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The broad framework

Identifying where inequities emerge on the path to completion

Peppered with mixture of statewide data and data from the Contra Costa Community College District
Before we start, a quick word on the many dimensions of equity

**Mandated in Equity Reports**

1. Ethnicity / race
2. Gender
3. Age
4. Foster Youth
5. Veterans

**Other populations we are starting to collect data on:**

1. Sexual orientation
2. First generation status
3. Socioeconomic status
4. English learners
5. Others
What does equity success look like?

Shrinking the equity or achievement gap sounds straightforward, but it can manifest itself in very different ways.
Scenario #2: Rising Tide

Rising Tide interventions help all groups equally.

Average Success Rate increases but the Achievement Gap remains unchanged.
Scenario #3: **Zero-Sum**

Zero-Sum interventions help the bottom but harm the top.
Scenario #4a: **Bottom-up**

Average Success Rate increases and the Achievement Gap decreases

**Bottom-up interventions** help the bottom and hold the top harmless.
Scenario #4b: **Win-Win**

- **Win-Win interventions** help everyone but raise the bottom more than the top.

- Average Success Rate increases substantially and the Achievement Gap decreases.
What’s the best way to frame the challenge?

Improving equity ≠ closing the achievement gap

Improving equity = Bringing up the bottom
(at a pace faster than the top)
Ok, back to our main story....

Using Data to **Identify Emergent Inequities** and the Effective Practices to Address Them
Variance components models are a way to assess the amount of variation in a dependent variable that is associated with one or more systematic-effects variables.

Note: Paper forthcoming.
Where do the inequities emerge on the path to completion?

A study of one large California District

1. Service Area Population
2. Enroll at Community College
3. Assess as College Ready
4. Credential Seeking Course Taking
5. Sufficient Academic Performance
6. Obtain Completion Credential

* Figures represent the explained variation from the model.
Inequities in access have been reduced through the lens of our traditional access measure.

With regard to student race/ethnicity we have been largely successful in closing the access gap.

* Figures represent the explained variance in completion.
Let’s start by looking at preparedness

Preliminary findings from one large California District

Q: Are our traditional approaches to student assessment and placement practices and actual student preparedness contributing to the inequities in outcomes?
The preparedness challenge

“College preparedness is the major determinant of inequities in educational attainment”

- Equity & Excellence in American Higher Education by Bowen, Kurzweil & Tobin
The relationship between college completion & student preparedness

Correlation = .74
### Equity, preparedness & completion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Students Unprepared</th>
<th>Completion Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asian</strong></td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White</strong></td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Filipino</strong></td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hispanic</strong></td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Afr-American</strong></td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The more students that arrive unprepared, the lower their completion rate.
## Prepared vs Unprepared

### Completion

Percentage of degree, certificate and/or transfer-seeking students starting first time in 2007-08 tracked for degree, certificate or transfer-related outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Prepared</th>
<th>Unprepared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall:** 48.1%
College Completion Rates by Student Ethnicity

Preparedness level explains more of the variation in completion than student ethnicity.

- **Asians**: 66% Completion Rates
  - Overall: 65%
  - Prepared Students: 70%
  - Unprepared Students: 57%

- **Filipinos**: 52% Completion Rates
  - Overall: 53%
  - Prepared Students: 64%
  - Unprepared Students: 44%

- **Hispanics**: 39% Completion Rates
  - Overall: 39%
  - Prepared Students: 41%
  - Unprepared Students: 35%

- **Afr Americans**: 38% Completion Rates
  - Overall: 38%
  - Prepared Students: 41%
  - Unprepared Students: 34%
Consider the scale of the underprepared population

Scorecard Starting Cohort

- Prepared Students: 70.2%
  - N = 49,560
  - Complete: 70.2%
    - N = 34,791

- Unprepared Students: 29.8%
  - N = 144,490
  - Complete: 40.5%
    - N = 58,518

Note: the State Chancellor’s Office defines unprepared as any completion oriented student whose first course in math or English was below transfer level.
The unprepared are not homogeneous

Completion Pathway

Unprepared students  Prepared students

Basic Skills course work  College level course work

Basic Skills Sequence

4 Levels Below  3 Levels Below  2 Levels Below  1 Level Below  Transfer Level
Likelihood of completing the basic skills math sequence given the student’s initial placement

Percentage of students completing college–level math within three years of initial placement and based on their level of placement

* Data source: The Basic Skills Cohort Tracker. Data are averages for a Fall 2011 cohort pulled from a sample of California Community Colleges that included all colleges for which the Cohort Tracker had sufficient data over the examined period.
A big part of our equity challenge is lurking in the placement of students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels Below</th>
<th>4 Levels Below</th>
<th>3 Levels Below</th>
<th>2 Levels Below</th>
<th>1 Level Below</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian &amp; White</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Af American &amp; Hispanic</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This data reflect the distribution for the developmental math sequence only.*
Q: Why aren’t more students moving through the sequence?

