

FOOTHILL COLLEGE

Institutional Research and Planning

DATE: October 15, 2020

TO: Cleve Freeman, Transfer Center Director & Counselor

Elaine Kuo, College Researcher

FROM: Lisa Ly, Research Analyst

RE: 2019-20 Transfer Center Visits: Top Services Used and Student Demographics

Overview

The Transfer Center provided Institutional Research & Planning (IR&P) with a list of students who visited the Center between 2015-16 and 2019-20. The list contained student IDs and services sought at the Center. IR&P was asked to determine which transfer services are being utilized the most and which students are accessing the center. The Transfer Center was particularly interested in disaggregating the student data by age, gender, ethnicity, low-income, DSPS, foster youth and veteran statuses. While data is provided for the past 5 years, the 2019-20 data is the focus of this report.

2019-20 Top Three Transfer Center Services

- In 2019-20, the total number of visits to the Transfer Center totaled 2,388, which is 11 fewer visits from the year prior (-0.5%).
- The majority of the students who visited the center enrolled only at Foothill in the same year they visited the center (76%). The remaining students enrolled at both Foothill and De Anza campuses (14%), De Anza only (1%) or did not enroll at all within the FHDA district (8%).
- The top three services used are counseling appointments (48%), transfer resources (25%) and counseling quick questions (18%).

Table 1: Transfer Center Services Used by Year

Doccore for Visit	2015-16		2016-17		201	.7-18	201	8-19	2019-20		5-Year Average	
Reasons for Visit	Visits	Percent	Visits	Percent	Visits	Percent	Visits	Percent	Visits	Percent	Visits	Percent
Counseling Appointments	686	28%	1,352	41%	1,311	42%	835	35%	1,148	48%	1,066	39%
Counseling Quick Questions	106	4%	465	14%	365	12%	234	10%	435	18%	321	12%
Transfer Resources	798	33%	624	19%	751	24%	995	41%	606	25%	755	28%
University Representative Appointments	286	12%	209	6%	232	7%	209	9%	115	5%	210	8%
Workshops	562	23%	657	20%	450	14%	126	5%	84	4%	376	14%
Total	2,438	100%	3,307	100%	3,109	100%	2,399	100%	2,388	100%	2,728	100%

Counseling appointments consist of scheduled discussions pertaining to career, class, major, educational plan, degree, certificate, transfer, transcript evaluation, essay evaluation, TAG/TAP agreements and personal counseling.

2019-20 Transfer Center Usage & Access Gap by Student Demographics

Table 2 provides information on the center's usage and access gap by student demographics. The access gap compares the center's student population¹ to the general student population with an educational goal of transfer. If an access gap is identified for a specific student group, it suggests the transfer center is serving fewer students from that group than is expected. The data highlighted below focuses on any student groups with an access gap that is equal to or less than -3.0. Overall, Transfer Center access could be improved for students who are ages 25 to 34, Latinx and from low-income households.

Age

- Usage: More than half of the Transfer Center students are 20 to 24 year olds (64%), followed by those who are 25 to 34 (18%).
- Gap: Improvements could be made for those 25 to 34 (-5.8) and 29 or less (-3.7).

Gender

- Usage: The proportion of female (49%) and male (50%) students who used the Transfer Center was comparable.
- Gap: There was no disproportionate impact observed for gender in 2019-20.

Ethnicity

- Usage: Asian (39%), Latinx (24%) and White (24%) students primarily use the Transfer Center.
- Gap: Improvement efforts could be made for Latinx students (-6.6).

Low Income

- Usage: Nearly one-quarter (23%) of the Transfer Center students are low income.
- Gap: Improvements could be made for low-income students (-6.3).

DSPS

- Usage: DSPS students represent 4% of the Transfer Center student population.
- Access Gap: There was no disproportionate impact observed for DSPS students in 2019-20.

Foster Youth

- Usage: Less than 1% of the Transfer Center students are foster youth students.
- Gap: There was no disproportionate impact observed for foster youth students in 2019-20.

Veteran

- Usage: Veteran students represent 2% of the Transfer Center student population.
- Gap: There was no disproportionate impact observed for veteran students in 2019-20.

¹ The Transfer Center student population reflect students who enrolled at Foothill only or Foothill and De Anza campuses in the same year they visited the Transfer Center, which is 91% of all students who visited the center in 2019-20.

