

Success Indicator A: Access

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

Los Angeles Mission College (LAMC) is a designated Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI) located in the northeast San Fernando Valley area of Los Angeles County. LAMC's primary service area consists of the three zip codes of 91342, 91331 and 91340, which cover the communities of Sylmar, Pacoima and the city of San Fernando, respectively.

Methodology

In the table below, the percentage point gap methodology is used to assess whether the LAMC student body is representative of the community it serves. The percentage point gaps are calculated by subtracting the participation rate of the subgroup from the group's representation in the service area. A negative sign indicates that the group has lower representation at the College than in the community served, while a positive sign indicates that the group has greater representation. A negative percentage point gap of -3 or greater is considered evidence of disproportionate impact and is highlighted in yellow in the table below. Percentage point gaps based on low base numbers (a denominator less than 30) are not considered statistically reliable. Cohorts with fewer than ten students are not analyzed due to low reliability and are indicated with ***.

Table A1. Enrollment Disaggregated by Gender and Ethnicity

Population Group	(A) # of Students Enrolled in Fall 2014*	(B) % of Total Enrollment*	(C) % of Adult Population in Service Area**	(D) Gap in Percentage Points
Female	6,720	60.2	49.8	+10.4
Male	4,437	39.8	50.2	-10.4
Total	11,157	100.0	100.0	
Hispanic	8,599	77.1	84.2	-7.1
White	1,226	11.0	7.8	+3.2
Asian	549	4.9	4.3	+0.6
Black	360	3.2	3.1	+0.1
Native American	16	0.1	0.1	+0.0
Pacific Islander	6	0.1	0.0	***
Multiethnic	167	1.5	0.6	+0.9
Unknown	234	2.1	0.0	+2.1
Total	11,157	100.0	100.0	

* Source: LACCD SIS.

** Source: emsiAnalyst.

*** Not analyzed due to low cell size.

Table A2. Enrollment Disaggregated by Special Population Groups

Population Group	(A) # of Students Enrolled in Fall 2014*	(B) % of Total Enrollment*	(C) % of Adult Population in Service Area***	(D) Gap in Percentage Points
Foster youth	136	1.3	0.7	+0.6
Students with disabilities	304	2.8	9.9	-7.1
Low-income students**	6,237	55.9	47.1	+8.8
Veterans	161	1.5	3.8	-2.3

* Source: CCCCCO Data Mart.

** Source: LACCD IRDS FINANCIAL_AID_FLAG = 1, 2, 3 or 4.

*** Source: 2009-2013 American Community Survey.

The three student groups experiencing the greatest gaps in access are (in rank order):

- Male students (-10.4 percentage points below their proportion in the community);
- Hispanic students (-7.1 percentage points below their proportion in the community);
- Students with disabilities (-7.1 percentage points below their proportion in the community).

Male students are significantly underrepresented in the LAMC student body, reflecting a broader trend in higher education worldwide. To provide more equitable access to higher education in our primary service area, LAMC will continue to focus on outreach to men to increase the proportion of male students on campus.

The majority of residents in LAMC's primary service area are Hispanic, an ethnic group that continues to be underrepresented in U.S. higher education. While LAMC's student body has one of the highest rates of Hispanic enrollment in the nation, there is still a gap between Hispanic enrollment and the proportion of Hispanics living in the community served. This is partly due to low educational attainment in the community. According to the 2013 American Community Survey, over two-thirds (67.1%) of the adult population aged 25 and older in LAMC's primary service area has never attended college. LAMC continues to do outreach in the community to increase awareness of and interest in higher education among members of the community.

According to the 2009-2013 American Community Survey, approximately ten percent of the adult population in Los Angeles County has some type of disability. LAMC's documented disabled student population is only two percent. However, this is likely due to lack of documentation of disability, rather than to lack of access. LAMC has dedicated resources to eliminating this equity gap, starting with the hiring of a full-time Associate Dean of Disabled Student Programs and Services in 2014-2015. The College also plans to re-establish programs that were cut due to budgetary restrictions in previous years to provide additional services for disabled students to eliminate this equity gap.

Success Indicator B: Course Completion (“Success”)

B. COURSE COMPLETION. The ratio of the number of credit courses that students, by population group, successfully complete compared to the number of courses in which students in that group are enrolled on census day. Course completion (“success”) rates are calculated by dividing the number of courses in which students earned an A, B, C or P grade by the number of courses students were enrolled in on census day for fall 2014.

