



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

Final Report

January 1, 2007 - June 30, 2007

Compiled by:

Mary Ho, Associate Director
Center for Multicultural Learning

Melvin E. Gaines
Inclusive Excellence Post-Baccalaureate Fellow
College of Arts and Sciences

&

Jack T.F. Ling, PhD, Executive Director
Center for Multicultural Learning &
Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences

Submitted to
The James Irvine Foundation
June 30, 2007

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-------|
| Executive Summary..... | 3 |
| 1. Introduction | 4-5 |
| 2. Narrative Progress Report on Campus Diversity & Outcomes..... | 6 |
| A. Methods..... | 6 |
| B. Progress in Achieving Goals and Strategies..... | 6 |
| GOALS 1.Increase the enrollment of racial minority and first generation college students..... | 6 |
| STRATEGY 1 - Involvement of student-led programs in admissions..... | 6-10 |
| GOALS 2.Increase the academic success of racial minority and first generation college students..... | 10-11 |
| STRATEGY 1 - LEAD/Bridge Program..... | 11-27 |
| STRATEGY 2 - Student Advising Efforts..... | 28-29 |
| GOALS 3.Provide resources for faculty of color teaching research to enhance academic excellence..... | 29-31 |
| STRATEGY 1 - Irvine grants for faculty of color..... | 31 |
| GOALS 4.Advance a multicultural curriculum that broadens education of all students..... | 32-33 |
| GOALS 5.Improve campus climate..... | 34-35 |
| STRATEGY 1 - Curriculum and co-curriculum grants..... | 35-38 |
| C. New Initiative on Diversity and Inclusive Excellence | 39 |
| 3. Conclusion..... | 40 |
| 4. Reference Cited..... | 40 |
| 5. Financial Status Report..... | 41 |
| 6. Appendices..... | 42-68 |
| Appendix A: Access Initiatives..... | 42-45 |
| Appendix B: Advance a multicultural curriculum: Across all ES Courses..... | 46-50 |
| Appendix C: Irvine Funded Programs..... | 51-64 |
| Appendix D: Description of Diversity Initiative Councils & Networks..... | 65-68 |
| Appendix E: 2005 TT/TE Faculty Disaggregated by Race & Ethnicity workbook (Attachment) | |

Executive Summary

In this final report, we documented the incremental progress that Santa Clara University has made in creating change in such areas as enrollment, retention and academic success of the undergraduate students, recruitment of faculty of color, development of future faculty of color, curricular assessment and development, and campus climate. We also compared and contrasted the relative changes in these areas over the years, in which, the Irvine Grant was in effect. The Executive Summary also includes some important indicators of the institution's overall effort to create diversity conscious policies, and to provide diversity opportunities for all its constituents.

- Enrollment: With regard to enrollment, the institution's recruitment efforts have yielded a stable and, generally, acceptable pattern of enrollment figures except for Asian American students. Approximately, African American student enrollment has increased by 1% since 2002 to 2006, Asian American students, unfortunately, have decreased by 5% since 2002 to 2006, Hispanic students have remained stable at approximately 12%, Native Americans continued to decrease from 1% in 2002 to less than .5% in 2006. Enrollment of students of color for Fall 2007 was not available, but early data show an increase in the number of students of color who deposited, except amongst Asian Americans. If change to this pattern is desired, new recruitment strategies may be needed.
- The LEAD/Bridge Program was successful in achieving its goals each year. Although there were clear methodological limitations, the data collected over the years supported the usefulness of the program and the importance of building on elements of the program in the future. In 2007-2008, the program will be expanded to serve twice as many students and its focus and scope will expand from the first year to all four years of students' undergraduate study.
- This past year, efforts to increase the diversity in tenure-track applicant pools continued to produce impressive results. A number of faculty searches produced applicant pools containing a good proportion of women, international, and ethnically diverse scholars (30% or more). However, not unlike the experience of previous years, the actual "yield" of scholars of color remained proportionally small with recruitment efforts being most successful in areas such as Ethnic Studies and East Asian History.
- The Center for Multicultural Learning continued to fund activities and initiatives sponsored by a small but stable group of faculty members, students, and staff. The Center administered the funds provided by the Irvine Foundation in a most effective way, helping to sustain a slowly expanding diversity educational programming effort on campus.
- This year, our assessment of the College's Inclusive Excellence Post-Doctorate and Post-Baccalaureate Initiatives produced generally positive but somewhat mixed results. Should these initiatives persist, better and more effective ways to provide administrative support and faculty mentoring may be warranted.
- Santa Clara University began the process of affirmation of accreditation by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) in 2007. Under the WASC review process each institution is asked to propose a self study focusing on themes or issues central to its own mission and institutional context. SCU has proposed to focus on the following three themes in its self study: Educating for Competence, Conscience, and Compassion; Supporting the Teaching Scholar Model; and Promoting a Community of Inclusive Excellence.
- Finally, the newly established Provost Council on Diversity and Inclusive Excellence will build on the successes of the Irvine-funded Building Partnerships for Diversity and collectively continue to provide leadership in advancing diversity as a central University-wide commitment.

1. Introduction

Phase II: Building Partnership for Diversity from July 2003 to June 2007 is coming to an end with the James Irvine Foundation grant. This report will cover the brief history of *Phase I: Building Partnerships for Diversity*, summation of the diversity initiatives from *Phase II* and specific analysis from the last set of data from January 2007-June 2007. This final report will document the progress that Santa Clara University has made to move diversity initiatives forward.

I. History of Diversity Initiatives at Santa Clara University

The call to make diversity a hallmark quality that could permeate and lend significant definition to the educational enterprise at SCU first came in 1987 when, then Academic Vice-President, Charlie Bierne S.J., launched the “Excellence Through Diversity Initiative”. The appointment of Fr. Paul Locatelli as President in 1989 brought further emphasis on the importance of diversity as an explicit mission of the institution. President Locatelli has consistently issued constructive and inclusive messages about diversity through his annual convocations and in other ways.

In 1993, Santa Clara’s Board of Trustees approved a Statement of Purpose that included a formal statement of our commitment to diversity. It reads:

“The University is thus dedicated to a community enriched by men and women of diverse backgrounds, respectful of difference and enlivened by open dialogue, caring and just toward others, and committed to broad participation in achieving the common good.”

The University community and its Board of Trustees later approved a new strategic plan. Intended to be a “living document”, the strategic plan has been revised and tightened over time. The Spring 2001 version of the plan (page 4) states cherishing “our diverse community and the roots that must sustain it” is one of Santa Clara University’s six fundamental values. The plan also (1.C, page 6) commits the University to (a) enrich the quality and diversity of our scholarly community of faculty, staff, and students, and (b) to enhance integrated education by incorporating international, multicultural, gender, environmental, and ethical issues and perspectives in the curriculum and co-curriculum (2.B.3).

Building Partnerships for Diversity is the vehicle by which Santa Clara would accomplish the goals laid forward in the strategic plan. Santa Clara University approached the James Irvine Foundation in the Fall of 1998 with a proposal to support *Building Partnerships for Diversity*. The overall goal expressed in the proposal was to create an intentional multicultural campus that expressed California’s growing diversity among its students, faculty and staff. The Undergraduate Admissions Office sought to replicate the state’s ethnic population among high school graduates. Faculty, staff, as well as academic, and administrative leadership were also part of this holistic multicultural vision, although proposal components focused more on recruiting and retaining faculty and students of color, while incorporating multicultural perspectives across the University’s curriculum and course offerings.

The *Building Partnerships for Diversity* grant enabled Santa Clara University to create the Center for Multicultural Learning (CML) “to advance multicultural education throughout the University and coordinate the multicultural infrastructure on campus.” Since its creation, the CML has developed partnerships with key Santa Clara University, ensuring that the commitment to a multicultural campus is an integrated aspect of the University’s academic, residential, and community-based learning activities.

II. Diversity Gains and Challenges – Phase I: Building Partnership for Diversity

Diversity and Multicultural Education at Santa Clara University: An Institutional Overview of Trends, Challenges, and Prospects provided analysis of the successes and challenges encountered during the three-year *Phase I: Building Partnerships for Diversity* grant.

Challenges identified in the *SCU Institutional Overview* included ensuring gains in students of color admissions, addressing differing levels of retention by race/ethnicity of our students, and creating a diverse tenure or tenure track faculty. Gains in multicultural course offerings were advanced throughout the grant period. However, there is still a lack of multicultural course offering in the Business and Engineering schools and uncertainty as to how much of the undergraduate student body is exposed to courses with multicultural components.

The SCU Institutional Overview also shared observations regarding the student climate on campus, with trained undergraduate researchers documenting instances of ethnic and racial mixing for institutional as well as social purposes. The observations showed that study groups and course related clusters appeared to be more diverse than social, free-time associations, which were often defined by ethnic identity. The *Overview* also highlighted Santa Clara's struggle to host multicultural events that go beyond acknowledging and celebrating cultural groups, as well as the struggle to have these events attended by significant amounts of students outside the host cultural group. Acknowledgement of these struggles presented a shortcoming in Santa Clara's effort to mutually transform Santa Clara's community of teaching and learning scholars.

III. Goals for Diversity – Phase II: Building Partnerships for Diversity

It became apparent that being an institution reflective of a diverse society through the numbers of people recruited and retained was not enough for the Santa Clara to reap the true benefits of multiculturalism. The results of the *SCU Institutional Overview* and consensus about the steps necessary to meet the institutional goals outlined in the University's strategic plan coincided to focus on the five main objectives of the *Building Partnerships for Diversity, Phase II*; a three year grant and extended for two additional years continued to be funded by the James Irvine Foundation. These objectives compose five institutional goals for diversity at SCU. The five goals are to (1) build stronger partnerships between Admissions and student-led groups to increase recruitment of under-represented students through empowering student leaders, (2) ensure the academic success of all students, with special attention paid to first generation college students and student of color, (3) provide resources for faculty of color for their teaching and research in ways that also benefit students, (4) advance an academically rigorous curriculum, particularly in the School of Business, that helps to broaden the education of all students, and (5) integrate and support curricular and co-curricular programs that educate across culture and groups to ultimately contribute to a transformative culture at Santa Clara.

The final report will focus on the summation from Building Partnerships for Diversity, Phase II (July 2003-June 2007) and the last reporting period from January 2007 – June 2007.

2. Narrative Progress Report on Campus Diversity Objectives & 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 below. In this final 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

Strategy 1: Involvement of student-led programs in Admissions to "Increase the enrollment of racial minority and first generation college students"

Collaborators: Staff from the Office of Admissions, YEP Student Coordinators, and Multicultural Center Leaders (Data Collection); Evaluation Team (Analysis).

Youth Empowerment Program

This program attempts to build partnerships between SCU and local schools and after school programs. Through campus visits, YEP allows local youth to experience college life and connect with students from the university. It also gives SCU students the opportunity to reach out to the local community and share their experience to those students who may or may not have college attendees in their families.

Formative Evaluation

The goals of the Youth Empowerment Program (YEP) are to educate, empower and encourage minority students to pursue higher education at colleges and universities. This year, the program was led by Vanessa Carrasco, who, with the help of the Admissions office, accommodated students from a variety of backgrounds, ranging from private to public schools, as well as some charter schools. One goal this year was to broaden the schools to be served by opening up to other areas of the Bay Area. This initiative was taken with the belief that creating a college-oriented goal at an earlier age would benefit both the students and the school's pool of applicants in the long run.

SCU YEP Signups

YEP signups were held at the very beginning of the year. Those SCU students who maintained interest in the YEP programs (a total of about 10 by the end of the school year) were informed of upcoming campus visitations and were invited to help in activities, panel discussion and tours.

SCU Campus Visits

YEP invites local schools and prospective SCU students to campus to participate in tours, panel discussion, and other student activities. This year, the largest school to visit was Downtown College Preparatory in Downtown San Jose. The school serves mostly students of color, and its mission is to prepare students for a four-year institution directly after high school. A total of 250 students visited the SCU campus, where they were given a campus tour in small groups, sent on a campus-wide scavenger hunt and given SCU souvenirs. Other large groups came from the Boys and Girls Club in Oakland, as well as other charter schools in the Bay Area.

MCC Club Collaboration

Another way the YEP program was able to reach local high school students was by helping existing outreach programs. This allowed YEP to support MCC clubs, as well as expand the YEP community. This year, YEP helped by attending Milpitas High School in Milpitas, where Igwebuike tutored the Black Student Union. Here, struggling Milpitas students were encouraged to raise their grades to be able to attend college. The students were also invited to attend an Igwebuike meeting and discuss college experience with some African-American SCU students. Also, YEP helped recruit during MEChA- El Frente's Raza Day, as well as Sadie and Noche Latina.

Expected Outcomes and Benchmarks

Increase in percentage of students from visited high schools applying and enrolling.

Table 1: Applications, Admittance, and Enrollment from schools visited by YEP student coordinators

| Schools Visited | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 * |
|--|----------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|--------|
| Abraham Lincoln High School: Number of Applications %(Number) Admitted %(Number) Enrolled | 17 65% (11) 29% (5) | 10 50% (5) 0% (0) | 19 47% (9) 11% (1) | Not Visited | 27 14% (4) 75% (3) | NA |
| James Lick High School: Number of Applications %(Number) Admitted %(Number) Enrolled | 12 58% (7) 71% (5) | 6 83% (5) 60% (3) | 9 67% (6) 67% (4) | 14 50% (7) 57% (4) | 17 53% (9) 56% (5) | NA |
| Independence High School: Number of Applications %(Number) Admitted %(Number) Enrolled | 36 47% (17) 63% (10) | 18 44% (8) 0% (0) | 34 35% (12) 33% (4) | Not Visited | 20 30% (6) 33% (2) | NA |
| Watsonville High School: Number of Applications %(Number) Admitted %(Number) Enrolled | 14 50% (7) 83% (5) | 14 50% (7) 43% (3) | 26 42% (11) 45% (5) | Not Visited | 10 50% (5) 0% (0) | NA |
| Downtown College Prep: Number of Applications %(Number) Admitted %(Number) Enrolled | Not Visited | Not Visited | Not Visited | 4 50% (2) 50% (1) | 4 50% (2) 0% (0) | NA |
| Lynbrook High School: Number of Applications %(Number) Admitted %(Number) Enrolled | Not Visited | Not Visited | Not Visited | 30 47% (14) 0% (0) | 29 66% (18) 11% (2) | NA |
| Mount Pleasant High School: Number of Applications %(Number) Admitted %(Number) Enrolled | Not Visited | Not Visited | Not Visited | 18 61% (11) 45% (5) | 10 60% (6) 33% (2) | NA |
| Sequoia High School: Number of Applications %(Number) Admitted %(Number) Enrolled | Not Visited | Not Visited | Not Visited | 12 42% (5) 0% (0) | 5 40% (2) 50% (1) | NA |
| Santa Clara High School: Number of Applications %(Number) Admitted %(Number) Enrolled | Not Visited | Not Visited | Not Visited | 17 82% (14) 29% (4) | 10 60%(6) 17%(1) | NA |
| Silver Creek High School: Number of Applications %(Number) Admitted %(Number) Enrolled | Not Visited | Not Visited | Not Visited | 16 56% (9) 22% (2) | 16 56% (9) 44% (4) | NA |
| Total YEP schools: Number of Applications %(Number) Admitted %(Number) Enrolled | 79 53% (42) 60% (25) | 48 52% (25) 24% (6) | 88 43% (38) 37% (14) | 111 56% (62) 26% (16) | 148 45% (67) 33% (20) | NA |

Note: Enrollment figures are Deposits as of May 1

Some schools are not visited because of scheduling conflicts and/or unavailability of volunteers.

Analyses:

YEP Program: (Table 1)

- 2003 (48) showed a decreased of applications from 2002 (79) which resulted in a lower number of students who were admitted in 2003 (25) and enrolled in 2003 (6).
- While a higher percentage of YEP school-visited applicants were admitted in 2005 (56%) compared to 2004 (43%), the 2005 yield (defined by deposits as of May 1, 2005) was lower (26% versus 37% in 2004).
- There was an increase in a number of schools visited in 2006 than previous years. While there are a higher number of applicants (148), we see a lower percentage of YEP school-visited applicants were admitted in 2006 (45%) compared to 2005 (56%). The yield in 2006 (33%, 20 students) was slightly higher than 2005 (26%, 16 students).
- Data received for 2007 was incomplete. See appendix A for more details.

Summation (Phase II):

Progress of the YEP Program has been measured mainly by keeping record of high schools visited and tracking the amount of applicants, admits, and deposits from those schools. In 2003, YEP visited six schools. Santa Clara received 88 applications from those six schools in 2004, the application year corresponding to 2003 visits. Thirty-eight of those applicants were admitted (43%), of which 14 (37%) enrolled at SCU by the May 1st, 2004 deadline. The volume of schools visited, as well as the numbers of applications, admits, and deposits from those schools have constantly increased over the past three years. Eleven schools were visited in 2006, corresponding to 148 applications, 67 admits (45%), and 20 deposits (30% of admitted students). Eight schools were visited in 2007, the data for applicants, admitted and enrolled were not accessible in time for this report.

YEP has evolved from being solely an outreach program, to incorporate components such as a mentor program that pairs SCU students with high school students, and hosting events that expose high school students to multicultural elements of Santa Clara. Overall, the visits to these schools as well as bringing students in for campus visits have benefited both the students and the campus.

