DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 381 214 JC 950 208

AUTHOR Isonio, Steven
TITLE Profile of Students on Probation/Disqualification at Golden West College.
INSTITUTION Golden West Coll., Huntington Beach, Calif.
PUB DATE May 95
NOTE 40p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; Academic Persistence; *Academic Probation; Community Colleges; Self Evaluation (Groups); *Student Characteristics; *Student Needs; Tables (Data); Two Year Colleges; *Two Year College Students
IDENTIFIERS *Golden West College CA

ABSTRACT

During the 1994-95 academic year, a task force on underpreparedness was convened at Golden West College, in Huntington Beach, California, to address the large number of students underprepared for college work. The task force examined records from the 1992-93 and 1993-94 academic years with regard to student academic status, gender, race/ethnicity, primary language, time out of school, performance in math and English courses, high school grade point average (GPA), number of hours of employment, importance of college to both the student and people close to the student, and basic skills performance. This information was matched with data collected during an assessment process. Using students' probation/disqualification (P/D) status as the primary indicator of student unpreparedness, study results indicated the following: (1) for each year examined, about 83% of enrolled students maintained good academic standing, 14% were on academic P/D, and 3% were on progress P/D; (2) there were no important differences in terms of student gender or primary language in terms of P/D rates; (3) P/D rates for Pacific Islander and African American students were notably higher than the rates for other racial groups; (4) native English speakers were more likely to be on P/D if they were in school at the time of assessment or had been out of school for a short time, had a lower high school GPA, or enrolled in a higher number of units; and (5) non-native English speakers were more likely to be on P/D if they had a low math or English grade, and were still in or had been out of school for a short time. The assessment instrument and 20 data tables are included. (MAB)

Profile of Students on Probation/Disqualification

at Golden West College

Research Office
Golden West College
Huntington Beach, CA

May 1995

Steven Isonio, Ph.D.

Overview

- The Task Force on Underpreparedness developed comprehensive, conceptual definitions of "underpreparedness" as it relates to students, faculty, staff, administrators, and the institution.

- One focus was to view student probation/disqualification status as an indicator of underpreparedness. That is, students who are placed on probation or disqualification are students who, for various possible reasons, were underprepared for their educational program. An advantage of this approach is that it is criterion-referenced, that is, linked to an objective outcome. However, this definition is rather conservative since it only identifies students who are ultimately placed on probation or disqualification.

- For each of the last two academic years, about 83% of enrolled students maintained good academic standing. Nearly 14% of the remaining students are on academic probation/disqualification, and only about 3% are on progress probation/disqualification.

- What are the characteristics of students on probation/disqualification? Data from the MIS Student Basic datasets and student assessment (CAPP) were used to develop a profile of probation/disqualification students.

- Results indicated no important differences in terms of student gender or primary language. The probation/disqualification rates for Pacific Islander and African American students were notably higher than the rates for other racial groups.

- Separate analyses were performed for native and non-native English speakers. For native English speakers, the results indicated that students are more likely to be placed on probation/disqualification if they were in school at the time of assessment or had been out of school for only a short time, had a lower GPA in high school, planned to enroll in a greater number of units, or reported that college is relatively more important to people close to them. Other, less strong discriminators included having lower scores on the APS Reading and APS Writing tests, poorer study skills, and lower grades in their previous math and English courses.

- For non-native English speakers, results indicated that students are more likely to be on probation/disqualification if they had a lower grade in their previous math course, reported that college is less important to them personally, were still in school or had been out of school for only a short time, reported that college is relatively more important to people close to them, and had a lower grade in their previous English course. Other, less strong discriminators included having planned to enroll in more units, as well a lower GPA in high school, lower CELSA test scores, and poorer study skills.

- This information can be used to develop models which identify at-risk students for purposes of early alert and intervention. Many questions remain and should be addressed by representatives of key campus constituencies. These questions include: How wide a net should be cast by the early identification model? Which format and what content should be used for the message to students? What is the best way to avoid creating negative expectations? What are the implications of "false positives" and "false negatives"? Can existing services/programs accommodate more students? Are new services/programs necessary? Which interventions are effective? To what extent? With which students?

