

Grant Number: 2002479



**Evaluation and Transformation
Using Research for Organizational Change**

**8th Semi-Annual Report
July 1, 2006 – January 31, 2007**

**Compiled by:
Jack T.F. Ling, Ph.D.
Executive Director/Associate Dean
Center for Multicultural Learning/ College of Arts and Sciences
&
Mary Ho, Associate Director
Center for Multicultural Learning**

**Submitted to
The James Irvine Foundation
January 31, 2007**

Table of Contents

1. *Introduction*
2. *Narrative Progress Report on Select Campus Diversity Initiative Objectives & Outcomes*
 - A. *Methods*
 - B. *Progress in Achieving Goals and Strategies*
 - Goal 1. Increase the Enrollment of racial minority and First Generation College Students*
 - Goal 2. Foster the Academic Success of all Students, particularly First Generation College students and Students of Color*
 - Goal 3. Provide Resources for Faculty of Color*
 - Goal 4. Advance a Multicultural Curriculum*
 - Goal 5. Improve Campus Climate and Exposure to Multiculturalism*
 - C. *Institution-wide Learning and Challenges/Obstacles*
 - D. *Progress Towards Goals and Strategies to be Reported in June 2007*
 - E. *Campus Diversity Initiative Financial Status Report*
 - G. *References Cited*
3. *Appendix A. Description of Faculty and Staff Funded Grants*
4. *Appendix B. Description of Student Support Grants*
5. *Appendix C. LEAD Summary Report*
6. *Appendix D. Description of Diversity Initiative Councils and Network*

Executive Summary

In this eighth semi-annual report, we documented the incremental progress that Santa Clara University has made in creating institutional change in such areas as enrollment, retention, academic success, recruitment of faculty of color, development of future faculty of color, curricular assessment and development, and campus climate. Some examples:

- Enrollment: In 2006, in spite of a slight drop in minority student application overall, the number of enrolled African and Latino American students increased slightly over 2005. Application and enrollment figures for API students continue to drop; and figures for Native American students also dropped slightly from the last year. The number of transfer students increased slightly among African American students. Apparently, our affirmative steps to increase African and Latino American students yielded some success.
- The 2006 cohort of LEAD/Bridge students continue to find the program highly satisfying. Their confidence level and academic persistence continued to out pace students in the Comparison group. While Bridge students also did somewhat better academically than the Comparison Group, continued attention to their academic success is needed. Variations in Academic Preparedness of Bridge students may have contributed to the change in GPA over the recent years; and attention should also be given to control other confounding variables that may have contributed to the measured performance differences between the bridge Cohorts and their respective Comparison Group.
- Our 2006 effort to increase the diversity in tenure-track applicant pools proved to be even more successful than last year. There were nine tenure-track searches (in the Humanities and the Sciences) during this academic period, about 20% of the applicants were scholars of color (domestic and international). The percentage of candidates brought on campus for interviews also reflected this diversity. However, recruitment of African American scholars continues to be a challenge, and the pool of new faculty appointments persists to lack sufficient diversity.
- Faculty diversity projects continue to increase in number and quality, providing a diversity of curricular-co-curricular collaborations on campus.
- The 2006 Teaching of Diaspora and Diversity Workshop was well attended and received;
- The Center for Multicultural Learning, aided by the efforts of two senior CML Faculty Project Leaders, completed the planning of a month long conference-seminar on the Impact of Diaspora and Diversity in Higher Education. Keynote speakers included African, Asian, Latino, and Native American scholars.
- In the fall of 2006, an assessment of Diversity in the College Curriculum was launched; and a web based Diversity Course Directory will develop from the results of this assessment initiative;
- By November, 2006, our assessment of the College's 2005 Inclusive Excellence (IE) Post-Doctorate and Post-Baccalaureate Initiatives was completed; and the College decided to continue both initiatives in 2007-2008.
- Finally, the University selected Inclusive Excellence as one the three WASC study areas; and a proposal for the integration of Diversity in the Core Curriculum was completed at the end of 2006. Judging from the faculty, staff, and student responses to these major initiatives, we concluded that campus climate is generally favorable to the President's vision of centralizing Diversity and Global Education at the University.

1. Introduction

In this eighth semi-annual report, we continue to document the effort and progress that Santa Clara University has made in weaving multiculturalism and intercultural understanding into campus life, be it in the areas of institutional policy, campus climate and culture, the curriculum, and overall student learning. These transformations, progress, and continuing diversity efforts are possible because of the generous funding support from the Irvine Foundation, along with substantial institutional contributions. Clearly, the diversity accomplishments engendered by the Irvine Foundation will be pivotal to the University's decision to maintain its funding support after June 30, 2007.

2. Narrative Progress on Selected Campus Diversity Initiative Objectives and Outcomes

A. METHODS

Our evaluation efforts continue to assess Santa Clara University's overall diversity initiatives and outcomes as well as endeavors that were funded through the *Building Partnerships for Diversity, Phase II* grant from the James Irvine Foundation. This grant is designed to complement and support the overall diversity goals of the university while introducing a new learning model that will contribute to the transformation of our institutional culture. The evaluation has been designed primarily as a formative evaluation that will inform the campus community of its strengths and areas needed for improvement in each of our stated goal areas. The evaluation is also designed to be a cooperative process with the goal of institutionalizing on-going assessment beyond the length of the grant. We use research methods that we hope will also contribute to meeting these goals through a participatory research process (as discussed by Ayers, 1987, Hallett & Rogers 1994, Kelly & Van Vlaenderen 1995, Nichols 2002, O'Sullivan & O'Sullivan 1998). This process involves the participation of a variety of stakeholders (faculty, staff) and, when possible, also includes students, both those who are from under-represented racial groups on campus as well as European American students, in the evaluation learning process. In this way, research can become another means by which multicultural transformation of the university community can be accomplished. Such a participatory model exemplifies the social justice mission of Santa Clara University and facilitates the inclusion of all sectors of campus. Our goal in the evaluation is to provide both broad and specific indicators of our successes and of areas for institutional improvement and change. Data are collected in ways that will ensure the institutionalization of evaluation and research as a consistent barometer of our progress.

Through the extension of the grant until June 2007, we are assessing the university's progress towards all the goals outlined above. In this sixth semi-annual report, as per our evaluation plan (*Evaluation and Transformation: Using Research for Organizational Change*, June 2003) that was approved by the Irvine Foundation, we focus on our progress in meeting the following goals and objectives: (1) increasing recruitment of undergraduate students of color, (2) increasing the retention of first generation students and students of color, (3) increasing the support of faculty of color in ways that will lead to better retention; (4) advancing a multicultural curriculum, and (4) improving the campus climate.

B. PROGRESS IN ACHIEVING GOALS AND STRATEGIES

GOAL 1: INCREASE THE ENROLLMENT OF RACIAL MINORITY AND FIRST GENERATION COLLEGE STUDENTS BY INVOLVING STUDENTS LEADERS IN THE ADMISSIONS PROCESS.

We present the data below as a means of tracking our progress in increasing the enrollment of racial minority and first generation college students, indicators which can also be used to examine the effectiveness of the student component of this process.

Tables 1-3 chart SCU's experience to-date on student enrollment:

- For the first time in the Irvine Report we are tracking students who chose not to identify in any of the ethnic categories. Although we do not have specific data in the report from previous years, many more students are not specifying (NS) than previously. Students choosing not to identify make it difficult to get the most accurate results on student enrollment based on race and ethnicity.
- In Fall 2006 we see a slight increase in African American and Hispanic American student enrollment from Fall 2005. The enrollment went from 2.6 to 3.2 percent.
- We see a continuous drop in Asian/PI American student enrollment in Fall 2006. The enrollment went from 17 to 15.0 percent. The Native American population drops slightly as well. The enrollment went from 0.7 to 0.4 percent.
- This year we see African American students actually transferring to Santa Clara University compared to no students from the previous year. This fall yielded 5 transfer students. Although we do see a significant drop of transfer students from the Asian/PI and Hispanic American student population. The Asian/PI population dropped from 56% to 35% and Hispanic American student population dropped from 35% to 17%.
- We see a significant drop in number of students who applied and were admitted in the African American student population. The number of African American student applicants went down from 272 to 194 and those who were admitted went from 152 to 117. The applicants from Hispanic American student population also dropped from 1230 to 1030 and those who are admitted dropped from 624 to 574.
- We also see a drop in number of students who applied in the Asian/PI American population from the previous year. The numbers went from 1643 to 1567, however there was a slight increase in those who were admitted. The numbers of admittance went from 1037 to 1056.
- Non-specified students (NS) is at 15%.

Table 1: Fall Freshman Class Profile 1995-2006 by Race/Ethnicity and First Generation College Student (Percentages)

Race/Ethnicity	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
African American	2.3	2.4	2.9	2.6	1.8	1.4	2.9	2.1	1.8	3.4	2.6	3.2
Hispanic American	13.9	13.3	13.1	14.9	12.8	15	13.1	11.4	13.8	13.0	11.8	12.4
Asian/PI American	22.2	20.0	18.3	18.1	18.9	17.8	19.0	22.0	15.6	19.1	17.0	15.8
Native American	.6	.7	.5	.4	.6	.5	.3	1.1	.1	0.7	0.7	0.4
European American	56.2	57.9	59.3	56.8	59.8	59.7	60.0	62.2	63.3	59.7	59.0	52.0
NS	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	15.5
First Generation ^a	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	11.8	19.4	11.6	13.6

^a Data on first generation college student were only collected on admissions applications starting Fall 1995.