Table 2: Attendance and Deposits by SADIE and Noche Latina Attendees

| | 2003 | 2004 (as of May 1, 2004) | 2005 (as of June 23, 2005) | 2006 (as of June 12, 2006) | 2007 (as of June 11, 2007) |
|--|-------|--------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| SADIE: Number attended | 40 | 22 | 21 | 19 | 32 |
| % (Number) of enrolled/deposits | 50.0% | 77.0% (17 deposits) | 57% (12 deposits) | 68% (13 deposits) | 68% (22 deposits) |
| Noche Latina: Number attended | 53 | 63 | 35 | 50 | 62 |
| % (Number) of deposits | 66.0% | 82.0% (52 deposits) | 52% (18 deposits) | 74% (37 deposits) | 53% (33 deposits) |

Analyses:

SADIE/Noche Latina (Table 2)

- The number of students who attended SADIE slightly increased in 2007 (32) as compared to 2006 (32). The percentage of students who deposited in 2006 (68%) remained the same in 2007 (68%) in proportion to the number of students who attended.

- The number of students who attended Noche Latina increased in 2007 (62) compared to 2006 (50). However, the percentage of students who deposited in 2007 (53%) is lower as compared to 2006 (74%).
- Note: While SADIE and Noche Latina/o are university funded programs, Phase II Irvine funds were used to provide travel subsidies for parents when needed and for t-shirts.

Summation (Phase II):

The goal of the SADIE (for African American students and their families) and Noche Latina (for Latino students and their families) programs is to increase student yield by raising awareness of students who have been admitted to SCU and their parents on the type of environment and community Santa Clara has to offer. Components of these events include icebreakers, class visits, housing and Bridge presentations, financial aid sessions, and evening entertainment.

SADIE and Noche Latina events have consistently yielded over 50% of their participants as deposits. The highest yield percentage for the SADIE event was in 2004, when 17 of 22 attendees deposited. Noche Latina's highest yield percentage also came in 2004, with 52 of 63 attendees depositing.

The lowest yield percentage for SADIE was in 2003, with 20 of the 40 attendees depositing; however, 40 is the highest number of SADIE attendees and 20 is the highest number of deposits from a SADIE event. Noche Latina's lowest yield percentage came in 2005 when 18 of 35 attendees deposited (52%). Thirty-five is the lowest number of Noche Latina attendees over the years, and 18 is also the lowest number of deposits from the event.

2003 to 2006 SADIE and Noche Latina events had a total of 303 attendees, of which 204 have deposited at Santa Clara (approximately 67%).

Goal 2: Increase the academic success of racial minority and first generation college students.

Strategy 1: LEAD (Leadership, Excellence, & Academic Development) Program.

A Diversity Leadership Bridge Program was designed and implemented in the summer of 2003 to provide first generation college students and students of color of the freshmen class of 2003 with leadership and educational opportunities designed to enhance their success at Santa Clara University upon entry and in the subsequent years. First generation support activities were also planned for all incoming students and their families. The second cohort of Bridge students participated in the program in the summer of 2004. 126 students were invited to participate as part of the third cohort in 2005 which remained at 30 students. For the Bridge Program 2006, 178 invitations were mailed with 30 remaining as the capacity for this final Bridge Program under Irvine funding.

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 were involved in developing the LEAD Programs. The Bridge partners assisted in the data collect; the Evaluation Team conducted the analysis.

Expected Outcomes and Benchmarks: (As per Evaluation Plan, Santa Clara University, 2003)

The LEAD program's goal is to increase the retention of racial minority and first generation college students. Students involved in the programs will have higher GPA's, credit completion, and retention than the comparison group of similar first year students.

2003 COHORT:

Table 5: 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

Table 5 (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) | Comparison (n=47) | Bridge (n=27) | Comparison (n=47) | Bridge (n=28) ¹ | 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

Table 5 (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

Table 5 (continued): 2003 COHORT: Bridge and Comparison Groups, All Students – GPA and Orderly Progress, FALL 2006 - WINTER 2007 GPA

| | | Bridge and Comparison Groups | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|----|
| | | Fall 2006 (cohort '03) | | Winter 2007 (cohort '03) | | Spring 2007 (cohort '03) | |
| GPA | | Bridge (n=26) | Comparison (n=42) | Bridge (n=26) | Comparison (n=42) | NA | NA |
| | LE 1.99 (Below C) | 0.0% | 4.7% | 11.5% | 14.3% | NA | NA |
| | 2.00-2.69 (C to C+) | 15.3 | 26.19 | 15.3 | 19.5 | NA | NA |
| | GE 2.7 (B- or Higher) | 84.6 | 69.0 | 73.0 | 65.8 | NA | NA |
| Orderly Academic Progress made? ¹ | NO | 3.8% | 2.3% | 7.6% | 7.3% | NA | NA |
| | YES | 96.2 | 97.7 | 92.4 | 92.7 | NA | NA |

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

¹ Orderly academic progress defined as: Spring 2007 (third quarter) = 44 units or more, Fall 2006 (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 analyses 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.
- In their last academic year, the bridge cohort received a higher GPA than the comparison group. 84% received a GPA of 2.7 or higher during fall quarter 2006 and during spring quarter, 73% received a GPA of 2.7 or higher. In the comparison group, 69% in during fall quarter and 65% during spring quarter received a GPA of 2.7 or higher.
- However there is no significant difference in orderly academic progress between the bridge and comparison group.
- Quantitative data during spring quarter 2007 at SCU was not available for final reporting.

2004 COHORT:

Table 6: 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

Table 6 (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

Table 6 (continued): 2004 COHORT: Bridge and Comparison Groups, All Students – GPA and Orderly Progress, FALL 2006 - WINTER 2007 GPA

| | | Bridge and Comparison Groups | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|----|
| | | Fall 2006 (cohort '04) | | Winter 2007 (cohort '04) | | Spring 2007 (cohort '04) | |
| GPA | | Bridge (n=29) ¹ | Comparison (n=91) ¹ | Bridge (n=28) | Comparison (n=93) ¹ | NA | NA |
| | LE 1.99 (Below C) | 0.0% | 4.7% | 11.5% | 14.3% | NA | NA |
| | 2.00-2.69 (C to C+) | 15.3 | 26.19 | 15.3 | 19.5 | NA | NA |
| | GE 2.7 (B- or Higher) | 84.6 | 69.0 | 73.0 | 65.8 | NA | NA |
| Orderly Academic Progress made? ² | NO | 10.3% | 10.9% | 0.0% | 10.7% | NA | NA |
| | YES | 89.7 | 89.1 | 100.0 | 89.3 | NA | NA |

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

¹ No grade recorded for 1 bridge group student in Winter 2007.

² Orderly academic progress defined as: Spring 2007 (third quarter) = 44 units or more, Fall 2006 (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 analyses 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%.
- In their third year, the bridge cohort received a higher GPA than the comparison group. 84% received a GPA of 2.7 or higher during fall quarter and during spring quarter, 73% received a GPA of 2.7 or higher. In the comparison group, 69% in during fall quarter and 65% during spring quarter received a GPA of 2.7 or higher.
- However there was no significant difference in orderly academic progress between the bridge and comparison group.
- Quantitative data during spring quarter 2007 at SCU was not available for final reporting.

2005 COHORT:

Table 7: 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 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

Table 7 (continued): 2005 COHORT: Bridge and Comparison Groups, All Students – GPA and Orderly Progress, FALL 2006 - WINTER 2007 GPA

| | | Bridge and Comparison Groups | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|----|
| | | Fall 2006 (cohort '05) | | Winter 2007 (cohort '05) | | Spring 2007 (cohort '05) | |
| GPA | | Bridge (n=28) | Comparison (n=89) | Bridge (n=26) ¹ | Comparison (n=87) ¹ | NA | NA |
| | LE 1.99 (Below C) | 17.8% | 7.8% | 11.5% | 9.1% | NA | NA |
| | 2.00-2.69 (C to C+) | 35.7 | 32.5 | 15.3 | 26.4 | NA | NA |
| | GE 2.7 (B- or Higher) | 46.4 | 59.5 | 73.0 | 64.3 | NA | NA |
| Orderly Academic Progress made? ² | NO | 3.5% | 4.4% | 0.0% | 2.3% | NA | NA |
| | YES | 96.5 | 95.6 | 100.0 | 87.7 | NA | NA |

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

¹ No grade recorded for 2 bridge group students in Winter 2007 and 2 comparison group students in Winter 2007.

² Orderly academic progress defined as: Spring 2007 (third quarter) = 44 units or more, Fall 2006 (first quarter) = 12 units or more

Analyses:

2005 Cohort

- During the first quarter their academic year, 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.
- The bridge cohort 2005 did not perform as strong as the comparison group during the second year fall quarter. 46% from the Bridge group received a GPA of 2.7 or higher while 59% in the comparison group received a GPA of 2.7 or higher during fall quarter. However, the bridge cohort did slightly better during winter quarter. 73% from the bridge cohort received 2.7 or higher compared to 64% in the comparison group.
- The bridge cohort also made orderly academic progress during winter quarter 2007. 100% from this cohort made orderly academic progress while 87% from the comparison group made orderly academic progress. There was little difference during fall quarter 2007.

- Quantitative data during spring quarter 2007 at SCU was not available for final reporting.

2006 COHORT:

Table 8: 2006 COHORT: Bridge and Comparison Groups, All Students – GPA and Orderly Progress, FALL 2006 - SPRING 2007 GPA

| | | Bridge and Comparison Groups | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|----|
| | | Fall 2006 (cohort '06) | | Winter 2007 (cohort '06) | | Spring 2007 (cohort '06) | |
| GPA | | Bridge (n=30) | Comparison (n=133) | Bridge (n=29) ¹ | Comparison (n=133) | NA | NA |
| | LE 1.99 (Below C) | 13.3% | 9.7% | 0.0% | 10.5% | NA | NA |
| | 2.00-2.69 (C to C+) | 16.6 | 35.3 | 17.2 | 33.8 | NA | NA |
| | GE 2.7 (B- or Higher) | 70.0 | 54.8 | 82.7 | 55.6 | NA | NA |
| Orderly Academic Progress made? ² | NO | 10.0% | 4.5% | 3.4% | 9.7% | NA | NA |
| | YES | 90.0 | 95.5 | 96.6 | 90.3 | NA | NA |

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

¹ No grade recorded for 1 bridge group student in Winter 2007.

² Orderly academic progress defined as: Spring 2007 (third quarter) = 44 units or more, Fall 2006 (first quarter) = 12 units or more

Analyses:

2006 Cohort

- The last bridge cohort to end with the James Irvine Foundation grant performed academically strong compared to the comparison group during their first year. 70% received a GPA of 2.7 or higher during their first quarter while 54% in the comparison group received a GPA of 2.7 or higher. Winter quarter demonstrated an even stronger difference. 82% of the bridge students received a GPA of 2.7 or higher while only 55% of the comparison group received a GPA of 2.7 or higher.
- 95% from the comparison group made orderly academic progress while 90% from the bridge cohort made orderly academic progress in fall quarter. However, 96% from the bridge cohort made orderly academic progress while 90% from the comparison group made orderly academic progress.
- Quantitative data during spring quarter 2007 at SCU was not available for final reporting.

2003 COHORT – First Generation Students:

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; ^ap <=.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

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? ¹ | 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; ^ap <=.10.

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

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) ¹ | 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 bridge 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

Table 9 (continued): 2003 COHORT: Bridge and Comparison Groups, First Generation Students – GPA and Orderly Progress, FALL 2006 To WINTER 2007

| | | First Generation and Comparison Groups | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|--|----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|----|
| | | Fall 2006 (cohort '03) | | Winter 2007 (cohort '03) | | Spring 2007 (cohort '03) | |
| GPA | | Bridge (n=15) | Comparison (n=18) | Bridge (n=15) | Comparison (n=18) | NA | NA |
| | LE 1.99 (Below C) | 0.0% | 5.6% | 6.7% | 23.5% | NA | NA |
| | 2.00-2.69 (C to C+) | 13.3 | 44.4 | 6.7 | 23.5 | NA | NA |
| | GE 2.7 (B- or Higher) | 86.7 | 50.0 | 86.7 | 58.8 | NA | NA |
| Orderly Academic Progress made? ¹ | NO | 0.0% | 5.6% | 6.7% | 5.9% | NA | NA |
| | YES | 100.0 | 94.4 | 93.3 | 94.1 | NA | NA |

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

¹ Orderly academic progress defined as: Spring 2007 (third quarter) = 44 units or more, Fall 2006 (first quarter) = 12 units or more

Analyses:

2003 Cohort

- During the fall quarter, the first generation college 2003 cohort performed significantly better than comparison group in their first year. 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.
- During fall and winter quarter of their last year, the first generation cohort performed academically stronger than the comparison group, 86% received a GPA of 2.7 or higher while the comparison group received 50% and 58% respectively.
- 100% of the first generation cohort made orderly academic progress while 94% from the comparison group made orderly academic progress. In winter quarter, there was no significant difference between the two groups.
- Quantitative data during spring quarter 2007 at SCU was not available for final reporting.

2004 COHORT – First Generation Students:

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=32) 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 5 comparison students in Spring 2005

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

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) ¹ | 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 bridge 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

Table 10 (continued): 2004 COHORT: Bridge and Comparison Groups, First Generation Students – GPA and Orderly Progress, FALL 2006 To WINTER 2007

| | | First Generation and Comparison Groups | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|--|----------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|----|
| | | Fall 2006 (cohort '04) | | Winter 2007 (cohort '04) | | Spring 2007 (cohort '04) | |
| GPA | | Bridge (n=21) | Comparison (n=31) | Bridge (n=20) ¹ | Comparison (n=30) ¹ | NA | NA |
| | LE 1.99 (Below C) | 14.3% | 16.1% | 0.0% | 12.9% | NA | NA |
| | 2.00-2.69 (C to C+) | 19.0 | 29.0 | 30.0 | 22.6 | NA | NA |
| | GE 2.7 (B- or Higher) | 66.7 | 54.8 | 70.0 | 64.5 | NA | NA |
| Orderly Academic Progress made? ² | NO | 14.3% | 9.7% | 0.0% | 12.9% | NA | NA |
| | YES | 85.7 | 90.3 | 100.0 | 87.1 | NA | NA |

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

¹ No grade recorded for 1 bridge student in Winter 2007 and 1 comparison student in Winter 2007

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 analyses below).

Analyses:

2004 Cohort

- During the fall quarter, the first generation college 2004 cohort performed significantly better than comparison group in their first year. 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 and winter in their second year at SCU 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.
- 66% of the first generation cohort received a GPA of 2.7 or higher during fall quarter of their third year while 54% from the comparison group received a GPA of 2.7 or higher. During winter quarter, the bridge cohort performed slightly better. 70% received a GPA of 2.7 or higher while 64% of the comparison group received a GPA of 2.7 or better.
- 85% of the first generation cohort made orderly academic progress during fall quarter 2006 and 100% made orderly academic progress. The comparison group did slightly better during fall quarter where 90% made orderly academic progress. However in winter quarter, only 87% made orderly academic progress.
- Quantitative data during spring quarter 2007 at SCU was not available for final reporting.

2005 COHORT – First Generation Students:

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) | |
| GPA | | Bridge (n=21) | Comparison (n=37) | Bridge (n=21) | Comparison (n=37) | Bridge (n=21) | Comparison (n=37) |
| | LE 1.99 (Below C) | 9.5% | 5.4% | 14.3% | 8.1% | 9.5% | 13.5% |
| | 2.00-2.69 (C to C+) | 54.1 | 52.4 | 23.8 | 29.7 | 23.8 | 35.1 |
| | GE 2.7 (B- or Higher) | 40.5 | 38.1 | 61.9 | 62.2 | 66.7 | 51.4 |
| Orderly Academic Progress made? ¹ | 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; ^a p <=.10.

¹Orderly 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. Therefore, data may differ slightly from previous reports. New analyses are provided with the updated data (see analyses below).

Table 11 (continued): 2005 COHORT: Bridge and Comparison Groups, First Generation Students – GPA and Orderly Progress, FALL 2006 To WINTER 2007

| | | First Generation and Comparison Groups | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|--|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|----|
| | | Fall 2006 (cohort '05) | | Winter 2007 (cohort '05) | | Spring 2007 (cohort '05) | |
| GPA | | Bridge (n=21) | Comparison (n=34) | Bridge (n=19) ¹ | Comparison (n=34) | NA | NA |
| | LE 1.99 (Below C) | 23.8% | 5.9% | 10.5% | 11.8% | NA | NA |
| | 2.00-2.69 (C to C+) | 28.6 | 38.2 | 21.1 | 17.6 | NA | NA |
| | GE 2.7 (B- or Higher) | 47.6 | 55.9 | 68.4 | 70.6 | NA | NA |
| Orderly Academic Progress made? ² | NO | 14.3% | 5.9% | 15.8% | 8.8% | NA | NA |
| | YES | 85.7 | 94.1 | 94.2 | 91.2 | NA | NA |

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

¹No grade recorded for 2 bridge students in Winter 2007

²Orderly academic progress defined as: Winter 2007 (third quarter) = 44 units or more, Fall 2006 (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 analyses below).

Analyses:

2005 Cohort

- During fall quarter of their first year, only 38% of the first generation college student 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%.
- During the second year, the first generation cohort did not outperform the comparison group. The difference is relatively insignificant. In the fall, 47% received a GPA of 2.7 or higher while 55% in the comparison group received a GPA of 2.7 or higher. In the winter, 68% received a GPA of 2.7 or higher while 70% in the comparison group received a GPA of 2.7 or higher.
- 85% of the first generation cohort made orderly academic progress in their second year, while 94% of the comparison group made orderly academic progress. The first generation cohort faired slightly better during the winter quarter. 94% made orderly academic progress, while only 91% made orderly academic progress.
- Quantitative data during spring quarter 2007 at SCU was not available for final reporting.

