De Anza College Office of Institutional Research and Planning

To: College Planning Committee

From: Mallory Newell, Office of Research and Planning

Date: 7/24/2024

Subject: Belonging, Civic Capacity, Basic Needs and Mental Health Survey, Spring 2024

The Belonging, Civic Capacity, Basic Needs and Mental Health Survey was designed to assess a variety of factors that could influence a student's ability to stay enrolled and successfully meet their educational goals. Those include a sense of belonging on campus, developing a sense of civic capacity to help other and an assessment of basic needs including food and housing insecurities and mental health as barriers to success. The survey was sent to all De Anza students enrolled during spring 2024 quarter. The survey was administered via email and remained open for two weeks. A total of 315 responses were collected. Each of the questions will be used to evaluate the college's Educational Master Plan goals and metrics.

Key Takeaways:

- 90% of respondents reported a sense of belonging at De Anza, consistent with spring 2023.
- 88% of respondents indicated a rate of civic capacity for community and social change, consistent with spring 2023.
- **51%** of respondents indicated they experienced **food insecurity** in the past 12 months, up from 29% from spring 2023.
- **47%** of respondents indicated they experienced **housing insecurity** in the past 12 months, up from 29% in spring 2022.
- 18% of respondents indicated homelessness in the past 12, consistent with spring 2023.
- **49**% of respondents indicated that **mental health issues impeded their success** at De Anza, consistent with spring 2023.

Students who identify as Latinx and Asian exhibit the highest rates of belonging while Filipinx students exhibit the highest rate of civic capacity. However, Black, and Filipinx students exhibit the highest rate of food insecurity while Black and Latinx students have the highest rates of housing insecurity, homelessness and mental health struggles.

Students who selected **nonbinary or 'other' gender category** are **less likely** to feel a sense of **belonging** and report a **higher rate of mental health issues** when compared to other gender identifies.

Students between the ages of 21 - 30 are less likely to feel a sense of belonging and higher rates of food and housing insecurity than other age groups.

Concerted attention and support should be diverted to our **PELL students who exhibited high** rates of food and housing insecurity and homelessness.

Belonging, Civic Capacity, Basic Needs and Mental Health

Table 1. Belonging, Civic Capacity, Basic Needs and Mental Health Indices

	Spring	g 2024	Spring	g 2023	Spring	g 2022	Spring	g 2021	Spring	g 2020	Fall 2	2018
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Belonging	283	90%	438	92%	433	89%	211	88%				
Civic Capacity	278	88%	424	89%	426	88%						
Food Insecurity	160	51%	139	29%	175	36%	80	33%	485	36%	1,171	58%
Housing Insecurity	149	47%	140	29%	190	40%	104	44%	528	40%	1,128	56%
Homelessness	58	18%	75	16%	67	14%	44	18%	155	12%	365	18%
Mental Health	155	49%	244	51%	230	47%	148	62%	776	57%		
Total Responses	315		478		486		239		1,352		2,211	

Notes: Spring 2024, 2023 and 2022 utilized the same survey format. Spring 2021 was specific to students of color. Spring 2020 was part of a student remote learning survey. Fall 2028 survey was part of the #RealCollege survey.

When comparing current survey results from spring 2024 to prior survey administrations:

- The **sense of belonging** rate **remained** rather **stable** ranging from 88% to 92% over the past four years.
- **Civic capacity** has **remained consistent** over the past three spring terms at 88% to 89%.
- Food insecurity increased rather drastically in spring 2024 from around 30% over the past 4 years to 51% in spring 2024.
- **Housing insecurity increased to 47%** in spring 2024 from 29% in spring 2023, though has been in the 40% range over the previous 3 years.
- **Homelessness remained rather consistent at 18%** which is consistent with the prior five years.
- The proportion of student respondents affected by **mental health** being a barrier to their success has **remained around 50%** over the past three years.

Table 1a. Belonging, Civic Capacity, Basic Needs and Mental Health Indices, by Village

	Artistic Expression		Business and Finance		Health and Life Sciences		Langu	Language and Communication		Physical Sciences and Technology		Social Sciences and Humanities	
							Commi						
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Belonging	19	90%	35	97%	46	90%	19	95%	56	89%	44	94%	
Civic Capacity	18	86%	31	86%	44	86%	18	90%	57	90%	45	96%	
Food Insecurity	6	29%	20	56%	24	47%	9	45%	41	64%	25	53%	
Housing Insecurity	8	38%	19	53%	29	57%	8	40%	42	66%	27	57%	
Homelessness	5	24%	7	19%	П	22%	3	15%	16	25%	7	15%	
Mental Health	8	38%	21	58%	27	53%	9	45%	35	55%	31	66%	

When comparing across villages:

• The **sense of belonging** is **highest** in the **Business and Finance** village and lowest in Physical Sciences and Technology.

- **Civic capacity** was **highest** in the **Social Sciences and Humanities** village and lowest in Artistic Expression, Business and Finance and Health and Life Sciences.
- Food insecurity was highest in Physical Sciences and Technology followed by Business and Finance.
- **Housing insecurity** was **highest** in **Physical Sciences and Technology** followed by Health and Life Sciences.
- **Homelessness** was **highest** in **Physical Sciences and Technology** followed by Artistic Expression.
- The proportion of student respondents affected by **mental health** being a barrier to their success was **highest** in the **Social Sciences and Humanities** Village.

