

Foothill College
Student Equity Report

Evaluation

The 2005 goal integrated the work of student equity into all aspects of the campus, including shared governance groups, Opening Day activities, staff development programs, and overall college planning.

While a Student Equity Committee has been formed, it is not currently a part of the shared governance committee, PaRC. Additionally, it is not clear who the committee reports to or who gets its recommendations. At this time, the overall goal of coordination and visibility of student equity has not been met.

2010 Recommendations

- 1) **Foothill College should make the Student Equity Plan a part of its main focus every year;**
- 2) **The main shared governance group, PaRC, should be assigned the responsibility of creating achievable, sustainable, measurable goals that become part of campus strategic planning and the program review process. PaRC should establish yearly goals, identify those who are responsible for the goals, and evaluate the goals at the end of each academic year.**

In order to achieve the above recommendations, the Student Equity Committee suggests the following for PaRC to consider:

- 1) Make student equity a part of the program review and resource allocation processes;
- 2) Establish benchmarks for hiring administrators, faculty, and classified staff;
- 3) Establish a Student Equity Office in the same vein as the Office of Multicultural Relations that existed a number of years ago;
- 4) Integrate student equity goals into the college and district strategic plans;
- 5) Establish periodic external evaluation of equity efforts, using members of the outside community; and

Table 1. Ethnic Breakdown of Foothill Student Population, Santa Clara County Residents, and K-12 Student Populations

Ethnicity	County Population, 2009	County K-12 Student Population, 2009	Fall 2009 FH Student Population
African American	3%	3%	4%
Asian / Filipino / PI	32%	32%	28%
Hispanic	26%	37%	13%
White	37%	24%	49%
Multi-Ethnic	3%	4%	6%

Source: Census.gov and Santa Clara County Office of Education.

Note: For purposes of comparison to the Santa Clara County percentages, students whose ethnicity is unreported are excluded from this table, constituting about 15% of the student body.

This table reveals that the Santa Clara County population is clearly changing. According to the Census data, we see that White residents currently account for the largest portion of the county at 37%, followed by Asian residents at 32%, and Hispanic residents at 26%. The K-12 student population data reveal the changing demographics of the county; in the K-12 population in 2009, the largest ethnic group was the Hispanic students at 37%, followed by Asian students at 32%, and White students at 24%.

Foothill's student population mirrors the two Santa Clara County population estimates with a similar proportion of Asian and African American students, but is clearly under-represented in terms of Hispanic students (13% Foothill, 26% County residents, and 37% K-12 students) and over-represented by White students (Foothill – 49%, County r

Hispanic students and their White and Asian counterparts, and this gap has if anything widened for African American students since 2003-04.

It should be noted that college-wide course success rates are a very high-level metric, and as such may miss key nuances in student segments' success. For example, if the types of courses taken by White students differ markedly from their Hispanic and African American counterparts, a success rate difference might be expected. Previous analyses does show that White students, compared to other student populations, tend to enroll disproportionately in "lifelong learning" courses where the success rates are very high. Further analysis should be undertaken to compare success rates within course categories (basic skills, transfer-level, etc.). It is very likely that the achievement gap noted above still exists in some form; such an analysis would simply identify more clearly points of intervention.

ESLL AND BASIC SKILLS COMPLETION

2005 Goal: Increase college-level course success by 5% across all student ethnic groups.

One method to address college-level course achievement is to track cohorts of students who start at the entry levels of basic skills and measure the percentage of students who succeed in the degree-applicable course in that discipline. For example, we could track the percentage of students starting in English 100 or English 110 who eventually succeed in English 1A. Similarly, we could look at the percentage of students starting in Fundamental Mathematics (250/200/230) or Beginning Algebra (101/220) who eventually succeed in the degree-applicable Math course of Intermediate Algebra (105).