Methodology

In the tables below, the percentage point gap methodology is used to assess whether an equity gap exists between disaggregated subgroups. The gap in percentage points is calculated by subtracting the success rate (%) of the subgroup from the average success rate (%) for the College as a whole. A negative sign indicates that the group has a lower success rate than the College average, while a positive sign indicates that the group has a better success rate. A negative percentage point gap of -3 or greater is considered evidence of disproportionate impact and is highlighted in yellow in the table below. Cohorts with fewer than ten students are not analyzed due to low reliability and are indicated with ***.

Table B1. Successful Course Completion Disaggregated by Population Group

Population Group	(A) # of Course Enrollments in Fall 2014*	(B) # of Passing Grades*	(C) Success Rate (B÷A) (%)	(D) Average Success Rate (%)	(E) Gap in Percentage Points
Female	13,857	9,238	66.7	64.6	+2.1
Male	9,621	5,926	61.6	64.6	-3.0
Total	23,478	15,164	64.6	64.6	
Hispanic	18,202	11,458	63.0	64.6	-1.6
White	2,560	1,920	75.0	64.6	+10.4
Asian	1,234	907	73.5	64.6	+8.9
Black	726	375	51.7	64.6	-12.9
Native American	32	21	65.6	64.6	+1.0
Pacific Islander	12	7	58.3	64.6	-6.3
Multiethnic	269	190	70.6	64.6	+6.0
Unknown	443	286	64.6	64.6	+0.0
Total	23,478	15,164	64.6	64.6	
Foster youth	334	175	52.4	64.6	-12.2
Students with disabilities	632	375	59.3	64.6	-5.3
Low-income**	16,811	11,100	66.0	64.6	+1.4
Veterans	35	25	71.4	64.6	+6.8

* Source: CCCC Data Mart.

** Source: LACCD IRDS FINANCIAL_AID_FLAG = 1, 2, 3 or 4.

The three student groups experiencing the *greatest percentage point gaps* for successful course completion are:

- Black students (–12.9 percentage points below the LAMC average);
- Foster youth (–12.2 percentage points below the LAMC average);
- Pacific Islanders (–6.3 percentage points below the LAMC average).

While the analysis above shows that Pacific Islanders are experiencing disproportionate impact, due to the low base number of students in this group, the data on successful course completion for Pacific Islanders is not statistically reliable and may not indicate an actual gap. The three groups with the *largest number of students affected* are:

Population Group	Gap (% below average)	# of Course Enrollments as of Census Day	# of “Lost” Enrollments that would have closed the equity gap if they had been successful
Male students	–3.0	9,621	289
Black students	–12.9	726	94
Foster youth	–12.2	334	41

ACADEMIC/PROGRESS PROBATION

Table B2. Academic and Progress Probation Disaggregated by Population Group

Population Group	(A) # of Credit Students in Fall 2014*	(B) # of Students on Probation**	(C) Probation Rate (B÷A) (%)	(D) Average Probation Rate (%)	(E) Gap in Percentage Points
Female	6,249	524	8.4	8.9	+0.5
Male	4,162	402	9.7	8.9	–0.8
Total	10,411	926	8.9	8.9	
Hispanic	7,895	776	9.8	8.9	–0.9
White	1,212	69	5.7	8.9	+3.2
Asian	541	29	5.4	8.9	+3.5
Black	351	28	8.0	8.9	+0.9
Native American	16	2	12.5	8.9	–3.6
Pacific Islander	6	2	33.3	8.9	***
Multiethnic	163	9	5.5	8.9	+3.4
Unknown	227	11	4.8	8.9	+4.0
Total	10,411	926	8.9	8.9	

* Source: LACCD SIS.

** Source: SEMC_ACADEMIC_PROB = 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9.

*** Not analyzed due to low cell size.

Academic probation results when a student has attempted a minimum of 12 units and fails to maintain a grade point average of 2.00. *Progress probation* is defined as having “W”

(Withdrawal), "INC" (Incomplete) or "NC" (No Credit) grades for fifty percent or more of all units in which a student has enrolled when a student has attempted a minimum of 12 units.

There does not appear to be an equity gap for academic and progress probation. The one group that shows a potential gap (Native Americans) has base numbers too low to be reliable and it would not be an efficient use of resources to stage a college-wide intervention for only two students.

Success Indicator C: ESL and Basic Skills Completion

C. ESL AND BASIC SKILLS COMPLETION. The percentage of students by population group who successfully complete a college-level English or math course within six years after attempting a basic skills English, math or ESL course, compared to the number of students who attempt a basic skills English, math or ESL course. Completion rates are calculated by dividing the number of students in the 2008-09 cohort who passed a college-level English or math course with an A, B, C or P grade by the end of the 2013-14 academic year by the number of students in that cohort who attempted a basic skills English, basic skills math or ESL course.