2006 COHORT – First Generation Students:

Table 12: 2006 COHORT: Bridge and Comparison Groups, First Generation Students – GPA and Orderly Progress, FALL 2006 - SPRING 2007 GPA

| | | First Generation and Comparison Groups | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|--|----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|----|
| | | Fall 2006 (cohort '06) | | Winter 2007 (cohort '06) | | Spring 2007 (cohort '06) | |
| GPA | | Bridge (n=24) | Comparison (n=53) | Bridge (n=24) | Comparison (n=53) | NA | NA |
| | LE 1.99 (Below C) | 8.3% | 9.4% | 0.0% | 11.3% | NA | NA |
| | 2.00-2.69 (C to C+) | 16.7 | 45.3 | 15.7 | 39.6 | NA | NA |
| | GE 2.7 (B- or Higher) | 75.0 | 45.3 | 83.3 | 49.1 | NA | NA |
| Orderly Academic Progress made? ² | NO | 4.2% | 3.8% | 87.5% | 94.3% | NA | NA |
| | YES | 95.8 | 96.2 | 12.5 | 5.7 | NA | NA |

* p <=.05; ^ap <=.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. Therefore, data may differ slightly from previous reports. New analyses are provided with the updated data (see analyses below).

Analyses:

2006 Cohort

- Cohort 2006, the last cohort to start with the James Irvine Foundation grant, did significantly better than the comparison group. During fall quarter, 75% received a GPA of 2.7 or higher while only 45% from the comparison group received a GPA of 2.7 or higher. During winter quarter 2007, 83% of the bridge cohort received a GPA of 2.7 or higher while only 49% received a GPA of 2.7 or higher.
- There was not much significant difference in the orderly academic progress between the two groups.
- Quantitative data during spring quarter 2007 at SCU was not available for final reporting.

Summation:

Submitted by Rosa Guerra-Sarabia, LEAD Programs Coordinator

The completion of the fourth Summer Bridge Program in 2006 represents an important step in understanding its full impact and value to students. As our first cohort of students graduate, we are only now able to fully evaluate their academic success and evaluate the efficacy of the program and follow up services. Reviewing the graduation rate of the Bridge cohort along with the comparison group and the class of 2007 overall, will give us a clear indicator as to the successful retention efforts of the Summer Bridge Program.

The mission of the Summer Bridge Program is to help incoming first generation college students and students of color at Santa Clara University make a **smooth transition both academically and socially from high school into college**. It is an opportunity to learn about the expectations of college courses by participating in two college-level classes. Through successful participation in the LEAD Summer Bridge Program, students will gain the necessary skills, resources, and peer mentorship that will help students succeed at Santa Clara University.

One of the precepts of the original grant proposal was to serve 30-36 diverse first year students through a leadership and transition program, providing students with an enhanced skill set to succeed at Santa Clara. Program success is measured by a sophomore year retention rate or 90 percent or greater, approximately the same as the overall SCU sophomore retention rate.

LEAD Summer Bridge Program: Sophomore Year Attrition

| | Freshmen Participants | Enrolled in Sophomore Year | Percent |
|-------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|---------|
| Bridge 2003 | 30 | 29 | 96% |
| Bridge 2004 | 29* | 29 | 100% |
| Bridge 2005 | 30 | 28 | 93% |
| Bridge 2006 | 30 | NA** | NA |
| Total | 119 | 86 | |

*Bridge 2004 admitted 30 participants; one student was removed from the program for behavioral issues.

**Students in the first quarter of study at SCU.

Leadership Survey

A recent survey of all sophomore, junior and senior Bridge participants (89 students) clearly illustrates meaningful engagement with the university community. Twenty-nine students replied to a list of 28 leadership and student on-

campus involvement activities in which they are engaged. The seven activities identified below are a sample of visible student leadership positions on campus. This demonstrates, in part, how the Bridge Program raises confidence levels among students and encourages their involvement in co-curricular activities. Other leadership positions reported by students are: Director of SCU's Emergency Medical Services (1), Bridge Program Community Facilitators (1) and Peer Educators (10).

Leadership Survey

| | Bridge 2003 (10) | Bridge 2004 (14) | Bridge 2005 (5) | Total (29) |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------|
| Elected to student government | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| Community facilitator (CF) | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Applied for the Community Facilitator position | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 |
| Orientation Leader (OL) | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| Applied for the Orientation Leader position | 4 | 1 | 0 | 5 |
| Study Abroad | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| Immersion Program | 4 | 2 | 0 | 6 |
| Admissions Recruitment volunteer (tours, panels) | 10 | 9 | 3 | 22 |
| Officer MCC executive board/MCC club | 4 | 6 | 1 | 11 |

Note: The 2006 cohort group was not included since the survey was administered in their first quarter. Though, it is important to note that two Bridge 2006 students are maintaining a blog for the SCU website to record their freshmen year experience.

I. Students involved in Bridge Program Pre/Post Test (compiled from Phase II reports):

2003 cohort

- Bridge students had significantly higher levels of confidence at post-test compared to pre-test in the areas of taking good notes, writing class papers, participating in class discussions, asking questions in class, using the computer for word processing, making new friends, and finding their way around campus.
- Changes were also noted in the areas of increased confidence in research, understanding texts, talking with professors, using the internet for research, finding the right major, finding professors, using the internet for research, finding the right major, finding professors you can relate to, finding students like you, and keeping up with school work.

2005 cohort

- Bridge students had significantly higher levels of confidence at post-test compared to pre-test in the areas of participating in class discussions and asking questions
- Changes were also noted in the areas of increased confidence in talking with professors, making new friends, finding their way around campus, and knowing where to go for help

2006 cohort

- Bridge program students had higher confidence levels in areas such as participating in class discussions, analyzing and writing about what they read, and doing well on test, at the end of the program than when they started the program
-

II. The levels of satisfaction of Bridge participants with the program

2003 cohort

- Students were most satisfied with the English class, with housing, lunch with faculty, and workshops on: Career/Academic Club information, the discussion with Professor Jimenez, learning more about the Jesuits, studying abroad and the Arrupe Center for Community Based Learning, the spirituality workshop, and the ropes course

- The Lowest Scores of satisfaction were with the meals. Other parts of the program that were not rated as highly as the other programs were: the library tour, the test/not taking workshop, and the academic goals workshop.

2005 cohort

- Students were most satisfied with the academic classes (engineering seminar, English classes, and the chemistry/religious studies classes) as well as with housing, the social events, the floor meetings were led by the Community facilitators in the residence hall, as well as the team building activities. They were also very satisfied with the peer educators and the program staff.
- The lowest scores of satisfaction were with the amount of free time offered as well as with the meals. Though the students were not as satisfied with some parts of the Bridge program, the overall satisfaction with the program was very high with a mean score of 4.66 out of 5.00

2006 cohort

- Overall satisfaction with the program was very high with a mean score of 4.72 out of 5.00

Goal 2: Increase the academic success of racial minority and first generation college students.

Strategy 2: Student advising to increase academic success of racial minority and first generation students.

Collaborators: Institutional Research (Data collection) and Evaluation Team (Analysis)

Expected Outcomes:

There will be an overall increase in student’s satisfaction with their advising experience over time and all racial/ethnic groups having similar levels of satisfaction.

Table 13: Mean Satisfaction with Advising Experience by Race/Ethnicity

| | European American | African American | Asian/Pacific Islander | Latino | Other |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| | 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 | 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 | 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 | 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 | 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 |
| Academic Advising | 3.29 3.49 3.63 3.81 3.44 | 3.10 3.17 3.00 3.60 3.40 | 3.39 3.15 3.63 3.41 3.45 | 3.26 3.32 3.89 3.36 3.52 | 3.27 3.30 3.31 3.46 3.52 |
| Quality of Instruction | 4.10 4.29 4.25 3.47 3.36 | 4.10 4.00 4.00 3.20 3.20 | 3.81 3.97 4.22 3.11 3.18 | 4.22 4.15 4.57 3.31 3.21 | 3.98 4.12 3.69 3.20 3.35 |
| Academic Tutoring or Assistance | 2.70 2.43 2.85 3.06 3.03 | 2.60 2.67 3.50 3.60 3.40 | 2.84 2.70 3.28 2.82 3.09 | 2.78 3.30 3.14 3.22 3.16 | 3.16 2.55 2.94 3.13 3.52 |
| Career Counseling and Advising | 3.30 3.14 3.25 3.28 3.45 | 3.30 3.00 3.00 2.40 3.0 | 3.23 3.00 3.63 3.52 3.50 | 2.94 3.28 3.39 3.13 3.40 | 3.17 2.97 3.37 3.06 3.82 |
| Amount of Contact with Faculty | 4.18 4.19 4.26 3.48 3.42 | 4.40 3.50 3.50 3.40 3.20 | 3.97 4.10 4.22 3.32 3.25 | 4.10 4.23 4.25 3.27 3.50 | 3.84 4.15 3.69 3.26 3.47 |
| Ability to Find Faculty/ Staff Mentor | 3.89 3.88 3.97 3.93 3.81 | 3.90 4.00 2.50 2.20 3.40 | 3.69 3.89 4.15 3.70 2.0 | 3.83 3.87 3.86 3.59 3.85 | 3.84 3.91 3.50 4.00 4.17 |

Source: HERI College Student Survey, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005 and 2006; 1 = did not use; 2 = least satisfied – 5 = most satisfied. In 2004 only 2 African American students were surveyed. In 2006, only 10 African American students were surveyed.

Summation:

On average all students were satisfied with the services offered in **academic advising**, from 2002 to 2006, it remained in the 3 point range on the scale. The **quality of instruction** started off in the 4 point range in most of the race/ethnic groups in 2002 but by 2006 it dropped to the 3 point range. However **academic tutoring and assistance** started off in the 2 point range on the scale and went up to the 3 point range in all race/ethnic groups. **Career counseling and advising** remained relatively the same at the 3 point range for all 4 years although there are more variations between the race/ethnic groups. **Amount of contact with faculty** were more likely amongst European Americans and Latino during the 4 years. For African American students, it went from a strong 4.4 to 3.2 and for Asian/Pacific American students it dropped from 3.97 to 3.23 in the 4 years. **Ability to find faculty/staff mentor** were the strongest amongst European American students and Latino students. In 2004 and 2005, the ability for African American students to find a mentor was difficult, though it increased to satisfactory level in 2006. For Asian American students, it dropped to a low of 2 point on the scale in the last 4 years. The ability for European American students and Latino students to find faculty mentors and the amount of contact they have with faculty member may be due to the higher numbers of faculty in the both these race/ethnic groups.

Goal 3: Provide resources for faculty of color teaching and research to enhance academic excellence

Collaborators: Institutional Research (Data collection) and Evaluation Team (Analysis)

Expected Outcomes: Faculty of color retention rates will be equal to rates for European American Faculty.

Table 14: Faculty attrition rates disaggregated by race/ethnicity, Fall 2000 – Fall 2006

| | Fall 2000 | | | | | Fall 2002 | | | | |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|
| | Continuing from previous year (Count) | New TT+TE (Count) | Total TE+TT (Count) | % change in: | | Continuing from previous year (Count) | New TT+TE (Count) | Total TE+TT (Count) | % change from 2000-2002 in: | |
| | | | | Continuing faculty ² | Overall ³ | | | | Continuing Faculty ² | Overall ³ |
| Native American | 1 | 0 | 1 | NA | NA | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| African American | 9 | 1 | 10 | NA | NA | 10 | 0 | 10 | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Latino/Hispanic | 16 | 3 | 19 | NA | NA | 19 | 0 | 19 | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| AA/PI | 24 | 4 | 28 | NA | NA | 27 | 1 | 28 | -3.6% | 0.0% |
| European American | 236 | 18 | 254 | NA | NA | 252 | 12 | 264 | -0.8% | 3.9% |

Table 14 (continued):

| | Fall 2003 | | | | | Fall 2004 | | | | |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|
| | Continuing from previous year (Count) | New TT+TE (Count) | Total TE+TT (Count) | % change from 2002-2003 in: | | Continuing from previous year (Count) | New TT+TE (Count) | Total TE+TT (Count) | % change from 2003-2004 in: | |
| | | | | Continuing faculty ² | Overall ³ | | | | Continuing faculty ² | Overall ³ |
| Native American | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| African American | 8 | 0 | 8 | -20.0% | -20.0% | 6 | 0 | 6 | -25.0% | -25.0% |
| Latino/Hispanic | 18 | 6 | 24 | -5.5% | 26.3% | 22 | 2 | 24 | -8.3% | 0.0% |
| AA/PI | 26 | 2 | 28 | -7.1% | 0.0% | 29 ⁴ | 0 | 29 | 3.5% | 3.5% |
| European American | 247 | 12 | 259 | -6.4% | -1.9% | 256 | 5 | 261 | -1.2% | 0.8% |

Table 14 (continued):

| | Fall 2005 | | | | | Fall 2006 | | | | |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|
| | Continuing from previous year (Count) | New TT+TE (Count) | Total TE+TT (Count) | % change from 2004-2005 in: | | Continuing from previous year (Count) | New TT+TE (Count) | Total TE+TT (Count) | % change from 2004-2005 in: | |
| | | | | Continuing faculty ² | Overall ³ | | | | Continuing faculty ² | Overall ³ |
| Native American | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA | NA |
| African American | 7 ⁵ | 1 | 8 | 16.7% | 2.0% | 8 | 0 | 8 | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Latino/Hispanic | 24 | 0 | 24 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 24 | 0 | 24 | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| AA/PI | 28 | 1 | 29 | -3.4% | 0.0% | 27 | 3 | 30 | -7.1% | 3.4 |
| European American | 250 | 7 | 257 | -4.3% | -1.5% | 253 | 10 | 263 | -1.6% | 2.3% |

1 Source: Campus provided data, January 2006. For more information, see Appendix E: Campus_Provided_Data Sheet.

2 % change in Continuing Faculty, say from 2000 to 2002 = ((Number continuing in 2002 from previous year – Total number of TT+TE in 2000)/Number continuing in 2000)* 100;

3 % change in Overall Faculty, say from 2000 to 2002 = ((Total TT+TE faculty in 2002 – Total TT+TE in 2000)/Total in 2000)*100.

4 One tenured Asian/Pacific Islander faculty member returned to full time instructional status in 2004-05 but was not a new hire.

5 One non tenure track African American moved from non tenure track to a tenured track position but was not a new hire.

6 One non tenure track European American moved from a non tenure track to a tenured track position but was not a new hire.

Summation (Phase II):

Faculty attrition rates disaggregated by race/ethnicity, Fall 2000-Fall 2006 in table 14, shows that Santa Clara has struggled to recruit and retain faculty of color. African American faculty have been the most difficult to recruit and retain. From 2002-2003 two of ten African American faculty members left Santa Clara. The following year two additional African American faculty members left Santa Clara, bringing the total number of tenure/tenure track African American faculty to 6. In 2005, one non tenure track African American faculty

member moved to a tenure track position, and another African American scholar was hired to a tenure track position, thus bringing the total number of tenured/tenure track African American Faculty to 8.

In response to the disproportionate attrition rates, particularly of African American faculty, the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences initiated “Inclusive Excellence” programs to diversify the campus community. In effort to build a critical mass of African American/African faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences, and ultimately the university, 2 new tenure-stream African American scholars joined the faculty, and 3 new African American scholars were awarded post-doctoral fellowships at the University in 2005-2006.

From 2000-2002 the number of Latino/Hispanic faculty remained constant at 19. In 2003, one Latino/Hispanic faculty member left Santa Clara, while 6 new tenure/tenure track Latino/Hispanic scholars joined the faculty, a total of 24. In 2004, two Latino/Hispanic scholars left Santa Clara, while 2 new Latino/Hispanic scholars joined the faculty. As of 2006 the number of Latino/Hispanic faculty has remained constant at 24.

From 2000 to 2006 the total number of Asian American and Pacific Islander tenured/tenure track faculty has either grown or remained constant, however, this has only been possible because of newly hired Asian American/Pacific Islander scholars to tenure track positions. Tenured/tenure track Asian American/Pacific Islander faculty left Santa Clara in 2002, 2003, 2005 and 2006. However, new Asian American/Pacific Islander scholars were added to the faculty in each of those years resulting in 30 tenured/tenure faculty by 2006.

Santa Clara University has not had a Native American tenured/tenure track faculty since in the last four years of assessment.

Strategy 1: Irvine faculty grants to provide resources for faculty of color teaching and research.

Collaborators: Faculty Grant Recipients (Data collection) and Evaluation Team (Analysis)

Table 15: Irvine grants for faculty of color scholarship, January-June 2007

| Number of faculty of color grants | # of conferences presentations/ programs/ exhibits partially or fully supported by Irvine Grant | # of curriculum development | Number of student research assistants |
|--|---|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 8 (1 grant was a staff of color grant) | 6 * | 2 | 1 |

* 2 of the grants were included in the faculty of color grants.

Analyses:

During January – June 2007, grant recipients are faculty from the following departments: Art & Art History, Communication, Electrical Engineering, English, Ethnic Studies Program, Liberal Studies Program, Office of Special Programs, Religious Studies, Sociology and Theatre and Dance, and grant recipients are staff from the following departments: de Saisset Museum, Office of Student Life and Undergraduate Admissions.

Please see appendix D for listing all the programs funded through the James Irvine Foundation, *Phase II: Building Partnership for Diversity*.

Goal 4: Advance a multicultural curriculum that broadens education for all Students

Collaborators: SCU Institutional Research (Data collection) and Evaluation Team (Analysis)

Baseline and Expected Outcomes: 33% increase per year over the 5 year grant period starting from the 2002-03 baseline rates of students completing Ethnic Studies courses.

