## Demographic Information and Achievement Data

## The RSCCD Community

The Rancho Santiago Community College District (RSCCD) boundaries encompass 193 square miles and comprise $24 \%$ of Orange County. This portion of Orange County is densely populated: over one million residents live within RSCCD boundaries in the six cities of Anaheim, Garden Grove, Orange, Santa Ana, Tustin, and Villa Park.

Table 2. Current and Projected Population by Cities within RSCCD Boundaries, 2010 and 2020

|  | 2010 | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% of } \\ \text { RSCCD } \\ \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ | 2020 | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% of } \\ \text { RSCCD } \\ \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ | \% change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Anaheim | 336,149 | 32\% | 369,107 | 33\% | 10\% |
| Garden Grove | 170,773 | 16\% | 179,402 | 16\% | 5\% |
| Orange | 136,256 | 13\% | 141,472 | 13\% | 4\% |
| Santa Ana | 324,483 | 31\% | 337,568 | 30\% | 4\% |
| Tustin | 75,488 | 7\% | 81,310 | 7\% | 8\% |
| Villa Park | 5,812 | 1\% | 6,041 | 1\% | 4\% |
| RSCCD Total | 1,048,961 |  | 1,114,900 |  | 6\% |
| Orange County Total | 3,010,232 |  | 3,266,190 |  | 9\% |
| California Total | 36,637,290 |  | 40,817,839 |  | 11\% |

Source: American Community Survey, Census 2010 and Center for Demographic Research, 2012

- The number of residents living within the RSCCD geographic boundaries is projected to increase 6\% by 2020.
- A population increase is projected for all cities within RSCCD boundaries; that of Santa Ana (SAC's primary service area) is expected to increase by four percentage points by 2020.
- The distribution of the population across the six cities within RSCCD is projected to remain stable over the next decade.

Table 3. Orange County Population by Race/Ethnicity, 2010 and 2020

|  | 2010 | \% of Total | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | \% of Total | \% change |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African-American | 44,000 | $1 \%$ | 43,864 | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Asian | 532,477 | $18 \%$ | 710,916 | $22 \%$ | $34 \%$ |
| Hispanic | $1,012,973$ | $34 \%$ | $1,136,811$ | $35 \%$ | $12 \%$ |
| White | $1,328,499$ | $44 \%$ | $1,273,440$ | $39 \%$ | $-4 \%$ |
| Other | 92,283 | $3 \%$ | 101,159 | $3 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| Orange County <br> Total | $\mathbf{3 , 0 1 0 , 2 3 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 , 2 6 6 , 1 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{9 \%}$ |

Source: Center for Demographic Research, 2012

- The three most predominant race/ethnicity groups in Orange County ( 2010 census) are White (44\%), Hispanic (34\%), and Asian (18\%). The projections for 2020 are that the majority of the county's population will be made up of the same race/ethnicity groups in the same order, although the proportions will shift, with White residents comprising the highest at 39\%, followed by Hispanic at $35 \%$ and Asian at $22 \%$.
- Over the next decade, the greatest shifts are in the race/ethnicity composition of Orange County's population will be an increase in residents who self-identify as Asian, Hispanic, and "other" at $34 \%, 12 \%$, and $10 \%$ respectively and a decrease in White residents from $44 \%$ to $39 \%$.

Table 4. Population by Race/Ethnicity within RSCCD Boundaries, 2010

| Anaheim | Garden <br> Grove | Orange | Santa Ana | Tustin | Villa Park | RSCCD <br> Community <br> Population <br> Total | Orange <br> County <br> Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African- <br> American | $2 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| Asian | $15 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $18 \%$ |
| Hispanic | $53 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $78 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $55 \%$ | $34 \%$ |
| White | $27 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $47 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $72 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $44 \%$ |
| Other | $3 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 3 6 , 2 6 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0 , 8 8 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 6 , 4 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{3 2 4 , 5 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 , 5 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 , 8 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 0 4 9 , 4 4 4}$ | $\mathbf{3 , 0 1 0 , 2 3 2}$ |

Source: Center for Demographic Research, 2012

- The race/ethnicity pattern of residents who live in the City of Santa Ana is significantly different that the pattern in the RSCCD Community Population and in Orange County: Seventy-eight percent of the 324,528 Santa Ana residents is Hispanic compared to $55 \%$ of the population of the RSCCD community.

Table 5. Population by Gender within RSCCD Boundaries, 2010

|  | Anaheim | Garden <br> Grove | Orange | Santa <br> Ana | Tustin | Villa <br> Park | Orange <br> County | California |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 166,333 | 84,413 | 68,069 | 166,863 | 36,309 | 2,973 | $1,467,799$ | $18,223,157$ |
| Female | 166,706 | 84,596 | 66,500 | 158,353 | 37,422 | 2,840 | $1,497,726$ | $18,414,133$ |
| \% Male/Female | $50 \% / 50 \%$ | $50 \% / 50 \%$ | $51 \% / 49 \%$ | $51 \% / 49 \%$ | $49 \% / 51 \%$ | $51 \% / 49 \%$ | $49 \% / 51 \%$ | $49 \% / 51 \%$ |

Source: American Community Survey (5-year), report S0101 (Age and Gender), Census 2010

- In all communities in RSCCD, current residents are approximately evenly divided in a 50-50 balance between males and females.

Table 6. Population by Age within RSCCD Boundaries, 2010

| Anaheim | Garden <br> Grove | Orange | Santa <br> Ana | Tustin | Villa <br> Park | Orange <br> County | California |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $0-14$ | $24 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $21 \%$ |
| $15-19$ | $8 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| $20-29$ | $15 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $14 \%$ |
| $30-39$ | $15 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $14 \%$ |
| $40-49$ | $14 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $15 \%$ |
| $50-59$ | $11 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $12 \%$ |
| $60+$ | $13 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $16 \%$ |
| TOTAL | 333,039 | 169,009 | 134,569 | $\mathbf{3 2 5 , 2 1 6}$ | 73,731 | 5,813 | $\mathbf{2 , 9 6 5 , 5 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 6 , 6 3 7 , 2 9 0}$ |

Source: American Community Survey (5-year), report S0101 (Age and Gender), Census 2010
Note: (1) The age cohorts are unevenly divided to provide a projection for college-going ages. (2) There is a slight discrepancy in the total Orange County population compared to previous data sets due because these data were extracted from a different source.

- For those who live within RSCCD boundaries, the proportion of residents in each age group is comparable to those of the County and the State. However, City of Santa Ana residents are significantly younger ( $35 \%$ is under the age of 20 compared to $29 \%$ county- and statewide).

Table 7. Median and Mean Household Income by Cities within RSCCD Boundaries, 2010

|  | Anaheim | Garden <br> Grove | Orange | Santa <br> Ana | Tustin | Villa <br> Park | Orange <br> County | California |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median household <br> income | $\$ 57,807$ | $\$ 61,026$ | $\$ 76,742$ | $\$ 54,877$ | $\$ 73,170$ | $\$ 146,776$ | $\$ 74,344$ | $\$ 60,883$ |
| Mean household <br> income | $\$ 73,807$ | $\$ 73,069$ | $\$ 97,672$ | $\$ 67,887$ | $\$ 95,506$ | $\$ 211,065$ | $\$ 99,719$ | $\$ 83,483$ |

Source: American Factfinder (American Community Survey 5-year DP03 Report), 2010 Census

- Both median and mean household income in the City of Santa Ana is below that of all other cities within RSCCD boundaries, as well as Orange County and California.

