

**Danville Area Community College
Equity Plan**

January 18, 2022



**Danville Area
Community College**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	2
Purpose of the Equity Plan	3
Institution Overview	3
Equity Statement	3
Current State	4
Evaluation Plan	7
College Equity Institutional Data	8
Future Vision	23
Hiring a Diverse Workforce	23
Equity Through Extra Learning Support	25
Envisioning High Achievers	27
Institutional Strategies	29
References	35

INTRODUCTION

We must look at data in a way that will help eliminate inequity. Releasing data about minorities is key and can compel change. But we need to ask deeper questions about data to know the source of inequity. Scholars say it helps to ask how data reveals “where and when inequities occur” (Bensimon and Hanson 2012, p. 70-71). When colleges ask about inequity in this way, they take ownership of inequity. When they do this, they no longer blame students for inequity, which is the “traditional” way to approach inequity (Bensimon and Hanson 2012, 72; Bauman, et al. 2005, p. 11). Instead, they take responsibility for creating equitable outcomes for underrepresented and underserved minority students. The excuse, then, is no longer the dysfunction or deficiency of students but our inaction.

A crucial element of collecting longitudinal data is making sure we have disaggregated data. For example, data on disaggregated success rates pinpoint more precisely where inequities in achievement occur. Smith (2020) states such data is vital because it shows us that “students from different groups may encounter challenges at different points.” This statement is true for employees of the institution as well. And it stresses that data-informed decision-making must come from data that is broken apart enough to view inequity from multiple perspectives. In doing so, it is possible to know the exact field of studies, majors, courses, and job positions that have had the most inequity.

The mission of this equity plan is to pinpoint actions necessary to close equity gaps to allow underrepresented and minority students, faculty, and staff to succeed at the College. Three crucial questions guide this equity plan: How can we focus on systemic racism that is a part of our everyday practices and policies and transform them to be equitable? How can we cooperate with each other to eliminate barriers that have hindered us from helping students, faculty, and staff equitably? How can we prepare for a diverse and globally connected world?

This plan emerges from a serious consideration of these questions. First, the College must seriously and objectively consider the presence of systemic racism and its impact. Acknowledging that systemic racism exists at the College does not mean the people of the institution are bad. As Robin DiAngelo states, the “good/bad binary” frame of racism “obscures the structural nature of racism” (DiAngelo 2018, p. 71-73). Identifying structural racism primarily pinpoints areas in which we have the opportunity to fix inequities. Indeed, systemic racism is more difficult to see today. But we can see it in who creates practices and policies for institutions. For example, many of the people at DACC with the power to shape policies and make final decisions are not people of color. We see this fact in our College Equity Institutional Data. So our “low number” of representation of people of color in our workforce is not arbitrary as some scholars claim (Mac Donald 2018, p. 79), but based on “academic [and] demographic data.” Second, diversity, equity, and inclusion must become a part of our everyday actions and interactions. No longer should diversity, equity, and inclusion be siloed or delegated to a few people concerned about such issues. Third, diversity-related programs are not enough. Efforts and investments should be made to ensure total access and success for underrepresented

students, faculty, and staff. Finally, disaggregated data must be collected, seriously analyzed, and shared over a long period of time to measure and safeguard that equity goals are being met.

One of the most fundamental steps to addressing inequity is to recognize historic and current injustices embedded in the practices and policies of higher education. For example, standardized tests began as a tool for eugenics and justifying the “inhumane treatment” of slaves who were perceived as cognitively deficient (ASHE 2015, p. 53). So at DACC, for instance, we should look at our placement tests—Accuplacer and ALEKS—as not objective or colorblind measures of students’ ability to succeed in college but tests that do not fully consider precollege experiences with racism in education or the disturbing nature of such tests. If such analysis is not done, working toward equity becomes impossible. But when we recognize the presence of injustice, wherever it is, we must invest the necessary energy to eliminate it. As Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. states, “Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere. We are caught in an inescapable network of mutuality, tied in a single garment of destiny. Whatever affects one directly affects all indirectly” (King 1986, 290). This interconnectivity exists in the College. And by addressing inequity wherever it is, we express a commitment to equity for not only the college community but the world.

PURPOSE OF THE EQUITY PLAN

DACC expects the results of increasing and encouraging workplace diversity, providing extra learning support to underrepresented students, seeing underrepresented students as high achievers, and work done to remove financial barriers as culminating in equitable outcomes and representation. Of course, students have their part in their success. But we see ourselves as taking a more proactive role in the success of students. The goal of this equity plan is to eliminate inequities and disparities in access, enrollment, and completions regarding students. Another goal of this equity plan is to eliminate racist practices and policies embedded in the institution that are barriers to equitable employment and opportunities.

INSTITUTION OVERVIEW

Founded in 1946, DACC is a public, two-year community college that provides higher education for students of diverse communities and educational needs. DACC is a nationally accredited community college offering numerous degree programs and certificates that reflect innovation and prepare students to succeed in the world. DACC is a Predominantly White Institution (PWI) but focuses on addressing disparities in equity between underrepresented minorities and White students, faculty, and staff. DACC is a wonderful resource for higher education and embraces a culture that celebrates, affirms, and supports the diversity of students, faculty, and staff.

EQUITY STATEMENT

DACC acknowledges the barriers, disparities, and disadvantages students face as they embark on their higher education journey. And we also recognize similar barriers to underrepresented employees in their careers. Thus, we take an asset-based or equity-minded approach to teaching,

learning, and support instead of a deficit-minded approach. We seek to address issues related to diversity, equity, and inclusion, knowing that any well-suited definition of such terms must be broad and inclusive enough to address issues related to access, opportunity, and growth for students and employees regardless of race, ethnicity, culture, gender identity, ability, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, and other differences.

CURRENT STATE

Snapshot

Examining the data over the past years, and especially in the past two years regarding graduation and completion by gender, race, and Pell Grant recipient status, it is clear that at Danville Area Community College, the most significant equity gaps persist by race. As the College Equity Institutional Data show, enrollment into academic programs is consistent amongst races and ethnicities. But there are significant inequities by race regarding students enrolled in developmental education and the success and completion rates of students in various programs such as transfer and vocational programs. Furthermore, great inequity exists in the representation in the workplace at Danville Area Community College.

Black or African American students experienced the most inequity in educational outcomes. Gatekeeper success rates, retention, and next-level coursework success rates all were inequitable for Black or African American students. There was significant inequity regarding Black or African American full-time students completing 24 credits in their first academic year (0.61). Similar inequity existed for Black or African American part-time students completing 12 credits in their first academic year (Table 7 & 8). Black or African American part-time students completing at least 12 credits in their first academic year experienced significant inequity (0.50) (Table 8).

Enrollment for groups was consistent or close to equitable except for career technical education (Table 11b) and vocational programs (Table 12a and Table 12b). Namely, Hispanic or Latinx and Multiracial students experienced inequitable enrollment (0.73 and 0.62) in career technical education programs for FY 2020 (Table 11b). Similar inequitable outcomes for enrollment persisted with Black or African American vocational program students in FY 2019 (0.57) and FY 2020 (0.50) (Table 12a & Table 12b), in which the Group Equity Index (GEI) of Black or African American students enrolled in vocational programs were less than 0.58. Hispanic or Latinx students also experienced significant inequity regarding enrollment in vocational programs for FY 2020 (0.84) (Table 12b). Significant disparities existed between Black or African American, Hispanic or Latinx, and White students enrolled in Adult Basic Education and Adult Secondary Education (Table 13a, Table 13b, Table 14a, and Table 14b). While Black or African American and Hispanic or Latinx students had significant overrepresentation for FY 2019 and FY 2020 regarding enrollment in adult basic education and adult secondary education, White students were significantly less and underrepresented in the same category.

