Foothill College Second Spring 2020 and Second Spring 2021
Census Enrollment Comparisons Report

From Second Spring 2020 and Second Spring 2021:

- Enrollment
  - Resident student enrollment is down 40%, Non-Resident student enrollment is down 37%.
  - Resident FTES is down 35%, and Non-Resident FTES is down 18%.
  - Overall, student enrollment declined by 581, which is a 35% decrease.
  - Overall, estimated FTES decreased by 58, which is a 33% decrease.

Table 1. Census Enrollment Comparisons
Second Spring 2020 and Second Spring 2021

	2020		2021		Change		% Change	
Groups	Enr	Est FTES	Enr	Est FTES	Enr	Est FTES	Enr	Est FTES
Resident	1,502	159	950	104	-552	-55	-37%	-35%
Non-Resident	157	17	128	14	-29	-3	-18%	-18%
Total	1,659	176	1,078	118	-581	-58	-35%	-33%

WSCH estimate based on positive attendance estimated at 100%. | Does not include Apprenticeship.
Census dates are 05/27/2020 and 05/25/2021.
Source: FHDA IRP

- Online Enrollment
  - Online learning estimated FTES is down 33% at 1,078.
  - Online learning headcount decreased from 1,411 to 858 (-39%).
  - Online learning enrollment is down 518 from 1,659 to 1,078.
  - Online learning sections offered decreased be 1 (37 to 36).

Table 2. Online Learning Census Enrollment
Second Spring 2020 and Second Spring 2021

	2020	2021	Change	% Change
HC	1,411	858	-553	-39%
Course Enr	1,659	1,078	-581	-35%
Est Wsch	7,937	5,290	-2,647	-33%
Est FTES	176	118	-58	-33%
Sections	37	36	-1	-3%

WSCH estimate based on census enrollment. | Online enrollment identified by courses ending in "W."
Source: FHDA IRP

- Resident Students
  - Headcount among Second Spring 2021 resident students is 757, a decline of 40% from Spring 2020 (1,267).
  - AB540 headcount decreased by 22 from 53 in Second Spring 2020 to 31 in Second Spring 2021, reflecting in a 36% decrease in FTES est (SS21: 103; SS20: 160).

Table 3. Resident Student Headcount and FTES

Second Spring 2020 and Second Spring 2021

	2020		2021		Change		% Change	
Resident Type	Headcount	Est FTES	Headcount	Est FTES	Headcount	Est FTES	Headcount	Est FTES
Resident	1,208	152	724	99	-484	-53	-40%	-35%
AB540	53	7	31	4	-22	-3	-42%	-43%
AB2364	5	1	1	0	-4	-1	-80%	-100%
VACA Veteran	1	0	1	0	0	0	0%	#DIV/0!
Total	1,267	160	757	103	-510	-57	-40%	-36%

Source: FHDA IRP

- Non-Resident Students
  - Headcount among Second Spring 2021 resident students is 101, a decline of 30% from Second Spring 2020 (144).
  - The international student headcount declined from 88 in Second Spring 2020 to 51 in Second Spring 2021. Additionally, there were 4 non-resident: out of country students in Second Spring 2021.

Table 4. Non-Resident Student Headcount and FTES

Second Spring 2020 and Second Spring 2021

	2020		2021		Change		% Change	
Resident Type	Headcount	Est FTES	Headcount	Est FTES	Headcount	Est FTES	Headcount	Est FTES
Non-Resident	56	7	46	7	-10	#REF!	-18%	0%
International	88	10	51	7	-37	-3	-42%	-30%
Out of Country	0	0	4	0	4	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Total	144	17	101	14	-43	-3	-30%	-18%

Second Spring 2020 did not code for Non-Resident: Out of Country.
Source: FHDA IRP

- Student Ethnicity Headcount and Est FTES
  - Headcount experienced the greatest decline among Asian (-233), White (-140), and Latinx (-111) students between Second Spring 2020 and Second Spring 2021.
  - No student ethnicity groups increased in headcount between Second Spring 2020 and Second Spring 2021.
  - The 32% decrease in FTES est from Second Spring 2020 and Second Spring 2021 is primarily due to decline among Asians (-38%) and White (-32%) students.