Methodology

In the tables below, the percentage point gap methodology is used to assess whether an equity gap exists between disaggregated subgroups. The gap in percentage points is calculated by subtracting the completion rate of the subgroup from the average completion rate for the College as a whole. A negative sign indicates that the group has a lower completion rate than the College average, while a positive sign indicates that the group has a greater completion rate. A negative percentage point gap of -3 or greater is considered evidence of disproportionate impact and is highlighted in yellow in the tables below. Cohorts with fewer than ten students are not analyzed due to low reliability and are indicated with ***.

BASIC SKILLS ENGLISH

Table C1. Basic Skills English Completion Disaggregated by Population Group

Population Group	(A) Attempted Remedial English*	(B) Passed College-level English*	(C) Completion Rate (B ÷ A) (%)	(D) Average Completion Rate (%)	(E) Gap in Percentage Points
Female	858	279	32.5	31.4	+1.1
Male	513	151	29.4	31.4	-2.0
Total	1,371	430	31.4	31.4	
Hispanic	1,040	325	31.3	31.4	-0.2
White	82	36	43.9	31.4	+12.5
Asian	53	14	26.4	31.4	-5.0
Black	66	10	15.2	31.4	-16.2
Native American	7	2	28.6	31.4	***
Pacific Islander	6	2	33.3	31.4	***
Multiethnic	0	0	N/A	31.4	N/A
Unknown	117	41	35.0	31.4	+3.6
Total	1,371	430	31.4	31.4	

* Source: CCCC Data on Demand.

*** Not analyzed due to low cell size.

Table C1. Basic Skills English Completion Disaggregated by Population Group (cont.)

Population Group	(A) Attempted Remedial English*	(B) Passed College-level English*	(C) Completion Rate (B ÷ A) (%)	(D) Average Completion Rate (%)	(E) Gap in Percentage Points
Foster youth**	10	4	40.0	31.4	+8.6
Students with disabilities	63	5	7.9	31.4	-23.5
Low-income students	913	317	34.7	31.4	+3.3
Veterans**	11	5	45.4	31.4	+14.0

* Source: CCCC Data on Demand.

** Source: LACCD SIS SEMC_FOSTER_YOUTH and STUD_FOSTER_YOUTH and LAMC veterans financial aid records.

The three student groups experiencing the *greatest percentage point gaps* with regard to basic skills English completion are (in rank order):

- Students with disabilities (-23.5 percentage points below students with no disability);
- Black students (-16.2 percentage points below the LAMC average);
- Asian students (-5.0 percentage points below the LAMC average).

As shown in the table below, the same three groups also have the *largest gaps in terms of the number of students affected*.

Population Group	Gap (% below average)	# of Course Enrollments as of Census Day	# of "Lost" Students that would have closed the equity gap if they had succeeded
Students with disabilities	-23.5	63	15
Black students	-16.2	66	11
Asian students	-5.0	53	3

ESL

There does not appear to be an equity gap for ESL completion. While there is evidence of disproportionate impact for Asian students, due to the low base number of students, the data is not statistically reliable and should not form the basis for decisions to implement interventions.

Table C2. ESL Completion Disaggregated by Population Group

Population Group	(A) Attempted ESL Course*	(B) Passed College-level English*	(C) Completion Rate (B ÷ A) (%)	(D) Average Completion Rate (%)	(E) Gap in Percentage Points
Female	154	14	9.1	8.4	+0.7
Male	73	5	6.8	8.4	-1.6
Total	227	19	8.4	8.4	

* Source: CCCC Data on Demand.

Table C2. ESL Completion Disaggregated by Population Group (cont.)

Population Group	(A) Attempted ESL Course*	(B) Passed College-level English*	(C) Completion Rate (B ÷ A) (%)	(D) Average Completion Rate (%)	(E) Gap in Percentage Points
Hispanic	149	10	6.7	8.4	-1.7
White	31	2	6.5	8.4	-1.9
Asian	19	1	5.3	8.4	-3.1
Black	0	0	N/A	8.4	N/A
Native American	0	0	N/A	8.4	N/A
Pacific Islander	1	0	0.0	8.4	***
Multiethnic	0	0	N/A	8.4	N/A
Unknown	27	6	22.2	8.4	+13.8
Total	227	19	8.4	8.4	
Foster youth**	0	0	N/A	8.4	N/A
Students with disabilities	5	1	20.0	8.4	***
Low-income students	164	17	10.4	8.4	+2.0
Veterans**	0	0	N/A	8.4	N/A

* Source: CCCC Data on Demand.