Table 16: Percentage of students completing Ethnic Studies courses disaggregated by school and race/ethnicity in 2002-03, 2003-04, 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07

| | 2002-03 | | 2003-04 | | 2004-05 | | 2005-06 | | 2006-07 | |
|----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | Students of Color | European American | Students of Color | European American | Students of Color | European American | Students of Color | European American | Students of Color | European American |
| A&S: % | 11.4% | 7.7% | 10.2% | 8.7% | 9.9% | 5.7% | 12.4% | 7.7% | 8.4% | 4.7% |
| N of Students | 2414 | 4878 | 2494 | 4949 | 2609 | 5028 | 2652 | 5104 | 2390 | 4908 |
| Business: % | 3.1% | 1.5% | 3.9% | 2.2% | 5.1% | 1.7% | 5.3% | 1.3% | 3.2% | .8% |
| N of Students | 1450 | 2167 | 1372 | 2104 | 1443 | 2365 | 1297 | 2338 | 1673 | 2549 |
| Engineering: % | 4.5% | 1.5% | 1.8% | 0.8% | 3.4% | .6% | 1.9% | .9% | .2% | .9% |
| N of Students | 246 | 847 | 623 | 731 | 609 | 629 | 561 | 636 | 579 | 723 |

Note: See Appendix C for more complete information. Number of students in a given year includes students who have taken multiple Ethnic Studies Courses.

Analyses (Table 16):

- There was a decrease of both students of color and European American students in the School of Arts and Sciences and the Business School who completed Ethnic Studies courses from academic 2005-06 to academic year 2006-07. In the School of Engineering, there is a slight drop for students of color but it remained the same for European Americans. The decreases are relatively insignificant.

Summation (Phase II):

The higher percentage of students taking Ethnic Studies courses in the College of Arts and Sciences compared to the Business School and School of Engineering is partly due to the fact that one “diversity” course is required for graduation from Arts & Sciences programs; however, students may complete this course with either an Ethnic Studies or a Women’s and Gender Studies course.

- Over 10% of students of color in the College of Arts and Sciences completed ethnic studies courses in every year since 2002-03
- Between academic years 2002-03 and 2005-06 the highest percentage of European American students that completed ethnic studies courses in the College of Arts and Sciences was 8.7% during 2003-04.

The Center for Multicultural Learning and the University’s Core Curriculum program planned a Curriculum Development Series (CDS) during April and June 2005. The CDS fostered the enhancement of faculty pedagogical approaches to teaching diversity issues. We received ten (10) syllabi revisions from faculty who participated in the Curriculum development Series.

- The percentage of students of color that took Ethnic Studies courses in the College of Arts and Sciences rose from academic year 2004-05 to academic year 2005-06. The number of students of color in the College of Arts and Sciences rose from 2,609 to 2,652 during this period.
- The percentage of students of color that took Ethnic Studies courses has been greater than the percentage of European Americans that took Ethnic studies courses in each school, every year since 2002.
- The percentage of students of color and European American students that took Ethnic Studies courses increased from the previous year in academic 2005-2006 in each school, except for the School of Engineering. The percentage of students of color in the engineering school that took ethnic studies courses dropped from 3.4% in 2004-05 to 1.9% in 2005-06.
- There was a slight increase of both students of color and European American students in the College of Arts and sciences who completed Ethnic Studies course in Table 10. The slight increase in students of color and the slight decrease of European American students who completed Ethnic Studies courses in the Business school are insignificant.
- Their was a slight decrease for both students of color and European American students who took Ethnic Studies courses in 2006-2007 in both the College of Arts and Sciences and the Business School. Students of color from the School of Engineer who took Ethnic Studies courses slightly declined as well in 2006-2007.

Overall, Table 16 demonstrates a very low percentage of Business School students who complete Ethnic Studies courses. Engineering School had an even lower percentage of students of color and European American Students completing Ethnic Studies courses. There was a significant drop in students of color in the Engineering School who completed Ethnic Studies from academic year 2002-2003 to academic year 2006-2007.

Goal 5: Improve campus climate

Collaborators: SCU Institutional Research (Data collection) and Evaluation Team (Analysis)

Expected Outcomes:

Increased appreciation (compared to CSS 2003 baseline) of benefits of living in a diverse community.

Table 17: Exposure to multiculturalism and positive diversity climate disaggregated by race/ethnicity; 2002 and 2003, 2004, 2005 and 2006 CSS-HERI survey.

| | European American | | | *African American | | | Asian/Pacific Islander | | | Latino | | | Other | | |
|--|-------------------|--------------|------|-------------------|--------------|------|------------------------|--------------|------|--------------|--------------|------|--------------|--------------|------|
| Year, 2002, 03, 04, 05, 06 | 02 05 | 03 06 | 04 | 02 05 | 03 06 | 04 | 02 05 | 03 06 | 04 | 02 05 | 03 06 | 04 | 02 05 | 03 06 | 04 |
| Took an Ethnic Studies Course (%) | 76 83 | 78 83 | 90 | 60 100 | 67 80 | 100 | 69 85 | 77 85 | 83 | 86 90 | 83 81 | 89 | 75 86 | 76 94 | 88 |
| Attended a Racial/Cultural Awareness Workshop | 25 45 | 25 36 | 34 | 20 40 | 50 80 | 0 | 31 38 | 34 49 | 39 | 50 72 | 51 52 | 61 | 41 66 | 42 52 | 63 |
| Had a Roommate of Different Race/Ethnicity | 53 51 | 52 54 | 63 | 90 80 | 83 70 | 100 | 53 58 | 60 66 | 72 | 76 63 | 66 69 | 89 | 61 66 | 61 64 | 75 |
| Participated in a Racial/Ethnic Student Assoc. | 12 23 | 10 20 | 21 | 60 80 | 50 60 | 100 | 53 50 | 44 59 | 57 | 54 68 | 43 38 | 57 | 43 60 | 30 52 | 56 |
| In College Grew in Knowledge of Different Races/Cultures (1-5) | 3.92 4.12 | 3.96 4.09 | 4.04 | 3.90 4.20 | 3.50 4.30 | 3.50 | 3.95 4.05 | 3.84 4.01 | 4.07 | 4.04 4.04 | 3.98 4.04 | 4.18 | 4.09 4.13 | 4.00 4.35 | 4.00 |
| Ability to Get Along with People of Different Races/Culture | 3.78 3.87 | 3.73 3.87 | 3.80 | 3.80 3.80 | 3.33 4.0 | 3.50 | 3.94 3.79 | 3.87 3.80 | 3.96 | 3.91 3.95 | 3.81 3.80 | 4.21 | 4.14 3.73 | 3.82 4.29 | 4.00 |
| Importance to You of Helping to Promote Racial Understanding (1=Not Impt. 4=Essential) | 2.27 2.46 | 2.17 2.37 | 2.29 | 3.10 2.40 | 2.83 3.50 | 1.50 | 2.54 3.44 | 2.51 2.50 | 2.80 | 2.79 2.95 | 2.74 3.16 | 3.00 | 2.79 2.46 | 2.21 3.12 | 2.75 |
| Agree Students Mix Freely Among Racial/Ethnic Backgrounds (1-5) | NA 2.97 | 2.93 NA | 2.81 | NA 3.25 | 3.00 NA | 1.50 | NA 3.00 | 2.60 NA | 2.59 | NA 3.28 | 2.58 NA | 2.18 | NA 3.54 | 2.79 NA | 2.54 |
| Agree Many Minority Students Feel Like Don't Fit-In On Campus | NA 3.05 | 3.06 NA | 3.23 | NA 3.75 | 3.25 NA | 5.00 | NA 3.40 | 3.61 NA | 3.24 | NA 3.78 | 3.39 NA | 3.36 | NA 2.81 | 3.48 NA | 3.45 |

Source: HERI College Student Survey, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006. *In 2004 only 2 African American students were surveyed. In 2005 only 5 African American students were surveyed. In 2006 only 10 African American students were surveyed. Rating on a 1-5 scale (1-much weaker, 5-much stronger) and rating on a 1-4 scale (1-not important, 4-essential).

Summation (Phase II):

According to the HERI college student survey, in the four years, on average more than 75% of the students has Ethnic Studies courses. European Americans are the least likely to attend a racial/cultural awareness workshop, the low was at 25% and the high was 45%. 80% African Americans attended racial/cultural awareness workshop in 2006 from a low of 20% in 2002. For the Latino students who attended awareness workshop, it remained relatively steady at 50% except in 2004 (61%) and 2005 (72%). "Other" and non-European American students were more like to have a roommate of a different race/ethnicity. African Americans being the group most likely to have a roommate of different race/ethnicity. European Americans were least likely to participate in racial/ethnic student associations where as African Americans were average more likely to join racial/ethnic student associations. On average 50% of Asian/Pacific Islander and Latino the four years were likely to join racial/ethnic student associations. On average, students from the survey will leave this campus with a strong knowledge of different races/cultures and the ability to get along with different races/cultures. Students from the survey on average also felt it was important to promote racial understanding. The ability to mix freely among different racial and ethnic background, on average was considered from important to very important in all ethnic/race groups. However, in 2004, African Americans did not consider it being important. All race/ethnic groups had strong beliefs that minority student "feel like they don't fit on campus.

Strategy 1: Curriculum and co-curriculum grants to Improve campus climate

Collaborators: Grant Recipients (Data collection) and Evaluation Team (Analysis).

Table 18: 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 | Jan-June 2007 |
| Persons of Color | 78.8% | 76.9% | 75.3% | 76.6% | 73.2% | 80.3% | 70% | 68% | 70% |
| European American | 21.2 | 23.1 | 24.7 | 23.4 | 26.8% | 19.7% | 30% | 32% | 30% |
| (Total) | (260) | (770) | (243) | (47) | (492) | (157) | (461) | (75) | (484) |

Note: See Appendix C for January - June program details. Programs prior to January 2007 have been described in previous Irvine reports.

Table 19: 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 19 (continued):

| Phase II Programs | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|----------------|------------------------|----------------|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------------|----------------|
| | January – June 2005 | | October – December 2005 | | January – June 2006 | | October 2006- January 2007 | | January – June 2007 | |
| | Student of Color | Euro. Amer. | 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% | 16% | 26% |
| Personal Interest | 85.2 | 56.3 | 79.8% | 58.6% | 74.7% | 44.7% | 100% | 100% | 84% | 74% |
| (Total) | (237) | (64) | (53) | (19) | (127) | (83) | (49) | (21) | (335) | (144) |

See Appendix C for more complete information. Programs prior to January 2007 have been described in previous Irvine reports.

Table 20: 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) |

See Appendix C for more complete information. Programs prior to January 2007 have been described in previous Irvine reports.

Table 20 (continued):

| Phase II Programs | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|----------------|------------------------|----------------|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------------|----------------|
| | January – June 2005 | | October – December 2005 | | January – June 2006 | | October 2006- January 2007 | | January – June 2007 | |
| | Student of Color | Euro. Amer. | 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% | 77% | 81% |
| Transform/ Change | 18.3 | 34.8% | 58.5% | 52.6% | 54.3% | 61.4% | 53.3% | 50% | 23% | 19% |
| (Total) | (360) | (132) | (53) | (19) | (127) | (83) | (15) | (21) | (233) | (108) |

See Appendix C for more complete information. Programs prior to January 2007 have been described in previous Irvine reports.

Analyses:

The current analysis covers programs in the Winter and Spring quarters 2007 (Tables 18-20)

- The months of January – June were high programming months. The trend continued to show that students of color are more likely to attend CML programs than European Americans. 70% who attended was a person of color and 30% was of European American.
- The trend also continued to show that students of color disproportionately likely to attend for “personal interest” (84%) rather than “class requirement (16%). This last cycle of programs under

the James Irvine Foundation, European Americans were also likely to attend due to personal interest (74%) than “class requirement” (26%).

- In this last cycle there was an increase to improve awareness (81%) rather than to transform change (19%). There was also an increase from students of color to improve understanding (77%) rather than to transform change (23%).

Summation:

Exposure to multiculturalism on Santa Clara’s campus did occur for European Americans. On average 25.7% of European American attended Phase II CML programs as opposed to 21.2% of European Americans who attended Pre-Phase II programs – there was a 4.5% increase in attendance. Exposure to multiculturalism did take place but it is hard to assess how well this helped to improve the campus climate. Students of color (Pre-Phase 94.3 % and Phase II 83.9%) and European American’s (53.3% Pre-Phase and 48.7% Phase II) both on average attended these events because of personal interest not because they wanted to increase their knowledge of multicultural students or the programs offered to them on Santa Clara’s campus.

As a result of the information given from Table 20: In Pre-Phase II 68.4% of European Americans had an improved awareness from CML programs on campus during Phase II there was only 50.4%, which means there was a 18% drop. Throughout Pre-Phase II 52.8% of students of color had an increased awareness and in Phase II there was 56.1% of increased awareness, which means there was a slight increase of 3.3%.

Pre-Phase II 31.6% of European Americans wanted to transform or change the campus because of what they had learned from CML programs; during Phase II, 49.6% of European Americans on campus wanted to transform or change the campus – there was an increase of 18%. Whereas the desire to improve one’s awareness dropped the desire to transform or change the campus as a result of what one had learned increased by the same percent – 18. During Pre Phase II 47.2% of the students of color had the desire to transform/change the campus and in Phase II 43.8% of the students of color had the desire to transform/change the campus. This means that there was a slight drop of 3.4%. The drop from the students of color was drastically lower than that of the drop from the European Americans- but nonetheless there was still a drop.

Overall there was an increase in awareness of diversity issues on campus. There were always a higher percentage of students of color who attended for personal interest compared to most European American students attending for class requirements. A noticeable amount of students felt the need to transform/change the campus of SCU as a result of the tools gained from CML programs; whether or not students integrated these tools to change SCU campus, has not been measured. It is hard to assess how well the campus climate of SCU was improved as a result of all of this work but it can clearly be stated and realized that awareness was increased as a result of diversity programs being offered on campus.

C. New Initiatives on Diversity and Inclusive Excellence

New initiatives on diversity and inclusive excellence are currently being developed in many areas around the campus, including student life, faculty recruitment and retention, peer education, and various aspects of campus climate. A brief description of some initiatives being put into place is provided below.

I. Campus Climate

1. Faculty: An associate dean in each of the Dean's Office will be assigned to oversee faculty recruitment and retention. A faculty member serving on the Provost's Council for Diversity and Inclusive Excellence will work with each of these individuals as we move this area forward.
2. Staff: The training program for staff who works with first and second year student leaders is being revised this summer with the assistance of a consultant who is a leading expert on diversity education and training. In addition, the staff person heading up this training will be a member of the new Provost's Council for Diversity and Inclusive Excellence.
3. Students: The training of student leaders will be reviewed and revised to ensure the appreciation for differences, cultural competence, appropriate response to bias language and actions in the area of student life. The Residential Learning Community is working to bring the "Tunnel of Oppression" program to campus in fall 2007. A staff member representing student needs as it pertains to diversity and inclusive excellence will also be a member of the Provost's Council.

II. Center for Multicultural Learning

- The Center for Multicultural Learning will evolve into a different structure over the next year to increase its effectiveness and make it more sustainable. The leadership of CML will be part of the Provost's Council and will report to the Provost at the University level.

III. Core Curriculum

- In May 2007, the Board of Trustees of the University approved a new core curriculum for SCU's undergraduate students. Its requirements bring the study of diversity into the university-wide core. Funds from the Irvine Foundation, which allowed for the development of innovative diversity initiatives within the existing curriculum, were instrumental in laying the foundation for this success.

IV. Provost Council

- The newly established Provost Council on Diversity and Inclusive Excellence will build on the success of the Irvine-funded Building Partnerships for Diversity and collectively continue to provide leadership in advancing diversity as a central University-wide commitment. The Council will be made up of 5-6 faculty and staff who will address the areas of curriculum, recruitment and retention, student life and campus climate.

V. LEAD

- In 2007-2008, the LEAD program will be expanded to serve twice as many students. In addition, its focus and scope will expand from the first year to all four years of the students' undergraduate study.

3. Conclusion

The Santa Clara University community has benefited greatly from the generous grant from the James Irvine Foundation since 1998 with *Phase I* and *Phase II of Building Partnerships for Diversity*. The theme Building Partnerships for Diversity were well reflected in all the goals and programs that required campus-wide support and collaboration in order to implement. As a community we must build upon the efforts that has been set forth and to create new opportunities for partnerships in diversity.

Past authors of the *Evaluation and Transformation: Using Research for Organizational Change* (James Irvine Foundation semi-annual reports) include: Marilyn Fernandez (Sociology, past CML Director), Dawn Lee (past CML Associate Director), Laura Nichols (Sociology), Vid Raatiar (past CML Associate Director).

4. 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.

5. Financial Status Report

| Budgeted Items | Amount Budgeted | Expenditures Feb07-Jun07 | Totals to Date | Total Remaining | % Remaining |
|--|-----------------|--------------------------|----------------|-----------------|-------------|
| Student Access Initiatives | | | | | |
| Access Council | \$1,000 | \$465.28 | \$698.72 | \$301.28 | 30.13% |
| Youth Empowerment Program | \$0 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | 0.00% |
| Noche Latina and SADIE Enhancement | \$2,500 | \$1,683.08 | \$1,683.08 | \$816.92 | 32.68% |
| Student Success Initiatives | | | | | |
| Enriched Orientation & Family Engagement* | \$3,000 | \$2,591.39 | \$2,591.39* | \$408.61 | 13.62% |
| Diversity Leadership Program** | \$52,557 | \$8,021.85 | \$49,892.47* | \$2,664.94 | 5.07% |
| Diversity Outreach & Student Success Coordinator *** | \$52,646 | \$29,122.89 | \$48,355.16* | \$4,290.84 | 8.15% |
| Multicultural Curriculum Enhancement & Research Support | | | | | |
| Curriculum Development | \$20,000 | \$9,459.16 | \$17,194.32 | \$2,805.68 | 14.03% |
| Faculty of Color Support Project | \$23,000 | \$18,100.00 | \$31,948.00 | -\$8,948.00 | -38.90% |
| Faculty Advisor Development | \$1,500 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$1,500.00 | 100.00% |
| Unity House: Diversity & Civic Engagement | \$7,000 | \$1,131.43 | \$4,201.43 | \$2,798.57 | 39.98% |
| Campus Climate Initiatives | | | | | |
| Student Cultural Support Projects | \$1,500 | \$1,700.00 | \$3,000.00 | -\$1,500.00 | -100.00% |
| CML Advisory Board | \$500 | \$391.18 | \$635.66 | -\$135.66 | -27.13% |
| Diversity Speaker Series | \$20,000 | \$7,257.55 | \$16,814.55 | \$3,185.45 | 15.93% |
| Diversity Dialogue Council | \$3,000 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$3,000.00 | 100.00% |
| Women of Color Network Funds | \$200 | \$293.27 | \$497.65 | -\$297.65 | -148.83% |
| Associates Network | \$2,000 | \$1,455.82 | \$1,645.52 | \$354.48 | 17.72% |
| Diaspora Conference | \$20,000 | \$20,008.18 | \$20,008.18 | -\$8.18 | -0.04% |
| Assessment & Communication Plan | | | | | |
| Assessment Team Fees, Development | \$500 | \$50.00 | \$98.00 | \$402.00 | 80.40% |
| Marketing/Communication | \$1,000 | \$828.60 | \$1,110.43 | -\$110.43 | -11.04% |
| Totals | \$211,903 | \$102,094.40 | \$199,675.84 | \$11,227.57 | 5.30% |

Amount Budgeted indicates the amount from January – June 2007 (except for LEAD which is allocated from July 06-June 07).

