Question 1

In fall 2019, did any of these scenarios apply at your college?

1. Students with an educational goal of transfer enrolled in a pre-transfer-level course;
2. Students with an educational goal of degree enrolled in a pre-degree-level course;
3. Students with an educational goal of certificate that requires transfer-level English or college-level math enrolled in a pre-degree-level course; OR
4. Students with a transfer or degree goal enrolled in a multi-term sequence in which they took either (1) a pre-transfer-level course in one term and a transfer-level course in a following term, or (2) a transfer-level course stretched over two terms (i.e., stretch curriculum).

None of the scenarios apply.

Do not complete Tabs 1 and 2. Proceed to Question 2.

One or more scenarios apply.

1. Go to Tab 10 and enter data there.
2. Return to Tab 1 to review the instructions.
3. Enter data on Tab 2.
4. Return to this flow chart to review Question 2.

Question 2

In fall 2019, did your college place students, who had an educational goal of transfer, degree or certificate requiring transfer-level English or college-level math or quantitative reasoning, and for whom you had high school transcript data, using a local placement model other than the statewide default placement rules?

NO

Do not complete Tabs 3 and 4. Proceed to Question 3.

YES

1. Go to Tab 10 and enter data there, if have not done so already.
2. Return to Tab 3 to review the instructions.
3. Enter data on Tab 4.
4. Return to this flow chart to review Question 3.

Question 3

In fall 2019 did your college use a guided or self-placement process that:

1. Placed students who have an educational goal of transfer into a pre-transfer-level course.
2. Placed students who have an educational goal of degree into a pre-degree-level course.
3. Placed students who have usable high school performance data available.
4. Incorporated sample problems or assignments, assessment instruments, or tests, including those designed for skill assessment.
5. Requested students to solve problems, answer curricular questions, present demonstrations/examples of course work designed to show knowledge or mastery of prerequisite skills, or demonstrate skills through tests or surveys.

None of the scenarios apply.

Do not complete Tab 5 and 6. Proceed to next step.

One or more scenarios apply.

1. Go to Tab 10 and enter data there, if have not done so already.
2. Return to Tab 5 to review the instructions.
3. Enter data on Tab 6.
4. Return to this flow chart and proceed to the last step.

Go to Tabs 7 and 8 to review a summary of overall outcomes.

The template is now complete. If you have been instructed to submit data on any tab, submit the template to the Chancellor's Office.

When Are Colleges Required to Complete this Template?

This evaluation template is intended to help colleges evaluate curricular structures under AB 705 and Title 5 requirements for students who enrolled in fall 2019. Colleges are required to use this template to evaluate their AB 705 implementation if any of the following four scenario applied at that time:

1 Students with an educational goal of transfer enrolled in a pre-transfer-level course;

2 Students with an educational goal of degree enrolled in a pre-degree-level course;

3 Students with an educational goal of certificate that requires transfer-level English or college-level math enrolled in a pre-degree-level course; OR

4 Students with a transfer or degree goal enrolled in a multi-term sequence in which they took either (1) a pre-transfer-level course in one term and a transfer-level course in a following term, or (2) a transfer-level course stretched over two terms (i.e., stretch curriculum).[1]

If students at your college were not able to enroll in any of the above four scenarios, you do not need to complete this portion of the template and can move to Tab 3. You only need to provide data for the scenarios that applied to your college. If required to enter data for any of the four scenarios above, first enter data into Tab 10, Table 10.1, cells B6 and B10:B17 first, then proceed to Tab 2. Tab 10 is used to calculate the comparison throughput rates for your college disaggregated by ethnicity. If you have developed more than one new curriculular approach in English or math, they need to be submitted in separate tables. If this is the case, copy Tab 2 and replicate it and submit data for each unique curricular approach.

Why Is Evaluation Required under AB 705?

Title 5, § 55522.a.1 and § 55522.a.2, requires California Community Colleges (CCC) to increase the number of students with a goal of transfer to a four-year institution, who enter and complete transfer-level English and mathematics (or quantitative reasoning) courses within one year; and to increase the number of students who enter and complete transfer-level or the required college-level English and mathematics (or quantitative reasoning) course within one year among students with a goal of earning a certificate or a local associate degree. This new regulation seeks to minimize disproportionate impacts on students caused by traditional placement practices. Further, title 5, § 55522.c.ii states that placement methods using localized research must be supported by data and research showing throughput rates at or above those achieved by direct placement into a transfer-level course (or college-level courses where appropriate). Such data and research must be validated within two years of the adoption method.

Further, title 5, § 55522.C.2 states that placement methods shall not authorize placement of students into a remedial sequence or pre-transfer coursework in English or mathematics (or quantitative reasoning) unless the student is highly unlikely to succeed in the college-level or transfer-level course, and enrollment in pre-transfer-level coursework will improve the student's likelihood of completing transfer-level/college-level courses in one year. Title 5, § 55522.c.1.B.ii refers to this scenario as the "throughput rate." The throughput rate is defined here as the percentage of students attempting and successfully completing the college-level or transfer-level English or math course appropriate to a students' education goal with a grade of C or better within a full academic year, including intersessions. For example, if a student started in a math course in the fall term, they would be tracked to completion of the college-level or transfer-level math (or quantitative reasoning) course through the following summer term.

Which Students Are Included in the Cohort?

Colleges should have planned to collect the data that allow for an evaluation of the throughput rate of students who participated in any of the four scenarios listed above compared to similar students who were enrolled in standalone transfer-level or college-level courses. If changes to course placement or scheduling do not allow for a comparison group, historical data will need to be used for comparison. For colleges that participated in the Multiple Measures Assessment Project (MMAP), CalPass Plus can provide a retrospective file of students who were previously placed and enrolled at each institution by high school GPA band to use as a comparison.[4]

Per AB 705, only students who are highly unlikely to succeed in college-level or transfer-level coursework (appropriate to their educational goal) are allowed to be placed into pre-transfer-level prerequisite courses. **No student outside the lowest high school performance band should be placed into pre-transfer/pre-college level courses.** Therefore, evaluation of the four scenarios above should focus on students in the lowest band of high school performance. Additionally, the law only applies to certificate or degree- and transfer-seeking students, as defined locally or using a student's informed educational goal. As such, additional filters should be applied to include only these student groups and detailed instructions on creating the cohorts are included under each table on the next tab.

Footnotes

[1] To date, there is no evidence that shows multi-term sequences outperform direct placement into transfer-level courses.

[2] ***https://assessment.cccco.edu/faqs*** and ***https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180AB705***

[3] ***https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5a565796692ebefb3ec5526e/t/5b6ccfc46d2a73e48620d759/1533857732982/07.18+AB+705+Implementation+Memorandum.pdf***

[4] ***https://rpgroup.org/Portals/0/Documents/Projects/MultipleMeasures/GuidesforImplementingMultipleMeasures/MMAP-Data-Match-Guide-10_26_15_1.pdf and https://rpgroup.org/Portals/0/Documents/Projects/MultipleMeasures/GuidesforImplementingMultipleMeasures/MMAP_Prospective_File.pptx.pdf***

Foothill College

Directions: Enter data into the blue cells in Tables 2.1 through 2.5; all other cells are populated automatically. See definitions for each column and the rows below the tables. Be sure to scroll down fully to see all information in the template. If you have developed more than one new curriculular approach in English or math, they need to be submitted in separate tables. If this is the case, copy Tab 2 and replicate it and submit data for each unique curricular approach in a separate tab. In these tables you are entering data for students enrolled in fall 2019.

Click here for instructions on how to complete the template.

Table 2.1. English - Evaluating Pre-Transfer/Multi-Term Sequence for Lowest High School GPA Band - Transfer and Unknown/Unreported or Degree Goal

	Students Enrolled in Pre-Transfer/Multi-Term Sequence Sections			Students Enrolled in Transfer-Level Course with or without a Corequisite				Decision Rule				Disproportionate Impact (DI) Analysis for Pre-Transfer Level		
English - Lowest High School GPA Performance Band with an Educational Goal of Degree or Transfer	**1. Total Enrolled**	**2. Subtotal who Completed Transfer-Level Course within One Year**	**3. Throughput Rate**	**4. Total Enrolled**	**2. Subtotal who Completed Transfer-Level Course within One Year**	**6. Throughput Rate**	**7. Throughput Rate Differences**	**8. Statewide Comparison Throughput Rate**	**9. Statewide or Local Comparison Rate Used (based on sample size)**	**10. Maximize Throughput?**	**11. Decision Conditional on Sample Size?**	**12. DI Action Level**	**13. DI Present (PI, if value<.80)**	**14. DI Present (PPG-1)**
Overall	**8**	**5**	**62.5%**	**8**	**6**	**75.0%**	**-12.5%**	**67.6%**	**Statewide**	**FALSE**	**Conditional**			
African American	0	0		0	0									
Asian	1	0	0.0%	1	1	100.0%	-100.0%					Action needed	0.00	TRUE
Filipino	0	0		0	0									
Hispanic	6	5	83.3%	4	2	50.0%	33.3%					No substantive DI	1.33	FALSE
Native American/Alaskan Native	0	0		0	0									
Multi-Ethnicity	0	0		3	3	100.0%								
Pacific Islander	1	0	0.0%	0	0							Action needed	0.00	TRUE
White Non-Hispanic	0	0		0	0									
Unknown	0	0		0	0									

Table 2.2. SLAM Math - Evaluating Pre-Transfer/Multi-Term Sequence for Lowest High School GPA Band - Transfer and Unknown/Unreported Goal

	Students Enrolled in Pre-Transfer/Multi-Term Sequence Sections			Students Enrolled in Transfer-Level Course with or without a Corequisite				Decision Rule				Disproportionate Impact (DI) Analysis for Pre-Transfer Level		
SLAM Math - Lowest High School GPA Performance Band with an Educational Goal of Transfer	**1. Total Enrolled**	**2. Subtotal who Completed Transfer-Level Course within One Year**	**3. Throughput Rate**	**4. Total Enrolled**	**5. Subtotal who Completed Transfer-Level Course within One Year**	**6. Throughput Rate**	**7. Throughput Rate Differences**	**8. Statewide Comparison Throughput Rate**	**9. Statewide or Local Comparison Rate Used (based on sample size)**	**10. Maximize Throughput?**	**11. Decision Conditional on Sample Size?**	**12. DI Action Level**	**13. DI Present (PI, if value<.80)**	**14. DI Present (PPG-1)**
Overall	**6**	**2**	**33.3%**	**53**	**25**	**47.2%**	**-13.8%**	**64.8%**	**Statewide**	**FALSE**	**Conditional**			
African American	0	0		2	1	50.0%								
Asian	0	0		5	2	40.0%								
Filipino	0	0		1	0	0.0%								
Hispanic	5	2	40.0%	29	14	48.3%	-8.3%					No substantive DI	1.20	FALSE
Native American/Alaskan Native	0	0		0	0									
Multi-Ethnicity	0	0		9	5	55.6%								
Pacific Islander	0	0		2	0	0.0%								
White Non-Hispanic	0	0		4	2	50.0%								
Unknown	1	0	0.0%	1	1	100.0%	-100.0%					Action needed	0.00	TRUE

Table 2.3. SLAM Math - Evaluating Pre-Transfer/Multi-Term Sequence for Lowest High School GPA Band - Degree Goal