Table 2: Race/Ethnicity of Transfer Students as a Percentage of Total Transfer Students, Fall (actual number in parentheses)

Race/Ethnicity	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
African American	1 (3)	2 (3)	4 (7)	NA	NA	.8 (1)	<1 (3)	3.2 (10)	7.07 (4)	0 (0)	2.9 (5)
Hispanic American	11 (14)	17 (22)	17 (28)	NA	NA	22 (26)	8.9 (29)	12.7 (39)	30.8 (16)	15 (35)	9.9 (17)
Asian/PI American	36 (47)	25 (32)	24 (41)	NA	NA	24 (29)	18.2 (59)	21.8 (67)	34.6 (18)	25 (56)	20 (35)
European American	45 (58)	44 (44)	43 (72)	NA	NA	50 (60)	36.0 (116)	51.6 (159)	26.9 (14)	45 (102)	47 (81)

Table 3: Applied and Admitted First Year Students by Race/Ethnicity

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
African American: Applied Admitted	2.4 (139) 2.1 (76)	2.1 (129) 2.5 (97)	2.1 (125) 2.1 (86)	2.4 (150) 2.1 (89)	2.9 (225) 2.3 (103)	3.1 (272) 2.8 (152)	2.2 (194) 2.0 (117)
Hispanic American: Applied Admitted	10.1 (594) 11.2 (402)	11.1 (670) 11.0 (422)	11.2 (652) 9.6 (389)	12.0 (766) 10.5 (442)	13.2 (1011) 11.0 (484)	13.8 (1230) 11.5 (624)	11.9 (1,030) 10.0 (574)
Asian/PI American: Applied Admitted	21.4 (1267) 20.2 (724)	23.0 (1393) 22.0 (841)	23.3 (1362) 22.6 (919)	19.6 (1252) 18.9 (798)	20.7 (1586) 19.7 (865)	18.5 (1643) 19.1 (1037)	18.0 (1,567) 18.3 (1,056)
European American: Applied Admitted	65.6 (3878) 66.0 (2370)	63.2 (3822) 69.0 (2447)	62.4 (3643) 64.9 (2643)	65.4 (4178) 67.9 (2870)	58.1 (4441) 62.2 (2730)	53.6 (4769) 55.6 (3012)	51.2 (4,437) 53.0 (3,054)
NS Applied Admitted	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	16.0 (1,385) 16.1 (928)
TOTAL: Applied Admitted	5,910 3,592	6,049 3,823	5,842 4,075	6,388 4,224	7,649 4,388	8,904 5,419	8,670 5,762

GOAL 2. FOSTER THE ACADEMIC SUCCESS OF ALL STUDENTS, PARTICULARLY FIRST GENERATION COLLEGE STUDENTS AND STUDENTS OF COLOR.

STRATEGY: Programs to support first generation and under-represented racial minority students and their families were developed in 2003. This included a Diversity Leadership Bridge program implemented in the summer of 2003 to provide first generation, students of color, and students with low index scores (defined below) with leadership and educational opportunities designed to enhance their success at Santa Clara University upon entry and in the subsequent years. A fourth cohort of students went through the Bridge program in the summer of 2006. We have begun to follow the newest group of students, cohort 2006. Here we report the evaluation of the GPA's and credit completion for cohort 2005 and the data for cohort 2006 will be in the final June 2007 report (See Appendix C for a full description of all of the programs).

COLLABORATORS: As part of Phase II of the Partnerships for Diversity Grant, the Drahmman Advising and Learning Resources Center, the Center for Multicultural Learning, and various SCU partners (including the School of Engineering and the Department of English as well as the Program for the Study of Women and Gender) were involved in developing the LEAD Programs described below.

LEAD: Orientation Dinner for First Generation College Students, Students of Color and Their Families:

For the first time, the Summer Orientation Programs and the LEAD Programs hosted an embedded session for all incoming first generation college students, students of color and their families during all Orientations Sessions. In the six sessions, the LEAD Programs Orientation hosted over 90 students and 150 families. The number surpassed the number of students we saw in our first three years combined. The LEAD Programs Orientation Dinner consisted of a sit down dinner for students and their families while a panel of speakers related their experiences as first generation college students and students of color.

LEAD: 2006 Summer Bridge Program: This program was aimed at helping already-accepted first generation students and students of color who desire a transitional program to develop leadership and academic skills that will enhance their immediate success at Santa Clara, as well as provide skills for continued advanced study beyond undergraduate studies. A total of 148 students with index scores below 2500 were invited to be part of the program. Thirty incoming first year students ultimately participated in the program. (See Appendix C for a full narrative of the Bridge Program.)

EXPECTED OUTCOMES AND BENCHMARKS (As per Evaluation Plan, Santa Clara University, 2003)

- Expected Outcomes:
1. Increase the retention of racial minority and first generation college students.
 2. Students involved in the Bridge Program will be more likely to be involved in mainstream organizations than students in the comparison group.
 1. Students will report high satisfaction with the program.

- Benchmarks:
1. Students involved in program will have 10% higher GPA's, credit completion, an retention than comparison group.
 2. Students involved in the Bridge program will be more likely to be involved in mainstream organizations by the spring of their first year than are students in the comparison group.

EVALUATION STRATEGY: To determine the success of the Bridge program in meeting its goals a longitudinal pre/post test design with a comparison group was used. Students in the Bridge program were pre-tested on a variety of items (including levels of confidence and likelihood of participating in various activities) when they first registered for the program (before even moving in on day one of the program) and then post-tested on the last day of the program (there is complete data on 29 of the 30 participants). The outcomes of these students are being compared to all students who were invited to the program who enrolled fall quarter.

COLLABORATORS: The LEAD Program involves several departments across the university (See Appendix C for more details). Some key players are: Staff from the Center for Multicultural Learning, the Drahnann Advising and Learning Resources Center, Faculty in the Department of English, the School of Engineering, the University President’s Office, and student peer educators and community facilitators (CF’s).

Table 4: Pre and Post Levels of Confidence in Bridge Sample

Confidence in Ability To:	Pre-Test (n=30) Mean Confidence (range 1-10)	Post-Test (n=30) Mean Confidence (range 1-10)
Taking good notes	7.13	7.56**
Writing class papers	6.40	9.66*
Understanding texts	6.70	6.90***
Analyzing and Writing about what you read	6.86	7.13**
Participating in class discussions	7.13	7.93***
Keeping up to date with school work	8.30	8.30
Talking with Professors	9.10	8.60
Asking questions in class	7.36	8.30**
Using internet find research	7.86	8.20***
Using computer for word processing	8.80	9.23**
Making new friends	8.10	8.56
Using SCU library	7.13	6.89
Finding way around SCU	6.46	7.86**
Doing well on tests	6.36	7.06***
Finding right major	6.93	7.36
Finding professors you can relate to	7.23	7.73
Afford tuition for 4 years	6.30	6.50***
Finding students like you	6.80	7.46
Managing school/family responsibilities	7.30	7.46
Getting along with roommate	8.00	8.11
Getting along with people of different backgrounds	8.63	8.60
Effectively managing your time	7.13	7.33
Finding resources needed	7.23	7.23
Being able to know where to go for help on campus (or who to ask)	7.06	7.86*

*** p < .001; ** p < .01; *p < .0

Table 5: Satisfaction with the Bridge Program (n=30)

	Mean (range 1-5)
Bridge Program as a whole	4.72
Housing arrangements	4.62
Food	3.10
Timing of classes	3.44
Locations of classes	4.24
Free time offered	3.79
Amount of study time	3.68
Social events	4.34
Family integration	3.75
English class helpful	4.68
Chemistry/Religious	4.20
Classroom etiquette	3.21
Note taking	3.36
Time management	3.43
Majors in college of Arts & Sciences	3.43
Majors in School of Business	3.24
Engineering Seminar	3.90
Vocation Seminar	3.16
Vocation Seminar: Introduction	3.73
Vocation Seminar: College	3.60
Vocation Seminar: Myers-Briggs	2.86
Vocation Seminar: Jesuit Philosophy	3.10
Vocation Seminar: Study Abroad	3.83
Vocation Seminar: Career Center	4.03
Vocation Seminar: Leadership	3.63
Vocation Seminar: Student Panel	3.96
Vocation Seminar: Alumni Panel	4.06
Faculty Lunch	3.50
Advising Sessions	4.13
City Beach Team Building	4.63
Retreat	3.93
Family/Community Dinner	3.73
Sunday Evening Spirituality/mass	3.30
Interactions with Peer Educators	4.56
Floor Meetings with CF's	4.56

2006 COHORT

Bridge Program Students Had Higher Confidence Levels at the End of Program Than When They Started the Program (Table 4).

