**Equity & Education: Results of HW from 10/5/18 Meeting**

Item 1 (from Patrick Morriss)

At our Oct 5 E&E meeting, I was tasked with some outreach to **Mellon Scholars, Owl Scholars**, and the **Assessment and Placement Ad Hoc Committee**, to provide feedback by Oct 22 for reporting at our Nov 9 meeting. I've reached out to Falk, Adrienne and Chris, and Kennedy and Fountainetta.

I heard from Falk about Mellon Scholars. The first student cohort is still going through that program, so there are no success measures available yet. For grant writing and other purposes, though, the kinds of measures we ask for are exactly the ones that the program will gather. When that information is available, I'll get it to E&E.

Item 2 (from Debbie Lee)

Here is what I got back from Bernie regarding **Honors**:

The Honors program was not considered a learning community by the College until this year, thus I never received a previous request to assess measures such as these. Our decisions and actions were typically based on anecdotal evidence and a desire to increase access to the baccalaureate degree for underrepresented students. When we received reports on student acceptance to UCLA, for example, the information did not include student demographic data.

I was never asked to develop SLOs for the program. The last year anyone contacted me about Program Review for Honors was in 2010. The report is posted online at <https://foothill.edu/schedule/service_program_reviews.html>. There may be small snippets of information related to honors imbedded in subsequent Office of Instruction Program Reviews which are also available online.

I am not sure how program “success” is defined. Honors Scholar completion? Completion of one course? Participation in the program? I would suggest you contact Elaine Kuo for this information.

\*The online Program Review Tool (in MyPortal) does allow us to disaggregrate data by “honors” course status. Carolyn did this to generate a report (attached). Bernie provided comments regarding that report, as follows:

(Additional information from Bernie Day regarding Honors):

I have a couple of reflections about the report, which does not seem to off base with regard to my experience with the honors program.

1. It is worth noting that there is a bit of a wild card with 10-24% of students declining to state their ethnicity depending upon the year.
2. The 100%+ increase in Latinx students over this four-year period reflects a concerted effort on the part of the program to collaborate with EOPS and Puente, as well as engaging in other targeted outreach efforts. That is very encouraging.
3. With regard to the African American student participation, the HI staff reached out to UMOJA staff/faculty on different occasions in an effort to establish some collaboration; however, they were never able to engage with us.
4. The data seems to demonstrate the need to increase academic support (to increase course success and decrease withdrawals) and outreach (to increase enrollment) for target populations, specifically Pacific Islander, Native American, and Filipino students. With the newly increased honors staffing and support, I would assume there will be additional time to engage in supporting such efforts. Thus, the potential is exciting!
5. I do not receive transfer data specifically for honors students. The only details I have are with regard to UCLA and UC Irvine.
	1. UCLA: On average, 25% of non-honors students are admitted while 75% of honors scholars are admitted.
	2. The number of Foothill Honors Scholars who are admitted to UCLA has been increasing every year.
	3. With the new UC Irvine Honors to Honors transfer program, we have not received a report on admission yet; however, we experienced an increase of more than 100 applicants to UC Irvine in one year.
	4. I do receive voluntary self-reported information from honors students; however, I’m not sure if that would be considered.

Item 3 (Al Guzman): Marketing and Outreach

* Marketing did conduct a targeted campaign for veteran students, including ads in veteran publications
* Marketing did obtain data from IR on the general student population who applied but did not register. Special messaging was sent to encourage them to enroll. No additional data was obtained on targeted groups.
* Marketing did create brochures and other marketing materials for the various learning communities and individual departments. The website redesign project included an updated events calendar to better share information across campus.
* Marketing did advertise in veteran publications but it’s unclear if any outreach to VA was done.
* Marketing created a student services pamphlet which includes the VRC. Also worked to promote the recent veterans plaza celebration.
* The marketing team works with Student Affairs and Activities and other areas to promote these events as they happen.
* Marketing did do some activities mentioned in the plan but did not collect the data mentioned here.

Item 4 (Al Guzman)

**SEP 1.0 Activity Being Evaluated: “Course Completion” B.5 Provide Equity Research on Student Needs and New Programs**

1. **Research on Student Needs and Identifying Student Curricular Bottlenecks (as written in SEP 1.0)**
2. Research on student needs, with a focus on part-time students, to be conducted using qualitative methods.
3. Focus on support for gatekeeper courses beyond basic skills. After identifying these courses, an examination of the data will inform whether additional sections should be offered.
4. Track students by major through the curriculum to identify bottlenecks.
5. Research to identify success gaps by gender – online courses, STEM courses.
6. Research the demand for new Associate Degrees for Transfer.
7. Research by faculty on offering additional curricular options in basic skills (including pathway through college-level math for students who place into developmental math).
8. Research by faculty on the expansion of the noncredit ESL curriculum.