	Students Enrolled in Pre-Degree/Multi-Term Sequence at Degree-Level Sections			Students Enrolled in College-Level Course with or without a Corequisite				Decision Rule				Disproportionate Impact (DI) Analysis for Pre-Transfer Level		
SLAM Math - Lowest High School GPA Performance Band with an Educational Goal of Degree	**1. Total Enrolled**	**2. Subtotal who Completed College-Level Course within One Year**	**3. Throughput Rate**	**4. Total Enrolled**	**5. Subtotal who Completed College-Level Course within One Year**	**6. Throughput Rate**	**7. Throughput Rate Differences**	**8. Statewide Comparison Throughput Rate**	**9. Statewide or Local Comparison Rate Used (based on sample size)**	**10. Maximize Throughput?**	**11. Decision Conditional on Sample Size?**	**12. DI Action Level**	**13. DI Present (PI, if value<.80)**	**14. DI Present (PPG-1)**

Overall	1	0	0.0%	6	3	50.0%	-50.0%	23.7%	Statewide	FALSE	Conditional			
African American	0	0		0	0									
Asian	0	0		0	0									
Filipino	0	0		1	0	0.0%								
Hispanic	0	0		4	2	50.0%								
Native American/Alaskan Native	0	0		0	0									
Multi-Ethnicity	0	0		1	1	100.0%								
Pacific Islander	0	0		0	0									
White Non-Hispanic	1	0	0.0%	0	0									
Unknown	0	0		0	0									

Table 2.4. B-STEM Math - Evaluating Pre-Transfer/Multi-Term Sequence for Lowest High School GPA Band - Transfer and Unknown/Unreported Goal

	Students Enrolled in Pre-Transfer/Multi-Term Sequence Sections			Students Enrolled in Transfer-Level Course with or without a Corequisite					Decision Rule			Disproportionate Impact (DI) Analysis for Pre-Transfer Level		
B-STEM Math - Lowest High School GPA Performance Band with an Educational Goal of Transfer	1. Total Enrolled	2. Subtotal who Completed Transfer-Level Course within One Year	3. Throughput Rate	4. Total Enrolled	5. Subtotal who Completed Transfer-Level Course within One Year	6. Throughput Rate	7. Throughput Rate Differences	8. Statewide Comparison Throughput Rate	9. Statewide or Local Comparison Rate Used (based on sample size)	10. Maximize Throughput?	11. Decision Conditional on Sample Size?	12. DI Action Level	13. DI Present (PI, if value<.80)	14. DI Present (PPG-1)
Overall	**16**	**4**	**25.0%**	**47**	**27**	**57.4%**	**-32.4%**	**54.4%**	**Statewide**	**FALSE**	**Conditional**			
African American	1	1	100.0%	0	0							No substantive DI	4.00	FALSE
Asian	1	0	0.0%	11	7	63.6%	-63.6%					Action needed	0.00	TRUE
Filipino	0	0		1	1	100.0%								
Hispanic	9	0	0.0%	20	11	55.0%	-55.0%					Action needed	0.00	TRUE
Native American/Alaskan Native	0	0		1	0	0.0%								
Multi-Ethnicity	2	1	50.0%	7	2	28.6%	21.4%					No substantive DI	2.00	FALSE
Pacific Islander	0	0		2	2	100.0%								
White Non-Hispanic	1	1	100.0%	5	4	80.0%	20.0%					No substantive DI	4.00	FALSE
Unknown	2	1	50.0%	0	0							No substantive DI	2.00	FALSE

Table 2.5. B-STEM Math- Evaluating Pre-Transfer/Multi-Term Sequence for Lowest High School GPA Band - Degree Goal

	Students Enrolled in Pre-Degree/Multi-Term Sequence at Degree-Level Sections			Students Enrolled in College-Level Course with or without a Corequisite					Decision Rule			Disproportionate Impact (DI) Analysis for Pre-Transfer Level		
B-STEM Math - Lowest High School GPA Performance Band with an Educational Goal of Degree	1. Total Enrolled	2. Subtotal who Completed College-Level Course within One Year	3. Throughput Rate	4. Total Enrolled	5. Subtotal who Completed College-Level Course within One Year	6. Throughput Rate	7. Throughput Rate Differences	8. Statewide Comparison Throughput Rate	9. Statewide or Local Comparison Rate Used (based on sample size)	10. Maximize Throughput?	11. Decision Conditional on Sample Size?	12. DI Action Level	13. DI Present (PI, if value<.80)	14. DI Present (PPG-1)
Overall	**0**	**0**		**8**	**5**	**62.5%**		**17.0%**	**Statewide**	**TRUE**	**Conditional**			
African American	0	0		0	0									
Asian	0	0		0	0									
Filipino	0	0		1	0	0.0%								
Hispanic	0	0		3	1	33.3%								
Native American/Alaskan Native	0	0		0	0									
Multi-Ethnicity	0	0		2	2	100.0%								
Pacific Islander	0	0		0	0									
White Non-Hispanic	0	0		2	2	100.0%								
Unknown	0	0		0	0									

Color Legend	
	Enter data here
	No data displayed for this area
	Maximizing throughput/No Substantive DI
	Consider Action - when one of two DI methods shows DI

	Not maximizing throughput/Action Needed - DI Present

Columns Explained	
Columns 1 and 4 - Total Enrolled:	These columns show the number of distinct students enrolled in fall 2019 at census with an educational goal of certificate, degree and/or transfer (transfer shall also include students with an undecided/unknown educational goal). If end of term data is used, include withdraws (EW, MW, and W grades) as enrollment in the course. Column 1 includes innovative curriculum sections and column 4 demonstrates transfer-level sections with or without a corequisite. The definition of a transfer-level course may be specific to a particular institution but should include the first-level English composition or math course that fulfills composition or math requirements for university transfer. The college-level course meets local degree requirements but usually is coded as one level below transfer (e.g., Intermediate Algebra).
Columns 2 and 5 - Subtotal who Completed Transfer-Level/College-Level Course within One Year:	These columns show the number of students from each group out of the total enrolled at census in fall 2019 who completed a transfer-level or college-level course within one full academic year, including intersessions. For example, if a student started in a discipline in the fall, they would be tracked through completion of the gateway course through the following summer term.
Columns 3 and 6 - Throughput Rate:	These columns show the percentage of students who successfully completed (C or higher) a transfer-level course within one year. To calculate the throughput rate, divide Column 2 by Column 1 and Column 5 by Column 4 (respectively).
Column 7 - Throughput Rate Differences:	For students with a transfer goal, this column shows the difference in throughput rates between students who successfully completed the transfer-level course after enrolling in a pre-transfer-level course and students who successfully completed transfer-level course sections with or without a corequisite. For students with a degree goal, it shows the difference in throughput rates between students who successfully completed the college-level course after enrolling in a pre-transfer-level course and students who successfully completed college-level course sections with or without a corequisite. The results in Column 7 are calculated by subtracting the number of students in Column 6 from the number in Column 3.
Column 8 - Statewide Comparison	See "Tab 10. Methodology" for more details.
Column 9 - Statewide or Local	Depending on overall sample size in Column 5; see "Tab 10. Methodology" for more details.
Column 10 - Maximize Throughput?:	This column determines if the local model maximized throughput when compared to the statewide or local throughput rate, per the requirements of AB 705. FALSE means model does NOT maximize throughput, whereas TRUE means model maximizes throughput.
Column 11 - Decision Conditional on Sample Size?:	Based on overall sample size in Column 5; if below a sample size of 100, decision is conditional on statewide throughput rate; if sample size is above 100, decision is not conditional on statewide throughput rate, but is based on local throughput rate.
Column 12 - Disproportionate Impact (DI) Action Level:	If either Column 13 or 14 fall below threshold, then consider action; when both columns fall below threshold, then action is needed. If neither column fall below threshold, then there is no substantive DI. DI will still be displayed even if model is not maximizing throughput.
Column 13 - DI Present (PI, if value<.80):	The proportionality index addresses the question, “If a subgroup of students represents 45% of the student body, does that subgroup also represent at least 45% of the students who achieve a specific educational outcome?” A proportionality index of 1.00 indicates that a group’s representation among those achieving an educational outcome is identical to that group’s representation in the student population. In contrast, a PI value of less than 1.00 indicates that a group’s representation among those achieving an educational outcome is lower compared to that same group’s representation in the student population. If the proportionality index falls below 80%, then the student group is disproportionately impacted.
Column 14 - DI Present (PPG-1):	The percentage point gap method addresses the question, “Is the difference between the throughput rate of a subgroup and the overall throughput rate (excluding the subgroup) statistically significant?". That is, significance is related to the sample size and the size of the difference. Smaller sample size require larger differences compared to larger sample sizes.

Rows Explained	
Racial/Ethnic Groups:	Disproportionate impact (DI) is also required to be evaluated in assessment processes. Disproportionate impacts are displayed regardless if the model maximizes throughput. In general terms, DI exists when one or more subgroups of students have outcomes that are at a substantially lower level than other groups. The determination of “substantial” is somewhat arbitrary, but a few indices have been created to guide decisions, such as the 80% rule and the proportionality index. If DI is detected, the college is required to plan, implement, and evaluate efforts to eliminate DI.

When Are Colleges Required to Complete This Template?

This evaluation template is intended for colleges to evaluate placement structures under AB 705 and Title 5 requirements for students enrolled in fall 2019. Colleges are required to use this template to evaluate their AB 705 implementation if the following scenario applied at that time:

In fall 2019, your college placed students, who had an educational goal of transfer, degree or certificate requiring transfer-level English or college-level math or quantitative reasoning, and for whom you had high school trancript data, using a local placement model other than the statewide default placement rules*.

If your college used the default placement rules to place all students with high school transcript data, you do not need to complete Tab 4 and can move to Tab 5. If required to enter data for the scenario above, first enter data into Tab 10, Table 10.1, cells B6 and B10:B17 (if you have not done so already), then proceed to Tab 4. Tab 10 is used to calculate the comparison throughput rates for your college disaggregated by ethnicity. If you have developed more than one new placement approach in English or math, they need to be submitted in separate tables. If this is the case, copy Tab 4 and replicate it and submit data for each unique approach. Do not report students placed via a Guided or Self-Placement model in Tab 4; enter them into Tab 6.

Why Is Evaluation Required under AB 705?

Title 5, § 55522.a.1 and § 55522.a.2, requires California Community Colleges (CCC) to increase the number of students with a goal of transfer to a four-year institution, who enter and complete transfer-level English and mathematics (or quantitative reasoning) courses within one year; and to increase the number of students who enter and complete transfer-level or the required college-level English and mathematics (or quantitative reasoning) course within one year among students with a goal of earning a certificate or a local associate degree. This new regulation seeks to minimize disproportionate impacts on students caused by traditional placement practices. Further, title 5, § 55522.c.ii states that placement methods using localized research must be supported by data and research showing throughput rates at or above those achieved by direct placement into a transfer-level course (or college-level courses where appropriate). Such data and research must be validated within two years of the adoption method.

Further, title 5, § 55522.C.2 states that placement methods shall not authorize placement of students into a remedial sequence or pre-transfer coursework in English or mathematics (or quantitative reasoning) unless the student is highly unlikely to succeed in the college-level or transfer-level course, and enrollment in pre-transfer-level coursework will improve the student's likelihood of completing transfer-level/college-level courses in one year. Title 5, § 55522.c.1.B.ii refers to this scenario as the "throughput rate." The throughput rate is defined here as the percentage of students attempting and successfully completing the college-level or transfer-level English or math course appropriate to a students' education goal with a grade of C or better within a full academic year, including intersessions. For example, if a student started in a math course in the fall term, they would be tracked to completion of the college-level or transfer-level math (or quantitative reasoning) course through the following summer term.