- **Bridge students had significant (**p<.001) higher levels of confidence at post-test compared to pre-test in the areas of:**
 - Participating in Class Discussions
 - Understanding Text
 - Using internet to find research
 - Doing well on tests
 - Being able to afford 4 years of tuition
- **Changes (**p<.01) in pre and post test confidence levels were noted in:**
 - Taking good notes
 - Analyzing and writing about what you read
 - Asking questions in class
 - Using computer for word processing
 - Finding your way around SCU
- **Changes (*p<.05) in pre and post test confidence levels were noted in:**
 - Writing class papers
 - Being able to know where to go (or who to ask) on campus for help

Overall, Students Were Satisfied With the Bridge Program (Table 5)

- Overall satisfaction with the program was very high with a mean score of 4.72 out of 5.00.
- Highest scores of satisfaction reported were for the academic courses, staff and team building activities:
 - English Class (4.68)
 - Religious Studies/Chemistry (4.20)
 - City Beach Team Building (4.63)
 - Student Staff Interactions (4.56)
- Lowest scores of satisfaction reported were:
 - Food (3.10)
 - Vocation Seminar Overall (3.16)
 - Vocation Seminar: Myers Briggs (2.86)
- Written comments on evaluation from the students:
 - I truly feel like Bridge helped me feel like I belong at SCU more than ever. I love when someone said that SCU accepted us so we could succeed not so we could fail. It will open new doors for me that will allow me to accomplish my dreams of making a difference in the world and bring a voice to those who are not being treated with dignity and respect. I'm here to represent *mi gente* and Latina women so society sees we can thrive and make the world a better place.
 - Thanks to all who participated to make it a reality
 - Keep up the good work and for the vocation classes—try to keep them shorter and interesting.
 - If there is any way to continue the Bridge program, it should be a focus of the entire university; if the university truly values diversity.

- Vocation seminar- more interactive and personal in regards to students. Retreat- maybe spend half the time as a group outside, the scenery was beautiful, it was lamentable to spend all day indoors. Twin Day, Black and White day, was very cute. There should be more fun days like those coordinated. It was all great and I'm very thankful to have been a part of it.
- Thanks Rosa for giving me this life changing experience!
- Please continue the Bridge Program. I see new freshmen coming in and I feel at an advantage compared to them.
- These were one of the best two weeks of my life!! I learned so much about everyone and everything!!
- Thank You! Everybody in Bridge, it was awesome!
- Thanks for everything, it was great.

Table 6: 2003 COHORT: Bridge and Comparison Groups, All Students – GPA and Orderly Progress, FALL 2003 - SPRING 2004 GPA

		Bridge and Comparison Groups					
		Fall 2003 (cohort '03)		Winter 2004 (cohort '03)		Spring 2004 (cohort '03)	
GPA		Bridge (n=28)	Comparison (n=56)	Bridge (n=28)	Comparison (n=54) ¹	Bridge (n=28)	Comparison (n=53) ¹
	LE 1.99 (Below C)	3.6%	12.5%	3.6%	16.7%	3.6%	13.2%
	2.00-2.69 (C to C+)	21.4	46.4	35.7	38.9	42.9	32.1
	GE 2.7 (B- or Higher)	75.0	41.1	60.7	44.4	53.6	54.7
Orderly Academic Progress made? ²	NO	3.6%	9.3%	0.0%	48.3%	3.6%	11.3%
	YES	96.4	90.7	100.0	51.7	96.4	88.7

* p <=.05; ^a p <=.10

¹ No grade recorded for 2 comparison group students in Winter 2004 and 3 comparison students in Spring 2004.

² Orderly academic progress defined as: Spring 2004 (third quarter) = 44 units or more, Fall 2003 (first quarter) = 12 units or more

Note: Updated data starting from 2003 cohort to 2005 cohort was received from Institutional Research on December 2006. All tables have been updated. Therefore, data may differ slightly from previous reports. New analyses are provided with the updated data (see below).

Table 6 (continued): 2003 COHORT: Bridge and Comparison Groups, All Students – GPA and Orderly Progress, FALL 2004 - SPRING 2005 GPA

		Bridge and Comparison Groups					
		Fall 2004 (cohort '03)		Winter 2005 (cohort '03)		Spring 2005 (cohort '03)	
GPA		Bridge (n=27) ¹	Comparison (n=47)	Bridge (n=27) ¹	Comparison (n=47)	Bridge (n=28)	Comparison (n=47)
	LE 1.99 (Below C)	3.7%	12.8%	0.0%	6.4%	7.1%	10.6%
	2.00-2.69 (C to C+)	33.3	31.9	25.9	27.7	21.4	29.8
	GE 2.7 (B- or Higher)	63.0	55.3	74.1	66.0	71.4	59.6
Orderly Academic Progress made? ²	NO	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.4%	7.1%	8.5%
	YES	100.0	100.0	100.0	93.6	92.9	91.5

* p <=.05; ^a p <=.10.

¹ No grade recorded for 1 bridge group students in Fall 2004 and Winter 2005.

² Orderly academic progress defined as: Spring 2005 (third quarter) = 44 units or more, Fall 2004 (first quarter) = 12 units or more

Note: Updated data starting from 2003 cohort to 2005 cohort was received from Institutional Research on December 2006. All tables have been updated. Therefore, data may differ slightly from previous reports. New analyses are provided with the updated data (see below).

Table 6 (continued): 2003 COHORT: Bridge and Comparison Groups, All Students – GPA and Orderly Progress, FALL 2005 - SPRING 2006 GPA

		Bridge and Comparison Groups					
		Fall 2005 (cohort '03)		Winter 2006 (cohort '03)		Spring 2006 (cohort '03)	
GPA		Bridge (n=26) ¹	Comparison (n=44)	Bridge (n=27)	Comparison (n=44)	Bridge (n=27)	Comparison (n=44)
	LE 1.99 (Below C)	0.0%	6.8%	6.8%	0.0%	0.0%	11.4%
	2.00-2.69 (C to C+)	26.9	34.1	25.9	20.5	22.7	25.9
	GE 2.7 (B- or Higher)	65.4	56.8	74.1	72.7	74.1	65.9
Orderly Academic Progress made? ²	NO	6.8%	0.0	3.7%	11.4%	7.4%	18.2%
	YES	93.2	100.0	96.3	88.6	92.6	81.8

* p <=.05; ^a p <=.10.

¹ No grade recorded for 1 bridge group students in Fall 2005.

² Orderly academic progress defined as: Spring 2006 (third quarter) = 44 units or more, Fall 2005 (first quarter) = 12 units or more

Note: Updated data starting from 2003 cohort to 2005 cohort was received from Institutional Research on December 2006. All tables have been updated to date. Therefore, data may differ slightly from previous reports. New analyses are provided with the updated data (see below).

Analyses:

2003 Cohort

- The bridge cohort did better academically in their first quarter at Santa Clara University than the comparison group. 75% of bridge students completed their first quarter with a GPA of 2.7 or higher in contrast to only 41% of the comparison group. However, by the end of their freshmen year, there were no statistically significant differences between the bridge and comparison groups in their GPA.
- The bridge cohort continues to do academically better than the comparison group during their second and third year. On average almost two-thirds of the bridge cohort received a GPA of 2.7 or higher. Although the comparison group did slightly better during their second and third year than their first year, the bridge cohort continues to outperform the comparison group.
- The bridge cohort continuously made orderly progress as compared to the comparison group in all three years except during fall quarter 2005. 93% of the bridge students made orderly progress compared to 100% in the comparison group. This may just be an anomaly.
- Quantitative data on their fourth year at SCU will be available in the final report in July 2007.

Table 7: 2004 COHORT: Bridge and Comparison Groups, All Students – GPA and Orderly Progress, FALL 2004 - SPRING 2005 GPA

		Bridge and Comparison Groups					
		Fall 2004 (cohort '04)		Winter 2005 (cohort '04)		Spring 2005 (cohort '04)	
GPA		Bridge (n=29)	Comparison (n=102)	Bridge (n=29)	Comparison (n=99) ¹	Bridge (n=29)	Comparison (n=99) ¹
	LE 1.99 (Below C)	0.0%	9.8%	6.9%	9.1%	3.4%	9.1%
	2.00-2.69 (C to C+)	41.4	51.0	27.6	42.4	31.0	45.5
	GE 2.7 (B- or Higher)	58.6	39.2	65.5	48.5	65.5	45.5
Orderly Academic Progress made? ²	NO	0.0%	3.9%	3.4%	7.1%	10.3%	7.1%
	YES	96.1	100.0	96.6	92.9	89.7	92.9

* p <=.05; ^a p <=.10.

¹ No grade recorded for 1 comparison students in Winter 2005 and Spring 2005.

² Orderly academic progress defined as: Spring 2005 (third quarter) = 44 units or more, Fall 2004 (first quarter) = 12 units or more

Note: Updated data starting from 2003 cohort to 2005 cohort was received from Institutional Research on December 2006. All tables have been updated to date. Therefore, data may differ slightly from previous reports. New analyses are provided with the updated data (see below).

Table 7 (continued): 2004 COHORT: Bridge and Comparison Groups, All Students – GPA and Orderly Progress, FALL 2005 - SPRING 2006 GPA

		Bridge and Comparison Groups					
		Fall 2005 (cohort '04)		Winter 2006 (cohort '04)		Spring 2006 (cohort '04)	
GPA		Bridge (n=28)	Comparison (n=95)	Bridge (n=28)	Comparison (n=95)	Bridge (n=28)	Comparison (n=93) ¹
	LE 1.99 (Below C)	7.1%	10.5%	0.0%	8.4%	7.1%	12.9%
	2.00-2.69 (C to C+)	25.0	31.6	25.0	34.7	29.0	25.5
	GE 2.7 (B- or Higher)	67.9	57.9	75.0	56.8	67.9	58.1
Orderly Academic Progress made? ²	NO	0.0%	7.4%	0.0%	5.3%	10.7%	8.6%
	YES	100.0	92.6	100.0	94.7	89.3	91.4

* p <=.05; ^a p <=.10.