** Source: LACCD SIS SEMC_FOSTER_YOUTH and STUD_FOSTER_YOUTH and LAMC veterans financial aid records.

*** Not analyzed due to low cell size.

BASIC SKILLS MATH

Table C3. Basic Skills Math Completion Disaggregated by Population Group

Population Group	(A) Attempted Remedial Math*	(B) Passed College-level Math*	(C) Progression Rate (B ÷ A) (%)	(D) Average Completion Rate (%)	(E) Gap in Percentage Points
Female	958	298	31.1	29.0	+2.1
Male	564	144	25.5	29.0	-3.5
Total	1,522	442	29.0	29.0	
Hispanic	1,119	320	28.6	29.0	-0.4
White	119	37	31.1	29.0	+2.1
Asian	45	16	35.6	29.0	+6.6
Black	77	13	16.9	29.0	-12.1
Native American	16	3	18.8	29.0	-10.3
Pacific Islander	4	0	0.0	29.0	***
Multiethnic	0	0	N/A	29.0	N/A
Unknown	142	53	37.3	29.0	+8.3
Total	1,522	442	29.0	29.0	

* Source: CCCC Data on Demand.

*** Not analyzed due to low cell size.

Table C3. Basic Skills Math Completion Disaggregated by Population Group (cont.)

Population Group	(A) Attempted Remedial Math*	(B) Passed College-level Math*	(C) Completion Rate (B ÷ A) (%)	(D) Average Completion Rate (%)	(E) Gap in Percentage Points
Foster youth**	8	1	12.5	29.0	***
Students with disabilities	78	14	17.9	29.0	-11.1
Low-income students	993	300	30.2	29.0	+1.2
Veterans**	17	10	58.8	29.0	+29.8

* Source: CCCC Data on Demand.

** Source: LACCD SIS SEMC_FOSTER_YOUTH and STUD_FOSTER_YOUTH and LAMC veterans financial aid records.

*** Not analyzed due to low cell size.

The student groups experiencing the *greatest percentage point gaps* with regard to basic skills math completion are (in rank order):

- Black students (-12.1 percentage points below the LAMC average);
- Students with disabilities (-11.1 percentage points below students with no disability);
- Native American students (-10.3 percentage points below the LAMC average).

Due to the low base number of Native American students, the data is not statistically reliable and may not indicate an actual gap. The three groups with the *largest number of students affected* by the equity gap in basic skills math completion are:

Population Group	Gap (% below average)	# of Course Enrollments as of Census Day	# of "Lost" Students that would have closed the equity gap if they had succeeded
Male students	-3.5	564	20
Black students	-12.1	77	9
Students with disabilities	-11.1	78	9

Success Indicator D: Degree and Certificate Completion

D. DEGREE AND CERTIFICATE COMPLETION. The percentage of first-time students with a minimum of 6 units who attempted any math or English course in the first three years of enrollment and earned an AA or AS degree or Chancellor’s Office-approved certificate within six years. The degree and certificate completion rate is calculated by dividing the number of students in the 2008-2009 cohort who meeting the criteria above who earned a degree or certificate by the end of the 2013-2014 academic year by the number of students in the cohort.

Methodology

In the tables below, the percentage point gap methodology is used to assess whether an equity gap exists between disaggregated subgroups for degree and certificate completion. The gap in percentage points is calculated by subtracting the completion rate of the subgroup from the average completion rate for the College as a whole. A negative sign indicates that the group has a lower completion rate than the College average, while a positive sign indicates that the group has a greater completion rate. A negative percentage point gap of -3 or greater is considered evidence of disproportionate impact and is highlighted in yellow in the table below. Cohorts with fewer than ten students are not analyzed due to low reliability and are indicated with ***.

Table D1. Degree and Certificate Completion Disaggregated by Population Group

Population Group	(A) # in 2008-09 Cohort*	(B) Earned Degree or Certificate*	(C) Completion Rate (B ÷ A) (%)	(D) Average Completion Rate (%)	(E) Gap in Percentage Points
Female	557	106	19.0	16.7	+2.3
Male	413	56	13.6	16.7	-3.1
Total	970	162	16.7	16.7	X
Hispanic	673	105	15.6	16.7	-1.1
White	79	19	24.1	16.7	+7.4
Asian	33	5	15.2	16.7	-1.5
Black	21	4	19.0	16.7	+2.3
Native American	5	1	20.0	16.7	***
Pacific Islander	4	1	25.0	16.7	***
Multiethnic	0	0	N/A	16.7	N/A
Unknown	155	27	17.4	16.7	+0.7
Total	970	162	16.7	16.7	X

* Source: CCCC Data on Demand.

