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This study examines enrollment patterns through 2010, which will result due to anticipated demographic changes. The purpose of this forecast is for use in program and practice related decision making.

The focus of this study is the traditional on-campus student enrolled in college courses for credit and excludes enrollment in fire academy, criminal justice academy, business seminars, and distance education courses.

The methodology included projecting Orange County sub-group populations to 2010 (by age, ethnicity, gender, and zip code/city). Projected enrollment participation rates for those population subgroups are applied to the projected population to create projected enrollments for 2010.

Assumptions upon which the projections are calculated include:

- Sub-group participation rates (enrollment divided by population) by zip code in 2005 changed significantly from those in 2000. By 2010 each is assumed to stabilize slightly above its 2005 level. Therefore, the 2010 distribution of students between SAC and SCC is assumed to remain similar to the current distribution.
- Reduced 2005 system-wide enrollment participation in California community colleges is assumed to have reached equilibrium, following large state-wide student fee increases. No further enrollment losses due to past fee increases are expected.
- Stabilization of declining non-Latino participation rates is assumed. A continuing decline of their participation rates would negatively impact the projected enrollment for 2010.

These forecasts assume the primary policies and funding levels in place for 2005 remain generally unchanged through 2010. If policy and relative funding levels remain unchanged, and the assumptions noted are realized, the resulting 2010 enrollment patterns will be as described in this report.

Detailed methodology, assumptions, and sensitivity analysis are included in the Addendum.

## Readers' Summary

The population of the total RSCCD service area is projected to increase 4\% between 2005 and 2010, from 687,532 to 718,264. It has increased 5\% from 2000.

- "Traditional," on-campus enrollment (which excludes fire and sheriff's academies, business seminars, and distance education) will increase 13\%, from 19,327 in 2005 (an averaged number calculated for "benchmarking") to 21,896 in 2010. (This assumes that current programs, practices, and facilities remain unchanged.)
- Total credit enrollment, including "non-traditional" off-campus enrollment, will increase to 32,796 in 2010 from 29,751 in 2005, a $\mathbf{1 0 \%}$ increase. All facts and projections noted below are for traditional enrollments only.
- SAC has become significantly younger and less ethnically diverse since 2000. Should the trends of 2000 to 2005 continue, there will be further reductions in student diversity.
- The enrollment percentage increase or decrease at SAC between 2000 and 2005 varies considerably depending upon sub-group, i.e., age group, location of residence, and ethnicity. Consequently, strategic enrollment management is critical.
- These enrollment projections for 2010 take into consideration the following trends and assumptions:
o Participation rates (the number of those enrolled divided by the population) and enrollment have declined since 2000, most probably due in part to increased tuition and the opening of SCC. However, on-campus participation rates will stabilize, and enrollment will increase 13\% due to certain sub-group population increases and their commensurate greater participation rates, primarily those for Latinos and those in the 17 to 21 year age group.
o Participation rates and enrollment have increased since 2000 for the 17 to 21 year age group, but declined significantly for other age groups.

0 Participation rates for non-Latinos have declined so significantly that a continuing decline, as opposed to the projected stabilization of their participation rates, would significantly negatively affect the projected enrollment for 2010. Participation rates vary depending upon location of residence; however, generally, participation rates of Asian, Black, and White ethnic groups are below that of Latinos.
o Enrollment since 2000 has increased for students living outside of the RSCCD service area but declined for those living within the service area. The decline of enrollment for Garden Grove residents is greater than that for Santa Ana residents.

- In sum, participation rates have increased, or remained stable, for:
o 17 to 21 year olds.
o Non-RSCCD residents, with the exception of Asians and Blacks.
- In sum, participation rates have decreased for:
o SAC service area zip codes, with the exception of 92701.
o SCC service area zip codes, with the exception of 92808.
o All ethnic groups residing within the SAC service area.
- Those age 17 to 21 years are the primary traditional on-campus student group, and will grow by $20 \%$ and represent $40 \%$ of total SAC enrollment in 2010.
- Total traditional on-campus enrollment will grow $13 \%$ by 2010.




Total traditional program on-campus enrollment at SAC increased 3\% between 2000 and 2005, reaching 19,327 in 2005 ( +574 ). Enrollment is projected to increase to 21,896 in 2010, an increase of $13 \%$.

## Overall, on-campus enrollment at SAC:

- increased 3\% during the past five years, but will increase $13 \%$ during the next five years.
- is expected to increase for all demographic sub-groups, from all geographic areas, between 2005 and 2010.
- Latino enrollment increased by 1,328 since 2000, while non-Latino enrollment declined by 754 (-1,360 Asians, -28 African Americans, +488 Whites, and +145 other).

For students from the SAC service area, age 17 to 21 years:

- Enrollment totaled 3,958 in 2005, up 8.9\% since 2000.
- Enrollment is projected to increase to 4,695 by 2010, up from 3,958 in 2005 (+19\%).
- Latino enrollment increased to 3,248 in 2005 (+14\%), and is expected to increase to 3,972 in 2010 ( $+22 \%$ ).
o 2,848 Latinos were enrolled in 2000, representing $78 \%$ of enrollments from the service area.
o In 2005 Latinos represented $82 \%$ of enrollments, and are expected to be $85 \%$ of enrollment in 2010 from the SAC service area.

Enrollment declined 7\% for students living in the RSCCD service area, but is expected to increase by $13 \%$ during the next five years:

- Enrollment at SAC decreased 5\% for students of all ages living the SAC service area, but by $17 \%$ for those living in the SCC service area between 2000 and 2005.
- Enrollment from within RSCCD increased since 2000 only for Latinos.
- Latinos made-up 70\% of SAC 2000 traditional program enrollment of 17 to 21 year olds from RSCCD, $76 \%$ of 2005 enrollment and which is anticipated to increase to $78 \%$ in 2010.
- Asian enrollment decreased by $37 \%$ between 2000 and 2005, and White enrollment declined by $22 \%$ for those students living in RSCCD.
- Though we assume Asian enrollment declines will cease for 2005 to 2010, participation rates (Asian enrollment divided by Asian population) would decline from 1.5\% in 2005 to about $0.9 \%$ by 2010 if trends of 2000 to 2005 continue. Participation could fall from the highest rate of major ethnic groups in 2000 into the bottom of the range for Asians by 2010.
- Enrollment declined 3\% for females and declined 12\% for males from RSCCD between 2000 and 2005.
- Enrollment rose 5\% for 17 to 21 year olds, but declined from $13 \%$ to $24 \%$ (depending upon age group) for older students from RSCCD between 2000 and 2005.
- The loss of enrollment of students attending SCC (-18\%) and SAC (-17\%) from Garden Grove is likely to be partially due to the elimination of traditional courses at the Garden Grove Center.


| What is "participation rate"? The number of students enrolled divided by the relevant population. It can be calculated for subgroups, such as the number of students enrolled from a particular zip code, divided by the population of that zip code. <br> Why is it useful? What do we use it for? This rate shows us the proportion of a population enrolled, or "market share." While we know whether total enrollment goes up or goes down, enrollment numbers alone don't tell us whether we are reaching certain segments of our population. |
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Participation rates vary widely between demographic subgroups from different locations, and a few more or less enrollments from a small area can greatly change enrollment participation rates.

