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Overall, about **14,000** students were served in ’18–’19, which was about **1 out of every 430** of CA’s **6.2 million** K-12 public school students.

This is about **8% fewer** MSP participants than in ’17–’18, but the overall counts and percentages by category are still essentially the same.

The main difference is a small decrease in the percent share for White, and a small increase for Other/More Than One.

When broken down by ethnicity, MSP was also slightly more diverse than CA public schools, overall, serving a **58%** of C/L population (compared to **54.6%** for CA overall) and a **5.7%** AA population (compared to **5.4%** for CA overall).

Of the 3 signature SAPEP programs, MESA is in the middle of the pack with respect to diversity. EAOP serves a higher share of AA participants, and Puente serves a higher share of C/L participants. However, given STEM’s traditional lack of URM participants, having MESA roughly reflect CA demographics is already a very good outcome.
When broken down by gender, MSP participants were roughly **45.4%** female, whereas CA public K-12 schools were about **48.6%** female in ’17-'18. (Unfortunately, the CDE no longer appears to be publishing a statewide gender breakdown on their website.)

Compared with EAOP (**53.0%** Female) and Puente (**60.1%** Female), MESA is closest to the gender proportions represented in the CA Public school population.
Decile ranks are based on CDE data for the proportion of students at each school who qualify for free/reduced-price meals (FRPM) under the National School Lunch Program (NSLP).

Using FRPM as a proxy for the level of “need” level at a schools, we see that MSP had a median of FRPM Rank 4 and the mode of FRPM Rank 3 in ’18-’19, which are the same as in ’17-’18.

In addition, 69.6% of service schools were disproportionately “high needs”, meaning they had decile ranks 1-5, with at least two out of every three students at these schools eligible for FRPMs.

This compares to 50% of schools all public K-12 schools statewide being “high needs”.
When broken down by school type, MSP service schools are still predominantly classified as high schools (meaning schools with highest grade 12) for FRPM ranking purposes.
When disaggregated by grade level, MSP participants have a similar distribution of grade levels in ’18-’19 as last year, with the median still Grade 8, even though the mode is still Grade 7.

This means that even though its Accountability Framework is primarily focused on high school seniors, MSP served nearly twice as many 7th-graders as 12th-graders, at 20.4% of participants (down from 20.8% in ’17-’18) versus 13.5% of participants (up from 12.5% in ’17-’18).

It’s also notable that there are no participants below grade 5 in ’18-’19, compared to three participants in grade 2-4 being reported in ‘17-’18.

Note that that grade level information was missing for roughly 1% of participants, compared to 0% of participants last year.
This final slide on ’18–’19 demographic data shows progress MSP has made in reporting participant data to the statewide office.

Many values on this slide are roughly the same as last year.

For the information we use to match to external datasets, there were significantly higher missing rates for grade levels, birthdates, genders, and ethnicity than last year, with the missing rate for SSIDs (the Statewide Student Identifier assigned to all K-12 public school students in California by the CDE) being significantly lower, which helps us match to sources like TES.

For the information we’re providing to UC admissions offices for prospecting, the only field with general useable information was email address.

For the information used to characterize the SAPEP service population, all missing rates were higher than last year.

Lowering the missing rates for these fields would allow us to more effectively report on MSP reaching the intended service population for SAPEP programs.

For comparison, though, all SAPEP programs struggle with missing data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Missing Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EL_Status</td>
<td>97.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low_Income_Status</td>
<td>96.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed_Guardian_2</td>
<td>50.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed_Guardian_1</td>
<td>25.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell_Phone_Number</td>
<td>97.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>96.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email_Address</td>
<td>28.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>11.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA_SSID</td>
<td>10.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>7.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth_Date</td>
<td>1.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade_Level</td>
<td>1.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS_Code</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First_Name</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last_Name</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Turning to outcomes, this slide gives an overview of MSP’s Goals and Outcomes under the new SAPEP Program Impact Framework (see https://ucop.app.box.com/v/SAPEP-PIF).

These goals replace the previous measurable objectives assigned to MSP under the old SAPEP Accountability Framework.

The goals are essentially the same as before, looking at A-G completion, college-entrance exam completion, and college-going. However, we’ve replaced the old objective for Algebra I completion with two new goals about financial-aid application submission and UC applications.

As in previous years, MSP 12th-grade participants do well for the measures we have information about, which are the rows in green.