6. Appendices

Appendix A: ACCESS INITIATIVES

A. Access Council

The goal of the Access Council is to increase ethnic diversity within the Santa Clara University community, with special emphasis on members of historically under-represented ethnic groups. The objective for 2006-2007 is to develop and implement student focused initiatives for the academic year that advanced the goal of the council. The council members included: Jack Ling, Mary Ho, Dennis Moberg, Laurie Laird, Nedra Shunk, Charmaine Williams, Lorenzo Gamboa, Rosa Guerra-Sarabia, Jeffrey Roush, Lulu Santana, AJ Howell-Williams, Sandra Hayes, Paul Fitzgerald, Francisco Jimenez, Laura Jimenez. The co-chairs for 2006-2007 were Marisela Rubio and Francine Davis, both from Undergraduate Admissions. The co-chairs were asked to identify challenges, successes and to make recommendations for possible future undertakings.

1. Challenges

- Internal to challenges within the Admission Office: scheduling was difficult due to both co-chairs having leadership positions in UGAD and the increase of application volume (which will continue to climb)
- Staff turnover in Admission (Web/Communication)
- Lack of consistent participation from Financial Aid Office
- No response or representation from Engineering School

2. Successes

- Unified three groups (ACCESS, LAAB, and AAAB), including voice, vision, understanding and mutual respect
- Communication among the different identities (ACCESS, LAAB & AAB)
- Becoming more focus on our overall mission and goals
- Structure and group protocols

3. Recommendations

- Institutionalize the mission and goals of the council's work, so that it becomes a campus-wide approach
- Senior-level leadership to obtain more University buy-in/acceptance
- Maintain current membership/create advisory group
- Have appropriate representation of key departments

4. Initiatives for this year

- List of scholarships for prospective and current underrepresented students
- Delivered financial aid information to Access Council

B. Noche Latina 2007

Noche Latina is an overnight recruitment (yield) program targeting admitted Latino students and their families. The program is designed to encourage admitted Latino students and their families to enroll at SCU by

connecting them with the Latino community, specifically putting them in touch with Latino students to hear about their experiences at SCU firsthand. Noche Latina is conducted in both English and Spanish.

Noche Latina 2007 attendance increased this year from 2006. A total of 62 students participated, of which 33 deposited. Overall, the evaluations demonstrated the program to be successful in creating a community for Latinos on this campus and helped them to make their decision to come to Santa Clara University.

This year Noche Latina was a huge success. Some of the positive comments include the following:

- Santa Clara is small and it was easy to find where I needed to be.
- I got a real sense of what students do here at SCU.
- My host was extremely helpful, and answered all my questions.
- Classes were very well. Surprised by how small the classes are. You can make that student-professor connection.
- Meeting people of my same race. Extremely helpful in my decision making.
- Everyone was very inviting, kind and respectful.
- My host was very welcoming even to my parents.
- Teachers are very unique and teach in different styles that gets everyone involved.
- Good set up in the dinner.
- My host was great she shared personal experiences she has had at SCU.
- The Bronco was my favorite.
- Definitely recommend Noche Latina to other students because it was helpful in my college decision making process.
- The atmosphere of the college is great.
- Love Jones was the best.
- Afternoon activities were very broad and demonstrated more than simply academics.
- Class visits were fun and interesting.
- I enjoyed learning about the different areas in engineering and being in the class.
- Talking to students in the dorms was my favorite part.
- Highly recommend Noche to other students.
- Host introduced me to a lot of people.
- Everything went smoothly.
- All my questions were answered.
- The helpful students and participants of Noche Latina, however, served as exceptional guides.
- The warm and vibrant campus, along with the affable participants of the event, made the afternoon activities enjoyable.
- My questions were answered with smiles and with personal stories that developed into thoughtful responses.
- Class visits were very informational.
- I grasped the gist of what can be expected from SCU.
- I will certainly urge future prospective students to attend Noche Latina.
- Love the location of SCU.
- My host was very helpful and made me feel at home.
- My favorite was staying with my host.
- My host was very friendly and informative.
- Sleeping in the dorms and feeling like an actual SCU student.
- I know a lot more about SCU that I did not know before.
- Welcomed me with open arms.

- Class visits were fun and entertaining.
- The program was very well organized and informative.
- Introduction to La Comunidad Latina was fun.
- Classes were fun and interesting.
- This event was very useful.
- Everyone is very friendly.
- Host had breakfast with me and that was nice.
- I feel that I know enough about SCU now.
- Loved the vibe that people give off from each other.

C. SADIE 2007

SADIE, the Student of African Descent Invitational Experience, is an overnight recruitment program targeting admitted African American students and their families. The main objective of this program is to help students make an informed decision for attending SCU by giving them and their parent general information regarding curriculum, housing, and financial aid.

SADIE 2007 attendance increased from 2007. A total of 32 students participated, of which 19 deposited. Overall, the program was successful. Some of the positive comments include the following:

- Meeting all the similar people.
- Love Jones.
- Tour.
- Student panel.
- Getting to know the peers and the school.
- Everything was great, except I wish it was a longer program.
- Doing group activities.

D. Youth Empowerment Program

Final report on schools visited:

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Oakland Boys and Girls Club | Oakland, CA | 25 |
| Downtown College Prep | San Jose, CA | 250 (2 visits) |
| MetWest High School | Oakland, CA | 30 |
| Saint Francis High School | Mountain View, CA | 25 |
| Animo Inglewood Charter High School | Inglewood, CA | 25 |
| La Paz Middle School | Salinas, CA | 30 |
| Cal-SOAP (Elementary Level) | Santa Barbara, CA | 45 |
| Pajaro Valley High School | Watsonville, CA | 150 |

Total schools: 8

Total number of students: 580

E. Leadership Excellence & Academic Development (LEAD) Program, submitted by Rosa Guerra Sarabia, Coordinator of LEAD Programs

Enriched Orientation and Family Engagement

a. Summer Orientation Dinner and Panel

The LEAD Programs Coordinator works closely with the Director of First Year Programs to schedule and implement an information session and student/faculty/staff panel exclusively for first generation college students and students of color as part of the general Summer Orientation Program.

LEAD Programs Summer Orientation Dinner

| | Summer 2003 | Summer 2004 | Summer 2005 | Summer 2006 |
|--------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Student Attendance | 18 | 30 | 16 | 94 |
| Family Attendance | 16 | 20 | 25 | 151 |

The number of attendees in the 2006 summer program outnumbered the attendance from the first three years combined due to a change in program delivery. In an effort to reach out to more students and families, the dinner and panel discussion were held during each of the six general Summer Orientation programs rather than during just one session over the summer. This format allowed the program to reach beyond the local population of students, and impacts a greater number of first generation students and their families.

b. Winter Reception

One of the original objectives was to bring at least 20 percent of LEAD students and their families to campus for an informative reception during the winter quarter. In Winter 2004, a reception was hosted; of the 100 students invited, only 6 students and their families attended. After evaluating the program with students, it was clear a stronger relationship needed to be established among families before inviting them to campus. While the desired program did not yield immediate success, additional time and effort on such programs will likely help in establishing relationships between the students and their families.

In 2005 a small group of interested Bridge students gathered to form the LEAD Student Advisory Board, but the members had little time and energy to continue with the group. The advisory board will be restructured to include nominated representatives from each cohort as well as one upper-class student to serve as co-chair. To give the board a clear direction, the board will be charged with creating a mission statement and outline goals for the year. Representatives can then review ideas for the year with their peers and bring feedback to the board.

c. Family Newsletters

Beginning 2004, LEAD students and their families received a fall and spring multilingual newsletter on the challenges and issues relevant to first year college students. For some families, this newsletter serves as the only source of information and context for their student's college experience.

Appendix B: Goal 4 - Advance a multicultural curriculum: Across all ES Courses

A. Ethnic Studies Courses Offered 2006-2007 and 2002-07 Enrollments

| | FALL 2006 | WINTER 2007 | SPRING 2007 |
|--------------------|---|---|---|
| Anthr | ANTH 90 Cross-Cultural Study of Women | ANTH 90 Cross-Cultural Study of Women ANTH 86 Native American Cultures | |
| Art/ArtHist | | | |
| Comm. | | COMM 121 Minorities & the Media | COMM 127 Intercultural Communication |
| Economics | | | |
| Education | EDUC 106 Urban Education & Multiculturalism | EDUC 106 Urban Education & Multiculturalism | |
| English | ENGL 35 African American Literature | ENGL 130 Studies in African Amer Literature | ENGL 69 Literature by Women Writers of color |
| | ENGL 36 Chicano Literature I | ENGL 155 Studies in Asian Amer Literature | ENGL 140 Studies in Chicano Literature |
| | | | ENGL 158G Native American Women Writers |
| Ethnic St. | ETHN 05 Intro to Study Race/Ethnicity in US | ETHN 05 Intro to Study Race/Ethnicity in US | ETHN 05 Intro to the Study Race&Ethnicity in US |
| | ETHN 20 Intro to Chicano Studies | ETHN 50 Intro to Filipino Amer. Studies | ETHN 20 Intro to Chicano Studies |
| | ETHN 30 Intro to African American Studies | ETHN 155 Racism in the US | ETHN 125 Latinas/os in the US |
| | ETHN 40 Intro to Asian American Studies | ETHN 190 Women of color in the US | ETHN 142 Asian American Communities |
| | ETHN 141 Asian American Women | ETHN 190 Women of color in the US | |
| History | | HIST 104 African Americans and Africa | |
| Mod Lang | | | |
| Perf. Stud | | | |
| Poli Sci | | POLI 153 Minority Politics in the US | POLI 185 Senior Seminar in Amer Politics |
| Psychology | | | |
| Relig Stud | RSOC 91 Native Spiritual Traditions | | RSOC 91 Native Spiritual Traditions |
| Sociology | SOCI 132 Social Stratification | | |
| | SOCI 153 Race, Class & Gender in the US | | |
| Theatre | | THTR 161 Amer Thr fr the Black Perspective | |

B. Fall 2002- Spring 2007 Students taking Ethnic Studies Courses Disaggregated by School and Race/Ethnicity (?)

Goal 4: Advance a multicultural curriculum (Page 16): Across all ES Courses

Table 4

| Arts & Sciences | | American Indian | % | African American | % | Latino/a | % | Asian Am PI | % | White | % | Non Resident | % | Unknown | % | Total |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|----|------------------|----|----------|-----|-------------|-----|-------|-----|--------------|----|---------|----|-------|
| 2002-03 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fall 2002 | Total Students | 19 | 1% | 72 | 3% | 370 | 14% | 382 | 14% | 1664 | 62% | 41 | 2% | 126 | 5% | 2674 |
| | Students Completing ES Courses | 2 | 1% | 8 | 3% | 71 | 28% | 35 | 14% | 120 | 47% | 4 | 2% | 14 | 6% | 254 |
| Winter 2003 | Total Students | 19 | 1% | 71 | 3% | 370 | 15% | 385 | 15% | 1643 | 65% | 34 | 1% | 18 | 1% | 2540 |
| | Students Completing ES Courses | 2 | 1% | 14 | 6% | 40 | 17% | 30 | 12% | 143 | 59% | 5 | 2% | 8 | 3% | 242 |
| Spring 2004 | Total Students | 18 | 1% | 67 | 3% | 268 | 11% | 373 | 15% | 1571 | 64% | 32 | 1% | 113 | 5% | 2442 |
| | Students Completing ES Courses | 1 | 1% | 5 | 3% | 34 | 18% | 34 | 18% | 110 | 58% | 1 | 1% | 6 | 3% | 191 |
| 2003-04 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fall 2003 | Total Students | 20 | 1% | 70 | 3% | 388 | 14% | 372 | 14% | 1682 | 62% | 38 | 1% | 124 | 5% | 2694 |
| | Students Completing ES Courses | 3 | 1% | 10 | 4% | 39 | 17% | 39 | 17% | 134 | 59% | 0 | 0% | 3 | 1% | 228 |
| Winter 2004 | Total Students | 22 | 1% | 67 | 2% | 380 | 14% | 369 | 14% | 1666 | 62% | 39 | 1% | 138 | 5% | 2681 |
| | Students Completing ES Courses | 1 | 0% | 3 | 1% | 49 | 19% | 39 | 15% | 158 | 60% | 3 | 1% | 10 | 4% | 263 |
| Spring 2004 | Total Students | 22 | 1% | 65 | 3% | 360 | 14% | 359 | 14% | 1601 | 62% | 38 | 1% | 118 | 5% | 2563 |
| | Students Completing ES Courses | 2 | 1% | 10 | 5% | 27 | 12% | 32 | 15% | 140 | 64% | 4 | 2% | 3 | 1% | 218 |
| 2004-05 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fall 2004 | Total Students | 22 | 1% | 89 | 3% | 374 | 13% | 416 | 15% | 1710 | 61% | 62 | 2% | 125 | 4% | 2798 |
| | Students Completing ES Courses | 1 | 1% | 9 | 5% | 38 | 23% | 29 | 18% | 80 | 49% | 4 | 2% | 3 | 2% | 164 |
| Winter 2005 | Total Students | 19 | 1% | 84 | 3% | 378 | 14% | 420 | 15% | 1697 | 61% | 36 | 1% | 133 | 5% | 2767 |
| | Students Completing ES Courses | 0 | 0% | 16 | 7% | 54 | 24% | 34 | 15% | 107 | 47% | 7 | 3% | 11 | 5% | 229 |
| Spring 2005 | Total Students | 17 | 1% | 80 | 3% | 369 | 14% | 399 | 15% | 1621 | 61% | 36 | 1% | 132 | 5% | 2654 |
| | Students Completing ES Courses | 1 | 1% | 5 | 3% | 43 | 22% | 30 | 15% | 100 | 51% | 4 | 2% | 12 | 6% | 195 |
| 2005-06 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fall 2005 | Total Students | 21 | 1% | 80 | 3% | 386 | 14% | 420 | 15% | 1728 | 61% | 42 | 1% | 160 | 6% | 2837 |
| | Students Completing ES Courses | 2 | 1% | 15 | 6% | 42 | 17% | 45 | 18% | 123 | 49% | 6 | 2% | 18 | 7% | 251 |
| Winter 2006 | Total Students | 20 | 1% | 79 | 3% | 374 | 13% | 421 | 15% | 1736 | 62% | 38 | 1% | 145 | 5% | 2813 |
| | Students Completing ES Courses | 2 | 1% | 20 | 7% | 55 | 18% | 49 | 16% | 152 | 51% | 6 | 2% | 15 | 5% | 299 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|--------------------------------|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|----|----|-----|----|------|
| Spring 2006 | Total Students | 19 | 1% | 71 | 3% | 360 | 14% | 401 | 15% | 1640 | 62% | 34 | 1% | 140 | 5% | 2665 |
| | Students Completing ES Courses | 0 | 0% | 20 | 9% | 51 | 22% | 30 | 13% | 123 | 54% | 1 | 0% | 4 | 2% | 229 |
| 2006-07 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fall 2006 | Total Students | 20 | 1% | 74 | 3% | 382 | 13% | 389 | 13% | 1739 | 60% | 51 | 2% | 237 | 8% | 2892 |
| | Students Completing ES Courses | 0 | 0% | 11 | 6% | 35 | 20% | 21 | 12% | 84 | 49% | 8 | 5% | 13 | 8% | 172 |
| Winter 2007 | Total Students | 19 | 1% | 74 | 3% | 358 | 13% | 363 | 13% | 1625 | 60% | 47 | 2% | 243 | 9% | 2729 |
| | Students Completing ES Courses | 1 | 1% | 12 | 6% | 39 | 21% | 26 | 14% | 98 | 52% | 4 | 2% | 8 | 4% | 188 |
| Spring 2007 | Total Students | 17 | 1% | 70 | 3% | 341 | 13% | 339 | 13% | 1544 | 60% | 40 | 2% | 233 | 9% | 2584 |
| | Students Completing ES Courses | 1 | 1% | 6 | 5% | 36 | 30% | 17 | 14% | 50 | 41% | 4 | 3% | 7 | 6% | 171 |

