

# ***PROGRESS REPORT***

Submitted by

Mission College  
3000 Mission College Blvd.  
Santa Clara, CA 95054-1804

A college of the

West Valley-Mission Community College District

to

The Accrediting Commission for Community and  
Junior Colleges

Western Association of Schools and Colleges

April 1, 2007

# Table of Contents

Statement of Preparation .....	iii
Progress Report on Recommendation Two .....	1
Board Agenda Item .....	18
Appendices .....	24

## STATEMENT OF REPORT PREPARATION

This report was prepared under the direction of the interim President of Mission College, Dr. Harriett J. Robles, in collaboration with Dr. Jonathan Brennan, faculty Accreditation Liaison Officer. The report was reviewed on February 21 and 28, 2007, by the College's principal shared governance body, the Governance and Planning Committee (GAP), which also serves as the Accreditation Steering Committee. It was reviewed by the Academic Senate on March 1, 2007. It was subsequently reviewed by the Chancellor and the District Council. The final report was presented to the Board of Trustees of the West Valley-Mission Community College District on March 15, 2007.

---

Dr. Harriett J. Robles  
Interim President, Mission College

Date

**MISSION COLLEGE  
PROGRESS REPORT  
April 1, 2007**

**Recommendation 2: The team recommends that Mission College develop, implement, and regularly assess the results of its recruitment, retention, and success plan for underrepresented faculty, staff, and students. (Standards 2.6, 4A.1, 5.7, 7D.2)**

In October 2006, Mission College submitted a progress report on the above recommendation as required by the Accrediting Commission. On January 31, 2007, the Commission notified the College that its report had been accepted. However, the Commission requested “a more complete report that fully articulates and demonstrates evidence of the work Mission College has done to complete work on the recommendation” to be submitted by March 15. Because the WVMCCD Board of Trustees would not be able to review the report prior to March 15, the Accrediting Commission approved an extension until April 1, 2007. Following is the College’s expanded report on its recruitment, retention and success planning for underrepresented faculty, staff and students.

Not noted in the October 2006 report was the fact that both colleges in the West Valley-Mission Community College District were operating under work-to-contract status, which had a major impact on the College’s progress since its October 2005 progress report. The Academic Senates implemented a resolution on March 15, 2006 that halted faculty participation on all committees, including accreditation, the College’s Student Equity Committee and the District Faculty and Staff Diversity Advisory Council. The Classified Senates also supported the resolution and suspended committee work effective March 15, 2006. Without full faculty and staff participation, many activities and initiatives came to a halt. Faculty participation in committees did not resume until November 2, 2006. Many committees were not able to schedule and resume their activities in the time remaining in the fall semester. The Classified Senate did not lift its resolution until February 7, 2007. Thus, some committees only resumed their activities beginning in February 2007. In spite of the work-to-contract environment, the College was able to continue its data collection efforts and was therefore prepared to move forward when the committees reconvened.

**Faculty and Staff:**

As noted in the College’s progress report of October 15, 2006, Mission College determined that the most effective approach to the development of a recruitment, retention and success plan for its faculty and staff would be to develop its plan in collaboration with the District and the District Faculty and Staff Diversity Advisory Council. In spite of the work-to-contract situation, one meeting was scheduled

during fall 2006 (See Attachment A for minutes), but substantive progress was made only after the work-to-contract resolution was lifted. At its February 5, 2007 meeting, the Diversity Council established subcommittees to work on different diversity-related activities. One group is drafting an updated diversity plan using the criteria from the Model Equal Employment Opportunity Plan and Guidelines for California Community Colleges/2006 as its starting point. (Because of the substantial length of the model plan, a copy is not included with this report but can be accessed at <http://www.cccco.edu/divisions/grea/eeo/eeo.htm>.) The time line for a first draft of this plan remains the same as indicated in the previous progress report: spring 2007. A second group is working with District Human Resources to devise standardized and easy-to-read formatting for data reports. A third group is drafting a diversity survey (Attachment K) for distribution to the full District community, with the possibility of targeted focus groups following this survey. Finally, college researchers have been assigned to work on further and expanded updates to this report.