*** Not analyzed due to low cell size.

Table D1. Degree and Certificate Completion Disaggregated by Population Group (cont.)

Population Group	(A) # in 2008-09 Cohort*	(B) Earned Degree or Certificate*	(C) Completion Rate (B ÷ A) (%)	(D) Average Completion Rate (%)	(E) Gap in Percentage Points
Foster youth**	4	0	0.0	16.7	***
Students with disabilities	29	1	3.4	16.7	-13.3
Low-income students	782	145	18.5	16.7	+1.8
Veterans**	4	2	50.0	16.7	***

* Source: CCCC Data on Demand.

** Source: LACCD SIS SEMC_FOSTER_YOUTH and STUD_FOSTER_YOUTH and LAMC veterans financial aid records.

*** Not analyzed due to low cell size.

The student groups experiencing the *greatest percentage point gaps* are:

- Student with disabilities (-13.3 percentage points below the LAMC average);
- Male students (-3.1 percentage points below the LAMC average).

The same two groups are also the groups with the *largest number of students affected* by the equity gap in degree and certificate completion:

Population Group	Gap (% below average)	# of Course Enrollments as of Census Day	# of "Lost" Students that would have closed the equity gap if they had succeeded
Male students	-3.1	413	13
Students with disabilities	-13.3	29	4

Success Indicator E: Transfer

E. TRANSFER. The percentage of first-time students with a minimum of 6 units who attempted any math or English course in the first three years of enrollment and transferred to a four-year institution within six years. The transfer rate is calculated by dividing the number of students in the 2008-09 cohort meeting the criteria above who transferred by the end of the 2013-14 academic year by the number of students in the cohort.

Methodology

In the tables below, the percentage point gap methodology is used to assess whether an equity gap exists between disaggregated subgroups for transfer to a four-year institution. The percentage point gaps are calculated by subtracting the transfer rate of the disaggregated subgroup from the average transfer rate for the College as a whole. A negative sign indicates that the group has a lower transfer rate than the College average, while a positive sign indicates that the group has a greater transfer rate. A negative percentage point gap of -3 or greater is considered evidence of disproportionate impact and is highlighted in yellow in the table below. Cohorts with fewer than ten students are not analyzed due to low reliability and are indicated with ***.

Table E1. Transfer Rates Disaggregated by Population Group

Population Group	(A) # in 2008-09 Cohort*	(B) # who Transferred*	(C) Transfer Rate (B ÷ A) (%)	(D) Average Transfer Rate (%)	(E) Gap in Percentage Points
Female	557	78	14.0	16.5	-2.7
Male	413	82	19.9	16.5	+3.2
Total	970	160	16.5	16.5	
Hispanic	673	106	15.8	16.5	-0.9
White	79	17	21.5	16.5	+4.8
Asian	33	10	30.3	16.5	+13.6
Black	21	3	14.3	16.5	-2.4
Native American	5	2	40.0	16.5	***
Pacific Islander	4	1	25.0	16.5	***
Multiethnic	0	0	N/A	16.5	N/A
Unknown	155	21	13.5	16.5	-3.2
Total	970	160	16.5	16.5	
Foster youth**	4	0	0.0	16.5	***
Students with disabilities	29	2	6.9	16.5	-9.8
Low-income students	782	118	15.1	16.5	-1.6
Veterans**	4	0	0.0	16.5	***

* Source: CCCC Data on Demand.

** Source: LACCD SIS SEMC_FOSTER_YOUTH and STUD_FOSTER_YOUTH and LAMC veterans financial aid records.

*** Not analyzed due to low cell size.

There is a transfer equity gap for students with disabilities (-9.8 percentage points below the LAMC average). However, due to the small number of students impacted (the gap would have been closed if three more students with disabilities had transferred), no specific intervention is proposed. Students of unknown ethnicity are also showing evidence of disproportionate impact, however, this group cannot be the focus of interventions.

Population Group	Gap (% below average)	# of Students in Cohort	# of "Lost" Students that would have closed the equity gap if they had succeeded
Students with disabilities	-9.8	29	3

STUDENT EQUITY DASHBOARD 2015

Success Indicator	Gender	Ethnicity	Disability	Veterans	Foster Youth	Low-Income
Access	Male	Hispanic				
Successful Course Completion	Male	Black				
Academic/Progress Probation		Native American				
Basic Skills English Completion		Black, Asian				
ESL Completion		Asian				
Basic Skills Math Completion	Male	Black, Native American				
Degree/Certificate Completion	Male					
Transfer						

LEGEND	EQUITY GAP: ACTION NEEDED
	No Equity Gap: No action needed
	Not Applicable: No students in cohort or cohort size too small for analysis