

Student Equity Plan Feedback Worksheet

College Name:

Team ID #

Reader ID #

Signature Page

1. Where all signatures present? If not, which one(s) were missing?

Executive Summary

2. Was an executive summary provided? Yes No

3. Did the Executive Summary cover these required topics?

Target Student Groups	Yes	X	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Goals	Yes	X	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Activities	Yes	X	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Resources	Yes	X	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Contact/Coordinator	Yes	X	No	<input type="checkbox"/>

4. What was done well in the executive summary? What should be improved in the future? Please consider these questions as you provide your feedback:

- Did the goals, activities, and expenditures address disproportionately impacted student groups, as defined by the college's research?
- Were the goals reasonable and achievable?
- Were activities appropriate for improving outcomes for students?

Demonstrates a clear conceptual framework based in research that grounds the plan. Shows ongoing effort to integrate equity with the college educational master plan. Goals and activities seem reasonable and target the DI populations. Seems well thought out. I am not sure how many African American students would need to be in ESL. That research and strategy may need to be checked.

Planning Committee and Collaboration

5. Did the required stakeholders participate in the planning committee (see Student Equity Plan Committee Membership List)?

Academic Senate	Yes	X	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Faculty	Yes	X	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Staff	Yes	X	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student Services Reps	Yes	X	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	Yes	X	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Community Members	Yes	x	No	<input type="checkbox"/>

6. Was the planning process collaborative and were other stakeholders representing target student groups included? Did the college attempt to integrate student equity planning with plans for other categorical programs (SSSP, EOPS, Basic Skills Initiative, CalWORKs, Financial Aid, etc.) and other institutional planning efforts? What was done well and what should be improved?

Very collaborative process. The college seems to have made an intensive and well-thought out effort to include as many stakeholder as possible. Excellent representation of community stakeholders as well.

Success Indicator: Access

Campus-Based Research: Access

7. Were all of the required target populations addressed in the research on Access?

Males	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Whites	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Females	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Some other race	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Am. Indians or Alaskan natives	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	More than one race	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Asian	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Current or former foster youth	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Black or African American	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Students with disabilities	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Hispanic or Latino	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Low income students	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Veterans	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

8. A disproportionate impact study *compares the performance of each target population to that of a reference group, and provides clear, data-driven conclusions* about affected populations. Did the college conduct a disproportionate impact study for this indicator? Yes No

9. Which groups showed a disproportionate impact for access and needed extra attention?

10. What problems did the college describe in conducting the research, if any?

11. What was done well in the Access research? Any best practices? Anything that should be improved?

Goals: Access

12. Did the college set goals to improve access? Yes No

13. If yes, do the goals address the student groups identified in the research as needing attention? Yes No

14. Are the goals numerically measurable? Yes No

15. Did they include a base year and target year for improvement? Yes No

16. Were they achievable and have a reasonable chance of improving *access* for targeted groups?

Activities: Access

17. Do the activities address the target populations identified in their research?

Not really, or only marginally. The main activity cited is really general outreach that any normal college would conduct. Since the goal listed was to improve access for disabled students, veterans, females and Latinas, I would have expected to see targeted outreach to locations where large groupings of those potential students are more present. I would have expected to see promotion of programs that are particularly attractive to women, if the goal was to increase access for females, for example.

18. Did the college cite any literature or research showing that the models they were implementing were potentially effective? Did the activities show potential for improving access for targeted students?

No research supporting outreach activities. Only marginal potential for improving access for targeted student groups. Yes, there was research related to financial aid awards, but this was confusing, since Low-income students were not ID'd as being disproportionately impacted or needing additional assistance.

19. Did the activities demonstrate coordination with other student equity-related programs? Any best practices for coordination? Areas where coordination could be improved?

Yes, they talked about raising awareness of many different student services in outreach campaigns. This was good. The charts were well laid out and demonstrated lots of thought

20. Was the funding level appropriate for activities? Were the expenditures allowable as described in [the Student Equity Expenditure Guidelines](#)?

Yes. But activity needs to be more targeted towards DI groups identified in goal.

21. What was done well to evaluate activities? Anything that should be improved?

The evaluation should be more linked to the actual goals – how successful is this activity in actually raising the number of student ID as disproportionately impacted.