While data are being collected for both colleges and the District, the Accrediting Commission's recommendation was to Mission College. Thus, our focus here is the data related to the recruitment and retention for Mission College faculty, staff and administration. Following is a summary of the data and the College researcher's analysis. This information is organized according to the five stages of the hiring process: (1) application; (2) submission/representation; (3) review of minimum qualifications; (4) interview selection; (5) finalist selection/selection for hire. At this time, data are broken down primarily by ethnicity. The college's research office will further break down the data by gender and by disability status across the hiring process stages.

Supporting documentation for faculty/staff is attached as follows:

- Attachment B: Mission College Hiring Process Statistical Breakdown: How to Read These Tables
- Attachment C: District Summary
- Attachment D: Mission Summary 05-06 All
- Attachment E: Mission Summary 05-06 without PT Faculty
- Attachment F: Mission Summary 04-05 without PT Faculty
- Attachment G: Summary data sets: Clerical, Executive, Professional, Service, Skilled, Technical, Faculty (FT), Faculty (PT)
- Attachment H: Comparison with County Demographics
- Attachment I: Faculty Retention
- Attachment J: Detail data sets: Clerical, Executive, Professional, Service, Skilled, Technical, Faculty (FT), Faculty (PT)
- Attachment K: Faculty/Staff Survey (Draft)

Stage 1. Application Submission/Representation:

In the academic year 2005-2006, Mission College conducted 62 searches for potential employment, including all categories of staff, faculty, and

administration. In some cases the same search served the purpose of filling more than one position, while others were for a position not at 100% of full-time equivalency. The vast majority of searches were for single positions, however. Of the 62 searches, 15 of them (or 24.2%) resulted in a failed search.

Reviewing all searches at Mission College as a whole, the 62 search processes resulted in the receipt of 683 applications for employment. Applications submitted by females were more than double those submitted by males, 61.2% versus 30.0% respectively (remaining percentage is of unknown sex). This compares to application submissions of 54.1% by females and 36.9% by males to the West Valley Mission Community College District (WVMCCD) as a whole over the same time period.

When excluding part-time faculty, the percentage of application submissions to Mission College by females is even higher, with a rate of 65.3% in 2005-2006. This rate is 9 percentage points higher than the 2004-2005 rate of 56.3%, indicating the gap between male and female applicants may be growing.

Looking at specific occupation categories, Professional Non-Faculty positions (100% of 3 applicants) and Clerical/Secretarial positions (78.2% of 174 applicants) experienced the highest percentages of female applicants. In contrast, Executive/Administrative/Management positions had the lowest percentage of female applicants at 45.6% of 68 applicants.

Disability status of applicants, where known, ranged from 0.0% to 12.8% of applicants, with the college overall rate at 8.6% of applicants. This compares to a rate of 8.8% for the WVMCCD as a whole.

Turning to ethnicity, the highest percentage of applicants overall to Mission College were self-reported as White, with 40.8% of all applications. The lowest percentage of White applicants was for Technical/Paraprofessional positions (at 28.2%) and the highest percentage of White applicants was for Professional Non-Faculty positions (at 66.7%). White applicants represented the highest percentage of applicants in all position categories, with the exception of Technical/Paraprofessional in which Asian/Pacific Islander applicants made up 43.6% of applicants. The overall rate of White applicants for the WVMCCD was 46.8%.

American Indian/Native Alaskan applicants represented the lowest percentage of applicants across all position categories, with only 0.7% of applicants overall to Mission. Notably, the American Indian/Native Alaskan population in Santa Clara County, where Mission College is

located, is also quite low at 0.3% as of the 2005 American Community Survey, published by the U.S. Census Bureau.

Of applicants with known ethnicity, Hispanic applicants and Asian/Pacific Islander applicants had lower levels of application relative to the Santa Clara County population (14.1% versus 25.0% for Hispanic and 26.1 versus 30.3 for Asian). It should be noted, however, that overall population demographics likely differ greatly from the demographics that make up the labor pool when viewed by different job categories. A comparison to the demographics of the available labor pool by job category is planned for a later round of analysis.

When excluding part-time faculty, the percentage of application submissions to Mission College in 2005-2006 remains relatively consistent to the percentages including part-time faculty—although the percentage of White applicants is somewhat lower at 36.9%. Comparing the percentage to 2004-2005, however, shows that White applicants—while still representing the largest proportion of submissions—no longer make up half of all applications, dropping a full 13.6 percentage points. African-American and Hispanic applicants appear to be the primary reason for the change, growing by 3.9 and 6.7 percentage points respectively between 2004-2005 and 2005-2006.