**A: It’s not because they aren’t passing the course**

The course success rate for level 3 Math (allowing for retakes) = **82%**

Of those that passed, **60%** never enrolled in Level 2 Math.

* This data reflect the distribution for the developmental math sequence only.
Q: Why aren’t more students moving through the sequence?

A: It’s not because they aren’t passing the course

- **70%**
  - Of those that passed Level 3 and enroll in Level 2, **90% passed** and **54% of those passing never enrolled** in Level 1 Math.

* This data reflect the distribution for the developmental math sequence only.
Finding consistent with national studies

“Many students who fail to complete their basic skills sequence do so without failing or withdrawing from a course. They either never show up for their remedial course or do not return after completing a course in the lower part of the sequence.”

-Redesigning America’s Community Colleges by Bailey, Jaggars & Jenkins
The dev ed challenge

To make any significant progress in closing the achievement gap, colleges must examine their approach to developmental education.

Most of the best practices promoted in the literature are effective primarily for prepared populations only.

Some promising practices that address unpreparedness:

1. Multiple Measures placement
2. Placement prep programs
3. Acceleration models
Let’s now look at pathway completion

Q: Are some populations wondering off their pathways and lengthening their time to degree more than others?

We need to place some sustained attention on pathways and milestone completion
What do students want out of their college experience?

Students pursue a wide variety of educational goals:

- Transfer
- AA/AS Degree
- Certificate
- Shoring up work skills
- Maintaining license
- 4 Yr student taking class at 2-Yr
- Concurrent enrollment
- Personal development
- Exploring educational goals
The problem: data gathered on student goals when they apply to go to college are only loosely connected to their course taking behavior once in college.

Student Self-reported Goal

“"I want to transfer to a four-year College""

Course selections for same student

First Term
- Gym course

Second Term
- Program elective
- Gym course

This type of mismatch occurs with surprising frequency within the community college domain.
National research: students are lost in a maze
Findings from a national study examining the typical student transfer experience

Problems

• Confusion about programs, requirements
• Transfer credits count only as electives
• Many decide on majors too late
• Students take excess credits, lose time and money

Recurring Themes

• Information students need is inaccurate, inaccessible
• Well-meaning but overwhelmed advisors
• Dysfunctional communication within/ among 2- and 4-years
• Students blame themselves
Are we making the problem worse?

**GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS**

(Select 12 courses from this list of more than 300)

---

**Basic Liberal Studies Requirements: [2 courses must include the Diversity (D) overlay]**

_English Communication: 6 credits; 3 credits must be in a writing course_
- Writing (ECW): ELS 112, 122 (nonnative speakers); HPR 326, WRT 104, 105, 106, 201, 227, 235, 302, 303, 304(D), 305(D), 333.
- General (EC): COM 100(D), 110(D); LIB 120; PHL 101.

_Fine Arts and Literature (A): 6 credits; 3 credits in Fine Arts and 3 credits in Literature_
- Fine Arts: ARH 120(D), 251(D), 252(D); ART 101, 207; FLM 101(D), 203(D), 204(D), 205(D); HPR 105, 124, 201A, 202A, 324; LAR 201; MUS 101(D), 106(D), 111, 292(D), 293(D); PLS 233; SPA 320(D); THE 100, 181, 351(D), 352(D), 381, 382, 383.
- Literature: AAF 257(D), 280(D), 281(D); AN 160(D), 305(D), 306(D); CAL 213(D); CLIS 110(D); ENG 130(D), 243(D), 247(D), 248(D), 251(D), 252(D), 260(D), 262(D), 263(D), 264(D), 265(D), 280(D), 300(D), 302(D), 303(D), 304(D), 317(D), 325(D), 357(D), 358(D); FRN 309(D), 310(D), 320(D), 391(D), 392(D), 393(D); HPR 105, 125, 201A, 220A; RUS 391(D), 392(D); SPA 305(D), 306(D), 307(D), 308(D), WMS 317(D).