Table 8. Level of Educational Attainment for Residents within RSCCD Boundaries Age 25+

| Anaheim | Garden <br> Grove | Orange | Santa <br> Ana | Tustin | Villa <br> Park | Orange <br> County | California |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ${\text { Below } 9^{\text {th }} \text { grade }}^{\text {An }} 13 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $10 \%$ |  |
| $9^{9^{\text {th }} \text { to } 12^{\text {th }} \text { grade }}$ | $13 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
| High school <br> graduate | $23 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $22 \%$ |
| Some college | $21 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $22 \%$ |
| Associate's degree | $6 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| Bachelor's degree | $17 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $19 \%$ |
| Graduate or <br> professional <br> degree | $7 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 \%}$ |
| Total Population | $\mathbf{2 1 3 , 8 3 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 9 , 6 4 5}$ | $\mathbf{8 8 , 6 9 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 2 , 4 4 3}$ | $\mathbf{4 8 , 5 6 6}$ | $\mathbf{4 , 0 5 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 0 0 8 , 7 7 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 , 4 9 7 , 9 4 5}$ |

Source: American Factfinder (American Community Survey 5-year DP02 Report), 2010.

- The proportion of adults who have not attended college in the City of Santa Ana (69\%) is significantly higher than that of other RSCCD cities (18\% to 51\%), the State (41\%), and the County (34\%).


## Local Economic Trends

Table 9. Top 10 Fastest Growing Occupations in Orange County for the Next 10 Years

| Occupations | Number of <br> Jobs |
| :--- | :---: |
| Food/Beverage Serving | 9,130 |
| Health Diagnosing/Treating | 8,380 |
| Retail Sales | 7,890 |
| Other Personal Care/Service | 7,170 |
| Business Operations Specialists | 5,560 |
| Retail Salespersons | 5,440 |
| Personal and Home Care Aides | 5,310 |
| Computer Specialists | 5,080 |
| Registered Nurses | 5,000 |
| Health Technologists/Technicians | 4,920 |

Source: California Employment Development Department presented at the Orange County Business Council, January, 2013

- Significant job growth is projected in a variety of occupations.
- Six of the top 10 fastest growing occupations in Orange County require postsecondary education.

Table 10. Employment and Payroll Losses in Orange County, 2007-2012

|  | Change in Job October 2007 to June 2012 | Average Annual Pay (\$) | Change in Payrolls (in Million \$) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Construction | -34,800 | 61,360 | -2,135 |
| Trade, Transportation \& utilities | -33,167 | 51,220 | -1,699 |
| Manufacturing | -23,434 | 67,132 | -1,573 |
| Financial Activities | -15,133 | 97,656 | -1,478 |
| Professional \& Business Services | -21,767 | 65,520 | -1,426 |
| State \& Local Government* | -10,234 | 52,806 | -540 |
| Information | -6,767 | 78,208 | -529 |
| Other Services | -3,167 | 29,380 | -93 |
| Federal Government | -467 | 72,852 | -34 |
| Leisure \& Hospitality | 5,800 | 21,476 | 125 |
| Education \& Health Services | 15,000 | 53,768 | 807 |
| Total Non-farm | -128,234 | 56,472 | -8,577 |

Source: Economic \& Business Review, Chapman University, November 2012
Note: Public education is included in the State \& Local Government Sector

- The number of jobs and total non-farm payroll is below the pre-recession numbers across all fields with the exceptions of leisure $\&$ hospitality and education $\&$ health services.
- Average pay within those fields is among the lowest reported.

Table 11. Projected Job Growth by Sector, 2013

|  | Orange County | California |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Construction \& Mining | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ |
| Financial Activities | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ |
| Trade, Transportation \& Utilities | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ |
| Manufacturing | $\hookleftarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| Professional \& Business Services | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ |
| Education \& Health Services | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ |
| Leisure \& Hospitality Services | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ |
| Government* | $\longleftrightarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |

Source: Economic \& Business Review, Chapman University, November 2012
Note: Public education is included in the State \& Local Government Sector

- Job growth in Orange County is projected to increase or remain stable in every sector.


## Santa Ana College

Table 12. SAC Staff Profile, Fall 2009 - Fall 2013

|  | Fall 2009 <br> $\mathbf{n}=\mathbf{2 1 8 6}$ | Fall 2010 <br> $\mathbf{n = 1 9 5 7}$ | Fall 2011 <br> $\mathbf{n = 1 8 1 8}$ | Fall 2012 <br> $\mathbf{n = 1 7 6 8}$ | Fall 2013 <br> $\mathbf{n = 1 8 4 1}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Administrative | 27 | 25 | 24 | 25 | 24 |
| Confidential | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Supervisory | 14 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 217 |
| Contract Faculty | 231 | 1358 | 1279 | 1150 | 1137 |
| Hrly Faculty | 288 | 258 | 256 | 232 | 12271 |
| Monthly Classified | 267 | 168 | 169 | 227 |  |
| Hrly Classified |  |  |  | 143 |  |

- SAC lost 345 staff in the last five years, primarily classified (555 to 370).
- The number of contract faculty fell from 231 to 211 . However, the college is in the process of hiring to fill 29 faculty vacancies which will exceed the total from five years ago.
- The number of Administrative/Supervisory/Confidential staff fell from 42 to 33 since Fall 2009.


## Santa Ana College

Table 13. SAC Staff Profile by Gender, Ethnicity, and Age, Fall 2009 - Fall 2013

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Fall } 2009 \\ n=2186 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Fall } 2010 \\ n=1957 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Fall } 2011 \\ n=1818 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Fall } 2012 \\ \mathrm{n}=1768 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Fall } 2013 \\ \mathrm{n}=1841 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GENDER | Female | 52\% | 50\% | 49\% | 49\% | 48\% |
|  | Male | 48\% | 50\% | 51\% | 51\% | 52\% |
| ETHNICITY | Asian/Pac. Isl. | 13\% | 12\% | 12\% | 12\% | 12\% |
|  | Black | 3\% | 3\% | 3\% | 2\% | 3\% |
|  | Hispanic | 26\% | 25\% | 26\% | 26\% | 27\% |
|  | White | 53\% | 55\% | 54\% | 55\% | 54\% |
|  | Other | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% | 4\% |
| AGE | $<30$ yrs | 1\% | 1\% | 2\% | 2\% | 3\% |
|  | 30-39 yrs | 16\% | 16\% | 18\% | 18\% | 20\% |
|  | 40-49 yrs | 25\% | 25\% | 25\% | 26\% | 26\% |
|  | 50-59 yrs | 27\% | 28\% | 28\% | 28\% | 28\% |
|  | 60+ yrs | 31\% | 30\% | 27\% | 26\% | 23\% |

- An increase in males employed as hourly faculty has resulted in a reversal of overall gender ratios; other employee groups remain majority female.
- Distribution of staff's ethnic breakdown has remained constant since Fall 2009.
- SAC staff is younger in Fall 2013 compared to five years ago ( $23 \% \mathrm{vs} .31 \%$ at the $60+$ age group, and $23 \%$ vs. $17 \%$ younger than 40 years of age).