## Stage 2. Review of Minimum Qualifications:

The number of applications received does not necessarily translate into the number of viable candidates, as some applicants submit applications deemed to not have met minimum qualifications. The second stage of the hiring process is a review of applications to see if minimum qualifications have been met as determined by the reviewers.

Looking at the transition from application to meeting minimum qualifications, African-American applicants fall out of the process at a higher rate than any other ethnic category, with the exception of those applicants with unknown ethnicity. At the conclusion of this stage, 85.1% of African-American applicants were found to meet minimum qualifications, and 78.2% of those with unknown ethnicity. This compares to a rate of 88.1% of all applicant groups combined. The group with the highest rate at this stage is Hispanic applicants, with 91.7% being found to have met minimum qualifications.

Comparing 2004-2005 to 2005-2006 through the exclusion of part-time faculty, one finds relatively similar patterns—although rates of meeting minimum qualifications are lower across the board in 2004-2005 (combined rate of 74.7%) than in 2005-2006 (combined rate of 89.8%). Hispanic applicants have the highest rate of success at this stage in both

years (77.0% in 2004-2005 and 92.3% in 2005-2006). Relative to when part-time faculty are included, African-American applicants are judged to meet minimum qualifications at slightly higher rates, no longer representing the group falling out the most (instead, that group is American Indian/Alaskan Native in 2004-2005 with 40.0% and applicants of unknown ethnicity in 2005-2006 with 86.0%).

While there is variation from one category of position to another, there is no identifiable pattern of variation, nor any particular type of position with notable trends. The largest variation appears to occur for applicants of unknown ethnicity.

One anomaly at this stage is American Indian/Alaskan Native applicants who actually have a higher than 100% rate due to 2 additional applicants being included at this stage than at the application received stage (WVMCCD is being contacted to verify whether this is accurate).

### Stage 3. Selection to be Asked to Interview:

The third stage of the hiring process involves committee review and discussion of applications to determine which applicants will be asked to participate in an interview.

When compared to the starting pools of all applicants, the percentage of applicants asked to participate in an interview is a combined rate of 45.4%. Overall variability ranges from 32.1% for those of unknown ethnicity and 40.0% for American Indian/Alaskan Native up to 52.1% for Hispanic applicants. If American Indian/Alaskan Native applicants and applicants of unknown ethnicity are excluded, variation at this stage ranges from 43.8% (Asian/Pacific Islander) to 52.1% (for Hispanic).

One note on American Indian/Alaskan Native applicants: the total determined as having met minimum qualifications is 6 applicants, a low number that would not be viewed as statistically robust. This means that even very small differences in totals (1 or 2 applicants) can result in very large differences in percentages (tens of percentages). Large swings will occur in percentages simply due to the mathematics of looking at such a small total and may not reflect actual trends within the group. As a result, inclusion of American Indian/Alaskan Native applicants in group comparisons creates difficulty. Statistically speaking, it is prudent to exclude this group from comparisons with full recognition that numbers for American Indian/Alaskan Native applicants are certainly low no matter how they are presented.

If cross-year comparisons are made by excluding part-time faculty, the findings are nearly identical, although slightly lower percentages are found

in 2004-2005 than in 2005-2006. Combining all groups, 35.1% of total applicants were asked to interview in 2004-2005 versus 40.6 in 2005-2006.

Another perspective at this stage in the process is to look at how many candidates were selected for possible interview from the respective pools of applicants determined to have met minimum qualifications. The overall combined rate of being invited to interview is 51.5%. Again, American Indian/Alaskan Native and unknown ethnicity applicants are the two groups with lowest rates for being asked to participate in an interview (33.3% and 41.0% respectively). If those two groups are again excluded, variation ranges from 51.0% for Asian/Pacific Islander applicants to 56.8% for Hispanic applicants.

Looking specifically at Technical/Paraprofessional positions among those meeting minimum qualifications, Asian/Pacific Islander applicants have a rate of 93.3% of being invited to interview. This is higher than for other position categories, as Asian/Pacific Islander invitations in remaining categories range from 24.0% (Faculty Full Time) to 76.9% (Executive/Administrative/Management). Asian/Pacific Islander applicants do appear overall to have the most variability at this stage across position types.

