

Student services requested information from the Food Pantry survey which was administered through Qualtrics (an online survey platform). This report illustrates results from the 2021/2022 and 2022/2023 academic years. A total of 287 valid online surveys were received and analyzed (69 for 2021/2022 and 218 for 2022/2023). Please note that there were no responses for the summer of 2021. Also, for the 2021/2022 academic year, there was a lack of those who answered whether they were walk-ins, so keep this in mind when looking at question 4.

Research Questions	2021/2022 Academic Year	2022/2023 Academic Year
1) How many students used the food pantry during each academic year?	Students used the food pantry <u>161 times</u> . <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 student used the food pantry 32 times; another student used the food pantry 15 times 69 individual students used the food pantry during the 2021/2022 academic year.	Students used the food pantry <u>1,133 times</u> . <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 student used the food pantry 44 times; another student used the food pantry 31 times 218 individual students used the food pantry during the 2022/2023 academic year.
2) How many of those students are part of our DI groups? (Hispanic, Black/African American, low SES)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Of the 69 students, there were 40 Hispanic students, 3 Black/African American students, and 42 low SES students. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Of the 218 students, there were 119 Hispanic students, 15 Black/African American students, and 134 low SES students.
3) Which disproportionately impacted groups have the most/least usage?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low SES¹ students (<u>60.9%</u>) and Hispanic students (<u>58.0%</u>) had the most usage. Black/African American students are among those with the least usage (<u>4.3%</u>). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low SES students (<u>61.5%</u>) and Hispanic students (<u>54.6%</u>) had the most usage. Black/African American students are among those with the least usage (<u>6.9%</u>).
4) How many students were walk-ins?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Of those who answered, there were a total of 10 walk-ins. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Of those 10 walk-ins, 2 were Hispanic, 2 were Black/African American, and 5 students were low SES. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Of those who answered, there were a total of 126 walk-ins. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Of those 126 walk-ins, 63 were Hispanic, 12 were Black/African American, and 72 students were low SES.
5) Which race/ethnicity groups who used the food pantry are disproportionately impacted? (Tables are shown below)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As illustrated in Table 1, proportionality indices are greater than 0.90² for all groups expect two: White students (0.64) and Asian students (0.87). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As illustrated in Table 2, proportionality indices are greater than 0.90 for all groups expect three: Asian students (0.81), Two or More Race students (0.60), and Unknown/Unreported students (0.64).
6) Which low SES groups who used the food pantry are disproportionately impacted? (Tables are shown below)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As illustrated in Table 3, proportionality indices are less than 0.85 for two groups: BOG B students (0.49) and BOG A students (0.00). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As illustrated in Table 4, proportionality indices are greater than 0.90 for all groups expect one: Pell students (0.37).

¹ Low SES was defined as those who were awarded a BOG A, BOG B, or Pell grant.

² PI values of .85 and lower reflect clear evidence of an equity gap, .86-.89 reflect some evidence of an equity gap, and .90 and higher reflect no evidence of an equity gap.

Disproportionate Impact Analyses:**Table 1. Food pantry outcome rates by race/ethnicity with the proportionality index (PI) method for the 2021/2022 academic year.**

Race/Ethnicity	CHC Cohort	Outcome Count	Percent (Cohort)	Percent (Outcome)	Outcome Rate (OR)	Proportionality Index (PI)
Asian	363	3	4.98	4.35	0.83	0.87
Black/African American	301	3	4.13	4.35	1.00	1.05
Hispanic	3,841	40	52.71	57.97	1.04	1.10
Two or More Races	419	8	5.75	11.59	1.91	2.02
Unknown/Unreported	62	1	0.85	1.45	1.61	1.70
White	2,301	14	31.58	20.29	0.61	0.64

Note. The proportionality index (PI) examines whether a subgroup's representation equals the same subgroup's representation in the general student population. If that answer is "yes" then there are equitable outcomes, if that answer is "no" then disproportionate impact may be indicated.