Profile of Students on Probation/Disqualification at Golden West College

Background

During the 1994-95 academic year, a task force on underpreparedness was convened at Golden West College. It was charged with addressing the challenge of the seemingly large number of students who appear underprepared for college work. Comprehensive definitions of underpreparedness as it relates to students, faculty, staff, and the institution generally, were developed. For students, underpreparedness was described as involving the following:

- o *lack of necessary skill levels in language, math, information, and science areas to successfully complete specific programs and classes,*
- o *lack of knowledge about self, institution, and study skills, lack of knowledge about academic skills, academic standards, and academic expectations,*
- o *lack of knowledge about the relationships between course content and prerequisites, and requirements for degree and transfer, and occupational and personal goals, and a lack of experience with, and understanding of other cultures.*

The definition of underpreparedness reflects the fact that it is a complex, multidimensional concept. It also directly suggests a number of specific intervention strategies which are being discussed by the task force. However, there still is a need to know which characteristics are compelling enough to be compiled into a "profile" of the underprepared student. This report documents the development of such a profile.

Academic probation/disqualification involves a relatively low grade point average (below 2.0), while progress probation/disqualification is related to excess incomplete grades or withdrawals. The reason for linking underpreparedness with probation/disqualification status was that, by definition, students who have been placed on probation/disqualification were not prepared to meet the demands of their educational programs.

This approach is very conservative. Only students who are ultimately placed on probation or are disqualified are identified. Clearly, not all students who are underprepared, and perhaps more important, not all students who can benefit from early identification and some form of intervention are eventually placed on probation or disqualification. Since this approach is conservative, it will tend to result in more "false negatives"--failures to identify students who are in fact underprepared, as being underprepared. Also, there are many reasons why a student may eventually be placed on probation or disqualification. It is quite possible that some students in these groups were well prepared for their educational program at the outset and do not lack the skills and knowledge identified in the by the task force in the definition of underpreparedness, but for various personal reasons have encountered academic difficulties. Considering these students to be "underprepared", after the fact, constitutes a "false positive" error.

Recognizing that there will be misclassifications, the goal of the present analysis was not to come to a full understanding of the cause of the probation/disqualification status. Rather, the intention was to determine the set of early measured indicators which best discriminates students with good academic standing from those either on progress or academic probation/disqualification, and thereby to develop a "profile" of these students. Such a profile could serve as the basis for early identification and intervention for students who are at risk of academic failure.

Method

Description of the Data.

Student Basic MIS files for the Fall and Spring terms of the 1992-93 and 1993-94 academic years were used with data from the GWC assessment database for the analyses. Data element SB22, from the Student Basic MIS file, indicates student academic status. The original groupings "progress and academic probation", "progress and academic disqualification",

"academic probation", and "academic disqualification" were all were recoded into a single "academic probation/disqualification" category. Similarly, "progress probation" and "progress disqualification" were recoded into a single "progress probation/disqualification" category. Additionally, Fall and Spring data for a given academic year were combined, creating an unduplicated listing. As a result, each student was categorized in one of three possible ways: good academic standing, academic probation/disqualification, or progress probation/ disqualification for the academic year. Tables 1 and 2 depict these breakdowns for Fall 1992 and Spring 1993, respectively; Tables 3 and 4 present the data for Fall 1993 and Spring 1994, separately, respectively.

Other data from the MIS Student Basic file were used. Specifically, SB04 (Student Gender), SB05 (Student Race/Ethnicity), and SB07 (Student Primary Language) were crossed with SB22, the student academic status to begin to build a profile of students on academic or progress probation/disqualification. In the case of student race/ethnicity (SB05), since nearly 75% of Asian students at GWC are Vietnamese, the general "Asian" category was coded in such a way that Vietnamese students could be analyzed separately, resulting in a "Vietnamese" grouping and an "Other Asian" grouping.

Data collected during the assessment process (via the CAPP form) which comprise the local assessment database were matched with the MIS Student Basic data to provide a more comprehensive view of academic and progress probation/disqualification students. Specifically, assessment data elements used included the number of years that the student has been out of school (as of the date of assessment), grades earned in the student's last math and English courses (again, as of the date of assessment), the high school grade-point-average, the number of hours per week the student plans to be employed, importance of college to people close to the student, and importance of college to the student him/herself. Also, information about test

scores in reading, writing, ESL, and mathematics as well as a locally developed study skills measure (see Appendix A) were analyzed.

Analysis.