Which Students Are Included in the Cohort?

Colleges should have planned to collect the data that allow for an evaluation of the throughput rate of students who participated in the scenario listed above compared to similar students who were placed in standalone transfer-level or college-level courses. If changes to course placement do not allow for a comparison group, historical data will need to be used for comparison. For colleges that participated in the Multiple Measures Assessment Project (MMAP), CalPass Plus can provide a retrospective file of students who were previously placed and enrolled at each institution by high school GPA band to use as a comparison.**

Per AB 705, only students who are highly unlikely to succeed in certificate, college-level or transfer-level coursework (appropriate to their educational goal) are allowed to be placed into pre-transfer-level prerequisite courses. **No student outside the lowest high school performance band should be placed into pre-transfer/pre-college level courses.** Therefore, evaluation of the scenario above should focus on students in the lowest band of high school performance. Additionally, the law only applies to certificate or degree- and transfer-seeking students, as defined locally or using a student's informed educational goal. As such, additional filters should be applied to include only these student groups and detailed instructions on creating the cohorts are included under each table on the next tab.

Footnotes

* ***https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5a565796692ebefb3ec5526e/t/5b6ccfc46d2a73e48620d759/1533857732982/07.18+AB+705+Implementation+Memorandum.pdf.pdf***

** ***https://rpgroup.org/Portals/0/Documents/Projects/MultipleMeasures/GuidesforImplementingMultipleMeasures/MMAP-Data-Match-Guide-10_26_15_1.pdf and***

** ***https://rpgroup.org/Portals/0/Documents/Projects/MultipleMeasures/GuidesforImplementingMultipleMeasures/MMAP_Prospective_File.pptx.pdf***

Foothill College

Directions: Enter data into the blue cells in Tables 4.1 through 4.5; all other cells are populated automatically. See definitions of each column and the rows below the tables. Be sure to scroll down fully to see all information in the template. If you have developed more than one new placement approach in English or math, they need to be submitted in a separate tables. If this is the case, copy Tab 4 and replicate it and submit data for each unique approach. In these tables you are entering data for students enrolled in fall 2019.

Click here for instructions on how to complete the template.

Table 4.1. English Placement Models for Students in the Lowest High School GPA Band - Transfer, Unknown/Unreported or Degree Goal

	Students Enrolled in Pre-Transfer-Level Sections Using Local Placement Rules or Local Measures			Students Enrolled Directly in Transfer-Level Sections with or without a Corequisite				Decision Rule				Disproportionate Impact (DI) Analysis for Pre-Transfer Level		
English - Lowest High School GPA Performance Band with an Educational Goal of Transfer, Unknown/Unreported or Degree	**1. Total Enrolled**	**2. Subtotal Who Completed Transfer-Level Course within One Year**	**3. Throughput Rate**	**4. Total Enrolled**	**5. Subtotal Who Completed Transfer-Level Course within One Year**	**6. Throughput Rate**	**7. Throughput Rate Differences**	**8. Statewide Comparison Throughput Rate**	**9. Statewide or Local Comparison Rate Used (based on sample size)**	**10. Maximize Throughput?**	**11. Decision Conditional on Sample Size?**	**12. DI Action Level**	**13. DI Present (PI, if value<.80)**	**14. DI Present (PPG-1)**
Overall	**0**	**0**		**0**	**0**			**67.6%**	**Statewide**		**Conditional**			
African American														
Asian														
Filipino														
Hispanic														
Native American/Alaskan Native														
Multi-Ethnicity														
Pacific Islander														
White Non-Hispanic														
Unknown														

Table 4.2. SLAM Math Placement Models for Students in the Lowest High School GPA Band - Transfer and Unknown/Unreported Goal

	Students Enrolled in Pre-Transfer-Level Sections using Local Placement Rules or Local Measures			Students Enrolled Directly in Transfer-Level Sections				Decision Rule				Disproportionate Impact (DI) Analysis for Pre-Transfer Level		
SLAM Math - Lowest High School GPA Performance Band with a Transfer Goal	**1. Total Enrolled**	**2. Subtotal who Completed Transfer-Level Course within One Year**	**3. Throughput Rate**	**4. Total Enrolled**	**5. Subtotal who Completed Transfer-Level Course within One Year**	**6. Throughput Rate**	**7. Throughput Rate Differences**	**8. Statewide Comparison Throughput Rate**	**9. Statewide or Local Comparison Rate Used (based on sample size)**	**10. Maximize Throughput?**	**11. Decision Conditional on Sample Size?**	**12. DI Action Level**	**13. DI Present (PI, if value<.80)**	**14. DI Present (PPG-1)**
Overall	**0**	**0**		**0**	**0**			**64.8%**	**Statewide**		**Conditional**			
African American														
Asian														
Filipino														
Hispanic														
Native American/Alaskan Native														
Multi-Ethnicity														
Pacific Islander														
White Non-Hispanic														
Unknown														

Table 4.3. SLAM Math Placement Models for Students in the Lowest High School GPA Band - Degree Goal

	Students Enrolled in Pre-College-Level Sections using Local Placement Rules or Local Measures	Students Enrolled Directly in College-Level Sections	Decision Rule	Disproportionate Impact (DI) Analysis for Pre-Transfer Level

SLAM Math - Lowest High School GPA Performance Band with a Degree Goal	1. Total Enrolled	2. Subtotal who Completed College-Level Course within One Year	3. Throughput Rate	4. Total Enrolled	5. Subtotal who Completed College-Level Course within One Year	6. Throughput Rate	7. Throughput Rate Differences	8. Statewide Comparison Throughput Rate	9. Statewide or Local Comparison Rate Used (based on sample size)	10. Maximize Throughput?	11. Decision Conditional on Sample Size?	12. DI Action Level	13. DI Present (PI, if value<.80)	14. DI Present (PPG-1)
Overall	**0**	**0**		**0**	**0**			**23.7%**	**Statewide**		**Conditional**			
African American														
Asian														
Filipino														
Hispanic														
Native American/Alaskan Native														
Multi-Ethnicity														
Pacific Islander														
White Non-Hispanic														
Unknown														

Table 4.4. B-STEM Math Placement Models for Students in the Lowest High School GPA Band - Transfer and Unknown/Unreported Goal

	Students Enrolled in Pre-Transfer-Level Sections using Local Placement Rules or Local Measures			Students Enrolled Directly in Transfer-Level Sections				Decision Rule				Disproportionate Impact (DI) Analysis for Pre-Transfer Level		
B-STEM Math - Lowest High School GPA Performance Band with a Transfer and Unknown/Unreported Goal	1. Total Enrolled	2. Subtotal who Completed Transfer-Level Course within One Year	3. Throughput Rate	4. Total Enrolled	5. Subtotal who Completed Transfer-Level Course within One Year	6. Throughput Rate	7. Throughput Rate Differences	8. Statewide Comparison Throughput Rate	9. Statewide or Local Comparison Rate Used (based on sample size)	10. Maximize Throughput?	11. Decision Conditional on Sample Size?	12. DI Action Level	13. DI Present (PI, if value<.80)	14. DI Present (PPG-1)
Overall	**0**	**0**		**0**	**0**			**54.4%**	**Statewide**		**Conditional**			
African American														
Asian														
Filipino														
Hispanic														
Native American/Alaskan Native														
Multi-Ethnicity														
Pacific Islander														
White Non-Hispanic														
Unknown														

Table 4.5. B-STEM Math Placement Models for Students in the Lowest High School GPA Band - Degree Goal

	Students Enrolled in Pre-College-Level Sections using Local Placement Rules or Local Measures			Students Enrolled Directly in College-Level Sections				Decision Rule				Disproportionate Impact (DI) Analysis for Pre-Transfer Level		
B-STEM Math - Lowest High School GPA Performance Band with a Degree Goal	1. Total Enrolled	2. Subtotal who Completed College-Level Course within One Year	3. Throughput Rate	4. Total Enrolled	5. Subtotal who Completed College-Level Course within One Year	6. Throughput Rate	7. Throughput Rate Differences	8. Statewide Comparison Throughput Rate	9. Statewide or Local Comparison Rate Used (based on sample size)	10. Maximize Throughput?	11. Decision Conditional on Sample Size?	12. DI Action Level	13. DI Present (PI, if value<.80)	14. DI Present (PPG-1)
Overall	**0**	**0**		**0**	**0**			**17.0%**	**Statewide**		**Conditional**			
African American														
Asian														
Filipino														
Hispanic														
Native American/Alaskan Native														
Multi-Ethnicity														
Pacific Islander														
White Non-Hispanic														
Unknown														

Color Legend	
	Enter data here
	No data displayed for this area
	Maximizing throughput/No Substantive DI
	Consider Action - when one of two DI methods shows DI
	Not maximizing throughput/Action Needed - DI Present

Columns Explained	
Columns 1 and 4 - Total Enrolled:	These columns show the number of distinct students enrolled in fall 2019 at census with an educational goal of certificate, degree, and/or transfer (transfer also includes unknown/unreported educational goals). If end of term data is used, include withdraws (EW, MW, and W grades) as enrollment in the course. Column 1 shows the number of students placed into pre-transfer level via a local model and Column 4 provides the number of students enrolled directly in transfer level.
Columns 2 and 5 - Subtotal who Completed Transfer-Level Course within One Year:	These columns demonstrate the number of students enrolled into pre-transfer courses and those enrolled into transfer-level courses out of the total enrolled who successfully completed a transfer-level course within one year with a C or better. Column 2 reflects the number of students who completed the pre-transfer-level course, and Column 5 shows the students who completed a transfer-level course when enrolled directly into a transfer-level course within one full academic year, including intersessions. For example, if a student started in a discipline in the fall, they would be tracked through completion of the transfer-level/college-level course through the following summer term.
Columns 3 and 6 - Throughput Rate:	These columns show the percentage of students who successfully completed (C or higher) a transfer-level (or college-level) course within one year. To calculate the throughput rate, divide Column 2 by Column 1 and Column 5 by Column 4 (respectively).
Column 7 - Throughput Rate:	Differences: [insert definition; is missing from this tab]
Column 8 - Statewide Comparison Throughput Rate:	See "Tab 10. Methodology" for more details.
Column 9 - Statewide or Local Comparison Rate Used:	Depending on overall sample size in Column 5; see "Tab 10. Methodology" for more details.
Column 10 - Maximize Throughput?:	This column determines if the local model maximized throughput when compared to the statewide or local throughput rate, per the requirements of AB 705. FALSE means model does NOT maximize throughput, whereas TRUE means model maximizes throughput.
Column 11 - Decision Conditional on Sample Size?:	Based on overall sample size in Column 5; if below a sample size of 100, decision is conditional on statewide throughput rate; if sample size is above 100, decision is not conditional on statewide throughput rate, but is based on local throughput rate.
Column 12 - Disproportionate Impact (DI) Action Level:	If either Column 13 or 14 fall below threshold, then consider action; when both columns fall below threshold, then action is needed. If neither column fall below threshold, then there is no substantive DI. DI is still displayed even if model does not maximize throughput.
Column 13 - DI Present (PI, if value<.80):	The proportionality index addresses the question, “If a subgroup of students represents 45% of the student body, does that subgroup also represent at least 45% of the students who achieve a specific educational outcome?” A proportionality index of 1.00 indicates that a group’s representation among those achieving an educational outcome is identical to that group’s representation in the student population. In contrast, a PI value of less than 1.00 indicates that a group’s representation among those achieving an educational outcome is lower compared to that same group’s representation in the student population. If the proportionality index falls below 80%, then the student group is disproportionately impacted.
Column 14 - DI Present (PPG-1):	The percentage point gap method addresses the question, “Is the difference between the throughput rate of a subgroup and the overall throughput rate (excluding the subgroup) statistically significant?". That is, significance is related to the sample size and the size of the difference. Smaller sample size require larger differences compared to larger sample sizes.