As illustrated in Table 1, proportionality indices are greater than 0.90 for all groups except two: White students (0.64) and Asian students (0.87). Note that Asian students are not highlighted in red because the cut-off is 0.85, so these students are approaching the level of concern, but are not technically disproportionately impacted. The PI results reflect, for example, that although White students make up 31.6% of the overall student population, they are utilizing the food pantry only 20.3% of the time. This suggests that this group of students may be considered to be disproportionately impacted.

Table 2. Food pantry outcome rate by race/ethnicity with the proportionality index (PI) method for the 2022/2023 academic year.

Race/Ethnicity	CHC Cohort	Outcome Count	Percent (Cohort)	Percent (Outcome)	Outcome Rate (OR)	Proportionality Index (PI)
Asian	388	9	5.12	4.13	2.32	0.81
Black/African American	370	15	4.88	6.88	4.05	1.41
Filipino	158	5	2.08	2.29	3.16	1.10
Hispanic	3,984	119	52.54	54.59	2.99	1.04
Two or More Races	408	7	5.38	3.21	1.72	0.60
Unknown/Unreported	54	1	0.71	0.46	1.85	0.64
White	2,221	62	29.29	28.44	2.79	0.97

As illustrated in Table 2, proportionality indices are greater than 0.90 for all groups except three: Asian students (0.81), Two or More Race students (0.60), and Unknown/Unreported students (0.64). The PI results reflect, for example, that although Two or more race students make up 5.38% of the overall student population, they are utilizing the food pantry only 3.21% of the time. This suggests that these three groups of students may be considered to be disproportionately impacted.

¹ Low SES was defined as those who were awarded a BOG A, BOG B, or Pell grant.

² PI values of .85 and lower reflect clear evidence of an equity gap, .86-.89 reflect some evidence of an equity gap, and .90 and higher reflect no evidence of an equity gap.

Table 3. Food pantry outcome rate by low SES with the proportionality index (PI) method for the 2021/2022 academic year.

BOG & Pell Grants (Low SES)	CHC Cohort	Outcome Count	Percent (Cohort)	Percent (Outcome)	Outcome Rate (OR)	Proportionality Index (PI)
BOG A	46	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
BOG B	3,234	13	62.66	30.95	0.40	0.49
Pell	1,881	29	36.45	69.05	1.54	1.89

As illustrated in Table 3, proportionality indices are less than 0.85 for two groups: BOG B students (0.49) and BOG A students (0.00). The PI results reflect, for example, that although BOG B students make up 62.66% of the overall student population, they are utilizing the food pantry only 30.95% of the time. This suggests that these two groups of students may be considered to be disproportionately impacted.

Table 4. Food pantry outcome rate by low SES with the proportionality index (PI) method for the 2022/2023 academic year.

BOG & Pell Grants (Low SES)	CHC Cohort	Outcome Count	Percent (Cohort)	Percent (Outcome)	Outcome Rate (OR)	Proportionality Index (PI)
BOG A	38	1	0.80	0.75	2.63	0.93
BOG B	2,887	114	60.79	85.07	3.95	1.40
Pell	1,824	19	38.41	14.18	1.04	0.37

As illustrated in Table 4, proportionality indices are greater than 0.90 for all groups except one: Pell students (0.37). The PI results reflect, for example, that although Pell students make up 38.41% of the overall student population, they are utilizing the food pantry only 14.18% of the time. This suggests that this group of students may be considered to be disproportionately impacted.

Summary:

- The food pantry should focus outreach efforts on the following student populations:
 - Two or more race students
 - Unknown/Unreported students
 - Asian students
- Given the mixed finding on low SES by year, it is also suggested that there be a focus on students who are awarded a BOG A, BOG B, or Pell grant.
- Please contact the Research Office to obtain outreach lists of students within the aforementioned populations including low-income students.

For questions, please contact Jessica Beverson, Research Analyst, at jbeverson@craftonhills.edu or 909-389-3268

¹ Low SES was defined as those who were awarded a BOG A, BOG B, or Pell grant.

² PI values of .85 and lower reflect clear evidence of an equity gap, .86-.89 reflect some evidence of an equity gap, and .90 and higher reflect no evidence of an equity gap.