| Business | | American Indian | % | African American | % | Latino/a | % | Asian Am PI | % | White | % | Non Resident | % | Unknown | % | Total |
|-----------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|----|------------------|----|----------|-----|-------------|-----|-------|-----|--------------|----|---------|-----|-------|
| 2002-03 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fall 2002 | Total Students | 7 | 1% | 10 | 1% | 170 | 13% | 315 | 23% | 739 | 55% | 52 | 4% | 50 | 4% | 1343 |
| | Students Completing ES Courses | 0 | 0% | 1 | 4% | 13 | 57% | 1 | 4% | 6 | 26% | 0 | 0% | 2 | 9% | 23 |
| Winter 2003 | Total Students | 7 | 1% | 10 | 1% | 164 | 12% | 315 | 23% | 736 | 55% | 61 | 5% | 55 | 4% | 1348 |
| | Students Completing ES Courses | 0 | 0% | 1 | 4% | 2 | 8% | 9 | 38% | 9 | 38% | 0 | 0% | 3 | 13% | 24 |
| Spring 2003 | Total Students | 6 | 0% | 8 | 1% | 153 | 12% | 285 | 23% | 692 | 55% | 59 | 5% | 53 | 4% | 1256 |
| | Students Completing ES Courses | 1 | 3% | 1 | 3% | 7 | 20% | 9 | 26% | 17 | 49% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 35 |
| 2003-04 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fall 2003 | Total Students | 6 | 0% | 13 | 1% | 156 | 12% | 295 | 22% | 725 | 55% | 75 | 6% | 56 | 4% | 1326 |
| | Students Completing ES Courses | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 5 | 22% | 8 | 35% | 8 | 35% | 2 | 9% | 0 | 0% | 23 |
| Winter 2004 | Total Students | 5 | 0% | 13 | 1% | 162 | 12% | 286 | 22% | 717 | 54% | 76 | 6% | 58 | 4% | 1317 |
| | Students Completing ES Courses | 0 | 0% | 2 | 6% | 3 | 9% | 8 | 24% | 19 | 56% | 1 | 3% | 1 | 3% | 34 |
| Spring 2004 | Total Students | 5 | 0% | 14 | 1% | 154 | 13% | 263 | 22% | 662 | 54% | 69 | 6% | 54 | 4% | 1221 |
| | Students Completing ES Courses | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 6 | 12% | 22 | 43% | 20 | 39% | 1 | 2% | 2 | 4% | 51 |
| 2004-05 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fall 2004 | Total Students | 5 | 0% | 29 | 2% | 161 | 11% | 297 | 20% | 798 | 55% | 93 | 6% | 69 | 5% | 1452 |
| | Students Completing ES Courses | 1 | 5% | 0 | 0% | 8 | 36% | 7 | 32% | 4 | 18% | 1 | 5% | 1 | 5% | 22 |
| Winter 2005 | Total Students | 5 | 0% | 29 | 2% | 163 | 11% | 290 | 20% | 808 | 56% | 73 | 5% | 64 | 4% | 1432 |
| | Students Completing ES Courses | 0 | 0% | 1 | 2% | 6 | 14% | 16 | 37% | 17 | 40% | 0 | 0% | 3 | 7% | 43 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|--------------------------------|---|----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|-----|-----|-----|------|
| Spring 2005 | Total Students | 5 | 0% | 30 | 2% | 159 | 12% | 270 | 20% | 759 | 56% | 66 | 5% | 58 | 4% | 1347 |
| | Students Completing ES Courses | 0 | 0% | 4 | 7% | 13 | 22% | 18 | 31% | 20 | 34% | 3 | 5% | 1 | 2% | 59 |
| 2005-06 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fall 2005 | Total Students | 4 | 0% | 35 | 2% | 177 | 12% | 301 | 21% | 775 | 54% | 72 | 5% | 76 | 5% | 1440 |
| | Students Completing ES Courses | 0 | 0% | 3 | 6% | 12 | 24% | 16 | 33% | 13 | 27% | 3 | 6% | 2 | 4% | 49 |
| Winter 2006 | Total Students | 6 | 0% | 36 | 2% | 179 | 12% | 316 | 21% | 805 | 54% | 72 | 5% | 77 | 5% | 1491 |
| | Students Completing ES Courses | 0 | 0% | 1 | 4% | 6 | 23% | 11 | 42% | 7 | 27% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 4% | 26 |
| Spring 2006 | Total Students | 5 | 0% | 36 | 3% | 173 | 12% | 299 | 21% | 758 | 53% | 74 | 5% | 76 | 5% | 1421 |
| | Students Completing ES Courses | 0 | 0% | 2 | 6% | 8 | 22% | 11 | 31% | 11 | 31% | 4 | 11% | 0 | 0% | 36 |
| Fall 2006 | Total Students | 6 | 8% | 41 | 3% | 195 | 12% | 324 | 20% | 834 | 51% | 77 | 5% | 146 | 9% | 1623 |
| | Student Completing ES Courses | 0 | 0% | 2 | 6% | 8 | 25% | 4 | 13% | 12 | 38% | 1 | 3% | 5 | 16% | 32 |
| Winter 2007 | Total Students | 7 | 0% | 40 | 2% | 199 | 12% | 323 | 20% | 861 | 52% | 70 | 4% | 152 | 9% | 1652 |
| | Student Completing ES Courses | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 5 | 19% | 10 | 38% | 7 | 27% | 0 | 0% | 4 | 15% | 26 |
| Spring 2007 | Total Students | 7 | 0% | 40 | 2% | 197 | 12% | 314 | 19% | 854 | 52% | 72 | 4% | 155 | 9% | 1639 |
| | Student Completing ES Courses | 0 | 0% | 5 | 16% | 7 | 22% | 14 | 44% | 3 | 9% | 1 | 3% | 2 | 6% | 32 |

Engineering

| | | American Indian | % | African American | % | Latino/a | % | Asian Am PI | % | White | % | Non Resident | % | Unknown | % | Total |
|----------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|----|------------------|-----|----------|-----|-------------|-----|-------|-----|--------------|----|---------|-----|-------|
| 2002-03 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fall 2002 | Total Students | 0 | 0% | 11 | 2% | 71 | 11% | 188 | 30% | 295 | 47% | 29 | 5% | 32 | 5% | 626 |
| | Students Completing ES Courses | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 3 | 60% | 1 | 20% | 1 | 20% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 5 |
| Winter 2003 | Total Students | 0 | 0% | 8 | 1% | 67 | 11% | 180 | 30% | 282 | 47% | 33 | 6% | 28 | 5% | 598 |
| | Students Completing ES Courses | 0 | 0% | 2 | 15% | 0 | 0% | 4 | 31% | 6 | 46% | 1 | 8% | 0 | 0% | 13 |
| Spring 2003 | Total Students | 0 | 0% | 7 | 1% | 65 | 11% | 174 | 30% | 270 | 47% | 32 | 6% | 27 | 5% | 575 |
| | Students Completing ES Courses | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 2 | 13% | 9 | 56% | 4 | 25% | 1 | 6% | 0 | 0% | 16 |
| 2003-04 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fall 2003 | Total Students | 1 | 0% | 4 | 1% | 64 | 12% | 154 | 29% | 259 | 49% | 24 | 5% | 25 | 5% | 531 |
| | Students Completing ES Courses | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 11% | 4 | 44% | 3 | 33% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 11% | 9 |
| Winter 2004 | Total Students | 1 | 0% | 4 | 1% | 57 | 11% | 141 | 28% | 242 | 48% | 28 | 6% | 29 | 6% | 502 |
| | Students Completing ES Courses | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 33% | 2 | 67% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 3 |
| Spring 2004 | Total Students | 1 | 0% | 4 | 1% | 54 | 11% | 138 | 28% | 230 | 47% | 27 | 6% | 32 | 7% | 486 |
| | Students Completing ES Courses | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 5 | 63% | 1 | 13% | 0 | 0% | 2 | 25% | 8 |

| | | 2004-05 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|--------------------------------|----------------|----|----|-----|----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|----|-----|----|-----|-----|
| Fall 2004 | Total Students | 2 | 0% | 7 | 1% | 58 | 12% | 144 | 29% | 218 | 45% | 32 | 7% | 28 | 6% | 489 |
| | Students Completing ES Courses | 0 | 0% | | 0% | 4 | 67% | 2 | 33% | | 0% | | 0% | | 0% | 6 |
| Winter 2005 | Total Students | 2 | 0% | 7 | 1% | 56 | 12% | 140 | 30% | 208 | 44% | 31 | 7% | 28 | 6% | 472 |
| | Students Completing ES Courses | 0 | 0% | 1 | 11% | 4 | 44% | 2 | 22% | 1 | 11% | 1 | 11% | 0 | 0% | 9 |
| Spring 2005 | Total Students | 2 | 0% | 7 | 2% | 49 | 11% | 135 | 30% | 203 | 45% | 30 | 7% | 27 | 6% | 453 |
| | Students Completing ES Courses | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 4 | 31% | 4 | 31% | 3 | 23% | 2 | 15% | 0 | 0% | 13 |
| | | 2005-06 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fall 2005 | Total Students | 4 | 1% | 9 | 2% | 48 | 11% | 127 | 28% | 215 | 47% | 24 | 5% | 30 | 7% | 457 |
| | Students Completing ES Courses | 0 | 0% | 1 | 13% | 1 | 13% | 1 | 13% | 4 | 50% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 13% | 8 |
| Winter 2006 | Total Students | 4 | 1% | 9 | 2% | 50 | 11% | 126 | 28% | 213 | 47% | 22 | 5% | 34 | 7% | 458 |
| | Students Completing ES Courses | 0 | 0% | 3 | 60% | 0 | 0% | 2 | 40% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 5 |
| Spring 2006 | Total Students | 4 | 1% | 10 | 2% | 48 | 11% | 122 | 27% | 208 | 47% | 20 | 5% | 32 | 7% | 444 |
| | Students Completing ES Courses | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 17% | 2 | 33% | 2 | 33% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 17% | 6 |
| Fall 2006 | Total Students | 4 | 1% | 17 | 3% | 51 | 10% | 134 | 26% | 247 | 47% | 15 | 3% | 55 | 11% | 523 |
| | Students Completing ES Courses | 0 | 0% | 1 | 11% | 1 | 11% | 5 | 56% | 2 | 22% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 9 |
| Winter 2007 | Total Students | 3 | 1% | 17 | 3% | 46 | 9% | 128 | 25% | 245 | 49% | 12 | 2 | 54 | 11% | 505 |
| | Students Completing ES Courses | 0 | 0% | 3 | 30% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 5 | 50% | 0 | 0% | 2 | 20% | 10 |
| Spring 2007 | Total Students | 3 | 1% | 16 | 3% | 45 | 9% | 125 | 26% | 231 | 48% | 11 | 2% | 54 | 11% | 485 |
| | Students Completing ES Courses | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 2 | 100% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 2 |

Appendix C: Irvine Funded Programs (January – June 2007)

A. Faculty of Color Support Initiative Projects

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

\$1,000, Lorenzo Gamboa (staff), Undergraduate Admissions
“Border Studies Seminar for Educators”

Lorenzo Gamboa, a staff of color, from Undergraduate Admissions requested funds to attend the Border Studies Seminar for Educators. The Border Studies Seminar explored the complexities of the U.S./Mexico border through a joint analysis of the core themes such as, immigration policy and law, root causes of migration, human rights and labor conditions. Gamboa will present his findings during academic year 2007-2008.

\$5,000, Tokunbo Ogunfunmi, Department of Electrical Engineering

“Minority Engineering Student Advising and Mentoring for Career Advancement”

Minority students in undergraduate and graduate schools in electrical engineering in the United States are quite few. This project will implement new ways to enhance mentoring for retention, graduation and career advancement for minority graduate and undergraduate students in engineering at Santa Clara University during academic year 2007-2008.

\$1,000, Leslie Carson, Liberal Studies Program

“20th Annual National Conference on Race and Ethnicity in Higher Education (NCORE)”

This project supported Carson to attend the 20th Anniversary of NCORE. Her attendance at NCORE helped her research agenda on the analysis of racial and ethnic identity development of African American college students.

\$2,200, Jordana Moore Saggese, Department of Art & Art History

“Jean Michel Basquiat and the Language of Creativity”

This project will allow Saggese to travel to Zurich, Switzerland summer 2007 to further her research on Jean-Michael Basquiat. Her travel will take her to Galerie Bruno Bischofberger where an extensive archives of photographs, personal drawings and correspondence are related to Basquiat.

\$5,000, Brett Solomon, The Office of College Special Programs

“Math Masters 2007”

The Math Masters program is a summer Math Analysis (pre-calculus) course that provides students with an entire academic year (two semesters) of pre-calculus in 6 weeks. The goal would be that students will be able to enroll in Calculus during their junior or senior years of high school. The rationale behind offering such a course relates to the benefits of the successful completion of Calculus on their high school transcript when they apply to college, as well as to boost the numbers of students of color in math and science disciplines.

\$2,600, Aldo Billingslea, Department of Theatre and Dance

“From the Bayou to the Bay: Stories of Hurricane Katrina Survivors transplanted to the Bay Area”

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. The theatre course, “American Theatre from the Black Perspective” attended the play with a predominantly African American cast and had the opportunity to meet 16 Katrina survivors who are all African descent.

\$1,980, Aparajita Nanda, Department of English

“Politicizing the Discourse of Healing and Reconciliation: The Oankali Agenda in Octavia Butler’s Adulthood Rites”

Her work will be presented at the 14th triennial conference of ACLALS (Association of Commonwealth Language and Literature Studies summer 2007). The paper questions the “moral values” involved in the discourse of ethnic health and healing and exposes the issues of racism and discrimination to initiating a sense of cultural respect that would accept ethnic “difference” as a part of community life.

\$2,500, Yahia Mahamdi, Department of Communication

“The Search for Inclusivity at Santa Clara University”

The Search for Inclusivity is a feature-length documentary film that investigates the racial tensions at Santa Clara University. The genesis of the idea for this film began with the news of the “South of the Border” theme party and the reactions of the SCU community which culminated in the Unity March and Paul Locatelli’s. The intent of this documentary is to weave together two interrelated stories. The objective of this film is two-fold: to heighten people’s awareness and sensitivity to the impact of racist behaviors on people of color and to convey to SCU students, faculty, and administrators that there are real tensions on campus.

Phase II Faculty of Color Support Grants:

a. Art & Art History

1. \$1,000 for “Dart Matter: The Art of David Huffman”
2. And Ethnic Studies department—\$4,050 for “Recovered Views: African American Portraits 1912-1925 and Here and Now”
3. \$5000 for “Connections and Links Between the Contemporary Application of Monumental Press-Molded Paper Constructions Used in Community Performance Events in Spain with Mexican-American Folk Art Traditions”
4. \$2180 for “Research in New York for Harlem Exhibition Articles”
5. \$5,000 for “Acquisitions for Diversity: African American Women in Visual Arts”
\$5,000 for “Acquisitions for Diversity: African Americans and Photography”
\$2,200 for “Jean Michel Basquiat and the Language of Creativity”

b. Biology Department and Chemistry.

1. \$7,000 for “Students of Color in Science: Institutionalizing a Multicultural Research Environment”
2. \$3,720 for “Student of Color in Science: Institutionalizing a Multicultural Research Environment
3. \$5,000 for “Student Summer Research”

c. Center for Student Leadership

1. \$460 for “Leadership Poster Series”

d. Communication Department

1. \$2,500 for "The Search for Inclusivity at Santa Clara University"

e. de Saisset Museum

1. \$600 for “Thursdays in May at the de Saisset Museum”
2. \$1500 for “Peaceful Painter: Hibiko Hibi”
3. \$4,000for “Spring 2005 College Night”

f. Electrical Engineering Department

1. \$5,000 for "Minority Engineering Student Advising and Mentoring for Career Advancement"

g. English Department

1. \$2,000 for “New Paradigms in U.S. Critical Race Studies”

2. And Women's and Gender Studies Department—\$700.00 for “Out There: The First National Conference of Scholars and Student Affairs Personnel involved in LGBTQ Issues on Catholic Campuses”
 3. \$4,963 for “Remembering the Rank and File: The Unheard Voices of the Black Panther Party”
 4. \$1,980 for "Politicizing the Discourse of Healing and Reconciliation: The Oankali Agenda in Octavia Butler's Adulthood Rites"
- h. Environmental Science/Studies Department
 1. \$4800 for “Restoration of a rare hemiparasitic plan: California’s seaside bird’s beak”
 - i. Finance School of Business
 1. \$3,200 for “Social Justice Oriented Business Student Internships”
 - j. Liberal Studies Program
 1. \$1,000 for "20th Annual National Conference on Race and Ethnicity in Higher Education (NCORE)"
 - k. Management School of Business
 1. \$5,400 for “The Drivers of Competitive Heterogeneity”
 - l. Modern Languages & Literature Department
 1. \$1,066 for “Translation of 19th Century documents from the Pueblo de San Jose de Guadalupe”
 2. \$1,001 for “Promoting Civic and Community Engagement in Intermediate French, German, Italian, and Spanish”
 - m. Music and Dance Department
 1. \$5,000 for “Carl Upchurch: An American Shaman goes to Edinburgh Fringe Festival”
 - n. Office of College Special Programs
 1. \$5,000 for "Math Masters 2007"
 - o. Office of Undergraduate Admission
 1. \$1,701 for “Igwebuike Retreat”
 2. \$1,000 for "Border Studies Seminar for Educators"
 - p. Political Science Department
 1. And Ethnic studies. \$920.00 for “Pathways to Political Incorporation—Asian and Latino Elected Officials in California”
 2. \$4,386 for “Research Support, Student of Color Mentoring & Conference Attendance of a Junior Faculty of Color”
 - q. Psychology department
 1. \$5,000 for “The Mental Health of Undocumented and Documented Latino Immigrants”
 - r. School of Engineering
 1. \$5,000 for “Promoting Sustainable Engineering Practices in a Multicultural Environment”
 - s. Sociology/Ethnic Studies
 1. \$3,360 for “Strengthening Research Skills Among Undergraduate Students of Color”
 - t. Theatre & Dance Department
 1. \$3,000 for “Scholarship Support for Othello, Anna Christie, and Potential Productions”
 2. \$1950 for MLK, Jr. Night
 3. \$2,600 for "From the Bayou to the Bay: Stories of Hurricane Katrina Survivors Transplanted to the Bay Area.