Hispanic or Latinx students experienced significant disparity in completions in general associate programs for FY 2020 (0.67) (Table 15b). Black or African American, Hispanic or Latinx, and Multiracial students experienced significant inequity in transfer programs (Table 16b).

Dual Credit Enrollment had significantly higher inequitable outcomes for Black or African American (0.69), Hispanic or Latinx (0.68), and Multiracial students (0.20) compared to White students (1.05) (Table 18).

Representation of the staff and faculty had widespread inequitable representation. Black or African American, Hispanic or Latinx, Asian American, Native American, and Multiracial employees all had significant underrepresentation and GEIs of 0.65 or lower, while White employees experienced consistent overrepresentation. Women had significant overrepresentation. And men experienced the greatest inequity in representation in classified staff and part-time faculty.

The College Equity Institutional Data for 2021 will serve as a baseline for the future data collection on equitable outcomes and representation. The limit of these data is they do not reflect all groups such as differently-abled, veterans, LGBTQ+, and other groups (see Table 1a - Table 1c). It is our goal to collect more disaggregated and broad data, outcomes, and representation. Still, the GEI is a proper quantitative tool that we will use as a benchmark for all outcomes and reflective representation.

TABLE 1a. Danville Area Community College 5-Year Enrollment Counts by Race

Race or Ethnicity	Fall 2021	Fall 2020	Fall 2019	Fall 2018	Fall 2017
Asian American	17 (1%)	24	25	22	43
Native American	4 (<1%)	6	6	16	11
Black or African American	301 (16%)	259	302	414	418
Hispanic or Latinx	117 (6%)	106	97	148	104
White	1320 (69%)	1660	1750	1812	1894
Multiracial	27 (1%)	37	26	0	0
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0 (0%)	1	1	3	3
Unknown or Other	114 (6%)	155	153	185	227

Data Source: Institutional Research Office

TABLE 1b. Danville Area Community College 5-Year Enrollment Counts by Gender

Gender	Fall 2021	Fall 2020	Fall 2019	Fall 2018	Fall 2017
Women	810 (43%)	955	984	1083	1151
Men	1073 (56%)	1251	1369	1517	1549
Other	17 (1%)	12	7	0	0

Data Source: Institutional Research Office

TABLE 1c. Danville Area Community College Employee Demographics by Race/Ethnicity and Gender

Group	Number	Percent
Asian American	6	1.6%
Black or African American	38	10.4%
Hispanic or Latinx	10	2.7%
White	311	85.2%
Women	226	61.9%
Men	139	38.0%

Data Source: Human Resources

EVALUATION PLAN

The College is well suited to track and seriously analyze the equity of our efforts and actions. As the College collects long-term data, it must also look at data in new ways. If the College makes an investment in technology to make disaggregated data more accessible, it must not only be at the disposal of those who drive diversity and equity efforts but shared in a way that all employees can make data-informed decisions that will have a positive impact on equity. DACC will track targeted populations in a timely manner to evaluate and update our equity plan.

Evaluation Strategy

Group Equity Index

We chose the Group Equity Index (GEI) to calculate the equity or inequity of educational outcomes and representation of faculty, staff, and administration. The GEI is a “quantitative method to measure equity” and is a “measure of proportionality based on the population for each group” (Williams 2013, p. 271). It is a tool that measures how outcomes, success rates, faculty, and staff should represent the population demographics. For example, if Black males are 20 percent (.20) of the students in developmental courses but are 10 percent (.10) of the students who succeed in such developmental courses, the GEI for Black males is $20/10$ or 0.50. We achieve equity when the GEI number is 1.0 (when the metric percentage equals the population percentage). And in most cases, such equity should serve as a benchmark. Of course, overrepresentation (when the number is above 1.0) may be a good indicator of equity when it applies to underrepresented and minority students and groups unless the overrepresentation is in an outcome that is less than ideal (i.e., failures). The GEI applied to data from multiple data sources.

COLLEGE EQUITY INSTITUTIONAL DATA

TABLE 2. Danville Area Community College Developmental Course Success Rate, FY 2020

Group	Outcome %/Population %	Group Equity Index
Black or African American	28.28%/27.84%	1.01
Hispanic or Latinx	5.05%/5.06%	1.00
White	59.0%/55.0%	1.07
Women	63.63%/59.81%	1.06
Men	36.36%/40.18%	0.90

Data Source: Institutional Research Office

TABLE 3. Danville Area Community College Gatekeeper Course Success Rate, FY 2020

Group	Outcome % /Population %	Group Equity Index
Black or African American	11.01%/17.43%	0.63
Hispanic or Latinx	4.24%/4.55%	0.93
White	74.85%/66.95%	1.11
Women	66.51%/61.40%	1.08
Men	33.48%/38.59%	0.86

Data Source: Institutional Research Office

TABLE 4. Danville Area Community College Fall to Spring Retention, 2019 Fall Cohort

Group	Outcome % /Population %	Group Equity Index
Black or African American	11.29%/17.12%	0.65
Hispanic or Latinx	5.64%/4.69%	1.2
White	75.0%/69.0%	1.1
Women	42.74%/42.54%	1
Men	57.25%/57.45%	1
Full-Time	86.69%/73.48%	1.17
Part-Time	13.30%/26.51%	0.50

Data Source: Institutional Research Office

TABLE 5. Danville Area Community College Fall to Fall Retention, 2019 Fall Cohort

Group	Outcome % /Population %	Group Equity Index
Black or African American	10.73%/17.12%	0.62
Hispanic or Latinx	6.21%/4.69%	1.32
White	74.57%/69.61%	1.07
Women	53.10%/57.45%	0.92
Men	46.89%/42.54%	1.10
Full-Time	85.87%/73.48%	1.16
Part-Time	14.12%/26.51%	0.53

Data Source: Institutional Research Office

TABLE 6. Danville Area Community College Success Rate of Developmental Students in Next-Level of Coursework, FY 2020

Group	Outcome % /Population %	Group Equity Index
Black or African American	17.81%/25.32%	0.70
Hispanic or Latinx	5.74%/5.19%	1.10
White	65.51%/59.41%	1.10
First-Generation	79.88%/78.24%	1.02
Non-First-Generation	20.11%/21.75%	.92

Data Source: Institutional Research Office

TABLE 7. Danville Area Community College First-Time Full-Time Students Completing 24 Credits in their First Academic Year, 2019-2020

Group	Outcome % /Population %	Group Equity Index
Black or African American	11.72%/19.18%	0.61
Hispanic or Latinx	5.12%/6.14%	0.83
White	71.79%/61.82%	1.16
Women	53%/54%	0.98
Men	46.15%/54.75%	0.84
Pell	49.08%/54.42%	0.90
Non-Pell	50.91%/45.19%	1.12

Data Source: Institutional Research Office

TABLE 8. Danville Area Community College First-Time Part-Time Students Completing 12 Credits in their First Academic Year, 2019-2020

Group	Outcome % /Population %	Group Equity Index
Black or African American	26.38%/51.96%	0.50
Hispanic or Latinx	4.16%/1.74%	2.4
White	58.33%/42.79%	1.8
Women	62.50%/67.98%	0.91
Men	37.5%/32.01%	1.17
Pell	51.38%/46.67%	1.10
Non-Pell	48.61%/53.34%	0.91