Success Indicator: Course Completion

Campus-Based Research: Course Completion

22. Were all of the required target populations addressed in the research on Course Completion?

Males	Yes	X	Whites	Yes	X
Females	Yes	X	Some other race	Yes	X
Am. Indians or Alaskan natives	Yes	X	More than one race	Yes	X
Asian	Yes	X	Current or former foster youth	Yes	X
Black or African American	Yes	X	Students with disabilities	Yes	X
Hispanic or Latino	Yes	X	Low income students	Yes	X
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	Yes	X	Veterans	Yes	x

23. A disproportionate impact study *compares the performance of each target population to that of a reference group, and provides clear, data-driven conclusions* about affected populations. Did the college conduct a disproportionate impact study for this indicator?

Yes No

24. Which groups showed a disproportionate impact for Course Completion and needed extra attention?

African American, foster youth, Latina/o and low-income students

25. What problems did the college describe in conducting the research, if any?

None

26. What was done well in the Course Completion research? Any best practices? Anything that should be improved?

The research was clear, understandable and well presented. Great idea to include research into students on Academic Probation. But Native Americans showed a DI of minus - 12.0% and Low Income students showed a DI of -7.3, yet no goals were set for them. Should to address activities for them, or at least say why the college is not doing so now and what they will do in the future.

Goals: Course Completion

27. Did the college set goals to improve Course Completion? Yes No

28. If yes, do the goals address the student groups identified in the research? Yes No

29. Are the goals numerically measurable? Yes No

30. Did they include a base year and target year for improvement? Yes No

31. Were they achievable and have a reasonable chance of improving *Course Completion* for targeted groups?

Yes

Activities: Course Completion

32. Do the activities address the target populations identified in the research?

Yes, most do, but others don't. Veterans are not ID'd as having a problem with course completion, yet expenditures and activities are designated to improved course completion for them. Maybe it would be better to expend funds for them under access or some other indicator where they actually show up as disproportionately impacted?

33. Did the college cite any literature or research showing that the models they were implementing were potentially effective? Did the activities show potential for improving Course Completion for targeted students?

No, not really, although many of the activities they are planning do have research showing them as promising practices

34. Did the activities demonstrate coordination with other student equity-related programs? Any best practices for coordination? Areas where coordination could be improved?

Yes

35. Was the funding level appropriate for activities? Were the expenditures allowable as described in [the Student Equity Expenditure Guidelines](#)?

In general, yes.

36. What was done well to evaluate activities? Anything that should be improved?

They have an evaluation plan for each activity, many of them linked to program review. Would like to see more about who that information will be shared with and how it will be used to improve or change activities in the future.

Success Indicator: ESL & Basic Skills Improvement

Campus-Based Research: ESL & Basic Skills Improvement

37. Were all of the required target populations addressed in the research on ESL & Basic Skills Improvement?

Males	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Whites	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Females	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Some other race	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Am. Indians or Alaskan natives	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	More than one race	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Asian	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Current or former foster youth	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Black or African American	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Students with disabilities	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Hispanic or Latino	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Low income students	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Veterans	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

38. A disproportionate impact study *compares the performance of each target population to that of a reference group, and provides clear, data-driven conclusions* about affected populations. Did the college conduct a disproportionate impact study for this indicator?

Yes No

Unclear. See note in Item 41.

39. Which groups showed a disproportionate impact for ESL & Basic Skills Improvement and needed extra attention?

The college identified DI in ESL and Basic Skills Course *Completion* (not Improvement) for the following groups: **ESL:** African American (-22.7), Latina/o (-22.3), Age 25 to 34 (-15.1) **BS Math:** Foster Youth (-26.7), Age 25 to 34 (-12.8), Disabled (-12.2), Latina/o (-9.2), African American (-6.7), Low-Income (-3.0), Male **BS English:** Foster Youth (-27.9), African American (-9.5), Latina/o (-8.9), Age 25 to 34 (-8.0)

40. What problems did the college describe in conducting the research, if any?

The college did not describe any problems, but it seems clear from the research presented that the college misunderstood the definition of this indicator

41. What was done well in the ESL & Basic Skills Improvement research? Any best practices? Anything that should be improved?

From the narrative describing the research, it seems that the college did not base their DI study on the correct definition for the indicator, Basic skills *improvement*. The narrative reference Basis skills course *completion*, which is not what this indicator is supposed to be measuring.