_Language/Culture (FC): 6 credits_
- Demonstration of competence through the intermediate level by examination or successfully completing through 104 (living language) or 302 (classical language)
- Two course sequence (or one course at the 111 level) in a previously studied language through at the appropriate level (all D): ARB 103, 104; CHN 103, 104; FREN 103, 104; GER 103, 104; GRK 301, 302; HEBW 103, 104; ITL 103, 104, 111; JPN 103, 104; LAN 193, 194; LAT 301, 302; POR 103, 104; RUS 103, 104; SPA 103, 104, 111, 210.
- Two-course sequence (or one course at the 111 level) in a language not previously studied (or studied for less than two years in high school) through the beginning level: ARB 101, 102; CHN 101, 102; FREN 101, 102; GER 101, 102; GRK 101, 102; HEBW 101, 102; ITL 101, 102; JPN 101, 102; LAT 101, 102; POR 101, 102; RUS 101, 102; SPA 101, 102.
- Study abroad in an approved program for one semester
- Major in a foreign language
- Formerly registered international students, students with recognized immigrant status, or naturalized citizens (at Dean’s discretion)
- Two courses in Cross-Cultural Competence: CPL 300(D); FREN 390(D), 310(D), 320(D), 391(D), 392(D), 393(D); HIS 312(D), 171(D), 172(D), 180(D), 311(D), 327(D), 374(D), 375(D); HPR 201F, 202E; LET 151(D), 151Q(D), 151R; NRS 300; PHL 331(D); RLS 313(D); SPA 320(D); TMD 224(D); six credits of a full semester approved Intercultural Internship in a foreign country through the Office of Internships and Experiential Education

_Letters(L): 6 credits_
- AAP 150(D), 201(D), 355(D), 356(D); APG 327; BGS 392(D); CLS 160(D), 235; EGR 316(D); ENG 110(D), 160(D); 243(D), 251(D), 252(D), 280(D), 355(D), 356(D); FRK 391(D), 392(D), 393(D); HIS 111, 112, 113(D), 114(D), 116, 117, 118(D), 130(D), 132(D), 141(D), 142(D), 145(D), 146(D), 150(D), 160(D), 171(D), 172(D), 180(D), 304, 305, 310(D), 311(D), 314, 323(D), 327(D), 332(D), 333(D), 340(D), 341(D), 346(D), 351(D), 355(D), 356(D), 374(D), 375(D); HPR 107, 201(L), 202(L), 307; JOR 110(D); LAR 202(D); LET 151(L); NTV 151Q; NTV 151R; NUR 360(D); PHL 101, 103, 204, 210(D), 212(D), 215, 217(D), 235, 314, 316(D), 321, 322, 323(D), 325(D), 328(D), 331(D), 346, 355; PSC 341, 342; PSY 310; RLS 311(D), 125, 126, 131(D); WMS 220(D), 315(D), 320(D)

_Mathematics(MQ): 3 credits satisfied by MTH 141_

_Natural Sciences(N): 6 credits; satisfied by PHY_
- APS 190, 210, 211; APG 201(D); AST 108, 118; AVS 101(D); BCH 190; BIO 101, 102, 105, 106, 286(D); BPS 201; BSM 100(D), 101, 103, 112; CHEM 100, 102, 103, 110, 113, 120; HPR 109, 201(L), 202(N); MIC 190; NPS 307; NRS 190; OCS 110, 123, 131; PHY 109, 111, 112, 140, 185, 186, 203, 204, 205, 273, 274, 275; PLS 150, 150; TMD 113

_Social Sciences(S): 6 credits_
- APG 200(D), 202, 203(D), 301(D); CPL 202(D); EEC 100(D), 201, 202, 306, 381(D); EDC 102(D); EEC 105, 310, 356; GEG 101(D), 104(D), 202(D); HDFS 225; HPS 309(D), 310, 202(N); HHS 130; JFR 110(D); KIN 123(D), LIN 200(D); MAE 100; MUR 150(D); PSC 113(D), 116(D), 274(D), 288; PST 103(D), 113(D), 232(D), 253(D), 254(D), 255(D); SOC 100(D), 121(D), 230(D), 240(D), 242(D), 245(D), 274(D); TMD 224(D), WMS 150(D)
Let’s look at some basic course taking patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Ethnicity</th>
<th>% of students earning 12 units in their first year</th>
<th>% of students earning 12 units within 6 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

82% of our students self-reported that a credential and/or transfer was their goal.
Let’s look at some basic course taking patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Ethnicity</th>
<th>% of students taking any math or English course within 6 years</th>
<th>Of those taking math or English, the % taking either at the pre-collegiate level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We have an open question

• Are our students genuinely interested in programs of study but getting lost wondering across the curriculum?
• Are life events derailing them?
• Do they take a couple courses and get discouraged?