Rows Explained	
Racial/Ethnic Groups:	Disproportionate impact (DI) is also required to be evaluated in assessment processes. Disproportionate impacts are displayed regardless if the model maximizes throughput. In general terms, DI exists when one or more subgroups of students have outcomes that are at a substantially lower level than other groups. The determination of “substantial” is somewhat arbitrary, but a few indices have been created to guide decisions, such as the 80% rule and the proportionality index. If DI is detected, the college is required to plan, implement, and evaluate efforts to eliminate DI.

When Are Colleges Required to Complete This Template?

This evaluation template is intended for colleges to evaluate their Guided or Self-Placement (GSP) model under AB 705 and Title 5 requirements. Colleges are required to use this template to evaluate their AB 705 implementation if any of the following scenarios apply to their GSP model. In fall 2019 did your college use a guided or self-placement process that:

1. Placed students who have an educational goal of transfer into a pre-transfer-level course.
2. Placed students who have an educational goal of degree into a pre-degree-level course.
3. Placed students who have usable high school performance data available.
4. Incorporated sample problems or assignments, assessment instruments, or tests, including those designed for skill assessment.
5. Requested students to solve problems, answer curricular questions, present demonstrations/examples of course work designed to show knowledge or mastery of prerequisite skills, or demonstrate skills through tests or surveys.

If your college's GSP model does not fall into any of the four scenarios above, you do not need to complete Tab 6. You only need to provide data for the scenarios that apply to your college. If required to enter data for any of the four scenarios above, first enter data into Tab 10, Table 10.1, cells B6 and B10:B17, if you have not done so already, then proceed to Tab 6. Tab 10 is used to calculate the comparison throughput rates for your college disaggregated by ethnicity.

Why Is Evaluation Required Under AB 705?

Title 5, § 55522.a.1 and § 55522.a.2, requires California Community Colleges (CCC) to increase the number of students with a goal of transfer to a four-year institution, who enter and complete transfer-level English and mathematics (or quantitative reasoning) courses within one year; and to increase the number of students who enter and complete transfer-level or the required college-level English and mathematics (or quantitative reasoning) course within one year among students with a goal of earning a certificate or a local associate degree. This new regulation seeks to minimize disproportionate impacts on students caused by traditional placement practices. Further, title 5, § 55522.c.ii states that placement methods using localized research must be supported by data and research showing throughput rates at or above those achieved by direct placement into a transfer-level course (or college-level courses where appropriate). Such data and research must be validated within two years of the adoption method.

Further, title 5, § 55522.C.2 states that placement methods shall not authorize placement of students into a remedial sequence or pre-transfer coursework in English or mathematics (or quantitative reasoning) unless the student is highly unlikely to succeed in the college-level or transfer-level course, and enrollment in pre-transfer-level coursework will improve the student's likelihood of completing transfer-level/college-level courses in one year. Title 5, § 55522.c.1.B.ii refers to this scenario as the "throughput rate." The throughput rate is defined here as the percentage of students attempting and successfully completing the college-level or transfer-level English or math course appropriate to a students' education goal with a grade of C or better within a full academic year, including intersessions. For example, if a student started in a math course in the fall term, they would be tracked to completion of the college-level or transfer-level math (or quantitative reasoning) course through the following summer term.

Chancellor's Office guidance on guided and self placement defines guided placement as: A process by which students choose tool used to encourage a student to reflect on his or her academic history and educational goals that may include the student evaluating their familiarity and comfort with topics in English or mathematics. After completing the process, students will receive their course placement. It also defines self placement as the process in which a student chooses their placement after consideration of the self-assessment survey results and other relevant factors. Survey results may culminate in course recommendations, but not placement. This survey may be part of the college's student onboarding process.

Which Students Are Included in the Cohort?

Colleges should have planned to collect the data that allow for an evaluation of the throughput rate of students who participated in the four scenarios listed above compared to similar students enrolled directly in standalone transfer-level or college-level courses. If changes to course placement do not allow for a comparison group, historical data will need to be used for comparison. For colleges that participated in the Multiple Measures Assessment Project (MMAP), CalPass Plus can provide a retrospective file of students who were previously placed and enrolled at each institution by high school GPA band to use as a comparison.*

Per AB 705, colleges are required to evaluate the four scenarios above for all student groups, therefore the tables are broken out into three groups: (1) students in the lowest high school GPA band, (2) students with unknown GPA, and (3) students in All Other GPA Bands. Additionally, the law applies to certificate, degree- and transfer-seeking students, as defined locally or using a student's informed educational goal. As such, additional filters should be applied to include only these student groups and detailed instructions on creating the cohorts are included under each table on Tab 6.

Footnotes

* ***https://rpgroup.org/Portals/0/Documents/Projects/MultipleMeasures/GuidesforImplementingMultipleMeasures/MMAP-Data-Match-Guide-10_26_15_1.pdf and https://rpgroup.org/Portals/0/Documents/Projects/MultipleMeasures/GuidesforImplementingMultipleMeasures/MMAP_Prospective_File.pptx.pdf***

Foothill College

Directions: Enter data into the blue cells in Tables 6.1 through 6.15; all other cells are populated automatically. See definitions for each column and the rows below the tables. Be sure to scroll down fully to see all information in the template. Enter data for students who enrolled in the course in fall 2019.

Click here for instructions on how to complete the template.

Table 6.1. English - Guided or Self Placement - Lowest High School GPA Band - Transfer, Unknown/Unreported or Degree Goal

	Students Enrolled in Pre-Transfer-Level Sections after Guided or Self Placement			Students Enrolled Directly in Transfer-Level Sections								Disproportionate Impact (DI) Analysis		
English - Lowest High School GPA Performance Band with an Educational Goal of A25	1. Total Enrolled	2. Subtotal who Completed Transfer-Level Course within One Year	3. Throughput Rate	4. Total Enrolled	2. Subtotal who Completed Transfer-Level Course within One Year	6. Throughput Rate	7. Throughput Rate Differences	8. Statewide Comparison Throughput Rate	9. Statewide or Local Comparison Rate Used (based on sample size)	10. Maximize Throughput?	11. Decision Conditional on Sample Size?	12. DI Action Level	13. DI Present (PI, if value<.80)	14. DI Present (PPG-1)
Overall	0	0		0	0			40%	Statewide		Conditional			
African American	0	0		0	0									
Asian	0	0		0	0									
Filipino	0	0		0	0									
Hispanic	0	0		0	0									
Native American/Alaskan Native	0	0		0	0									
Multi-Ethnicity	0	0		0	0									
Pacific Islander	0	0		0	0									
White Non-Hispanic	0	0		0	0									
Unknown	0	0		0	0									

Table 6.2. English - Guided or Self Placement - Unknown High GPA - Transfer, Unknown/Unreported or Degree Goal

	Students Enrolled in Pre-Transfer-Level Sections after Guided or Self Placement			Students Placed Directly in Transfer-Level Sections								Disproportionate Impact (DI) Analysis		
English - High School GPA Unknown with an Educational Goal of Transfer, Unknown/Unreported or Degree	1. Total Enrolled	2. Subtotal who Completed Transfer-Level Course within One Year	3. Throughput Rate	4. Total Enrolled	2. Subtotal who Completed Transfer-Level Course within One Year	6. Throughput Rate	7. Throughput Rate Differences	8. Statewide Comparison Throughput Rate	9. Statewide or Local Comparison Rate Used (based on sample size)	10. Maximize Throughput?	11. Decision Conditional on Sample Size?	12. DI Action Level	13. DI Present (PI, if value<.80)	14. DI Present (PPG-1)
Overall	6	6	100%	25	20	80%	20%	67.6%	Statewide	TRUE	Conditional			
African American	0	0		0	0									
Asian	6	6	100%	20	17	85%	15%					No substantive DI	1.00	
Filipino	0	0		0	0									
Hispanic	0	0		0	0									
Native American/Alaskan Native	0	0		0	0									
Multi-Ethnicity	0	0		1	1	100%								
Pacific Islander	0	0		0	0									
White Non-Hispanic	0	0		2	2	100%								
Unknown	0	0		2	0	0%								

Table 6.3. English - Guided or Self Placement - All Other GPA bands - Transfer, Unknown/Unreported or Degree Goal

	Students Enrolled in Pre-Transfer-Level Sections after Guided or Self Placement			Students Placed Directly in Transfer-Level Sections								Disproportionate Impact (DI) Analysis		
English - All Other High School GPA Bands Students with an Educational Goal of Transfer, Unknown/Unreported or Degree	1. Total Enrolled	2. Subtotal who Completed Transfer-Level Course within One Year	3. Throughput Rate	4. Total Enrolled	5. Subtotal who Completed Transfer-Level Course within One Year**	6. Throughput Rate	7. Throughput Rate Differences	8. Statewide Comparison Throughput Rate	9. Statewide or Local Comparison Rate Used (based on sample size)	10. Maximize Throughput?	11. Decision Conditional on Sample Size?	12. DI Action Level	13. DI Present (PI, if value<.80)	14. DI Present (PPG-1)

Overall	1	1	100%	6	5	83%	17%	**70.2%**	**Statewide**	**TRUE**	**Conditional**			
African American	0	0		1	1	100%								
Asian	1	1	100%	2	2	100%	0%					No substantive DI	1.00	
Filipino	0	0		1	1	100%								
Hispanic	0	0		0	0									
Native American/Alaskan Native	0	0		0	0									
Multi-Ethnicity	0	0		0	0									
Pacific Islander	0	0		0	0									
White Non-Hispanic	0	0		2	1	50%								
Unknown	0	0		0	0									

Table 6.4. SLAM Math - Guided or Self Placement - Lowest High School GPA Band - Transfer and Unknown/Unreported Goal

	Students Enrolled in Pre-Transfer-Level Sections after Guided or Self Placement			**Students Placed Directly in Transfer-Level Sections**								**Disproportionate Impact (DI) Analysis**		
SLAM Math - Lowest High School GPA Performance Band with an Educational Goal of Transfer	**1. Total Enrolled**	**2. Subtotal who Completed Transfer-Level Course within One Year**	**3. Throughput Rate**	**4. Total Enrolled**	**5. Subtotal who Completed Transfer-Level Course within One Year****	**6. Throughput Rate**	**7. Throughput Rate Differences**	**8. Statewide Comparison Throughput Rate**	**9. Statewide or Local Comparison Rate Used (based on sample size)**	**10. Maximize Throughput?**	**11. Decision Conditional on Sample Size?**	**12. DI Action Level**	**13. DI Present (PI, if value<.80)**	**14. DI Present (PPG-1)**
Overall	0	0		0	0			**27%**	**Statewide**		**Conditional**			
African American	0	0		0	0									
Asian	0	0		0	0									
Filipino	0	0		0	0									
Hispanic	0	0		0	0									
Native American/Alaskan Native	0	0		0	0									
Multi-Ethnicity	0	0		0	0									
Pacific Islander	0	0		0	0									
White Non-Hispanic	0	0		0	0									
Unknown	0	0		0	0									