The primary analysis involved crosstabulating the categorical variables with student academic status. Further, percentages of students in "good standing" were compared in a way similar to the EEOC disproportionate impact approach (Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures, 1978). This involves identifying the group with the highest "good standing" percentage to serve as the baseline for comparison. Other groups with rates below 80% of the top rate warrant further examination to determine whether differences are due to factors that can be changed by the institution.

Since the "predictors" are likely related to each other, some of them may tap the same underlying causal component. That is, two measured variables may each, separately, appear to relate rather strongly to academic status, but they may overlap to such a degree that the predictive power of both of them together is no greater than for each one alone. One approach to dealing with this overlap is to use a statistical procedure which simultaneously weights variables to account for this overlap (multicollinearity). Specifically, a discriminant function analysis was conducted to determine the optimal set of variables for discriminating between groups of students who had a good academic standing and those on academic probation/disqualification. In this case, separate analyses were performed for students whose native language is English and those for whom English is a second language. Since these two groups of students take different tests at assessment, and since the skills measured by these tests were to be a part of the analysis, the two datasets would have to be analyzed separately.

Results and Summary

Crosstabulations.

Table 1 and Table 2 show student academic status for the Fall 1992 and Spring 1993 terms, respectively. Tables 3 and 4 depict this information for Fall 1993 and Spring 1994, respectively. As can be seen, just over 80% of students in each of these terms is in good academic standing. Most of the remaining students (about 13%) are on academic probation/disqualification, with a very small percentage (3-4%) on progress probation/disqualification.

Tables 5-A and 5-B contain breakdowns of student academic status by gender for the 1992-93 and 1993-94 academic years, respectively. The proportions of males and females with good academic standing was virtually identical for the two academic years. Although more males were on probation, the difference is rather small (about 82% versus 78% each year), indicating that gender is not a good discriminator of academic standing and should not be included in the probation profile.

The breakdowns of racial/ethnic category by academic standing for the two academic years analyzed are presented in Tables 6-A and 6-B. The rates for a given group were fairly consistent for the two academic years. Also, with few exceptions, the probation/disqualification rates are generally comparable across ethnic/racial groups. In both years, Vietnamese students had the highest rate of good academic standing. No other group had a rate that was less than 80% of that rate for the 1992-93 data; only the rate for African-American students fell below 80% of the baseline established by Vietnamese students for 1993-94. Nevertheless, of note is that the academic probation/disqualification rates for Vietnamese (and Asian students, generally) and Whites are consistently higher than the rates associated with other groups.

Tables 7-A and 7-B present information for primary language category. As these Tables show, students whose primary language was one other than English had a slightly higher "good standing" rate than did native speakers of English for both academic years analyzed, a difference that reflects a lower academic probation/disqualification rate. Again, however, the magnitude of this difference is not great, and does not exceed the EEOC 80% threshold. Table 8 presents academic standing by number of years out of school at the time of assessment. Students report the number of years out of school and other background information at the initial assessment session. There is a clear tendency for students who have been out of school for longer periods prior to starting at GWC to have higher rates of good academic standing.

Tables 9 through 11 depict academic standing crossed with aspects of students' previous academic history--grade earned in the last English course, grade earned in the last math course, and overall high school grade point average. As with time out of school just discussed, these data were collected on the CAPP form at assessment. Students who report earning A or B grades in their last English course (Table 9) and their last math course (Table 10) have a higher percentage representation in the good academic standing category. In particular, what seems to be driving this difference is the greater proportion of students who received D or F grades, and to a lesser degree C grades, in their last English or math course. Table 11 shows the relationship between self-reported high school grade point average and academic standing. Perhaps most striking, the rate of academic probation/disqualification for students either still in school, or who have been out of school for less than one year, is 28.5%, a value that is more than two times the rate of those who were out of school for at least three years.

Table 12 depicts academic standing by employment hours anticipated at time of assessment. The relationship between these variables is more complex. Students who reported that they would be working full-time have the lowest rate of academic probation/disqualification, followed by those who plan to work between 31 and 40 hours weekly. Interestingly, however,

students who plan to work some intermediate number of hours--between 11 and 30 have the highest academic probation/disqualification rates. Finally, the rates for those who report that they will work 10 hours or fewer are slightly greater than those who will work at least 30 hours weekly, but much lower than the 11 to 30 hour students.