Table 14. SAC Demographics of Total Credit Student Body

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9 - 1 0}$ <br> $\mathbf{N}=\mathbf{4 7 0 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0 - 1 1}$ <br> $\mathbf{N}=\mathbf{4 2 5 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 1 - 1 2}$ <br> $\mathbf{N}=\mathbf{4 5 4 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 2 - 1 3}$ <br> $\mathbf{N}=\mathbf{4 1 0 1 3}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |
| African American | $2 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| Latino | $38 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $43 \%$ |
| Asian,Pac Islander | $10 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
| White | $29 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $21 \%$ |
| Other | $4 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| Decline to State | $17 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $22 \%$ |
| Age |  |  |  |  |
| not reported | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| $<=19$ | $13 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $15 \%$ |
| $20-21$ | $11 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $13 \%$ |
| $22-25$ | $15 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $16 \%$ |
| $26-29$ | $12 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $11 \%$ |
| $30-39$ | $22 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $21 \%$ |
| $40-49$ | $17 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $16 \%$ |
| $50+$ | $10 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| Gender |  |  |  |  |
| female | $37 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $40 \%$ |
| male | $62 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $60 \%$ |
| not reported | $1 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |

- In recent years, there has been a shift in the proportions of our students' ethnicity. The proportion of White students has decreased steadily (from 29\% in 2009-10 to 21\% in 2012-13); conversely, the proportion of Hispanic students has grown (from 38\% in 2009-10 to 43\% in 2012-13).
- The proportion of students traditional college-going ages (under 25 years) has increased, slightly but steadily, each year. There has been a correspondingly steady decrease in the proportion of students in each age group older than 30 years of age ( $49 \%$ to $45 \%$ in the last four years).
- There are more males than females, mostly due to the large criminal justice and fire academies.

Table 15. SAC Demographics for Academies vs. Non-Academies

|  | Academies |  |  |  | Non-Academies |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2009-10 \\ N=15008 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2010-11 \\ \mathrm{~N}=15691 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2011-12 \\ \mathrm{~N}=15592 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2012-13 \\ \mathrm{~N}=15167 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2009-10 \\ \mathrm{~N}=33281 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2010-11 \\ \mathrm{~N}=27664 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2011-12 \\ \mathrm{~N}=30912 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2012-13 \\ \mathrm{~N}=26368 \end{gathered}$ |
| Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| African American | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% |
| Latino | 17\% | 17\% | 17\% | 16\% | 47\% | 53\% | 50\% | 57\% |
| Asian,Pac Islander | 4\% | 4\% | 3\% | 3\% | 13\% | 13\% | 12\% | 12\% |
| White | 39\% | 34\% | 33\% | 31\% | 25\% | 18\% | 24\% | 16\% |
| Other | 3\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 4\% | 4\% | 3\% | 3\% |
| Decline to State | 35\% | 41\% | 43\% | 46\% | 9\% | 10\% | 9\% | 8\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| not reported | 1\% | 1\% | 0\% | 1\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| <=19 | 3\% | 4\% | 3\% | 3\% | 18\% | 21\% | 20\% | 22\% |
| 20-21 | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 16\% | 18\% | 17\% | 20\% |
| 22-25 | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% | 19\% | 21\% | 20\% | 22\% |
| 26-29 | 13\% | 13\% | 12\% | 12\% | 12\% | 12\% | 11\% | 11\% |
| 30-39 | 36\% | 35\% | 35\% | 35\% | 16\% | 14\% | 15\% | 13\% |
| 40-49 | 28\% | 28\% | 30\% | 29\% | 10\% | 8\% | 10\% | 7\% |
| 50+ | 12\% | 12\% | 13\% | 13\% | 8\% | 6\% | 7\% | 5\% |
| Gender |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| female | 15\% | 16\% | 17\% | 18\% | 46\% | 51\% | 46\% | 52\% |
| male | 85\% | 83\% | 82\% | 81\% | 54\% | 48\% | 54\% | 48\% |
| not reported | 0\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 0\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% |

Academies are identified by subject codes "FAC" (Fire Academy) and "CJA" (Criminal Justice Academy)
Academies/Non-Academies subgroups are not exclusive; a student enrolled in both types of courses will be included in each group (and summed will exceed TOTAL SAC headcount)

- Whites represent a higher proportion of students in the academies (criminal justice and fire) than in nonacademies. More than one-third of academy students "decline to state" their ethnicity. In the academies, Latinos comprise about half (or more) of the headcount.
- On average, students in traditional college credit programs are younger (ages under 25) while academies attract students, on average, over thirty years of age.
- The Criminal Justice and Fire Academies are predominantly male (81\% to $85 \%$ ), while traditional credit programs represent males and females nearly equally.

Table 16. SAC Demographics of Distance Education vs. Non-Distance Education

|  | Distance Education |  |  |  | Non-Distance Education |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 2009-10 \\ & \mathrm{~N}=5674 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2010-11 \\ & \mathrm{~N}=5838 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2011-12 \\ & \mathrm{~N}=6172 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2012-13 \\ & \mathrm{~N}=6119 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2009-10 \\ \mathrm{~N}=31829 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2010-11 \\ \mathrm{~N}=26155 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2011-12 \\ \mathrm{~N}=29195 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2012-13 \\ \mathrm{~N}=24652 \end{gathered}$ |
| Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| African American | 3\% | 4\% | 4\% | 3\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% |
| Latino | 42\% | 46\% | 48\% | 51\% | 47\% | 53\% | 50\% | 59\% |
| Asian,Pac Islander | 16\% | 15\% | 15\% | 14\% | 13\% | 13\% | 12\% | 12\% |
| White | 26\% | 24\% | 22\% | 21\% | 25\% | 18\% | 24\% | 16\% |
| Other | 5\% | 4\% | 4\% | 3\% | 4\% | 4\% | 3\% | 3\% |
| Decline to State | 8\% | 7\% | 7\% | 8\% | 9\% | 10\% | 9\% | 8\% |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| not reported | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| <=19 | 11\% | 12\% | 13\% | 13\% | 18\% | 21\% | 20\% | 23\% |
| 20-21 | 20\% | 20\% | 19\% | 19\% | 16\% | 18\% | 17\% | 20\% |
| 22-25 | 26\% | 26\% | 27\% | 27\% | 19\% | 21\% | 21\% | 22\% |
| 26-29 | 15\% | 16\% | 15\% | 15\% | 11\% | 12\% | 11\% | 11\% |
| 30-39 | 17\% | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% | 14\% | 14\% | 12\% |
| 40-49 | 8\% | 8\% | 8\% | 7\% | 11\% | 8\% | 10\% | 7\% |
| 50+ | 3\% | 3\% | 3\% | 4\% | 9\% | 6\% | 7\% | 5\% |
| Gender |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| female | 56\% | 56\% | 56\% | 55\% | 45\% | 51\% | 45\% | 52\% |
| male | 44\% | 44\% | 43\% | 44\% | 54\% | 49\% | 55\% | 48\% |
| not reported | 0\% | 0\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |

Distance Education is identified by "method of delivery" codes "DINT", "DINT2", and "ITV"
Distance Education and Non-Distance Education subgroups are not exclusive; a student enrolled in both types of courses will be included in each group (and summed will exceed TOTAL SAC headcount)

- Ethnic distributions for both those enrolled in distance education courses and non-distance education courses are similar; Latinos represent a very slightly higher proportion of the non-distance education students while Asian and White students slightly more represented in distance education sections.
- The distance education sections are comprised of slightly older students (over 25) than those enrolled in non-distance education classes.
- Slightly more females enroll in distance education classes than in non-distance education.