Data Source: Institutional Research Office

TABLE 9a. Danville Area Community College Enrollment in General Associate Programs, FY 2019

Group	Outcome % /Population %	Group Equity Index
Black or African American	19.48%/14.75%	1.3
Hispanic or Latinx	5.92%/5.12%	1.15
White	67.37%/68.57%	0.98
Asian American	2.58%/0.9%	2.6
Multiracial	1.4%/0.8%	1.75

Data Source: Illinois Community College Board

TABLE 9b. Danville Area Community College Enrollment in General Associate Programs, FY 2020

Group	Outcome % /Population %	Group Equity Index
Black or African American	18.18%/14.12%	1.28
Hispanic or Latinx	5.26%/5.57%	0.94
White	67.37%/70.03%	0.96
Asian American	2.63%/1.15%	2.28
Multiracial	1.19%/0.8%	1.48

Data Source: Illinois Community College Board

TABLE 10a. Danville Area Community College Enrollment in Transfer Programs, FY 2019

Group	Outcome % /Population %	Group Equity Index
Black or African American	17.61%/14.75%	1.19
Hispanic or Latinx	6.59%/5.12%	1.28
White	63.36%/68.57%	0.92
Asian American	1.0%/0.9%	1.3
Multiracial	1.95%/0.8%	2.4

Data Source: Illinois Community College Board

TABLE 10b. Danville Area Community College Enrollment in Transfer Programs, FY 2020

Group	Outcome % /Population %	Group Equity Index
Black or African American	18.55%/14.12%	1.31
Hispanic or Latinx	7.16%/5.57%	1.28
White	62.83%/70.03%	0.89
Asian American	1.05%/1.15%	0.91
Multiracial	1.86%/0.8%	2.32

Data Source: Illinois Community College Board

TABLE 11a. Danville Area Community College Enrollment in Career and Technical Education Programs, FY 2019

Group	Outcome % /Population %	Group Equity Index
Black or African American	16.52%/14.75%	1.12
Hispanic or Latinx	4.15%/5.12%	1.05
White	73.13%/68.57%	1.03
Asian American	1.02%/0.9%	1.2
Multiracial	0.2%/0.8%	0.68

Data Source: Illinois Community College Board

TABLE 11b. Danville Area Community College Enrollment in Career Technical Education Programs, FY 2020

Group	Outcome % /Population %	Group Equity Index
Black or African American	16.83%/14.12%	1.19
Hispanic or Latinx	4.09%/5.57%	0.73
White	72.92%/70.03%	1.04
Asian American	0.5%/1.15%	0.43
Multiracial	0.5%/0.8%	0.62

Data Source: Illinois Community College Board

TABLE 12a. Danville Area Community College Enrollment in Vocational Programs, FY 2019

Group	Outcome % /Population %	Group Equity Index
Black or African American	8.55%/14.75%	0.57
Hispanic or Latinx	3.78%/5.12%	0.73
White	73.64%/68.57%	1.07
Asian American	0.29%/0.9%	0.29
Multiracial	0.04%/0.8%	0.05

Data Source: Illinois Community College Board

TABLE 12b. Danville Area Community College Enrollment in Vocational Programs, FY 2020

Group	Outcome % /Population %	Group Equity Index
Black or African American	7.09%/14.12%	0.50
Hispanic or Latinx	4.73%/5.57%	0.84
White	76.67%/70.03%	1.09
Asian American	1.07%/1.15%	0.93
Multiracial	0%/0.8%	0.0

Data Source: Illinois Community College Board

TABLE 13a. Danville Area Community College Enrollment in Adult Basic Education, FY 2019

Group	Outcome % /Population %	Group Equity Index
Black or African American	40.74%/14.75%	2.76
Hispanic or Latinx	5.82%/5.12%	1.13
White	48.67%/68.57%	0.70
Asian American	1.58%/0.9%	1.6

Data Source: Illinois Community College Board

TABLE 13b. Danville Area Community College Enrollment in Adult Basic Education, FY 2020

Group	Outcome % /Population %	Group Equity Index
Black or African American	35.67%/14.12%	2.52
Hispanic or Latinx	5.73%/5.57%	1.02
White	50.95%/70.03%	0.72
Asian American	0.0%/1.15%	0.0
Multiracial	0.6%/0.8%	0.75

Data Source: Illinois Community College Board

TABLE 14a. Danville Area Community College Enrollment in Adult Secondary Education Programs, FY 2019

Group	Outcome % /Population %	Group Equity Index
Black or African American	25.92%/14.75%	1.75
Hispanic or Latinx	2.46%/5.12%	0.48
White	71.60%/68.57%	1.04

Data Source: Illinois Community College Board

TABLE 14b. Danville Area Community College Enrollment in Adult Secondary Education, FY 2020

Group	Outcome % /Population %	Group Equity Index
Black or African American	26.3%/14.12%	1.86
Hispanic or Latinx	10.52%/5.57%	1.88
White	52.63%/70.03%	0.75
Asian American	0.0%/1.15%	0.0
Multiracial	0%/0.8%	0.0

Data Source: Illinois Community College Board

TABLE 15a. Danville Area Community College Completions in General Associate Programs, FY 2019

Group	Outcome % /Population %	Group Equity Index
Black or African American	20.37%/19.48%	1.04
Hispanic or Latinx	7.40%/5.92%	1.25
White	57.40%/67.37%	0.85
Asian American	0.0%/2.58%	0.0
Multiracial	3.70%/1.4%	2.64

Data Source: Illinois Community College Board

TABLE 15b. Danville Area Community College Completions in General Associate Programs, FY 2020

Group	Outcome % /Population %	Group Equity Index
Black or African American	23.21%/18.18%	1.27
Hispanic or Latinx	3.57%/5.26%	0.67
White	67.85%/67.37%	1.00
Asian American	0.0%/2.63%	0.0
Multiracial	0.0%/1.19%	0.0

Data Source: Illinois Community College Board

TABLE 16a. Danville Area Community College Completions in Transfer Programs, FY 2019

Group	Outcome % /Population %	Group Equity Index
Black or African American	9.39%/17.61%	0.53
Hispanic or Latinx	6.04%/6.59%	0.91
White	75.16%/63.36%	1.18
Asian American	3.35%/1.0%	1.3
Multiracial	2.68%/1.95%	1.37

Data Source: Illinois Community College Board

TABLE 16b. Danville Area Community College Completions in Transfer Programs, FY 2020

Group	Outcome % /Population %	Group Equity Index
Black or African American	10.71%/18.55%	0.57
Hispanic or Latinx	3.57%/7.16%	0.49
White	71.82%/62.83%	1.14
Asian American	0.0%/1.05%	0.0
Multiracial	1.19%/1.86%	0.63

Data Source: Illinois Community College Board

TABLE 17a. Danville Area Community College Completions in Career Technical Programs, FY 2019

Group	Outcome % /Population %	Group Equity Index
Black or African American	14.40%/16.52%	0.87
Hispanic or Latinx	4.15%/4.15%	1.0
White	73.13%/73.13%	1.0
Asian American	1.93%/1.02%	1.89
Multiracial	0.2%/0.2%	1

Data Source: Illinois Community College Board

TABLE 17b. Danville Area Community College Completions in Career Technical Programs, FY 2020