Table 13 depicts summaries of analyses of study skills. As can be seen, students with good academic standing have a mean study skills score of 2.88, compared with 2.71 and 2.74 for those with progress probation/disqualification and academic probation/disqualification, respectively. Although these means are statistically significantly different [$F_{(2, 3271)} = 23.42$, $p < .0001$], as suggested by the very comparable magnitudes, this difference is not likely of great practical value.

Discriminant Analyses.

As noted earlier, separate discriminant function analyses were performed with students grouped according to the two primary language categories--native English speakers and non-native English speakers in order to include assessment test scores, since native and non-native English speakers take different tests. In each case, separately, the set of factors which best discriminates between students with good academic standing and those on academic probation/disqualification were determined.

Table 14 summarizes the analysis for native speakers of English. Three factors were particularly strong discriminators--the number of years out of school at the time of assessment, high school grade point average, and the number of units planned for the next term. Standardized discriminant function coefficients which reflect the magnitude of the variables' contributions (Klecka, 1980) are also depicted in Tables 14 and 15. The profile that emerged is that academic probation students are those who are still in school or have been out of school for a relatively short time (such as first time students coming to GWC from high school), who had a

comparatively low grade point average in high school, and who planned to enroll in a greater number of units. Other factors, with less strong discrimination power, complete the profile. These include the importance of college to people close to the student, scores on the APS reading and writing tests, grades received in the most recently completed math and English courses, and study skills. In this case, academic probation students reported lower grades in their previous math and English courses and received lower scores on both the APS reading and writing tests than their good academic standing counterparts. Also, interestingly, these students reported that college is relatively *more* important to people close to them than did students in good standing. The overall model resulted in a canonical correlation of .32 and correct classification of 62.4% of the cases (See Table 14-B).

Table 15 summarizes the discriminant function analyses for non-native English speakers. Again several variables were identified as contributing to the discrimination between good academic standing and academic probation/disqualification. The strongest factor was the grade received in the last math class, with academic probation students having received a lower grade. Quite interestingly, academic probation students reported that college is *less* important to them personally, but *more* important to people close to them, in comparison to students with good academic standing. As was the case with native English speakers, students with a primary language other than English were more likely to be on academic probation if they had reported that they were still in school or had recently been in school (the first time high school student), received low grades in their last English course, and had a low overall high school grade point average. Also, there was a tendency, although not strong, for the academic probation students to have poorer study skills. In this case, the overall model resulted in a canonical correlation of .34 and correct classifications in 70.6% of the cases.

Summary and Recommendations

The value of analyzing factors related to academic standing in order to gain insight about underpreparedness reflects the strength of the association between underpreparedness and future academic standing. As noted earlier, this association is likely strong and the approach has the advantage of being objective and criterion-referenced. Many aspects of underpreparedness as outlined by the GWC task force are not easily or efficiently measured. However, if some student data which *are* currently gathered can be shown to effectively discriminate between probation students and those in good standing, then these indicators can serve as an empirically-based proxy for the full set of factors noted in the Task Force definition. Further, they can be viewed as a profile and used in models for early identification of at-risk students.

The analyses outlined above clearly support the notion that previous academic history is a strong predictor of current academic performance and are consistent with a large and growing literature which documents the ability of past academic performance to predict future performance (e.g., Cabrera, Nora, & Castaneda,1993; Dey & Astin, 1993; Grosset, 1994). The strong ab ity of high school grade point average and past grades earned in key courses to discriminate probation students from those in good-standing was supported by the present analysis. Clearly, past academic performance should be given a central role in any model designed to identify students who are at risk academically at GWC.

A number of factors beyond those related to academic history seem to contribute to the discrimination between good academic standing and academic probation and warrant inclusion in the "profile", as well. Among these are reading and writing skills and study skills. Although they were clearly not the strongest predictors, APS Reading and APS Writing test scores, as well as scores on the CELSA, did contribute to the model, as did the study skills measure. The fact that the direct measures of basic skills--reading and writing--contributed less to the discriminant

model than did most other factors may be surprising. However, it is important to remember that these measures come from tests that are designed for initial placement into specific courses and not as tools to predict future academic standing. In any case, the academic skills levels of students are major components of their preparedness and should be included in any model to identify at-risk status.