## Overall, for on-campus program credit enrollment:

- Participation rates for those from the SAC service area, age 17 to 21 years, rose between 2000 and 2005. This increase came about as population of this group declined by $3 \%$ and enrollment increased by $9 \%$ from within the SAC service area.
- Participation rates fell significantly at SAC since 2000 for students from Garden Grove, Orange and Villa Park, fell modestly from other RSCCD cities, and were stable or rose from other areas of Orange County.
- The South Orange County CCD area demonstrated both increased population and participation rates at SAC, leading to an increased enrollment at SAC from this area of 513 students (+36\%) since 2000.

Participation rates of 17 to 21 year old students at SAC from the SCC service area declined since 2000, while the population of the SCC service area increased.

- Overall, $10.7 \%$ of 17 to 21 year olds from the SAC service area enrolled at SAC in 2005. 5.4\% of the 17 to 21 year olds from the SCC service area enrolled at SAC in 2005.
- As a comparison, $12.6 \%$ of the 17 to 21 year olds from the SCC service area enrolled at SCC in 2005, and $1.7 \%$ of those from the SAC service area enrolled at SCC.
- Participation rates at SAC from the SAC service area (for all age groups) were $1.95 \%$ in 2000, $1.78 \%$ in 2005, and are expected to rebound to $1.93 \%$ by 2010.
- SCC participation rates from the SCC service area (for all age groups) rose from $1.56 \%$ in 2000 , to $1.61 \%$ in 2005, and are expected to rise to $1.73 \%$ in 2010.


## From those residing within RSCCD:

- Enrollment participation rates in 2005 from RSCCD of Whites and Asian are below those for Latinos, though on an overall basis, participation rates are closely related to the age distribution.
o In 2005, Latinos had the highest participation rate.
o In 2000, Asians had the highest participation rate.
- Participation rates are highest for those age 17 to 21 years.
o Participation rates declined for all ages, except those 17 to 21 years of age, since 2000.
o The participation rate for those over 50 years of age is $0.39 \%$, versus the other extreme of $9.17 \%$ for 17 to 19 year olds.
o Latino female participation rates from RSCCD rose to $12.9 \%$, up from $11.8 \%$ in 2000, and Latino male participation rates rose to 9.0\%, up from 7.6\% in 2000.
o Asian females participate at a $6.8 \%$ rate, down from 10.1\% in 2000, and Asian males participate at a $6.8 \%$ rate, down from $8.5 \%$ in 2000.



## Addendum <br> Critical Assumptions and Limited Sensitivity Analysis

- The forecast for traditional program enrollment in 2010 assumes the decline in participation rates between 2000 and 2005 is halted. It is assumed the decline is due to increased fees set at the state-level and the opening of SCC. Both factors are expected to have reached equilibrium by 2005, and though participation rates do not return to 2000 levels for geographic sub-areas and demographic subgroups, the total overall participation rate is expected to increase during the next five years to a level similar to that in 2000.
- Participation rates at SAC from areas in the SCC service area are expected to remain well below the rates seen in 2000.
- The participation rate declines between 2000 and 2005 were most extreme for Asians. Without intervention, it is possible that the rates will continue to decline. If the change in participation rates between 2000 and 2005 continues for each ethnic group, instead of 57\% Latino students at SAC from all of Orange County, and 69\% from within RSCCD, Latinos would be 60\% of Orange County based students and 74\% of the enrollment at SAC in 2010 from RSCCD. Asians would decline from $22 \%$ in 2000 , to $10 \%$ in 2010, of all enrollment from Orange County, rather than remaining at $15 \%$ of the total as in 2005.
- In addition, the loss of Asian enrollment (if participation rate declines continue for only this group) would produce an enrollment, about 1,300 students ( $6 \%$ of enrollment), below the indicated forecast $15 \%$ of enrollment from all of Orange County, and reduce the forecast enrollment growth from Orange County residents at SAC from 15\% to 7\% between 2005 and 2010.


## Addendum <br> Enrollment and Population Forecast Methodology

Overall, enrollment participation rates are lower in 2005 than 2000. Based upon non-quantitative assessment of Orange County, overall 2010 participation rates are most likely to reflect conditions in 2000. Due to the expansion of SCC, the distribution of enrollment between SAC and SCC has changed since 2000. The enrollment forecast for 2010 utilizes 2005 participation rates which are then adjusted upwards by $5 \%$ to reflect the return to overall rates of enrollment seen in 2000.

Population and enrollment forecasts at SAC (and SCC) are by ethnic-group, age-group, and gender for traditional "on-campus" credit program. Traditional "on-campus" programs exclude Apprenticeship, Fire Academy, Contract Management, Criminal Justice Academy, Quality Assurance, TV, and Business Seminars. Enrollment in the CED and non-traditional programs can vary widely between years due to budget considerations, which are tied to funding mechanisms established by the California legislature. Though computed for this study, CED and non-traditional program enrollments are more volatile, and only summary totals are presented.

Enrollment is based on an average of three semesters (two fall and one spring). For Fall 2005, the data is preliminary, and based on seventh week information rather than end-of-term data as for other semesters. Data for SAC and SCC may be added together, but the resulting counts will reflect duplicated counts for students attending both campus locations.

The non-Orange County resident enrollment is "forecast" based upon most recent enrollment count data at the college level. Counts are used because there is no clear appropriate population base to use to compute enrollment participation rates - state, nation, or world. The 2010 forecast of total enrollment includes this non-Orange County resident category, which is set to be equal to the 2005 enrollment (i.e. assumes that the enrollment will not change between 2005 and 2010 for the nonOrange County residents).

The population estimates for 2005 and forecasts for 2010 use the 2000 Census data for Orange County as a starting point. For each demographic sub-group for each ZIP code area, the population at each single year of age in the year 2000 was "aged" to 2010 using Orange County "census survival rates". The population under 10 years of age was estimated for 2010 using women in 2010 of reproductive age and the child to women of reproductive age ratios from 2000. This preserves the age-genderethnic distribution of the sub-groups, properly aged, to 2010.

First, total 2010 population for each Orange County city is forecast, based upon the 2000 to 2005 population and growth rates published by the State of California and the U.S. Census Bureau. The initial forecast 2010 population by age, gender and ethnicity at the ZIP code level is then adjusted based on total city population estimates for 2010, which forced the sum of ZIP code areas to equal the forecast population of each city (and county). The California Department of Finance population forecasts for 2010 for Orange County were used to determine the ethnic distribution. The summed ZIP code population sub-groups were further adjusted to be equal to the ethnic distribution for Orange County. The two forced adjustment target procedures, for total population by city and ethnic distribution of Orange County, were repeated iteratively until the resulting total population in each Orange County city and the summed ethnic distribution for Orange County were within $0.1 \%$ or 10 people of the target figures. For 2005, the population of each sub-group is the average of the Census population in 2000 five years younger, and the 2010 forecast population five years older.