Group	Outcome % /Population %	Group Equity Index
Black or African American	16.75%/16.83	0.99
Hispanic or Latinx	2.97%/4.09%	0.72
White	74.86%/72.92%	1.02
Asian American	0.5%/0.5%	1.0
Multiracial	0.5%/0.5%	1

Data Source: Illinois Community College Board

TABLE 18. Danville Area Community College Enrollment in Dual Credit Programs, FY 2020

Group	Outcome % /Population %	Group Equity Index
Black or African American	10.7%/15.5%	0.69
Hispanic or Latinx	4.7%/6.9%	0.68
White	75.4%/71.4%	1.05
Asian American	1.1%/0.6%	1.83
Multiracial	1.1%/5.5%	0.20

Data Source: ISBE Report Card, U.S. Census Bureau

TABLE 19. Danville Area Community College Administrative Staff

Group	Representation % /Population %	Group Equity Index
Black or African American	13%/20%	0.65
Hispanic or Latinx	5%/11%	0.45
White	81%/66%	1.22
Asian American	0%/3%	0.0
Native American	0%/1%	0.0
Multiracial	0%/3%	0.0
Men	43%/49%	.087
Women	57%/51%	1.11

Data Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Human Resources. **Methodology:** (for Table 19-23) We compared percentages of the groups' representation regarding race/ethnicity and the averaged percentages of the groups' population demographics regarding race/ethnicity in Danville, Illinois, Vermilion County, and the U.S. Census Bureau's population projections for the year 2030. Choosing to average these percentages links to DACC's mission statement and Statement on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, which emphasize an importance on preparing all students for "lifelong academic, cultural and economic needs" in a "globally connected world." So, to prepare for the future, population projections were used as one of the percentages.

TABLE 20. Danville Area Community College Classified Staff

Group	Representation % /Population %	Group Equity Index
Black or African American	8%/20%	0.40
Hispanic or Latinx	1%/11%	0.09
White	88%/66%	1.33
Asian American	1%/3%	0.33
Native American	0%/1%	0%
Multiracial	0%/3%	0%
Men	24%/49%	0.48
Women	76%/51%	1.49

Data Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Human Resources.

TABLE 21. Danville Area Community College Part-Time Staff

Group	Representation % /Population %	Group Equity Index
Black or African American	13%/20%	0.65
Hispanic or Latinx	3%/11%	0.27
White	81%/66%	1.27
Asian American	1%/3%	0.33
Native American	0%/1%	0.0
Multiracial	0%/3%	0.0
Men	42%/49%	0.85
Women	58%/51%	1.13

Data Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Human Resources.

TABLE 22. Danville Area Community College Full-Time Faculty

Group	Representation % /Population %	Group Equity Index
Black or African American	5%/20%	0.25
Hispanic or Latinx	1%/11%	0.09
White	90%/66%	1.36
Asian American	3%/3%	1
Native American	0%/1%	0
Multiracial	0%/3%	0
Men	40%/49%	0.81
Women	60%/51%	1.17

Data Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Human Resources.

TABLE 23. Danville Area Community College Part-Time Faculty

Group	Representation % /Population %	Group Equity Index
Black or African American	9%/20%	0.45
Hispanic or Latinx	0%/11%	0.0
White	90%/66%	1.36
Asian American	1%/3%	0.33
Native American	0%/1%	0.0
Multiracial	0%/3%	0.0
Men	38%/49%	0.61
Women	62%/51%	1.21

Data Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Human Resources.

FUTURE VISION

Our first strategy is finding and hiring diverse employees to increase our workplace diversity and show a commitment to equity regarding structural representation. Increased workplace diversity will foster not only an equitable environment but a collegial environment that questions assumptions and drives innovation. The second strategy is to provide resources and support to new diverse candidates to retain new diverse talent. The College wants not only to increase workplace diversity but to cultivate diversity in a way that makes diverse employees know they are in an environment where they can grow and thrive. Third, we want to establish hiring practices that are structured in a way that removes vestiges of systemic racism and unconscious bias. For example, one way to remove vestiges of systemic racism and unconscious bias is to acknowledge race and bias during the hiring process. Currently, DACC does not require implicit bias training for search committee members. Neither does race or ethnicity consistently play a part in how we evaluate candidates. This is surprising, given that the primary reason for affirmative action is to eliminate a “continuing systemic racism” (ASHE 2015, p. 55; Jayakumar & Adamian, 2015). Yet we cannot fight against systemic racism if we are not willing to acknowledge race in our hiring practices. Thus, race must be a part of the discourse when we hire employees. Having the proper safeguards and practices in place before and during the hiring process ensures that diverse and underrepresented candidates have an equal opportunity to be a part of the College. The fourth strategy is to provide underrepresented students with the extra learning support they need to succeed. DACC has programs like TRIO and Toolbox that provide support to underrepresented students. Yet DACC could benefit from embedding such services into the curriculum. Offering a math course with an embedded TRIO tutor is an example of such extra support. Likewise, our fifth strategy is to provide underrepresented students with support services that are catered to them. Research shows students have greater success when learning support and academic plans cater to their specific needs. The sixth strategy is to remove the ability to pay as a barrier to underrepresented students continuing their education at DACC. We want to remove any barriers that have become a systemic barrier to underrepresented students receiving education. Finally, our last strategy is to collect long-term and disaggregated data and seriously analyze them to help us make data-informed decisions regarding equity.

Hiring a Diverse Workforce

When a search committee member of color asks why there are not any people of color in the final candidate pool? The search committee chair tells her, “I don’t think we need to look at color as a criteria for candidates. Besides, many of the candidates of color had Ph.D. 's and would probably want more money than what we are offering for this position.” The committee chair continues, “There just wasn’t a good supply of qualified candidates of color. We had a few interesting candidates of color, but they just didn’t seem like a good fit.”

Hiring diverse faculty, staff, and administrators is more than meeting a quota. Having a diverse workforce is about developing and maintaining academic and institutional excellence and student success. As Fujimoto (2012) states, we need a diverse faculty “to have a positive impact on educational quality and student achievement.” So hiring a diverse workforce goes beyond a quota or ethics. It is at the core of equity: equal educational outcomes and representation. A diverse faculty and workforce have extremely positive effects on academic performance, excellence, and quality (Williams and Wade-Golden 2013, p. 289). So, diversity is largely an educational tactic—a tactic to help all students succeed. With that said, DACC lags behind a majority of national averages (American Council on Education, 2019) for workplace diversity.

Diversity and equity are linked. Most people accept that a diverse workforce is beneficial. In fact, as Crutcher (2018) states, when we “expand representational diversity as a means of ensuring” equity, “regardless of [people’s] race, ethnicity, class, gender, or sexual orientation,” we help people “[feel] included.” Such a sense of belonging helps people to work harder and better. Diversity in the workplace has cognitive benefits as well. For instance, in a 2015 study of a homogenous and diverse group, scholars found that “diversity improves the way people think. By disrupting conformity, racial and ethnic diversity prompts people to scrutinize facts, think more deeply and develop their own opinions” (Crutcher 2018, 30; Smith 2020). In other words, diversity positively affects us making arguments, questioning evidence, and making developed judgments about our assumptions, and is key to not only education but the collegial environment of our institution. That means diversity in the workplace can disrupt tradition, conformity, and the desire to continue to do things that do not work. And it can force us to question our assumptions and lead us to innovative and better solutions for our institutional problems. This can lead to the scrutinizing of structural racism and help disrupt tradition when necessary to ensure equity.