Table 2. Belonging, Civic Capacity, Basic Needs and Mental Health Index by Demographic Groups, Spring 2024

Spring 2024	Belonging		Civic Capacity		Food Insecurity		Housing Insecurity		Homelessness		Mental Health	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Ethnicity		•				· ·				· ·		
Asian	104	93%	101	90%	54	48%	46	41%	19	17%	59	53%
Black	10	91%	- 11	100%	9	82%	8	73%	3	27%	9	82%
Filipinx	10	83%	- 11	92%	9	75%	6	50%			6	50%
Latinx	45	94%	43	90%	27	56%	34	71%	12	25%	32	67%
Native American												
Pacific Islander	3	100%	3	100%								
White	53	91%	51	88%	24	41%	29	50%	9	16%	30	52%
Decline to State	56	81%	56	81%	34	49%	24	35%	13	19%	17	25%
Gender												
Woman	146	92%	144	91%	82	52%	83	53%	32	20%	91	58%
Man	87	94%	83	89%	46	49%	47	51%	17	18%	43	46%
Nonbinary	3	75%	4	100%							3	75%
Other Gender Identity	13	72%	13	72%	13	72%	Ш	61%	5	28%	14	78%
Age												
Age: 20 and under	66	90%	61	84%	35	48%	35	48%	12	16%	45	62%
Age: 21 - 30	85	89%	83	87%	55	58%	56	59%	18	19%	54	57%
Age: 31+	97	93%	99	95%	51	49%	50	48%	23	22%	50	48%
Other Groups												
LGBTQ+	60	90%	55	84%	37	55%	38	57%	13	19%	50	75%
Foster Youth	5	100%	5	100%	4	80%	3	60%	3	60%	4	80%
PELL	48	94%	48	94%	42	82%	37	73%	19	37%	36	71%
Disability	47	90%	45	87%	27	52%	30	58%	12	23%	37	71%
Non-US Citizen	54	92%	52	88%	27	46%	33	56%	8	14%	30	51%
Veteran	5	100%	5	100%	3	60%	3	60%			3	60%

Note: lowest rate(s) for belonging and civic capacity were bolded, whereas the highest rates in food, housing and mental health in each category were bolded for emphasis. Cell sizes suppressed when less than 3 respondents.

Belonging

Goal: Achieving the Success Factors

Metric: The rate at which students report they feel a sense of belonging on campus will be no more than 5 percentage points different for Black, Filipinx, Foster Youth, Latinx, LGBTQ+, Native American and Pacific Islander students, compared with the rate for all other students.

To create an index for belonging to measure the goal of achieving the success factors, students were asked to respond to five questions that focused on a sense of belonging at De Anza, either online or in person. If a respondent selected either 'great extent' or 'some extent' on three or more of the five questions, they were included within the belonging index.

As displayed in Table 1 above, there is an **overall high rate of belonging reported by all respondents at 90%.** When disaggregating the Belonging index (Table 2), the lowest rate is 72%.

- The **lowest rate of belonging** by ethnicity was exhibited by **decline to state** at **81%**.
- Students who identify as **other gender identify exhibited the lowest rate** of belonging at 72% while those who identify as man exhibited the highest rate of 94%.
- Students aged 21-30 exhibited a rate of 89% while 31+ had a rate of 93%.
- LGBTQ+ students and PELL recipients had the lowest rate of belonging of any group at 90%.

Civic Capacity

Goal: Civic Capacity for Community and Social Change

Metric: The rate at which students report they are able to make a positive difference for others will be no more than 5 percentage points different for Black, Filipinx, Foster Youth, Latinx, LGBTQ+, Native American and Pacific Islander students, compared with all other students.

To create an index for civic capacity to measure the goal of civic capacity for community and social change, students were asked to respond to five questions that focused on making a positive difference for others. If a respondent selected either 'great extent' or 'some extent' on three or more of the five questions, they were included within the civic capacity index.

As displayed in Table 1 above, there is an **overall high rate of civic capacity reported by all respondents at 88%.** When disaggregating the civic capacity index (Table 2), the lowest rate is 72%.

• The **lowest rate of students expressing a sense of civic capacity** by ethnicity was for students who identify as **declined to state at 81%**, followed by 88% for white students.

- Students who identify as an 'other' gender identify exhibited the lowest rate of civic capacity at 72% while those who identify as a nonbinary exhibited the highest rate of 100%.
- Students aged 20 and under exhibited the lowest rate by age at 84%.
- Students with a disability had the lowest rate of all groups at 87%, followed by non-US citizen students at 88%.

Food Insecurity

To create an index for Food Insecurity, students were asked to respond to five questions that focused on access to food and the ability to buy enough food in the past year. If a respondent responded affirmatively to two or more of the five questions, they were included within the food insecurity index.

As displayed in Table 1 above, the rate of food insecurity is 51%, when disaggregating the index, the rate of food insecurity differs by group. The higher the rate, the higher the rate of food insecurity (e.g., less access to food with or without hunger).