Table 17. SAC Demographics of Basic Skills vs. Non-Basic Skills

|  | Basic Skills |  |  |  | Non-Basic Skills |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9 - 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0 - 1 1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{N = 5 5 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 1 - 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 2 - 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9 - 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0 - 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 1 - 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 2 - 1 3}$ |  |  |
| $\mathbf{N = 5 1 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{N = 4 7 9 9}$ | $\mathbf{N = 3 2 4 4 7}$ | $\mathbf{N = 2 6 8 7 3}$ | $\mathbf{N}=\mathbf{3 0 1 4 4}$ | $\mathbf{N = 2 5 7 2 7}$ |  |  |  |
| Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| African American | $2 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| Latino | $65 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $65 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $52 \%$ | $49 \%$ | $58 \%$ |
| Asian,Pac Islander | $16 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $12 \%$ |
| White | $7 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $17 \%$ |
| Other | $3 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| Decline to State | $7 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| not reported | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| $<=19$ | $34 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $22 \%$ |
| $20-21$ | $18 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $20 \%$ |
| $22-25$ | $16 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $22 \%$ |
| $26-29$ | $9 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $11 \%$ |
| $30-39$ | $11 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $13 \%$ |
| $40-49$ | $8 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| $50+$ | $4 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| Gender |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| female | $56 \%$ | $56 \%$ | $56 \%$ | $55 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $51 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $52 \%$ |
| male | $44 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $54 \%$ | $49 \%$ | $54 \%$ | $48 \%$ |
| not reported | $0 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ |

Basic Skills is identified using subject/course associations from ITS from SAC coding
Basic Skills and Non-Basic Skills subgroups are not exclusive; students will be included in both subgroups if they are enrolled in both types of courses (and sum of two subgroups will exceed TOTAL headcount)

- About two-thirds of the basic skills enrollees are Latinos; about half of students enrolled in non-basic courses are Latinos.
- Students enrolled in basic skills courses are young; about one-thirds is under the age of 20.
- Slightly more females are enrolled in basic skills courses.

Table 18. SAC Demographics of CTE vs. Non-CTE

|  | CTE |  |  |  | Non-CTE |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 2009-10 \\ \mathrm{~N}=33027 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{2 0 1 0 - 1 1} \\ \mathrm{N}=29527 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2011-12 \\ \mathrm{~N}=32935 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2012-13 \\ \mathrm{~N}=28685 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2009-10 \\ & \mathrm{~N}=22525 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2010-11 \\ \mathrm{~N}=21580 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2011-12 \\ \mathrm{~N}=20981 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2012-13 \\ \mathrm{~N}=20573 \end{gathered}$ |
| Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| African American | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% |
| Latino | 30\% | 33\% | 32\% | 35\% | 56\% | 58\% | 60\% | 62\% |
| Asian, Pac. Islander | 8\% | 8\% | 7\% | 8\% | 15\% | 13\% | 13\% | 12\% |
| White | 34\% | 27\% | 31\% | 25\% | 16\% | 15\% | 14\% | 14\% |
| Other | 3\% | 3\% | 3\% | 3\% | 4\% | 3\% | 3\% | 2\% |
| Decline to State | 22\% | 27\% | 25\% | 28\% | 7\% | 9\% | 8\% | 8\% |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| not reported | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| <=19 | 9\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 24\% | 24\% | 25\% | 25\% |
| 20-21 | 8\% | 9\% | 9\% | 10\% | 20\% | 21\% | 21\% | 23\% |
| 22-25 | 12\% | 13\% | 12\% | 13\% | 23\% | 23\% | 23\% | 24\% |
| 26-29 | 12\% | 12\% | 11\% | 12\% | 11\% | 11\% | 11\% | 10\% |
| 30-39 | 26\% | 26\% | 26\% | 25\% | 12\% | 11\% | 11\% | 10\% |
| 40-49 | 21\% | 20\% | 21\% | 20\% | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% | 5\% |
| 50+ | 12\% | 10\% | 11\% | 10\% | 4\% | 4\% | 3\% | 3\% |
| Gender |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| female | 28\% | 31\% | 30\% | 33\% | 54\% | 54\% | 54\% | 54\% |
| male | 71\% | 68\% | 70\% | 66\% | 46\% | 46\% | 46\% | 46\% |
| not reported | 1\% | 1\% | 0\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |

CTE identified by subject/course associations provided by ITS based on college-assigned coding
CTE and Non CTE subgroups are not exclusive; students will be included in both subgroups if they are enrolled in both types of courses (and sum of two subgroups will exceed TOTAL headcount)

- One-third of the CTE students are White and another one-third are Latino. However, less than $20 \%$ of nonCTE courses are White and nearly two-thirds are Latino. It should be noted that the academies are a large component of the CTE programs.
- CTE students are older than non-CTE students . Fifty-five percent of the CTE students are 30 years of age or older compared to the $20 \%$ that age group represents in the non-CTE subgroup.
- More than two-thirds of the CTE are male while about half of non-CTE students are male. Again, the difference is attributable to the predominantly-male academies that comprise a huge proportion of the CTE program.

Table 19. SAC Course Success 2009-2013

|  | $\begin{gathered} 2009-10 \\ \mathrm{~N}=138827 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2010-11 \\ \mathrm{~N}=131008 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2011-12 \\ \mathrm{~N}=136332 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2012-13 \\ \mathrm{~N}=129056 \end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% Success | \% Retention | \% Success | \% Retention | \% Success | \% Retention | \% Success | \% Retention |
|  | 72\% | 84\% | 72\% | 84\% | 74\% | 86\% | 73\% | 85\% |
| Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| African American | 65\% | 80\% | 64\% | 80\% | 67\% | 83\% | 67\% | 81\% |
| Latino | 64\% | 80\% | 64\% | 80\% | 66\% | 82\% | 65\% | 81\% |
| Asian, Pac Islander | 77\% | 86\% | 76\% | 86\% | 78\% | 86\% | 79\% | 87\% |
| White | 83\% | 90\% | 82\% | 89\% | 86\% | 92\% | 85\% | 91\% |
| Other | 71\% | 84\% | 74\% | 85\% | 78\% | 87\% | 77\% | 86\% |
| Decline to State | 82\% | 91\% | 81\% | 90\% | 84\% | 92\% | 86\% | 92\% |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| not reported | 78\% | 88\% | 80\% | 91\% | 82\% | 91\% | 82\% | 91\% |
| <=21 | 62\% | 80\% | 62\% | 81\% | 64\% | 82\% | 63\% | 81\% |
| 22-25 | 66\% | 80\% | 66\% | 80\% | 68\% | 82\% | 68\% | 81\% |
| 26-29 | 75\% | 84\% | 75\% | 85\% | 77\% | 86\% | 78\% | 87\% |
| 30-39 | 84\% | 90\% | 84\% | 90\% | 86\% | 92\% | 86\% | 91\% |
| 40-49 | 89\% | 93\% | 88\% | 93\% | 91\% | 95\% | 91\% | 94\% |
| 50+ | 85\% | 92\% | 85\% | 92\% | 90\% | 95\% | 89\% | 94\% |
| Gender |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| female | 68\% | 82\% | 68\% | 82\% | 70\% | 83\% | 71\% | 84\% |
| male | 75\% | 86\% | 74\% | 86\% | 78\% | 88\% | 76\% | 87\% |
| not reported | 78\% | 88\% | 80\% | 91\% | 82\% | 91\% | 82\% | 91\% |