Comparing only those applicants meeting minimum qualifications in 2004-2005 to 2005-2006 by excluding part-time faculty, there are slight differences in terms of which ethnicity is asked to interview the most, but overall variation is quite small in both years. For 2004-2005, those meeting minimum qualifications who were asked to interview ranged from 44.4% for Asian/Pacific Islander applicants to 53.3% for African Americans (combined rate of 47.0%). For 2005-2006, the combined rate for all groups was 45.2% with American Indian/Alaskan Natives at the low end (20.0%) and Hispanic applicants at the high end (51.4%). Again, it should be noted that American Indian/Alaskan Native applicants are very few to start.

#### Stage 4. Selection as a Finalist:

Looking at the next stage of the hiring process, 22.5% of all applicants combined, and 25.6% of all applicants determined to have met minimum qualifications were selected as finalists.

For all applicants, variation ranges from lows of 16.7 % (unknown) and 18.5% (Asian/Pacific Islander) to a high of 26.9% for White applicants. When looking at only those applicants viewed to have met minimum qualifications, the upper range is again among White applicants (29.5%),

with the lows being for American Indian/Native Alaskan (16.7%), Unknown (21.3%) and Asian/Pacific Islander (21.6%).

Again there is a fair amount of variation from one category of position to another, but no identifiable pattern of variation, nor any particular type of position with notable trends.

Excluding part-time hires to allow for 2005-2006 comparison to 2004-2005 reveals an interesting change in result. While both 2005-2006 and 2004-2005 share similar results, both vary a fair amount from the 2005-2006 results which include part-time faculty. In particular, White applicants do not represent the highest percentage of finalists in either year, whether looking at total applicants or only those who met minimum qualifications. Instead, White applicants fall behind a few other categories in both years, with African-American representing the greatest percentage of finalists among those meeting minimum qualifications (20.0%) in 2004-2005 and Asian/Pacific Islander the greatest percentage (21.1%) in 2005-2006. Again though, overall variation from low to high is minimal in both years.

#### Stage 5. Selection for Hire:

The final stage of the hiring process is selection for hire, although it should be noted that not all candidates selected as this stage accept the offer for employment and thus there are more applicants selected than actual positions hired.

Of the original 683 applications received, 15.4%, or 105 of this total are ultimately selected for hire. Of candidates considered to have met minimum qualifications, the rate of selection for hire is slightly higher, with a rate of 17.4% for the entire college. This compares to an overall rate of 14.2% for those in the WVMCC District who also met minimum qualifications, and 11.6% of all applicants.

American Indian/Alaskan Native applications had an overall rate of 20% of applicants being selected (16.7% of those meeting minimum qualifications). Remember, however, that total applications number at 6. For purposes of further discussion, this group will be excluded from comparisons.

One interesting finding is that the group found to meet minimum qualifications at the highest rate, Hispanics (at a rate of 91.7%), did not have the highest rate of ultimate selection even when looking only at those applicants who met minimum qualifications. In fact, among minimum qualification passers, Hispanic applicants were selected at a rate of 15.9%--lower than the all groups combined rate of 17.4%. Asian/Pacific Islander applicants met minimum qualifications at a rate of 86.0%, but

were selected for hire at a rate of 13.1%. The group with the lowest rate of selection, however, was the group with unknown ethnicity (9.8% of the unknown group meeting minimum qualifications, and 7.7% of all unknown candidates).

Also of note is that White applicants were the only group among all those meeting minimum qualifications which was selected for hire at a rate (22.4%) higher than the all groups combined rate (combined rate of 17.4%; note that African-Americans were essentially at the combined rate with 17.5%). Similarly, when looking at all candidates, White applicants continued on to final selection at a rate of 20.4%--higher than the combined rate of 15.4%--and the only group to do so at a higher than combined rate if American Indian/Native Alaskan applicants are excluded from comparison (20.0% rate).

Comparison of 2004-2005 to 2005-2006 adds some further consideration when looking at who is finally selected for hire. Since it is necessary to remove part-time faculty from analysis to compare the years, this removal shows that a large number of White applicants are being selected among the part-time faculty. Once part-time faculty are removed from the picture, the distribution of final selection is markedly different—with White applicants no longer making up the majority of selections for hire in either year. Looking at applicants who met initial qualifications, the highest selections for hire goes to applicants of unknown ethnicity (10.5%) and Hispanic applicants (8.5%) in 2004-2005 and to Asian/Pacific Islander applicants in 2005-2006. In fact, without part-time faculty in 2005-2006, White applicants make up a smaller percentage of selections for hire than is the combined average (5.4% versus 6.4% for all applicants, 5.9% versus 7.1% among applicants meeting minimum qualifications).