- The **highest rate of food insecurity by ethnicity was for Black students at 82%**, followed by 75% for Filipinx students and 56% for Latinx students.
- Students who identify as an 'other' gender identify exhibited the highest rate of all gender identities with 72% reporting food insecurity.
- Students between the ages of 21 and 30 had the highest rate of all age groups at 58%.
- **PELL recipients** had the **highest rate of any group at 82%**, followed by foster youth students at 80%.

Basic Needs and Mental Health

Goal: Meeting Basic Needs

Metric: The rate of basic needs challenges – including homelessness, housing insecurity, food insecurity and mental health issues – reported by Black, Filipinx, Foster Youth, Latinx, LGBTQ+, Native American and Pacific Islander students will be no more than 5 percentage points different from the rate for all other students, as measured by the annual basic needs survey.

Housing Insecurity

To create an index for Housing Insecurity to be used to measure part of the basic needs goal, students were asked to respond to five questions that focused on housing, including the ability to pay for housing in the past 12 months. If a respondent answered affirmatively to any of the five questions, they were included in the housing insecurity index.

As displayed in Table 1 above, the rate of housing insecurity is 47%. When disaggregating the index, the rate of housing insecurity varied by student group. Similar to food insecurity, the higher the rate, the higher the rate of housing insecurity (e.g., moved two or more times in a year).

- The **highest rate of housing insecurity** by ethnicity was for **Black students at 73%**, followed by Latinx students at 71%.
- The housing insecurity rate was **highest for students who selected 'other' gender identity** at 61%.
- Students between the ages of 21 and 30 had the highest rate of all age groups at 59%.
- PELL recipient students had the highest rate of housing insecurity of any group at 73%, followed by foster youth and veteran students both at 60%.

Homelessness

To create an index for Homelessness to be used to measure part of the basic needs goal, students were asked to respond to six questions that focused on having a place to sleep in the past year. If a respondent selected affirmative to any of the six questions, they were included in the homelessness index.

As displayed in Table 1 above, the rate of homelessness is 18%, when disaggregating the index, the rate of homelessness varied by student group. Again, similar to food and housing insecurities, the higher the rate, the higher the rate of homelessness (e.g., stayed in a shelter).

- The highest rate of homelessness was exhibited by Black students at 27% followed by Latinx at 25%.
- Students who **selected 'other' gender identity** exhibited the **highest rate of homelessness** for any gender category **at 28%**.
- Students over the age of 30 had the highest rate of all age groups at 22%.
- Foster youth students had the highest rate of homelessness of any group at 60% followed by PELL recipients at 37%.

Mental Health

The rate at which mental health issues impeded a students' ability to be successful was measured through one question, to be used to measure part of the basic needs goal of mental health. If a respondent selected 'great effect' or 'moderate effect' they were included as having a mental health barrier.

As displayed in Table 1 above, **49% of respondents indicated that mental health issues impeded their success** at De Anza. When disaggregating by student group, the rates varied. Similar to food, housing and homelessness, the higher the rate, the higher the rate of mental health barriers.

- The **highest rate** of mental health as a barrier to success by ethnicity was for **Black students** at a rate of 82%, followed by **Latinx students** at 67%.
- Students who selected 'other' gender identity exhibited the **highest rate** of mental health as a barrier to success at 78%, **followed by nonbinary at 75%**.
- Students between the ages of 21 and 30 exhibited the highest rate of all age groups at 57%.
- Foster youth students had the highest rate of mental health as a barrier to success of all student groups at 80%, followed by students who identify as LGBTQ+ at 75%.

Demographics

Table 3. Belonging, Civic Capacity, Basic Needs and Mental Health Index, Respondent Demographics