Table 5. Student Ethnicity Headcount and FTES

Second Spring 2020 and Second Spring 2021

	2020		2021		Change		% Change	
Ethnicity	Headcount	Est FTES	Headcount	Est FTES	Headcount	Est FTES	Headcount	Est FTES
African American	88	12	55	8	-33	-4	-38%	-33%
Asian	512	63	279	39	-233	-24	-46%	-38%
Filipinx	61	8	38	5	-23	-3	-38%	-38%
Latinx	323	41	212	30	-111	-11	-34%	-27%
Native American	6	1	2	0	-4	-1	-67%	-100%
Pacific Islander	20	2	16	2	-4	0	-20%	0%
White	364	44	224	30	-140	-14	-38%	-32%
Decline to State	37	5	32	5	-5	0	-14%	0%
Total	1,411	176	858	119	-553	-57	-39%	-32%

Filipinx and Latinx are gender neutral terms.
Source: FHDA IRP

- Student Ethnicity Headcount as Percent of Total Population
  - Asian students were the only group to decrease in their representation within the total population (-4%).
  - Despite the decrease in headcount, Latinx and White students increased as a rate of the total student population (Latinx: +2%; White: +1%).

Table 6. Student Ethnicity Headcount as a Percent of Total
Second Spring 2020 and Second Spring 2021

	2020		2021		Change	
Ethnicity	Headcount	Percent	Headcount	Percent	Headcount	Percent
African American	88	6%	55	6%	-33	0%
Asian	512	36%	279	33%	-233	-4%
Filipinx	61	4%	38	4%	-23	0%
Latinx	323	23%	212	25%	-111	2%
Native American	6	0%	2	0%	-4	0%
Pacific Islander	20	1%	16	2%	-4	0%
White	364	26%	224	26%	-140	0%
Decline to State	37	3%	32	4%	-5	1%
Total	1,411	100%	858	100%	-553	0%

Filipinx and Latinx are gender neutral terms.
Source: FHDA IRP

- Zip Code Grouping
  - Headcount continued to decline from the Service Area (-154), including "Service Area: Cupertino, Sunnyvale, Santa Clara (part), San Jose (part), Saratoga (part)" (-58) and "Service Area: Los Altos, Los Altos Hills, Mountain View, Palo Alto, Stanford" (-96).
  - Both Santa Clara and San Mateo Counties experienced a decline in enrollment between Second Spring 2020 and Second Spring 2021 (SCC: -306; SMC:-56).
  - "South Santa Clara County: SJ West 880/101" had the largest decrease in headcount outside of the service area (-78).

Table 7. Student Headcount by Zip Code Grouping

Second Spring 2020 and Second Spring 2021

	2020	2021	Change	% Change
Zip Code Grouping	HC	HC	HC	HC
Service Area: Los Altos, LA Hills, Mt. View, Palo Alto, Stanford	188	92	-96	-51%
Service Area: Cupertino, Sunnyvale, Santa Clara (part), San Jose (part), Saratoga (part)	145	87	-58	-40%
S Santa Clara County (SJ west 880/101)	171	93	-78	-46%
E Santa Clara County (Alviso, Milpitas, SJ east 880/101)	125	67	-58	-46%
W Santa Clara County (Campbell, Los Gatos, Monte Sereno, Santa Clara (rest of), Saratoga (rest of))	27	17	-10	-37%
Other Santa Clara County (Morgan Hill, Gilroy)	14	8	-6	-43%
S Peninsula (Atherton, Belmont, E PA, Foster City, Menlo Park, Redwood City, San Carlos, San Mateo)	127	84	-43	-34%
W Peninsula (El Granada, Half Moon Bay, La Honda, Ladera, Montara, Moss Beach, Pacifica, Pescadero, Portola Valley, Woodside)	16	6	-10	-63%
N Peninsula (Brisbane, Burlingame, Colma, Daly City, Hillsborough, Millbrae, San Bruno, S SF)	15	12	-3	-20%
S Alameda County (Fremont, Newark, Union City)	61	42	-19	-31%
Alameda County (rest of)	56	33	-23	-41%
San Francisco County	29	13	-16	-55%
N Santa Cruz County (Ben Lomand, Boulder Creek, Felton, Santa Cruz, Scotts Valley)	10	10	0	0%
Other Bay Area Region	54	57	3	6%
All Other Areas	373	237	-136	-36%
Total	1,411	858	-553	-39%

Source: FHDA IRP

- Zip Code Grouping as Percent of Total Headcount
  - As a percentage of total headcount, students from the service area decreased by 2%-points from 23% to 21%. Students from the service area represent slightly more than one-fifth of the headcount for Second Spring 2021.
  - All zip code groupings remained consistent or decreased slightly as a percentage of total headcount from Second Spring 2020 to Second Spring 2021, with the exception of our primary service area (Los Altos, LA Hills, Mtn. View, Palo Alto, Stanford: -2%-points).