## Addendum

## Non-Traditional Program and CED Enrollment

Non-traditional program enrollment is concentrated in the Fire and Police Academies at SAC, with additional enrollment in Business Seminars, Quality Assurance, and Distance Education. Participation rates were computed for non-traditional enrollment and the CED (Adult Continuing Education) in a manner similar to the traditional program. These rates were projected to 2010, and applied to the projected population sub-groups to produce the 2010 forecast of enrollment for these programs.

Enrollment in the CED and non-traditional programs is subject to wide variation from year to year, and frequently depends upon contracts with other public agencies and departments. The forecast enrollment figures are produced using many assumptions concerning the budget and priorities set at SAC, RSCCD, California, and the federal government. They are primarily intended to supplement the traditional program enrollment forecast, and to provide a complete enrollment forecast for the full SAC program.

Non-traditional program enrollment fell 1,255 between 2000 and 2005 at SAC, but is expected to increase from 10,424 to 10,900 during the next five years. Over half of the students in non-traditional programs are from outside Orange County, as non-traditional programs attract students from a wide area. Most of the non-Orange County students were from neighboring counties in California.

For the CED, $85 \%$ of the students enrolled in 2000, and $79 \%$ of those enrolled in 2005 were from within the RSCCD service area. Less than 1\% in 2000 and around 2\% in 2005 were unknown or from outside of Orange County. CED enrollment increased by 496 between 2000 and 2005, and is anticipated to increase another 1,920 in the next five years ( $+10 \%$ ).

Table 1
Santa Ana College Traditional On-Campus Credit Program Enrollment by Residence Location All Ages, All Ethnicity, All Genders

| Student Residence Location | Population |  |  | SAC Enrollment |  |  | Participation Rate |  |  | Percent Change |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | 2000 to 2005 | 2005 to 2010 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Census 2000 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Estimated } \\ & 2005 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Forecast } \\ 2010 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | 2000 | 2005 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Forecast } \\ 2010 \end{gathered}$ | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | Enrollment | Population | Enrollment | Population |
| Anaheim Hills | 55,895 | 58,520 | 61,154 | 362 | 344 | 399 | 0.65\% | 0.59\% | 0.65\% | -5\% | 5\% | 16\% | 5\% |
| Garden Grove* | 94,122 | 98,436 | 102,819 | 1,829 | 1,526 | 1,746 | 1.94\% | 1.55\% | 1.70\% | -17\% | 5\% | 14\% | 4\% |
| Orange | 135,385 | 143,960 | 152,528 | 2,058 | 1,681 | 1,948 | 1.52\% | 1.17\% | 1.28\% | -18\% | 6\% | 16\% | 6\% |
| Santa Ana | 363,938 | 378,403 | 393,025 | 7,104 | 6,977 | 7,831 | 1.95\% | 1.84\% | 1.99\% | -2\% | 4\% | 12\% | 4\% |
| Silverado Area | 1,839 | 2,069 | 2,326 | 13 | 11 | 13 | 0.69\% | 0.55\% | 0.56\% | -11\% | 13\% | 15\% | 12\% |
| Villa Park | 5,932 | 6,144 | 6,412 | 46 | 29 | 35 | 0.78\% | 0.47\% | 0.55\% | -38\% | 4\% | 22\% | 4\% |
| Total RSCCD | 657,111 | 687,532 | 718,264 | 11,412 | 10,567 | 11,972 | 1.74\% | 1.54\% | 1.67\% | -7\% | 5\% | 13\% | 4\% |
| Coast CCD | 625,294 | 659,976 | 695,362 | 2,203 | 2,296 | 2,581 | 0.35\% | 0.35\% | 0.37\% | 4\% | 6\% | 12\% | 5\% |
| North OC CCD | 819,536 | 868,492 | 917,531 | 2,631 | 2,769 | 3,244 | 0.32\% | 0.32\% | 0.35\% | 5\% | 6\% | 17\% | 6\% |
| South OC CCD | 750,467 | 837,972 | 926,083 | 1,434 | 1,947 | 2,352 | 0.19\% | 0.23\% | 0.25\% | 36\% | 12\% | 21\% | 11\% |
| OC TOTAL | 2,852,408 | 3,053,972 | 3,257,240 | 17,680 | 17,580 | 20,149 | 0.62\% | 0.58\% | 0.62\% | -1\% | 7\% | 15\% | 7\% |
| Non-OC Resident | (1) |  |  | 1,044 | 1,739 | 1,739 |  |  |  | 67\% |  | 0\% |  |
| Unknown Residence |  |  |  | 29 | 9 | 9 |  |  |  | -69\% |  | 0\% |  |
| Total SAC Head Count |  |  |  | 18,753 | 19,327 | 21,896 |  |  |  | 3\% |  | 13\% |  |

* Includes two of four Garden Grove ZIP code areas (92840 and 92843), though only about half of each are within the official RSCCD boundaries.

Note: For this study, RSCCD boundaries follow ZIP Code areas. Anaheim Hills (92707) includes areas north of the Santa Ana River (not in RSCCD officially) and 92708. Garden Grove ZIP codes 92840 and 92843 are included in this study, but only about half of these areas are in the official RSCCD boundaries. The portion of Santa Ana ZIP code area 92704 west of Euclid Avenue is not in the official RSCCD boundaries, but included in RSCCD for this study. RSCCD population totaled 586,003 for 2000 (Census), and differs from that shown here due to differences in sub-area detail available (ZIP code areas versus Census Block for 2000).

1) There is no "participation rate" for non-Orange County students because an appropriate population base does not exist. Consequently, for this study, the 2010 headcount of students from outside of Orange County is assumed to be unchanged from 2005.

Table 2
Santa Ana College Traditional On-Campus Credit Program Enrollment by Ethnicity