Ethnicity Asian 112 36% 38% Black 11 3% 4% Filipinx 12 4% 6% Latinx 48 15% 25% Native American 2 1% 0% Pacific Islander 3 1% 1% White 58 18% 19% Decline to state 69 22% 7% Gender Woman 158 50% 48% Man 93 30% 50% Nonbinary 4 1% 0% Genderqueer/nonconforming 6 2% - Transgender 8 3% - Other gender identity 4 1% - Unreported 42 13% 2% Age: 21 - 30 95 30% 33% Age: 22 and under 73 23% 34% Age: 31 + 104 33% 33% <t< th=""><th></th><th></th><th></th><th>De Anza</th></t<>				De Anza	
Asian 112 36% 38% Black 111 3% 4% Filipinx 12 4% 6% Latinx 48 15% 25% Native American 2 1% 0% Pacific Islander 3 1% 1% 1% White 58 18% 19% Decline to state 69 22% 7% Gender Woman 158 50% 48% Man 93 30% 50% Nonbinary 4 1% 0% Genderqueer/nonconforming 6 2% - Transgender 8 3% - Other gender identity 4 1% - Unreported 42 13% 2% Age: 21 - 30 95 30% 33% Age: 21 - 30 95 30% 33% Age: 31 + 104 33% 33% Age: 21 - 30 95 30% 33% Age: 31 + 104 33% 33% Age: 21 - 30 95 30% 33% Age: 31 + 104 33% 33% Age: 31 + 104 34 34 Age: 31 + 104 34 Age: 31 + 104 44 54 Age: 31 + 104 44 54 Age: 31 + 104 44 Age: 31 + 10		Responses	%	Spring 2024	
Black 11 3% 4% Filipinx 12 4% 6% Latinx 48 15% 25% Native American 2 1% 0% Pacific Islander 3 1% 1% White 58 18% 19% Decline to state 69 22% 7% Gender Woman 158 50% 48% Man 93 30% 50% Man 93 30% 50% Nonbinary 4 1% 0% Genderqueer/nonconforming 6 2% - Transgender 8 3% - Other gender identity 4 1% - Unreported 42 13% 2% Age: 20 and under 73 23% 34% Age: 21 - 30 95 30% 33% Age: 21 - 30 95 30% 33%	Ethnicity				
Filipinx 12 4% 6% Latinx 48 15% 25% Native American 2 1% 0% Pacific Islander 3 1% 1% White 58 18% 19% Decline to state 69 22% 7% Gender Woman 158 50% 48% Man 93 30% 50% Man 93 30% 50% Man 93 30% 50% Nonbinary 4 1% 0% Genderqueer/nonconforming 6 2% - Transgender 8 3% - Other gender identity 4 1% - Unreported 42 13% 2% Age: 20 and under 73 23% 34% Age: 21 - 30 95 30% 33% Age: 21 - 30 95 30% 33% U	Asian	112	36%	38%	
Latinx 48 15% 25% Native American 2 1% 0% Pacific Islander 3 1% 1% White 58 18% 19% Decline to state 69 22% 7% Gender Woman 158 50% 48% Man 93 30% 50% Nonbinary 4 1% 0% Genderqueer/nonconforming 6 2% - Transgender 8 3% - Other gender identity 4 1% - Unreported 42 13% 2% Age: 20 and under 73 23% 34% Age: 21 - 30 95 30% 33% Age: 31 + 104 33% 33% Unreported 43 14% 0% Other Disability 52 17% 3% LGBTQ+ 67 21% - Foster Youth 5 2% 0% Non U.S. Citizen 59 19% 10% PELL 51 16% 7% Veteran 5 2% 1% Sexuality Straight (heterosexual) 174 55% - Asexual 11 3% - Bisexual 22 7% - Gay 5 2% - Pansexual 7 - Pansexual 7 - Pansexual 9 3% - Panidentity not listed 2 1% -	Black	11	3%	4%	
Native American 2 1% 0% Pacific Islander 3 1% 1% White 58 18% 19% Decline to state 69 22% 7% Gender Woman 158 50% 48% Man 93 30% 50% Nonbinary 4 1% 0% Genderqueer/nonconforming 6 2% - Transgender 8 3% - Other gender identity 4 1% - Unreported 42 13% 2% Age: 20 and under 73 23% 34% Age: 31+ 104 33% 33% Age: 31+ 104 33% 33% Unreported 43 14% 0% Other Disability 52 17% 3 LGBTQ+ 67 21% - Foster Youth 5	Filipinx	12	4%	6%	
Pacific Islander 3 1% 1% 1% White 58 18% 19% 19% Decline to state 69 22% 7% 7% 66nder 79 22% 7% 78 79 79 79 79 79 79 79 79 79 79 79 79 79	Latinx	48	15%	25%	
White 58 18% 19% Decline to state 69 22% 7% Gender Woman 158 50% 48% Man 93 30% 50% Nonbinary 4 1% 0% Genderqueer/nonconforming 6 2% - Transgender 8 3% - Other gender identity 4 1% - Unreported 42 13% 2% Age 20 30% 33% Age: 20 and under 73 23% 34% Age: 31+ 104 33% 33% Age: 31+ 104 33% 33% Unreported 43 14% 0% Other Disability 52 17% 3% LGBTQ+ 67 21% - Foster Youth 5 2% 0% Non U.S. Citizen 59 19% <t< td=""><td>Native American</td><td>2</td><td>1%</td><td>0%</td></t<>	Native American	2	1%	0%	
Decline to state 69 22% 7%	Pacific Islander	3	1%	1%	
Gender Woman 158 50% 48% Man 93 30% 50% Nonbinary 4 1% 0% Genderqueer/nonconforming 6 2% - Transgender 8 3% - Other gender identity 4 1% - Unreported 42 13% 2% Age: 20 and under 73 23% 34% Age: 21 - 30 95 30% 33% Age: 31 + 104 33% 33% Urreported 43 14% 0% Other Disability 52 17% 3% LGBTQ+ 67 21% - Foster Youth 5 2% 0% Non U.S. Citizen 59 19% 10% PELL 51 16% 7% Veteran 5 2% 1% Sexuality <td< td=""><td>White</td><td>58</td><td>18%</td><td>19%</td></td<>	White	58	18%	19%	
