

**Fall 2016-17 Glendale Community College  
Student Equity Program: ACCESS**

The percentage point gap methodology compares the percent of students in a disaggregated subgroup who succeed in an outcome with the percent of **ALL** students who succeed in the same outcome. The resulting 'percentage point gap' will have a - / + **designation** that signals whether or not the subgroup is experiencing a rate that is lower (-) or higher (+) than the all student average. A **-3 percentage** point gap or greater is evidence of a disproportionate impact.

**Credit Students in Regional Service Area**

Index	Color	Percentage Point Gap Method
+ %	Green	No evidence of adverse or disproportional impact
0% to - 2.9%	Yellow	Some evidence of adverse or disproportional impact
Greater than - 3%	Red	Evidence of adverse or disproportional impact/These are the most adversely impacted groups

**ACCESS:** The percentage of each population group that is enrolled to the percentage of each group in the adult population within the community served.

Subgroups	Fall 2013-14	Fall 2016-17
<b><u>Ethnicity</u></b>		
African-Americans	-0.3%	-0.6%
American Indians / Alaskan Natives		
Asians/Pacific Islanders	-0.7%	-1.8%
Latinos	-18.5%	-24.7%
White-Armenians		
White-Europeans		
<b><u>Gender</u></b>		
Females		
Males	-6.8%	-6.4%
<b><u>Groups</u></b>		
Disability	-0.7%	-3.9%
Foster Youth	-0.2%	0.0%
Low-Income		
Veterans	-2.4%	-2.6%

**Fall 2016 Glendale Community College  
Student Equity Program: COURSE COMPLETION RATES**

The percentage point gap methodology compares the percent of students in a disaggregated subgroup who succeed in an outcome with the percent of *ALL* students who succeed in the same outcome. The resulting 'percentage point gap' will have a - / + designation that signals whether or not the subgroup is experiencing a rate that is lower (-) or higher (+) than the all student average. A -3 percentage point gap or greater is evidence of a disproportionate impact.

Index	Color	Percentage Point Gap Method
+ %	Green	No evidence of adverse or disproportional impact
0% to - 2.9%	Yellow	Some evidence of adverse or disproportional impact
Greater than - 3%	Red	Evidence of adverse or disproportional impact/These are the most adversely impacted groups

**Course Completion**—Successful completion of a credit course for which a student receives a grade of A, B, C, or Pass (i.e., retention).

Subgroups	Fall 2014	Fall 2016
<b><u>Ethnicity</u></b>		
African-Americans	-15.3%	-13.0%
Asians		
Filipinos		
Latinos	-10.5%	-10.8%
White-Armenians		
White-Europeans		
<b><u>Gender</u></b>		
Females		
Males	-3.8%	-2.7%
<b><u>Groups</u></b>		

Disability		-1.8%
Foster Youth	-27.0%	<b>-7.9%</b>
Low-Income		-0.7%
Veterans	-12.7%	<b>0.8%</b>

The gap for Latino students' course completion rate in Fall 2016 was about 10% below the average of all students, similar to the gap in Fall 2014.

The gap for African-American students' course completion rate in Fall 2016 was about 13% below the average, whereas it was 15% below the average in Fall 2014, thus about a 2% improvement.

The gap between female and male students' course completion rate in Fall 2016 was 5%, compared with 7% in Fall 2014, thus about a 2% narrowing of the gap.

The gap for foster youth students' completion in Fall 2016 was about 8% below the average, whereas it was over 20% below the average in Fall 2014, thus they had over 12% improvement.

Perhaps most improved of all, veterans students' course completion in Fall 2016 matched the average of all students, whereas it was 13% below average in Fall 2014.

**Spring 2017 Glendale Community College  
Student Equity Program: ESL COMPLETION RATES**

The percentage point gap methodology compares the percent of students in a disaggregated subgroup who succeed in an outcome with the percent of **ALL** students who succeed in the same outcome. The resulting ‘percentage point gap’ will have a - / + **designation** that signals whether or not the subgroup is experiencing a rate that is lower (-) or higher (+) than the all student average. A **-3 percentage** point gap or greater is evidence of a disproportionate impact.