Table 8. Zip Code Grouping as a Percent Change of Total Headcount
Second Spring 2020 and Second Spring 2021

	2020		2021	
Zip Code Grouping	HC	% Total	HC	% Total
Service Area: Los Altos, LA Hills, Mt. View, Palo Alto, Stanford	188	13%	92	11%
Service Area: Cupertino, Sunnyvale, Santa Clara (part), San Jose (part), Saratoga (part)	145	10%	87	10%
S Santa Clara County (SJ west 880/101)	171	12%	93	11%
E Santa Clara County (Alviso, Milpitas, SJ east 880/101)	125	9%	67	8%
W Santa Clara County (Campbell, Los Gatos, Monte Sereno, Santa Clara (rest of), Saratoga (rest of))	27	2%	17	2%
Other Santa Clara County (Morgan Hill, Gilroy)	14	1%	8	1%
S Peninsula (Atherton, Belmont, E PA, Foster City, Menlo Park, Redwood City, San Carlos, San Mateo)	127	9%	84	10%
W Peninsula (El Granada, Half Moon Bay, La Honda, Ladera, Montara, Moss Beach, Pacifica, Pescadero, Portola Valley, Woodside)	16	1%	6	1%
N Peninsula (Brisbane, Burlingame, Colma, Daly City, Hillsborough, Millbrae, San Bruno, S SF)	15	1%	12	1%
S Alameda County (Fremont, Newark, Union City)	61	4%	42	5%
Alameda County (rest of)	56	4%	33	4%
San Francisco County	29	2%	13	2%
N Santa Cruz County (Ben Lomand, Boulder Creek, Felton, Santa Cruz, Scotts Valley)	10	1%	10	1%
Other Bay Area Region	54	4%	57	7%
All Other Areas	373	26%	237	28%
Total	1,411	100%	858	100%

Source: FHDA IRP

- Zip Code Grouping within Santa Clara County among African Americans, Filipinx, Latinx Students
  - African American, Filipinx, and Latinx headcount decreased by 91 students.
  - African Americans experienced the largest headcount decrease from the immediate service area "Los Altos, LA Hills, MT. View, Palo Alto, Stanford" (-9; 11 to 2).
  - Latinx experienced the largest headcount decrease from "South Santa Clara County: San Jose west 880/101" (-22; 58 to 36).

Table 9. Headcount among Disproportionately Impacted Groups within Santa Clara County Second Spring 2020 and Second Spring 2021

		2020	2021	Change	% Change
Ethnicity	Zip Code Grouping	HC	HC	HC	HC
African American	Service Area 1 (Cupertino, Sunnyvale, Santa Clara (part of), San Jose (part of), Saratoga (part of))	2	2	0	0%
	Service Area 2 (Los Altos, LA Hills, Mt. View, Palo Alto, Stanford)	11	2	-9	-82%
	S Santa Clara County (SJ west 880/101)	13	7	-6	-46%
	E Santa Clara County (Alviso, Milpitas, SJ east 880/101)	3	2	-1	-33%
	W Santa Clara County (Campbell, Los Gatos, Monte Sereno, Santa Clara (rest of), Saratoga (rest of))	3	0	-3	-100%
	Other Santa Clara County (Morgan Hill, Gilroy)	1	1	0	0%
African American Total		33	14	-19	-58%
Filipinx	Service Area 1 (Cupertino, Sunnyvale, Santa Clara (part of), San Jose (part of), Saratoga (part of))	3	3	0	0%
	Service Area 2 (Los Altos, LA Hills, Mt. View, Palo Alto, Stanford)	2	1	-1	-50%
	S Santa Clara County (SJ west 880/101)	10	5	-5	-50%
	E Santa Clara County (Alviso, Milpitas, SJ east 880/101)	7	7	0	0%
	W Santa Clara County (Campbell, Los Gatos, Monte Sereno, Santa Clara (rest of), Saratoga (rest of))	0	0	0	#DIV/0!
	Other Santa Clara County (Morgan Hill, Gilroy)	0	0	0	#DIV/0!
Filipinx Total		22	16	-6	-27%
Latinx	Service Area 1 (Cupertino, Sunnyvale, Santa Clara (part of), San Jose (part of), Saratoga (part of))	18	8	-10	-56%
	Service Area 2 (Los Altos, LA Hills, Mt. View, Palo Alto, Stanford)	38	25	-13	-34%
	S Santa Clara County (SJ west 880/101)	58	36	-22	-38%
	E Santa Clara County (Alviso, Milpitas, SJ east 880/101)	33	17	-16	-48%
	W Santa Clara County (Campbell, Los Gatos, Monte Sereno, Santa Clara (rest of), Saratoga (rest of))	8	6	-2	-25%
	Other Santa Clara County (Morgan Hill, Gilroy)	7	4	-3	-43%
Latinx Total		162	96	-66	-41%
Total		217	126	-91	-42%

