

**CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE**

1102 Q STREET, SUITE 4554
SACRAMENTO, CA 95811-6549
(916) 445-8752
<http://www.cccco.edu>



Via email only

May 20, 2015

TO: Byron Breland, Chief Executive Officer, San Jose City College
Duncan Graham, Chief Instructional Officer, San Jose City College
Marie-Elaine Burns, Chief Student Services Officer, San Jose City College
Jorge Excobar, Chief Business Officer, San Jose City College
Marie Elaine Burns, Student Equity Coordinator, San Jose City College
Jesus Covarrubias, Academic Senate President, San Jose City College

FROM: Denise Noldon, Ph.D.
Vice Chancellor, Student Services and Special Programs (Interim)

SUBJECT: Student Equity Plan Feedback

As you know, colleges were required to submit Student Equity Plans in January, 2015 that contained college research into student groups experiencing achievement gaps, and the goals, activities and expenditures the college planned to address those gaps. On March 18-20, 2015 the Chancellor's Office brought together a panel of thirty college volunteers representing faculty, students, researchers, administrators, and others to read and provide feedback on the plans. Readers were divided into ten teams of three who read between 10-11 plans. Readers discussed each plan and provided joint feedback using a worksheet designed for that purpose. Enclosed, you will find the comments and suggestions readers had for your college plan.

Content of Feedback

Readers were asked to evaluate your plan for compliance with title 5 regulations and Education Code (Ed. Code) subdivision (d), Sections 78220-78221 (added by the passage of Senate Bill (SB) 860 in June, 2014). Since some of the Ed Code requirements were new and were added on short notice, no college plan fully complied. As a result, all colleges will be asked to submit a new, revised plan in Fall, 2015 which will be covered later in this memo. Based on reader comments, your college plan will need to improve any section below marked with an N (No) or a U (Unclear, Unknown) to be in compliance. Sections marked with a Y (Yes), seem to be in compliance, but may still benefit from changes.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) The executive summary addressed all of the required topics. | N |
| 2) The planning process was collaborative. | Y |
| 3) The plan addressed all of the required target populations. | N |
| 4) A disproportionate impact study was conducted for <i>each</i> success indicator. | Y |
| 5) The goals and activities were aligned with the research and target populations. | N |
| 6) The goals were measurable and include baseline data. | N |

- | | |
|--|--------|
| 7) The budget provided detail on how funds would be spent. | Y |
| 8) The plan demonstrated coordination with the Student Success and Support Program. | N |
| 9) The plan demonstrated coordination with some other categorical programs. | Y |
| 10) The plan included an evaluation, and;
the evaluation examines links between the goals, activities and budget. | Y
N |

If colleges provided budget detail (not required for this year but preferred) we asked readers to check to see if expenditures were allowable, based on the [Student Equity Expenditure Guidelines](#).

We also asked readers to comment on what colleges did well in the plans, highlighting any innovative practices or approaches. After each team had commented on their assigned plans, we asked them to help us identify colleges that had well-constructed plans that could be used as models for other colleges. If the last item on the worksheet is marked with a “Y”, readers indicated that your college had “one of the best plans yet.” It is clear from the comments that readers were generally impressed with the dedication and creativity colleges showed in attempting to improve equitable outcomes for students. Please see the attached copy of your college Student Equity Feedback Worksheet for detailed reader comments on your plan.

New Plan Template and Revised Plan Due Date

As mentioned above, since SB 860 added new requirements that were not included in the plan template the Chancellor's Office published in March, 2014, colleges will be asked to submit a revised plan that addresses these new requirements. My staff are currently developing a new plan template to help colleges meet these requirements. We expect to email it to related listservs in the next 4-6 weeks. The revised plan will be due on **November 23, 2015**.

Colleges can expect the plan template to include the following changes:

- The new requirements of Ed. Code Sections 78220-78221 related to target populations, required stakeholders and coordination with categorical programs.
- Increased focus on college-wide collaboration – a description of who was involved in the planning process and a list of planning participants.
- A description of the overall college strategy and priorities for improving equity, including the criteria and process used for setting priorities for activities and funding.
- Better alignment of research, goals, activities and expenditures – the plan template will be reorganized so that research, goals, activities, and budget are all a subset of each success indicator: access, course completion, basic skills and English as a Second Language (ESL) completion, degrees and certificates and transfer.
- A separate budget template using [Budget and Accounting Manual](#) definitions which will link expenditures to goals, activities, target populations and related categorical program expenditure sources.
- A statement to be signed by college presidents and chief business officers certifying that student equity funds are being used in accordance with the expenditure guidelines.

Colleges do not need to wait for the new template to begin revisions however; this feedback is intended to guide you as you develop your revised plan.

