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The Community College Equity Assessment Laboratory (CCEAL) is a national research and practice lab that partners with community colleges to support their capacity in advancing outcomes for students who have been historically underserved in education, particularly students of color. CCEAL houses the Minority Male Community College Collaborative (M2C3).

CCEAL was developed to advance three objectives:

- **Research** - to conduct and disseminate empirical research on the experiences of historically underserved students in community colleges;
- **Training** - to provide training that improves practices and research relevant to students of color in community colleges; and
- **Assessment** - to use assessment and evaluation to facilitate capacity-building within community colleges.
National Consortium on College Men of Color

About NCCMC
• 132 Member Campuses
• 21 states represented
• 6 Affiliate Partners

Member Benefits
- Monthly webinars
- Information Sharing Sessions
- Annual convening – the “Working Group”
- Assessment tools (CCSSI & MPACE)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Metric</th>
<th>Number of Colleges</th>
<th>States</th>
<th>Students/Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community College Success Measure (CCSM)</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>78,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC Instructional Development Inventory (CCIDI)</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College Student Success Inventory (CCSSI)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Program Assessment for College Excellence (MPACE)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Qualitative Assessment

Student focus groups
Examining students’ perceptions of factors influencing success in community college

Faculty interviews
Examining perceptions of factors that are effective in educating students of color in community colleges

Consensus focus groups
Collective sensemaking approach for identifying root challenges facing students in community colleges from an equity-based perspective

Narratives of success
Narratives from educators with a documented record of success in teaching and supporting underserved students of color

10 colleges
CA, 252 students, 50 focus groups

10 colleges
CA, 102 faculty

32 colleges
CA & MN, 240 faculty/staff
52 consensus groups

14 colleges
12 states, 78 educators
An Overview of Trends and Challenges

• Heightened attention in the past decade, nationally and statewide

• Equity plan movement identified men of color as a primary intervention group

• Primary pathway into postsecondary education for 18 to 24 year old Black and Latino men, 75.7% and 79.4%, respectively (NPSAS, 2016).
What are some common challenges that men of color face on your campus?
Table 1
Six-Year Completion Rate, 2009-2010 to 2014-2015 (Percentage of Males Who Earned a Certificate, Degree, Transferred, or Became Transfer Eligible)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>49.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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An Overview of Trends and Challenges

• Basic skills has served as a central site for intervention due to disparities in outcomes.

• Innovative interventions employed (e.g., reducing levels below transfer, accelerated courses, supplemental instruction, changes in placement testing).

• Further recognized as an ‘equity’ intervention area due to merging of plans and monies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
</tr>
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An Overview of Trends and Challenges

• Primary intervention types include mentoring programs and student clubs:
  • Often not effective
  • Often not scalable, and
  • Often not sustainable.

• Interventions typically focus on students and not on institutional capacity building.
An Overview of Trends and Challenges

• Acknowledge that there are external pressures.

• Income
• Food and Housing Insecurity
• Financial Dependents
• Commuting and Transportation
Annual Income of $20k or less

Source: CCSM subset (2016)
Percent Reporting Stressful Life Events

Source: CCSM subset (2016)
Percent with Financial Dependents

Source: CCSM subset (2016)
Commuting 7 or more hours weekly

Source: CCSM subset (2016)
Analysis of Equity Plans
Analytic Approach

• Findings draw from 42 Community Colleges
  • In the Central Valley, Inland Empire, and greater Los Angeles area

• Focused on understanding the goals and activities of each plan across indicator area:
  1. Identified Student Groups
  2. Activities/Strategies Proposed
  3. Details within Activity Implementation Plan
  4. Student Equity Funds Allocated
Analytic Framework

• What Was Learned

923 Total Activities Across 42 Equity Plans

32% (295) Identified Disproportionate Impact for Men of Color

6% (60) Explicitly Described Ways to Address Men of Color

27 of the 42 student equity plans proposed an explicit activity for Men of Color

Categorized Activities into 3 Areas:
* General
* Identified
* Explicit
Overview of Results

- Within the 42 community college equity plans, 924 different activities were proposed to address student equity gaps.

- 295 identified men of color as facing an equity gap.

- Only 6% of all activities (60) explicitly addressed men of color, with the largest groups addressed being classified as men of color (17), African American men (16), Hispanic and African American men (13), and Hispanic men (9).

- Those 60 activities were analyzed and divided into five categories:
  - (a) additional research
  - (b) direct student support (books)
  - (c) outreach strategies (high schools)
  - (d) professional development
  - (e) targeted student services*

- Only 17% of all explicit activities fell outside of the categories of targeted student services (e.g., African American learning communities)—comprising 48%, and professional development (e.g., working with an outside organization to provide faculty with culturally-relevant training)—comprising 35%.
What are some interventions that your campus is using to support the success of college men of color?
Innovative and Promising Practices
Recommended Practices

• Implement early alert systems in gatekeeper and basic skills courses

• Proactive identification of patterns that require intervention

• All CCC’s are required to have an early alert
  • When notification occurs (halfway) (structural)
  • Feedback on intervention (black hole effect)
  • User concerns (academic freedom) (independence) (buy-in) (punishment) (faculty performance)
Recommended Practices

• Provide High-Impact, Intrusive Professional Development for Faculty and Staff

  • Faculty are subject matter experts.