| Student |  | Population |  |  | SAC Enrollment |  |  | Participation Rate |  |  | Percent Change |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2000 to 2005 | 2005 to 2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residence <br> Location | Ethnicity |  |  |  | Census 2000 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Estimated } \\ & 2005 \end{aligned}$ | Forecast 2010 | 2000 | 2005 | Forecast 2010 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | Enrollment | Population | Enrollment | Population |
| RSCCD | Asian | 80,563 | 87,068 | 93,705 | 2,106 | 1,317 | 1,451 | 2.61\% | 1.51\% | 1.55\% | -37\% | 8\% | 10\% | 8\% |
|  | Black | 8,433 | 8,346 | 8,440 | 204 | 167 | 188 | 2.42\% | 2.00\% | 2.23\% | -18\% | -1\% | 13\% | 1\% |
|  | Latino | 351,506 | 390,182 | 428,918 | 6,557 | 7,017 | 8,246 | 1.87\% | 1.80\% | 1.92\% | 7\% | 11\% | 18\% | 10\% |
|  | Other | 14,233 | 14,229 | 14,130 | 771 | 684 | 705 | 5.42\% | 4.81\% | 4.99\% | -11\% | 0\% | 3\% | -1\% |
|  | White | 202,376 | 187,707 | 173,071 | 1,775 | 1,382 | 1,379 | 0.88\% | 0.74\% | 0.80\% | -22\% | -7\% | 0\% | -8\% |
| Non-RSCCD in OC | Asian | 304,274 | 368,541 | 433,239 | 1,857 | 1,336 | 1,566 | 0.61\% | 0.36\% | 0.36\% | -28\% | 21\% | 17\% | 18\% |
|  | Black | 34,284 | 39,060 | 44,332 | 198 | 185 | 222 | 0.58\% | 0.47\% | 0.50\% | -7\% | 14\% | 20\% | 13\% |
|  | Latino | 524,860 | 637,294 | 750,181 | 2,049 | 2,695 | 3,326 | 0.39\% | 0.42\% | 0.44\% | 32\% | 21\% | 23\% | 18\% |
|  | Other | 71,232 | 77,265 | 82,994 | 581 | 708 | 828 | 0.82\% | 0.92\% | 1.00\% | 22\% | 8\% | 17\% | 7\% |
|  | White | 1,260,647 | 1,244,280 | 1,228,230 | 1,584 | 2,088 | 2,237 | 0.13\% | 0.17\% | 0.18\% | 32\% | -1\% | 7\% | -1\% |
| Total Orange County | Asian | 384,837 | 455,609 | 526,944 | 3,963 | 2,653 | 3,017 | 1.03\% | 0.58\% | 0.57\% | -33\% | 18\% | 14\% | 16\% |
|  | Black | 42,717 | 47,406 | 52,772 | 402 | 352 | 410 | 0.94\% | 0.74\% | 0.78\% | -12\% | 11\% | 17\% | 11\% |
|  | Latino | 876,366 | 1,027,476 | 1,179,099 | 8,605 | 9,712 | 11,573 | 0.98\% | 0.95\% | 0.98\% | 13\% | 17\% | 19\% | 15\% |
|  | Other | 85,465 | 91,494 | 97,124 | 1,352 | 1,392 | 1,533 | 1.58\% | 1.52\% | 1.58\% | 3\% | 7\% | 10\% | 6\% |
|  | White | 1,463,023 | 1,431,987 | 1,401,301 | 3,358 | 3,470 | 3,616 | 0.23\% | 0.24\% | 0.26\% | 3\% | -2\% | 4\% | -2\% |
| Non-Orange County and Unknown | Asian |  |  |  | 192 | 142 |  |  |  |  | -26\% |  |  |  |
|  | Black |  |  |  | 86 | 108 |  |  |  |  | 25\% |  |  |  |
|  | Latino |  |  |  | 393 | 614 |  |  |  |  | 56\% |  |  |  |
|  | Other |  |  |  | 136 | 241 |  |  |  |  | 77\% |  |  |  |
|  | White |  |  |  | 266 | 642 |  |  |  |  | 141\% |  |  |  |
| Total SAC | Asian |  |  |  | 4,155 | 2,795 |  |  |  |  | -33\% |  |  |  |
|  | Black |  |  |  | 488 | 460 |  |  |  |  | -6\% |  |  |  |
|  | Latino |  |  |  | 8,998 | 10,326 |  |  |  |  | 15\% |  |  |  |
|  | Other |  |  |  | 1,488 | 1,633 |  |  |  |  | 10\% |  |  |  |
|  | White |  |  |  | 3,624 | 4,112 |  |  |  |  | 13\% |  |  |  |

March 2006

Table 3
Santa Ana College Traditional On-Campus Credit Program Enrollment
By Age

| Student |  | Population |  |  | SAC Enrollment |  |  | Participation Rate |  |  | Percent Change |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2000 to 2005 | 2005 to 2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residence Location | Age |  |  |  | Census 2000 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Estimated } \\ 2005 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Forecast } \\ 2010 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 2000 | 2005 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Forecast } \\ 2010 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | Enrollment | Population | Enrollment | Population |
| RSCCD | 0 to 16 | 191,966 | 194,392 | 188,336 | 198 | 256 | 262 | 0.10\% | 0.13\% | 0.14\% | 29\% | 1\% | 2\% | 3\% |
|  | 17 to 21 | 51,579 | 51,850 | 58,180 | 4,507 | 4,754 | 5,673 | 8.74\% | 9.17\% | 9.75\% | 5\% | 1\% | 19\% | 12\% |
|  | 22 to 29 | 88,371 | 85,698 | 88,413 | 3,276 | 2,840 | 3,048 | 3.71\% | 3.31\% | 3.45\% | -13\% | -3\% | 7\% | 3\% |
|  | 30 to 39 | 113,596 | 113,435 | 110,732 | 1,726 | 1,369 | 1,404 | 1.52\% | 1.21\% | 1.27\% | -21\% | 0\% | 3\% | 2\% |
|  | 40 to 49 | 86,244 | 97,745 | 105,011 | 966 | 789 | 903 | 1.12\% | 0.81\% | 0.86\% | -18\% | 13\% | 14\% | 7\% |
|  | 50 plus | 125,355 | 144,412 | 167,592 | 739 | 560 | 679 | 0.59\% | 0.39\% | 0.41\% | -24\% | 15\% | 21\% | 16\% |
| Non-RSCCD in OC | 0 to 16 | 538,276 | 559,929 | 541,964 | 16 | 22 | 22 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 43\% | 4\% | -1\% | 3\% |
|  | 17 to 21 | 141,398 | 157,639 | 185,740 | 1,746 | 2,194 | 2,740 | 1.23\% | 1.39\% | 1.47\% | 26\% | 11\% | 25\% | 18\% |
|  | 22 to 29 | 250,380 | 244,784 | 272,087 | 2,066 | 2,121 | 2,448 | 0.83\% | 0.87\% | 0.90\% | 3\% | -2\% | 15\% | 11\% |
|  | 30 to 39 | 378,698 | 366,431 | 344,875 | 1,290 | 1,268 | 1,281 | 0.34\% | 0.35\% | 0.37\% | -2\% | -3\% | 1\% | 6\% |
|  | 40 to 49 | 335,441 | 386,139 | 404,621 | 661 | 892 | 1,012 | 0.20\% | 0.23\% | 0.25\% | 35\% | 15\% | 13\% | 5\% |
|  | 50 plus | 551,104 | 651,518 | 789,689 | 490 | 515 | 678 | 0.09\% | 0.08\% | 0.09\% | 5\% | 18\% | 32\% | 21\% |
| Total Orange County | 0 to 16 | 730,242 | 754,321 | 730,300 | 214 | 279 | 284 | 0.03\% | 0.04\% | 0.04\% | 30\% | 3\% | 2\% | 3\% |
|  | 17 to 21 | 192,977 | 209,489 | 243,920 | 6,253 | 6,948 | 8,412 | 3.24\% | 3.32\% | 3.45\% | 11\% | 9\% | 21\% | 16\% |
|  | 22 to 29 | 338,751 | 330,482 | 360,500 | 5,342 | 4,961 | 5,497 | 1.58\% | 1.50\% | 1.52\% | -7\% | -2\% | 11\% | 9\% |
|  | 30 to 39 | 492,294 | 479,866 | 455,607 | 3,015 | 2,637 | 2,685 | 0.61\% | 0.55\% | 0.59\% | -13\% | -3\% | 2\% | 5\% |
|  | 40 to 49 | 421,685 | 483,884 | 509,632 | 1,627 | 1,680 | 1,915 | 0.39\% | 0.35\% | 0.38\% | 3\% | 15\% | 14\% | 5\% |
|  | 50 plus | 676,459 | 795,930 | 957,281 | 1,229 | 1,075 | 1,357 | 0.18\% | 0.14\% | 0.14\% | -13\% | 18\% | 26\% | 20\% |
| Non-Orange County and Unknown | 0 to 16 |  |  |  | 0 | 1 |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |
|  | 17 to 21 |  |  |  | 249 | 320 |  |  |  |  | 29\% |  |  |  |
|  | 22 to 29 |  |  |  | 379 | 481 |  |  |  |  | 27\% |  |  |  |
|  | 30 to 39 |  |  |  | 234 | 398 |  |  |  |  | 70\% |  |  |  |
|  | 40 to 49 |  |  |  | 148 | 353 |  |  |  |  | 138\% |  |  |  |
|  | 50 plus |  |  |  | 62 | 194 |  |  |  |  | 212\% |  |  |  |