¹ No grade recorded for 2 comparison students in Spring 2006.

² Orderly academic progress defined as: Spring 2006 (third quarter) = 44 units or more, Fall 2005 (first quarter) = 12 units or more

Note: Updated data starting from 2003 cohort to 2005 cohort was received from Institutional Research on December 2006. All tables have been updated to date. Therefore, data may differ slightly from previous reports. New analyses are provided with the updated data (see below).

Analyses:

2004 Cohort

- During the first year, the percent of bridge students who received GPA of 2.7 or higher is more than the comparison group. 58% of the bridge students received GPA of 2.7 or higher compared to 39% from the comparison group. However, the percentage of students in this bridge cohort received a GPA between 2.00 and 2.69 is higher than the previous 2003 bridge cohort.
- During the fall and spring quarter of the first year, the percentage of bridge students who made orderly progress is slightly lower than the comparison group. In the fall, 96% made orderly academic progress in the bridge group compared to 100% in the comparison group. In the spring, 89% made progress in the bridge group compared to 100% in the comparison group.
- In second year, the orderly academic progress made by the bridge students was 100% in both fall and winter quarter. By the spring quarter the bridge cohort orderly academic progress fell to 89% as compared to the comparison group which was at 91%.
- Quantitative data on their third year at SCU will be available in the final report in July 2007.

Table 8: 2005 COHORT: Bridge and Comparison Groups, All Students – GPA and Orderly Progress, FALL 2005 - SPRING 2006 GPA

		Bridge and Comparison Groups					
		Fall 2005 (cohort '05)		Winter 2006 (cohort '05)		Spring 2006 (cohort '05)	
GPA		Bridge (n=30)	Comparison (n=96)	Bridge (n=30)	Comparison (n=95) ¹	Bridge (n=30)	Comparison (n=94) ¹
	LE 1.99 (Below C)	10.0%	9.5%	13.3%	6.3%	13.3%	12.8%
	2.00-2.69 (C to C+)	40.0	36.8	20.0	29.5	23.3	26.6
	GE 2.7 (B- or Higher)	50.0	53.7	66.7	64.2	63.3	60.6
Orderly Academic Progress made? ²	NO	13.3%	0.0%	6.3%	13.3%	13.3%	10.6%
	YES	86.7	100.0	93.7	86.7	86.7	89.4

* p <=.05; ^a p <=.10.

¹ No grade recorded for 1 comparison student in Winter 2006 and 1 comparison student in Spring 2006

² Orderly academic progress defined as: Spring 2006 (third quarter) = 44 units or more, Fall 2005 (first quarter) = 12 units or more

Note: Updated data starting from 2003 cohort to 2005 cohort was received from Institutional Research on December 2006. All tables have been updated to date. Therefore, data may differ slightly from previous reports. New analyses are provided with the updated data (see below).

Analyses:

2005 Cohort

- During the first quarter, the bridge cohort performed slightly lower than the comparison group. 50% of the bridge cohort completed their first quarter with a GPA of 2.7 compared to 53% from the comparison group. However, the gap is small enough where there is no significant difference.
- The orderly academic progress from the bridge group is lower than the comparison group. 86% made orderly academic progress compared to 100% in the comparison group in the fall quarter. 93% made orderly academic progress in the winter quarter compared to 86% from the comparison group. By spring quarter, it dropped back down to 86% in the bridge group.
- During the second and third quarters, the bridge cohort performed slightly better than the comparison group. The difference is insignificant. In the second quarter, 66% of the bridge cohort completed with a GPA of 2.7 compared to 64% of the comparison group. In the third quarter, 64% of the bridge cohort completed with a GPA of 2.7 compared to 60% of the comparison group.
- Quantitative data on their second year at SCU will be available in the final report in July 2007.

Analyses:

2006 Cohort

- The quantitative data for 2006 bridge cohort was not completed in time for this report. For qualitative data on confidence level and satisfaction with the Bridge Program, please see tables 4 and 5.

Table 9: 2003 COHORT: Bridge and Comparison Groups, First Generation Students – GPA and Orderly Progress, FALL 2003 To SPRING 2004

		First Generation and Comparison Groups					
		Fall 2003 (cohort '03)		Winter 2004 (cohort '03)		Spring 2004 (cohort '03)	
GPA		Bridge (n=15)	Comparison (n=22)	Bridge (n=15)	Comparison (n=21) ¹	Bridge (n=15)	Comparison (n=21) ¹
	LE 1.99 (Below C)	0.0%	13.6%	0.0%	19.0%	6.7%	19.0%
	2.00-2.69 (C to C+)	13.3	50.0	46.7	57.1	33.3	33.3
	GE 2.7 (B- or Higher)	86.7	36.4	53.3	23.8	60.0	47.6
Orderly Academic Progress made? ²	NO	0.0%	13.6%	0.0%	9.5%	0.0%	19.0%
	YES	100.0	86.4	100.0	90.5	100.0	81.0

* p <=.05; ^a p <=.10.

¹ No grade recorded for 1 comparison student in Winter 2004 and 1 comparison student in Spring 2004

² Orderly academic progress defined as: Spring 2004 (third quarter) = 44 units or more, Fall 2003 (first quarter) = 12 units or more

Note: Updated data starting from 2003 cohort to 2005 cohort was received from Institutional Research on December 2006. All tables have been updated to date. Therefore, data may differ slightly from previous reports. New analyses are provided with the updated data (see below).

Table 9 (continued): 2003 COHORT: Bridge and Comparison Groups, First Generation Students – GPA and Orderly Progress, FALL 2004 To SPRING 2005

		First Generation and Comparison Groups					
		Fall 2004 (cohort '03)		Winter 2005 (cohort '03)		Spring 2005 (cohort '03)	
GPA		Bridge (n=15)	Comparison (n=18)	Bridge (n=15)	Comparison (n=18)	Bridge (n=15)	Comparison (n=18)
	LE 1.99 (Below C)	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	5.6%	0.0%	11.1%
	2.00-2.69 (C to C+)	20.0	33.3	20.0	33.3	20.0	38.9
	GE 2.7 (B- or Higher)	80.0	50.0	80.0	61.1	80.0	50.0
Orderly Academic Progress made? ²	NO	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	11.1%
	YES	100.0	100.0	100.0	88.9	100.0	81.0

* p <=.05; ^a p <=.10.

¹ Orderly academic progress defined as: Spring 2005 (third quarter) = 44 units or more, Fall 2004 (first quarter) = 12 units or more

Note: Updated data starting from 2003 cohort to 2005 cohort was received from Institutional Research on December 2006. All tables have been updated to date. Therefore, data may differ slightly from previous reports. New analyses are provided with the updated data (see below).

Table 9 (continued): 2003 COHORT: Bridge and Comparison Groups, First Generation Students – GPA and Orderly Progress, FALL 2005 To SPRING 2006

		First Generation and Comparison Groups					
		Fall 2005 (cohort '03)		Winter 2006 (cohort '03)		Spring 2006 (cohort '03)	
GPA		Bridge (n=14)	Comparison (n=18)	Bridge (n=15)	Comparison (n=18)	Bridge (n=15)	Comparison (n=18)
	LE 1.99 (Below C)	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	5.6%	0.0%	11.1%
	2.00-2.69 (C to C+)	28.6	38.9	20.0	27.8	26.7	33.3
	GE 2.7 (B- or Higher)	71.4	44.4	80.0	66.7	73.3	55.6
Orderly Academic Progress made? ²	NO	0.0%	5.6%	0.0%	16.7%	6.7%	27.8%
	YES	100.0	94.4	100.0	83.3	93.3	72.2

* p <=.05; ^a p <=.10.

¹ No grade recorded for 1 first generation student in Fall 2005

² Orderly academic progress defined as: Spring 2006 (third quarter) = 44 units or more, Fall 2005 (first quarter) = 12 units or more

Note: Updated data starting from 2003 cohort to 2005 cohort was received from Institutional Research on December 2006. All tables have been updated to date. Therefore, data may differ slightly from previous reports. New analyses are provided with the updated data (see below).

Analyses:

2003 Cohort

- During the fall quarter, the first generation college 2003 cohort performed significantly better than comparison group. 86% of the first generation cohort received a GPA of 2.7 or higher compared to 36% of the comparison group. By the spring quarter, the gap closed slightly with 60% of first generation cohort receiving a GPA of 2.7 or higher and 47% from the comparison group.
- During the second and third year, 80% the first generation college cohort continued to perform significantly better than the comparison group. During the second year, the first generation college cohort consistently received a GPA of 2.7 or higher compared to the comparison group, who received 50% in the fall and spring and 61% in the winter. Progress continued to be made in the first generation college cohort during the third year.
- During all three years, 100% of the first generation cohort made orderly academic progress, with the exception of spring quarter 2006 where 93% made orderly academic progress.

