

Grossmont College
Student Equity Plan

November 16, 2004

GROSSMONT COLLEGE STUDENT EQUITY PLAN

Table of Contents

Signature Page	1
Executive Summary	2 - 6
Target Groups	
Goals	
Activities	
Resources	
Campus-Based Research	7 - 12
Overview	
Access	
Course Completion (<i>Retention</i>)	
ESL and Basic Skills Completion	
Degree and Certificate Completion	
Transfer	
Goals and Activities	13 - 26
Access	
Course Completion (<i>Retention</i>)	
ESL and Basic Skills Completion	
Degree and Certificate Completion	
Transfer	
Budget	27 - 28
Sources of Funding	
Evaluation Schedule and Process	29 - 30
Attachments	31 - 48

***Grossmont College
Student Equity Plan***

Signature Page

District: Grossmont-Cuyamaca **College:** Grossmont College

President, Board of Trustees

Date

District Chancellor: _____

College President: _____

Academic Senate President: _____

Classified Senate President: _____

Associated Students of Grossmont College President: _____

Student Equity Coordinator: _____

Executive Summary

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The creation of Grossmont College’s Student Plan began with the formation of a district-wide Student Equity Committee. This committee, composed of members from Grossmont College, Cuyamaca College, and our District office, was charged with the responsibility of coordinating the planning efforts at the two colleges. This committee reviewed the Student Equity planning materials, developed an overall strategy for completing the assignment, and directed the two campuses to begin the development of their own Student Equity plan.

The membership of the Grossmont College Student Equity Committee was drawn from two sources. First, the college’s Student Success Committee was recruited for the job. This committee serves as the matriculation coordinating group on campus. Its members include representatives from the Academic Senate, Classified Senate, a variety of instructional and student service programs, and administrators. The second source of members was the district-wide Student Equity committee. Faculty members on this committee were asked to also serve on the college’s committee. The resulting group consisted of 21 members drawn from all quarters of the campus (Attachment #1).

The first step in the development of the plan was to review the student success research that would help us identify those equity issues that needed our attention. The District’s Office of Institutional Research, Planning and Academic Services was charged with the responsibility for examining the “success indicators” and comparing Grossmont’s student body against these indicators. A full discussion of this process is included in the Campus Based Research section. Presented here are the highlights of the research.

We found eight items within four of the success indicators that needed to be addressed by our plan. These items are presented below.

Course Completion

- Black non-Hispanic and Hispanic students succeed at a lower rate in basic skills courses.
- Black non-Hispanic students succeed at a lower rate in degree-applicable courses.
- Black non-Hispanic students succeed at a lower rate in vocational courses.

ESL and Basic Skills Completion

- Black non-Hispanic and Hispanic students succeed at a lower rate in pre-collegiate math courses.
- Black non-Hispanic students succeed at a lower rate in pre-collegiate English courses.

Degree and Certificate Completion

- Black non-Hispanic and Hispanic students earn degrees at a lower rate.
- Black non-Hispanic students earn certificates at a lower rate.

Transfer

- Black non-Hispanic and Hispanic students transfer at a lower rate.

Once these eight items were identified, the committee then began constructing a plan that would focus on these issues. Each committee member was asked to contribute items from his/her areas of interest or expertise, thereby ensuring a broad campus-wide response to the differences identified by the campus research. Members were asked to send in information about existing services, programs, and activities that contribute toward providing a plan to ensure student equity. In addition, they were also asked to think of new strategies that the college could adopt, within resource limitations, which would hasten our progress toward student equity.

The initial response from the committee members and other faculty resulted in a compilation of the many student success endeavors on campus. This list was reviewed by the committee and narrowed down to those items that (a) are perceived to most directly influence the success indicators, (b) are focused on the target groups identified by the research, and (c) are amenable to additional study to evaluate their effectiveness in reducing disparities for identified groups. The college will continue its support of the many student success efforts on campus that are not listed in this Plan. Furthermore, recent improvements in state funding will lead to a new wave of full-time faculty hires. These new positions will give us an opportunity to strengthen the college's commitment to student equity by bringing additional faculty experience, expertise and resources to bear on this issue.

Listed below are the titles of the goals and activities included in our plan, organized by success indicator. A full description of these goals and activities can be found in the Goals & Activities section.