Woman 158 50% 48% Man 93 30% 50% Nonbinary 4 1% 0% Genderqueer/nonconforming 6 2% - Transgender 8 3% - Other gender identity 4 1% - Unreported 42 13% 2% Age: 20 and under 73 23% 34% Age: 21 - 30 95 30% 33% Age: 31 + 104 33% 33% Age: 31 + 104 33% 33% Unreported 43 14% 0% Other Disability 52 17% 3% LGBTQ+ 67 21% - Foster Youth 5 2% 0% Non U.S. Citizen 59 19% 10% PELL 51 16% 7% Veteran 5 2% 1% <td col<="" td=""><td>Decline to state</td><td>69</td><td>22%</td><td>7%</td></td>	<td>Decline to state</td> <td>69</td> <td>22%</td> <td>7%</td>	Decline to state	69	22%	7%
Man 93 30% 50% Nonbinary 4 1% 0% Genderqueer/nonconforming 6 2% - Transgender 8 3% - Other gender identity 4 1% - Unreported 42 13% 2% Age: 20 and under 73 23% 34% Age: 21 - 30 95 30% 33% Age: 31 + 104 33% 33% Age: 31 + 104 33% 33% Urreported 43 14% 0% Other Disability 52 17% 3% LGBTQ+ 67 21% - Foster Youth 5 2% 0% Non U.S. Citizen 59 19% 10% PELL 51 16% 7% Veteran 5 2% 1% Sexuality Straight (heterosexual) 174	Gender				
Nonbinary 4 1% 0% Genderqueer/nonconforming 6 2% - Transgender 8 3% - Other gender identity 4 1% - Unreported 42 13% 2% Age: 20 and under 73 23% 34% Age: 21 - 30 95 30% 33% Age: 31 + 104 33% 33% Unreported 43 14% 0% Other Disability 52 17% 3% LGBTQ+ 67 21% - Foster Youth 5 2% 0% Non U.S. Citizen 59 19% 10% PELL 51 16% 7% Veteran 5 2% 1% Sexuality Straight (heterosexual) 174 55% - Asexual 11 3% - Bisexual 2	Woman	158	50%	48%	
Genderqueer/nonconforming 6 2% - Transgender 8 3% - Other gender identity 4 1% - Unreported 42 13% 2% Age: 20 and under 73 23% 34% Age: 21 - 30 95 30% 33% Age: 31 + 104 33% 33% Unreported 43 14% 0% Other Disability 52 17% 3% LGBTQ+ 67 21% - Foster Youth 5 2% 0% Non U.S. Citizen 59 19% 10% PELL 51 16% 7% Veteran 5 2% 1% Sexuality Straight (heterosexual) 174 55% - Asexual 11 3% - Bisexual 2 7% - Gay 5 <td< td=""><td>Man</td><td>93</td><td>30%</td><td>50%</td></td<>	Man	93	30%	50%	
Transgender 8 3% - Other gender identity 4 1% - Unreported 42 13% 2% Age: 20 and under 73 23% 34% Age: 21 - 30 95 30% 33% Age: 31 + 104 33% 33% Unreported 43 14% 0% Other Disability 52 17% 3% LGBTQ+ 67 21% - Foster Youth 5 2% 0% Non U.S. Citizen 59 19% 10% PELL 51 16% 7% Veteran 5 2% 1% Sexuality Straight (heterosexual) 174 55% - Asexual 11 3% - Bisexual 2 7% - Gay 5 2% - Lesbian 5 2% <td>Nonbinary</td> <td>4</td> <td>1%</td> <td>0%</td>	Nonbinary	4	1%	0%	
Other gender identity 4 1% - Unreported 42 13% 2% Age Age: 20 and under 73 23% 34% Age: 21 - 30 95 30% 33% Age: 31+ 104 33% 33% Age: 31 + 104 33% 33% 0 Other Unreported 43 14% 0% Octation 21 67 21% - PELL 51 16% 7% - Sexuality 2	Genderqueer/nonconforming	6	2%	-	
Unreported 42 13% 2% Age Age: 20 and under 73 23% 34% Age: 21 - 30 95 30% 33% Age: 31 + 104 33% 33% Unreported 43 14% 0% Other Disability 52 17% 3% LGBTQ+ 67 21% - Foster Youth 5 2% 0% Non U.S. Citizen 59 19% 10% PELL 51 16% 7% Veteran 5 2% 1% Sexuality Straight (heterosexual) 174 55% - Asexual 11 3% - Bisexual 22 7% - Gay 5 2% - Lesbian 5 2% - Pansexual 5 2% - Pan	Transgender	8	3%	-	
Age Age: 20 and under 73 23% 34% Age: 21 - 30 95 30% 33% Age: 31 + 104 33% 33% Unreported 43 14% 0% Other Disability 52 17% 3% LGBTQ+ 67 21% - Foster Youth 5 2% 0% Non U.S. Citizen 59 19% 10% PELL 51 16% 7% Veteran 5 2% 1% Sexuality Straight (heterosexual) 174 55% - Asexual 11 3% - Gay 5 2% - Lesbian 5 2% - Pansexual 5 2% - Queer 8 3% - Queer 8 3% - Questio	Other gender identity	4	1%	-	
Age: 20 and under 73 23% 34% Age: 21 - 30 95 30% 33% Age: 31 + 104 33% 33% Unreported 43 14% 0% Other Use of properties of proper	Unreported	42	13%	2%	
Age: 21 - 30 95 30% 33% Age: 31 + 104 33% 33% Unreported 43 14% 0% Other Disability 52 17% 3% LGBTQ+ 67 21% - Foster Youth 5 2% 0% Non U.S. Citizen 59 19% 10% PELL 51 16% 7% Veteran 5 2% 1% Sexuality Straight (heterosexual) 174 55% - Asexual 11 3% - Bisexual 22 7% - Gay 5 2% - Lesbian 5 2% - Pansexual 5 2% - Queer 8 3% - Questioning or unsure 9 3% - An identity not listed 2 1% -	Age				