Table 6.5. SLAM Math - Guided or Self Placement - Unknown High School GPA - Transfer and Unknown/Unreported Goal

	Students Enrolled in Pre-Transfer-Level Sections after Guided or Self Placement			**Students Placed Directly in Transfer-Level Sections**								**Disproportionate Impact (DI) Analysis**		
SLAM Math - Unknown High School GPA with an Educational Goal of Transfer and Unknown/Unreported	**1. Total Enrolled**	**2. Subtotal who Completed Transfer-Level Course within One Year**	**3. Throughput Rate**	**4. Total Enrolled**	**5. Subtotal who Completed Transfer-Level Course within One Year****	**6. Throughput Rate**	**7. Throughput Rate Differences**	**8. Statewide Comparison Throughput Rate**	**9. Statewide or Local Comparison Rate Used (based on sample size)**	**10. Maximize Throughput?**	**11. Decision Conditional on Sample Size?**	**12. DI Action Level**	**13. DI Present (PI, if value<.80)**	**14. DI Present (PPG-1)**
Overall	0	0		15	15	100%		**64.8%**	**Statewide**	**TRUE**	**Conditional**			
African American	0	0		0	0									
Asian	0	0		12	12	100%								
Filipino	0	0		0	0									
Hispanic	0	0		0	0									
Native American/Alaskan Native	0	0		0	0									
Multi-Ethnicity	0	0		0	0									
Pacific Islander	0	0		0	0									
White Non-Hispanic	0	0		3	3	100%								
Unknown	0	0		0	0									

Table 6.6. SLAM Math - Guided or Self Placement - All Other High School GPA - Transfer and Unknown/Unreported Goal

	Students Enrolled in Pre-Transfer-Level Sections after Guided or Self Placement	**Students Placed Directly in Transfer-Level Sections**	**Disproportionate Impact (DI) Analysis**

SLAM Math - All Other High School GPA with an Educational Goal of Transfer and Unknown/Unreported	1. Total Enrolled	2. Subtotal who Completed Transfer-Level Course within One Year	3. Throughput Rate	4. Total Enrolled	5. Subtotal who Completed Transfer-Level Course within One Year**	6. Throughput Rate	7. Throughput Rate Differences	8. Statewide Comparison Throughput Rate	9. Statewide or Local Comparison Rate Used (based on sample size)	10. Maximize Throughput?	11. Decision Conditional on Sample Size?	12. DI Action Level	13. DI Present (PI, if value<.80)	14. DI Present (PPG-1)
Overall	0	0		6	6	100%		65.1%	Statewide	TRUE	Conditional			
African American	0	0		0	0									
Asian	0	0		2	2	100%								
Filipino	0	0		0	0									
Hispanic	0	0		0	0									
Native American/Alaskan Native	0	0		0	0									
Multi-Ethnicity	0	0		3	3	100%								
Pacific Islander	0	0		0	0									
White Non-Hispanic	0	0		1	1	100%								
Unknown	0	0		0	0									

Table 6.7. SLAM Math - Guided or Self Placement - Lowest High School GPA Band - Degree Goal

	Students Enrolled in Pre-College-Level Sections after Guided or Self Placement			Students Placed Directly in College-Level Sections								Disproportionate Impact (DI) Analysis		
SLAM Math - Lowest High School GPA Performance Band with an Educational Goal of Degree	**1. Total Enrolled**	**2. Subtotal who Completed College-Level Course within One Year**	**3. Throughput Rate**	**4. Total Enrolled**	**5. Subtotal who Completed College-Level Course within One Year****	**6. Throughput Rate**	**7. Throughput Rate Differences**	**8. Statewide Comparison Throughput Rate**	**9. Statewide or Local Comparison Rate Used (based on sample size)**	**10. Maximize Throughput?**	**11. Decision Conditional on Sample Size?**	**12. DI Action Level**	**13. DI Present (PI, if value<.80)**	**14. DI Present (PPG-1)**
Overall	0	0		0	0			**4%**	**Statewide**		**Conditional**			
African American	0	0		0	0									
Asian	0	0		0	0									
Filipino	0	0		0	0									
Hispanic	0	0		0	0									
Native American/Alaskan Native	0	0		0	0									
Multi-Ethnicity	0	0		0	0									
Pacific Islander	0	0		0	0									
White Non-Hispanic	0	0		0	0									
Unknown	0	0		0	0									

Table 6.8. SLAM Math - Guided or Self Placement - High School GPA Band Unknown - Degree Goal

	Students Enrolled in Pre-College-Level Level after Guided or Self-Placement			Students Placed Directly in College-Level Sections								Disproportionate Impact (DI) Analysis		
SLAM Math - Unknown High School GPA with an Educational Goal of Degree	**1. Total Enrolled**	**2. Subtotal who Completed College-Level Course within One Year**	**3. Throughput Rate**	**4. Total Enrolled**	**5. Subtotal who Completed College-Level Course within One Year**	**6. Throughput Rate**	**7. Throughput Rate Differences**	**8. Statewide Comparison Throughput Rate**	**9. Statewide or Local Comparison Rate Used (based on sample size)**	**10. Maximize Throughput?**	**11. Decision Conditional on Sample Size?**	**12. DI Action Level**	**13. DI Present (PI, if value<.80)**	**14. DI Present (PPG-1)**
Overall	0	0		2	2	100%		**23.7%**	**Statewide**	**TRUE**	**Conditional**			
African American	0	0		0	0									
Asian	0	0		1	1	100%								
Filipino	0	0		0	0									
Hispanic	0	0		0	0									
Native American/Alaskan Native	0	0		0	0									
Multi-Ethnicity	0	0		0	0									
Pacific Islander	0	0		0	0									
White Non-Hispanic	0	0		1	1	100%								
Unknown	0	0		0	0									

Table 6.9. SLAM Math - Guided or Self Placement - All Other High School GPA Bands - Degree Goal

	Students Enrolled in Pre-College-Level Sections after Guided or Self Placement			Students Placed Directly in College-Level Sections								Disproportionate Impact (DI) Analysis		
SLAM Math - All Other High School GPA Bands with an Educational Goal of Degree	1. Total Enrolled	2. Subtotal who Completed College-Level Course within One Year	3. Throughput Rate	4. Total Enrolled	5. Subtotal who Completed College-Level Course within One Year	6. Throughput Rate	7. Throughput Rate Differences	8. Statewide Comparison Throughput Rate	9. Statewide or Local Comparison Rate Used (based on sample size)	10. Maximize Throughput?	11. Decision Conditional on Sample Size?	12. DI Action Level	13. DI Present (PI, if value<.80)	14. DI Present (PPG-1)
Overall	0	0		0	0			**23.9%**	**Statewide**		**Conditional**			
African American	0	0		0	0									
Asian	0	0		0	0									
Filipino	0	0		0	0									
Hispanic	0	0		0	0									
Native American/Alaskan Native	0	0		0	0									
Multi-Ethnicity	0	0		0	0									
Pacific Islander	0	0		0	0									
White Non-Hispanic	0	0		0	0									
Unknown	0	0		0	0									

Table 6.10. B-STEM Math - Guided or Self Placement - Lowest High School GPA Band - Transfer and Unknown/Unreported Goal

	Students Enrolled in Pre-Transfer-Level Sections after Guided or Self Placement			Students Placed Directly in Transfer-Level Sections								Disproportionate Impact (DI) Analysis		
B-STEM Math - Lowest High School GPA Performance Band with an Educational Goal of Transfer and Unknown/Unreported Goal	1. Total Enrolled	2. Subtotal who Completed Transfer-Level Course within One Year	3. Throughput Rate	4. Total Enrolled	5. Subtotal who Completed Transfer-Level Course within One Year**	6. Throughput Rate	7. Throughput Rate Differences	8. Statewide Comparison Throughput Rate	9. Statewide or Local Comparison Rate Used (based on sample size)	10. Maximize Throughput?	11. Decision Conditional on Sample Size?	12. DI Action Level	13. DI Present (PI, if value<.80)	14. DI Present (PPG-1)
Overall	0	0		4	3	75%		**32%**	**Statewide**	**TRUE**	**Conditional**			
African American	0	0		0	0									
Asian	0	0		2	2	100%								
Filipino	0	0		0	0									
Hispanic	0	0		1	1	100%								
Native American/Alaskan Native	0	0		0	0									
Multi-Ethnicity	0	0		0	0									
Pacific Islander	0	0		0	0									
White Non-Hispanic	0	0		1	0	0%								
Unknown	0	0		0	0									

Table 6.11. B-STEM Math - Guided or Self Placement - Unknown High School GPA - Transfer and Unknown/Unreported Goal

	Students Enrolled in Pre-Transfer-Level Sections after Guided or Self Placement			Students Placed Directly in Transfer-Level Sections								Disproportionate Impact (DI) Analysis		
B-STEM Math - Unknown High School GPA with an Educational Goal of Transfer and Unknown/Unreported Goal	1. Total Enrolled	2. Subtotal who Completed Transfer-Level Course within One Year	3. Throughput Rate	4. Total Enrolled	5. Subtotal who Completed Transfer-Level Course within One Year**	6. Throughput Rate	7. Throughput Rate Differences	8. Statewide Comparison Throughput Rate	9. Statewide or Local Comparison Rate Used (based on sample size)	10. Maximize Throughput?	11. Decision Conditional on Sample Size?	12. DI Action Level	13. DI Present (PI, if value<.80)	14. DI Present (PPG-1)
Overall	0	0		48	45	94%		**54.4%**	**Statewide**	**TRUE**	**Conditional**			
African American	0	0		0	0									
Asian	0	0		43	41	95%								
Filipino	0	0		0	0									
Hispanic	0	0		1	1	100%								

Native American/Alaskan Native	0	0		0	0									
Multi-Ethnicity	0	0		0	0									
Pacific Islander	0	0		0	0									
White Non-Hispanic	0	0		2	1	50%								
Unknown	0	0		2	2	100%								

Table 6.12. B-STEM Math - Guided or Self Placement - All other High School GPA - Transfer and Unknown/Unreported Goal

	Students Enrolled in Pre-Transfer-Level Sections after Guided or Self Placement			Students Placed Directly in Transfer-Level Sections									Disproportionate Impact (DI) Analysis		
B-STEM Math - Unknown High School GPA with an Educational Goal of Transfer and A176Unknown/Unreported	1. Total Enrolled	2. Subtotal who Completed Transfer-Level Course within One Year	3. Throughput Rate	4. Total Enrolled	5. Subtotal who Completed Transfer-Level Course within One Year**	6. Throughput Rate	7. Throughput Rate Differences	8. Statewide Comparison Throughput Rate	9. Statewide or Local Comparison Rate Used (based on sample size)	10. Maximize Throughput?	11. Decision Conditional on Sample Size?	12. DI Action Level	13. DI Present (PI, if value<.80)	14. DI Present (PPG-1)
Overall	0	0		7	5	71%		63.4%	Statewide	TRUE	Conditional			
African American	0	0		1	1	100%								
Asian	0	0		1	1	100%								
Filipino	0	0		0	0									
Hispanic	0	0		1	0	0%								
Native American/Alaskan Native	0	0		0	0									
Multi-Ethnicity	0	0		2	2	100%								
Pacific Islander	0	0		0	0									
White Non-Hispanic	0	0		2	1	50%								
Unknown	0	0		0	0									