Table 2: Transfer Center Use & Access Gap by Key Demographics

	ı	204	F 46				bie 2: i	italisie	er Cerr			ess Ga	ih nà v			JIIICS	2010 20				F Voor A				
	2015-16				2016-17				2017-18					2018-19				2019-20				5-Year Average			
	Trans	fer Ctr	Comp.		Transf	Transfer Ctr			Transfer Ctr		Comp.		Transfer Ctr		Comp.		Transfer Ctr		Comp.		Transf	er Ctr	Comp.		
	Students Group		Group	Access	Students		Comp. Group	Access	Students		Group	Access	Students		Group	Access	Students		Group	Access	Students		Group	Access	
		D	D =	Gap	116		D = === == +	Gap			D	Gap			Daves	Gap			D	Gap	110	D	D = === == t	Gap	
A C	HC	Percent	Percent		HC	Percent	Percent		HC	Percent	Percent		HC	Percent	Percent		HC	Percent	Percent		HC	Percent	Percent		
Age Group	400	4.07	4.07	0.5	460	440/	400/		450	440/	4.00	2.6	400	440/	4.40/	2.0		100/	450/		450	100/	4.40/		
19 or less	198	14%	14%	0.5	168	11%	12%	-1.4	159	11%	14%	-2.6	132	11%	14%	-2.9	124	12%	15%	-3.7	156	12%	14%	-2.0	
20 to 24	871	62%	53%	9.0	1,022	65%	54%	10.4	920	63%	54%	9.6	763	63%	52%	11.2	679	64%	51%	13.2	851	63%	53%	10.6	
25 to 34	269	19%	24%	-5.3	304	19%	25%	-6.0	295	20%	25%	-4.3	253	21%	25%	-4.1	191	18%	24%	-5.8	262	20%	25%	-5.1	
35 to 44	44	3%	6%	-2.5	64	4%	5%	-1.4	58	4%	5%	-1.3	41	3%	6%	-2.5	42	4%	6%	-2.2	50	4%	6%	-2.0	
45 or more	22	2%	3%	-1.7	22	1%	3%	-1.7	22	2%	3%	-1.3	19	2%	3%	-1.7	21	2%	3%	-1.5	21	2%	3%	-1.6	
Total	1,404	100%	100%	-	1,580	100%	100%	-	1,454	100%	100%	-	1,208	100%	100%	-	1,057	100%	100%	-	1,341	100%	100%	-	
Gender																									
Female	728	52%	50%	1.7	815	52%	51%	0.7	773	53%	50%	3.0	623	52%	51%	1.0	517	49%	52%	-2.7	691	52%	51%	0.9	
Male	672	48%	49%	-1.4	753	48%	48%	-0.8	674	46%	49%	-2.9	582	48%	49%	-0.4	532	50%	47%	3.0	643	48%	49%	-0.7	
Non-Binary	0	0%	0%	0.0	2	0%	0%	0.1	0	0%	0%	0.0	0	0%	0%	0.0	1	0%	0%	0.0	1	0%	0%	0.0	
Decline to State	4	0%	1%	-0.3	10	1%	1%	0.1	7	0%	1%	-0.1	3	0%	1%	-0.5	7	1%	1%	-0.3	6	0%	1%	-0.2	
Total	1,404	100%	100%	-	1,580	100%	100%	-	1,454	100%	100%	-	1,208	100%	100%	-	1,057	100%	100%	-	1,341	100%	100%	-	
Ethnicity																									
African American	58	4%	7%	-2.6	65	4%	6%	-1.9	71	5%	6%	-0.9	54	4%	6%	-1.6	46	4%	6%	-2.0	59	4%	6%	-1.8	
Asian	466	33%	27%	6.2	534	34%	29%	5.1	532	37%	30%	6.4	452	37%	30%	7.5	413	39%	30%	9.1	479	36%	29%	6.7	
Filipinx	66	5%	6%	-1.3	72	5%	7%	-2.0	73	5%	6%	-1.3	50	4%	6%	-1.7	45	4%	6%	-1.3	61	5%	6%	-1.5	
Latinx	332	24%	27%	-3.4	393	25%	28%	-3.3	370	25%	30%	-4.4	288	24%	30%	-6.3	255	24%	31%	-6.6	328	24%	29%	-4.7	