Age: 31 + 104 33% 33% Unreported 43 14% 0% Other Disability 52 17% 3% LGBTQ+ 67 21% - Foster Youth 5 2% 0% Non U.S. Citizen 59 19% 10% PELL 51 16% 7% Veteran 5 2% 1% Sexuality Straight (heterosexual) 174 55% - Asexual 11 3% - Bisexual 22 7% - Gay 5 2% - Lesbian 5 2% - Pansexual 5 2% - Queer 8 3% - Questioning or unsure 9 3% - An identity not listed 2 1% -	Age: 20 and under	73	23%	34%	
Unreported 43 14% 0% Other Disability 52 17% 3% LGBTQ+ 67 21% - Foster Youth 5 2% 0% Non U.S. Citizen 59 19% 10% PELL 51 16% 7% Veteran 5 2% 1% Sexuality Straight (heterosexual) 174 55% - Asexual 11 3% - Bisexual 22 7% - Gay 5 2% - Lesbian 5 2% - Pansexual 5 2% - Queer 8 3% - Questioning or unsure 9 3% - An identity not listed 2 1% -	Age: 21 - 30	95	30%	33%	
Other Disability 52 17% 3% LGBTQ+ 67 21% - Foster Youth 5 2% 0% Non U.S. Citizen 59 19% 10% PELL 51 16% 7% Veteran 5 2% 1% Sexuality Straight (heterosexual) 174 55% - Asexual 11 3% - Bisexual 22 7% - Gay 5 2% - Lesbian 5 2% - Pansexual 5 2% - Queer 8 3% - Questioning or unsure 9 3% - An identity not listed 2 1% -	Age: 31+	104	33%	33%	
Disability 52 17% 3% LGBTQ+ 67 21% - Foster Youth 5 2% 0% Non U.S. Citizen 59 19% 10% PELL 51 16% 7% Veteran 5 2% 1% Sexuality Straight (heterosexual) 174 55% - Asexual 11 3% - Bisexual 22 7% - Gay 5 2% - Lesbian 5 2% - Pansexual 5 2% - Queer 8 3% - Questioning or unsure 9 3% - An identity not listed 2 1% -	Unreported	43	14%	0%	
LGBTQ+ 67 21% - Foster Youth 5 2% 0% Non U.S. Citizen 59 19% 10% PELL 51 16% 7% Veteran 5 2% 1% Sexuality Straight (heterosexual) 174 55% - Asexual 11 3% - Bisexual 22 7% - Gay 5 2% - Lesbian 5 2% - Pansexual 5 2% - Queer 8 3% - Questioning or unsure 9 3% - An identity not listed 2 1% -	Other				
Foster Youth 5 2% 0% Non U.S. Citizen 59 19% 10% PELL 51 16% 7% Veteran 5 2% 1% Sexuality Straight (heterosexual) 174 55% - Asexual 11 3% - Bisexual 22 7% - Gay 5 2% - Lesbian 5 2% - Pansexual 5 2% - Queer 8 3% - Questioning or unsure 9 3% - An identity not listed 2 1%	Disability	52	17%	3%	
Non U.S. Citizen 59 19% 10% PELL 51 16% 7% Veteran 5 2% 1% Sexuality Straight (heterosexual) 174 55% - Asexual 11 3% - Bisexual 22 7% - Gay 5 2% - Lesbian 5 2% - Pansexual 5 2% - Queer 8 3% - Questioning or unsure 9 3% - An identity not listed 2 1% -	LGBTQ+	67	21%	-	
PELL 51 16% 7% Veteran 5 2% 1% Sexuality Straight (heterosexual) 174 55% - Asexual 11 3% - Bisexual 22 7% - Gay 5 2% - Lesbian 5 2% - Pansexual 5 2% - Queer 8 3% - Questioning or unsure 9 3% - An identity not listed 2 1% -	Foster Youth	5	2%	0%	
Veteran 5 2% 1% Sexuality Straight (heterosexual) 174 55% - Asexual 11 3% - Bisexual 22 7% - Gay 5 2% - Lesbian 5 2% - Pansexual 5 2% - Queer 8 3% - Questioning or unsure 9 3% - An identity not listed 2 1% -	Non U.S. Citizen	59	19%	10%	
Sexuality Straight (heterosexual) 174 55% - Asexual 11 3% - Bisexual 22 7% - Gay 5 2% - Lesbian 5 2% - Pansexual 5 2% - Queer 8 3% - Questioning or unsure 9 3% - An identity not listed 2 1% -	PELL	51	16%	7%	
Straight (heterosexual) 174 55% - Asexual 11 3% - Bisexual 22 7% - Gay 5 2% - Lesbian 5 2% - Pansexual 5 2% - Queer 8 3% - Questioning or unsure 9 3% - An identity not listed 2 1% -	Veteran	5	2%	1%	
Asexual 11 3% - Bisexual 22 7% - Gay 5 2% - Lesbian 5 2% - Pansexual 5 2% - Queer 8 3% - Questioning or unsure 9 3% - An identity not listed 2 1% -	Sexuality				
Bisexual 22 7% - Gay 5 2% - Lesbian 5 2% - Pansexual 5 2% - Queer 8 3% - Questioning or unsure 9 3% - An identity not listed 2 1% -	Straight (heterosexual)	174	55%	-	
Gay 5 2% - Lesbian 5 2% - Pansexual 5 2% - Queer 8 3% - Questioning or unsure 9 3% - An identity not listed 2 1% -	Asexual	П	3%	-	
Lesbian 5 2% - Pansexual 5 2% - Queer 8 3% - Questioning or unsure 9 3% - An identity not listed 2 1% -	Bisexual	22	7%	-	
Pansexual 5 2% - Queer 8 3% - Questioning or unsure 9 3% - An identity not listed 2 1% -	Gay	5	2%	-	
Queer 8 3% - Questioning or unsure 9 3% - An identity not listed 2 1% -	Lesbian	5	2%	-	
Questioning or unsure 9 3% - An identity not listed 2 1% -	Pansexual	5	2%	-	
An identity not listed 2 1% -	Queer	8	3%	-	
,	Questioning or unsure	9	3%	-	
Prefer not to disclose 74 23% -	An identity not listed	2	1%	-	
	Prefer not to disclose	74	23%	-	