The amount of time a student had been out of school, the number of units planned, and the importance of college to the student and to people close to the student were also important discriminating factors. Perhaps most striking, the rate of academic probation/disqualification for students who were either still in school at the time of assessment, or who have been out of school for less than one year, is 28.5%, a value that is more than two times the rate for those who were out of school for at least three years. That is students who had been out of school for longer periods of time, who are likely older and more mature, have a lower probation rate. Similarly, reports by students of the importance of college to people close to them were related to academic standing in an unexpected way. Specifically, students on academic probation/ disqualification were more likely than those in good academic standing to say that college is very important to people with whom they are close. While the question "How important is it to the people closest to you that you go to college?" appears to be a measure of degree of support for the student from family and friends, it may actually be an indicator of the student's "ownership" of the student role. Thus, those who indicate that college is very important to people close to them may have less commitment to their own educational program which may translate into poorer performance as indicated by the higher probation rate. Factors such as time out of school, units planned, and importance of college contributed to the profile of academic probation students.

These analyses show that it is possible to discriminate between students who are likely to maintain good academic status and those who are at greater risk of being placed on probation or disqualification. The discussion of early identification approaches and intervention strategies

which culminated in specific recommendations by the task force during the Spring 1995 semester should continue. A model for early identification of at-risk students which reflects the results of the analyses and the judgment of campus representatives should be developed and pilot tested. Questions that would have to be addressed include: What is the appropriate scope for the model? Which format and what content should be used for communication with identified students? What is the best way to avoid creating negative expectations regarding identified students? What are the implications of "false positives" and "false negatives"? Can existing services/programs accommodate the likely increase in student demand? Are new services/programs necessary? Which interventions are effective?

References

Cabrera, A. F., Nora, A. & Castaneda, M . B. (1993). College persistence: Structural equation modeling test of an integrated model of student retention. *Journal of Higher Education*, *64*(2), 123-139.

Dey, E. L. & Astin, A. W. (1993). Statistical alternatives for studying college student retention: A comparative analysis of logit, probit, and linear regression. *Research in Higher Education*, *34*(5), 569-581.

Grosset, J. M. (1994). A profile of community college stop-outs. *Community College Review*, *20*(4), 51-58.

Klecka, W. R. (1980). *Discriminant Analysis*. Newbury Park, CA.: Sage Publications.

Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures. *Federal Register*, Vol. 43, No. 166. Friday, August 25, 1978, pp. 38, 296-309.

APPENDIX

Golden West College Policy on Probation

A student shall be placed on probation whenever he or she meets one of the two conditions listed below:

1. Academic Probation

   Has attempted at least 12 semester units at Golden West College and

   a. has a grade point average of less than 2.0 in the most recent semester completed
   b. has a cumulative grade point average of less than 2.0 in all units attempted

2. Progress Probation

   Has attempted at least 12 semester units at Golden West College and the percentage of units in which the student has been enrolled for which entries of "W", "I", and "NC" are recorded reaches or exceeds 50 percent.

A student on probation at Golden West College, Orange Coast College, or Coastline College shall be on probation at any district college. All probationary students shall be notified of their status and counseling services will be made available. (Title 5 Sections 55754, 55755)

Source: Golden West College Catalogue, 1994-95.

Golden West College Policy on Disqualification

A student at Golden West College who is on academic or progress probation shall be disqualified whenever he or she meets one of the two conditions listed below:

1. Academic Disqualification

   Any student on academic probation for two consecutive semesters shall be academically disqualified. However, any student on academic probation whose most recent semester grade point average equals or exceeds 2.0 or whose cumulative grade point average equals or exceeds 2.0 shall not be disqualified but shall be continued on academic probation.

2. Progress Disqualification

   Any student who is on progress probation for two consecutive semesters shall be disqualified for lack of satisfactory progress. However, any student on progress probation whose most recent semester work indicates fewer than 50 percent units of "W", "I", and "NC" shall not be disqualified but shall be continued on lack of progress probation.

Any student disqualified from a college in the Coast Community College District may be dismissed for a minimum of one semester. A student dismissed from one district college shall not attend another district college during the semester of disqualification. (Title 5 Section 55756)

Source: Golden West College Catalogue, 1994-95.

GWC Study Skills Questions

Response Scale:

A = Almost always
B = Most of the time
C = Sometimes
D = Rarely
E = Almost never

1. I take class notes that are adequate for my needs.
2. I select locations to study that are quiet and free from distractions.
3. I am able to set and adhere to a definite study schedule.
4. I allow commitments--personal, work, home--to interfere with my studying.
5. I know about and use effective test-taking strategies.
6. I make regular class attendance a high priority.
7. I complete my assignments in a timely manner.