Native American	7	0%	1%	-0.1	8	1%	1%	-0.1	10	1%	1%	0.1	6	0%	0%	0.0	7	1%	1%	0.2	8	1%	1%	0.0	
Pacific Islander	22	2%	1%	0.1	22	1%	2%	-0.2	11	1%	1%	-0.6	11	1%	1%	-0.5	15	1%	1%	0.0	16	1%	1%	-0.3	
White	300	21%	26%	-4.9	336	21%	25%	-3.9	341	23%	24%	-1.0	330	27%	24%	2.9	256	24%	23%	1.0	313	23%	25%	-1.4	
Decline to State	153	11%	5%	6.0	150	9%	3%	6.4	46	3%	2%	1.6	17	1%	2%	-0.4	20	2%	2%	-0.4	77	6%	3%	3.0	
Total	1,404	100%	100%	-	1,580	100%	100%	-	1,454	100%	100%	-	1,208	100%	100%	-	1,057	100%	100%	-	1,341	100%	100%	-	
Low Income Status																									
Low Income	356	25%	30%	-4.6	428	27%	33%	-5.8	393	27%	33%	-6.1	311	26%	32%	-6.5	242	23%	29%	-6.3	346	26%	32%	-5.7	
Not Low Income	1,048	75%	70%	4.6	1,151	73%	67%	5.8	1,061	73%	67%	6.1	897	74%	68%	6.5	813	77%	71%	6.3	994	74%	68%	5.7	
Total	1,404	100%	100%	-	1,579	100%	100%	-	1,454	100%	100%	-	1,208	100%	100%	-	1,055	100%	100%	-	1,340	100%	100%	-	
DSPS Status																									
DSPS	56	4%	2%	2.0	67	4%	2%	2.2	45	3%	2%	1.0	61	5%	2%	2.8	38	4%	2%	1.5	53	4%	2%	1.9	
Not DSPS	1,348	96%	98%	-2.0	1,512	96%	98%	-2.2	1,409	97%	98%	-1.0	1,147	95%	98%	-2.8	1,017	96%	98%	-1.5	1,287	96%	98%	-1.9	
Total	1,404	100%	100%	-	1,579	100%	100%	1	1,454	100%	100%	-	1,208	100%	100%	-	1,055	100%	100%	-	1,340	100%	100%	-	
Foster Youth Status					·												-								
Foster Youth	7	0%	1%	0.0	5	0%	1%	-0.3	7	0%	0%	0.0	6	0%	1%	0.0	4	0%	1%	-0.3	6	0%	1%	-0.1	
Not Foster Youth	1,397	100%	99%	0.0	1,574	100%	99%	0.3	1,447	100%	100%	0.0	1,202	100%	99%	0.0	1,051	100%	99%	0.3	1,334	100%	99%	0.1	
Total	1,404	100%	100%	-	1,579	100%	100%	-	1,454	100%	100%	-	1,208	100%	100%	-	1,055	100%	100%	-	1,340	100%	100%	-	
Veteran Status	Ĺ				· ·												-								
Veteran	13	1%	1%	-0.5	23	1%	1%	0.1	20	1%	2%	-0.2	20	2%	2%	0.1	17	2%	2%	0.1	19	1%	1%	-0.1	
Not Veteran	1.391	99%	99%	0.5	1,556	99%	99%	-0.1	1.434	99%	98%	0.2	1,188	98%	98%	-0.1	1,038	98%	98%	-0.1	1,321	99%	99%	0.1	
Total	1,404	100%	100%	-	1,579	100%	100%	-	1,454	100%	100%	-	1,208	100%	100%	-	1,055	100%	100%	-	1,340	100%	100%	-	
	_,	20070			-,0,0	-50/0	_00/0		-, 10 7	20070			-,-00	_00/0			-,555	200/0			-,5 10	200/0	20070		

Note: Low Income, DSPS, Foster Youth and Veteran unknown statuses are omitted from the table (N=5 over the five-year period). Low income reflect self-reported annual household income of \$24,999 or less. Comparison Group reflects the general student population who indicated an educational goal of transfer. **Access gap** is calculated by taking the Transfer Center (%) less Comparison Group (%).