Demographic characteristics among survey respondents were somewhat representative of the De Anza's student population in spring 2024 in varying categories. The greatest exceptions were

observed among Latinx students who were underrepresented in the sample by 10 percentage points and an overrepresentation of students in the survey who declined to state their racial/ethnic identity.

Regarding gender, there was an underrepresentation of students who identify as a man by 20 percentage points in the survey compared to the student population. There was also a higher proportion of students who chose not to identify their gender in the survey than within the student population leading to variability. This was also the case for age, where a higher rate of respondents chose not to identify their age than in the De Anza population, resulting in an underrepresentation of students aged 20 and under.

In regard to other student populations, students with a disability, non U.S. citizens and PELL grant recipients were overrepresented in the survey.

Appendix

Sense of Belonging

Table 4. Questions Measuring Sense of Belonging, Spring 2024

					Feel your						
			Feel a pe	rsonal	experie	ences					
			connectio	connection with and/or		d/or culture are Feel lik		ou can	Feel you h	nave a	
			other stude	other students, staff		honored and		re your	good support		
	Feel like yo	u belong	or instru	or instructors		respected		point of view		network	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Great extent	106	34%	111	35%	141	45%	152	48%	135	43%	
Some extent	176	56%	160	51%	129	41%	122	39%	138	44%	
No extent	28	9%	41	13%	42	13%	38	12%	38	12%	
Unreported	5	2%	3	1%	3	1%	3	1%	4	1%	
Total	315	100%	315	100%	315	100%	315	100%	315	100%	

- Respondents selected 'great extent' at the highest rate for: feel like you can openly share your point of view (48%) followed by feel your unique personal experiences and/or culture are honored and respected (35%).
- The lowest rated response in the 'great extent' category was at 34%: feel like you belong, followed by 35%: feel a personal connection with other students, staff and instructors.

Civic Capacity

Table 5. Questions Measuring Civic Capacity, Spring 2024

See yourself as a person who can work with others

Voice your opinions to make a positive

	See yourself as a		on campus, at work,		difference on		Understand issues in		Develop solutions	
	person who	se voice	or in	your	campus or in your		the world around		to real-world	
	and opinion	s matter	comm	nunity	comm	unity	уо	u	probl	ems
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Great extent	127	40%	114	36%	148	47%	154	49%	121	38%
Some extent	140	44%	141	45%	116	37%	136	43%	145	46%
No extent	45	14%	54	17%	46	15%	22	7%	44	14%
Unreported	3	1%	6	2%	5	2%	3	1%	5	2%
Total	315	100%	315	100%	315	100%	315	100%	315	100%

- Respondents selected 'great extent' at the highest rate for: understand issues in the world around you (49%) and see yourself as a person whose voice and opinions matter (47%).
- The lowest rated response was at 36% reporting 'great extent' for: voice your opinions on campus, at work, or in your community, followed by 38% for: develop solutions to real world problems.

Food Insecurity

Food security among survey respondents was measured using the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Six-Item Short Form of the Food Security Survey Module. The food security scale has been adjusted to use in a self-administered survey format. Responses to each item on the food security scale are scored based on the number of affirmative responses. The score for each respondent determined their food security status; with a score between 0 and 1 affirmative responses indicating high or marginal food security, a score between 2 and 4 indicating low food security, and a score between 5 and 6 indicating a very low food security¹.

¹ (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 2012): https://www.ers.usda.gov/media/8282/short2012.pdf

Table 6. Rates of affirmative responses to specific items in the USDA food security scale

	#	%
I couldn't afford to eat balanced meals	166	53%
The food that I bought just didn't last and I didn't have enough money to get more	145	46%
Did you ever eat less than you felt you should because there wasn't enough money for food?	115	37%
Did you ever cut the size of your meals or skip meals because there wasn't enough money for food?	136	43%
Were you ever very hungry but didn't eat because there wasn't enough money for food?	82	26%

- The highest rate of food insecurity was observed for statements: I couldn't afford to eat balanced meals at the highest rate at 53% (166), followed by the food that I bought just didn't last and I didn't have enough money to get more at 46% (145) of respondents.
- The lowest rated response was at 26% (82) for: were you ever very hungry but didn't eat because there wasn't enough money for food?