Even with these fairly significant differences, when comparing selection rates based on data including part-time faculty to selection rates based on data without part-time faculty, there is not evidence of straightforward favoritism within the category of part-time hiring. Looking specifically at part-time faculty applicants found to have met minimum qualifications, one finds that White applicants do not make up the highest percentage of successful selections for hire—instead that group is African-American applicants at 62.5%. White applicants do make up the second highest selection rate at 56%. However, this is not dramatically higher than the combined rate for all part-time faculty applicants of 48.3%.

Returning to the total numbers for 2005-2006, while White applicants become selected at a higher rate as a percentage of all same-ethnicity applicants found to have met minimum qualification standards, this occurs without White applicants consistently being selected at the highest rate among the position categories. In fact, if one looks at all categories of

positions and which applicant group has the highest rate of selection for that category, White applicants have the highest rate of selection for only one group—Professional Non-Faculty positions. Instead, White applicants reach an overall level of “first place” among all jobs by reaching “second” and “third place” within many categories of positions.

Overall, while it is true that White applicants make up the highest percentage of applicants by far (40.8% of 2005-2006, including part-time faculty), the above percentages are based on same-ethnicity groupings, not overall applications. In other words, even with fewer total applicants, each grouping of applicants mathematically has an equal chance of achieving a particular rate or percentage of selection. It is possible, however, that the significantly large number of White applicants does play a role, as perhaps having more total applications also results in having more top candidates (realizing that meeting minimum qualifications does not equal being a top candidate). In any case, the high percentage of White applicants to start with, as well as the high percentage of those who are selected for hire both among those meeting minimum qualifications and those not—warrants further consideration.

#### Beyond Hiring. Retention:

Assuming candidates successfully complete the hiring process with an offer and acceptance of a position, not all faculty and staff remain with the college. While Mission College has a large number of employees who have spent five years, ten years, or even longer with the College, many employees also leave after much shorter stays.

Understanding why employees leave or stay is crucially important for addressing issues of faculty and staff diversity. Increased diversity in hiring will mean little if quality, diverse employees do not stay with the College. Between 2002-2003 and 2005-2006, Mission College lost 34 faculty, 9 of whom resigned (the remainder retired). Further, of the 9 faculty who resigned, 6 resigned prior to their second year with Mission. The Vice President of Instruction conducted exit interviews with most of the faculty who resigned; however, more information is needed to understand why faculty leave. We are in the process of collecting additional data which will allow for a breakout by ethnicity and gender. Data are also being collected for staff and administrators.

#### Student Equity:

As noted in its previous progress report of October 2006, the College’s research office was compiling data from 2005-06 to present to the Student Equity

Committee in the anticipation that the work-to-contract status described above would be resolved in time for the committee to review and respond that semester. However, the work-to-contract limitations were not lifted until November 2, 2006 for faculty and February 7, 2007 for classified staff. Thus, there was insufficient time to convene the committee prior to the end of the semester. A meeting was scheduled as soon as possible after the beginning of spring semester and was held on February 14, 2007. A copy of the Committee's minutes is attached (Attachment L).

At that meeting, the College researcher shared the data that had been collected on the five goals contained in the College's Student Equity Plan (Attachment M). Following is a description of each goal and the results of the data that were presented to the Committee for its review.

Supporting documentation for student equity is attached as follows:

- Attachment N: Goal 1
- Attachment O: Goal 2
- Attachment P: Goal 3
- Attachment Q: Goal 4
- Attachment R: Goal 5

Goal 1. Access: Increase access for the most underserved populations (Hispanic by 5% and African-American by 3%) based on 2002-2003 data.

Because of its location in the heart of Silicon Valley, Mission College is exceptionally sensitive to demographic and economic shifts. The 2001 dot-com bust had a significant impact on the College. The loss of 200,000 jobs, primarily in the high-tech sector, the emigration of a large number of workers and their families, and high housing costs have contributed to significant declines in enrollment. Accordingly, as a straight percentage of previous totals, no demographic group has experienced gains in access—access between 2002-2003 and 2005-2006 has dropped for all known population groupings.

