data to develop further non-credit programs	Institutional Researcher, Basic Skills Coordinator
3. Provide opportunities for Student Leadership Conferences	x			Students from disproportionately impacted groups will attend at student leadership conferences	Dean of Student Services, ASMC Advisor
4. Hire Native American Specialist		X		Hire and Train Native American Specialist	Dean of Student Services

5. Provide Professional Development Opportunities		X		Provide professional development opportunities to the College campus regarding serving disproportionately impacted student groups	Vice President of Education and Student Services
6. Research models of specialized student support programs			X	At least one model program for serving disproportionately impacted student populations will be identified	Institutional Researcher

EXPECTED OUTCOME D.1.1

Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Fall 2017
1. Increase degree and certificate completion for all students by 2%, including targeted populations 2. ESL data will be generated and analyzed	1. Increase the number of Native American students on campus from 6% to 10% 2. College employees have a better understanding of topics related to multiculturalism, and the needs of populations experiencing disproportionate impact	1. Student Equity committee will have a better understanding of specialized student support programs

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.

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

GOAL E. Increase percentage of students who transfer to a four-year college or university for all students, with special focus on targeted populations—Native American students, African American students, and Foster Youth.					
Activities	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Measureable	Person Responsible
1. Provide services for students to complete abbreviated and comprehensive Student Education Plans	X			Disproportionately impacted students will complete abbreviated and comprehensive Student Education Plans	Dean of Student Services
2. Identify Lead Transfer Counselor	X			Designate a lead transfer counselor in the Counseling department	Dean of Student Services
3. Provide embedded counseling services in Transfer – Level courses		X		Counselors will visit transfer-level classrooms in the District four times during the semester	Dean of Student Services, Dean of Instruction
4. Strengthen Transfer-Day Activities		X		Strengthen transfer day activities and partnerships with four-year institutions	Dean of Student Services, Transfer Center counselors
5. Create Peer-Mentoring Program			X	Designate 15 Peer-Mentors per semester to work with disproportionately impacted students	Student Equity Coordinator

EXPECTED OUTCOME E.1.1

Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Fall 2017
1. 3% more students will access Career-Transfer Center services including meeting with lead transfer counselor	1. 2% more students will transfer to four-year schools	1. Native American students, African American students, and Foster Youth will participate in peer mentor program

Budget

The budget is for the 2014 – 2015 academic year is developed in support of the Year 1 activities as detailed in the preceding "Goals and Activities" section of the 2014-2017 Mendocino College Student Equity Plan. Every effort has been made to ensure that expenditures are adequate, reasonable, allowable, and cost effective. The budget is developed in order to provide quality personnel, materials, and supplies to ensure that disproportionately impacted population receive comprehensive services in support of their success.

Personnel / Salaries / Benefits
The Year 1 budget includes hiring a Student Equity Coordinator, providing embedded counseling and providing supplemental instruction in basic skills courses.

Travel
Travel is included in the Year 1 budget in support of professional development for faculty, staff and administrators. Travel is also included for training opportunities for student leadership.

Supplies
The Year 1 budget includes a modest amount of funds for Starter Kits to be provided to all new students who are part of the disproportionately impacted population.

Other
Funds for childcare pilot program for students while they are attending evening classes at off-campus locations are included as part of the Year 1 budget.

Research and Evaluation
Funds for USC Equity Center to conduct Equity Scorecard at Mendocino College are also included in the Year 1 budget.

Sources of Funding
Year 1 activities are primarily supported through Student Equity funds. As the Braided Funding Worksheet (see Appendix) indicates, the Mendocino-Lake Community College District is also leveraging funds from the Student Success and Support Program (SSSP) funding, Basic Skills Initiative (BSI) funding, District funds and other categorical funds to support student success. The Basic Skills Committee is currently piloting embedded counseling and supplemental instruction practices at Mendocino College and BSI funds have supported that on a limited basis. SSSP funds have supported outreach, orientation and University Day. Student Equity activities will dovetail with these activities to provide greater depth of services.