Of course, court cases like *Regents of University of California v. Bakke*, 438 U.S. 265 (1978), *Hopwood v. Texas* 78 F.3d 932 5th Circuit (1996), *Grutter v. Bollinger*, 539 U.S. 306 (2003), *Fisher v. University of Texas*, 570 U.S. 297 (2013), and *Fisher v. University of Texas*, 579 U.S. (2016) confirm it is increasingly important to make sure initiatives to hire a more diverse and equitable workforce do not use quotas or are only an effort to correct historical racism. Efforts for a more diverse and equitable workforce should primarily come from an academic standpoint. The reason is that many ethical issues and complexities surround hiring diverse employees (Fujimoto 2012). The debate surrounding these complexities manifest when people oppose race-conscious and affirmative action-based diversity efforts. But when diversity and equity efforts are academic based, it is easier for most to see how they positively affect the institution.

Such efforts, however, should not lose a race consciousness. And race-conscious diversity and equity efforts succeed the most when senior leadership drives them. As scholars state, there are times when

obstacles are placed in front of an affirmative action, faculty diversity effort. It is increasingly clear that the necessary changes in diversification of faculty are greatly aided when there is race-conscious ethical leadership and commitment from the top levels of the organization. In the absence of such leadership and commitment, the [the

failure to hire a diverse faculty] have the potential to persist and multiply. (Fujimoto 2012)

So DACC must have a full commitment to diversity and equity from senior leadership. If DACC does not have the support of senior leadership, hiring a diverse faculty will be difficult, making equitable representation impossible.

Tactics to hire diverse candidates are not novel. Many colleges and universities have benefited from working toward a diverse and equitable workplace. Affirmative action and race-conscious efforts to hire a diverse workforce are inexpensive. So there is usually no financial barrier to implementing a program to hire more diverse candidates. Still, such efforts to hire a more diverse faculty and workforce take commitment and determination. As Williams and Wade-Golden (2013) say, “Departments must move beyond the self-fulfilling prophecies about the difficulty of hiring underrepresented faculty and approach recruitment with rigor and creativity” (p. 283). Gone are the days when we can make excuses that we do not have enough diverse candidates to offer them a job. The responsibility is on us to do what we must to recruit and hire a diverse workforce.

There are misconceptions about efforts to recruit a diverse workforce. And the following myths impede efforts to achieve a diverse workforce:

- Institutions cannot compete with other institutions and businesses for “highly sought after” diversity candidates.
- Diversity candidates do not want to come to a place that lacks diversity.
- Efforts for a diverse workforce is an example of “reverse discrimination.” (Williams and Wade-Golden 2013, p. 283)
- There are not enough diverse candidates in our area.

But no valid excuse exists to not consider diverse candidates; there are many ways to increase faculty and workforce diversity. Of course, some say efforts to increase workplace diversity “[weakens] academic” or professional “qualifications” (Mac Donald 2018, p. 95). But we do not intend to lower the standard of our qualifications, we only seek to make our standards broader. One solution to attracting more diverse candidates is making job descriptions more inclusive. For instance, the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) requires faculty who teach general education or non-occupation courses to have a master’s degree or higher in the discipline or subfield or at least 18 graduate hours in the discipline or subfield (Higher Learning Commission, 2020). But if a job advertisement for a chemistry professor states the applicant must have a master’s or higher in chemistry or at least 18 graduate credit hours in chemistry, this advertisement is exclusive and could be an extension of a racist practice. Indeed, chemistry is a subfield of science. Thus, it is better to state that the applicant must have a master’s in science, chemistry, or a subfield of chemistry or at least 18 graduate credits in science, chemistry, or a subfield of chemistry. Listing all possible subfields in such a job advertisement would also help. Making deliberate and small changes like this will draw a larger and more diverse pool of candidates. This is only one example of how to attract diverse candidates. Furthermore, stating how the College is committed to building a more diverse, equitable, and inclusive campus is key

to encouraging applicants from underrepresented groups to apply. And to increase the opportunities for success for underrepresented students, it is in the best interest of DACC to commit itself to hiring a diverse faculty and workforce.

Equity Through Extra Learning Support

A meeting is scheduled to discuss why students of color are not having success in college after they complete remedial courses. One member of the committee says, “We are providing so many opportunities and resources for students of color to succeed in college, even free tutoring. I just think they are not taking advantage of the resources in front of them for some reason.”

It is well known that traditional developmental and remedial education is not the best model for college students. Over-placement in developmental and remedial courses causes a greater gap in achievement between students from underrepresented groups and students from the majority group (Goldman and Abrahamson 2019, p. 2-3). “Only 17% of Illinois’ students enrolled in developmental education end up completing a gateway course in math and English” (Goldman and Abrahamson 2019, p. 2). And, “among students attending community college, 62% of Latino students and 71% of African American students are placed in remediation, compared to only 41% of white students” (Goldman and Abrahamson 2019, p. 3). In 2020, over 35% of DACC Black or African American students out of 88 did not have success in traditional developmental education (DACC Institutional Effectiveness Office, 2020). And in the same year, only 148 out of 383 (39%) had success in gatekeeper courses such as English, Math, Psychology, Biology, etc. In fact, 31 out of 78 Black students (40%) had success in next-level coursework after a developmental course (DACC Institutional Effectiveness Office, 2020). Such data exist for traditional remedial education and gatekeeper courses. Given this data, we should provide more support for underrepresented students and change the traditional developmental education model to a *corequisite support model*. Doing this will have a significant impact on the trajectory of underrepresented students’ success.

Traditional developmental education adds obstacles to students by increasing the time it takes for them to complete a degree. In an effort to decrease the number of students placed in developmental education, the Illinois General Assembly recommends a multiple-measure framework to determine the readiness of students to be enrolled in introductory college-level courses under the “Developmental Education Reform Act.” This is a practice DACC has put in place. And DACC has significantly decreased the number of students, including underrepresented students, placed into developmental education courses. In fact, DACC is aware of the implications of too much traditional developmental education. And such knowledge has helped scale down developmental education and students enrolled in remedial courses.

Yet, for multiple measures to benefit underrepresented students, multiple measures must be measured. If a student scores lower in areas like math or reading, but still places in college-level courses, that student should know the details of their score. In other words, admittance into a college-level course does not help students who may need help in coursework. As Ngo and Kwon

(2014) state, Most students do not know “not know if placement into a particular level was the result of a multiple measure point boost” and, in fact, “college students generally feel uninformed and unaware of community college assessment and placement policies.” Therefore, a detailed multiple-measure framework, which includes measures like work history, essays, references, and other measures, should be disclosed to students. This way, students will know and, perhaps, receive recommendations for help they should receive in college-level courses.

Furthermore, scaling down traditional developmental education is not the only option to help underrepresented students succeed. And scaling down learning support without another alternative is not the best strategy; developmental education itself is not the primary problem. And 883 credit hours in developmental education in 2021 is not really scaling down traditional remedial education. To be sure, some colleges, such as Illinois Central College, have eliminated all placement tests for traditional developmental education.