B. Curriculum Development Initiative Projects

The CML Advisory Board has been responsible for reviewing and making appropriate decisions on grant proposals for the Curriculum Development Fund. The following projects have been approved and funded by this particular line item:

\$5,000, Jean Molesky-Poz, Religious Studies Department
“Developing Resources for Native Spiritual Traditions”

This project will enhance the curricular design, resources and pedagogical practices for two courses in the Religious Studies Department for RSOC 91 Native Spiritual Traditions and RSOC 33, Maya Spirituality. The funding from this project will allow the department to build a DVD collection, invite speakers and to take students on Native American programs for academic year 2007-2008.

\$4353.98, Alma Garcia, Department of Sociology
“Latina Day Laborers: Gendered Struggles in Silicon Valley”

This project will document the lives of Latinas whose labor facilitates the economy of the Silicon Valley by providing an important source of labor that is mostly “invisible” from the formal and regulated vulnerability. These interviews will be incorporated into the curriculum by integrating actual transcripts, audio recordings and edited narratives as assigned material in the Soc. 33 – Social Programs in the United States, Soc. 135, Women & Social Change in Latin America and Soc. 118 – Qualitative Methods for academic year 2007-2008.

Phase II Curriculum Development Grants

a. Art & Art History

1. And Ethnic studies \$2,900 for “Increasing the Visibility of Communities of Color Through Art history and Ethnic Studies Core Curriculum”
2. \$3000.00 for “Exploring Society Through Photography”
3. \$5,000 for “California Native Art”

b. English Department

1. \$1350 for “Woke Up One Morning: The Documentary Photography of Ben Cochran”
2. \$4,342.31 for “The Photo Essay and Moments of Racial Crisis in the United States”

c. Modern Languages and Literature Department

1. \$3354 for “The Legacy Project”

d. Religious Studies Department

1. \$5000 for “Developing Resources for Native Spiritual Traditions”

e. Sociology Department

1. \$4353.98 for “Latina Day Laborers: Gendered Struggles in Silicon Valley”

C. Diversity Speaker Series Initiative Projects

The CML Advisory Board has been responsible for reviewing and making appropriate decisions on grant proposals for the Diversity Speaker Series Fund. The following projects have been approved and funded by this particular line item:

\$3,200, Karen Kienzle, de Saisset Museum
“California Native American Summit”

The summit brought together Native Californians, scholars, and museum professionals to discuss ways the Museum can incorporate native voices, narratives, and perspectives into the exhibition. The discussions and information obtained from the summit will provide guidelines for the Museum as it moves forward in the development of the new California History exhibition.

\$1,500, James Lai, Ethnic Studies Program

“The Second Annual Ethnic Studies Distinguished Alumni Speaker Series: Transforming Our Lives, Transforming the World”

The speaker series gave an opportunity for students (current and alumni), staff and faculty a way to explore the complex meanings of race and ethnicity in our world from one individual’s perspective who was an Ethnic Studies minor and a graduate of Santa Clara University. California State Assembly

Member Alberto Torrico graduated from Santa Clara University in 1991 was chosen as this year's alumni speaker.

\$1,000, Karen Kienzle, de Saisset Museum

“Miniature Worlds: Art from India Community Days”

This project provided the entire Santa Clara University community with a unique opportunity to experience the art of India. The exhibition, which took place in Spring 2007 featured watercolors, drawings, and sculpture spanning 400 years of Indian history. Drawn from the permanent collection of The Art Complex Museum in Duxbury, MA, the exhibition illuminates various forms of Indic media from the 15th to the 19th centuries as well as aspects of the country's religion and history.

\$1,550, Lisa Millora, Office of Student Life

“Speaking Out: A Video Portrait of SCU Student of Color”

This project documented the current experiences of SCU students of color in a 10 minute video. This video gave students of color a safe space to share their experience. This video project was distributed to the CML Advisory Board. The funding supported the technical pieces involved to make this video project.

Phase II Diversity Speaker Series Grants:

- a. Art & Art History/Ethnic Studies
 1. \$2,000 for “Conversations: Women Collaborate”
- b. Campus Ministry
 1. \$3000 for “Dream Alive! A Celebration of Black History with Kim and Reggie Harris”
- c. English Department
 1. \$1000 for Fissures and Sutures: Sources of Division and Mutual Aid in Postcolonial Reflections on History and Literature—An International Conference”
- d. Ethnic Studies
 1. \$1000.00 for “Ethnic Studies Alumni Speaker Series”
 2. \$1,500 for “The Second Annual Ethnic Studies Distinguished Alumni Speaker Series”
- e. de Saisset Museum
 1. \$5,000 for “Sixth Street Photography Workshop”
 2. \$3,200 for “California Native American Summit”
 3. \$1,000 for “Miniature Worlds: Art from India Community Days”
- f. Liberal Studies Department
 1. \$1,630 for “MLK Jr. Knight”
- g. Music Department
 1. \$5,000 for “Musica para El Dia de los Muertos”
 2. \$500 for “A City Called Heaven: Guest Composer Olly Wilson”
 3. \$5000 for “Santa Clara New Music Festival 2006, Featuring guest Composer Chen Yi”
- h. Office of Student Life
 1. \$1,550 for “Speaking Out: A Video Portrait of SCU Student of Color”
- i. Other
 1. “David Roche: Keynote Speaker, Humorist, Performer”
- j. Religious Studies Department
 1. \$600 for “Worlds Apart: Screening, panel, and Research Exploration”
2. Theatre and Dance Department
 1. \$1500 for “Guest Lecturer: Jonathan Adams”
 2. \$2625 for “Martin Luther King Jr.”

3. \$1300 for “The Fatherhood Project—a Multicultural Dialogue through Performance, Photography, and Interactive Workshop”
 4. \$2000 for “A Killing in Choctaw”
 5. \$1000 for “Gem of the Ocean”
3. Women’s and Gender Studies Program
 1. \$1000 for “Women’s History Month Programs”
 2. \$2,200 for “Women’s and Gender Studies Spring 2007 Guest Speaker”

D. Residential Education Initiative Projects

The Residential Education Council has been responsible for reviewing and making appropriate decisions on grant proposals for the Residential Education Fund. The following projects have been approved and funded by this particular line item:

\$1144.00, Seth Grossman, Residential Learning Communities
 “Senior Staff Formation, Avenue Q”

As part of the senior staff formation, the staff will attend the musical “Avenue Q”. “Avenue Q” tells a story of a young man who recently graduated from college and embarks on a journey. The show discusses pertinent world issues such as different socio-economic classes, different races and ethnicities, different sexual orientations, and bi-racial relationships. After seeing the musical, the senior staff of RLC will discuss all the issues that were brought to light in the play.

Phase II Residential Education Initiative Projects:

- a. Dance Department
 3. \$870 for “Alvin Ailey American Dance Theatre”
 4. \$0.00 for “trip to see a performance by the Bill T. Jones Dance Company”
- b. De Saisset Museum
 1. \$2,000 for “Americanos: Latino Life in the United States”
- c. English Department
 1. \$2100 for “Reading and Classroom Visits by Professor Greg Sarris
 2. \$800 for “Culture Clash: Zorro in Hell at the Berkeley Repertory Theatre”
- d. Environmental Studies
 1. \$450 for “Exploring Environmental Justice in East Palo Alto with YUCA”
- e. Ethnic Studies
 1. \$1000 for “Understanding and Appreciating Difference”
- f. Ethnic Studies and Art History Department
 1. \$940 for “Angel Island Trip”
 2. \$2,750 for “Conversations: Women Collaborate
 3. \$1,351.57 for “China Town Alley Tour”
 4. \$1588.26 for “San Francisco Chinatown Alley Tour”
- g. Ethnic Studies and Sociology Department
 1. \$700 for “Black Panther Tour
 2. \$270.63 for “San Jose Historic Chinatown Tour”
- h. Modern Languages Department
 1. \$40 for “Asia Night”
- i. And English Department—\$400 for “Visiting Scholar Alfred Arteaga”
- j. Political Science Department
 1. \$250 for “Visiting Scholar Doris Godl, Ph.D.
 2. \$218 for “Trip to see a production of the play “Pentecost”
- k. Religious Studies Department
 1. \$5,000 for “Local Religion in the South Bay Project”

2. \$300 for “Visiting Scholar Father Dugan”
 3. \$746.81 for “Asian Art Museum Trip”
 4. \$380 for “Latino Theologians Talks”
 5. \$375 for “Interfaith Dialogue in Silicon Valley: Students and Zen and Catholic Meditation Masters Talk about Meditations Power to Transfer Suffering”
 6. \$450 for “Course on Hispanic Theology
- l. Students
 1. \$58.75 for “Lunch with Amy Anderson”
 2. \$200 for “Behind the Swoosh: Sweatshops and Social Justice
 - m. Theatre Department
 1. \$375 for “Teatro Vision Field Trip and Speakers”
 2. \$1,000 for “Guest Lecturer: Jonathan Adams”
 3. \$0.00 for trip to see a production of the play “People’s Temple”
 4. \$63 for “Cantinflas! Production”
 5. \$150 for “Visiting actor Rosamaria Escalante from El Teatro Campesino”
 6. \$800 for “A Visit to see ALozo King’s Lines Ballet”
 7. \$1050 for “From the Bayou to the Bay: Stories of Hurricane Katrina Survivors transplanted to the Bay Area”
 8. \$500 for “The Relationship of French Society to African Art”
 - n. Women’s and Gender Studies Program
 1. \$834.76 for “Women’s History Month Programs”
 2. \$700 for “Women’s History Month Programs”

E. Student Cultural Support Projects

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:

\$500, MEChA-El Frente

“El Frente’s Cena Familiar”

This event gave an opportunity for everyone to celebrate Latino heritage through food and performance. The event was opened to the entire Santa Clara University community. This year, Dr. Ramon Chacon, Ethnic/Chicano faculty who has served Santa Clara University for 25 years was honored. The funding request was used to support the mariachi group.

\$500, Asian Pacific Student Union (APSU)

“APSU, 19th Annual Cultural Show, Take Me On”

“Take Me On” was a cultural show hosted for the entire community with the mission of increasing cultural awareness. The show brought about ideas and experiences regarding stereotypes in the Asian community that APSU members can relate to. The year’s theme focused on identity in the Asian community.

\$500, Students from Intermediate Spanish Studies

“Encuentro”

The program, Encuentro was to raise awareness and promote understanding of the Latino immigrant community in the context of Santa Clara University and the larger community. The organizers invited speakers from the St. Joseph Day Worker Center and to sit on a panel to answer questions about immigration and how their lives were affected by their position in the community. This program was opened to the entire SCU and local community.

\$500, Barkada

“Pilipino Cultural Night 2007”

The Pilipino Cultural Night 2007 celebrated the Pilipino culture through performances and acts. The year’s skit focused on a family coming together upon the passing of a beloved grandfather. The story covered societal issues that affect the Filipino-American community. This included parental expectations regarding education, Filipino stereotypes, identity crisis, family cohesion and how to live life. The event was opened to the SCU community and family and friends.

\$500, Intandesh

“Rangeeli Shaam VII”

Rangeeli Shaam VII represents the unity between the cultures of the East and West, bringing together the South Asian tradition and American influence. This year’s show used the bollywood format to showcase different dances, songs and stories of 10 strangers traveling to various parts of South Asia. The play will take the audience to various parts of South Asia. The event was opened to the SCU community and family and friends.

\$500, Intandesh

“Miniature Worlds: Art from India”

This event is a College Night event co-sponsored by the de Saisset Museum and Intandesh. The event was opened to the public and provided a unique opportunity for all the experience the art of India. The exhibition featured watercolors, drawings, and sculpture spanning 400 years of Indian history. Aside from the art exhibition, there are also food and performances.

\$500, Vietnamese Student Association (VSA)

“Embracing Roots, VSA Cultural Show”

This event is the annual Vietnamese cultural show. The goal of the cultural show was to educate, challenge and a sharing of a different culture. The show included cultural and historical aspects through cultural and modern dances, singing intertwined in a skit. The event was opened to the SCU community and family and friends.

\$500, MEChA-El Frente

“Nuestras Raices, 2nd Annual Cultural Show”

The 2nd annual cultural show celebrated the Latino heritage through music, performance, and drama. The main goal was to create an environment of *familia* while emphasizing the importance of the preservation of our cultural roots. The main story line focused on immigration which was told through dance, music and drama. The event was opened for the entire SCU community and family and friends.

\$500, Arab Cultural Society

“Fann Wa Tarab, Entertainment from the Arab World”

The 4th annual production of Fann Wa Tarab showcased performers, art, fashion, and food from the Arabic culture. Performances included traditional belly dancers, traditional musical instrumentation, poetry, debke dancing and a fashion show. The aim of this event is to educate and bring the community together.

\$500, Igwebuike

“Igwebuike Retreat”

The Igwebuike student retreat fostered camaraderie among club members through a series of group activities, trust building exercises, free expression of ideas and motivational speakers. During this time, the club will evaluate the direction of the club and will provide input to move the organization forward. The retreat goal is to strengthen leadership and relationships among the executive board and club members.

\$250, Ka Mana’o ‘O Hawaii

“Ka Mana’o ‘O Kanikapila:

‘O Kanikapila is a concert deeply rooted in Hawaiian music and culture. The participants in the project brought two bands local to Hawai’i. This is the first Hawaiian concert on this campus. The goal of this program is to build community amongst the Hawaiian student community as well as to share the music and culture with the SCU campus.

Phase II Student Support Projects:

1. \$500 for “Raza Day 2003”
2. \$1,500 for “Cinco de Mayo week”
3. \$500 for “Asian American History X: APSU Cultural Show”
4. \$500 for “Global Village 2004”
5. \$500 for “CSA 2nd Annual Cultural Show”
6. \$238 for “CSA Chinatown Cultural Scavenger Hunt”
7. “\$500 for “Return to Viet-Nam”
8. \$500 for “Rangeeli Shaam V”
9. \$500 for “ACS Shaab il Salaam”
10. \$400 for “14th Annual Pilipino Cultural Nigh”
11. \$500 for “04-05 National Hispanic Business Association Leadership Conference”
12. \$500 for “Raza Day 2004”
13. \$500 for “AIDS Awareness Week”
14. \$500 for “Rangeeli Shaam VI
15. \$500 for “Tarab Ebbladna (Entertainment from Our Homeland)”
16. \$500 for “Global Village”
17. \$500 for “3rd Annual CSA Cultural Show”
18. \$500 for “Barkada’s 15th Annual Pilipino Cultural Night”
19. \$500 for “A Mid-New Year Night’s Dream”
20. \$1090 for “M.E.Ch.A.-El Frente’s Cena Familiar”
21. \$500 for “ATV—APSU Annual Fashion Show”
22. \$434.64 for “SCU Pilipino Graduation Ceremony”
23. \$280 for “Barrio Fiesta”
24. \$500 for “National Hispanic Business Association Conference”
25. \$500 for “Raza Day 2005”
26. \$500 for “Bum Rush Benson”
27. \$300 for “Love Jones”
28. \$500 for “Igwebuike Annual Retreat”
29. \$400 for “Dr. Juan Andrade Scholarship Recipient”
30. \$500 for “Global Village, The Worlds in Your Corner”
31. \$300 for “Barrio Fiesta”
32. \$500 for “The Mental Health of Undocumented Latino Immigrants”
33. \$500 for “Martin Luther King Jr. night.
34. \$250 for “Ka Mana’o ‘O Kanikapila
35. \$500 for “Encuentro”
36. \$500 for “Miniature Worlds: Art from India”

Many of these programs were rewarded on multiple times since many of them are annual cultural shows, programs or retreats.

F. Special Program - Diaspora Symposium 2007

Mission

The Symposium will highlight the concept of Diversity in a global context. While it aims to capture and celebrate the creative dynamism and aspirations of peoples who crossed many barriers and boundaries to become new Americans, it also directs our attention to the pains and sufferings resulting from the historical and current definitions of national boundaries, normative culture, and racial identities. Most importantly, the Symposium will underscore the impact of intercultural exchanges between regions of the world and the United States, and depict the growing multicultural and international footprint in the U.S.

The racial and ethnic categories that helped us define diversity in the sixties and seventies may need to be reexamined in light of the ever expanding diversities of cultures and people arriving and leaving the United States. As this country becomes transformed by the dynamic and unavoidable mixing and exchange of faces, languages, customs, traditions, and beliefs, the impact of how economic and social powers become distributed across these differences will become pivotal in the analysis of equity and inclusion.

Conference Organizers, Submitted by: Alma Garcia, Professor, Department of Sociology
Dr. Alma M. García, Sociology Department & CML Faculty Project Leader
Dr. Teresia Hinga, Religious Studies Department & CML Faculty Project Leader
Dr. Jack T. F. Ling, Executive Director of CML & Associate Dean of College of Arts & Sciences
Mary Ho, CML Associate Director
Event Coordinator: Jessica Gopp

Co-Sponsors

Office of the Provost, Center for Multicultural Learning's Diversity & Dialogue Council, Center for Multicultural Learning's Residential Education Council, College of Arts & Sciences & Departments of Anthropology, English, History, International Studies, Political Science, Religious Studies and Sociology. The following university units also co-sponsored the symposium: Ethnic Studies Program, Women and Gender Studies Program, Residential Learning Communities and the Center for Performing Arts.

The Santa Clara University Diaspora Symposium consisted of: 1) Four Keynote Speakers, Music at Noon and a Film Series.

Publicity

Feature stories and prominent ads were placed in the SCU student paper, a local Santa Clara neighborhood newspaper, the San Jose Mercury News and a weekly entertainment magazine.