Table 4
Santa Ana College Traditional On-Campus Credit Program Enrollment

## By Gender

| Student |  | Population |  |  | SAC Enrollment |  |  | Participation Rate |  |  | Percent Change |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2000 to 2005 | 2005 to 2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residence <br> Location | Gender |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Census } \\ 2000 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Estimated } \\ & 2005 \end{aligned}$ | Forecast 2010 | 2000 | 2005 | Forecast $2010$ | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | Enrollment | Population | Enrollment | Population |
| RSCCD | Female | 322,534 | 339,036 | 355,739 | 5,978 | 5,812 | 6,622 | 1.85\% | 1.71\% | 1.86\% | -3\% | 5\% | 14\% | 5\% |
|  | Male | 334,577 | 348,496 | 362,525 | 5,434 | 4,755 | 5,347 | 1.62\% | 1.36\% | 1.47\% | -12\% | 4\% | 12\% | 4\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Non-RSCCD } \\ & \text { in OC } \end{aligned}$ | Female | 1,110,798 | 1,203,864 | 1,297,617 | 3,017 | 3,163 | 3,714 | 0.27\% | 0.26\% | 0.29\% | 5\% | 8\% | 17\% | 8\% |
|  | Male | 1,084,499 | 1,162,576 | 1,241,359 | 3,252 | 3,850 | 4,466 | 0.30\% | 0.33\% | 0.36\% | 18\% | 7\% | 16\% | 7\% |
| Total Orange County | Female | 1,433,332 | 1,542,900 | 1,653,356 | 8,995 | 8,975 | 10,336 | 0.63\% | 0.58\% | 0.63\% | 0\% | 8\% | 15\% | 7\% |
|  | Male | 1,419,076 | 1,511,072 | 1,603,884 | 8,686 | 8,605 | 9,813 | 0.61\% | 0.57\% | 0.61\% | -1\% | 6\% | 14\% | 6\% |
| Non-Orange County and Unknown | Female |  |  |  | 450 | 575 |  |  |  |  | 28\% |  |  |  |
|  | Male |  |  |  | 622 | 1,172 |  |  |  |  | 88\% |  |  |  |

Table 5
Santa Ana College On-Campus Credit Program Enrollment by ZIP Code in the RSCCD Service Area All Ages, All Ethnicity, All Genders

| Student Residence |  | Population |  |  | SAC Enrollment |  |  | Participation Rate |  |  | Percent Change |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2000 to 2005 | 2005 to 2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { ZIP } \\ \text { Code } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Census } \\ 2000 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Estimated } \\ 2005 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Forecast } \\ 2010 \end{gathered}$ | 2000 | 2005 | Forecast 2010 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | Enrollment | Population | Enrollment | Population |
| Garden Grove | 92840 | 50,636 | 52,186 | 53,771 | 874 | 728 | 833 | 1.73\% | 1.39\% | 1.55\% | -17\% | 3\% | 14\% | 3\% |
| Garden Grove | 92843 | 43,486 | 46,250 | 49,048 | 955 | 798 | 913 | 2.20\% | 1.73\% | 1.86\% | -16\% | 6\% | 14\% | 6\% |
| Santa Ana | 92701 | 58,151 | 62,116 | 66,126 | 991 | 1,053 | 1,252 | 1.70\% | 1.70\% | 1.89\% | 6\% | 7\% | 19\% | 6\% |
| Santa Ana | 92703 | 70,003 | 73,642 | 77,304 | 1,493 | 1,455 | 1,612 | 2.13\% | 1.98\% | 2.08\% | -3\% | 5\% | 11\% | 5\% |
| Santa Ana | 92704 | 91,176 | 94,944 | 98,707 | 1,647 | 1,519 | 1,678 | 1.81\% | 1.60\% | 1.70\% | -8\% | 4\% | 10\% | 4\% |
| Santa Ana | 92705 | 44,110 | 42,476 | 40,911 | 609 | 576 | 636 | 1.38\% | 1.36\% | 1.55\% | -5\% | -4\% | 10\% | -4\% |
| Santa Ana | 92706 | 37,871 | 39,138 | 40,416 | 1,088 | 1,098 | 1,236 | 2.87\% | 2.81\% | 3.06\% | 1\% | 3\% | 13\% | 3\% |
| Santa Ana | 92707 | 62,627 | 66,087 | 69,561 | 1,275 | 1,275 | 1,413 | 2.04\% | 1.93\% | 2.03\% | 0\% | 6\% | 11\% | 5\% |
| SAC Service Area |  | 458,060 | 476,839 | 495,844 | 8,933 | 8,503 | 9,572 | 1.95\% | 1.78\% | 1.93\% | -5\% | 4\% | 13\% | 4\% |
| Anaheim Hills | 92807 | 36,283 | 37,603 | 38,934 | 266 | 230 | 259 | 0.73\% | 0.61\% | 0.67\% | -14\% | 4\% | 13\% | 4\% |
| Anaheim Hills | 92808 | 19,612 | 20,917 | 22,220 | 96 | 114 | 140 | 0.49\% | 0.55\% | 0.63\% | 18\% | 7\% | 23\% | 6\% |
| Orange | 92865 | 18,039 | 18,731 | 19,438 | 211 | 174 | 202 | 1.17\% | 0.93\% | 1.04\% | -18\% | 4\% | 16\% | 4\% |
| Orange | 92866 | 15,380 | 16,210 | 17,037 | 295 | 213 | 241 | 1.92\% | 1.31\% | 1.41\% | -28\% | 5\% | 13\% | 5\% |
| Orange | 92867 | 40,914 | 43,328 | 45,757 | 546 | 461 | 552 | 1.33\% | 1.06\% | 1.21\% | -16\% | 6\% | 20\% | 6\% |
| Orange | 92868 | 23,152 | 25,477 | 27,798 | 445 | 414 | 459 | 1.92\% | 1.62\% | 1.65\% | -7\% | 10\% | 11\% | 9\% |
| Orange | 92869 | 37,900 | 40,214 | 42,498 | 561 | 419 | 494 | 1.48\% | 1.04\% | 1.16\% | -25\% | 6\% | 18\% | 6\% |
| Silverado | 92676 | 1,839 | 2,069 | 2,326 | 13 | 11 | 13 | 0.69\% | 0.55\% | 0.57\% | -11\% | 13\% | 17\% | 12\% |
| Villa Park | 92861 | 5,932 | 6,144 | 6,412 | 46 | 29 | 36 | 0.78\% | 0.47\% | 0.56\% | -38\% | 4\% | 26\% | 4\% |
| SCC Service Area |  | 199,051 | 210,693 | 222,420 | 2,479 | 2,064 | 2,395 | 1.25\% | 0.98\% | 1.08\% | -17\% | 6\% | 16\% | 6\% |
| RSCCD Service Area |  | 657,111 | 687,532 | 718,264 | 11,412 | 10,567 | 11,968 | 1.74\% | 1.54\% | 1.67\% | -7\% | 5\% | 13\% | 4\% |