However, we’re still waiting on the information we need from the College Board to determine exam completion. Typically we get this in early spring each year.

And we weren’t able to determine UC application, due to the large amount of missing for the fields needed to determine UC eligibility, which are A-G completion and HS GPA.
This slide gives fall 2019 higher-education-institution (HEI) destinations of AY’18-'19 12th-grade participants by ethnicity where “OOS” is an abbreviation for “Other/Out-of-State”, meaning any college or university that’s not a UC, CSU, or CCC.

The overall rates of attending college stayed roughly the same, with 79% of 12th-grade participants immediately enrolling in college both in fall 2018 and fall 2019.

For comparison, the CDE estimates that roughly 64% of all CA public high school seniors enroll in college within one year after they graduate.

The labels for each bar give the number of 12th-graders for each ethnic group, along with their percentage share; for example, 55.6% of 12th-graders with matching information were C/L, followed by 26.2% API, and so on.

Note that the category “Unknown” this doesn’t necessarily mean participants didn’t go to college. It means we couldn’t find any college-going for them in fall 2019 since they couldn’t be matched to the National Student Clearinghouse or the UC Corporate Student System using name-and-DOB matching.

In addition, the National Student Clearinghouse doesn’t have records for all schools, and records for students can be blocked, due to FERPA, so the college-going rates should be seen as lower bounds.
This slide makes it easier to see the relative size of each ethnic group's higher-education-institution destinations, with all percentages less than 10% suppressed for clarity.

At a glance, the plurality of college-goers enroll at UC, which is an amazing outcome. However, the only subgroups having a plurality of their college-going participants matriculating to UC are API and White, whereas C/L participants tended to matriculate to CSUs, and participants in the AA, AI, Other/More Than One, and Unreported categories tend to matriculate to CCCs.

Overall, these are roughly the same outcomes as last year.

For comparison, these are higher college-going rates, overall, than for EAOP and Puente.
This slide shows where MSP participants ended up enrolling in fall 2019, focusing just on UCs and CSUs.

**CSU Long Beach** is at the top of the list, and 6 UCs are in the top 10. This is essentially the same list as last year, but with the order changed a bit.

Overall, MSP participants enrolled at all 9 undergraduate UC campuses and 22 of the 23 CSU campuses, with all 9 UCs in the top 17 destinations.

The only CSU campus with no matriculation is California State University Bakersfield.
This slide shows were MSP participants ended up enrolling in fall 2019, focusing on CA community colleges, with the top 12 destinations shown due to a 5-way tie for 8th place.

This year, **Delta College** is at the top of the list.

In total, MSP participants enrolled at **64 of the 114** community colleges, though primarily in CCCs that are the typical feeder schools for UCs and CSUs.
This slide shows the private and out-of-state schools MSP participants matriculated to in fall 2019, with the top 15 destinations shown due to a 10-way tie for 6th place.

Like last year, **USC** and **University of the Pacific** are at the top of the list.

The full list includes **79 schools** in **30 states and Washington, D.C.**, with 68 schools in CA. Also, AZ and MA are tied for the most popular non-CA destinations, with 11 schools in each.

Unlike previous years, only two of the eight Ivy League schools (Columbia and Dartmouth) are included this time.
This slide looks a lot like last year, giving roughly the same overview of UC application activity for 12th-grade participants by ethnicity.

The overall application rate of MESA participants is about the same as in fall 2017, at 57.3% of in fall 2017.

The groups most significantly deviating from the overall application rate are AI and “Unreported” (with lower application rates) and API (with higher application rates).

MSP participants had a roughly 71% admission rate, overall, versus 59% statewide.

When broken down by ethnicity, the acceptance rate was 55% for MSP AA participants, versus 43% statewide, and 69% for MSP C/L participants, versus 52% statewide.

MSP participants also had a roughly 59% enrollment yield, overall, versus 52% for all CA public high school admittees.

When broken down by ethnicity, the enrollment yield was 50% for MSP AA participants, versus 43% statewide, and 56% for MSP C/L participants, versus 47% statewide.

In summary, MSP participants were roughly 20% more likely to be accepted than their peers and 13% more likely to enroll once accepted.

For comparison, these are considerably higher UC acceptance and enrollment rates, overall, than either EAOP or Puente.

Note: Statewide comparisons are for fall 2018 and taken from https://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/infocenter/freshman-admissions-summary.
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- UC Data Warehouse
  http://data.ucop.edu/
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