STATE OF CALIFORNIA                                         BRICE W. HARRIS, CHANCELLOR

**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**
jowel.laguerre@solano.edu; shirley.lewis@solano.edu; Leslie.minor@solano.edu; Yulian.Ligioso@solano.edu;
shirley.lewis@solano.edu; michael.wyly@solano.edu

May 20, 2015

**TO:**     Jowel Laguerre, Chief Executive Officer, Solano Community College
            Leslie Minor, Chief Instructional Officer, Solano Community College
            Shirley Lewis, Chief Student Services Officer, Solano Community College
            Yulian Ligioso, Chief Business Officer, Solano Community College
            Shirley Lewis, Student Equity Coordinator, Solano Community College
            Michael Wyly, Academic Senate President, Solano Community 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 *each* 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.                                    N
8) The plan demonstrated coordination with the Student Success and Support                    Y
   Program.
9) The plan demonstrated coordination with some other categorical programs.                   Y
10) The plan included an evaluation, and;                                                      Y
    the evaluation examines links between the goals, activities and budget.                    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:** Solano

**Team ID #** 9      **Reader ID #** ABC

## Executive Summary

1. Was an executive summary provided?     Yes | XX |   No | |

2. Did the Executive Summary cover these required topics?

| | | Yes | | No | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Target Groups* | Yes | XX | No | | |
| *Goals* | Yes | | No | XX | |
| *Activities* | Yes | | No | XX | |
| *Resources* | Yes | XX | No | | |
| *Contact/Coordinator* | Yes | XX | No | | |

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

> All constituency groups were represented in its creation although there were no community members. An existing plan had been Board approved in 2013 and updated in 2014. A broad based equity committee was already in place.

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

> Kudos for having a plan in place prior to 2015. A good place to start with that plan and enhance it. In the future please provide specific summary of data and disproportional impacts rather than a general summary of support and services. Excellent style within each category by providing an overview first followed by details. Very complete, particularly the resources. Specific data references would have made this section better. Methods of determination would have been nice to include.

## Campus-Based Research

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

| | Yes | | No | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Males | Yes | XX | No | |
| Females | Yes | XX | No | |
| Am. Indians or Alaskan natives | Yes | XX | No | |
| Asian | Yes | XX | No | |
| Black or African American | Yes | XX | No | |
| Hispanic or Latino | Yes | XX | No | |
| Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander | Yes | XX | No | |
| Whites | Yes | XX | No | |
| Some other race | Yes | | No | XX |
| More than one race | Yes | | No | |
| Current or former foster youth | Yes | | No | XX |
| Students with disabilities | Yes | XX | No | |
| Low income students | Yes | XX | No | |
| Veterans | Yes | | No | XX |

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

age

7. 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 each indicator?

Yes [ XX ] 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* | White, male, disabled |
| *Course Completion* | African-American |
| *ESL and Basic Skills Completion* | ESL: Hispanic, female, 25-49 yo; Remedial English: 20-24 yo, 25-49 yo, African-American, Hispanic; Remedial math: African-American, Hispanic, economically disadvantaged |
| *Degree & Cert Completion* | 20-49 yo, African-American, Hispanic, White, disabled, low income |
| *Transfer* | 20-24, 25-29, African-American, Hispanic, White, disabled, economically disadvantaged |

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

Some populations were too small to draw statistically sound conclusions, foster youth information will be more complete in the future, no data was presented on veterans

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

More than one source of information was used and summarized nicely. Highlighting the Dis would make it more noticeable. Good detail and explanation of demographic groups that are impacted. However, additional statistical analysis was given which is great but dramatically clouds the purpose of each section.

## Goals and Activities

**Access**

11. Did the college set goals and plan activities to improve access? Yes [ XX ] No [   ]

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

Very detailed goals and activities for the targeted populations. Veterans are not included in the research but are listed in the goals in this area.

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

There appears to be sufficient time to have a reasonable chance to achieve the goals by utilizing the activities. Be sure to measure increases by each individual group.

2

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

> The activities are numerous and should result in success. An ambitious goal. A wide net so that there are multiple approaches to reach the targeted population.

## Course Completion (*Retention*)

15. Did the college set goals & plan activities to improve course completion?     Yes [ XX ]     No [    ]

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

> Yes.

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

> Yes, 20% is an ambitious goal but aim high.

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

> Clear measureable goals with a two year timeline. Be sure to track improvements then do more research to set more goals.

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

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

> yes

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

> Achievable and will likely result in improving completion for the targeted groups.

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

> One student success course is planned but should be scaled up. Sufficiently broad to reach a sizeable number of target students. Improvement goal of 20% is ambitious.

## Degree and Certificate Completion

23. Did the college set goals and plan activities to improve degree and certificate completion?     Yes [ XX ]     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?

> yes

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

> Yes, again 20% is ambitious.

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

> Setting a clear and ambitious goal.

### Transfer

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

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

> yes

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

> Development of ADT should not have waited for Equity. Once the curriculum is established efforts can be moved to other aspects of student equity.

## Budget

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

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

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

> Appropriate list of funding sources as well as potential grants. No mention of how the money will be spent. No specific funding for activities.

## Coordination with Other Programs

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

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

> Assignment of various activities to various positions at the college. Financial aid representation?