Table 10: 2004 COHORT: Bridge and Comparison Groups, First Generation Students – GPA and Orderly Progress, FALL 2004 To SPRING 2005

		First Generation and Comparison Groups					
		Fall 2004 (cohort '04)		Winter 2005 (cohort '04)		Spring 2005 (cohort '04)	
GPA		Bridge (n=21)	Comparison (n=37)	Bridge (n=21)	Comparison (n=35) ¹	Bridge (n=21)	Comparison (n=35) ¹
	LE 1.99 (Below C)	0.0%	8.1%	5.7%	0.0%	4.8%	11.4%
	2.00-2.69 (C to C+)	23.8	54.1	19.0	40.0	28.6	60.0
	GE 2.7 (B- or Higher)	76.2	37.8	81.0	54.3	66.7	28.6
Orderly Academic Progress made? ²	NO	0.0%	8.1%	0.0%	5.7%	14.3%	8.6%
	YES	100.0	91.9	100.0	94.3	85.7	91.4

* p <=.05; ^a p <=.10.

¹ No grade recorded for 2 comparison students in Winter 2005 and Spring 2005

² Orderly academic progress defined as: Spring 2005 (third quarter) = 44 units or more, Fall 2004 (first quarter) = 12 units or more

Note: Updated data starting from 2003 cohort to 2005 cohort was received from Institutional Research on December 2006. All tables have been updated to date. Therefore, data may differ slightly from previous reports. New analyses are provided with the updated data (see below).

Table 10 (continued): 2004 COHORT: Bridge and Comparison Groups, First Generation Students – GPA and Orderly Progress, FALL 2005 To SPRING 2006

		First Generation and Comparison Groups					
		Fall 2005 (cohort '04)		Winter 2006 (cohort '04)		Spring 2006 (cohort '04)	
GPA		Bridge (n=21)	Comparison (n=32)	Bridge (n=20)	Comparison (n=32)	Bridge (n=20)	Comparison (n=31) ¹
	LE 1.99 (Below C)	4.8%	12.5%	0.0%	12.5%	5.0%	16.1%
	2.00-2.69 (C to C+)	19.0	34.4	20.0	37.5	15.0	32.3
	GE 2.7 (B- or Higher)	76.2	53.1	80.0	50.0	80.0	51.6
Orderly Academic Progress made? ²	NO	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%	6.3%	15.0%	12.9%
	YES	100.0	93.8	100.0	93.8	85.0	87.1

* p <=.05; ^a p <=.10.

¹ No grade recorded for 1 comparison student in Spring 2006

² Orderly academic progress defined as: Spring 2006 (third quarter) = 44 units or more, Fall 2005 (first quarter) = 12 units or more

Note: Updated data starting from 2003 cohort to 2005 cohort was received from Institutional Research on December 2006. All tables have been updated to date. Therefore, data may differ slightly from previous reports. New analyses are provided with the updated data (see below).

Analyses:

2004 Cohort

- During the fall quarter, the first generation college 2004 cohort performed significantly better than comparison group. 76% of the first generation cohort received a GPA of 2.7 or higher compared to 37% of the comparison group. The first generation cohort continued to significantly outperform the comparison group during the first year.
- During the second year, the first generation cohort continued to perform better than the comparison group. On average, 20% more of the first generation cohort received a GPA of 2.7 or better in every quarter.
- 100% of the first generation college students made orderly academic progress in both fall 2004 and winter 2005 as compared to 91% and 94% respectively for the comparison group. However by the spring 2005, 91% of the comparison group made orderly academic progress compared to 85% from the first generation cohort group.

Table 11: 2005 COHORT: Bridge and Comparison Groups, First Generation Students – GPA and Orderly Progress, FALL 2005 To SPRING 2006

		First Generation and Comparison Groups					
		Fall 2005 (cohort '05)		Winter 2006 (cohort '05)		Spring 2006 (cohort '05)	
		Bridge (n=21)	Comparison (n=37)	Bridge (n=21)	Comparison (n=37)	Bridge (n=21)	Comparison (n=37)
GPA	LE 1.99 (Below C)	5.4%	9.5%	14.3%	8.1%	9.5%	13.5%
	2.00-2.69 (C to C+)	52.4	54.1	23.8	29.7	23.8	35.1
	GE 2.7 (B- or Higher)	38.1	40.5	61.9	62.2	66.7	51.4
Orderly Academic Progress made? ²	NO	0.0%	14.3%	9.5%	5.4%	14.3%	10.8%
	YES	100.0	85.7	90.5	94.6	85.7	89.2

* p <=.05; ^ap <=.10.

¹ Orderly academic progress defined as: Spring 2004 (third quarter) = 44 units or more, Fall 2003 (first quarter) = 12 units or more

Note: Updated data starting from 2003 cohort to 2005 cohort was received from Institutional Research on December 2006. All tables have been updated to date. Therefore, data may differ slightly from previous reports. New analyses are provided with the updated data (see below).

Analyses:

2005 Cohort

- During fall quarter, only 38% of the first generation college student cohort 2005 received a GPA of 2.7 or more compared to 40% of the comparison group. Although the gap is insignificant, more students from the first generation cohort received GPAs between 2.00-2.69 during their first quarter than a GPA of 2.7 or more.
- By spring quarter, the first generation cohort performed slightly better. 66% received a GPA of 2.7 or better, 23% received a GPA of 2.00-2.69 or better and 9% received a GPA below 1.99. In the comparison group, 51% received a GPA of 2.7 or higher, 35% received a GPA between 2.00-2.69 while 13.5% received a GPA below 1.99.
- 100% of the first generation cohort made orderly academic progress during the fall quarter. By spring quarter it fell to 85% as compared to the comparison group where 85% made orderly academic progress during the fall and by spring quarter it increased it 89%.

GOAL 3: PROVIDE RESOURCES FOR FACULTY OF COLOR TEACHING AND RESEARCH TO ENHANCE SANTA CLARA'S ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE THROUGH FUNDING FACULTY OF COLOR SUPPORT PROJECTS FOR RESEARCH.

FORMATIVE EVALUATION. We funded 3 grants to faculty of color projects, 3 grants to fund diversity speaker series 2 to support curriculum development, all were from the College of Arts and Sciences. Brief descriptions of grants are available in Appendix A: Description of Faculty and Staff Funded Grants.

GOAL 4: ADVANCE A MULTICULTURAL CURRICULUM THAT BROADENS THE EDUCATION OF ALL STUDENTS.

FORMATIVE EVALUATION. As part of our efforts to infuse diversity issues more broadly in our curriculum, the Center for Multicultural Learning, the University's Core Curriculum Program, the Advisor and Curriculum Development Council coordinated the program, "Diversity in the New Core Curriculum" in the winter quarter. The event generated critical discussions around defining diversity in the curriculum. See Appendix E for more details. In the fall, 2 grants were approved under by the Advisory Board in the area of curriculum development. Both curriculum development proposals were from the College of Arts and Sciences. See Appendix A for more details.

GOAL 5: IMPROVE CAMPUS CLIMATE AND EXPOSURE TO MULTICULTURALISM

Collaborators: Grant Recipients (Data Collection) and Evaluation Team (Analyses).

Expected Outcomes: Improved exposure of programs to diverse audiences (pre-Phase II programs as baseline).

Table 8: Who Has Been Attending CML Sponsored Programs Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity

	Pre-Phase II Programs (June-Dec. 2002)	Phase II Programs						
		Jan-Dec. 2003	Jan-May 2004	Oct-Dec. 2004	Jan-June 2005	Oct – Dec 2005	Jan-June 2006	Oct 2006-Jan 2007
Persons of Color	78.8%	76.9%	75.3%	76.6%	73.2%	80.3%	70%	68%
European American	21.2	23.1	24.7	23.4	26.8%	19.7%	30%	32%
(Total)	(260)	(770)	(243)	(47)	(492)	(157)	(461)	(75)

Note: See Appendix B for October 2006-January 2007. Programs prior to October 2006 have been described in previous Irvine reports. A limited number of evaluations were collected during this reporting period.

Table 9: Reported Reasons for Attending Offered by Students

	Phase II Programs							
	Pre-Phase II Programs (June –Dec. 2002)		January – December 2003		January- June 2004		September- December 2004	
	Student of Color	Euro. Amer.	Student of Color	Euro. Amer.	Student of Color	Euro. Amer.	Student of Color	Euro. Amer.
Reasons for attending: Class Requirement	5.7%	46.7%	12.4%	48.1%	17.3%	48.6%	18.8%	57.1%
Personal Interest	94.3%	53.3%	87.6%	51.9%	82.7%	51.4%	81.3%	42.9%
(Total)	(159)	(30)	(418)	(79)	(127)	(37)	(32)	(7)

Table 9 (continued): Reported Reasons for Attending Offered by Students

		Phase II Programs							
		January- June 2005		October- December 2005		January- June 2006		October 2006 - January 2007	
		Student of Color	Euro. Amer.	Student of Color	Euro. Amer.	Student of Color	Euro. Amer.	Student of Color	Euro. Amer.
Reasons for attending: Class Requirement		14.8%	43.8%	20.2%	41.4%	25.3%	55.2%	0%	0%
Personal Interest		85.2%	56.3%	79.8%	58.6%	74.7%	44.7%	100%	100%
(Total)		(237)	(64)	(53)	(19)	(127)	(83)	(49)	(21)

Note: See Appendix B for October 2006-January 2007. Programs prior to October 2006 have been described in previous Irvine reports. A limited number of evaluations were collected during this reporting period.