Filipinx and Latinx are gender neutral terms.
Source: FHDA IRP

- Headcount by Top 10 Enrollment by County
  - While Santa Clara and San Mateo Counties had the highest enrollment by headcount, these two counties also had the largest decrease in headcount (-362) from Second Spring 2020 and Second Spring 2021.
  - Together Santa Clara and San Mateo Counties represent over half of total headcount in Second Spring 2020 (59%) and Second Spring 2021 (55%).
  - Contra Costa County had the largest headcount increase from 35 to 39 (+4). All other top 10 counties by enrollment experienced a decrease in headcount.
  - Santa Clara County had the largest headcount decrease from 671 to 364 (-307).

Table 10. Top 10 Enrollment by County

Second Spring 2020 and Second Spring 2021

		2020	2021	Change	% Change
Rank	Zip Code Grouping	HC	HC	HC	HC
1	Santa Clara	671	364	-307	-46%
2	San Mateo	160	105	-55	-34%
3	Alameda	117	75	-42	-36%
4	Los Angeles	106	43	-63	-59%
5	Orange	41	26	-15	-37%
6	Contra Costa	35	39	4	11%
7	San Francisco	29	13	-16	-55%
8	Orange	168	112	-56	-33%
9	San Diego	29	15	-14	-48%
10	Sacramento	20	16	-4	-20%
	Total	1,376	808	-568	-41%

Total Second Spring 2020 HC=1,411| Top 10 Second Spring 2020 represents 98% of total headcount
Total Second Spring 2021 HC=858 | Top 10 Second Spring 2021 represents 94% of total headcount
Source: FH IRP

- African American Headcount by County
  - Santa Clara County decreased in African American representation from Second Spring 2020 to Second Spring 2021 from 38% to 25% among African American total headcount.
  - Among the top 5 counties for African American headcount, there was a 58% decrease in headcount between Second Spring 2020 and Second Spring 2021 (-42 students).
  - Among the top 5 counties for African American headcount, Santa Clara, Los Angeles, and San Bernardino, and Sacramento Counties experienced the largest headcount decrease (SCC: -19; SBC: -8: LAC: -7).

Table 11. Top 5 African American Enrollment by County

Second Spring 2020 and Second Spring 2021

		2020	2021	Change	% Change
Rank	Zip Code Grouping	HC	HC	HC	HC
1	Santa Clara	33	14	-19	-58%
2	Alameda	12	7	-5	-42%
3	Los Angeles	11	4	-7	-64%
4	San Bernardino	9	1	-8	-89%
5	San Mateo	8	5	-3	-38%
	Total	73	31	-42	-58%

Total Second Spring 2020 African American HC=88 | Top 10 Second Spring 2020 African American represents 83% of total headcount
Total Second Spring 2021 African American HC=55 | Top 10 Second Spring 2021 African American represents 56% of total headcount
Source: FH IRP

- Latinx Headcount by County
  - Santa Clara and San Mateo Counties represent over three-fourths of Latinx headcount (SS20: 69%; SS21: 64%).
  - Among the top 5 counties for Latinx headcount, Santa Clara, San Mateo, and Los Angeles Counties experienced the largest headcount decrease (-99).
  - None of the top 5 counties for Latinx headcount experienced an increase in students from Second Spring 2020 to Second Spring 2021.