Table 6.13. Math - Guided or Self Placement - Lowest High School GPA Band - Degree Goal

	Students Enrolled in Pre-College-Level Sections after Guided or Self Placement			Students Placed Directly in College-Level Sections									Disproportionate Impact (DI) Analysis		
B-STEM Math - Lowest High School GPA Performance Band with an Educational Goal of Degree	1. Total Enrolled	2. Subtotal who Completed College-Level Course within One Year	3. Throughput Rate	4. Total Enrolled	5. Subtotal who Completed College-Level Course within One Year**	6. Throughput Rate	7. Throughput Rate Differences	8. Statewide Comparison Throughput Rate	9. Statewide or Local Comparison Rate Used (based on sample size)	10. Maximize Throughput?	11. Decision Conditional on Sample Size?	12. DI Action Level	13. DI Present (PI, if value<.80)	14. DI Present (PPG-1)
Overall	0	0		0	0			12%	Statewide		Conditional			
African American	0	0		0	0									
Asian	0	0		0	0									
Filipino	0	0		0	0									
Hispanic	0	0		0	0									
Native American/Alaskan Native	0	0		0	0									
Multi-Ethnicity	0	0		0	0									
Pacific Islander	0	0		0	0									
White Non-Hispanic	0	0		0	0									
Unknown	0	0		0	0									

Table 6.14. Math - Guided or Self Placement - High School GPA Band Unknown - Degree Goal

	Students Enrolled in Pre-College-Level Level after Guided or Self-Placement			Students Placed Directly in College-Level Sections									Disproportionate Impact (DI) Analysis		
B-STEM Math - Unknown High School GPA with an Educational Goal of Degree	1. Total Enrolled	2. Subtotal who Completed College-Level Course within One Year	3. Throughput Rate	4. Total Enrolled	5. Subtotal who Completed College-Level Course within One Year	6. Throughput Rate	7. Throughput Rate Differences	8. Statewide Comparison Throughput Rate	9. Statewide or Local Comparison Rate Used (based on sample size)	10. Maximize Throughput?	11. Decision Conditional on Sample Size?	12. DI Action Level	13. DI Present (PI, if value<.80)	14. DI Present (PPG-1)

Overall	0	0		15	15	100%		**17.0%**	**Statewide**	**TRUE**	**Conditional**				
African American	0	0		0	0										
Asian	0	0		12	12	100%									
Filipino	0	0		0	0										
Hispanic	0	0		0	0										
Native American/Alaskan Native	0	0		0	0										
Multi-Ethnicity	0	0		0	0										
Pacific Islander	0	0		0	0										
White Non-Hispanic	0	0		1	1	100%									
Unknown	0	0		2	2	100%									

Table 6.15. B-STEM Math - Guided or Self Placement - All Other High School GPA Bands - Degree Goal

	Students Enrolled in Pre-College-Level Sections after Guided or Self Placement			**Students Placed Directly in College-Level Sections**								**Disproportionate Impact (DI) Analysis**		
B-STEM Math - All Other High School GPA Bands with an Educational Goal of Degree	**1. Total Enrolled**	**2. Subtotal who Completed College-Level Course within One Year**	**3. Throughput Rate**	**4. Total Enrolled**	**5. Subtotal who Completed College-Level Course within One Year**	**6. Throughput Rate**	**7. Throughput Rate Differences**	**8. Statewide Comparison Throughput Rate**	**9. Statewide or Local Comparison Rate Used (based on sample size)**	**10. Maximize Throughput?**	**11. Decision Conditional on Sample Size?**	**12. DI Action Level**	**13. DI Present (PI, if value<.80)**	**14. DI Present (PPG-1)**
Overall	0	0		0	0			**19.1%**	**Statewide**		**Conditional**			
African American	0	0		0	0									
Asian	0	0		0	0									
Filipino	0	0		0	0									
Hispanic	0	0		0	0									
Native American/Alaskan Native	0	0		0	0									
Multi-Ethnicity	0	0		0	0									
Pacific Islander	0	0		0	0									
White Non-Hispanic	0	0		0	0									
Unknown	0	0		0	0									

Color Legend	
	Enter data here
	No data displayed for this area
	Maximizing throughput/No Substantive DI
	Consider Action - when one of two DI methods shows DI
	Not maximizing throughput/Action Needed - DI Present

Columns Explained	
Columns 1 and 4 - Total Enrolled:	These columns show the number of distinct students enrolled in fall 2019 at census with an educational goal of certificate, degree, and/or transfer (transfer also includes unknown/unreported educational goals) who went through the GSP process and enrolled in a course at pre-degree level or pre-transfer level compared to students who enrolled directly at degree or transfer level. If end of term data is used, include withdraws (EW, MW, and W grades) as enrollment in the course. Column 1 shows the number of students who started at pre-transfer level whether or not they placed at pre-degree level, pre-transfer level, or transfer-level using a GSP model. Column 4 provides the number of students enrolled directly into a college-level or transfer-level course who successfully completed the college-level or transfer-level course within one full academic year, including intersessions. For example, if a student started in a discipline in fall 2019, they would be tracked through completion of the gateway course through the following summer term.
Columns 2 and 5 - Subtotal who Completed Transfer-Level Course within One Year:	These columns demonstrate the number of students placed via GSP and those placed directly into college-level or transfer-level courses out of the total enrolled who successfully completed a college-level or transfer-level course within one year with a C or better. Column 2 reflects the number of students who completed the college-level/transfer-level course by GSP placement model, and Column 5 shows the students who completed a college-level/transfer-level course when placed using high school transcript data.
Columns 3 and 6 - Throughput Rate:	These columns show the percentage of students who successfully completed (C or higher) a transfer-level (or college-level) course within one year. To calculate the throughput rate, divide Column 2 by Column 1 and Column 5 by Column 4 (respectively).
Column 7 - Throughput Rate Differences:	For students with a transfer goal, this column shows the difference in throughput rates between students who successfully completed the transfer-level course after enrolling in a pre-transfer-level course and students who successfully completed transfer-level course sections with or without a corequisite. For students with a degree goal, it shows the difference in throughput rates between students who successfully completed the college-level course after enrolling in a pre-transfer-level course and students who successfully completed college-level course sections with or without a corequisite. The results in Column 7 are calculated by subtracting the number of students in Column 6 from the number in Column 3.
Column 8 - Statewide Comparison Throughput Rate:	See "Tab 10. Methodology" for more details.

Column 9 - Statewide or Local Comparison Rate Used:	Depends on overall sample size in Column 5; see "Tab 10. Methodology" for more details.
Column 10 - Maximize Throughput?:	This column determines if the GSP maximized throughput when compared to the statewide or local throughput rate, per the requirements of AB 705. FALSE means model does NOT maximize throughput, whereas TRUE means model maximizes throughput.
Column 11 - Decision Conditional on Sample Size?:	Based on overall sample size in Column 5; if below a sample size of 100, decision is conditional on statewide throughput rate; if sample size is above 100, decision is not conditional on statewide throughput rate, but is based on local throughput rate.
Column 12 - Disproportionate Impact (DI) Action Level:	If either Column 13 or 14 fall below threshold, then consider action; when both columns fall below threshold, then action is needed. If neither column fall below threshold, then there is no substantive DI. DI is still displayed even if model does not maximize throughput.
Column 13 - DI Present (PI, if value<.80):	The proportionality index addresses the question, “If a subgroup of students represents 45% of the student body, does that subgroup also represent at least 45% of the students who achieve a specific educational outcome?” A proportionality index of 1.00 indicates that a group’s representation among those achieving an educational outcome is identical to that group’s representation in the student population. In contrast, a PI value of less than 1.00 indicates that a group’s representation among those achieving an educational outcome is lower compared to that same group’s representation in the student population. If the proportionality index falls below 80%, then the student group is disproportionately impacted.
Column 14 - DI Present (PPG-1):	The percentage point gap method addresses the question, “Is the difference between the throughput rate of a subgroup and the overall throughput rate (excluding the subgroup) statistically significant?". That is, significance is related to the sample size and the size of the difference. Smaller sample size require larger differences compared to larger sample sizes.

Rows Explained	
Racial/Ethnic Groups:	Disproportionate impact (DI) is also required to be evaluated in assessment processes. Disproportionate impacts are displayed regardless if the model maximizes throughput. In general terms, DI exists when one or more subgroups of students have outcomes that are at a substantially lower level than other groups. The determination of “substantial” is somewhat arbitrary, but a few indices have been created to guide decisions, such as the 80% rule and the proportionality index. If DI is detected, the college is required to plan, implement, and evaluate efforts to eliminate DI.

Foothill College						
		Pre-Transfer or Multi-Term Sequence for Lowest High School GPA Band	Placement Models for Students in the Lowest High School GPA Band	Guided or Self Placement - Lowest High School GPA Band	Guided or Self Placement - High School GPA Unknown	Guided or Self Placement - All Other GPA Levels
English	Does Placement Model Maximize Throughput?	No			Yes	Yes
	Does Placement Model Result in Disproportionate Impact on Some Groups? (Please see "8. Results - Equity" tab for more information)	Yes			No Substantive DI	No Substantive DI
SLAM Math - Transfer Goal	Does Placement Model Maximize Throughput?	No			Yes	Yes
	Does Placement Model Result in Disproportionate Impact on Some Groups? (Please see "8. Results - Equity" tab for more information)	Yes				
SLAM Math - Degree Goal	Does Placement Model Maximize Throughput?	No			Yes	
	Does Placement Model Result in Disproportionate Impact on Some Groups? (Please see "8. Results - Equity" tab for more information)					
B-STEM Math - Transfer Goal	Does Placement Model Maximize Throughput?	No		Yes	Yes	Yes
	Does Placement Model Result in Disproportionate Impact on Some Groups? (Please see "8. Results - Equity" tab for more information)	Yes				
B-STEM Math - Degree Goal	Does Placement Model Maximize Throughput?	Yes			Yes	
	Does Placement Model Result in Disproportionate Impact on Some Groups? (Please see "8. Results - Equity" tab for more information)					

Color Legend	
	Maximizing throughput/No Substantive DI
	Not maximizing throughput/Action Needed - DI Present

Foothill College						
		Innovative Curriculum for Lowest High School GPA Band	Placement Models for Students in the Lowest High School GPA Band	Guided or Self Placement - Lowest High School GPA Band	Guided or Self Placement - High School GPA Unknown	Guided or Self Placement - All Other GPA Levels
		DI Level	DI Level	DI Level	DI Level	DI Level
English	African-American					
	Asian	Action needed			No substantive DI	No substantive DI
	Filipino					
	Hispanic	No substantive DI				
	Native American/Alaskan Native					
	Multi-Ethnicity					
	Pacific Islander	Action needed				
	White Non-Hispanic					
	Unknown					