Goals: ESL & Basic Skills Improvement

42. Did the college set goals to improve ESL & Basic Skills Improvement Completion?

Yes No

43. If yes, do the goals address the student groups identified in the research as needing attention? Yes No
44. Are the goals numerically measurable? Yes No
45. Did they include a base year and target year for improvement? Yes No
46. Were they achievable and have a reasonable chance of improving *ESL & Basic Skills Improvement* for targeted groups?

Activities: *ESL & Basic Skills Improvement*

47. Do the activities address the target populations identified in their research?
48. Did the college cite any literature or research showing that the models they were implementing were potentially effective? Did the activities show potential for improving *ESL & Basic Skills Improvement* for targeted students?
49. Did the activities demonstrate coordination with other student equity-related programs? Any best practices for coordination? Areas where coordination could be improved?
50. Was the funding level appropriate for activities? Were the expenditures allowable as described in [the Student Equity Expenditure Guidelines](#)?
51. What was done well to evaluate activities? Anything that should be improved?
52. What was done well in the plan to improve *ESL & Basic Skills Improvement*? What should be improved in the future?

Success Indicator: Degree & Certificate Completion

Campus-Based Research: Degree & Certificate Completion

53. Were all of the required target populations addressed in the research on Degree & Certificate Completion?
 Males Yes Females Yes

Am. Indians or Alaskan natives	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Some other race	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Asian	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	More than one race	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Black or African American	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Current or former foster youth	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Hispanic or Latino	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Students with disabilities	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Low income students	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Whites	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Veterans	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

54. A disproportionate impact study *compares the performance of each target population to that of a reference group, and provides clear, data-driven conclusions* about affected populations. Did the college conduct a disproportionate impact study for this indicator? Yes No

55. Which groups showed a disproportionate impact for Degree & Certificate Completion and needed extra attention?

Disabled students, Males, Age 25-34

56. What problems did the college describe in conducting the research, if any?
None

57. What was done well in the Degree & Certificate Completion research? Any best practices? Anything that should be improved?

Clear and understandable. Age groups are actually not one of the target populations.

Goals: Degree & Certificate Completion

58. Did the college set goals to improve Degree & Certificate Completion? Yes No

59. If yes, do the goals address the student groups identified in the research? Yes No

60. Are the goals numerically measurable? Yes No

61. Did they include a base year and target year for improvement? Yes No

62. Were they achievable and have a reasonable chance of improving *Degree & Certificate Completion* for targeted groups?

yes

Activities: Degree & Certificate Completion

63. Do the activities address the target populations identified in their research?
Sort of. I would have expected to see at least one activity directly addressing the needs of disabled students either investigating why they are having problems obtaining degrees or helping them to do so. Most of the activities listed are the same activities listed under Course completion and ESL and Basic Skills Improvement are only tangentially related to the specific student groups in ID'd in the research as needing support, although many of the efforts might lead to improvements for males.

64. Did the college cite any literature or research showing that the models they were implementing were potentially effective? Did the activities show potential for improving Degree & Certificate Completion for targeted students?

no

65. Did the activities demonstrate coordination with other student equity-related programs? Any best practices for coordination? Areas where coordination could be improved?

yes

66. Was the funding level appropriate for activities? Were the expenditures allowable as described in [the Student Equity Expenditure Guidelines](#)?

yes

67. What was done well to evaluate activities? Anything that should be improved?

Would like to see evaluation of the activities more directly linked to the actual goals set for these students

Success Indicator: Transfer

Campus-Based Research: Transfer

68. Were all of the required target populations addressed in the research on Transfer?

Males	Yes	X	Whites	Yes	X
Females	Yes	X	Some other race	Yes	X
Am. Indians or Alaskan natives	Yes	X	More than one race	Yes	X
Asian	Yes	X	Current or former foster youth	Yes	X
Black or African American	Yes	X	Students with disabilities	Yes	X
Hispanic or Latino	Yes	X	Low income students	Yes	X
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	Yes	x	Veterans	Yes	x

69. A disproportionate impact study *compares the performance of each target population to that of a reference group, and provides clear, data-driven conclusions* about affected populations. Did the college conduct a disproportionate impact study for this indicator?