Status Update

*Note: IRP is not responsible for the activities listed above, but rather provides support. The status update provided is what IRP knows, but we do not have information on the lead person responsible for said activities.*

**Item 1.d**: **Research to identify success gaps** is completed annually to track the progress of Foothill College’s course success rate. The evaluation looks at all instructional modalities, as well as disaggregates by face-to-face/hybrid vs. online courses. The data is further disaggregated by student demographics: gender, ethnicity, low income, DSPS, veteran and foster youth. The data has been shared with BSI-SEP-SSSP Student Success Collaborative, administrative council and at college opening day.

Additionally, there are two online tools available to administrators, faculty and staff: *Faculty Inquiry Tool* and *Program Review Tool (via MyPortal).* Both tools examine enrollment and course outcomes by division, department, course and section level (the latter is available via *Faculty Inquiry Tool* and section-level data is only accessible to the instructor who taught the section). End users could disaggregate data by modalities and student demographics.

**Items 1.c, 1.e and 1.f**: IRP does not have information on the status or outcome of **tracking students by major to identify bottlenecks, researching demand for new Associate Degrees for Transfer and/or research by faculty on offering additional curricular options in basic skills**. What we do know is there have been preliminary discussions among the Guided Pathway Study Group to consider clustering majors into meta-majors and mapping courses to Associate Degrees for Transfer.

**Item 1.g:** IRP does not have information on the status or outcome of the **research by faculty on the expansion of non-credit ESL curriculum**. What we do know is that a non-credit ESL curriculum has been developed. For more information, see dean of language arts and/or ESL faculty.

**Items 1.a and 1.b** IRP does not have information on the status or outcome of **research of student needs or support for gatekeeper courses beyond basic skills**. Lead person unknown.

1. **Research the Development of a Service Learning Program (as written in SEP 1.0)**

As one of the EMP objectives also focuses on collaboration with other institutions in ways that serve students and society by exploring student participation in leadership and activities Foothill College Student Equity Plan 2015-16 Page 32 Foothill – De Anza Community College District Foothill College outside the classroom (including service/work-based learning) that engages students with the College and the community, additional pay will be provided to a faculty member to help plan and design opportunities for service learning at Foothill College. This effort will also examine previous programs at Foothill College to learn from their implementations.

Status Update

*Note: The status update provided is what IRP knows, and we think the development of service learning program is a collaboration between the office of the president and equity office.*

This is not research per se, but an activity completed to help define and compile examples of service learning and service leadership projects was the “60for60” <https://foothill.edu/60yearsofservice/>.

A consultant was hired to develop and administer a survey that aimed to define, solicit examples and identify core competencies student developed through the 7 service learning/service leadership strategies Foothill had identified: (1) service learning, (2) leadership classes, (3) “21st century competencies” in Career Technical Education program, (4) civic engagement, (5) scholarship, (6) research, and publication, community service, and (7) equity. Additionally, the consultant met with individual employees and groups. The results from the survey and employee meetings as well as a meeting with senior leadership is slated for fall 2018.

1. **Research on Offering a Program to Support African American Students (as written in SEP 1.0)**

This research project will provide seed funding for faculty professional development about state-wide program models for African American students. This project will provide additional pay for a faculty member to help plan and design the development of an Umoja or other African-American student focused program at Foothill College.

Status Update

IRP does not have information on the status or outcome of the funding for faculty professional development about state-wide program models and/or design development of an Umoja program. What we do now is that an Umoja learning community started at Foothill College in 2016-17. For more information, see Umoja faculty coordinator(s).