“Community college have traditionally been structured around offering a variety of courses rather than programs. Colleges designed to maximize course enrollments are not well designed to maximize completion of high-quality programs of study.”

-Redesigning America’s Community Colleges
Now let’s look at pathway patterns

Examination of the first 30 units earned by degree recipients within four highly enrolled programs at the Contra Costa Community College District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Dev Ed Units</th>
<th># Units on Pathway</th>
<th># Units off Pathway</th>
<th># of times student declared a new major</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian &amp; White Students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American &amp; Hispanic Students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The four degree programs examined were Liberal Arts: Social & Behavioral Sciences; Liberal Arts: Math & Science; Liberal Arts: Arts & Humanities; AS in Business Administration.
## Findings from the Contra Costa District

### Degree obtaining students 2011/12 – 2014/15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Starting Pathway</th>
<th>Student Ethnicity</th>
<th>Ave # of Unearned Units</th>
<th>Ave # of Transferable Units Earned Overall</th>
<th>Median Time to Degree in years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College-Ready</td>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Developmental Ed Courses</td>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Let’s look at pathway progression

### Prepared Students

- **Starting Cohort**: First-time students with a minimum of 6 units earned within six years who also attempted any Math or English in the first three years*

  - **Earning 30 Units**: Students earning 30 Transferable / Degree-Applicable Units

  - **Completion**: Students achieving a certificate, degree, transfer to a four-year or achieve transfer-prepared status within six years of entry:

### Unprepared Students

- **Starting Cohort**

  - **Earning 30 Units**

  - **Completion**

* About 30% of first-time students statewide meet the starting cohort requirements
There is a significant drop in both the prepared & unprepared student populations attempting to achieve 30 earned units of instruction.

However, the road from the 30 unit milestone to completion is much more challenging for unprepared students.

Preliminary research findings 2015. Analysis performed by Gregory Stoup, Contra Costa Community College District.
For prepared CCC students, the median time to degree is 3.6 years.

The typical unprepared student has accumulated only 42 transferable units in that amount of time & requires 1.2 additional years to complete.
“National studies have noted that students tend to earn developmental credits at the expense of earning college-level credits, and never quite catch up to their peers in terms of the number of college-level credits they earn.”

-Redesigning America’s Community Colleges by Bailey, Jaggars & Jenkins
Graduation: a tale of units and years

The traditional model: Full-time student attends for 2 years and earns 60 units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>California Community Colleges</th>
<th>Prepared Students</th>
<th>Students Requiring Remediation*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median Units Attempted:</strong></td>
<td><strong>89 units</strong></td>
<td><strong>77 units</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median Units Earned:</strong></td>
<td><strong>78 units</strong></td>
<td><strong>69 units</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median Time to Degree:</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.1 Years</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.6 Years</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: Campaign for College Opportunity (2014).
* Figures are for students completing any basic skills course in math or English.
Evidence from one CCC District

- Prepared Students
- Unprepared Students

- African-American
- Asian
- Filipino
- Hispanic
- White
- Other

# in Starting Cohort
# Earning 30 Units
# Completing
# in Starting Cohort
# Earning 30 Units
# Completing
Evidence from one CCC District

African-American  Asian  Filipino  Hispanic  White  Other

# in Starting Cohort  # Earning 30 Units  # Completing  # in Starting Cohort  # Earning 30 Units  # Completing

Prepared Students

Unprepared Students

Modest inequity

Significant inequity
Evidence from one CCC District

Most of the inequality in overall student completion occurs in this transition from 30 units to completion for unprepared students.
Let’s turn our attention to course success

Q: Are there significant variations in academic performance that seem to be impacting completion?
A quick glance at our routine metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Ethnicity</th>
<th>Course Pass Rates</th>
<th>Term-to-term persistence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FYI – your best persistence strategy is often a student success strategy
Unearned units creates immediate friction slowing student’s pathway progress.
Students can react differently to setbacks.

The literature tells us that nearly all students respond to poor performance by working harder. Prepared and acclimated students work harder to better understand the material. Underprepared and first gen students often work harder by trying to memorize more of the material.

- Redesigning America’s Community Colleges
Traditional approaches might not be working as well as we think they are. A growing body of evidence suggests that the lecture is not generic or neutral, but a specific cultural form that favors some people while discriminating against others, including women, minorities and low-income and first-generation college students. This is not a matter of instructor bias; it is the lecture format itself — when used on its own without other instructional supports — that offers unfair advantages to an already privileged population.
Traditional approaches aren’t always working as well as we think they are.