Still, a part of reforming developmental education is how we design and integrate it into the curriculum. One way we can help students not get stuck in non-credit pathways and fail in college-level courses is to follow the proven corequisite support model. In such a model,

students are immediately enrolled in credit-bearing, college-level courses while receiving additional support to ensure their success. This approach balances pacing and active learning to build student confidence as they earn important early credits towards their program of study. (Complete College of America 2021)

Corequisite support removes the educational barriers of many students. And such a model has had success around the country. For instance, the City University of New York (CUNY) experienced that students with corequisite support graduated at a higher rate than students in a traditional prerequisite remedial model (Logue 2019). And the University System of Georgia “doubled the percentage of students who completed gateway courses for all students, regardless of race or entrance exam scores” after “[abandoning] traditional remedial approaches in favor of new models” (Complete College of America 2021). Many colleges and universities are experiencing similar success around the country. And given the success of such a shift in how to teach and integrate developmental education, scholars say the choice to move to this corequisite support model “isn’t happening quickly enough” (Complete College of America 2021). Thus, we believe if DACC can adopt a similar approach to developmental education—scaling up corequisite support models for developmental education and adding other learning assistance in classrooms—we can see similar increased success with underrepresented students.

The idea of this initiative would not be to eliminate developmental courses but to scale up remedial education in a different form to offer extra support to underrepresented students. Certainly, some students might perform well in a course initially. But after a few weeks, they might fall behind for various reasons. Usually, such students must depend on a tutoring service to help stay on track. This requires students to schedule out-of-class time for support. But with a course that uses a corequisite support model, it integrates support in the class. So the student does not need to schedule out-of-class time for help. And unlike traditional prerequisite

remedial courses, these corequisite remedial courses would not increase the time-to-degree for underrepresented students or be a hassle to schedule.

Other assistance should be provided for students as well. Adaptive learning and adaptive learning technology are promising practices that target students' specific educational needs. In fact, scholars state, "students learn best when their individual needs are targeted" (Liu et al. 2017, p. 1621). And "With today's technological advancement, adaptive learning has emerged as a way to better meet individual student needs" (Liu et al. 2017, p. 1621). Students do better when customizable learning experiences are available. But institutions must be careful that adaptive learning does not add too much of a workload or time commitment for students (Liu et al. 2017). Such a practice does not benefit students.

Still, adaptive learning with corequisite support models and other forms of learning assistance (supplemental instruction, tutoring, teaching assistants, etc.) that are integrated in the course can work together to overcome most educational barriers to finishing courses and performing at high levels in such courses. Thus, DACC will benefit from a more comprehensive, formalized, and centralized admissions, advising, and support service for underrepresented students that incorporates corequisite support models, adaptive learning, supplemental instruction, and learning assistance. These changes will undoubtedly have a positive impact on student retention and completion rates.

Envisioning High Achievers

A student success coordinator tells a colleague, "So many of our underrepresented minority students lack the skills to succeed in college. Neither do they know about the unwritten rules of academia. We have to do more to help such under-resourced students persist and graduate."

Students are crucial to the success of any institution of higher education. But a deficit-based strategy is not the only strategy diversity and equity efforts should take. Deficit-based refers to a strategy that uses deficit-minded language, which expresses and emphasizes resources that students do not have. But faculty, staff, and administrators have a lot to do with student success. Deficit-based strategies treat students who are highly and historically underrepresented as, some scholars say, like "survivors." (Bauman, et al. 2005, p. 11). While survivors persist and overcome struggles, they do not over-achieve or perform at high levels. They only "get through" school.

In a study by the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), scholars state why institutions must change the mentality of only wanting underrepresented individuals and groups "to get by" in higher education:

From our perspective, "inclusive excellence" is achieved when these historically underrepresented students exhibit traditional academic characteristics of high achievers, such as high grade point averages, honors, high class rankings, and so on. We emphasize traditional measures of academic excellence because for too long, institutions of higher

education have approached the college participation of historically underrepresented students as a matter of producing survivors—students who persist and graduate—largely disregarding the institution’s responsibility and effectiveness in producing leaders. (Bauman 2005, p. 11)

Such an effort, scholars say, calls for a change from thinking of a student as “dysfunctional” (Bauman et al. 2005, p. 11; Association for the Study of Higher Education 2015, p. 68) —socially, culturally, and financially deficient—to recognizing that there are flaws in internal systems, curriculum, co-curriculum, or institutional and educational policies and practices. To do this, we must engage in encouraging and keeping track of the “high achievement” of underrepresented individuals and groups (Bauman et al. 2005, p. 11). Yet this takes work. And it is not a passive task. Faculty, staff, deans, administrators, and advisors must take full responsibility for equitable outcomes and become agents for students within underrepresented groups. And colleges and universities must disaggregate data and have measurable indicators to start this work (Bauman et al. 2005, p. 11). Keeping track of every kind of student in every kind of program is crucial to really help underrepresented students. Thus, a commitment to the long-term collection of data on diverse students is vital.

But we cannot overstate how crucial it is to look for change within instead of without.

The willingness of institutional actors to examine themselves and their institutions critically is a prerequisite for addressing the problem of inequities based on race/ethnicity. One of the greatest obstacles to learning and change at the institutional level is a natural tendency to look past ourselves for the source of problems or to avoid examining them at all. (Bauman et al. 2005, p. 11)

This shift in thinking cannot be temporary. Neither can we apply it as a step-by-step process that will automatically lead to equitable educational outcomes. This shift in thinking must take place every day in the minds of faculty, staff, and administration. And it must show through the everyday interactions and actions of the College. We must see ourselves as helping students not only achieve but achieve at extremely high levels. Instead of focusing only on persistence, retention, and graduation, we should focus more on academic excellence, marketability, and acceptance in prestigious institutions.

INSTITUTIONAL STRATEGIES

GOAL 1: Find and hire diverse employees to achieve proportional representation.

Objective: Make the institution attractive to diverse employees through engagement and providing pathways to employment for diverse candidates.

- a. Advertise in diversity publications and job boards.
- b. Attend diversity-focused recruitment events.
- c. Establish a faculty diversity plan.
- d. Host future faculty diversity symposiums on campus.
- e. Take part in diverse faculty exchange programs with HBCUs, MSIs, PBIs, etc.
- f. Develop a pipeline program for future faculty.
- g. Develop search plans that are reviewed for broad outreach including publications that might reach diverse audiences.
- h. Use funds to hire diverse candidates.
- i. Provide diversity-themed postdoctoral fellowships.
- j. Require candidates to submit a statement of commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Alignment with Strategic Plan: 3.C.4

Time Period: Ongoing

Measures/Benchmarks

- Number of applicants responding to job advertisements equal or greater than GEI.
- Number of diverse contacts who applied for positions at DACC.
- Publication of a faculty diversity plan and action steps.
- Number and percentage of diversity symposium participants who apply for positions at DACC.
- Number of credit hours/courses taught by faculty from HBCUs, MSI, PBIs, etc. through the faculty exchange program.
- Number of participants who are hired through future faculty pipeline.
- Number of times search plans are used for candidate searches by the College.
- Number of funds used to hire diverse candidates.
- Number of fellows in the diversity-themed fellowship program.
- Number of “diversity statements” from candidates.

GOAL 2: Retain diverse talent to achieve and maintain proportional representation.

Objective: To provide resources, support, and incentives for existing diverse employees.

- a. Establish a mentor program for new diverse employees.

- b. Develop start-up research funds for new diverse faculty.
- c. Provide graduate research support for new diverse faculty.
- d. Offer shorter tenure timelines for diverse faculty.