- Success rates ( $72 \%$ to $73 \%$ ) and retention rates ( $84 \%$ to $86 \%$ ) have remained fairly constant in the four years of study.
- White students have the highest success and retention rates; Latino and African-American students' success is about twenty percentage points lower.
- Generally, the older the students, the higher the success and retention rates.
- Across all years of study, males have higher success (+5 to 8 percentage points) and retention rates (+3 to 5 percentage points) than females.

Table 20. SAC Success and Retention in Academies (Fire and Criminal Justice) vs. Non-Academies

|  | Academies |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Non-Academies |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 2009-10 \\ \mathrm{~N}=23552 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2010-11 \\ \mathrm{~N}=23898 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2011-12 \\ \mathrm{~N}=24726 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 2012-13 \\ & \mathrm{~N}=25929 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2009-10 \\ \mathrm{~N}=115275 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2010-11 \\ N=107110 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2011-12 \\ N=111606 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2012-13 \\ N=103127 \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | \% <br> Success | $\%$ Retention | $\begin{gathered} \hline \% \\ \text { Success } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | \% <br> Retention | $\%$ <br> Success | $\%$ Retention | $\%$ <br> Success | \% Retention | \% <br> Success | \% Retention | \% <br> Success | \% <br> Retention | $\%$ <br> Success | \% Retention | $\%$ <br> Success | \% Retention |
|  | 98\% | 99\% | 98\% | 99\% | 98\% | 99\% | 98\% | 99\% | 67\% | 81\% | 66\% | 81\% | 69\% | 83\% | 67\% | 82\% |
| Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Afr. American | 99\% | 100\% | 97\% | 99\% | 97\% | 99\% | 97\% | 99\% | 59\% | 76\% | 59\% | 76\% | 62\% | 89\% | 61\% | 77\% |
| Latino | 96\% | 99\% | 96\% | 98\% | 96\% | 99\% | 96\% | 99\% | 62\% | 79\% | 61\% | 79\% | 64\% | 81\% | 63\% | 80\% |
| Asian,Pac Islnder | 98\% | 99\% | 98\% | 99\% | 97\% | 98\% | 97\% | 99\% | 75\% | 85\% | 75\% | 85\% | 76\% | 86\% | 77\% | 86\% |
| White | 98\% | 99\% | 98\% | 99\% | 98\% | 100\% | 98\% | 100\% | 76\% | 85\% | 73\% | 84\% | 81\% | 89\% | 75\% | 85\% |
| Other | 96\% | 99\% | 97\% | 99\% | 97\% | 99\% | 97\% | 99\% | 68\% | 82\% | 70\% | 83\% | 74\% | 85\% | 73\% | 83\% |
| Decline to State | 99\% | 100\% | 99\% | 100\% | 99\% | 99\% | 100\% | 100\% | 67\% | 82\% | 66\% | 82\% | 71\% | 85\% | 70\% | 83\% |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| not reported | 99\% | 100\% | 96\% | 98\% | 98\% | 100\% | 98\% | 99\% | 72\% | 85\% | 74\% | 88\% | 77\% | 88\% | 75\% | 88\% |
| <=19 | 93\% | 98\% | 94\% | 97\% | 94\% | 98\% | 90\% | 97\% | 61\% | 80\% | 62\% | 81\% | 64\% | 83\% | 63\% | 82\% |
| 20-21 | 82\% | 96\% | 83\% | 92\% | 79\% | 95\% | 79\% | 93\% | 62\% | 79\% | 61\% | 79\% | 63\% | 81\% | 63\% | 80\% |
| 22-25 | 92\% | 97\% | 91\% | 96\% | 92\% | 98\% | 93\% | 98\% | 64\% | 78\% | 64\% | 79\% | 67\% | 81\% | 66\% | 80\% |
| 26-29 | 97\% | 99\% | 96\% | 99\% | 97\% | 99\% | 97\% | 99\% | 70\% | 81\% | 69\% | 81\% | 71\% | 82\% | 72\% | 83\% |
| 30-39 | 99\% | 100\% | 99\% | 100\% | 99\% | 100\% | 99\% | 100\% | 75\% | 85\% | 74\% | 83\% | 78\% | 86\% | 75\% | 84\% |
| 40-49 | 99\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 99\% | 99\% | 100\% | 100\% | 81\% | 88\% | 76\% | 85\% | 84\% | 90\% | 78\% | 86\% |
| 50+ | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 99\% | 99\% | 100\% | 100\% | 78\% | 88\% | 75\% | 86\% | 84\% | 91\% | 78\% | 87\% |
| Gender |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| female | 97\% | 99\% | 98\% | 99\% | 98\% | 99\% | 98\% | 99\% | 67\% | 81\% | 66\% | 81\% | 68\% | 82\% | 69\% | 82\% |
| male | 98\% | 99\% | 98\% | 99\% | 98\% | 99\% | 98\% | 99\% | 67\% | 81\% | 65\% | 81\% | 70\% | 84\% | 66\% | 81\% |
| not reported | 99\% | 100\% | 96\% | 98\% | 98\% | 100\% | 98\% | 99\% | 72\% | 85\% | 74\% | 88\% | 77\% | 88\% | 75\% | 88\% |

Academies (Fire and Criminal Justice) are identified by subject codes "FAC" and "CJA"

- Success rates and retention rates are high at $98 \%$ and $99 \%$ respectively for the academies; non-academies success rates are lower by about thirty percentage points and retention rates are lower by nearly twenty percentage points in the four years of study.
- There are minor differences among the ethnic groups in the academies; however, White and Asian students have significantly higher success and retention rates than do other ethnic subgroups in the non-academies coursework.
- Generally, the older the students, the higher the success and retention rates.
- Males and females have comparable success and retention rates for both the academies and non-academies subgroups.