As a relative proportion of the student body population, however, the target populations have experienced increases. Hispanic students increased from 14.9% of the student body in academic year 2002-2003 to 16.6% of students in 2005-2006. This represents an increase of 1.7% over the three-year period. African-American students increased proportionately from 3.8% of the student body population to 4.5% between 2002-2003 and 2005-2006, an increase of .7%.

During this same three-year period, Asian students as a proportion of the student body experienced the only notable decline, decreasing by 6.4%--

although as a proportion of students, Asian students still represent a higher proportion than is represented in the general population of Santa Clara County (35.9% of Mission students versus 25.6% of Santa Clara County). Compared to the population of Santa Clara County, Mission College is disproportionately low for white Non-Hispanic students (23.4% at Mission versus 39.4% in the County) and Hispanic students (16.6% at Mission versus 25.0% in the County).

Further demographic comparison between Mission College and Santa Clara County shows that Mission has a higher proportion of females (55%) relative to the County (49.1%). Additionally, Mission has a lower proportion of DSPS students (1.7%) than there are persons with disability status in the County (9.4%)—although it should be noted both that Mission has significantly increased the proportion of DSPS students since 2002-2003 (just 1.7%) and that disability status as reflected in County numbers represents a wide range of disabilities.

Goal 2. Course Completion (Retention): Increase retention in basic skills. Increase Hispanic and African-American retention to achieve benchmark numbers based on the 1992-2000 composite data. Benchmarks as listed in Student Equity Plan: Basic Skills 61% and All Courses 67%.

Course completion (retention) rates had high levels of success for all groups in Fall 2005, with an average retention of 85.17% across all courses and an average retention of 88.8% within pre-collegiate basic skills courses.

Looking at overall retention rates for all courses in Fall 2005, Filipino and Asian students performed the best, with rates of 87.5% and 87.3% respectively. Hispanic students (85.3%) and African-American students (83.9%) performed well above the target benchmark of 67%. White students (81.1%) and non-listed “other” ethnicity students (81.3%) performed at the lowest level—but still above the set benchmark level. Comparing Fall 2003 rates to Fall 2005, these two groups are among four groups that experienced modest decreases, joined by American Indian/Alaskan Native and students of unknown ethnicity.

For Pre-Collegiate Basic Skills in Fall 2005, again students performed well ahead of the targeted benchmark rate of 61%. Specifically, Hispanic students’ retention rate was 88.6% and African-American students’ rate was 88.0%. In this category, non-listed “other” ethnicity students performed at the highest level, with a rate of 93.5%, and American Indian/Alaskan Native students performed at the lowest level with a rate of 79.2%. Comparing Fall 2003 rates to Fall 2005, all groupings by ethnicity experienced slight increases, with the exception of American Indian/Alaskan Native students, who had a slight decrease.

Goal 3. ESL & Basic Skills: Improve completion rates for the following: (1) Math completion rate by 10% for African-American, Filipino, and Hispanic students; (2) ESL completion rates by 5% for males.

Successful completion rates, completion of a course with a grade of A,B,C or Credit, in pre-collegiate basic skills mathematics courses increased from 26% to 45.6% for African-American students between Fall 2003 and Fall 2005, 31% to 46.9% for Filipino students, and 23% to 37.2% for Hispanic students. These increases range from 14% to over 19%, all higher than the 10% goal in the Student Equity Plan.

For non-basic skills mathematics courses between Fall 2003 and Fall 2005, African-American student rates improved from 46% to 50%, Filipino student rates rose from 41% to 45%, and Hispanic student rates increased from 32% to 47%. While Hispanic student rates surpassed an improvement of 10%, both Filipino student rates and African-American students have not yet reached this level.

Increases in both pre-collegiate and non-basic skills mathematics courses occurred for males and females over the two year period, although the increases are much greater for females than males (just over 10% in both cases for females, and 0.9% in both cases for males).

With ESL, successful completion rates increased for males from 61.7% to 65.9% between Fall 2003 and Fall 2005. This increase of 4.2% approaches the goal of 5%. ESL success rates improved at an even higher rate for females, increasing from 67% in Fall 2003 to 74.7% in Fall 2005, an increase of 7.7%.