Item 5 (Lakshmi Auroprem and Carolyn Holcroft)

* SEP 1.0 Section **B.1.** is dedicated to PD plans to help eliminate disparities in **course success rates**. These plans are listed below, along with a status update for each:
	+ **hiring a dean** - in progress after a false start last year
	+ **financial support for part-time faculty training and development**: only anecdotal data about how/where this is occurring (i.e., some departments/divisions are said to be compensating PT faculty sporadically but no formal data at this point)
	+ Effective practices workshops for faculty **teaching online**: last year, Carolyn (Office of Equity and PD) teamed up with Heather Garcia and Judy Baker (Online Learning) to offer a six-week online "course" about effective practices for online teaching and learning. We ran it in the Winter and Spring quarters. We also encourage interested faculty to complete one or more of the many @ONE free or low-cost "courses" in online pedagogybut have not collected data about Foothill faculty/staff participation or completion rates.
	+ **Cultural competency training** for faculty, staff, and administrators: we've offered a variety of opportunities at Foothill such as "Beyond Diversity I &II," district and college opening day workshops and quarterly PD day workshops; additionally, SEP 1.0 money funded attendance at off-campus activities with cultural competency components (such as NCORE). The Office of Equity and PD collects participant feedback (data) for the on-campus events and some, but not all, off-campus events.
	+ Coordination of a range of faculty PD activities, including **training for effective practices for incorporating an equity perspective in the teaching and services that faculty provide**. Examples of PD activities include focusing on pedagogical practices using an equity lens. Many activities have been offered, such as the Faculty Teaching, Learning Academy and the Center for Urban Education's Equity in Pedagogy program, and the Black Minds Matter series. Feedback is collected from participants.
* SEP 1.0 B.1. specifies "the **evaluation** [of these plans] will **document** and **assess the outcomes** of the professional development activities, focusing on*what participants learned* and the *changes they make to instruction and practice* as a result of their participation in these professional development activities.

\*a document listing the equity PD events offered at Foothill and equity-specific off-campus events supported by SEP funds is attached. Faculty may well have attended other off-campus equity-related PD that were not SEP-funded.

**Broad, overarching conclusion(s)**:

* We are successfully offering a variety of equity-related professional development activities at Foothill, and providing funding for attendance at equity-specific off-campus PD events
* These activities are all voluntary and only a relatively small proportion of faculty take advantage
* For all of the on-campus activities coordinated by the Office of Equity and PD, data are collected to ascertain what folks learned and how it will affect their instruction and practice (i.e. we are doing the evaluations we said we'd do in SEP 1.0 for on-campus events but not necessarily for all off-campus events).
* To date, we have not systematically collected or analyzed any before/after training course success rates at either the program or individual instructor level. Efforts to engage faculty in instructor-level analysis have not yet been successful. We know the some faculty are attending the PD events and changing their pedagogy as a result, but don't know if these changes are mitigating disparate course success rates. I.e. we are not "closing the loop."

Item 6 (Al Guzman)

(**Financial Aid**)

1. How have you been evaluating your learning community (or communities) in terms of student retention outcomes, and, what progress have you made?

We have not evaluated the retention/success outcomes for financial aid students only. We have spent the time increasing processing time and reducing obstacles to access to college, but have not analyzed the success’ of these specific students.

1. Are all demographic groups achieving success at the same rate in your program?

Unknown

**Item 7 (from Ram Subramaniam) STEM Core:**

**Mission:** STEM Core’s mission is to increase STEM transfer rates with accelerated math and contextualized engineering and computer science courses. Funded by the California Careers Pathway Trust, the program came to fruition as an attempt to address the systemic inequities students in remedial math face. To pursue STEM degrees, students in remedial math often stay in CC’s 1-3 years more than the traditional 2-3 years for other majors. This is due to the high level of math competency required for STEM majors. This disproportionately affects two major groups: 1) underserved minorities who are overserved in remedial math classes and 2) females who are underrepresented in higher math classes.

**Recruitment:** Program participants are recruited from remedial math classes, faculty or counselor referrals, or voluntary participation. The program is intentional to recruit underserved students with interest in STEM majors such as Latinx, African Americans and women but accepts all students who meet program requirements.

**Data:** In the 2016-2017 cohort, 60% of students successfully completed Math 105 through Math 48C. In the 2017-2018 cohort, 26% of students successfully completed the four quarter math sequence. In evaluating the program, we look at student progress i.e. exam and quiz scores, and course success (A, B, or C letter grades). For more detailed data, please consult Institutional Research.

The largest equity gap is among our Latino students. In the 2017-2018 cohort, the program served 12 students who identified as Latinx. Of the 12, only 1 successfully completed all four quarters of math in one year. In comparison, the cohort prior served 5 Latinx with 2 who successfully completed the program.

For women, the numbers are slightly higher – Cohort 1, 83% success rate; Cohort 2, 40% success rate. In the 2 years of the program, two women have transferred with a STEM degree.

Of the 21 students in the 2018-2019 cohort, 9 are female and 6 are Latinx (mutually exclusive).

*\*Percentages include students who withdraw from the program.*

Donna Miranda

Program Coordinator
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