March 2006

Table 6
Santa Ana College Traditional On-Campus Credit Program Enrolment by Residence Location, Gender and Ethnicity

## Age 17 to 21 Years

| CCD | Ethnic | Gender | Population |  |  | Enrollment |  |  | Participation Rate |  |  | Change 2000-2005 |  |  | Change 2005-2010 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | Pop. | Enroll | Part. <br> Rate | Pop. | Enroll | Part. <br> Rate |
| Rancho <br> Santiago | Asian | Female | 2,660 | 3,162 | 3,007 | 268 | 215 | 220 | 10.1\% | 6.8\% | 7.3\% | 18.9\% | -19.8\% | -33\% | -4.9\% | 2.3\% | 7\% |
|  |  | Male | 3,047 | 3,147 | 3,299 | 258 | 214 | 235 | 8.5\% | 6.8\% | 7.1\% | 3.3\% | -17.1\% | -20\% | 4.8\% | 9.8\% | 4\% |
|  | Black | Female | 238 | 246 | 319 | 25 | 23 | 32 | 10.4\% | 9.3\% | 10.2\% | 3.4\% | -8.0\% | -11\% | 29.7\% | 39.1\% | 10\% |
|  |  | Male | 335 | 305 | 326 | 32 | 31 | 39 | 9.7\% | 10.1\% | 11.9\% | -9.0\% | -3.1\% | 4\% | 6.9\% | 25.8\% | 18\% |
|  | Latino | Female | 14,940 | 15,849 | 18,868 | 1,764 | 2,037 | 2,515 | 11.8\% | 12.9\% | 13.3\% | 6.1\% | 15.5\% | 9\% | 19.0\% | 23.5\% | 3\% |
|  |  | Male | 18,431 | 17,216 | 20,263 | 1,407 | 1,553 | 1,912 | 7.6\% | 9.0\% | 9.4\% | -6.6\% | 10.4\% | 18\% | 17.7\% | 23.1\% | 4\% |
|  | Other | Female | 612 | 533 | 625 | 128 | 120 | 131 | 20.9\% | 22.5\% | 20.9\% | -12.9\% | -6.3\% | 8\% | 17.3\% | 9.2\% | -7\% |
|  |  | Male | 608 | 609 | 588 | 137 | 118 | 118 | 22.5\% | 19.3\% | 20.0\% | 0.2\% | -13.9\% | -14\% | -3.4\% | 0.0\% | 4\% |
|  | White | Female | 5,197 | 5,229 | 5,267 | 244 | 203 | 217 | 4.7\% | 3.9\% | 4.1\% | 0.6\% | -16.8\% | -17\% | 0.7\% | 6.9\% | 5\% |
|  |  | Male | 5,511 | 5,554 | 5,618 | 245 | 241 | 255 | 4.4\% | 4.3\% | 4.5\% | 0.8\% | -1.6\% | -2\% | 1.2\% | 5.8\% | 5\% |
| Coast | Asian | Female | 3,308 | 3,865 | 4,215 | 100 | 107 | 121 | 3.0\% | 2.8\% | 2.9\% | 16.8\% | 7.0\% | -7\% | 9.1\% | 13.1\% | 4\% |
|  |  | Male | 3,445 | 4,049 | 4,514 | 88 | 84 | 98 | 2.6\% | 2.1\% | 2.2\% | 17.5\% | -4.5\% | -19\% | 11.5\% | 16.7\% | 5\% |
|  | Black | Female* | 171 | 177 | 204 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0.2\% | 1.7\% | 2.0\% | 3.5\% |  |  | 15.3\% | 33.3\% | 18\% |
|  |  | Male | 208 | 206 | 220 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1.8\% | 2.4\% | 2.6\% | -1.0\% | 25.0\% | 33\% | 6.8\% | 20.0\% | 8\% |
|  | Latino | Female | 4,224 | 4,709 | 5,926 | 73 | 112 | 143 | 1.7\% | 2.4\% | 2.4\% | 11.5\% | 53.4\% | 41\% | 25.8\% | 27.7\% | 0\% |
|  |  | Male | 5,092 | 5,119 | 6,335 | 73 | 86 | 105 | 1.4\% | 1.7\% | 1.7\% | 0.5\% | 17.8\% | 21\% | 23.8\% | 22.1\% | 0\% |
|  | Other | Female | 750 | 877 | 857 | 15 | 17 | 18 | 2.0\% | 1.9\% | 2.1\% | 16.9\% | 13.3\% | -5\% | -2.3\% | 5.9\% | 11\% |
|  |  | Male | 748 | 851 | 916 | 21 | 27 | 29 | 2.8\% | 3.2\% | 3.2\% | 13.8\% | 28.6\% | 14\% | 7.6\% | 7.4\% | 0\% |
|  | White | Female | 8,703 | 9,015 | 10,529 | 24 | 39 | 45 | 0.3\% | 0.4\% | 0.4\% | 3.6\% | 62.5\% | 33\% | 16.8\% | 15.4\% | 0\% |
|  |  | Male | 9,091 | 9,779 | 10,846 | 62 | 115 | 130 | 0.7\% | 1.2\% | 1.2\% | 7.6\% | 85.5\% | 71\% | 10.9\% | 13.0\% | 0\% |