Significant gains (at least 6%) in successful ESL completion rates occurred across all age groups, with the notable exception of students aged 26 to 30, which experienced a decrease of 4.5%. Similarly, sizable increases for ESL success rates occurred across most racial/ethnic categories, however drops of over 5% occurred for both white Non-Hispanic students and students not fitting the listed categories (*i.e.*, those listed as "Other"). Rates overall for Spring 2004 to Spring 2006 are fairly similar, with some minor differences—although one major increase Fall to Fall (African-American rates increased 22.5%) is actually a decrease Spring to Spring (down 6.7%). This suggests a need to look at the differences in classes offered Fall versus Spring to identify possible reasons for this disparity and how increases can be sustained across the full year of classes.

Goal 4. Degree & Certificate Completion: Increase number of awards (degrees for all students and certificates for male students) so that males represent 75% of females who earn certificates based on 2003-2004 data.

Comparing 2003-2004 to 2005-2006, the total number of awards, including certificates and degrees, increased from 851 to 900, growth of 5.8%. It should be noted that during this same period, headcount decreased by 8.0% (from 17,925 to 16,490). Looking at just degrees (as noted in the Student Equity goal), Mission grew from 494 to 567, an improvement of 14.8%.

The Student Equity Plan includes an indicator to show whether males are improving the rate of certificate achievement. This indicator is established as a relative percentage of what females earn, rather than as a simple percentage growth. Looking at this relative comparison, males earned 18.2% of the total certificates females achieved in 2004-2005, well short of the Student Equity goal of 75%. Furthermore, this actually represents a decrease from 2003-2004, in which males earned 20.7% of the number of certificates females earned.

In terms of total numbers, males had a total of 304 awards in 03-04 (females had 540), versus 286 awards in 05-06 (females increased to 605 awards). Thus, looking at total awards, including both certificates and degrees, males decreased relative to females between 2003-2004 and 2005-2006

For DSPS students, awards increased in 2005-2006, with 31 degrees (versus 27 in 2003-2004 and 16 in 2002-2003) and 16 certificates (up from 5 in 2003-2004 and 10 in 2002-2003, but down from 20 in 2004-2005).

Goal 5. Transfer: Increase the number of Hispanic and African-American students transferring to the UC and CSU systems based on 2001-2002 data. For the UC and CSU systems, within the Hispanic transfer-seeking population, increase transferring students to 45 students annually for years '06 through '08 and to 55 students annually for years '09 and '10. Within the African-American transfer seeking population, increase transferring students to 14 students annually for years '06 through '08 and to 16 students annually for years '09 and '10.

Looking at 2005-2006, the number of Hispanic students transferring to the UC and CSU systems (5 and 32, respectively) totals 37, short of the goal of 45 students for years '06 through '08, and an increase of only 1 from 2001-2002. For African-American students, transferring students decreased from 2001-2002 with 11 to CSU schools to 2005-2006, with 8 to CSU schools and 1 to UC schools. While these numbers are short of

the Student Equity Plan goals, they have occurred in a period in which overall enrollment has dropped from 19,429 to 16,490. Overall, 28 students at Mission transferred in 2005-2006, versus 34 in 2001-2002.

### **Action Plan for Spring 2007 – Fall 2007**

The Committee began its review of the data in February 2007. The Committee is scheduled to meet regularly throughout the semester to complete its analysis, identify additional research questions as necessary, and recommend specific intervention strategies by May 2007 in areas where goals have not been achieved. Following is a preliminary list, by goal, of areas recommended for further examination.

#### Goal 1. Access: Increase access for the most underserved populations (Hispanic by 5% and African-American by 3%) based on 2002-2003 data.

As noted above, both Hispanic and African-American enrollments have increased, but still fall short of established goals by 3.3% and 2.3%. Based on the data, areas to be more closely examined include:

- Title V grant activities designed to attract and retain Hispanic and other under served populations.
- Participation and success data for student support programs designed for underrepresented students, such as ACCESS and Avanzar (Title V).
- College recruitment, outreach and marketing plans.

#### Goal 2. Course Completion (Retention): Increase retention in basic skills. Increase Hispanic and African-American retention to achieve benchmark numbers based on the 1992-2000 composite data. Benchmarks as listed in Student Equity Plan: Hispanic Basic Skills 50% and All Courses 58%; African-American Basic Skills 55% and All Course 58%; Native American Basic Skills 53% and All Courses 57%.