		Innovative Curriculum for Lowest High School GPA Band	Placement Models for Students in the Lowest High School GPA Band	Guided or Self Placement - Lowest High School GPA Band	Guided or Self Placement - High School GPA Unknown	Guided or Self Placement - All Other GPA Levels
		DI Level	DI Level	DI Level	DI Level	DI Level
SLAM Math - Transfer Goal	African-American					
	Asian					
	Filipino					
	Hispanic	No substantive DI				
	Native American/Pacific Islander					
	Multi-Ethnicity					
	Pacific Islander					
	White Non-Hispanic					
	Unknown	Action needed				

		Innovative Curriculum for Lowest High School GPA Band	Placement Models for Students in the Lowest High School GPA Band	Guided or Self Placement - Lowest High School GPA Band	Guided or Self Placement - High School GPA Unknown	Guided or Self Placement - All Other GPA Levels
		DI Level	DI Level	DI Level	DI Level	DI Level
SLAM Math - Degree Goal	African-American					
	Asian					
	Filipino					
	Hispanic					
	Native American/Pacific Islander					
	Multi-Ethnicity					
	Pacific Islander					
	White Non-Hispanic					
	Unknown					

		Innovative Curriculum for Lowest High School GPA Band	Placement Models for Students in the Lowest High School GPA Band	Guided or Self Placement - Lowest High School GPA Band	Guided or Self Placement - High School GPA Unknown	Guided or Self Placement - All Other GPA Levels
		DI Level	DI Level	DI Level	DI Level	DI Level
B-STEM Math - Transfer Goal	African-American	No substantive DI				
	Asian	Action needed				
	Filipino					
	Hispanic	Action needed				
	Native American/Pacific Islander					
	Multi-Ethnicity	No substantive DI				
	Pacific Islander					
	White Non-Hispanic	No substantive DI				
	Unknown	No substantive DI				

		Innovative Curriculum for Lowest High School GPA Band	Placement Models for Students in the Lowest High School GPA Band	Guided or Self Placement - Lowest High School GPA Band	Guided or Self Placement - High School GPA Unknown	Guided or Self Placement - All Other GPA Levels
		DI Level	DI Level	DI Level	DI Level	DI Level
B-STEM Math - Degree Goal	African-American					
	Asian					
	Filipino					
	Hispanic					
	Native American/Pacific Islander					
	Multi-Ethnicity					
	Pacific Islander					
	White Non-Hispanic					
	Unknown					

Color Legend	
	No Substantive DI
	Consider Action - when one of two DI methods shows DI
	Action Needed - DI Present

Definitions	
Cohort	Include all students who were enrolled at census in Fall 2019 in their FIRST Math course for Math or their FIRST English course for English at census. Include courses appropriate to the students educational goal of degree or transfer. If end of term data are used, include withdraws (EW, MW and W grades) as enrollment in the course.
HSGPA	The measure of cumulative high school GPA collected by the college. Data source can be CalPass, CCCApply (self-reported), or other methods.
GPA Bands	GPA Bands are determined by the following document https://assessmentplacement.squarespace.com/s/0718-AB-705-Implementation-Memorandumpdf.pdf
Subtotal: Completed Transfer-Level or College-Level Course in One Year	The number of students who successfully completed a transfer-level or college-level (as appropriate) course in the discipline (including math courses outside of the math department such as Psychology Statistics) within one year including intersessions (e.g., for fall 2019 cohort, completed a transfer-level course by summer 2020).
Statewide Comparison Throughput Rate	Statewide throughput rate as calculated in Tab 10 is calculated as follows: the sample consists of all students who enrolled in their first math course or first English course in Fall 2019 and that first course represents a transfer-level or college-level course (e.g., students enrolled directly in transfer level course or degree applicable course as appropriate). A one-term completion of the transfer or college-level course is used as the comparison because data for the full 2019-2020 cohort were not yet available. Throughput rates are further disaggregated by HSGPA bands and racial/ethnic categories.
Statewide or Local Comparison Rate Used (based on sample size)	The statewide or local comparison rate as displayed in Tab 10 used for each college is a weighted average of 1-term throughput rates by ethnicity. The weights represent the proportions of ethnicity groups defined by the college. For instance, if a college has 20% Hispanic students, the statewide 1-term throughput rate for Hispanic students is weighted by 0.2.
Reference Rate for Unknown HSGPA	Unknown HSGPA statewide reference rate is a weighted average of the three HSGPA bands. The weight represents the sample proportion of the three HSGPA bands (see tab 10 for actual proportions). For instance, if students with HSGPA<1.9 represent 20% of all students with known HSGPA, the throughput rate for students with HSGPA<1.9 is weighted by o.2 towards the unknown HSGPA throughput rate.
Statewide vs. Local Reference Rate	If the cohort of students enrolled directly in transfer-level courses is fewer than 100 students, the statewide throughput rate for students enrolled directly in transfer level courses is used as comparison or reference to determine if throughput is maximized in each scenario. If College Cohort of students enrolled directly in transfer-level courses is 100 students or more, the college throughput rate for students directly placed into transfer level courses is used as reference.
Disproportionate Impact Methodology	Disproportionate Impact (DI) uses both the percentage point gap method (PPG-1) as well as the proportionality index (with a 0.8 cutoff) to check for DI. If one method indicates DI, the cell is highlighted yellow and the field indicates "Consider action." If both methodologies indicate DI, the cell is highlighted red and the field indicates "Action needed." If neither methodology indicates DI, the field indicates "No substantive DI."[1]
Degree/Transfer Students	Transfer (or undecided) seeking students (SB14= A,B,M), Degree seeking students (SB14=C)

[1] ***http://www.sdmesa.edu/about-mesa/institutional-effectiveness/institutional-research/data-warehouse/data-reports/Equity%20Calculations%20Explained.pdf***

Directions: Enter data into the blue cells in Table 10.1 only. All other cells are populated automatically. These data are used to populate the other tables in the form to provide a statewide comparison throughput rate.

Color Legend	
	Enter data here

Foothill College

Table 10.1. Fall 2019 Cohort: All students with a degree or transfer goal whose first enrollment in English or first enrollment in Math was in Fall 2019

	Student headcount (N)	%
African American	67	3.8%
Asian	494	28.3%
Hispanic	466	26.7%
Native American	4	0.2%
Pacific Islander	23	1.3%
Two or more races	275	15.8%
Unknown	51	2.9%
White	366	21.0%
Total	1746	

Table 10.2. College Throughput Reference Rates Degree and Transfer Goal Students

		Reference Rate Degree/Transfer Goal	Reference Rate Transfer Goal	Degree Goal
English	**GSP reference rate**	67.6%		
	HS GPA<1.9	40.5%		
	HS GPA≥1.9 and <2.6	52.5%		
	HS GPA≥2.6	76.9%		
	GPA >=1.9	70.2%		
	Total	70.2%		
Math SLAM	**GSP reference rate**	64.6%	64.8%	23.7%
	HS GPA<2.3	27.6%	27.5%	4.2%
	HS GPA≥2.3 and <3.0	43.1%	43.3%	19.2%
	HS GPA≥3.0	65.1%	65.3%	23.9%
	GPA >=2.3	64.9%	65.1%	23.9%
	Total	56.3%	56.5%	38.7%
Math B-STEM	**GSP reference rate**	66.1%	54.4%	17.0%
	HS GPA<2.6	72.7%	32.0%	11.7%
	HS GPA≥2.6 and <3.4	52.4%	52.5%	21.7%
	HS GPA≥3.4	72.7%	72.9%	16.8%
	GPA >=2.3	65.0%	63.4%	19.1%
	Total	56.3%	56.5%	38.7%

Table 10.3 Fall 2019 Statewide Throughput Rates by GPA and Ethnicity - Degree, Transfer, or Undecided Goal Students

	English			Math SLAM			Math B-STEM		
	HSGPA Bands	**1-year TP rate**	**N**	**HSGPA Bands**	**1-year TP Rate**	**N**	**HSGPA Bands**	**1-year TP Rate**	**N**
African American	HS GPA≥2.6	63.2%	2169	HS GPA≥3.0	48.3%	874	HS GPA≥3.4	59.1%	328

Asian	HS GPA≥2.6	82.6%	7954	HS GPA≥3.0	75.0%	5700	HS GPA≥3.4	80.8%	3373
Hispanic	HS GPA≥2.6	71.5%	30931	HS GPA≥3.0	58.1%	13995	HS GPA≥3.4	67.8%	6313
Native American	HS GPA≥2.6	65.2%	221	HS GPA≥3.0		94	HS GPA≥3.4		38
Pacific Islander	HS GPA≥2.6	62.7%	284	HS GPA≥3.0		131	HS GPA≥3.4		53
Two or more races	HS GPA≥2.6	76.7%	2880	HS GPA≥3.0	65.7%	1618	HS GPA≥3.4	73.0%	886
Unknown	HS GPA≥2.6	75.7%	4396	HS GPA≥3.0	64.9%	2267	HS GPA≥3.4	73.7%	1154
White	HS GPA≥2.6	80.0%	14453	HS GPA≥3.0	68.1%	8413	HS GPA≥3.4	75.3%	4717
African American	HS GPA≥1.9 and <2.6	44.7%	1345	HS GPA≥2.3 and <3.0	31.0%	885	HS GPA≥2.6 and <3.4	39.3%	1067
Asian	HS GPA≥1.9 and <2.6	59.1%	1542	HS GPA≥2.3 and <3.0	53.7%	2118	HS GPA≥2.6 and <3.4	62.7%	3802
Hispanic	HS GPA≥1.9 and <2.6	48.1%	15535	HS GPA≥2.3 and <3.0	35.1%	11457	HS GPA≥2.6 and <3.4	44.5%	14715
Native American	HS GPA≥1.9 and <2.6		124	HS GPA≥2.3 and <3.0		78	HS GPA≥2.6 and <3.4		104
Pacific Islander	HS GPA≥1.9 and <2.6		115	HS GPA≥2.3 and <3.0		112	HS GPA≥2.6 and <3.4		146
Two or more races	HS GPA≥1.9 and <2.6	51.0%	780	HS GPA≥2.3 and <3.0	41.8%	759	HS GPA≥2.6 and <3.4	52.4%	1226
Unknown	HS GPA≥1.9 and <2.6	51.2%	1591	HS GPA≥2.3 and <3.0	36.6%	1400	HS GPA≥2.6 and <3.4	49.5%	2007
White	HS GPA≥1.9 and <2.6	55.6%	3179	HS GPA≥2.3 and <3.0	46.3%	3459	HS GPA≥2.6 and <3.4	55.2%	6077
African American	HS GPA<1.9	32.8%	536	HS GPA<2.3	19.6%	587	HS GPA<2.6	20.8%	951
Asian	HS GPA<1.9	49.0%	337	HS GPA<2.3	35.7%	636	HS GPA<2.6	41.5%	1279
Hispanic	HS GPA<1.9	34.2%	5726	HS GPA<2.3	20.0%	6276	HS GPA<2.6	24.0%	10700
Native American	HS GPA<1.9		41	HS GPA<2.3		57	HS GPA<2.6		87
Pacific Islander	HS GPA<1.9		39	HS GPA<2.3		54	HS GPA<2.6		98
Two or more races	HS GPA<1.9	35.0%	243	HS GPA<2.3	25.8%	330	HS GPA<2.6	29.6%	595
Unknown	HS GPA<1.9	39.2%	561	HS GPA<2.3	23.2%	706	HS GPA<2.6	25.1%	1212
White	HS GPA<1.9	45.8%	722	HS GPA<2.3	31.7%	1019	HS GPA<2.6	35.9%	2097
African American	GPA Unknown	60.9%	1128	GPA Unknown	50.0%	626	GPA Unknown	50.0%	626
Asian	GPA Unknown	82.0%	3261	GPA Unknown	77.0%	2848	GPA Unknown	77.0%	2848
Hispanic	GPA Unknown	66.0%	6438	GPA Unknown	52.5%	3958	GPA Unknown	52.5%	3958
Native American	GPA Unknown		97	GPA Unknown		73	GPA Unknown		73
Pacific Islander	GPA Unknown		94	GPA Unknown		60	GPA Unknown		60
Two or more races	GPA Unknown	70.3%	583	GPA Unknown	58.0%	448	GPA Unknown	58.0%	448
Unknown	GPA Unknown	75.2%	1676	GPA Unknown	69.8%	1207	GPA Unknown	69.8%	1207
White	GPA Unknown	76.2%	4295	GPA Unknown	68.1%	3149	GPA Unknown	68.1%	3149
African American	Total	54.7%	5178	Total	37.8%	2972	Total	37.8%	2972
Asian	Total	78.8%	13094	Total	69.3%	11302	Total	69.3%	11302
Hispanic	Total	61.1%	58630	Total	43.4%	35686	Total	43.4%	35686
Native American	Total	58.0%	483	Total	42.4%	302	Total	42.4%	302
Pacific Islander	Total	57.0%	532	Total	43.1%	357	Total	43.1%	357
Two or more races	Total	69.2%	4486	Total	54.7%	3155	Total	54.7%	3155
Unknown	Total	68.4%	8224	Total	53.6%	5580	Total	53.6%	5580
White	Total	74.8%	22649	Total	61.1%	16040	Total	61.1%	16040
Total	HS GPA≥2.6	75.0%	63288	HS GPA≥3.0	64.1%	33092	HS GPA≥3.4	73.0%	16862
Total	HS GPA≥1.9 and <2.6	49.9%	24211	HS GPA≥2.3 and <3.0	39.2%	20268	HS GPA≥2.6 and <3.4	49.6%	29144
Total	HS GPA<1.9	36.2%	8205	HS GPA<2.3	22.7%	9665	HS GPA<2.6	26.9%	17019
Total	GPA Unknown	72.1%	17572	GPA Unknown	63.8%	12369	GPA Unknown	63.8%	12369
Total	Total	66.4%	113276	Total	52.0%	75394	Total	52.0%	75394