Table 10: What attendees learned or planned to do with lessons learned in the programs?

Phase II Programs									
		Pre-Phase II Programs (June –Dec. 2002)		January – December 2003		January- June 2004		September- December 2004	
		Student of Color	Euro. Amer.	Student of Color	Euro. Amer.	Student of Color	Euro. Amer.	Student of Color	Euro. Amer.
Improve Understanding/ awareness		52.8%	68.4%	59.9%	56.6%	71.1%	67.6%	46.7%	27.3%
Transform/ Change		47.2%	31.6%	40.1%	43.4%	28.9%	32.4%	53.3%	72.7%
(Total)		(123)	(38)	(322)	(36)	(83)	(34)	(30)	(11)

Table 10 (continued): What attendees learned or planned to do with lessons learned in the programs?

Phase II Programs								
	January – June 2005		October – December 2005		January – June 2006		October 2006- January 2007	
	Student of Color	Euro. Amer.	Student of Color	Euro. Amer.	Student of Color	Euro. Amer.	Student of Color	Euro. Amer.
Improve Understanding/ awareness	81.7%	65.2%	41.5%	47.4%	45.6%	38.5%	46.7%	50%
Transform/ Change	18.3%	34.8%	58.5%	52.6%	54.3%	61.4%	53.3%	50%
(Total)	(360)	(132)	(53)	(19)	(127)	(83)	(15)	(4)

Note: See Appendix B for October 2006-January 2007. Programs prior to October 2006 have been described in previous Irvine reports. A limited number of evaluations were collected during this reporting period. Only 30 respondents indicated that they planned to use what they learned to improve understanding or to promote change (the remaining respondents either did not answer the question or provided a response that did not fall into one of these categories). Of these 30 responses, only 19 indicated their race and only four were white.

Analyses

The current analysis covers programs from October 2006 – January 2007 (Table 8-10).

- The number of evaluations received from October 2006-January 2007 is small compared to previous reporting cycle. However, there continued to be significantly more students of color who attend CML programs than European Americans. 68% of evaluations collected were from a person of color compared to 32% from European Americans.
- 100% of students of color and European American students attended these programs due to personal interest.
- More students of color attended these events to help transform change than to improve understanding. European American students were evenly divided between both reasons for attending these events. 46% attended to improve understanding and awareness while 53% attended to transform change. These results were similar to the previous year.

C. INSTITUTION-WIDE LEARNING & CHALLENGES/OBSTACLES

- The continuing stability of the overall minority student enrollment over the recent decade suggests that new strategies of recruitment should be explored if progress were to be made in increasing some traditionally underrepresented student groups. Similarly, affirmative efforts may be extended to the declining API and Native American student populations.
- As the process of identity self-referencing become more complex, and the traditional ways of categorizing student groups of color become progressively inadequate, the University must develop admissions policies and recruitment procedures that can be simultaneously discriminating and inclusive. Its present Affirmative Admissions Policy and strategies should be evaluated in terms of the institution's continuing efforts to reach greater inclusiveness and equity. For example, should the social-economic class of student applicants be considered in conjunction with race and ethnicity, and thus given more weight in the deliberation process?
- Some at the University recognizes the differences between the goals of Affirmative Action, Diversity, and Inclusive Excellence. However, many of its constituents are still unsure of how the University will promote an excellent inclusive education when diversity within its professoriate is still inadequate, and decision-making remains generally hierarchical in nature. In short, the University must clearly define what an inclusive Jesuit learning community means in clear, concrete, and operational terms.
- The primary obstacle to diversity and inclusion at the University may be rooted in how its leadership and constituents actually view multicultural inclusion in education, whether the different diversities (racial, ethnic, gender, class, religious etc.) are *equal contributors* to educational excellence. In order that significant progress can be achieved, the University may choose to foster genuine and open dialogue on this matter, bringing relative transparency to this complex and difficult issue.

D. PROGRESS TOWARDS GOALS AND STRATEGIES TO BE REPORTED IN JUNE 2007

- Build partnerships linking the Undergraduate Admissions Office with appropriate student led programs.
- Building partnerships with a wider range of offices on campus to create a comprehensive mentoring system for students of color.
- Continued tracking of the academic progress and retention of the 2003, 2004, 2005 and 2006 Bridge and comparison students.
- Develop a more comprehensive program of academic progress and support for students of color beyond the first quarter.
- Advance a multicultural curriculum and co-curriculum that would broaden the education of all students.
- Provide resources for faculty diversity development, and faculty of color in teaching and research to enhance Santa Clara's academic excellence; 2005-2006 retention analyses.
- Improve campus climate and increase exposure to and understanding of multicultural inclusion across the campus.

E. CAMPUS DIVERSITY INITIATIVE – FINANCIAL STATUS REPORT

Budgeted Items	Amount Budgeted	Expenditures Jul06-Jan07	Totals to Date	Total Remaining	% Remaining
Student Access Initiatives					
Access Council	\$500	\$233.44	\$233.44	\$266.56	53.31%
Youth Empowerment Program	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Noche Latina and SADIE Enhancement	\$1,500	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	100.00%
Student Success Initiatives					
Enriched Orientation & Family Engagement*	\$3,000	\$2,591.39	\$2,591.39	\$408.61	15.76%
Diversity Leadership Program**	\$52,557.41	\$41,870.62	\$41,870.62	\$10,686.79	20.33%
Diversity Outreach & Student Success Coordinator ***	\$52,646	\$19,232.27	\$19,232.27	\$33,413.73	63.46%
Multicultural Curriculum Enhancement & Research Support					
Curriculum Development	\$20,000	\$7,735.16	\$7,735.16	\$12,264.84	62.32%
Faculty of Color Support Project	\$23,000	\$12,438.85	\$12,438.85	\$10,561.15	45.91%
Faculty Advisor Development	\$1,500	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,500	100.00%
Unity House: Diversity & Civic Engagement	\$7,000	\$3,070.00	\$3,070.00	\$3,930.00	56.14%
Campus Climate Initiatives					
Student Cultural Support Projects	\$1,500	\$1,300.00	\$1,300.00	\$200.00	13.33%
CML Advisory Board	\$500	\$244.48	\$244.48	\$255.52	51.10%
Diversity Speaker Series	\$20,000	\$9,557.00	\$9,557.00	\$10,443.00	52.22%
Diversity Dialogue Council	\$3,000	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,000	100.00%
Women of Color Network Funds	\$200	\$204.38	\$204.38	-\$4.38	-2.19%
Associates Network	\$2,000	\$189.70	\$189.70	\$1,810.30	90.51%
Diaspora Conference	\$20,000	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$20,000	100.00%
Assessment & Communication Plan					
Assessment Team Fees, Development	\$500	\$48.00	\$48.00	\$452.00	90.40%
Marketing/Communication	\$1,000	\$281.83	\$281.83	\$718.17	71.82%
Totals	\$210,403.41	\$98,997.12	\$98,997.12	\$110,115.05	52.33%

Programming revised in July 2006 (some eliminated, some merged).

NOTES: The following are commonly referred to at Santa Clara University as the LEAD Programs (refer to Evaluation Report)

* LEAD: First Generation College Student Orientation & Family Engagement

** LEAD: Summer Bridge Program

*** LEAD Programs Coordinator

F. REFERENCES CITED

- Ayers, T. D. (1987). Stakeholders as partners in evaluation: A stakeholder-collaborative approach. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 10(3), 263-271.
- Hallett, M. A. & Rogers, R. (1994). The push for "truth in sentencing": Evaluating competing stakeholders constructions. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 17(2), 187-196.
- Harris, S. M. (1995). Cultural concerns in the assessment of nonwhite students' needs. In: S. Stabb, S. Harris, J. Talley (Eds.), *Multicultural needs assessment for college and university student populations* (pp. 17-50). Springfield: Charles C Thomas Publisher.
- Kelly, K. & Van Vlaenderen, H. (1995). Evaluating participation processes in community development. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 18, 371-383.
- Nichols, L. (2002). Participatory program planning: Including program participants and evaluators. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 25, 1-14.
- O'Sullivan, R. G. & O'Sullivan, J. M. (1998). Evaluation voices: Promoting evaluation from within programs through collaboration. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 21, 21-29.
- Papineau, D. & Kiely, M. C. (1996). Participatory evaluation in a community organization: Fostering stakeholder empowerment and utilization. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 19(1), 79-93.
- Santa Clara University. (2001). Strategic Plan. www.scu.edu
- Santa Clara University. (June, 2002). Diversity and Multicultural Education at Santa Clara University: An Institutional Overview of Trends, Challenges, and Prospects.
- Santa Clara University. (June 2003). Evaluation and Transformation: Using Research for Organizational Change.