Index	Color	Percentage Point Gap Method
+ %	Green	No evidence of adverse or disproportional impact
0% to -2.9%	Yellow	Some evidence of adverse or disproportional impact
Greater than -3%	Red	Evidence of adverse or disproportional impact/These are the most adversely impacted groups

**ESL Completion Rates**— After completing the last sequence of the ESL course...the successful completion of “college-level” ESL/English with a value of 3 or more units.

Subgroups	Fall 2008 – Spring 2015	Fall 2010 – Spring 2017
<b>Ethnicity</b>		
African-Americans*		
Asians		-3.6%
Filipinos		
Latinos	-12.3%	-4.7%
White-Armenians		
White-Europeans	-1.5%	0.3%
<b>Gender</b>		
Females		
Males	-4.1%	-8.4%
<b>Groups</b>		
Disability	-13.2%	-5.7%
Foster Youth*		
Low-Income		
Veterans*		

\*Note: There were insufficient numbers of African-America, foster youth, and veteran students to calculate completions rates for ESL.

The gap for Latinos has narrowed from 12% in 2015 to 5% for this year. The gap for students with disability narrowed from 13% in 2015 to 6% for this year. Most ESL students are females, and compared with male students, the gap for male students increased from 4% in 2015 to 8% this year.

**Spring 2017 Glendale Community College  
Student Equity Program: BASIC SKILLS ENGLISH COMPLETION RATES**

The percentage point gap methodology compares the percent of students in a disaggregated subgroup who succeed in an outcome with the percent of **ALL** students who succeed in the same outcome. The resulting ‘percentage point gap’ will have a - / + **designation** that signals whether or not the subgroup is experiencing a rate that is lower (-) or higher (+) than the all student average. A **-3 percentage** point gap or greater is evidence of a disproportionate impact.

Index	Color	Percentage Point Gap Method
+ %	Green	No evidence of adverse or disproportional impact
0% to -2.9%	Yellow	Some evidence of adverse or disproportional impact
Greater than -3%	Red	Evidence of adverse or disproportional impact/These are the most adversely impacted groups

**Basic Skills English Completion**— After completing the last sequence of the English Basic Skills course...the successful completion of “college-level” English with a value of 3 or more units.

Subgroups	Fall 2008 – Spring 2015	Fall 2010 – Spring 2017
<b><u>Ethnicity</u></b>		
African-Americans	-24.1%	-20.7%
Asians		
Filipinos		
Latinos	-11.3%	-7.2%
White-Armenians		
White-Europeans		
<b><u>Gender</u></b>		
Females		
Males	-4.5%	-5.2%
<b><u>Groups</u></b>		
Disability	-5.2%	-11.9%
Foster Youth*		
Low-Income		
Veterans	-3.4%	-6.3%

\*Note: There were insufficient numbers of foster youth to calculate completions rates.

The gap for African-American students narrowed from 24% in 2015 to 21% this year. The gap for Latino students narrowed from 11% in 2015 to 7% this year. However, the gap for students with disability increased from 5% in 2015 to 12% this year.

**Spring 2017 Glendale Community College  
Student Equity Program: BASIC SKILLS MATH COMPLETION RATES**

The percentage point gap methodology compares the percent of students in a disaggregated subgroup who succeed in an outcome with the percent of **ALL** students who succeed in the same outcome. The resulting ‘percentage point gap’ will have a - / + **designation** that signals whether or not the subgroup is experiencing a rate that is lower (-) or higher (+) than the all student average. A **-3 percentage** point gap or greater is evidence of a disproportionate impact.

Index	Color	Percentage Point Gap Method
+ %	Green	No evidence of adverse or disproportional impact
0% to -2.9%	Yellow	Some evidence of adverse or disproportional impact
Greater than -3%	Red	Evidence of adverse or disproportional impact/These are the most adversely impacted groups

**Basic Skills Math Completion Rates—After** completing the last sequence of the Basic Skills math course...the successful completion of “college-level” math course with a value of 3 or more units.