Definitions of the three food security statuses according to the USDA's Guide to Measuring Household Food Security² are:

- High or marginal food security: Food secure – Household show no or minimal evidence of food insecurity
- Low food security: *Food insecure* Without hunger
- Very low food security: *Food insecure* With hunger

² (United States Department of Agriculture, 2000): https://fns-prod.azureedge.net/sites/default/files/FSGuide.pdf

Table 7. Scale of Food Security Status, Spring 2024

	Last 12 Months			
Food Security scale	#	%		
High or marginal security (score = 0-1)	146	46%		
Low security (score = 2-3)	55	17%		
Very low security (score = 4-5)	105	33%		

- 46% (146) of survey respondents reported "high or marginal" food security, meaning they were food stable.
- 33% (105) of respondents had a "very low" food security status, meaning they have the greatest food assistance needs.
- 17% (55) of respondents had a "low" food security status.

Housing Insecurity

Housing insecurity and homelessness survey questions were adapted from Wisconsin Hope Lab. Housing insecurity was defined as a set of broad housing issues including frequent moves, crowding, poor housing quality, or the inability to afford rent or bills. Homelessness describes the absence of a place to live, which includes people who live in shelters, vehicles, or abandoned structures³. Housing insecurity and homelessness were measured with five survey items each with an addition of one locally added question to the housing security items.

Table 8. Rates of affirmative response items measuring housing insecurity (past 12 months)

	De Anza R	espondents
	#	%
Any of the below items:	149	47%
Doubled up or shared a room	83	26%
Moved in with other people due to financial problems	82	26%
Didn't pay the full amount of utilities	69	22%
Didn't pay the full amount of rent or mortgage	62	20%
Moved two or more times in the year	37	12%

- 47% (149) of respondents answered affirmatively to at least one of the items indicating housing insecurity.
- 26% (83) of respondents indicated they had to double up or share a room during the past 12 months compared.
- 26% (82) of respondents indicated they had to move in with other people due to financial problems.

³ (Goldrick-Rab, Richardson, & Hemandez, 2017): http://www.wihopelab.com/publications/Hungry-and-Homeless-in-College-Report.pdf

Homelessness

Table 9. Rates of affirmative response items measuring homelessness (past 12 months)

	De Anza Respondents		
	#	%	
Any of the below items:	75	16%	
Did not know where you were going to sleep, even for one night	34	11%	
Didn't have a home	27	9%	
Was thrown out of your home	30	10%	
Stayed in a vehicle, abandoned building, or other place not meant as housing	19	6%	
Was evicted from your home	6	2%	
Stayed in a shelter	7	2%	

- 16% (75) of respondents answered affirmatively to at least one of the items indicating homelessness.
- Two homelessness items had the highest rates of affirmative responses:
 - o 11% (34) of respondents indicated that they did not know where they were going to sleep, even for one night
 - o 10% (30) of respondents indicated that they didn't have a home sometime during the past 12 months.

Mental Health

Table 10. Questions Included in Mental Health Index, Spring 2024

How much have mental health issues (e.g., personal or family mental health issues or lack of access to mental health services) affected your ability to be successful at De Anza College?

	#	%
Mental health rate	155	49%
Great effect	82	26%
Moderate effect	73	23%
Little effect	59	19%
No effect	62	20%
Unreported	39	12%
Total	315	100%

- 49% (155) of respondents indicated they faced mental health challenges that impeded their success at De Anza.
 - o 26% (82) of respondents indicated mental health had a 'great effect' on their ability to be successful.
 - o 23% (73) of respondents indicated mental health had a 'moderate effect' on their ability to be successful.

References

- De Anza's Office of Institutional Research and Planning. (2018). *Student Demographics and Characteristics*. Retrieved from De Anza College: http://www.deanza.edu/ir/deanza-research-projects/studentcharacteristics/LGBTQIReport.pdf
- Goldrick-Rab, S., Richardson, J., & Hemandez, A. (2017, March). *Hungry and Homeless in College: Results from a National Study of Basic Needs Insecurity in Higher Education*. Retrieved from Wisconsin HOPE Lab: http://www.wihopelab.com/publications/Hungry-and-Homeless-in-College-Report.pdf
- U.S. Department of Agriculture. (2012, September). *U.S. Household Food Security Module: Six-Item Short Form.* Retrieved from Food Security in the U.S.: Survey Tools: https://www.ers.usda.gov/media/8282/short2012.pdf
- United States Department of Agriculture. (2000). *Guide to Measuring Household Food Security*. Retrieved from USDA ERS Survey Tools: https://fns-prod.azureedge.net/sites/default/files/FSGuide.pdf
- United States Department of Housing and Urban Development . (2017, December). *The 2017 Annual Homeless Assessment Report (AHAR) to Congress*. Retrieved from HUD Exchange Resource Library: https://www.hudexchange.info/resources/documents/2017-AHAR-Part-1.pdf
- Wisconsin HOPE Lab. (2017). Los Angeles Community College District: District report from fall 2016 Survey of Student Basic Needs. Retrieved from Publications: Reports, Articles, & Briefs: http://wihopelab.com/publications/Wisconsin-HOPE-Lab-LA-CC-District-Report-Survey-Student-Needs.pdf