	Classification		Professional Development	Outreach, Student Support & Retention	Research & Evaluation		Total
			Mendocino College Student Equity Plan Budget **2015 – Year 1**				
1000	Academic Salaries: Part-time Counselors			$48,179			**$48,179**
2000	Student Equity Plan Coordinator			$62,862			**$62,862**
	Tutors – Supplemental Instruction (hourly)			$2,939			**$2,939**
3000	Employee Benefits: Part-time Counselors			$6,821			**$6,821**
	Employee Benefits: Student Equity Plan Coordinator			$17,138			**$17,138**
	Employee Benefits: Tutors – Supplemental Instruction			$61			**$61**
4000	Supplies & Materials – Starter Kits			$5,000			**$5,000**
5000	Other Operating Exp. & Services						
	Student Travel to Leadership conferences		$2,500				**$2,500**
	Staff Travel Conferences/Seminars		$1,500				**$1,500**
	Personal Service Agreements				$60,000		**$60,000**
7000	Childcare expense			$10,000			**$10,000**
	Total		**$4,000**	**$153,000**	**$60,000**		**$217,000**

Process and Evaluation Schedule

Process
The creation of the Mendocino College Student Equity Plan was a faculty driven process, which included diverse representation from college staff and faculty, students, and community members (See Appendix). Equity group members consisted of Academic Senate members, Basic Skills Committee members, Student Success and Support Program (SSSP) committee members, faculty from various disciplines, the Academic and Student Services Deans, college students, and community members, including representation from local Veteran's Affairs Office and the Native American Advisory Committee (NAAC). The Vice President of Educational and Student Services also sat on the Student Equity Committee.

By including members already working on important campus efforts including SSSP and Basic Skills, the Student Equity committee was able to ensure that plans were aligned and shared the common goal of supporting student success.

Progress on the Student Equity Plan was discussed at a college-wide Teacher Institute in fall 2014. The plan was also discussed at the fall 2014 Strategic Planning retreat. Progress on the plan was also presented to the Academic Senate. The Mendocino College Planning and Budgeting Committee also discussed the Student Equity Plan.

Evaluation
The evaluation process for Year 1 activities will begin in spring 2015. As stated in the "Goals and Activities" section of the Student Equity Plan, a Most Responsible Person (MRP) has been identified for each activity. Additionally, Expected Outcomes have been identified for the next three years. The Student Equity Coordinator, the Student Equity Committee, the MRPs and the Institutional Researcher will coordinate efforts to ensure that all activities are effectively completed and that progress is monitored, measured and reported out to the campus community.

The Mendocino College has recently revised its program review process to align program review, the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Cycle, and the curriculum review cycle. Starting in Fall 2015, the program review cycle will now be a six-year review cycle and will also include a review of Student Equity Data for instructional and student services areas. (See Appendix "Program Review Cycle") Additionally, in the Spring of 2015, the Educational Action Plan (EAP) Committee will thoroughly review all fields of the Program Review form. In this review, EAP will make recommendations regarding the inclusion of Student Equity Data in all Part II screens of program review.

Attachments

1) List of Student Equity Committee members and workgroup members.
2) Braided Funding Worksheet
3) Program Review Cycle

Mendocino College
Student Equity Committee Members

1. Ketmani Kouanchao –Dean of Student Services and Co-Chair of Student Equity Committee
2. Sarah Walsh—ESL Faculty, Basic Skills Coordinator, and Co-Chair of Student Equity Committee
3. Rhea Hollis—DRC Coordinator/ Counselor
4. Minerva Flores—Institutional Researcher
5. Tascha Whetzel—Learning Disability Specialist/Faculty
6. Leslie Banta—Math Faculty
7. Jordan Anderson—Chemistry Faculty
8. Mike Giuffrida—Hopland Band Pomo Indian Education Director, Adjunct Mendocino College English Faculty
9. Jessica Crofoot—Adjunct Faculty
10. Debra Polak—Dean of Instruction
11. Maria Cetto—World Languages Faculty
12. Virginia Guleff—Vice President of Education and Student Services
13. Roy Thompson—Assistant Football Coach
14. Frank Espy –Head Football Coach
15. Darletta Fulwider—Native American Club Advisor, Student Services/Counseling Administration Assistant
16. Joseph Gallagher—Mendocino College Student and Veteran's Service Office Representative
17. Charles Brown—Vice President of Mendocino College Native American Club and Mendocino College Student
18. Angela James—NAAC(Native American Advisory Committee) Member, Pinoleville Nation Vice Chairwoman
19. John Feliz—NAAC Member and Mendocino College student

Mendocino College
Student Equity Workgroup Members

Defined by Three College Populations Who are Experiencing
the Greatest Disproportionate Impact