Table 12. Top 5 Latinx Enrollment by County

Second Spring 2020 and Second Spring 2021

		2020	2021	Change	% Change
Rank	Zip Code Grouping	HC	HC	HC	HC
1	Santa Clara	162	96	-66	-41%
2	San Mateo	61	39	-22	-36%
3	Los Angeles	20	9	-11	-55%
4	Alameda	17	13	-4	-24%
5	Sacramento	6	2	-4	-67%
5	San Diego	6	2	-4	-67%
	Total	272	161	-111	-41%

Total Second Spring 2020 Latinx HC=323 | Top 10 Second Spring 2020 Latinx represents 84% of total headcount
Total Second Spring 2021 Latinx HC=212 | Top 10 Second Spring 2021 Latinx represents 76% of total headcount
Source: FH IRP

- First Generation Status
  - First generation students decreased from 341 to 195 between Second Spring 2020 and Second Spring 2021 (-146). This decrease represents a -43% in headcount.

Table 13. First Generation Status

Second Spring 2020 and Second Spring 2021

	2020		2021			
	HC	Percent	HC	Percent	Change	% Change
First Generation	341	25%	195	24%	-146	-43%
Non First Generation	1,020	75%	632	76%	-388	-38%
Total	1,361	100%	827	100%	-534	-39%

NCES defines first generation as a student whose parent(s) completed high school or less.
Only reports those who responded to the questions.
Unknown First Generation HC: Second Spring 2020 - 150; Second Spring 2021 - 31
Source: FH IRP

- First Generation by Ethnicity
  - Latinx and Asians represent the majority of first generation students (SS20: 77%; SS21: 80%).
  - Latinx and Asian students experienced the greatest decrease in their first generation headcount (-104).
  - First generation Pacific Islander students increased their headcount (2 to 7).

Table 14. First Generation by Ethnicity

Second Spring 2020 and Second Spring 2021

	2020		2021			
Ethnicity	HC	Percent	HC	Percent	Change	% Change
African American	26	8%	13	7%	-13	-50%
Asian	115	34%	52	27%	-63	-55%
Filipinx	8	2%	1	1%	-7	-88%
Latinx	145	43%	104	53%	-41	-28%
Native American	1	0%	0	0%	-1	-100%
Pacific Islander	2	1%	7	4%	5	250%
White	38	11%	18	9%	-20	-53%
Decline to State	6	2%	0	0%	-6	-100%
Total	341	100%	195	100%	-146	-43%

NCES defines first generation as a student whose parent(s) completed high school or less.
Only reports those who responded to the questions.
Second Spring 2020 HC: 1,411 | Second Spring 2021 HC: 858
Source: FH IRP

- First Generation Headcount as a Percent of Disproportionately Impacted Student Groups
  - African American and Latinx first generation headcount decreased by 54 between Second Spring 2020 to Second Spring 2021.
  - African American first generation students decreased by 6-percentage points.
  - First generation students represent almost half of Latinx population (49%).

Table 15. First Generation DI Groups as a Percent of DI Group
Second Spring 2020 and Second Spring 2021

	2020		2021			
	HC	Percent	HC	Percent	Change	% Rate Change
African American First Gen	26	30%	13	24%	-13	-6%
African American Total	88		55		-33	
Filipinx First Gen	8	13%	1	3%	-7	-10%
Filipinx Total	61		38		-23	
Latinx First Gen	145	45%	104	49%	-41	4%
Latinx Total	323		212		-111	

NCES defines first generation as a student whose parent(s) completed high school or less.
Total headcounts includes non-first generation and unknown generation students.
Source: FH IRP

- Income
  - 178 fewer students reported a low family income (-47%) between Second Spring 2020 and Second Spring 2021.
  - Over three-fourths of students reported a family income of $25,001 and above (SS21: 77%).

Table 16. Self-Reported Family Income
Second Spring 2020 and Second Spring 2021

	2020		2021			
	HC	Percent	HC	Percent	Change	% Change
$25,000 and below (low income)	379	27%	201	23%	-178	-47%
$25,001 and above (not low income)	1,027	73%	656	77%	-371	-36%
Total	1,406	100%	857	100%	-549	-39%

Question is stated, "What is your family income from the past year? Family income would include the income of you and family members living with you from all sources including jobs as well as other sources such as rents, welfare payments, social security, or even interest from stocks, bonds, savings."
Only reports those who responded to the question. Unknown Income HC: Second Spring 2020 - 5; Second Spring 2021 - 1
Source: FH IRP

- Low Income by Ethnicity
  - Low income Latinx represent around one-third of low income students (SS20: 31%; SS21: 37%). This rated increased by 6%-points between Second Spring 2020 and Second Spring 2021.
  - Asian and White students represent roughly half of low income students (SS20: 50%; SS21: 46%), reflecting a decrease of 4%-points from Second Spring 2020 to Second Spring 2021.