Table 21. SAC Success and Retention in Distance Education vs. Non-Distance Education

|  | Distance Education |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Non-Distance Education |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2009-10 \\ & \mathrm{~N}=9288 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2010-11 } \\ & \mathrm{N}=9711 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2011-12 \\ \mathrm{~N}=10458 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2012-13 \\ \mathrm{~N}=10142 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2009-10 \\ 105987 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2010-11 \\ \mathrm{~N}=97399 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2011-12 \\ \mathrm{~N}=101148 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 2012-13 \\ & \mathrm{~N}=92985 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \% \\ \text { Success } \end{gathered}$ | \% <br> Retention | $\begin{gathered} \hline \% \\ \text { Success } \end{gathered}$ | \% <br> Retention | $\begin{gathered} \hline \% \\ \text { Success } \end{gathered}$ | \% <br> Retention | $\begin{gathered} \hline \% \\ \text { Success } \end{gathered}$ | \% <br> Retention | $\begin{gathered} \hline \% \\ \text { Success } \end{gathered}$ | \% <br> Retention | $\begin{gathered} \hline \% \\ \text { Success } \end{gathered}$ | \% <br> Retention | $\begin{gathered} \hline \% \\ \text { Success } \end{gathered}$ | \% <br> Retention | $\begin{gathered} \hline \% \\ \text { Success } \end{gathered}$ | \% <br> Retention |
|  | 54\% | 70\% | 54\% | 70\% | 54\% | 71\% | 57\% | 72\% | 68\% | 82\% | 67\% | 82\% | 71\% | 84\% | 68\% | 83\% |
| Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Afr. American | 42\% | 62\% | 39\% | 64\% | 44\% | 67\% | 41\% | 65\% | 62\% | 78\% | 63\% | 79\% | 65\% | 82\% | 65\% | 80\% |
| Latino | 45\% | 65\% | 47\% | 65\% | 49\% | 68\% | 52\% | 69\% | 63\% | 80\% | 63\% | 80\% | 65\% | 82\% | 64\% | 81\% |
| Asian,Pac IsInder | 63\% | 76\% | 62\% | 76\% | 61\% | 75\% | 65\% | 76\% | 77\% | 86\% | 76\% | 86\% | 78\% | 87\% | 79\% | 87\% |
| White | 61\% | 76\% | 62\% | 77\% | 61\% | 76\% | 65\% | 78\% | 78\% | 87\% | 75\% | 85\% | 84\% | 90\% | 77\% | 86\% |
| Other | 54\% | 71\% | 56\% | 71\% | 51\% | 69\% | 59\% | 75\% | 70\% | 83\% | 72\% | 85\% | 78\% | 88\% | 75\% | 85\% |
| Decline to State | 56\% | 71\% | 53\% | 70\% | 56\% | 73\% | 58\% | 73\% | 68\% | 83\% | 66\% | 83\% | 72\% | 86\% | 71\% | 84\% |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| not reported | 46\% | 62\% | 71\% | 90\% | 52\% | 80\% | 65\% | 92\% | 74\% | 86\% | 74\% | 87\% | 80\% | 89\% | 75\% | 88\% |
| <=19 | 46\% | 68\% | 49\% | 67\% | 50\% | 72\% | 54\% | 73\% | 61\% | 81\% | 62\% | 82\% | 64\% | 83\% | 63\% | 82\% |
| 20-21 | 48\% | 66\% | 47\% | 67\% | 47\% | 68\% | 50\% | 68\% | 63\% | 80\% | 62\% | 80\% | 65\% | 82\% | 64\% | 81\% |
| 22-25 | 50\% | 69\% | 50\% | 69\% | 52\% | 70\% | 55\% | 70\% | 66\% | 80\% | 66\% | 80\% | 69\% | 82\% | 68\% | 82\% |
| 26-29 | 56\% | 71\% | 56\% | 72\% | 56\% | 72\% | 60\% | 75\% | 71\% | 82\% | 71\% | 83\% | 74\% | 84\% | 75\% | 84\% |
| 30-39 | 59\% | 74\% | 61\% | 74\% | 58\% | 73\% | 62\% | 76\% | 77\% | 86\% | 76\% | 85\% | 81\% | 88\% | 78\% | 86\% |
| 40-49 | 69\% | 79\% | 63\% | 74\% | 63\% | 75\% | 64\% | 76\% | 82\% | 89\% | 77\% | 86\% | 86\% | 91\% | 80\% | 88\% |
| 50+ | 64\% | 74\% | 68\% | 77\% | 69\% | 78\% | 66\% | 80\% | 79\% | 89\% | 76\% | 86\% | 86\% | 92\% | 79\% | 88\% |
| Gender |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| female | 54\% | 71\% | 54\% | 70\% | 55\% | 71\% | 59\% | 73\% | 68\% | 82\% | 68\% | 82\% | 70\% | 84\% | 70\% | 83\% |
| male | 53\% | 70\% | 54\% | 70\% | 53\% | 71\% | 55\% | 71\% | 68\% | 82\% | 65\% | 82\% | 72\% | 85\% | 67\% | 82\% |
| not reported | 46\% | 63\% | 71\% | 90\% | 52\% | 80\% | 65\% | 92\% | 74\% | 86\% | 74\% | 87\% | 80\% | 89\% | 75\% | 88\% |

Distance Education is identified by "method of delivery" codes "DINT", "DINT2", and "ITV"

- Success rates and retention rates are lower for students enrolled in distance education courses than non-distance education coursework (10 to 15 percentage point differences).
- White and Asian students have significantly higher success and retention rates both distance education and non-distance education subgroups than do Latino and African-American students (10+ percentage points).
- Generally, the older the students, the higher the success and retention rates.

Table 22. SAC Success and Retention in Basic Skills vs. Non-Basic Skills, 2009-2013