APPENDIX A. Description of Faculty & Staff Funded Grants

I. Faculty of Color Support Projects

The CML Advisory Board has been responsible to review and make appropriate decisions on submitted grant proposals for Faculty of Color Support Fund. The following projects have been approved and funded by this particular line item:

\$4,963, Aaron Oforlea, English Department

Project title: “Remembering the Rank and File: The Unheard Voices of The Black Panther Party”

This project brings to light and bring honor to these forgotten activists’ work and dedication and to record the life stories of some of the Black Panther Party members. Their stories will inform and enlighten others about the volatile times and the political unrest that played itself out on the American landscape. Aaron Oforlea, a post doctoral traveled to Angola prison in New Orleans, Louisiana and to Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania to conduct personal interviews and capture on video tape incarcerated members of the Black Panther Party and their families as they talk about their experiences in the party and the impact of incarceration on their lives. Oforlea will publish his research in an academic refereed journal and to package the use of the video as an instructional aid in his classes and present the video at The American Folklore Society, Popular Cultural Conference, and at the 40th Anniversary of the Black Power Movement. His research will be done through academic year 2006-2007.

\$5,000, Lucila Ramos Sanchez, Counseling Psychology Department

Project title: “The Mental Health of Undocumented and Documented Latino Immigrants”

Latinos are the largest ethnic group in California and the population is expected to increase over the next few decades due to the birth rates and immigration. This research project will focus on mental health of undocumented and documented Latino immigrants. The purpose of this study is to access the psycho-social stressors experienced by undocumented immigrants and the impact this has on his/her mental health, such as stress, anxiety, depression and alcohol abuse) and compare then with documented Latino immigrants. Participants will include 100 undocumented Latino/a and 100 documented Latino/a immigrants from the Silicon Valley. This research project will extend through 2007-2008 academic year.

\$5,000, Barbara Fraser, Music and Dance Department

Project title: “Carl Upchurch: An American Shaman goes to the Edinburgh Fringe Festival”

This project supports the scholarship of Aldo Billingslea, a faculty of color in the play, *Carl Upchurch: An American Shaman*. This play was written by Barbara Means Fraser, Associate Professor, and the main character of Carl Upchurch will be portrayed by Aldo Billingslea. Upchurch was an African American man who was born into a crime-infested neighborhood of Philadelphia and was raised by America’s penal system. A lost and angry young man was transformed by the encouragement of significant people in his life and his love of reading- especially Shakespeare. They hope to take this production to the Edinburg Fringe Festival, which is a prestige festival with international exposure in August 2007 as well as Santa Clara University.

II. Diversity Speaker Series

The CML Advisory Board has been responsible to review and make appropriate decisions on submitted grant proposals for Diversity Speaker Series. The following projects have been approved and funded by this particular line item:

\$5,000, Teresa McCollough, Music Department

Project title: “Musica para El Dia de los Muertos”

“*Musica para El Dia de los Muertos*” is a concert that featured music written for the Mexican Day of the Dead celebration. The concert includes works written specifically for that holiday and other works in that theme. Two composers wrote world premieres for the concert: Gabriela Lena Frank (Requiem for a Magical America; El Dia de los Muertos) and Belinda Reynolds (Remembrance). Homage, by resident faculty composer Pam Quist, was performed. The second half featured George Crumb’s hallmark ensemble piece: *The Ancient Voices of Children*, based on the texts of Federico Garcia Lorca. The concert was held on November 3rd, 2006.

\$1,630, Brett Solomon, Liberal Studies Department

Project title: “MLK Jr. Night”

Igwebuike’s Martin Luther King Jr. Night was evening of culturally centered acts aimed to educate the Santa Clara University community about America’s premiere civil rights hero. To honor the late Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., this program highlighted aspects of the African American experience through various forms of personal expression (i.e. skits, poetry and interpretive dance). The goal for Igwebuike’s hosting MLK Night is to celebrate the realization of Martin Luther King’s dream, and to further educate our audience members about African American Culture and History. This program took place on January 16th, 2006.

\$2,200, Linda Garber, Women’s and Gender Studies

Project title: “Women’s and Gender Studies Spring 2007 Guest Speaker”

As part of the Women’s and Gender Studies Program’s quarterly guest speaker lecture series, Native American author Janet Campbell Hale will be invited onto campus for a lecture and two or three smaller group meetings and classroom visits in Spring 2007. The project will be in coordination with the course, ENGL 158G-Native American Women Writers which will be taught by Professor Michelle Burnham.

II. Curriculum Development

\$5,000, Karen Kienzle & Kate Morris, de Saisset Museum & Art & Art History

Project title: “California Native Art”

The “California Native Art” project sought funds for a permanent collection of works by California Native America artists to diversify the Museum’s permanent collection holdings. Through the permanent acquisitions program, the de Saisset Museum will work collaboratively with Professor Kate Morris and her students to make selections for acquisitions that will diversify the permanent collection. These acquisitions will enhance the future teaching of Professor Kate Morris, by allowing current students to learn through the acquisitions process and future students to learn from viewing and studying relevant artworks. At the same time, these acquisitions will benefit the entire Bay Area community through exhibition and research opportunities that more accurately represent the diversity of the area. The Native American course will take place during Winter 2007.

\$4,342.31, Megan Williams & Rebecca Black, English Department

Project title: "The Photo Essay and Moments of Racial Crisis in the United States"

This project will develop a new course in the English Department on how the photo essay at the twentieth century represents historically under-represented ethnic populations in the United States. This course is based on the premise that the photo essay conditions how we, as Americans, have learned how to "see" race in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. The proposal is a collaborative effort between Williams and Black who are both renewable lecturers in the English Department. Each co-director will teach one section of English 79: Writing about Literature and Culture devoted to this study of the photo essay and representations of racial conflict or this course will be team-taught. The plan for this course will be Fall 2007.

III. Residential Council Programs

Residential Education Council (REC) fund speakers, trips, and meals in an effort to support the development of co-curricular multicultural education in the Residential Learning Communities (RLC's). The following projects have been approved and funded by this particular line item:

\$1050, Aldo Billingslea, Theatre Department

Project title: "From the Bayou to the Bay: Stories of Hurricane Katrina Survivors transplanted to the Bay Area"

Course and RLC affiliation: Theatre 161, Unity, Delphi, possibly Communitas and Loyola RLCs

Bayou to the Bay is a play developed by Ellen Gavin, the Artistic Director of "Brava! For Women in the Arts" in San Francisco's Potrero Hill. Ellen's process involved video recording the Katrina survivors who have been evacuated to the Bay area and then compiling a script from the hours of video footage that coherently told their individual and collective stories. To bring each individual character to life professional Bay Area Actors were hired who studied DVD's and the script to best honor the individual survivors (who were in attendance).

\$500, Kristin Kusanovich, Theatre Department

Project title: "The Relationship of French Society to African Art"

Course and RLC affiliation: Theatre 12, Loyola RLC

Jean-Claude Gigot, an artist and producer from Benin, Africa, will hold a special guest lecture on the influence of French Colonial society on the Arts in Benin and other West African countries, with particular regard to the 17th, 18th and 19th century colonial relationship between power, performance and culture.

\$870.00, David Popalisky, Dance Department

Project title: "Alvin Ailey American Dance Theatre"

Course and RLC affiliation: Dance 62/162, Unity RLC

Funds will support a class trip to see the Alvin Ailey American Dance Theatre. Viewing this concern and his masterwork "Revelation" will culminate class work up to this point near the end of the quarter.

\$450.00, Ana Maria Pineda, Religious Studies Department

Project title: “Course on U.S. Hispanic Theology”

Course: U.S. Hispanic Theology

Three speakers will be invited to address different topics in U.S. Hispanic Theology, e.g., Theology and Art, Latina Feminist Theology and Conversation between U.S. Hispanic Theology and Latin American Liberation theology. The course addresses the development of U.S. Hispanic theology and the significant themes that are based in the living experience of the Latino/Hispanic communities in the U.S. In doing so, the course focuses on the history, cultural, religious dimensions of this specific community in the United States.

\$200.00, Kelly Flanagan, student

Project Title: BEHIND THE SWOOSH: SWEATSHOPS AND SOCIAL JUSTICE

“Educating for justice directors, Jim Keady and Leslie Kretzu found out what it is like to live on a sweatshop wage in a developing country. They spent one month in an Indonesian factory workers’ slum living on \$1.25 a day, a typical wage paid to Nike’s subcontracted workers. In this two-hour interactive multi-media presentation that includes slide shows, role-playing, powerful video footage, and a Question-Answer period, Keady and Kretzu share their personal accounts of lived solidarity. They also impart the latest information on Nike’s overseas practices and attempt to de-commodify “labor,” challenging their audience to deal in human terms with the women, men and sometimes children, who are the foundation of Nike’s global manufacturing. Using the perspective of the reality of factory workers as a starting point, the presentation includes solid analysis and reflection, as well as the outlining of proactive steps towards making the economic, social, and environmental conditions for workers more fair and just.

APPENDIX B. Description of Student Support Grants

Student Cultural Support Grant

The CML Staff has been responsible for reviewing and making appropriate decisions on submitted grant proposals for Student Cultural Support Projects. The following projects have been approved and funded by this particular line item:

\$300, Barkada

Project title: “Barrio Fiesta”

Coordinated by the Filipino student group, this project celebrates the end of Filipino American Heritage Month in October. The Barrio Fiesta features Filipino American music, dance, and culture. This event includes workshops on martial arts and Filipino script writing. This project exposes the Santa Clara community to the Filipino American culture through combining both the old traditions in the Philippines and the new culture in America.