Note: Throughput rate suppressed for ethnic groups with N<200. Only students with degree/transfer goals

Table 10.4 Fall 2019 Statewide Throughput Rates by GPA and Ethnicity - Math SLAM by Ed Goal

	Math SLAM - Transfer (or undecided) Goal			Math SLAM - Degree Goal		
	HSGPA	**1-year TP rate**	**N**	**HSGPA**	**1-year TP Rate**	**N**
African American	HS GPA≥3.0	48.80%	832	HS GPA≥3.0		56
Asian	HS GPA≥3.0	75.12%	5607	HS GPA≥3.0		114
Hispanic	HS GPA≥3.0	58.32%	13449	HS GPA≥3.0	45.59%	703
Native American	HS GPA≥3.0		88	HS GPA≥3.0		7
Pacific Islander	HS GPA≥3.0		126	HS GPA≥3.0		5

Two or more races	HS GPA≥3.0	65.86%	1570	HS GPA≥3.0		60
Unknown	HS GPA≥3.0	65.29%	2198	HS GPA≥3.0		89
White	HS GPA≥3.0	68.46%	8110	HS GPA≥3.0	56.00%	366
African American	HS GPA≥2.3 and <3.0	30.96%	843	HS GPA≥2.3 and <3.0		61
Asian	HS GPA≥2.3 and <3.0	53.78%	2079	HS GPA≥2.3 and <3.0		63
Hispanic	HS GPA≥2.3 and <3.0	35.11%	10948	HS GPA≥2.3 and <3.0	38.95%	732
Native American	HS GPA≥2.3 and <3.0		76	HS GPA≥2.3 and <3.0		4
Pacific Islander	HS GPA≥2.3 and <3.0		105	HS GPA≥2.3 and <3.0		9
Two or more races	HS GPA≥2.3 and <3.0	42.37%	727	HS GPA≥2.3 and <3.0		51
Unknown	HS GPA≥2.3 and <3.0	36.79%	1351	HS GPA≥2.3 and <3.0		64
White	HS GPA≥2.3 and <3.0	46.53%	3310	HS GPA≥2.3 and <3.0	41.79%	237
African American	HS GPA<2.3	19.39%	557	HS GPA<2.3		58
Asian	HS GPA<2.3	35.63%	609	HS GPA<2.3		44
Hispanic	HS GPA<2.3	20.14%	5885	HS GPA<2.3	15.73%	734
Native American	HS GPA<2.3		51	HS GPA<2.3		8
Pacific Islander	HS GPA<2.3		51	HS GPA<2.3		4
Two or more races	HS GPA<2.3	25.16%	310	HS GPA<2.3		34
Unknown	HS GPA<2.3	22.73%	682	HS GPA<2.3		46
White	HS GPA<2.3	31.64%	945	HS GPA<2.3		128
African American	GPA Unknown	50.18%	562	GPA Unknown		127
Asian	GPA Unknown	77.17%	2694	GPA Unknown	75.38%	247
Hispanic	GPA Unknown	52.70%	3683	GPA Unknown	45.81%	468
Native American	GPA Unknown		68	GPA Unknown		9
Pacific Islander	GPA Unknown		56	GPA Unknown		6
Two or more races	GPA Unknown	59.62%	416	GPA Unknown		52
Unknown	GPA Unknown	69.78%	1135	GPA Unknown		108
White	GPA Unknown	68.33%	2908	GPA Unknown	57.80%	412
African American	Total	37.83%	2794	Total	30.48%	302
Asian	Total	69.40%	10989	Total	61.61%	468
Hispanic	Total	43.61%	33965	Total	32.86%	2637
Native American	Total	41.70%	283	Total		28
Pacific Islander	Total	42.60%	338	Total		24
Two or more races	Total	55.18%	3023	Total		197
Unknown	Total	53.65%	5366	Total	32.88%	307
White	Total	61.40%	15273	Total	49.25%	1143
Total	HS GPA≥3.0	64.40%	31980	HS GPA≥3.0	49.58%	1400
Total	HS GPA≥2.3 and <3.0	39.29%	19439	HS GPA≥2.3 and <3.0	36.65%	1221
Total	HS GPA<2.3	22.72%	9090	HS GPA<2.3	18.43%	1056
Total	GPA Unknown	64.10%	11522	GPA Unknown	52.11%	1429
Total	Total	52.31%	72031	Total	38.44%	5106

Note: Throughput rate suppressed for ethnic groups with N<200.

Table 10.5 Fall 2019 Statewide Throughput Rates by GPA and Ethnicity - Math BSTEM by Ed Goal

	Math BSTEM - Transfer (or undecided) Goal			Math BSTEM - Degree Goal		
	HSGPA	**1-year TP rate**	**N**	**HSGPA**	**1-year TP Rate**	**N**
African American	HS GPA≥3.4	59.69%	320	HS GPA≥3.4		14
Asian	HS GPA≥3.4	80.97%	3327	HS GPA≥3.4		55
Hispanic	HS GPA≥3.4	68.01%	6093	HS GPA≥3.4	63.04%	272
Native American	HS GPA≥3.4		35	HS GPA≥3.4		4
Pacific Islander	HS GPA≥3.4		52	HS GPA≥3.4		1
Two or more races	HS GPA≥3.4	73.33%	866	HS GPA≥3.4		28
Unknown	HS GPA≥3.4	74.26%	1119	HS GPA≥3.4		45
White	HS GPA≥3.4	75.47%	4553	HS GPA≥3.4		184
African American	HS GPA≥2.6 and <3.4	39.42%	1002	HS GPA≥2.6 and <3.4		83

Asian	HS GPA≥2.6 and <3.4	62.66%	3728	HS GPA≥2.6 and <3.4		101
Hispanic	HS GPA≥2.6 and <3.4	44.63%	14099	HS GPA≥2.6 and <3.4	40.32%	835
Native American	HS GPA≥2.6 and <3.4		100	HS GPA≥2.6 and <3.4		5
Pacific Islander	HS GPA≥2.6 and <3.4		136	HS GPA≥2.6 and <3.4		11
Two or more races	HS GPA≥2.6 and <3.4	52.69%	1173	HS GPA≥2.6 and <3.4		66
Unknown	HS GPA≥2.6 and <3.4	49.74%	1940	HS GPA≥2.6 and <3.4		86
White	HS GPA≥2.6 and <3.4	55.53%	5842	HS GPA≥2.6 and <3.4	52.05%	326
African American	HS GPA<2.6	20.77%	910	HS GPA<2.6		78
Asian	HS GPA<2.6	41.69%	1240	HS GPA<2.6		65
Hispanic	HS GPA<2.6	24.14%	10090	HS GPA<2.6	20.26%	1062
Native American	HS GPA<2.6		80	HS GPA<2.6		10
Pacific Islander	HS GPA<2.6		94	HS GPA<2.6		6
Two or more races	HS GPA<2.6	29.40%	568	HS GPA<2.6		51
Unknown	HS GPA<2.6	24.83%	1172	HS GPA<2.6		68
White	HS GPA<2.6	36.09%	1970	HS GPA<2.6	30.00%	221
African American	GPA Unknown	50.18%	562	GPA Unknown		127
Asian	GPA Unknown	77.17%	2694	GPA Unknown	75.38%	247
Hispanic	GPA Unknown	52.70%	3683	GPA Unknown	45.81%	468
Native American	GPA Unknown		68	GPA Unknown		9
Pacific Islander	GPA Unknown		56	GPA Unknown		6
Two or more races	GPA Unknown	59.62%	416	GPA Unknown		52
Unknown	GPA Unknown	69.78%	1135	GPA Unknown		108
White	GPA Unknown	68.33%	2908	GPA Unknown	57.80%	412
African American	Total	37.83%	2794	Total	30.48%	302
Asian	Total	69.40%	10989	Total	61.61%	468
Hispanic	Total	43.61%	33965	Total	32.86%	2637
Native American	Total	41.70%	283	Total		28
Pacific Islander	Total	42.60%	338	Total		24
Two or more races	Total	55.18%	3023	Total		197
Unknown	Total	53.65%	5366	Total	32.88%	307
White	Total	61.40%	15273	Total	49.25%	1143
Total	HS GPA≥3.4	73.23%	16365	HS GPA≥3.4	62.50%	603
Total	HS GPA≥2.6 and <3.4	49.81%	28020	HS GPA≥2.6 and <3.4	41.56%	1513
Total	HS GPA<2.6	27.02%	16124	HS GPA<2.6	22.18%	1561
Total	GPA Unknown	64.10%	11522	GPA Unknown	52.11%	1429
Total	Total	52.31%	72031	Total	38.44%	5106

Note: Throughput rate suppressed for ethnic groups with N<200.

Data calculated on a data file provided to the MMAP team with data through fall 2019. Data file created: 07-17-2020