|  | Basic Skills |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Non-Basic Skills |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 2009-10 \\ & N=9647 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 2010-11 \\ & N=9413 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 2011-12 \\ & N=8925 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 2012-13 \\ & N=8165 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2009-10 \\ N=105628 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2010-11 \\ & \mathrm{~N}=97697 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2011-12 \\ N=102681 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2012-13 \\ \mathrm{~N}=94962 \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | \% Success | $\%$ Retention | \% Success | \% <br> Retention | \% Success | $\%$ Retention | \% <br> Success | \% <br> Retention |  | $\%$ Retention | \% Success | \% <br> Retention | $\begin{gathered} \hline \% \\ \text { Success } \end{gathered}$ | $\%$ Retention | \% Success | \% Retention |
|  | 58\% | 78\% | 57\% | 79\% | 61\% | 81\% | 62\% | 82\% | 67\% | 81\% | 66\% | 81\% | 70\% | 83\% | 68\% | 82\% |
| Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Afr. American | 45\% | 69\% | 53\% | 79\% | 51\% | 76\% | 48\% | 74\% | 60\% | 77\% | 59\% | 76\% | 63\% | 80\% | 62\% | 78\% |
| Latino | 53\% | 76\% | 52\% | 76\% | 55\% | 78\% | 57\% | 80\% | 63\% | 79\% | 62\% | 79\% | 65\% | 81\% | 64\% | 80\% |
| Asian, Pac IsInder | 76\% | 87\% | 76\% | 88\% | 80\% | 91\% | 82\% | 92\% | 75\% | 85\% | 75\% | 84\% | 76\% | 85\% | 76\% | 85\% |
| White | 56\% | 76\% | 57\% | 75\% | 61\% | 77\% | 67\% | 83\% | 76\% | 85\% | 73\% | 84\% | 81\% | 89\% | 75\% | 85\% |
| Other | 59\% | 78\% | 55\% | 81\% | 62\% | 82\% | 66\% | 82\% | 68\% | 82\% | 71\% | 83\% | 75\% | 85\% | 74\% | 83\% |
| Decline to State | 56\% | 81\% | 58\% | 81\% | 66\% | 84\% | 61\% | 79\% | 67\% | 82\% | 67\% | 82\% | 71\% | 85\% | 70\% | 83\% |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| not reported | 74\% | 87\% | 75\% | 90\% | 42\% | 92\% | 43\% | 64\% | 72\% | 85\% | 74\% | 88\% | 79\% | 88\% | 76\% | 89\% |
| <=19 | 49\% | 77\% | 49\% | 77\% | 55\% | 79\% | 54\% | 79\% | 62\% | 81\% | 63\% | 82\% | 65\% | 87\% | 64\% | 82\% |
| 20-21 | 52\% | 76\% | 52\% | 77\% | 54\% | 78\% | 57\% | 79\% | 63\% | 79\% | 62\% | 79\% | 64\% | 81\% | 64\% | 80\% |
| 22-25 | 59\% | 78\% | 57\% | 77\% | 65\% | 82\% | 66\% | 83\% | 64\% | 78\% | 64\% | 79\% | 67\% | 81\% | 66\% | 80\% |
| 26-29 | 66\% | 80\% | 63\% | 79\% | 64\% | 79\% | 70\% | 83\% | 70\% | 81\% | 69\% | 81\% | 72\% | 83\% | 72\% | 82\% |
| 30-39 | 67\% | 79\% | 66\% | 80\% | 66\% | 81\% | 74\% | 84\% | 76\% | 85\% | 74\% | 84\% | 79\% | 87\% | 75\% | 84\% |
| 40-49 | 71\% | 83\% | 71\% | 83\% | 72\% | 84\% | 75\% | 86\% | 82\% | 89\% | 76\% | 85\% | 85\% | 90\% | 78\% | 86\% |
| 50+ | 74\% | 86\% | 74\% | 86\% | 78\% | 90\% | 77\% | 91\% | 79\% | 88\% | 76\% | 85\% | 85\% | 91\% | 78\% | 87\% |
| Gender |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| female | 60\% | 80\% | 61\% | 81\% | 64\% | 82\% | 64\% | 83\% | 67\% | 81\% | 67\% | 81\% | 68\% | 82\% | 69\% | 82\% |
| male | 54\% | 76\% | 52\% | 76\% | 56\% | 79\% | 59\% | 81\% | 68\% | 82\% | 66\% | 81\% | 71\% | 84\% | 66\% | 81\% |
| not reported | 74\% | 87\% | 75\% | 90\% | 42\% | 92\% | 43\% | 64\% | 72\% | 84\% | 74\% | 88\% | 79\% | 88\% | 76\% | 89\% |

Basic Skills identified by subject/course associations in ITS based on college coding of basic skills

- Success rates and retention rates in basic skills courses are lower ( $57 \%$ to $62 \%$ success rates and $78 \%$ to $82 \%$ retention rates) than in nonbasic skills coursework ( $66 \%$ to $70 \%$ in success rates and $81 \%$ to $83 \%$ retention rates). Basic skills course success rates have, however, increased four percentage points in the last four years vs. about one percentage point for non-basic skills rates and retention rates.
- In the basic skills subgroup, Asian students significantly outperform other groups; Both White and Asian students in the non-basic skills subgroup are generally about ten percentage points higher than Latino and African-American students for both success and retention.
- Females perform better than males in basic skills, and comparably to males in non-basic skills coursework.

Table 23. Success and Retention in CTE vs. Non-CTE, 2009-2013

|  | CTE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Non-CTE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 2009-10 \\ \mathrm{~N}=61230 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{2 0 1 0 - 1 1} \\ \mathrm{N}=56209 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2011-12 \\ & \mathrm{~N}=64226 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 2012-13 \\ & \mathrm{~N}=58193 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2009-10 \\ \mathrm{~N}=80182 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2010-11 \\ \mathrm{~N}=77132 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2011-12 \\ \mathrm{~N}=74504 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2012-13 \\ \mathrm{~N}=74110 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  |  | $\%$ <br> Retention |  | $\%$ <br> Retention |  | $\%$ <br> Retention | $\%$ <br> Success | $\%$ <br> Retention | $\%$ <br> Success | $\%$ <br> Retention | $\%$ <br> Success | $\%$ <br> Retention |  | $\%$ <br> Retention |  | \% <br> Retention |
|  | 85\% | 91\% | 84\% | 91\% | 87\% | 93\% | 86\% | 92\% | 63\% | 79\% | 64\% | 80\% | 65\% | 81\% | 65\% | 81\% |
| Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Afr-American | 80\% | 87\% | 76\% | 86\% | 81\% | 90\% | 79\% | 88\% | 56\% | 75\% | 57\% | 75\% | 59\% | 78\% | 59\% | 76\% |
| Latino | 74\% | 86\% | 74\% | 86\% | 76\% | 87\% | 75\% | 86\% | 60\% | 78\% | 60\% | 78\% | 62\% | 80\% | 62\% | 79\% |
| Asian, Pac IsInder | 81\% | 88\% | 80\% | 88\% | 83\% | 89\% | 83\% | 89\% | 75\% | 85\% | 75\% | 85\% | 75\% | 85\% | 76\% | 85\% |
| White | 91\% | 95\% | 90\% | 95\% | 93\% | 96\% | 92\% | 95\% | 68\% | 80\% | 68\% | 81\% | 69\% | 82\% | 72\% | 83\% |
| Other | 82\% | 90\% | 84\% | 93\% | 87\% | 93\% | 86\% | 92\% | 63\% | 79\% | 65\% | 80\% | 67\% | 81\% | 68\% | 79\% |
| Decline to State | 93\% | 96\% | 93\% | 97\% | 95\% | 97\% | 96\% | 98\% | 63\% | 80\% | 64\% | 81\% | 68\% | 83\% | 69\% | 83\% |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <=19 | 63\% | 81\% | 64\% | 84\% | 68\% | 85\% | 64\% | 83\% | 61\% | 80\% | 62\% | 81\% | 64\% | 82\% | 63\% | 82\% |
| 20-21 | 63\% | 80\% | 63\% | 81\% | 67\% | 82\% | 64\% | 80\% | 62\% | 79\% | 61\% | 79\% | 63\% | 80\% | 63\% | 80\% |
| 22-25 | 75\% | 85\% | 73\% | 85\% | 76\% | 86\% | 76\% | 86\% | 62\% | 77\% | 62\% | 78\% | 65\% | 80\% | 64\% | 79\% |
| 26-29 | 85\% | 91\% | 85\% | 91\% | 87\% | 93\% | 88\% | 93\% | 65\% | 78\% | 65\% | 79\% | 65\% | 79\% | 68\% | 80\% |
| 30-39 | 93\% | 96\% | 93\% | 95\% | 94\% | 96\% | 93\% | 96\% | 68\% | 80\% | 69\% | 81\% | 68\% | 81\% | 71\% | 81\% |
| 40-49 | 94\% | 97\% | 94\% | 96\% | 96\% | 98\% | 96\% | 97\% | 73\% | 83\% | 72\% | 82\% | 72\% | 83\% | 73\% | 83\% |
| 50+ | 91\% | 95\% | 92\% | 95\% | 95\% | 97\% | 94\% | 96\% | 73\% | 86\% | 73\% | 85\% | 73\% | 85\% | 76\% | 88\% |
| Gender |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| female | 78\% | 87\% | 78\% | 87\% | 80\% | 88\% | 81\% | 89\% | 65\% | 80\% | 65\% | 80\% | 66\% | 81\% | 66\% | 81\% |
| male | 87\% | 93\% | 87\% | 93\% | 90\% | 95\% | 88\% | 93\% | 62\% | 79\% | 62\% | 79\% | 64\% | 80\% | 64\% | 80\% |
| not reported | 87\% | 94\% | 85\% | 95\% | 90\% | 95\% | 92\% | 96\% | 66\% | 80\% | 72\% | 85\% | 64\% | 83\% | 70\% | 86\% |