Foster Youth Student Workgroup	African American Student Workgroup	Native American Student Workgroup
Leslie Banta, Math Faculty	Tascha Whetzel, Learning Disability Specialist/Faculty	Mike Giuffrida, Hopland Band Pomo Indian Education Director, Adjunct English Faculty
Rhea Hollis, DRC Coordinator/Counselor	Maria Cetto, World Languages Faculty	Darletta Fulwider, Native American Club Advisor/ Student Services and Counseling Administration Assistant
Jordan Anderson, Chemistry Faculty	Frank Espy, Head Football Coach	Charles Brown, Vice President of Mendocino College Native American Club and Mendocino College Student
Jessica Crofoot, Adjunct Faculty	Roy Thompson, Assistant Football Coach	Angela James, NAAC(Native American Advisory Committee) Member, Pinoleville Nation Vice Chairwoman
	Debra Polak, Dean of Instruction	John Feliz, NAAC Member and Mendocino College student

Resp	Funding Stream	Fund Revenue Source	Funding Amount	Objectives	Target Student Pop	Salary and Benefits				Supplies/ Technology	Support Services					Equip	To/For Students
						Counselor	Tutor	Other	Benes		Prof Dev	Outreach	Tech	Travel	Other		
DP	Basic Skills Initiative	462, 458	$ 107,109	Support Basic Skills Students, Programs and Support Services	Basic Skills Students	$ 53,545	$ 12,429	$ 20,000	$ 15,741	$ 2,000	$ 3,394		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
KK	CalWORKs	425	$ 143,152	Support students on county assistance pursuing certificates, transfer or AA degree	County assisted students; at risk	$ 8,220	$ 5,606	$ 78,854	$ 19,989	$ 25,483	$ 4,000		$ -	$ -	$ -		$ 1,000
MF	CAMP	120	$ 509,585	CAMP assists students who are migratory or seasonal farmworkers (or children of such workers) enrolled in their first year of undergraduate studies at an Institution of Higher Education (IHE)	Migrant/Seasonal Farmworking students in their first year of study at Mendocino College	$ 78,144	$ 4,000	$ 91,623	$ 74,665	$ 5,800	$ 6,100		$ -	$ 1,000	$ 20,152	$ -	$ 72,420
KK	CARE	440	$ 39,838	Support single-parent students; head of household with one child under the age of 14 who want to break the cycle of poverty through education	Single-parent students and head of household with one child under the age of 14 and receiving cash aid for self and child	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 15,000	$ 18,838		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 6,000
SH	Career Pathways Trust	491	$ 142,972	Outreach, student services	9-12th grades	$ 32,000	$ -	$ -	$ 14,400	$ -	$ -		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
KK	DSPS	411	$ 429,601	Support students with diagnosed disabilities with accommodation so they can complete their education goal	Students with diagnosed disabilities	$ 40,170	$ -	$ 199,631	$ 120,546	$ 11,620	$ 5,500		$ -	$ -	$ 52,134	$ -	$ -
KK	EOPS	412	$ 351,388	Assist students who are from at-risk population to complete their education goal	Students who are academically at-risk; socially, economically and linguistically disadvantaged	$ 114,526	$ 3,000	$ 62,336	$ 74,396	$ 30,630	$ 8,500		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 58,000
DP	Eisenhower Fellowship	126	$ 30,000	Support MESA program and student success	MESA Students	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 30,000
KK	Financial Aid BFAP	403	$ 171,924			$ -	$ -	$ 123,103	$ 48,383	$ -	$ -		$ -	$ -	$ 438	$ -	$ -
VG	Foundation		$ 20,000	Support innovation and outreach	All District Students							$ 13,000			$ 7,000		
MF	HEP	110	$ 399,547	The goal of HEP is to assist migrant or seasonal agricultural workers (and their immediate family members) to obtain a high school equivalency certificate and subsequently gain improved employment or begin post secondary studies or enlist in the military	Migrant/Seasonal Farmworking adults needing to complete their high school equivalency or GED	$ -	$ 4,000	$ 173,619	$ 103,127	$ 5,800	$ 6,100		$ -	$ 1,000	$ 50,889	$ -	$ 27,450
MF	Health Resources & Services Admin		$ 100,000	Increase the area workforce of Behavioral Health Paraprofessionals	Students pursuing the AOD certificate or degree; underrepresented students	$ -	$ 1,962	$ 8,246	$ 1,134	$ 256	$ -		$ -	$ 325	$ 3,081	$ -	$ 85,000
DP	MESA	416, 444	$ 55,564	Support MESA Program, Students and Support Services	MESA Students		$ 7,336	$ 14,816	$ 1,024	$ 13,382	$ 4,870			$ 2,900	$ 2,736		$ 8,500
KK	SSSP Credit	414	$ 459,268	Support students who are new and at-risk to receive core services in order to matriculate to the next level and succeed in their education goals	Students who are at-risk for not completing their education goals	$ 137,806	$ -	$ 130,734	$ 133,960	$ 47,500	$ 9,268		$ 40,782	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
KK	SSSP Non-Credit	415	$ 13,317	Support students who are in basic skills, ESL and continuing education through the mandated services from the Chancellor's Office		$ -	$ -	$ 7,185	$ 5,548	$ 145	$ -		$ -	$ 439	$ -	$ -	$ -
VG/KK	Student Equity	490	$ 217,000	Address gaps in student success as a result of SSSP implementation	Current and previous Foster Youth, African American students, and Native American students	$ 48,179	$ 2,939	$ 62,862	$ 24,020	$ 5,000	$ 4,000				$ 60,000		$ 10,000
KK	TANF	426	$ 41,324	Support students who are on the TANF program to complete their education goal	Student in-county assisted programs	$ 20,000	$ -	$ 10,000	$ 3,453	$ 1,871	$ 4,000		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 2,000
					TOTALS	$ 532,590	$ 41,272	$ 983,009	$ 640,386	$ 164,487	$ 74,570		$ 40,782	$ 5,664	$ 196,430	$ -	$ 300,370