(Students respond to these locally-developed items at the time of their initial assessment)

Background Assessment Questions from CAPP Form

Q9 How long have you been out of school? (Do not include summer)

Still in school
Less than 1 year
1 - 2 years
3 - 4 years
5 - 10 years
More than 10 years

Q11 What grade did you receive in the last English class you completed?

Q12 What is your high shcool grade point average (G. P.A.)?

A- to A	3.5 - 4.0
B to A-	3.0 - 3.4
B- to B	2.5 - 2.9
C to B-	2.0 - 2.4
C- to C	1.5 - 1.9
D to C-	1.0 - 1.4
Below D	0 - 0.9

Q15 What grade did you receive in the last math class you completed?

Q18 College units planned next term:

Fewer than 6 units
6 - 8 units
9 - 11 units
12 units or more

Q19 Employment hours planned while enrolled:

None
1 - 10 hours/week
11 - 20 hours/week
21 - 30 hours/week
31 - 40 hours/week
More than 40 hours/week

Q25 How important is it to the people closest to you that you go to college?

Not very important
Somewhat important
Very important

Q26 How important is college to you personally?

Not very important
Somewhat important
Very important

Table 1

Student Academic Standing, Fall 1992

Academic Standing	N	Percent
Good Standing	13782	83.2
Progress Probation/Disqual.	585	3.5
Academic Probation/Disqual.	2200	13.3
Total	16567	100.0

Note: Students with both Academic and Progress Probation/Disqualification are coded as Academic Probation/Disqualification.

Table 2

Student Academic Standing, Spring 1993

Academic Standing	N	Percent
Good Standing	12571	81.8
Progress Probation/Disq.	581	3.8
Academic Probation/Disq.	2207	14.4
Total	15359	100.0

Note: Students with both Academic and Progress Probation/Disqualification are coded as Academic Probation/Disqualification.

Table 3

Student Academic Standing, Fall 1993

Academic Standing	N	Percent
Good Standing	12774	83.4
Progress Probation/Disq	543	3.5
Academic Probation/Disq	1991	13.0
Total	15308	100.0

Note: Students with both Academic and Progress Probation/Disqualification are coded as Academic Probation/Disqualification.

Table 4

Student Academic Standing, Spring 1994

Academic Standing	N	Percent
Good Standing	14145	83.0
Progress Probation/Disqual.	624	3.7
Academic Probation/Disqual.	2269	13.3
Total	17038	100.0

Note: Students with both Academic and Progress Probation/Disqualification are coded as Academic Probation/Disqualification.

Table 5-A

Academic Status By Gender, at Golden West College, Fall and Spring,

1992-93 Academic Year

		Good Standing		Progress Prob/Disq.		Academic Prob/Disq.	
Gender	N	n	%	n	%	n	%
Female	11337	9316	82.2	439	3.9	1582	14.0
Male	11094	8720	78.6	508	4.6	1866	16.8
Overall	22516	18115	80.5	950	4.2	3451	15.3

Note: Students with both Academic and Progress Probation/Disqualification are coded as Academic Probation/Disqualification. The "Overall" total does not equal the column sum since "unknown/unreported" categories do not appear in the body of the Table but are included in the "Overall" totals.

Table 5-B

Academic Status (SB22) By Gender (SB04) at Golden West College,

Fall and Spring, 1993-94 Academic Year

Gender	N	Good Standing n	%	Progress Prob/Disq n	%	Academic Prob/Disq n	%
Female	10741	8875	82.6	407	3.8	1459	13.6
Male	11012	8643	78.5	524	4.8	1845	16.8
Overall	21866	17623	80.6	933	4.3	3310	15.1

Note: Students with both Academic and Progress Probation/Disqualification are coded as Academic Probation/Disqualification. The "Overall" total does not equal the column sum since "unknown/unreported" categories do not appear in the body of the Table but are included in the "Overall" totals.