\$500, Ana Cabrera

Project title: “The Mental Health of Undocumented Latino Immigrants”

Ana Cabrera, a Masters level graduate student in the Counseling Psychology Program requested funding to attend the National Multicultural Conference and Summit in 2007 to present her research with Dr. Lucila Ramos-Sanchez on undocumented immigrants and the psychological and physical stress they face. Their research will recommend treatment, practice, and training for psychologists working with undocumented Latinos/as. Cabrera will also present her research to MEChA, a student organization on the campus.

\$500, Igwebuike

Project title: “Martin Luther King Jr. Night”

Igwebuike’s Martin Luther King Jr. Night was evening of culturally centered acts aimed to educate the Santa Clara University community about America’s premiere civil rights hero. To honor the late Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., this program highlighted aspects of the African American experience through various forms of personal expression (i.e. skits, poetry and interpretive dance). The goal for Igwebuike’s hosting MLK Night is to celebrate the realization of Martin Luther King’s dream, and to further educate our audience members about African American Culture and History. This program took place on January 16th, 2006.

APPENDIX C. LEAD Summary Report

Leadership Excellence and Academic Development Programs (LEAD)

LEAD: Orientation Dinner for First Generation College Students, Students of Color and Their Families

For the first time, the Summer Orientation Programs and the LEAD Programs hosted an embedded session for all incoming first generation college students, students of color and their families during all Orientation Sessions. For the past three years, we offered a one-time dinner for first generation college students and their families, but with the desire to connect with all our incoming LEAD students, the Orientation Programs included this important event in each of its six orientation dates.

In the six sessions, the LEAD Programs Orientation dinner hosted over 90 students and 150 families. The number surpassed the number of students we saw in our first three years combined. The LEAD Programs Orientation Dinner consisted of a sit down dinner for students and their families while a panel of speakers related their experiences as first generation college students and students of color. We had 8 faculty/staff and 4 current student speakers.

LEAD Family Engagement Program – November 2006

The LEAD Family Newsletter was mailed to 193 families of all our freshmen first generation college students in November 2006 during the students first quarter at Santa Clara University.

LEAD Summer Bridge Program 2006

The LEAD Programs coordinated the fourth and final Summer Bridge Program for 30 incoming first generation college students and students of color at Santa Clara University. 148 invitations were mailed to students who qualified for the program and received 62 applications. Participants began their English I Composition and Rhetoric class early and gained additional classroom experience through a Religious Studies course and a Chemistry course. For the third year, we also offered an Engineering Seminar for 8 students majoring in Engineering. The School of Engineering supported the seminar with partial funding for expenses related to the seminar.

The students will continue their English II class with the same professor and classmates in winter quarter.

Of the ten student staff, 9 were past Bridge participants.

LEAD Seminar Course – Fall 2006

University Advisor, Laura Fujieda, conducted the LEAD Seminar course in fall quarter 2006. The course is open only to LEAD (first generation college students, students of color) in their freshmen year. The class had 6 students and received positive evaluations.

LEAD Workshops

Fall Registration Workshop – November 2006

36 students attended the Fall Quarter Registration Workshop. Laura Fujieda navigated the on-line registration program for students and made course recommendations based on majors and core curriculum requirements.

LEAD Pilot Programs

Mentoring Program: The LEAD Programs Coordinator has begun to conduct research on other promising mentoring programs for students of color. The mentoring coordination will begin in winter quarter with creating a formal contract with mentors and mentees, and establishing a protocol for the program. The hope is to have the pilot program in place for two quarters and be able to offer it to all students of color in fall 2007.

Advising: The LEAD Programs Coordinator has worked closely with the University Advisors in training in the area of advising and specifically working with students in color through the Multicultural Center. The advising efforts have included emailing all students of color important university registration dates and following up questions from students. The coordinator also attends weekly advisor meetings to learn more about procedures and case scenarios.

Reported by Rosa Guerra Sarabia for the Irvine Report

APPENDIX D. Description of Diversity Initiative Councils and Networks

Councils

Access Council

Co-Chairs: Francine Davis (Undergraduate Admission) & Marisela Rubio (Undergraduate Admission)

The Access Council reconvened during Winter Quarter. The goal of this meeting was to solidify the council by consolidating members from LAAB and African American recruitment council.

Mission:

To increase support and increase the recruitment and retention of historically underrepresented ethnic student populations and first generation students through advocacy, unification of resources, and promotion of SCU's mission.

Strategy:

Unify members of Santa Clara community to create awareness on issues that may hinder the recruitment and/or retention of historically underrepresented ethnic groups and first generation students. The Council will identify and decide on issue(s) that the group would support and advocate during the academic year.

The first meeting resulted in a discussion on how and what pertinent issues the Access council can take on for this year. The council identified the most pressing issue is to continue to the L.E.A.D. program after the James Irvine Foundation grant ends this year.

Advisor and Curriculum Development Council

Co-Chairs: Laura Fujieda (Drahmann Center) & Robert Senkewicz (History)

The Advisor Curriculum Development Council (ACDC) had a brainstorming meeting during the Fall Quarter to discuss the direction of the council. The council's focus will be on programming in multicultural course content, multicultural pedagogy and multicultural advising. During the brainstorming meeting, a suggestion was made to invite the CML Faculty Project Leaders to be members of the council. The ACDC met in November to talk about coordinating an event for Winter Quarter 2007. The first event entitled, "Diversity in the New Core Curriculum", was held in January. This event was co-sponsored by ACDC, the Core Curriculum and Center for Multicultural Learning. The event drew 31 attendees from across the curriculum and generated critical discussion on defining diversity in the core.

Diversity Dialogue Council

Co-Chairs: James Lai (Political Science and Ethnic Studies) & Tam Nguyen (Center for Student Leadership)

The 2006-2007 Diversity & Dialogue Council (DDC) consists of 3 faculty council members and 4 staff council members.

In consultation with the Center for Multicultural Learning (CML), the mission and purpose of the council was revisited during the fall quarter. It was decided that the role of the DDC needed to be more structurally defined within the CML.

The DDC will reconvene during the winter quarter with a streamlined process for providing support to CML sponsored programs. A pilot model will be put in place with a viable and more focused approach in mind. For the remainder of the academic year, the DDC will execute the following steps to offer opportunities for campus dialogue in conjunction with existing programs:

- (1) Review upcoming CML sponsored events/programs
- (2) Choose one event/program to support with a campus dialogue related to the main topic
- (3) Determine the format and scope of the dialogue
- (4) Identify potential classes that can be linked to the topic and contact respective faculty to secure their support
- (5) Collaborate with the primary coordinators (i.e. Faculty Project Leaders) of the CML sponsored event/program

The DDC will make every effort to continue addressing campus climate issues by offering opportunities for students, staff, and faculty to engage in discussions about diversity and multiculturalism.

Residential Education Council

Co-Chairs: Heather Dumas-Dyer

This past fall in preparation for the 2007 winter quarter, the Residential Education Council (REC) continued to fund speakers, trips, and theater productions in an effort to support the development of co-curricular multicultural education in the Residential Learning Communities (RLC's). As in the past, our primary focus has been funding projects that are related to courses offered in an RLC, but for the first time the council opened the application process up to all university students, staff and faculty as long as the program was open and made available to students in any of the RLCs.

This fall the REC convened with four members. The committee consists of two faculty Directors, one from the Unity RLC, one Resident Director from the Unity RLC, and a student who also serves as the Community Facilitator from the Unity RLC. The council solicited proposals from all faculty that were teaching RLC linked courses winter term. The council set a priority deadline for all requests during the last week of fall term courses. This was done to allow the council to meet and approve requests before the winter break to allow faculty to better be able to plan and finalize plans over the break.

The council continues to work and promote the REC to other RLCs in an effort to seed multicultural programs in other RLC's. The chair of the REC meets at least once a term with the Faculty Directors in all of the RLCs and in addition communicates to all faculty teaching RLC linked courses at least once a term.

Associates Network

Three faculty project leaders joined CML in the Fall 2006. They are Alma Garcia, Sociology, Michelle Burnham, English and Teresia Hinga, Religious Studies. The goal of the faculty project leaders is to reinvigorate the CML Associates so they feel more connected to CML. The first Associates event was coordinated in October. This event focused on first generation college students. Laura Nichols and Rosa Guerra-Sarabia were invited to present their research as well as to present on the Bridge program. A survey was also headed out to collect ideas and interest for future events from faculty and staff who attended this program. The second Associates event focused on diversity in the new core curriculum (see ACDC) and two more Associates events have been planned for the winter quarter.

Women of Color Network

In Fall 2006, the Women's and Gender Studies and the Center for Multicultural Learning re-launched the Women of Color Network. The Women of Color Network is comprised of a membership of women of color from Santa Clara University. All women faculty, staff, and students of color are welcome to join. The mission of the network is to provide empowerment and support to the members of the network and to provide education and awareness to the campus community. The first program, "Challenges of Being a Women of Color in Higher Education" was a panel discussion with women of color faculty and staff. This program had over 50 attendees helped to successfully re-launch the network.

Conclusion:

The Center for Multicultural Learning has generously received funding from the James Irvine Foundation since 1999 to support *Building Partnership for Diversity, Phase I* and in 2002 *Building Partnership for Diversity, Phase II*. The *Building Partnership for Diversity* grant will end in June 2007. The final report will be a summation of initiatives, programs and campus-wide changes that were made possible by this grant.