Tables 4 and 5 provide the differential cohort tracking rates by ethnicity for student cohorts starting in the entry levels of basic skills English and Math in 2003-04 and 2007-08. These two time points were identified to allow for three years of cohort tracking data.

Table 4. Cohort Tracking Rate for English Entry Level Starters, 2003-04 and 2007-08

Ethnicity	2003-04 Cohort English 1A Success Rate	2007-08 Cohort English 1A Success Rate	Difference
African American	37%	35%	-2%
Asian / Filipino / PI	41%	44%	3%
Hispanic	38%	38%	0%

track differential rates by ethnicity of Math 105 attainment by the exact starting levels of their Math sequence, but limited sample sizes hinder this analytical approach. Regardless, there is clearly a significant issue that needs to be

Evaluation:

Regardless of any caveats, the degree and certificate attainment rates are fairly low for students within both cohorts. Even so, there are some interesting trends to report.

In the degree table (Table 6), it appears that African American first-time freshmen experienced a 60% increase in degree attainment from 5.2% in the 2000 cohort to 8.3% in the 2005 cohort. While African American students in 2005 outpaced their White counterparts in degree attainment (8.3% vs. 5.2%), Asian students demonstrated the highest level of degree attainment at 9.5%. The data suggests a marked difference in degree rates for the Hispanic cohort, whose degree attainment trailed the other groups at 3.8%. Even though their degree attainment figures appear low, this percentage reflects a doubling of the 1.7% attainment rate from 2000.

The certificate attainment rate is nearly reversed from the degree rate (Table 7). Hispanic students demonstrated the highest certificate achievement rate (7.1%) with Asian students experiencing the lowest certificate rate (2.1%). While this difference may have something to do with the differential attainment goals set by the two groups, it still remains an equity issue. This possible explanation warrants further investigation.

The monitoring of degree and certificate attainment rates will continue to be a priority to ensure that success rates are becoming more comparable between student ethnic groups.

TRANSFER

2005 Goals: 1) Increase the number of students who transfer by 8% each fall for the next five years.

2) Assure that the ethnic and gender distribution of transfers is comparable or greater than that of the total student body enrollment.

3) Work to obtain better data on the number of students who transfer.

Evaluation:

Since the 2005 report was written, the RP Group conducted the “Transfer Velocity Cohort Report” for the Chancellor’s Office. Our access to this query-able database allows for comparison of transfer rates by college by cohort year, including breakdowns by ethnicity and other demographics (see <http://webprod.cccco.edu/datamartrans/dmtrnsstucsel.aspx> for more details).

Table 8 provides a summary of data extracted from this database for the 1999-00

Our access to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) data shows the trends on transfer to the UC and CSU systems by ethnicity over the past five academic years (Tables 9 and 10).

Table 9. Foothill College Transfers to CSU by Ethnicity, 2004-05 to 2008-09

Ethnicity	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
African American	16	14	23	11	15
Asian/ Filipino/PI	68	68	70	74	59
Hispanic	37	54	50	47	44
White	127	136	158	154	126
Other	178	148	119	107	90
Total	426	420	420	393	334

Table 10. Foothill College Transfers to UC by Ethnicity, 2004-05 to 2008-09

Ethnicity	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
African American	1	3	4	5	3
Asian/Filipino/PI	133	139	131	130	160
Hispanic	12	5	15	20	17
White	96	100	97	94	69
Other	25	17	21	14	23
Total	267	264	268	263	272

The data suggests there has been a decline in CSU transfers in the last two years, while the UC transfers remain relatively constant. There are not definitive patterns in this data among the student ethnic groups, other than a consistent decrease in CSU transfers among students of “other” and unknown backgrounds. One possible explanation for this finding is that over the last few years, transfer to private and out-of-state institutions has increased, although there are no current figures to make comparisons by ethnic background. Additionally, there is the possibility that there may exist differential transfer institution goals among different ethnic groups, which may be revealed by closer examination of student transfer goals and patterns.