Table 6-A

Academic Status By Racial/Ethnic Category at Golden West College, Fall and Spring, 1992-93 Academic Year

Ethnic/Racial Category	N	Good Standing n	%	Progress Prob/Disq. n	%	Academic Prob/Disq. n	%
African American	367	290	79.0	23	6.2	54	14.7
Filipino	361	280	77.6	18	5.0	63	17.5
Hispanic	2318	1766	76.2	106	4.6	446	19.2
Native American	336	251	74.7	10	3.0	75	22.3
Pacific Islander	116	84	72.4	8	6.9	24	20.7
Vietnamese	3075	2547	82.8	123	4.0	405	13.2
Other Asian	1635	1312	80.2	68	4.2	255	15.6
White	13336	10786	80.9	557	4.2	1993	14.9
Overall	22516	18115	80.4	950	4.2	3451	15.3

Note: Students with both Academic and Progress Probation/Disqualification are coded as Academic Probation/Disqualification. "The "overall" value does not equal the column sum since "unknown/unreported" do not appear in the body of the Table, but are included in the "Overall" totals.

Table 6-B

Academic Status (SB22) By Racial/Ethnic Category (SB05) at Golden West College, Fall and Spring, 1993-94 Academic Year

Racial/Ethnic Category	N	Good Standing n	%	Progress Prob/Disq. n	%	Academic Prob/Disq. n	%
African American	354	260	73.4	20	5.6	74	20.9
Filipino	341	271	79.5	8	2.3	62	18.2
Hispanic	2402	1802	75.0	114	4.7	486	20.2
Native American	327	246	75.2	16	4.9	65	19.9
Pacific Islander	134	91	67.9	13	9.7	30	22.4
Vietnamese	3959	3269	82.6	184	4.6	506	12.8
Other Asian	1427	1169	81.9	65	4.6	193	13.5
White	11894	9651	81.1	476	4.0	1767	14.9
Overall	21866	17623	80.6	933	4.3	3310	15.1

Note: Students with both Academic and Progress Probation/Disqualification are coded as Academic Probation/Disqualification. The "Overall" value does not equal the column sum since "unknown/unreported" do not appear in the body of the Table, but are included in the "Overall" totals.

Table 7-A

Academic Status By Primary Language Category at Golden West College,

Fall and Spring, 1992-93 Academic Year

Primary Language Category	N	Good Standing n	%	Progress Prob/Disq. n	%	Academic Prob/Disq. n	%
English	17316	13794	79.7	746	4.3	2776	16.0
Not English	3676	3050	83.0	164	4.5	462	12.6
Overall	22516	18115	80.5	950	4.2	3451	15.3

Note: Students with both Academic and Progress Probation/Disqualification are coded as Academic Probation/Disqualification. "The "overall" value does not equal the columnn sum since "unknown/unreported" do not appear in the body of the Table, but are included in the "Overall" totals.

Table 7-B

Academic Status (SB22) By Primary Language Category (SB07) at Golden West College, Fall and Spring, 1993-94 Academic Year

Primary Language Category	N	Good Standing n	%	Progress Prob/Disq. n	%	Academic Prob/Disq. n	%
English	16448	13048	79.3	722	4.4	2678	16.3
Not English	4324	3609	83.5	176	4.1	539	12.5
Overall	21866	17623	80.6	933	4.3	3310	15.1

Note: Students with both Academic and Progress Probation/Disqualification are coded as Academic Probation/Disqualification. The "Overall" value does not equal the column sum since "unknown/unreported" do not appear in the body of the Table, but are included in the "Overall" totals.

Table 8

Academic Standing By Number of Years Out of School

Number of Years Out of School	N	Good Standing n	%	Progress Prob/Disq. n	%	Academic Prob/Disq. n	%
Still in school/ less than year	3458	2270	65.6	204	5.9	984	28.5
1 to 2 years	672	528	78.6	37	5.5	107	15.9
3 or more years	2097	1751	83.5	87	4.1	259	12.4
Overall	6227	4549	73.1	328	5.3	1350	21.7

Note: Academic Standing is for 1993-94 academic year.

Table 9

Academic Standing By Grade in Last English Course

Grade in Last English Course	N	Good Standing n	%	Progress Prob/Disq. n	%	Academic Prob/Disq. n	%
A or B grade	3189	2342	73.4	150	4.7	697	21.9
C grade	1527	982	64.3	109	7.1	436	28.6
D or F grade	308	191	62.0	25	8.1	92	29.9
Overall	5024	3515	70.0	284	5.7	1225	24.4

Note: Academic Standing is for 1993-94 academic year.

