

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	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	x
Activities	Yes	x	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Resources	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	x
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?

Good use of the pie chart showing the breakdown of funding for each category. Would have been interested in seeing more targeted activities in Access.

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	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	X
Community Members	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	X

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?

The planning process appears to be collaborative, however, the college did not mention how Equity Planning would be integrated with other institutional planning efforts (ex: Ed. Master plan or

program review planning process).

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?

Asian Indian, Veterans, Vietnamese

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

N/A

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

Done Well: The college recognized that the many students of its Filipino and Pacific Island students self-identify as Asian. The college choose to disaggregate the data to increase their understanding of Access for segments of the Asian population.

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?

Well thought out implementation plan. The college included "Other activities to support disproportionately impacted groups" section, however the activities described do not appear support improving access for target groups. The ideas are good but it should be included in another section.

Activities: Access

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

Yes, marketing plan appears to be well thought out and will target the identified groups.

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 citation of literature. However, the activities show potential to improve access for target populations.

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

yes

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

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

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	
Am. Indians or Alaskan natives	Yes	X	More than one race	Yes	
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 x No

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

African American, Latino and Low-Income

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

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

Good activities

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?

Activities: Course Completion

32. Do the activities address the target populations identified in the research?
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?
34. Did the activities demonstrate coordination with other student equity-related programs? Any best practices for coordination? Areas where coordination could be improved?
35. Was the funding level appropriate for activities? Were the expenditures allowable as described in [the Student Equity Expenditure Guidelines](#)?
36. What was done well to evaluate activities? Anything that should be improved?

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"/>	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Females	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Whites	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Am. Indians or Alaskan natives	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Some other race	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
Asian	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	More than one race	Yes	<input 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
Low income students Yes

Veterans Yes

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

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

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

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

Goals: ESL & Basic Skills Improvement

42. Did the college set goals to improve ESL & Basic Skills Improvement? 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 were 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Whites	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Females	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Some other race	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
Am. Indians or Alaskan natives	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	More than one race	Yes	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	Veterans	Yes	<input 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?

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

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

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?

Activities: Degree & Certificate Completion

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

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?

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

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

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

Success Indicator: Transfer

Campus-Based Research: Transfer

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

Males	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Whites	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Females	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Some other race	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
Am. Indians or Alaskan natives	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	More than one race	Yes	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	Veterans	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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
Yes No

disproportionate impact study for this indicator?

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

African American, Latino, and low-income

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

N/A

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?

Yes

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?

No citation of literature. Please write out acronyms (ADT)

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

unclear

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?

Further explanation would have been helpful

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

*** College did not include this section*** N/A

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?

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

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

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

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

Budget

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

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?

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?

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

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?

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?

Other Comments?

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