Yes No

70. Which groups showed a disproportionate impact for Transfer and needed extra attention?

Age 25 to 34 years, Disabled, Foster Youth, Latina/o, Veterans, Filipino, Low-Income, African American, Age 18 to 24 years

71. What problems did the college describe in conducting the research, if any?

none

72. What was done well in the Transfer research? Any best practices? Anything that should be improved?

Goals: Transfer

73. Did the college set goals to improve Transfer?

Yes No

74. If yes, do the goals address the student groups identified in the research as needing attention? Yes No
75. Are the goals numerically measurable? Yes No
76. Did they include a base year and target year for improvement? Yes No
77. Were they achievable and have a reasonable chance of improving *Transfer* for targeted groups?

Activities: Transfer

78. Do the activities address the target populations identified in their research?
79. Did the college cite any literature or research showing that the models they were implementing were potentially effective? Did the activities show potential for improving Transfer for targeted students?
80. Did the activities demonstrate coordination with other student equity-related programs? Any best practices for coordination? Areas where coordination could be improved?
81. Was the funding level appropriate for activities? Were the expenditures allowable as described in [the Student Equity Expenditure Guidelines](#)?
82. What was done well to evaluate activities? Anything that should be improved?
83. What was done well in the plan to improve Transfer? What should be improved in the future?

Initiatives Affecting Several Indicators

Goals: Initiatives Affecting Several Indicators

84. Did the college indicate which goals would be affected by the institutional activities? Yes No
85. Did they describe the student groups that would be affected? Yes No

Activities: Initiatives Affecting Several Indicators

86. Do the activities address the target populations identified in their research?

87. Did the college cite any literature or research showing that the models they were implementing were potentially effective? Did the activities show potential for improving outcomes for targeted students?

Yes – multiple measures

88. Did the activities demonstrate coordination with other student equity-related programs? Any best practices for coordination? Areas where coordination could be improved?

Yes, good to see these programs listed as part of the equity plan. Good to see that the college is involved in MMAP and loved the English & Math Readiness Summer Jams. I would encourage the college to think about how they will coordinate and work together with the activities listed in other sections of the plan.

89. Was the funding level appropriate for activities? Were the expenditures allowable as described in [the Student Equity Expenditure Guidelines](#)?

Yes – these activities were funded from other sources

90. What was done well to evaluate activities? Anything that should be improved?

All activities should be integrated into some kind of master evaluation that is linked to the stated Student Equity goals.

91. What was done well in the plan to improve Initiatives Affecting Several Indicators? What should be improved in the future?

Shows lots of involvement from several existing programs.

Budget

92. Could you clearly identify in the budget summary which activities were being funded in the plan narrative? If not, what was unclear?

Yes, very clear

93. Did the budget include expenditures that may not have been allowable as described in the [Student Equity Expenditure Guidelines, 2015-16](#) available on the CCCCO website?

no

94. Districts and colleges cannot use equity funds to supplant funding for programs, positions or services funded from another source, prior to the availability of equity funds in the 2014-15 FY. Was there evidence that the college might have supplanted funds?

no

95. What was done well in the budget section? What should be improved in the future?

Everything was traceable back to the activities described in the narrative.

Evaluation

96. Did the college describe the evaluation process and provide an evaluation schedule?

Yes

No

97. Does the evaluation describe any coordination with program review, [Institutional Effectiveness](#) goal setting, educational master planning or other related institutional planning or evaluation processes?

Yes, great collaboration with educational master plan and IEPI goals.

98. Does the evaluation describe who will be informed of the results of the evaluation, how the results will be used to improve practice? What was done well in the plan to evaluate student equity implementation at the college? What should be improved in the future?

It does describe who will be informed of the results, but does not really address how results will be used to improve practice. Best practice was the obvious coordination with IEPI and the Scorecard. What needs to be improved is that the evaluation really did not address how the specific goals for each equity indicator were going to be measured. In the institutional goals that were measured, it needs to show not only institution wide progress as a whole, but those indicators should be disaggregated so that it is obvious how individual student groups are doing.

Other Comments?

Over all, this is a very solid plan that shows a college-wide commitment to equity and a good attempt to coordinate among different programs and departments. It does need some tweaks in the areas already described in the different sections. It could use some further work to better understand if and how the activities will actually help the college reach the student equity goals they have stated. Good work!

This plan was one of the best I have read and should be used as a model for other colleges! (Please mark with an x if you agree with this statement.)

Yes