Measures/Benchmarks

- Number of diverse employees who take part in the mentor program.
- Full coverage of funds needed for the beginning of research by new diverse faculty (funds that help acquire external research funding and those to further research initiatives such as travel computers, software, lab supplies, summer salary, graduate student support, etc.).
- Full coverage of funds needed for research supplies, software, related training, and so on, excluding tuition; the number of published or in-review projects or articles.
- Number of diverse faculty obtaining tenure.

Alignment with Strategic Plan: 3.C.4

Time Period: Ongoing

GOAL 3: To achieve an equitable and structured hiring process that benefits diverse candidates and makes the search committee operate as a search and screening committee.

Objective: To require structure, training, and evidence-based criteria in the hiring process so that the evaluation of candidates is inclusive and unbiased.

- a. Establish a search committee before each job posting.
- b. Before job posting, require a search committee to develop a search plan on how to reach diverse audiences.
- c. Make sure search committees are charged by the hiring authority.
- d. Require that search committees receive department-specific data on the race/ethnicity and gender of incumbents and related affirmative action goals.
- e. Make language in job postings reflect an interest in candidates who contribute to the diversity priorities of the institution and department.
- f. Appoint diversity liaison (i.e., Chief Diversity Officer, etc.) to search committees to ensure consistency in search processes.
- g. Require that shortlists for interviews be reviewed by the diversity liaison or hiring authority to ensure inclusion of members of underrepresented groups whenever possible.
- h. Require that the institution provide guidelines and sample reference-checking forms that address the need for job-related inquiries, possible evaluative biases, and avoidance of unsuitable questions (search and screening process).
- i. Require that the submission of the final candidates recommended for hire include a statement of the efforts made to recruit and interview women and underrepresented minorities.
- j. Require a diverse pool of applicants in the hiring process.

- k. Ensure that necessary accommodations are made for any applicant with a disability (sign language translator, subtitles/closed captioning, patience to hear candidates' answers, reading all information on visual slides, etc.).

Alignment with Strategic Plan: 3.C.4

Time Period: Ongoing

Measures/Benchmarks

- A search committee appointed 100% of the time before a job posting.
- A search plan was developed to reach diverse audiences for 100% of searches.
- Hiring authority charges the search committee 100% of the time.
- Search committees receive department-specific data on race/ethnicity and gender of candidates, incumbents, and Affirmative Action goals.
- All job postings express interest in diverse candidates.
- Diversity liaison serves on the search committee 100% of the time.
- The number of underrepresented candidates on the shortlist equals the GEI of 1.0.
- All members of search committees are trained in unconscious bias, job-related inquiry, and unsuitable questions.
- All searches are accompanied with statements expressing effort made to recruit and interview women and underrepresented minorities.
- The number of diverse candidates in the pool equals a GEI of 1.0.
- The use of technology and services that accommodate applicants with disabilities.

GOAL 4: Achieve equitable educational outcomes by expanding learning support specifically for underrepresented students.

Objective: Expand the use of corequisite remediation and other learning support techniques.

- a. Develop new courses that have had long-lasting inequitable outcomes for underrepresented students that incorporate an embedded corequisite component.
- b. Make use of adaptive learning technology to support instructors.
- c. Establish embedded tutors into courses with the most inequitable outcomes.
- d. Establish student supplemental instruction leaders for study groups.
- e. Establish a learning assistant program.
- f. Provide training for student workers to assist in learning.
- g. Initiate bridge and summer bridge programs for underrepresented students.
- h. Make faculty and staff aware of the inequitable outcomes experienced by underrepresented students.

Alignment with Strategic Plan: 1.B.3, 2.B.1, 2.C.3

Time Period: Ongoing

Measures/Benchmarks

- Percentage of courses with inequitable outcomes using corequisite support.
- Percentage of courses with inequitable outcomes using adaptive learning resources or technology.
- Percentage of courses with inequitable outcomes using embedded tutors.
- Number of supplemental instruction groups.
- Development of a program that integrates multiple forms of learning assistance and adaptive learning technology (Realizeit) and embeds corequisite remediation and tutoring.
- Percentage of learning assistants in courses with inequitable outcomes.
- Development of active bridge and summer bridge programs.
- Faculty and staff develop plans to reach a GEI of 1.0 for previously inequitable programs.

GOAL 5: Achieve equitable access into academic programs by developing institutional structures that focus on underrepresented students and equity.

Objective: Support excellence and ensure equal access into academic programs for underrepresented students to eliminate structurally racist practices.

- a. Hire admissions officers with a diversity-equity focus.
- b. Hire advisors with a diversity-equity focus.
- c. Hire student services liaisons with a diversity-equity focus.
- d. Hire a mental health therapist/counselor with a diversity focus.
- e. Establish a holistic admissions process.
- f. Envision underrepresented students as high achievers and having a purpose.
- g. Ensure equitable enrollment in academic programs.
- h. Provide unconscious bias training for students, faculty, and staff.
- i. Develop an inclusive curriculum that includes Black or African American, Hispanic or Latinx, Asian American, and Multiracial authors and perspectives.
- j. Develop a diversity-multicultural education program that focuses on the experiences and issues in underrepresented communities.
- k. Conduct a Diversity Climate Survey that analyzes the well-being of underrepresented students, faculty, and staff.

Alignment with Strategic Plan: 2.C.3

Time Period: Ongoing

Measures/Benchmarks

- The hiring of an admissions officer with a diversity focus.
- The hiring of an advisor with a diversity focus.
- The hiring of a student services liaison with a diversity focus.
- The hiring of a mental health therapist/counselor with a diversity focus.
- The implementation of a holistic admissions process.

- The evaluation of actions in classrooms, admission processes, advising, etc. show that faculty and staff view underrepresented students as high achievers.
- The development of an academic plan for underrepresented students and a GEI of 1.0 for enrollment in academic programs.
- Established and available unconscious bias training for students, faculty, and staff.
- Developed action plans in faculty diversity plan, mentioned earlier in this report, to make curriculum more inclusive.
- Development of a new academic program with courses that are diversity-equity focused (i.e. Policy Advocacy, Protest, and Community Organizing, Philosophy of Race and Gender, etc.).
- The collection of disaggregated data from the Diversity Climate Survey.

GOAL 6: Remove the ability to pay as a barrier for underrepresented students from enrolling, persisting, and completing college.

Objective: Eliminate financial barriers that prevent underrepresented students from enrolling, persisting, or completing college.

- a. Make college emergency aid more accessible for underrepresented students and set aside funds to help underrepresented students complete their degrees or persist in the instance of a financial emergency.
- b. Establish a debt forgiveness program for underrepresented who would like to come back to school but have small amounts of outstanding debt.
- c. Use broad and flexible eligibility criteria to accept as many interested returning underrepresented students as possible.
- d. Publicize and advertise such equity-minded-financial initiatives to the underrepresented communities.
- e. Release administrative holds and allow students to register despite outstanding balances.
- f. Conduct internal audit of scholarships to ensure equitable disbursement.

Alignment with Strategic Plan: 1. Student Learning and 2. Student Success

Time Period: Ongoing

Measures/Benchmarks

- Development of an emergency fund for underrepresented students.
- Number of debt forgiven for underrepresented students with outstanding debt; and their success in persisting and completing college.
- Percentage of underrepresented students who return through lessened restrictions of eligibility criteria.
- The implementation of events that express the College's commitment to eliminating the ability to pay as a barrier for underrepresented students.
- Percentage of students who get to continue their education despite outstanding balances.
- Scholarship disbursement for students has a GEI of 1.0.

GOAL 7: Identify barriers to equity by seriously analyzing disaggregated data.