Table 6 (Continued)
Santa Ana College Traditional On-Campus Credit Program Enrolment by Residence Location, Gender and Ethnicity
Age 17 to 21 Years

| CCD | Ethnic | Gender | Population |  |  | Enrollment |  |  | Participation Rate |  |  | Change 2000-2005 |  |  | Change 2005-2010 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | Pop. | Enrol. | Part. <br> Rate | Pop. | Enrol. | Part. <br> Rate |
| North <br> Orange <br> County | Asian | Female | 3,946 | 4,649 | 4,824 | 59 | 38 | 42 | 1.5\% | 0.8\% | 0.9\% | 17.8\% | -35.6\% | -47\% | 3.8\% | 10.5\% | 13\% |
|  |  | Male | 3,982 | 4,890 | 5,274 | 50 | 38 | 40 | 1.3\% | 0.8\% | 0.8\% | 22.8\% | -24.0\% | -38\% | 7.9\% | 5.3\% | 0\% |
|  | Black | Female | 705 | 717 | 1051 | 10 | 9 | 13 | 1.4\% | 1.2\% | 1.2\% | 1.7\% | -10.0\% | -14\% | 46.6\% | 44.4\% | 0\% |
|  |  | Male | 756 | 831 | 1209 | 18 | 17 | 31 | 2.3\% | 2.0\% | 2.6\% | 9.9\% | -5.6\% | -13\% | 45.5\% | 82.4\% | 30\% |
|  | Latino | Female | 12,679 | 14,160 | 18,045 | 230 | 330 | 451 | 1.8\% | 2.3\% | 2.5\% | 11.7\% | 43.5\% | 28\% | 27.4\% | 36.7\% | 9\% |
|  |  | Male | 14,049 | 15,445 | 19,077 | 217 | 285 | 376 | 1.5\% | 1.8\% | 2.0\% | 9.9\% | 31.3\% | 20\% | 23.5\% | 31.9\% | 11\% |
|  | Other | Female | 1030 | 1106 | 1253 | 26 | 28 | 35 | 2.5\% | 2.6\% | 2.8\% | 7.4\% | 7.7\% | 4\% | 13.3\% | 25.0\% | 8\% |
|  |  | Male | 1027 | 1111 | 1283 | 34 | 50 | 61 | 3.3\% | 4.5\% | 4.8\% | 8.2\% | 47.1\% | 36\% | 15.5\% | 22.0\% | 7\% |
|  | White | Female | 10,391 | 10,303 | 10,317 | 87 | 71 | 76 | 0.8\% | 0.7\% | 0.7\% | -0.8\% | -18.4\% | -13\% | 0.1\% | 7.0\% | 0\% |
|  |  | Male | 10,370 | 10,949 | 10,815 | 140 | 148 | 156 | 1.4\% | 1.4\% | 1.4\% | 5.6\% | 5.7\% | 0\% | -1.2\% | 5.4\% | 0\% |
| South <br> Orange <br> County | Asian | Female | 5,031 | 3,530 | 4,665 | 24 | 24 | 33 | 0.5\% | 0.7\% | 0.7\% | -29.8\% | 0.0\% | 40\% | 32.2\% | 37.5\% | 0\% |
|  |  | Male | 4,628 | 3,960 | 4,769 | 21 | 23 | 27 | 0.5\% | 0.6\% | 0.6\% | -14.4\% | 9.5\% | 20\% | 20.4\% | 17.4\% | 0\% |
|  | Black | Female | 395 | 375 | 506 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 1.3\% | 1.4\% | 1.6\% | -5.1\% | 0.0\% | 8\% | 34.9\% | 60.0\% | 14\% |
|  |  | Male | 419 | 412 | 582 | 9 | 6 | 7 | 2.2\% | 1.4\% | 1.2\% | -1.7\% | -33.3\% | -36\% | 41.3\% | 16.7\% | -14\% |
|  | Latino | Female | 4,351 | 5,549 | 7,514 | 76 | 125 | 169 | 1.8\% | 2.3\% | 2.2\% | 27.5\% | 64.5\% | 28\% | 35.4\% | 35.2\% | -4\% |
|  |  | Male | 4,882 | 6,248 | 7,940 | 82 | 122 | 157 | 1.7\% | 1.9\% | 2.0\% | 28.0\% | 48.8\% | 12\% | 27.1\% | 28.7\% | 5\% |
|  | Other | Female | 1080 | 1227 | 1636 | 26 | 23 | 30 | 2.4\% | 1.9\% | 1.9\% | 13.6\% | -11.5\% | -21\% | 33.3\% | 30.4\% | 0\% |
|  |  | Male | 1107 | 1246 | 1650 | 25 | 36 | 50 | 2.2\% | 2.9\% | 3.0\% | 12.6\% | 44.0\% | 32\% | 32.4\% | 38.9\% | 3\% |
|  | White | Female | 12,135 | 15,667 | 18,855 | 45 | 69 | 86 | 0.4\% | 0.4\% | 0.5\% | 29.1\% | 53.3\% | 0\% | 20.3\% | 24.6\% | 25\% |
|  |  | Male | 12,695 | 16,617 | 19,913 | 101 | 153 | 192 | 0.8\% | 0.9\% | 1.0\% | 30.9\% | 51.5\% | 13\% | 19.8\% | 25.5\% | 11\% |
| Total |  |  | 192,977 | 209,489 | 243,920 | 6,253 | 6,948 | 8,412 | 3.2\% | 3.3\% | 3.4\% | 26.4\% | 34.5\% | 6\% | 16.4\% | 21.1\% | 3\% |

March 2006

* For 2000, average of Fall 1999, Spring 2000 and Fall 2000 enrollment from Coast CCD for African-American females was 0.3 (rounded to 0).

Table 7
Santa Ana College Traditional Credit Program Enrollment by Service Area of Residence, Gender and Ethnicity Age 17 to 21 Years

| CCD | Ethnic | Gender | Population |  |  | Enrollment |  |  | Participation Rate |  |  | Change 2000-2005 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | Population | Enrollment |
| SAC Service Area | Asian | Female | 1,988 | 2,235 | 2,078 | 214 | 176 | 175 | 10.8\% | 7.9\% | 8.4\% | 12.4\% | -17.8\% |
|  |  | Male | 2,245 | 2,210 | 2,244 | 191 | 169 | 182 | 8.5\% | 7.6\% | 8.1\% | -1.6\% | -11.5\% |
|  | African- <br> American | Female | 146 | 161 | 183 | 18 | 14 | 17 | 12.3\% | 8.7\% | 9.3\% | 10.3\% | -22.2\% |
|  |  | Male | 188 | 170 | 205 | 23 | 22 | 30 | 12.2\% | 12.9\% | 14.6\% | -9.6\% | -4.3\% |
|  | Latino | Female | 13,015 | 13,300 | 15,450 | 1,592 | 1,844 | 2,249 | 12.2\% | 13.9\% | 14.6\% | 2.2\% | 15.8\% |
|  |  | Male | 15,663 | 14,211 | 16,609 | 1,256 | 1,404 | 1,723 | 8.0\% | 9.9\% | 10.4\% | -9.3\% | 11.8\% |
|  | Other | Female | 338 | 308 | 332 | 72 | 79 | 72 | 21.3\% | 25.6\% | 21.7\% | -8.9\% | 9.7\% |
|  |  | Male | 365 | 371 | 326 | 79 | 74 | 66 | 21.6\% | 19.9\% | 20.2\% | 1.6\% | -6.3\% |
|  | White | Female | 2,068 | 1,994 | 1,934 | 93 | 78 | 80 | 4.5\% | 3.9\% | 4.1\% | -3.6\% | -16.1\% |
|  |  | Male | 2,211 | 2,140 | 2,092 | 96 | 98 | 101 | 4.3\% | 4.6\% | 4.8\% | -3.2\% | 2.1\% |
|  | sub-total |  | 38,227 | 37,100 | 41,453 | 3,634 | 3,958 | 4,695 | 9.5\% | 10.7\% | 11.3\% | -2.9\% | 8.9\% |
|  | Asian | Female | 672 | 927 | 929 | 54 | 39 | 45 | 8.0\% | 4.2\% | 4.8\% | 37.9\% | -27.8\% |
|  |  | Male | 802 | 937 | 1,055 | 67 | 45 | 53 | 8.4\% | 4.8\% | 5.0\% | 16.8\% | -32.8\% |
|  | African- <br> American | Female | 92 | 85 | 136 | 7 | 9 | 16 | 7.6\% | 10.6\% | 11.8\% | -7.6\% | 28.6\% |
|  |  | Male | 147 | 135 | 121 | 10 | 8 | 9 | 6.8\% | 5.9\% | 7.4\% | -8.2\% | -20.0\% |
|  | Latino | Female | 1,925 | 2,549 | 3,418 | 171 | 193 | 267 | 8.9\% | 7.6\% | 7.8\% | 32.4\% | 12.9\% |
|  |  | Male | 2,768 | 3,005 | 3,654 | 151 | 149 | 188 | 5.5\% | 5.0\% | 5.1\% | 8.6\% | -1.3\% |
|  | Other | Female | 274 | 225 | 293 | 56 | 41 | 59 | 20.4\% | 18.2\% | 20.1\% | -17.9\% | -26.8\% |
|  |  | Male | 243 | 238 | 262 | 57 | 44 | 51 | 23.5\% | 18.5\% | 19.5\% | -2.1\% | -22.8\% |
|  | White | Female | 3,129 | 3,235 | 3,333 | 152 | 125 | 137 | 4.9\% | 3.9\% | 4.1\% | 3.4\% | -17.8\% |
|  |  | Male | 3,300 | 3,414 | 3,526 | 149 | 143 | 153 | 4.5\% | 4.2\% | 4.3\% | 3.5\% | -4.0\% |
|  | sub-total |  | 13,352 | 14,750 | 16,727 | 874 | 796 | 978 | 6.5\% | 5.4\% | 5.8\% | 10.5\% | -8.9\% |