Mendocino College Six Year Program Review Cycle

The new Program Review/Curriculum Review/SLO-SAO Assessment combined cycle will be a six year cycle. Each group is assigned a year on the cycle, as indicated below. In 2015-16, Group A will move to year 3, Group B will move to Year 4, Group C will move to Year 5, Group D will move to Year Six and Group E will move to year 1.

Year 1-5: Faculty/Staff in the Assigned Group are responsible for Program Review **Part One** and SAO or SLO assessment (discipline areas complete 25% of their course SLO assessments).

Year 6: Faculty/Staff in Assigned Group are responsible for Program Review **Part 2** in the fall; discipline areas complete 5 yr. Curriculum Review in the spring

	Cycle Year 1	Cycle Year 2	Cycle Year 3	Cycle Year 4	Cycle Year 5	Cycle Year 6
2014-15	N/A	A	B	C	D	E
2015-16	E	N/A	A	B	C	D
2016-17	D	E	N/A	A	B	C
2017-18	C	D	E	N/A	A	B
2018-19	B	C	D	E	N/A	A
2020-21	A	B	C	D	E	N/A
2021-22	N/A	A	B	C	D	E

GROUP A	GROUP B	GROUP C	GROUP D	GROUP E
ART	THE	CDV	MUS	BOT
CLO	ENG	PSY	HUM	BUS (w/o SST/RLS)
CSC	ESL	AGR	FSC	RLS
ATH	SPN (World Lng)	SST	ADJ	ECO
PEA-PEF-PEM-PES	ASL	HST	AUT	HUS
KIN	COM	LRS	WLD	AOD
HLH	SPE	BIO	PHY	CCS
NUR	JRN	CHM	EGR	MTH
Financial Aid	EDU	EAS-GEO	AST	CAM
VPESS	ANT	GEL	CED (incl 196/7)	A&R
Library	SOC	SCI	Institutional Research	Fiscal Services
Information Tech	POL	NRS	Outreach	President's Office
	PHL	Counseling/Advising	Lake Center	Student Life
	THE	North Co. Center	Maintenance/Ops	CDC
	Instruction Office	LRC		
	Spec Pops Support	Admin Services		
	PIO/Marketing	Human Resources		
	Facilities Planning			

Service Areas

Student Services	Instruction	Admin	S/P
Financial Aid	VPESS	Administrative Services	President's Office
A&R	Instruction Office	Facilities Planning	PIO/Marketing
Counseling/Advising	North Co. Center	Fiscal Services	Human Resources
Student Life	Lake Center	Maintenance/Ops	Institutional Research
Outreach	Athletics (see ATH)	Information Tech	
Special Pops Support	Library		
LRC	CDC		