While current data indicates successful achievement of the stated goals, these achievements need to be further examined to ensure the effect is substantial and long-lasting. Further investigation would include:

- Examination of state definitions to ensure data reflect the same information as when benchmarks were established.
- Changes in practice and other reasons which may have yielded the positive effects.

- Whether any changes made were permanent in nature and will be able to lead to sustained impact.

Goal 3. ESL & Basic Skills: Improve completion rates for the following: (1) Math completion rate by 10% for African-American, Filipino, and Hispanic students; (2) ESL completion rates by 5% for males.

The College has had significant success in the completion rates for pre-collegiate math for all target groups, well exceeding established goals. While Hispanics significantly exceeded the goal in respect to progress in non-basic skills math courses, Filipino and African-American students were below the goal by 6% and 4% respectively. The ESL completion rate for males missed the goal by 0.8%. The overall data for basic skills completion rates raised additional areas to be examined. A preliminary list of areas to be examined includes:

- Current interventions that account for the significant progress of Hispanic students. If they are unique to this population, can they be successfully applied to other populations?
- Best practices employed by other community colleges to improve completion rates for African-American and Filipino students.
- Reasons for the decrease in the completion rate for ESL students aged 26 to 30.
- Reasons for the disparity between male and female progress and strategies for improving the progress of male students in both math and ESL.
- Reasons for the change in ESL success rates fall-to-fall and spring-to-spring.
- Data and analysis from Title V and MAPS (new, intensive math program).

Goal 4. Degree & Certificate Completion: Increase number of awards (degrees for all students and certificates for male students) so that males represent 75% of females who earn certificates based on 2003-2004 data.

Despite an 8% drop in headcount, the total number of awards increased by 5.8% and the total number of degrees increased by 14.8%. However, the goal is to increase the number of certificates earned by male students to 75% of those earned by females. The college fell well short of this goal. In 2004-05, males

achieved 47.3% of the total awards and only 18.2% of the certificates. A preliminary list of areas to be further examined includes:

- Academic goals by gender
- Program enrollment by gender
- Data and analysis by gender from counseling, matriculation, and other student support services
- Correlation between age and gender
- Correlation between age, gender, and ethnicity
- Correlation between gender and other equity indicators

Goal 5. Transfer: Increase the number of Hispanic and African-American students transferring to the UC and CSU systems based on 2001-2002 data. For the UC and CSU systems, within the Hispanic transfer-seeking population, increase transferring students to 45 students annually for years '06 through '08 and to 55 students annually for years '09 and '10. Within the African-American transfer seeking population, increase transferring students to 14 students annually for years '06 through '08 and to 16 students annually for years '09 and '10.

From 2003-04 to 2005-06, Mission's headcount dropped 8%. Transfers have also dropped and the College fell short of its 05-06 goals by 8 Hispanic students and 3 African-American students. A preliminary list of areas to be further examined includes:

- Transfer-focused activities, including counseling, advising, and the Transfer Center
- Type, availability and distribution of transfer information
- Financial aid information
- Identification of transfer-ready students

Title V Data:

The College was awarded a Title V Grant for Hispanic serving institutions in 2004. The goals and measures for this grant include increased enrollment of under served student groups, increased satisfaction, and increased academic progress, specifically:

Outreach

- Hispanic participation in orientation/pre-enrollment assessment will increase 5% over Fall 2004

Student Satisfaction

- 80% of students surveyed will indicate a high degree of satisfaction with improvements so far.
- Ability to track and monitor student outcomes through college and/or district data bases will be increased by 30%.

Pedagogy

- 100% of ESL and math basic skills instructors will be able to use student learning outcomes to evaluate improvements to track student cohorts.
- Success rates for ESL and math will increase over Fall 2004; success rates will increase by 2% over Fall 2003.
- Cohorts in first ESL and math pilots will persist to next level at a 5% higher rate than other students
- Semester-to-semester persistence of Hispanic 1st time freshmen will increase 3% over 04-05 baseline.
- One-year retention of Hispanic students will increase by 3% over Fall 2003

The Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey was administered in fall 2006 and data have recently been received. Additional data collected in late fall 2006 suggest that the activities have had positive results. The data are being more closely analyzed and will be provided to both the Title V Advisory Committee and the Student Equity Committee when they are complete. ♦