“Among students with comparable skills, students of color got less of a return on those skills when exposed to traditional models of instruction and support.”

- Whistling Vivaldi by Claude M Steele

Some promising win-win practices:

1. Flipped classroom
2. California Acceleration Project
3. Multiple Measures assessment
4. Student Support (Re)defined strategies
Flipped classrooms are generating **win-win** results
The California Acceleration project and Multiple Measures are also demonstrating **win-win outcomes**
Student Support (Re)defined has unearthed some practices that have **win-win** potential

Defining the “Six Success Factors”

- **Directed**: students have a goal and know how to achieve it
- **Focused**: students stay on track—keeping their eyes on the prize
- **Nurtured**: students feel somebody wants and helps them to succeed
- **Engaged**: students actively participate in class and extra-curricular activities
- **Connected**: students feel like they are part of the college community
- **Valued**: students’ skills, talents, abilities and experiences are recognized; they have opportunities to contribute on campus and feel their contributions are appreciated

A growing body of evidence indicates that strategic supports—delivered inside and outside the classroom—can increase students’ abilities to achieve completion and transfer. This research suggests that student support activities must be (1) integrated into students’ daily experience and (2) included in the overall curriculum. The RP Group’s review of leading studies on student support found that effective support—in addition to being integrated and intrusive—helps students become:

“Research in psychology has found that student academic performance is enhanced by a **sense of belonging** — a feeling that minority, low-income, and first-generation students often acutely lack when encountering institutions of higher education.”

Brilliant: The New Science of Smart Annie Murphy Paul
Student Support (Re)defined has unearthed some practices that have win-win potential

Unique Findings for African-American and Latino Students

• Both were more likely to be report **spending their time outside of class on campus alone**

• Both were more likely to indicate that **not passing a class as a very good reason not to re-enroll**

• African-American students were more likely to say that **having someone at the college who cared about them** was a key motivating factor in their decision to return the following semester
“The twin goals of *equity* and *high quality education* have profound meaning for our society, and we *cannot permit one to yield to the other in principle or in practice*.”

- Equity and Excellence in American Higher Education
  by William Bowen, Martin Kurzweil & Eugene Tobin
In closing, something to consider from the scholarship on equity and race:

Mandated in Equity Reports

1. Ethnicity / race
2. Gender
3. Age
4. Foster Youth
5. Veterans

Engaging the Race Question: Accountability and Equity in U.S. Higher Education

When discussing race, groups frequently push to expand the conversation to include other groups i.e. low income, student w/ disabilities, GLBT, etc.

“... that can be a mistake. It can often dilute or deflect difficult conversations about race into safer arenas and groups never address the hard questions....the best approach might be to work to establish high levels of trust that then make it possible to have courageous conversations “
The current equity challenge in higher education stems more from weakness of purpose, confusion of vision, underuse of talent, and lack of leadership than from conditions beyond our control.
Thoughts, comments, reflections ...

Yours, not mine ;)
Student success and Equity

It has been a pleasure

Gregory M Stoup
Vice President, The RP Group Board
Senior Dean, Contra Costa Community College District
Quantifying the contribution to inequity in completion (preliminary findings)

Preliminary findings from one large California District

Service Area Population → Enroll at Community College → Assess as College Ready → Credential Seeking Course Taking → Sufficient Academic Performance → Obtain Completion Credential

Not much inequity is observed through the lens of our traditional access measure.

50% - 60% → 15% - 25% → 15% - 25%

The biggest driver of inequity in outcomes emerges in our placement process.

We need to place some sustained attention on pathways and milestone completion.

Our traditional approaches just might be widening the gap.

Analysis by Gregory Stoup. Figures represent of the explained variation from the model. Paper forthcoming.
A few books, articles & monographs on equity

- **Equity and Excellence in American Higher Education** by William Bowen, Martin Kurzweil & Eugene Tobin

- **Basic Skills Education in Community Colleges** by Norton Grubb & Robert Gabriner

- **Engaging the Race Question: Accountability and Equity in U.S. Higher Education** by Alicia C. Dowd & Estela Mara Bensimon

- **Redesigning America’s Community Colleges: A Clearer Path to Student Success** by Thomas R. Bailey, Shanna Smith Jaggars, Davis Jenkins

- **Indicators of Higher Education Equity in the U.S.** by the Pell Institute

- **Whistling Vivaldi** by Claude Steele

- **Student Success in Community Colleges: A Practical Guide to Developmental Education** by The RP Group