If you have any questions or concerns, feel free to contact Debra Sheldon via email at dsheldon@cccco.edu or me at dnoldon@cccco.edu.

Student Equity Plan Feedback Worksheet

College Name:

Team ID #

Reader ID #

Executive Summary

1. Was an executive summary provided? Yes No

2. Did the Executive Summary cover these required topics?

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

3. Was the planning process collaborative and were all of the necessary stakeholders included?

4. What was done well in the executive summary? What should be improved in the future?

Campus-Based Research

5. Were all of the required target populations addressed in the research?

Males	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Females	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Am. Indians or Alaskan natives	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Asian	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Black or African American	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hispanic or Latino	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Whites	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Some other race	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
More than one race	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Current or former foster youth	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Students with disabilities	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Low income students	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Veterans	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>

6. Did the college address any other optional populations? If so, which ones? (Age groups, LGBT, etc.)

7. A disproportionate impact study compares of 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 each indicator?

Yes No

8. Which target populations showed a disproportionate impact, and/or were indicated as experiencing an achievement gap and/or needing extra help?

Indicators	Populations
Access	Whites, Asians, age groups, DSPS
Course Completion	None listed
ESL and Basic Skills Completion	50+, American Indian (male), Pacific Islander
Degree & Cert Completion	American Indian (especially unprepared)
Transfer	Female, 20-24 and 30+, American Indian, Pacific Islander

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

No Veteran's or Foster Youth Data available

10. What was done well in the Research section? What should be improved in the future?

Gave an example of 80% rule but utilized prop. Index. The prop index is more appropriate especially for small sub groups. Perhaps change the example?

Goals and Activities

Access

11. Did the college set goals and plan activities to improve access?

Yes No

12. Do the goals and activities for *access* address the target populations identified in the research?

Yes

13. Are the goals and activities appropriate, achievable and have a reasonable chance of improving *access* for targeted groups?

Yes

14. What was done well in the plan to improve *access*? What should be improved in the future?

Love the Kindergarten outreach, good activities that reach across groups and interact. Good solid plans.

Course Completion (*Retention*)

15. Did the college set goals & plan activities to improve course completion?

Yes No

16. Do the goals and activities for *course completion* address the target populations identified in their research?

No groups identified as impacted

17. Are the goals and activities appropriate, achievable and have a reasonable chance of improving *course completion* for targeted groups?

Unclear – targeted are 25+ age groups, but not identified. The activities and goals might help but are not very focused and are trying to be identified via survey. More planning needs to be done.

18. What was done well in the plan to improve *course completion*? What should be improved in the future?

19. Did the college set goals and plan activities to improve ESL and basic skills completion? Yes No

20. Do the goals and activities for *ESL and basic skills completion* address the target populations identified in the research?

No

21. Are the goals and activities appropriate, achievable and have a reasonable chance of improving *ESL and basic skills completion* for targeted groups?

There is a disconnect between identified groups and activity for Summer Bridge

22. What was done well in the plan to improve *ESL and basic skills completion*? What should be improved in the future?

This area needs more discussion and planning.

Degree and Certificate Completion

23. Did the college set goals and plan activities to improve degree and certificate completion? Yes No

24. Do the goals and activities for *degrees and certificate completion* address the target populations identified in the research as experiencing a disproportionate impact?

No Identified group not specifically discussed

25. Are the goals and activities appropriate, achievable and have a reasonable chance of improving *degrees and certificate completion* for targeted groups?

Activity only speaks to incoming HS students

26. What was done well in the plan to improve *degrees and certificate completion*? What should be improved in the future?

This area needs more discussion and planning.

Transfer

27. Did the college set goals and plan activities to transfer? Yes No

28. Do the goals and activities for *transfer* address the target populations identified in the research as experiencing a disproportionate impact?

Partially but females are not mentioned, veteran's had not been identified as in need are mentioned, not clear about why health services and vaccinations are mentioned

29. What was done well in the plan to improve *transfer*? What should be improved in the future?

Budget

30. Does the budget section contain a list of funding sources for activities outlined in the plan? Yes No

31. Did the college provide any detail on how they plan to spend their student equity funds? Yes No

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

Coordination with Other Programs

33. Does the plan show evidence of coordination with the Student Success and Support Program (SSSP)? Yes No

34. Does the plan show evidence of coordination with any other programs? If yes, which ones?

35. What was done well to coordinate with other programs or initiatives? What should be improved in the future?

Evaluation Schedule and Process

36. Did the college describe the evaluation process and provide an evaluation schedule? Yes No

37. The instructions in the student equity plan template state that the evaluation should link the goals, activities and budget sections? Was this link evident?

38. 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