Objective: Identify barriers to equity in proportional representation, educational outcomes, access to dual credit for underrepresented students. Commit to longitudinal data collection and analysis of disaggregated data.

- a. Establish improvement targets and/or benchmarks for achieving success and equity for underrepresented students in academic programs and dual credit.
- b. Require reporting on racial and other demographic representation, student placement (in college-level or developmental education), and student success metrics for all academic programs.
- c. Gather survey responses from underrepresented students to inform future updates to initiatives.
- d. Gather institutional data on population demographics, enrollment, educational outcomes, retention, etc.
- e. Ensure the Chief Diversity Officer has access, control, and necessary privileges to crucial metrics and data (such as through Ellucian CRM Advise) to analyze diversity and equity properly and effectively.
- f. Tracking campus-wide structural diversity and equity.

Alignment with Strategic Plan: 2.A.1, 2.A.2, 2.C.2

Time Period: Ongoing

Measures/Benchmarks

- The collection of data of student success in academic programs and dual credit.
- Achieving a sophisticated level of disaggregation of demographic information for students.
- A summary report of qualitative and quantitative data from surveys and focus groups.
- The determination of the effectiveness of existing programs for underrepresented students and identification of ways to improve or eliminate such programs.
- A comprehensive snapshot of the student population available to the Chief Diversity Officer through customer relationship management.
- The release of an annual report on diversity and equity regarding the population demographics and equitable outcomes and representation and the development of a strategic diversity, equity, and inclusion plan derived from such data.

References

- American Council on Education. "Race and Ethnicity in Higher Education: A Status Report." 2019. <https://www.acenet.edu/Pages/default.aspx>.
- Association for the Study of Higher Education. "Systemic Racism in Higher Education." *ASHE Higher Education Report* 42, no. 1 (November 2015): 49–71. Academic Search Premier.
- Bauman, Georgia L., Leticia Tomas Bustillos, Estela Mara Bensimon, M. Christopher Brown II, and RoSusan D. Bartee. "Achieving Equitable Educational Outcomes with All Students: The Institution's Roles and Responsibilities." *Association of American Colleges and Universities*, 2005.
- Bensimon, Estela Mara and Debbie Ann Hanson. "The Equity Scorecard Process: Tools, Practices, and Methods." in *Confronting Equity Issues on Campus: Implementing the Equity Scorecard in Theory and Practice*. Edited by Estela Mara Bensimon and Lindsey Malcom. Sterling: Stylus, 2012.
- Center for Governmental Studies, Northern Illinois University. "Danville Area Community College's Economic Impacts and Student Employment Outcomes." *ICCB*. August 2021.
- Complete College America. "No Room for Doubt: Moving Corequisite Support from Idea to Imperative." 2021. <https://www.completecollege.org/noroomfordoubt>.
- Crutcher, Ronald A. "Toward a Thriving and Inclusive Intercultural Community." *Liberal Education* 104, no. 4 (Fall 2018): 28–33. MasterFILE Premier.
- DiAngelo, Robin. *White Fragility: Why It's So Hard for White People to Talk About Racism*. Boston: Beacon Press, 2018.
- Fujimoto, Eugene Oropeza. "Hiring Diverse Faculty Members in Community Colleges: A Case Study in Ethical Decision Making." *Community College Review* 40, no. 3 (July 2012): 255–74. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0091552112450069>.
- Goldman, Emily and Mike Abrahamson. "Policy Brief: Remediation Reform." *Partnership for College Completion*. March 2019. [https://partnershipfcc.org/images/Policy/Final Remediation Brief.pdf](https://partnershipfcc.org/images/Policy/Final_Remediation_Brief.pdf).
- Harper, Lori, D. Patton, and Ontario S. Wooden. "Access and Equity for African American Students in Higher Education: A Critical Race Historical Analysis of Policy Efforts." *The Journal of Higher Education* 80, no. 4 (August 2009): 389–414. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25511120>.

- Higher Learning Commission. “Determining Qualified Faculty Through HLC’s Criteria for Accreditation and Assumed Practices: Guidelines for Institutions and Peer Reviewers.” 2020. https://download.hlcommission.org/FacultyGuidelines_OPB.pdf.
- Illinois Board of Higher Education. “A Message from the DFI Board of Directors.” <https://www.ibhe.org/dfi.html>. 2021.
- Illinois Community College Board. “2021 Data and Characteristics of the Illinois Public Community College System.” 2021. <http://www2.iccb.org/data/data-characteristics/2021-data-and-characteristics-of-the-illinois-public-community-college-system/>.
- . “Illinois Community College Board 2020 Data & Characteristics Peer Comparison for Danville Area Community College.” December 2020.
- Illinois General Assembly. “Developmental Education Reform Act.” In the “Public Act 101-0654, HB2170.” 2019. <https://www.ilga.gov/legislation/101/HB/PDF/10100HB2170enr.pdf>.
- Institutional Effectiveness Office of Danville Area Community College. “Key Performance Indicators for Achieving the Dream.” 2020. https://dacc.edu/assets/pdfs/depts/ie/DACC_Key_Performance_Indicators_2021.pdf.
- Jayakumar, Uma M., and Annie S. Adamian. “The Fifth Frame of Colorblind Ideology: Maintaining the Comforts of Colorblindness in the Context of White Fragility.” *Sociological Perspectives* 60, no. 5 (October 2017): 912–36. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0731121417721910>.
- King Jr., Dr. Martin Luther. “Letter from Birmingham City Jail.” In *A Testament of Hope: The Essential Writings and Speeches of Martin Luther King Jr.* Edited by James Melvin Washington. New York: HarperCollins, 1986.
- Liu, Min, Emily McKelroy, Stephanie Corliss, and Jamison Carrigan. “Investigating the Effect of an Adaptive Learning Intervention on Students’ Learning.” *Educational Technology Research & Development* 65, no. 6 (December 2017): 1605–25. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11423-017-9542-1>.
- Logue, A. W., Douglas, D., & Watanabe-Rose, M. “Corequisite Mathematics Remediation: Results Over Time and in Different Contexts.” *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 41, 294-315 (2019).
- Mac Donald, Heather. *The Diversity Delusion: How Race and Gender Pandering Corrupt the University and Undermine Our Culture*. New York: St. Martin’s Griffin, 2018.

- Ngo, Frederick and Will Kwon. "Using Multiple Measures to Make Math Placement Decisions: Implications for Access and Success in Community Colleges." *University of California*. 2014.
<http://pullias.usc.edu/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/Ngo-Kwon-2014-Using-Multiple-Measures-0714web.pdf>.
- Smith, Daryl G. *Diversity's Promise for Higher Education: Making It Work*. Third Edition. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2020.
- Vespa, Jonathan, Lauren Medina, and David M. Armstrong. "Demographic Turning Points for the United States: Population Projections for 2020 to 2060." *U.S. Census Bureau*. February 2020.
<https://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/library/publications/2020/demo/p25-1144.pdf>.
- Williams, Damon A and Katrina C. Wade-Golden. *Chief Diversity Officer: Strategy, Structure, and Change Management*. Sterling: Stylus, 2013.
- Williams, Damon A. *Strategic Diversity Leadership: Activating Change and Transformation in Higher Education*. Sterling: Stylus, 2013.
- Wilson, Nathan R., Jay Brooks, Michelle Dufour, and Jana Ferguson. *Illinois Community College Board*. "Dual Credit in the Illinois Community College System." March 2021.