Table 10

Academic Standing By Grade in Last Math Course

Grade in Last Math Course	N	Good Standing n	%	Progress Prob/Disq. n	%	Academic Prob/Disq. n	%
Grade of A or B	2607	1975	75.8	127	4.9	505	19.4
Grade of C	2058	1371	66.6	136	6.6	551	26.8
Grade of D or F	633	391	61.8	34	5.4	208	32.9
Overall	5298	3737	70.5	297	5.6	1264	23.9

Note: Academic Standing is for 1993-94 academic year.

Table 11

Academic Standing By High School Grade Point Average

High School Grade Point Average	N	Good Standing n	%	Progress Prob/Disq. n	%	Academic Prob/Disq. n	%
3.0 or higher	1976	1603	81.1	74	3.7	299	15.1
2.0 to 2.9	2750	1778	64.7	169	6.1	803	29.2
1.9 or lower	595	375	63.0	50	8.4	170	28.6
Overall	5321	3756	70.6	293	5.5	1272	23.9

Notes: Academic Standing is for 1993-94 academic year.

Table 12

Academic Standing By Anticipated Employment Hours

Anticipated Employment Hours	N	Good Standing n	%	Progress Prob/Disq. n	%	Academic Prob/Disq. n	%
None	1665	888	74.6	82	6.9	220	18.5
1 to 10 hours	475	358	75.4	24	5.1	93	19.6
11 to 20 hours	1558	1052	67.5	78	5.0	428	27.5
21 to 30 hours	1280	836	65.3	74	5.8	370	28.9
31 to 40 hours	1051	836	79.5	43	4.1	172	16.4
40 or more hours	398	338	84.9	15	3.8	45	11.3
Overall	5952	4308	72.4	316	5.3	1328	22.3

Note: Academic Standing is for 1993-94 academic year.

Table 13

Mean Study Skills Score, By Academic Standing Category

Academic Standing Category	n	M	Sx
Good Standing	2407	2.88	.59
Progress Probation/Disqual.	171	2.71	.60
Academic Probation/Disqual.	796	2.74	.56

Note. Study skills score represents mean response to seven items scaled 1 to 5, with 5 indicating higher level of study skills.

Table 14-A

Profile of Academic Probation/Disqualification Students Based on Standardized Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients--*Native* Speakers of English

Indicator	Coefficient[1]	Academic Probation/Disqualification "Profile"
CAPP Q9	.62	In school now or very few years out of school
CAPP Q12	.48	Lower HS GPA
CAPP Q18	.40	Plans to enroll in greater number of units
CAPP Q25	.24	College is more important to the people close to the student.
APS Reading test score	.15	Lower score on the APS Reading test
CAPP Q15	.14	Lower grade in previous math course
CAPP Q11	.11	Lower grade in previous English course
Study Skills score	.11	Poorer study skills
APS Writing test score	.10	Lower score on the APS English test

1 = Absolute value of standardized discriminant function coefficient.

Table 14-B

Discriminant Analysis Classification Results for Native English Speakers

			Predicted Group	
		# cases	1	2
Actual Group	1	1381	833 60.3%	548 39.7%
	2	565	184 32.6%	381 67.4%

Overall percent correctly classified = 62.4%

Note: Group 1 = Good academic standing
Group 2 = Probation/Disqualification

Table 15-A

Profile of Academic Probation/Disqualification Students Based on Standardized Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients--*Non-Native* Speakers of English

Indicator	Coefficient[1]	Academic Probation/Disqualification "Profile"
CAPP Q15	.62	Lower grade in last math course
CAPP Q26	.47	College is less important to the student personally
CAPP Q9	.45	In school now or very few years out of school
CAPP Q25	.39	College is more important to people close to the student
CAPP Q11	.34	Lower grade in last English course
CAPP Q18	.27	Plans to enroll in higher number of units
CAPP Q12	.16	Lower HS GPA
CELSA test score	.16	Lower scores on the CELSA test
Study Skills score	.08	Poorer study skills

1 = Absolute value of standardized discriminant function coefficient

Table 15-B

Discriminant Analysis Classification Results for Non-Native English Speakers

			Predicted Group	
		# cases	1	2
Actual Group	1	276	195 70.7%	81 29.3%
	2	64	19 29.7%	45 70.3%

Overall percent correctly classified = 70.6%

Note: Group 1 = Good academic standing
Group 2 = Probation/Disqualification