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## Demographics of sample

Data for the Communications General Education Learning Outcome (GELO) was extracted from TracDat and was then merged with MIS data. The result was a data set with a total of 1,282 student responses in the following classes:

Table 1. Courses in GELO Analysis


The demographic breakdown of this student sample was as follows:
Table 2. Ethnicity of GELO Sample

|  |  | \# Students | Sample <br> Percent | Norco <br> Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ethnicity | Asian | 91 | 7.1 | 6.0 |
|  | African American | 74 | 5.8 | 5.7 |
|  | Hispanic | 729 | 56.9 | 57.3 |
|  | Native American/Alaskan | 3 | . 2 | . 3 |


|  | Pacific Islander | 3 | .2 | .3 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | White | 328 | 25.6 | 24.7 |
|  | Two or more races | 44 | 3.4 | 3.0 |
| Unreported/Unknown | 8 | .6 | .5 |  |
| Total | 1280 | 99.8 | 97.8 |  |
| Missing | System | 2 | .2 | 2.2 |
| Total |  | 1282 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Table 3. Age of GELO Sample

|  |  |  | Sample | Norco |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  | \# Students | Percent | Percent |
| Age | 19 or less | 429 | 33.5 | 33.2 |
|  | $20-24$ | 616 | 48.0 | 40.3 |
|  | $25-29$ | 139 | 10.8 | 12.1 |
|  | $30-34$ | 46 | 3.6 | 5.5 |
|  | $35-39$ | 21 | 1.6 | 3.3 |
|  | $40-49$ | 5 | 1.9 | 3.7 |
| 50+ | 1280 | 99.8 | 100.0 |  |
| Missing | System | 2 | .2 | 0.0 |
| Total |  | 1282 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Table 5 Gender of GELO Sample

|  |  |  | Sample | Norco |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  | \# Students | Percent | Percent |
| Gender | Female | 706 | 55.1 | 53.5 |
|  | Male | 568 | 44.3 | 45.7 |
|  | Unknown/non-respondent | 6 | .5 | .8 |
|  | Total | 1280 | 99.8 | 100.0 |
| Missing | System | 2 | .2 | 0.0 |
| Total |  | 1282 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

In comparing the Norco College student demographics (see Data Mart at http://datamart.cccco.edu/DataMart.aspx) for Fall 2015 against the sample
demographics above, the GELO sample closely approximates the college in ethnicity, age
and gender overall. This implies that the outcomes for this GELO study can probably be generalized to the college as a whole.

## OUTCOMES OF COMMUNICATIONS GELO ANALYSIS

The Communications GELO analysis compared the average score for three different groups of students in the sample based on the number of GE units completed: less than 12 units GE, 12-24 units GE, and more than 24 units GE. The assumption is that this GE Outcome should be correlated with then number of GE units completed. In essence, the more GE courses a student takes, the more exposure to the Communications GELO they would have. If this assumption was supported by the data, one would assume that the average score for each group would increase significantly in comparison to the lower group. The data for this analysis is below:

Table 6. Average GELO score for three groups of students based on GE units completed

|  |  | Average <br> GELO |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | \# Students | Score |
| Below 12 GE units | 276 | 2.56 |
| 12-24 GE units | 266 | 3.16 |
| Above 24 GE units | 738 | 3.16 |
| Total | 1280 | 3.03 |

The difference between the Below 12 GE Units and the 12-24 GE units group was significant ( $p<.001$ ). Upon further comparison, it is clear that there was no difference between the next two groups (12-24 GE Units \& Above 24 GE Units) in the analysis. This indicates that communications skills for students seem to improve at the beginning of students' education in the GE program. However, as they continue in the GE program their communications skills seem to plateau at an adequately high level (3.16 on a 4point scale).

Another level of assessment that is necessary is the disaggregation of GELO outcomes by student groups or demographics. The following analysis shows the average Communications GELO scores by ethnic, age, and gender groups. Any groups that had less than 20 students were suppressed due to questionable ability to generalize to the Norco College student population. Disproportionate impact (DI) was calculated for each group, and any groups lower than 0.80 are highlighted in yellow. Disproportionate impact is calculated by dividing each subgroup in demographic category by the highest
achieving group. If a subgroup's average GELO score was less than $80 \%(0.80)$ of the highest group, disproportionate impact has occurred in that subgroup.

Table 7. Disproportionate Impact Analysis in Ethnicity for Communications GELO

|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Average |  |  |
| GELO |  |  |  |
| E Students |  |  |  |
| Ethnicity | 91 | 3.25 | 1.00 |
| Asian | 74 | 2.76 | 0.85 |
| African American | 729 | 2.97 | 0.91 |
| Hispanic | 3 | 1.67 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| Native American/Alaskan | 3 | 3.67 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| Pacific Islander | 328 | 3.14 | 0.97 |
| White | 44 | 3.18 | 0.98 |
| Two or more races | 8 | 3.25 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| Unreported/Unknown | 1266 | 3.03 |  |
| Total |  |  |  |

Table 8. Disproportionate Impact Analysis in Age for Communications GELO

|  |  | Average <br> GELO |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Age | \# Students | Score | DI Score |
| 19 or less | 429 | 3.00 | 0.90 |
| $20-24$ | 616 | 2.97 | 0.89 |
| $25-29$ | 139 | 3.32 | 1.00 |
| $30-34$ | 46 | 3.22 | 0.97 |
| $35-39$ | 21 | 3.00 | 0.90 |
| $40-49$ | 24 | 3.17 | 0.95 |
| $50+$ | 5 | 2.60 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| Total | 1280 | 3.03 |  |

Table 9. Disproportionate Impact Analysis in Gender for Communications GELO

|  |  | Average <br> GELO |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Gender | \# Students | Score | DI Score |
| Female | 706 | 3.07 | 1.00 |
| Male | 568 | 2.97 | 0.97 |

Based on these data, it appears there is no indication of disproportionate impact between any subgroups for any demographic category based on ethnicity, age, or gender.