Keynote Speakers

Micere Githae Mugo, African Diaspora, April 24, 2007: 4:00-6:00pm

Micere Githae Mugo is a professor of African American studies, Meredith Professor for Teaching Excellence, and chair of the Department of African American Studies at Syracuse University. She is a writer, activist, and academic. Born in Kenya, she received her BA from Makerere University, a teaching diploma from Nairobi University (PGDE), and a master's and doctorate from the University of New Brunswick, Canada. In 1980 she was elected the first woman faculty dean in Kenya, possibly in all of Africa. Mugo, a distinguished

poet, is the author or editor of 15 books and is frequently anthologized. Founder and president of the Pan African Community of Central New York, she initiated volunteer programs in two prisons, has been an official speaker for Amnesty International and a consultant for the "Africa on the Horizon" series by Blackside. She consults for a number of foundations; is on the editorial board of many journals including *Transition*, *African Commentary*, *Third World in Perspective*, and *African Women*. She has published two books of poetry: *Daughter of My People Sing* (1976) and *My Mother's Poem and Other Songs* (1994).

In her presentation, Professor Mugo addressed the issue of the forced movements of Africans to the United States and South America. Her presentation focused on the historical and political causes for such Diasporas and the consequences for sending and receiving societies. She also stressed the development of civil rights movements among diasporic communities and the need to "build bridges" to unite people from diverse backgrounds.

Approximately 70 people attended. Audience included faculty, students, staff and members of the surrounding area including San Francisco, San Jose and Santa Clara. Students from San Francisco State University and San Jose State University also attended.

Cynthia Feliciano Latino Diaspora, May 8, 2007: 4:00-6:00pm

Cynthia Feliciano is an Assistant Professor of Sociology and Chicano/Latino Studies at the University of California, Irvine. She earned her Ph.D. from the University of California, Los Angeles in 2003 and was a University of California President's Postdoctoral Fellow from 2003-4. She has been awarded fellowships from the Ford Foundation and the Social Science Research Council for her research, which focuses on the intersections of immigration, race and ethnicity and education. Her articles have appeared in journals such as *Sociology of Education*, *Demography*, *International Migration Review*, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, and *Social Science Quarterly*. She recently published a book entitled *Unequal Origins: Immigrant Selection and the Education of the Second Generation*.

Professor Feliciano's lecture examined the relationship between an immigrant's socio-economic status and the educational attainment levels of their U.S. born children. Drawing on a diverse data set including statistics from the World Bank and the United Nations, Dr. Feliciano concluded that immigrants come to the United States with different occupational backgrounds and that even if they are not able to retain their occupational status once they enter the U.S., their children stand to benefit from such experiences. Children of immigrant parents with a white collar or professional occupation in their country of origin achieved higher educational attainment levels than those children of parents at lower occupational levels.

Approximately 40 people attended. Audience included Santa Clara University faculty, students, staff and members of the surrounding Santa Clara and San Jose area.

Evelyn Hu-Dehart, Asian Diaspora, May 23, 2007: 4:00-6:00pm

Evelyn Hu-DeHart is a Professor of History, and Director of the Center for the Study of Race and Ethnicity in America at Brown University. She joined Brown from the University of Colorado at Boulder where she was Chair of the Department of Ethnic Studies and Director of the Center for Studies of Ethnicity and Race in America. She has also taught at the City University of New York system, New York University, Washington University in St. Louis, University of Arizona and University of Michigan, as well as lectured at universities and research institutes in Mexico, Peru, Cuba, France, Honking, Taiwan, and China. She was born in China and immigrated to the United States with her parents when she was twelve. As an undergraduate at Stanford University she studied in Brazil on an exchange program. She became fascinated with Latin America and that interest eventually led her to a Ph.D. in Latin American History from the University of Texas at Austin. In 1988 she left the City University of New York to become the CSERA Director at the University of Colorado at Boulder. She has written two books on the Yaqui Indians, and is now engaged in a large research project on the

Asian Diaspora in Latin America and the Caribbean. Her publications include: *Missionaries, Miners, and Indians: History of Spanish Contact with the Yaqui Indians of Northwestern New Spain, 1533-1830*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1981; *Yaqui Resistance and Survival: Struggle for Land and Autonomy, 1821-1910*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984.

Professor Hu-Dehart's presentation examined the movement of Asians-Chinese, Japanese, Filipino and Indian – throughout the world, specifically to Latin America and the Caribbean. She provided the historical and economic contexts that led to the mass movement of people, mostly male workers, to countries such as the United States where they provided a labor supply for agriculture, mining and the railroads. Her main message involved the need to look to past to understand the future of a globalizing world.

Approximately 50 people attended. Audience included Santa Clara University faculty, students, staff and members of the surrounding Santa Clara and San Jose area

Philip Deloria, Native American Diaspora, May 30, 2007: 4:00-6:00pm

Philip J. Deloria is a professor in the Department of History and the Program in American Culture at the University of Michigan. He has been instrumental in building a Native American Studies program at Michigan and is presently serving as the Director of the Program in American Culture, one of the top American Studies programs in the U.S. He teaches courses in environmental history, indigeneity, popular culture and cultural studies, the American West, and general U.S. history. He received his Ph.D. from Yale University in 1994.

His 1998 book *Playing Indian* (Yale University Press) was the winner of a Gustavus Myers outstanding book award from the Gustavus Myers Program for the study of Bigotry and Human Rights in North America. In that book, he traced "Indian play" from the Boston Tea Party to Boy Scouts and Campfire Girls to the New Age movement, arguing that white Americans have consistently acted out "Indianness" in order to imagine and proclaim national and modern identities. His latest work is *Indians in Unexpected Places* (Kansas, fall 2004), which examines the ideologies surrounding Indian people at the turn of the twentieth century—and the ways Native Americans challenged those ideologies through world travel, film and theater, sports, automobility, and musical performance. The book is the 2006 winner of the John C. Ewers prize of the Western History Association. Deloria is the author of numerous articles and essays, was a co-author of *The Native Americans* (Turner, 1993), and is presently at work on three other book-length projects. Among other honors, he was awarded a National Endowment for the Humanities Fellowship in 1999. He has been active in a number of professional organizations, including the American Studies Association, the Organization of American Historians, the American Historical Association, and the Western History Association.

Professor Deloria provided a historical overview of the relations between Native Americans and the United States. He stressed how the legal status of Native American changed as they were relegated to a condition of second-class citizenship on the reservations and later as migrants to the urban centers.

Approximately 45 people attended. Audience included Santa Clara University faculty, students, staff and members of the surrounding Santa Clara and San Jose area

Diaspora Music At Noon

Coordinated by Robert Bozina, Music Department

The "Music at Noon" concert series brought the music of people from all over the world to Santa Clara University and the surrounding community. A member of the SCU community introduced each concert. The artist(s) began their performance by explaining the origins of their musical genre and its impact on music in the United States.

Attendance at each concert varied from 25 people to 45. Many community members were participated regularly, including members from the Santa Clara Adult Education/Rehabilitation Center.

April 18

Music Department, Recital Hall

Louie Romero's Mazacote

Afro Puerto Rican/Cuban Music

April 25

Music Department, Recital Hall

Zaira Menesses

Guitarista Mexicana

May 2

Adobe Wall, Mission Gardens.

Mariachi Tapatio

Traditional Mexican Music

Co-Sponsored with The College of Arts and Sciences, Center for Multicultural Learning and MEChA-El Frente and the Multicultural Center

May 9

Music Department, Recital Hall

Hong Wang

Instruments Of China

□ **May 16th**

Music Department, Recital Hall

Michael Partington

Music of Latin America

Film Series

The Diaspora Symposium included a Film Series that consisted of the showing of four films that deal with the four highlighted Diasporas: African, Asian, Latino and Native American. The films were shown in four different Santa Clara University Residential Learning Centers (dorms) as part of the students' co-curricular educational requirements for the Residential Learning Centers. Faculty members introduced the films and led a discussion at the conclusion of the film. Attendance ranged from ten to 50, mostly Santa Clara University students, but some community members also attended. The participation of four of the Sudanese men who were portrayed in the films represented a highlight of the Film Series.

African Diaspora Film: *Lost Boys of the Sudan*

Location: Walsh Residence Hall Basement

Date: Monday, April 30

Time: 6:00 - 8:30 pm

Introduction of Film: Professor Teresia Hinga (SCU Religious Studies Department)

Discussion to follow film: Facilitated by Prof Hinga

Synopsis

This award-winning documentary follows two Sudanese refugees throughout their intense journey from their native Africa to the United States. As orphans living in the middle of a brutal civil war, Peter and Santino dealt with dangers like lion attacks and gunfire from militia. But even more daunting are the challenges they face in suburbia after they're chosen to start a new life in America.

Asian Diaspora Film: *My America*

Location: Swig Lounge

Date: Monday, May 14

Time: 6:00 - 8:30 pm

Film 1 hour & 27 min, discussion to follow

Introduction of Film: Associate Dr. Juliana Chang (SCU, English Department)

Discussion followed film: Facilitated by Juliana Chang

Synopsis:

In *My America* Renee Tajima-Pena (Who Killed Vincent Chin?) recalls her childhood, back in the days when her vacationing family crossed five state lines without ever seeing another Asian face. Tajima-Pena hits the road again to explore just how much the racial and cultural landscape of America has changed. Driving coast-to-coast and stopping in New York and San Francisco's Chinatowns but also in Duluth, Minnesota, New Orleans, and Arkansas, she seeks out what it means to be Asian American in our rapidly changing society. The film chronicles an eclectic group of offbeat and distinctive people -- from Chinese American debutantes and eighth generation Filipinos in New Orleans to the entrepreneur Chung Y. Choi with his fortune cookie factory, fish business, and security job, and Cambodian telehuckster Tom Vu. Tajima-Pena also explores the challenge for Asian Americans now that they are no longer "the invisible minority."

Latino Diaspora Film: *Maria Full of Grace*

Location: Casa Italiana Commons

Date: Monday, April 16

Time: 6:00 - 8:30 pm

Introduction of Film: Fr. Luis Calero, S.J. (SCU Anthropology Department)

Discussion followed film: Facilitated by Fr. Calero

Synopsis:

Maria Full of Grace is the harrowing story of an atypical drug-running "mule." Maria Alvarez (Catalina Sandino Moreno, whose portrayal earned her an Independent Spirit Award for Best Female Lead) is a smart, independent 17-year-old girl from Colombia who agrees to smuggle a half-kilo of heroin into the United States for a shot at a normal existence in the magical land of "El Norte."

Native American Diaspora Film***Rosebud to Dallas***

Location: Sobrato Commons B

Date: Monday, May 21

Time: 6:00 - 8:30 pm

Introduction of Film: Dr. Jean Molesky-Poz (SCU Religious Studies Department)

Discussion followed film: Facilitated by Jean Molesky-Poz

Synopsis:

In the early 1950s, the federal government inaugurated the relocation program through which thousands of American Indians were moved from their reservation homes to cities: Dallas, Seattle, Chicago, and the San Francisco Bay Area, including San Jose and Oakland. *Rosebud to Dallas* tells the story of five families who relocated from the Rosebud Sioux Reservation under the Bureau of Indian Affairs Relocation/Employment Assistance program in the early 1950s. It documents the promised transportation, housing, job training, and employment of the Relocation Program, but exposes the realities of another broken treaty. The long-term effects

contributed to the urbanization of American Indian people in the latter half of the twentieth century.

Appendix D: Description of Diversity Initiative Councils and Networks

A. Diversity & Dialogue Council

Program from the DDC this last cycle

The 2006-2007 Diversity & Dialogue Council (DDC), co-chaired by James Lai and Tam Nguyen, consisted of 1 faculty member 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. A pilot model was formed with the following approach:

- (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 reconvened during winter quarter with a streamlined process for providing support to CML sponsored programs. To execute the programming model established during fall quarter, the DDC chose to support a student-initiated program for the spring quarter. The objective was to provide an engaging and interactive program with influential leaders from community organizations to address the ways in which race, class, and campus climate issues at Santa Clara University impact the larger Silicon Valley community. Although the program topic was timely considering campus climate issues, the DDC was unable to secure representatives from the local community to serve on a panel. Lack of availability and numerous spring programs made it difficult to move forward with the program.

Past programs from the DDC included: *David Roche: Keynote Speaker, Humorist, Performer*, “(Terror)izing Latino Immigrants: U.S. Immigration Policy Post 9/11, *Students Speak: Should Ethnic Studies and Women’s & Gender Studies be separate core requirements for all students*, *Memoirs of a Geisha Lecture, Darfur Diaries*.

The co-chairs were asked to identify challenges, successes and to make recommendations for possible future undertakings.

1. Challenges

- The DDC has struggled to establish and maintain a clear identity and purpose from year to year. Several approaches have been attempted in order to provide opportunities for dialogue around campus climate. The DDC shifted from reviewing proposals and allocating funds to council programming.
- The availability of council members to meet and execute programs was a challenge, primarily because involvement is based on volunteer membership. Priorities for co-chairs and members were relatively unbalanced.
- Programming efforts oftentimes duplicated or overlapped programs coordinated by students and faculty. Attendance at DDC programs was unpredictable and required recruitment from classes.

2. Successes

- The DDC benefited from having faculty and staff from various campus departments come together to discuss diversity issues and the ways in which the council could address campus climate.

3. Recommendations

- If the DDC is to continue as a council, it would be beneficial to first consider the charge of the council. Once a comprehensible mission and purpose is established, new members with a desire to impact change should be brought on. Expectations and time commitment need to be clearly communicated from the beginning. The co-chairs of the council should be a faculty and staff member who can devote an adequate amount of time to maintaining the council.

B. Residential Education Council

The mission of the council is to promote the REC to other Residential Learning Communities in an effort to seed multicultural programs in other RLC's. The REC meets at least once a term and in addition communicates to all faculty teaching RLC linked courses at least once a term. The co-chair for this council was Heather Dumas-Dyer, resident director for Unity RLC. The co-chair was asked to identify challenges, successes and to make recommendations for possible future undertakings.

1. Challenges

- The biggest challenge was finding and convincing folks to submit applications. Although we had an adequate number of applications each quarter (on average 2-3 requests) the demand never out paced our quarterly budget.
- A second challenge was getting larger numbers of students to attend the events. Although the events had plenty of participants/attendees, largely because the event was a class requirement, the numbers of those not enrolled presented a challenge.
- Another challenge was finding faculty and staff to be on the council. This past year we had a small council of 2 faculty members, 1 staff, and 1 student representative. We opened up the grant process to all faculty, staff and students as long as they could connect their program to an RLC. This year we had one student organization take us up on the offer. However, we struggled with other non RLC-linked faculty submitting requests.

2. Successes

- The REC seemed to work very well when we combined both a blanket solicitation for grants and utilized personal relationships.
- Working with the committee largely through email allowed us to be nimble and speed up turn around time. The application was very simple and required the most basic information. I think this was conducive to raising the number of applications. Once grants were awarded the process by which events were publicized (email, flyers, posters in the halls and announcements by CF's) and process by which the funds were distributed (budget transfers and reimbursement of receipts) was very simple.

- Connecting the events to classes seemed to make strong courses stronger and taped faculty as resources thus resulting in a great diversity and quality of speakers/trips. Holding the events in the RLC's and/or making the trips open to the RLC made the events conducive to residents of the RLC who might not otherwise attend.
- This past year the committee met in person Fall and Winter terms. However, committee members preferred to discuss over email as requests came in throughout the term after our priority deadline rather than meeting more than once a term.

3. Recommendations

- As the inclusive excellence initiatives move forward I recommend efforts include the RLC's with a focus on the RLC affiliated courses. Granting funds to faculty to do programming for courses in the halls is one effective way to meet this desire.

A. Advisor Curriculum Development Council

The mission of the Advisor Curriculum Development Council is to integrate diversity into advising and curriculum development. The co-chairs for this council were Laura Fujieda from the Drahmann Center and Robert Senkewicz from the History Department. No events were planned for Spring 2007. The council like many of the other councils went through many transitions as new leadership cycled in and out of CML. The mission of the council to be integrated in some of the work in the new Provost Council on Diversity and Inclusive Excellence.

G. Associates Gathering

The Associates Gatherings offered this year were organized by the faculty project leaders, Alma Garcia, Sociology, Michelle Burnham, English and Teresia Hinga, Religious Studies. The Associates event in the winter quarter event featured Dr. Shawan Worsely from the University of San Francisco. The focus of her talk was on the hip hop culture and the media. The last Associates event was a social gathering for faculty, staff and students.

We have seen many successes in the Associates events this past year. The faculty project leaders and the topics we choose for this year increased our Associates membership list to 87 faculty, staff and students. We covered conversations on the core curriculum, the south of the border party that took place this year and current cultural issues. The continuation of the Associates Gathering events and Associates membership is critical for CML to continue to educate and build partnerships with faculty, staff and students on campus. One recommendation would be to continue to build a stronger network with students.

H. Women of Color Network

The Women of Color Network is a collaborative effort between Women's and Gender Studies and the Center for Multicultural Learning. The Women of Color Network is comprised of a membership of women of color from Santa Clara University. 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. In the Spring, we coordinated "Challenges of Being a Women Student of Color in Higher Education". This event complimented the Winter event which focused "Challenges of Being a Women of Color in Higher Education". We had the largest turn out for these two events than any other Women of Color Network event. Past Women of Color events since 2003 included: *End of Summer Tea, Women of Color Network reception, Perspectives: Student Scholars Share Their Research on Women of Color, Reception and Walk through of a poster series in honor of International Women's Day and funding for Women's History Month Programs.*

The success of the re-launch of the Women of Color Network this year showed a strong indication that a network of such is needed on this campus. Women's and Gender Studies and the Center for Multicultural

Learning will continue to build and foster a community within the Women of Color Network. Planning is already under way for next year's programs.

Appendix E:

2007 TT/TE Faculty Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity – Campus Provided Data

See workbook as an attachment