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

A year or two into the effort it will be clear to identify changes needed to achieve the goals. Solano needs to identify how the SEP will be integrated with other campus programs and committees to result in desired outcomes.

## Evaluation Schedule and Process

36. Did the college describe the evaluation process and provide an evaluation schedule?    Yes [XX]  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?

Done on an annual basis.

38. What was done well in the plan to evaluate student equity implementation at the college? What should be improved in the future?

Integrated into the program review cycle and process. Assigning responsibility to a position creates ownership.

## Other Comments?

Thorough plan. Only missing actual budget and defined expenditures tied to specific activities.

**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 [ ]

**College Name:** Solano

**Team ID #** 9      **Reader ID #** ABC

## Executive Summary

1. Was an executive summary provided?      Yes [ XX ]   No [   ]

2. Did the Executive Summary cover these required topics?

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Target Groups* | Yes | XX | No | |
| *Goals* | Yes | | No | XX |
| *Activities* | Yes | | No | XX |
| *Resources* | Yes | XX | No | |
| *Contact/Coordinator* | Yes | XX | No | |

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

All constituency groups were represented in its creation although there were no community members. An existing plan had been Board approved in 2013 and updated in 2014. A broad based equity committee was already in place.

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

Kudos for having a plan in place prior to 2015. A good place to start with that plan and enhance it. In the future please provide specific summary of data and disproportional impacts rather than a general summary of support and services. Excellent style within each category by providing an overview first followed by details. Very complete, particularly the resources. Specific data references would have made this section better. Methods of determination would have been nice to include.

## Campus-Based Research

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

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Males | Yes | XX | No | |
| Females | Yes | XX | No | |
| Am. Indians or Alaskan natives | Yes | XX | No | |
| Asian | Yes | XX | No | |
| Black or African American | Yes | XX | No | |
| Hispanic or Latino | Yes | XX | No | |
| Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander | Yes | XX | No | |
| Whites | Yes | XX | No | |
| Some other race | Yes | | No | XX |
| More than one race | Yes | | No | |
| Current or former foster youth | Yes | | No | XX |
| Students with disabilities | Yes | XX | No | |
| Low income students | Yes | XX | No | |
| Veterans | Yes | | No | XX |

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

> age

7. 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 each indicator?  Yes [XX]  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* | White, male, disabled |
| *Course Completion* | African-American |
| *ESL and Basic Skills Completion* | ESL: Hispanic, female, 25-49 yo; Remedial English: 20-24 yo, 25-49 yo, African-American, Hispanic; Remedial math: African-American, Hispanic, economically disadvantaged |
| *Degree & Cert Completion* | 20-49 yo, African-American, Hispanic, White, disabled, low income |
| *Transfer* | 20-24, 25-29, African-American, Hispanic, White, disabled, economically disadvantaged |

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

> Some populations were too small to draw statistically sound conclusions, foster youth information will be more complete in the future, no data was presented on veterans

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

> More than one source of information was used and summarized nicely. Highlighting the Dis would make it more noticeable. Good detail and explanation of demographic groups that are impacted. However, additional statistical analysis was given which is great but dramatically clouds the purpose of each section.

## Goals and Activities

**Access**

11. Did the college set goals and plan activities to improve access?  Yes [XX]  No [ ]

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

> Very detailed goals and activities for the targeted populations. Veterans are not included in the research but are listed in the goals in this area.

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

> There appears to be sufficient time to have a reasonable chance to achieve the goals by utilizing the activities. Be sure to measure increases by each individual group.

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

> The activities are numerous and should result in success. An ambitious goal. A wide net so that there are multiple approaches to reach the targeted population.

## Course Completion (*Retention*)

15. Did the college set goals & plan activities to improve course completion?   Yes | XX |   No | |

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

> Yes.

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

> Yes, 20% is an ambitious goal but aim high.

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

> Clear measureable goals with a two year timeline. Be sure to track improvements then do more research to set more goals.

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

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

> yes

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

> Achievable and will likely result in improving completion for the targeted groups.

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

> One student success course is planned but should be scaled up. Sufficiently broad to reach a sizeable number of target students. Improvement goal of 20% is ambitious.

## Degree and Certificate Completion

23. Did the college set goals and plan activities to improve degree and certificate completion?     Yes | XX |   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?

> yes

3

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

> Yes, again 20% is ambitious.

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

> Setting a clear and ambitious goal.

## Transfer

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

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

> yes

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

> Development of ADT should not have waited for Equity. Once the curriculum is established efforts can be moved to other aspects of student equity.

## Budget

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

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

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

> Appropriate list of funding sources as well as potential grants. No mention of how the money will be spent. No specific funding for activities.

## Coordination with Other Programs

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

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

> Assignment of various activities to various positions at the college. Financial aid representation?

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

A year or two into the effort it will be clear to identify changes needed to achieve the goals. Solano needs to identify how the SEP will be integrated with other campus programs and committees to result in desired outcomes.

## Evaluation Schedule and Process

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

Yes [XX] 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?

Done on an annual basis.

38. What was done well in the plan to evaluate student equity implementation at the college? What should be improved in the future?

Integrated into the program review cycle and process. Assigning responsibility to a position creates ownership.

## Other Comments?

Thorough plan. Only missing actual budget and defined expenditures tied to specific activities.

**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 [ ]