  • Emphasis on culturally relevant teaching, collaborative learning, intrusive practices, high expectations, validation, personal relationships, empowerment, and authentic care.

  • Intrusive, high impact professional development.
Development of the CC-IDI

Relational Strategies
- Disclosing
- Welcomeness (inside)
- Welcomeness (outside)
- Microaggressions
- Relationships
- Validation

Epistemology
- Institutional Responsibility
- High Expectations

Teaching Strategies
- Empowerment
- Collaborative Learning
- Culturally relevant teaching
- Intrusiveness
- Performance Monitoring

Faculty Student Engagement
Recommended Practices

• Examine the Proportion of Full-Time to Part-Time Faculty Teaching Basic Skills Courses

• Men of color concentrated in basic skills

• “Colleges have structured educational experiences in a manner that places students in need of the greatest level of support in classes with faculty who often provide the least level of support” (not their fault)

• Looking at data and engaging questions about ‘desirability’
Distribution of Instructional Faculty in Developmental Education, 2016

- Full-Time (non-tenure track): 21%
- Full-Time (tenure track): 25%
- Full-Time (tenured): 54%
- Part-Time (multiple colleges): 12%
- Part-Time (full-time): 15%
- Part-Time (teaching here): 27%

- Full-Time
- Part-Time
CC-IDI Threshold Scores (Z scores)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Red</th>
<th>Orange</th>
<th>Yellow</th>
<th>Green</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immediate attention</td>
<td>Needs attention</td>
<td>Emerging concern</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;= -1.96</td>
<td>-1.95 to 0</td>
<td>0 to +1.95</td>
<td>&gt;= 1.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Immediate Attention** – a score significantly lower than the mean of top quarter colleges
- **Needs Attention** – a score lower than the mean of top quarter colleges
- **Emerging Concern** – a score higher than the mean of top quarter colleges
- **Acceptable** - a score significantly higher than the mean of top quarter colleges
## Structure Matters
### Part-Time Faculty in Developmental Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Part-Time Faculty Teaching Here Part-Time</th>
<th>Part-Time Faculty Teaching Here Full-Time</th>
<th>Part-Time Faculty Teaching at Multiple Institutions</th>
<th>Part-Time Faculty Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Learning</td>
<td>Immediate Attention</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Immediate Attention</td>
<td>Needs Attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally Relevant Teaching</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Emerging Concern</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Monitoring</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Needs Attention</td>
<td>Immediate Attention</td>
<td>Emerging Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship-Building</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Immediate Attention</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Responsibility</td>
<td>Immediate Attention</td>
<td>Immediate Attention</td>
<td>Immediate Attention</td>
<td>Immediate Attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Expectations</td>
<td>Immediate Attention</td>
<td>Immediate Attention</td>
<td>Immediate Attention</td>
<td>Immediate Attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validating Messages</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Needs Attention</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Student Engagement</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Immediate Attention</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate Disclosing</td>
<td>Needs Attention</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Immediate Attention</td>
<td>Needs Attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcoming Engagement (In Class)</td>
<td>Immediate Attention</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Immediate Attention</td>
<td>Emerging Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcoming Engagement (Out of Class)</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Immediate Attention</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Needs Attention</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrusive Practices</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Needs Attention</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microaggressions</td>
<td>Immediate Attention</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Immediate Attention</td>
<td>Needs Attention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Scores for “Immediate Concern” and “Acceptable” represent statistically significant differences based on national exemplar colleges.
Recommended Practices

• Enhance Support for Part-Time Faculty (Particularly in Basic Skills and Gatekeeper Courses)

• Compensation for office hours
• Office space
• Location of office space
• Privacy of office space
• Priority scheduling
Recommended Practices

• Integrate Equity Goals into Institutional Strategic Plans

• Pertinent Concerns
  • Equity issues existed before equity plans
  • Equity funding is not permanent
  • Integration of equity, basic skills, SSSP

• Integration into institutional structural mechanisms.
Recommended Practices

- Require Faculty to Demonstrate a Commitment to Serving Underserved Students
  - CSU Pomona (commitment to diversity for RTP)
  - Equity and diversity as a commitment for hiring
- Revise hiring questions
- Revise interview structure
- Revise review of teaching performance
Recommended Practices

• Engage in Ongoing, Collective Sensemaking at the Campus and Unit Level

• Equity Scorecard
  • Better understand outcomes and institutional breakdowns
  • A focus on systemic racism

• Equity Root Cause Analysis
  • A root cause focused on institutional breakdowns
  • Emphasizing institutional responsibility
Root Causes Example

Men of color are not using academic support services

- We are not intentionally connecting services to classes
- We are not offering the services when they need them
- We are not making them aware of the services
- We are not fully aware of what each service does
- We are assuming that students will access services on their own
- We are not prioritizing underserved students
- We do not fully understand the value of being intrusive
- We do not believe it is our responsibility
- We are making assumptions that those who need help don’t belong

We are making assumptions that those who need help don’t belong
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