Subgroups	Fall 2008 – Spring 2015	Fall 2010 – Spring 2017
<b><u>Ethnicity</u></b>		
African-Americans	-13.7%	-17.6
Asians		
Filipinos		
Latinos	-12.0%	-10.8%
White-Armenians		
White-Europeans	-0.5%	
<b><u>Gender</u></b>		
Females		
Males	-8.5%	-10.4%
<b><u>Groups</u></b>		
Disability	-5.1%	-2.1%
Foster Youth*		
Low-Income		
Veterans		

**\*Note: There were insufficient numbers of foster youth students to calculate completion rates.**

For math basic skills completion, the results are mixed. The gap for African-American students increased from 14% in 2015 to 18% this year. The gap for Latino students narrowed slightly from 12% in 2015 to 11% this year. The gap for male students increased slightly from 8% in 2015 to 10% this year. The gap for students with disability is now less than 3% (moving from red to yellow).

**Spring 2017 Glendale Community College  
Student Equity Program: DEGREE & CERTIFICATE COMPLETION RATES**

The percentage point gap methodology compares the percent of students in a disaggregated subgroup who succeed in an outcome with the percent of **ALL** students who succeed in the same outcome. The resulting ‘percentage point gap’ will have a - / + **designation** that signals whether or not the subgroup is experiencing a rate that is lower (-) or higher (+) than the all student average. A **-3 percentage** point gap or greater is evidence of a disproportionate impact.

Index	Color	Percentage Point Gap Method
+ %	Green	No evidence of adverse or disproportional impact
0% to - 2.9%	Yellow	Some evidence of adverse or disproportional impact
Greater than - 3%	Red	Evidence of adverse or disproportional impact/These are the most adversely impacted groups

**Degree and Certificate Completion Rates**—Ratio of the # of students by subgroup who receive a degree or certificate.

Subgroups	Fall 2007 -Spring 2014	Fall 2010 -Spring 2017
<b><u>Ethnicity</u></b>		
African-Americans	-5.6%	-2.5%
Asians	-4.7%	-2.1%
Filipinos		-2.8%
Latinos	-1.9%	-2.1%
White-Armenians		
White-Europeans		-0.1%
<b><u>Gender</u></b>		
Females		
Males	-6.0%	-3.7%
<b><u>Groups</u></b>		
Disability	-3.9%	1.6%
Foster Youth*		
Low-Income		
Veterans	-2.7%	-3.7%

\*Note: There were insufficient numbers of foster youth students to calculate degree and certificate completion rates.

Most subgroups moved from red to yellow. Students with disability moved from red to green. However, veteran-students moved from yellow to red.

**Spring 2016 Glendale Community College  
Student Equity Program: TRANSFER RATES**

The percentage point gap methodology compares the percent of students in a disaggregated subgroup who succeed in an outcome with the percent of **ALL** students who succeed in the same outcome. The resulting ‘percentage point gap’ will have a **- / + designation** that signals whether or not the subgroup is experiencing a rate that is lower (-) or higher (+) than the all student average. A **-3 percentage** point gap or greater is evidence of a disproportionate impact.

Index	Color	Percentage Point Gap Method
+ %	Green	No evidence of adverse or disproportional impact
0% to -2.9%	Yellow	Some evidence of adverse or disproportional impact
Greater than -3%	Red	Evidence of adverse or disproportional impact/These are the most adversely impacted groups

**Transfer**—Ratio of subgroup who complete a minimum of 12 units and have attempted a transfer level course in math or English who actually transfer up to six years.

Subgroups	Fall 2007 -Spring 2014	Fall 2009 -Spring 2016
<b><u>Ethnicity</u></b>		
African-Americans	-6.0%	-14.4%
Asians		
Filipinos	-9.5%	2.7%
Latinos	-20.3%	-14.4%
White-Armenians		
White-Europeans		
<b><u>Gender</u></b>		
Females		
Males	-1.7%	-4.1%
<b><u>Groups</u></b>		
Disability	-20.9%	-9.9%
Foster Youth*		
Low-Income	-1.4%	-1.0%
Veterans	-1.7%	5.2%

\*Note: There were insufficient numbers of foster youth students to calculate transfer rates.

For transfer rates, the results are mixed. The gap for African-American students increased from 6% in 2014 to 14% 2016. The gap for Filipinos closed and moved to green. The gap for Latino students narrowed slightly from 20% in 2014 to 14% 2015. The gap for male students increased slightly from 2% in 2014to 4% 2016. The gap for students with disability decreased from 21% in 2014 to than 10% 2016. The gap closed for veteran-students (moving from yellow to green).