Table 8
SAC Service Area Population and SAC Service Area Enrollment by Ethnicity

| Ethnicity | Population |  |  | Percent of Population |  |  | Enrollment |  |  | Percent of Enrollment |  |  | Enrollment Rate |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 |
| Asian | 58,892 | 61,766 | 64,680 | 13\% | 13\% | 13\% | 1,741 | 1,077 | 1,165 | 19\% | 13\% | 12\% | 3.0\% | 1.7\% | 1.8\% |
| Black | 5,551 | 5,266 | 5,095 | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 149 | 120 | 129 | 2\% | 1\% | 1\% | 2.7\% | 2.3\% | 2.5\% |
| Latino | 298,399 | 323,224 | 348,103 | 65\% | 68\% | 70\% | 5,758 | 6,243 | 7,250 | 64\% | 73\% | 76\% | 1.9\% | 1.9\% | 2.1\% |
| Other | 8,562 | 8,238 | 7,900 | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 475 | 431 | 415 | 5\% | 5\% | 4\% | 5.5\% | 5.2\% | 5.3\% |
| White | 86,656 | 78,345 | 70,066 | 19\% | 16\% | 14\% | 811 | 632 | 614 | 9\% | 7\% | 6\% | 0.9\% | 0.8\% | 0.9\% |
| Total | 458,060 | 476,839 | 495,844 | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 8,933 | 8,503 | 9,573 | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 2.0\% | 1.8\% | 1.9\% |

Table 9
SAC Service Area Population and SAC Service Area Enrollment by Ethnicity
Age 17 to 21 Years

| Ethnicity | Population Age 17-21 Years |  |  | Percent of Population |  |  | Enrollment |  |  | Percent of Enrollment |  |  | Enrollment Rate |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 |
| Asian | 4,233 | 4,445 | 4,322 | 11\% | 12\% | 10\% | 405 | 345 | 357 | 11\% | 9\% | 8\% | 9.6\% | 7.8\% | 8.3\% |
| Black | 334 | 331 | 388 | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 41 | 36 | 47 | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 12.3\% | 10.9\% | 12.1\% |
| Latino | 28,678 | 27,511 | 32,059 | 75\% | 74\% | 77\% | 2,848 | 3,248 | 3,972 | 78\% | 82\% | 85\% | 9.9\% | 11.8\% | 12.4\% |
| Other | 703 | 679 | 658 | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 151 | 153 | 138 | 4\% | 4\% | 3\% | 21.5\% | 22.5\% | 21.0\% |
| White | 4,279 | 4,134 | 4,026 | 11\% | 11\% | 10\% | 189 | 176 | 181 | 5\% | 4\% | 4\% | 4.4\% | 4.3\% | 4.5\% |
| Total | `38,227 | 37,100 | 41,453 | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 3,634 | 3,958 | 4,695 | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 9.5\% | 10.7\% | 11.3\% |

Table 10
SAC Non-Traditional Enrollment

| Reporting Area | Enrollment |  |  | Percent Change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2000 to 2005 | 2005 to 2010 |
| RSCCD | 1,478 | 1,401 | 1,495 | -5\% | 7\% |
| Coast CCD | 1,460 | 1,075 | 1,135 | -26\% | 6\% |
| North OC CCD | 1,272 | 1,130 | 1,223 | -11\% | 8\% |
| South OC CCD | 1,833 | 1,670 | 1,899 | -9\% | 14\% |
| Non-Orange County (1) | 5,606 | 5,139 | 5,139 | -9\% | 0\% |
| Unknown/Not Reported | 30 | 9 | 9 | -70\% | 0\% |
| \% Non-Orange County | 48\% | 49\% | 47\% |  |  |
| Total Non-Traditional | 11,679 | 10,424 | 10,900 | -11\% | 5\% |

Table 11
SAC CED Enrollment

| Reporting Area | Enrollment |  |  | Percent Change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2000 | 2005 | 2010 | 2000 to 2005 | 2005 to 2010 |
| RSCCD | 15,352 | 14,784 | 16,181 | -4\% | 9\% |
| Coast CCD | 875 | 1,056 | 1,239 | 21\% | 17\% |
| North OC CCD | 469 | 654 | 771 | 40\% | 18\% |
| South OC CCD | 884 | 878 | 1,101 | -1\% | 25\% |
| Non-Orange County (2) | 430 | 911 | 911 | 112\% | 0\% |
| Unknown/Not Reported (2) | 142 | 365 | 365 | 157\% | 0\% |
| \% RSCCD | 85\% | 79\% | 79\% |  |  |
| Total Continuing Education | 18,152 | 18,648 | 20,568 | 3\% | 10\% |

1) Enrollment in EMS (Emergency Medical Service) within the Fire Academy declined between 2000 and 2005, and primarily explains the decline in non-RSCCD and non-Orange County student enrollment, as the EMS program draws from a wide area.
2) Expanded offerings of the Ed/Career Assessment course appears closely related to the increase in non-Orange County and unknown/unreported residence locations. The maintenance of student records for this course may explain most of the changes noted.