Table 17. Self-Reported Low Family Income by Ethnicity

Spring 2020 and Spring 2021

	2020		2021			
Ethnicity	HC	Percent	HC	Percent	Change	% Change
African American	47	12%	24	12%	-23	-49%
Asian	115	30%	53	26%	-62	-54%
Filipinx	17	4%	1	0%	-16	-94%
Latinx	116	31%	74	37%	-42	-36%
Native American	1	0%	2	1%	1	100%
Pacific Islander	3	1%	3	1%	0	0%
White	74	20%	41	20%	-33	-45%
Decline to State	6	2%	3	1%	-3	-50%
Total	379	100%	201	100%	-178	-47%

Question is stated, "What is your family income from the past year? Family income would include the income of you and family members living with you from all sources including jobs as well as other sources such as rents, welfare payments, social security, or even interest from stocks, bonds, savings."
Low income=$25,000 and below | Only reports those who responded to the question.
Second Spring 2020 HC: 1,411 | Second Spring 2021 HC: 858
Source: FH IRP

- Low Income Headcount as a Percent of Disproportionately Impacted Student Groups
  - Overall, low income students represented at least one-third of all African American and Latinx respectively (44% and 35%).
  - Fewer African Americans reported being low income from Second Spring 2020 to Second Spring 2021, reflecting a 10%-point decline (HC: -23).

Table 18. Self-Reported Low Family Income DI Groups as a Percent of DI Group
Second Spring 2020 and Second Spring 2021

	2020		2021			
	HC	Percent	HC	Percent	Change	% Rate Change
African American Low Income	47	54%	24	44%	-23	-10%
African American Total	87		54		-33	
Filipinx Low Income	17	28%	1	3%	-16	-25%
Filipinx Total	61		38		-23	
Latinx Low Income	116	36%	74	35%	-42	-1%
Latinx Total	322		212		-110	

Question is stated, "What is your family income from the past year? Family income would include the income of you and family members living with you from all sources including jobs as well as other sources such as rents, welfare payments, social security, or even interest from stocks, bonds, savings."
Low income=$25,000 and below | Only reports those who responded to the question.

Source: FH IRP

- Pell Grant
  - A minority of students are awarded a Pell grant (6%) and this rate declined between Second Spring 2020 and Second Spring 2021 (-57%).

Table 19. Pell Grant Status
Second Spring 2020 and Second Spring 2021

	2020		2021			
	HC	Percent	HC	Percent	Change	% Change
Pell Grant Award	126	9%	54	6%	-72	-57%
No Pell Grant Award	1,285	91%	804	94%	-481	-37%
Total	1,411	100%	858	100%	-553	-39%

Source: FH IRP

- Pell Grant by Ethnicity
  - Latinx students represent the largest percentage of Pell grant recipients (SS20: 37%; SS21: 39%).
  - White students represented at least one-fourth of Pell grant recipients (SS21: 26%).
  - Decreases among Pell grant recipients occurred for all ethnicities with the largest headcount decreases among Latinx (-26) and African American (-22) students.

Table 20. Pell Grant Recipients by Ethnicity

Second Spring 2020 and Second Spring 2021

	2020		2021			
Ethnicity	HC	Percent	HC	Percent	Change	% Change
African American	31	25%	9	17%	-22	-71%
Asian	13	10%	8	15%	-5	-38%
Filipinx	6	5%	0	0%	-6	-100%
Latinx	47	37%	21	39%	-26	-55%
Native American	0	0%	0	0%	0	#DIV/0!
Pacific Islander	3	2%	2	4%	-1	-33%
White	21	17%	14	26%	-7	-33%
Decline to State	5	4%	0	0%	-5	-100%
Total	126	100%	54	100%	-72	-57%

Pell Award recipients represent 9% of Second Spring 2020 and 6% of Second Spring 2021.
Second Spring 2020 HC: 1,411 | Second Spring 2021 HC: 858

Source: FH IRP