CTE identified by subject/course associations provided by ITS based on college-assigned coding

- Success rates and retention rates in CTE coursework are significantly higher than in non-CTE coursework (+20 percentage points for success rates and +10 percentage points for retention).
- White students significantly outperform students in other ethnic subgroups in CTE while Asian students outperform other ethnic subgroups in non-CTE courses.
- Males performed at higher rates than females in CTE coursework, but outcomes are reversed in non-CTE coursework.

Table 24. SCE Student Demographics, 2010-2013

|  | $\begin{aligned} & 2010-11 \\ & \mathrm{~N}=40013 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2011-12 } \\ \mathrm{N}=36348 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2012-13 \\ \mathrm{~N}=24292 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ethnicity |  |  |  |
| African-American | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% |
| Asian | 7\% | 9\% | 8\% |
| Latino | 50\% | 72\% | 79\% |
| White | 4\% | 6\% | 3\% |
| Other | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% |
| Not Reported | 37\% | 10\% | 8\% |
| Age |  |  |  |
| <=19 | 17\% | 14\% | 12\% |
| 20-21 | 10\% | 11\% | 6\% |
| 22-25 | 14\% | 15\% | 13\% |
| 26-29 | 11\% | 10\% | 12\% |
| 30-39 | 20\% | 19\% | 23\% |
| 40-49 | 15\% | 16\% | 19\% |
| 50+ | 13\% | 14\% | 16\% |
| Gender |  |  |  |
| Female | 51\% | 53\% | 54\% |
| Male | 48\% | 47\% | 46\% |
| Not Reported | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% |

NOTE: academic year includes summer, fall, and spring

- The largest proportions of students are Latinos.
- The proportion of students over 30 years of age have increased ten percentage points in the last three years (48\% to 58\%)
- There are more slightly more females than males.

Table 25. SCE Offerings and FTES, 2010-2013

|  | $2010-2011$ | $2011-2012$ | $2012-2013$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Offerings | 1749 | 1721 | 1457 |
| FTES | 5612 | 4922 | 4558 |

- In recent years, the state reduced the number of students funded. As a result, there has been a decrease in the number of non-credit offerings and full-time equivalent students (FTES).

Table 26. Completion Rates, CASAS Learning Gains and Matriculation to Credit Program, 2010-2013

|  | $2010-2011$ | $2011-2012$ | $2012-2013$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Successful Course <br> Completions | 11726 | 13767 | 13072 |
| CASAS Learning Gains | 15201 | 15280 | 16151 |
| Matriculation from Non- <br> Credit to Credit Program | 716 | 655 | 801 |

Note: (1) Prior to 2010-2011, only two programs reported grades. Since then, a policy change required all departments to issue and report final grades to better track students' successful completion of offerings required for certificates of completion. (2) The acronym CASAS is for Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System which is an assessment tool used in California to measure gains in student learning as measured a gain of three to five points comparing a pre-test and post test. A learning gain is also captured when a student earns a high school diploma, GED, or U.S. Citizenship. In addition, there are other assessments in which a learning gain can be captured through the English Language (EL) Civics program. Through EL Civics, students demonstrate that they have achieved competence in performing a civic task, such as writing to a legislator, participating in a city council meeting, visiting the post office or library, etc.

- The number of successful completions of non-credit offerings has increased despite the slight reduction in the number of offerings.
- CASAS learning gains continue to increase in the last three years.
- The number of students who matriculate to credit coursework from the School of Continuing Education to college credit coursework increased 12 percentage points.

Table 27. SCE Awards, 2010-2013

| Type of Award | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| High School Diploma | 168 | 144 | 211 |
| Certificates of Program <br> Completion | 434 | 2306 | 1462 |
| General Education <br> Development (GED) | 35 | 20 | 60 |

Note: California transitioned to a standardized grading system in 2011-2012. This change resulted in the identification of a greater number of course/program completions.

- Awards of high school diplomas and general education development certificates rebound in the over the three-year period.
- Awards of program completion certificates increased dramatically in 2011-2012 due to college’s effort to develop new program certificates and approval from the Chancellor's Office; however, it is expected that the number of certificates awarded will stabilize over time.

Table 28. SAC Credit Full-time Equivalent Students (FTES), 2008-2009 to 2012-2013

|  | 2008-2009 | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Full-time <br> Equivalent <br> Students | 15,888 | 15,780 | 16,239 | 14,501 | 15,376 |

Note: The measure of full-time equivalent students (FTES) is the method by which RSCCD reports student information to the state and consequently is the basis for allocations from the state to RSCCD.

- College credit FTES increased 17 percentage points in the first three years of this 5 -year snapshot, dropped sharply in 2011-12, and is starting to recover.

Table 29. SAC Degrees and Certificates Awarded, 2008-2009 to 2012-2013

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8 - 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9 - 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0 - 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 1 - 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 2 - 1 3}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AA/AS Degrees | 1,294 | 1,322 | 1,445 | 1,503 | $\mathbf{1 , 7 0 2}$ |
| Certificates | 524 | 1,094 | 1,206 | 1,298 | 1,303 |

- The number of associate degrees awarded continues to increase.
- The number of certificates awarded more than doubled, from 524 in 2008-09 to 1,303 in 2012-13.

Table 30. SAC Transfers to Universities, 2008-2009 to 2012-2013

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8 - 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}-\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0 - 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 1 - 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 2 - 1 3}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CSU | 939 | 985 | $\mathbf{1 , 1 9 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 2 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 1 0 8}$ |
| UC | 234 | 198 | 240 | 196 | 210 |
| Private/Out-of-State | 359 | 578 | 660 | 821 | 898 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 , 5 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 7 6 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 0 9 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 2 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 2 7 6}$ |

Note: The number of students who transfer in any year is contingent on both student readiness to transfer and the capacity of the universities to accept transfers.

- The number of students who transfer to CSU and private universities has increased dramatically over the past five years while the number of students who transfer to UC has remained relatively consistent.