Course Completion

Project Success

Friday ESL Workshops for Students

ESL Professional Development Workshops for Faculty

Learning Assistance Centers

Academic Achievement Workshops

Student Success Strategies

ESL and Basic Skill Completion

Math 299 - *Strategies for Success in Math*
Friday Tutoring for Developmental Math
PDC/ESL/Basic Skills Links
Expanded Early Alert

Degree and Certificate Completion

New Student Orientation/Advisement
Student Clubs and Organizations
Student Ambassadors
Automatic Degree Audit

Transfer

Puente Program
Band of Brothers and Sisters

The programs listed above rely upon a wide variety of resources to accomplish their goals. The college provides the lion's share of resources by funding the faculty and staff who are responsible for these programs. The college's general fund also provides support through the various department budgets, from which the necessary supplies, equipment, and other resources are purchased. A detailed listing of these resources is found in the Budget section. However, the college's ability to maintain its commitment to Student Equity is currently threatened by an increasing number of vacant full-time faculty positions. Faculty play a paramount role in student success. If these positions remain vacant, the college will suffer a loss of both instructional and non-instructional faculty whose teaching, counseling, and other activities provide the backbone of our Student Equity efforts.

Previous research into the issue of student success has shown that the various measures of success (course completion, retention, persistence, etc.) have been extremely stable over time. This stability holds true whether we look at the overall college rates or the rates of smaller student groups. Yet, even though there is no apparent trend when looking at the data on a year-to-year basis, over a long period of time we do find small increases in student success. Therefore, when developing performance measures and a timeline that would chart our progress toward student equity goals, we were conservative in our predictions. Our committee decided that a realistic goal for improving success, as measured by the success indicators, was 1%-1.5% per year.

Once the required information was gathered together, a draft version of the plan was sent around campus for review by the various interested groups. These groups included the Academic Senate, the Classified Senate, the Student Services Council, the Instructional Administrators Council and the Associated Students of Grossmont College. A copy of the draft was also sent to the district-wide Student Equity committee for review at the District level.

A series of draft copies of the plan was produced, each draft incorporating additional comments from the campus. The final version was sent to the district Chancellor's Office and was then presented to the Board of Trustees for approval.

Campus-Based Research

CAMPUS-BASED RESEARCH

At the first meeting of the Grossmont College Student Equity committee, a small working group volunteered to review a collection of research reports provided by the Office of Institutional Research, Planning and Academic Services. The working group consisted of Darlene Cole, Manager of Institutional Research and Planning; Keren Brooks, Research Analyst; Bob Eygenhuysen, Director of Risk Management (and representing the district-wide Student Equity committee); Susan Working, math instructor; and Jim Fenningham, Dean of Counseling. The purpose of this review was to identify any areas that needed the committee's attention for follow-up discussion and inclusion in the Student Equity Plan. Presented below are the results of our review.

The research was organized according to the five "metrics" published by the Chancellor's Office. These five metrics are: Access, Course Completion, ESL and Basic Skills Completion, Degree and Certificate Completion, and Transfer. The metrics were initially defined by the Chancellor's Office, but the districts were invited to review and modify these definitions. Attachment 2A provides a revised, operational definition written by our Office of Institutional Research. Further clarification of this terminology is given in Attachment 2B.

We started by establishing two guidelines for our review. First, we needed to establish the "comparison group" which gives us the standard by which we would determine if any inequity existed. When examining ethnicity categories, we used the White non-Hispanic category as our comparison group. There are two reasons for using this category. First, it is a federally non-protected group and second, it is the largest of the ethnic categories. When examining other factors, we used the college's service areas and the college's overall student statistics as our comparison groups.

The second guideline was the definition of "significant difference". In other words, how different do two groups need to be in order to be considered unequal. For this guideline, we used the 80/20 (or 4/5ths) rule, a federal legal guideline to assess adverse impact. This rule says that if one group falls within 80% or higher of the measurement of a second group, there is not a significant difference that our Student Equity plan needs to address.

- 1. ACCESS.** The number and percentage of students at the College within each demographic for six academic years, along with available demographic information for the GCCCD district boundaries and commonly-served zip codes.

ACCESS (Please refer to the charts *Number of Students by Student Demographic and Low Income Students*, Attachments 3A and 3B).

- Gender – No significant differences.
- Ethnicity – No significant difference. Footnote #3 on the chart points out that the Latino census number includes people of any race, who also identify themselves as Latino. Therefore, this number is artificially inflated.
- Age – Not applicable to this metric. We do not expect the college population to mirror the community in this factor, since about 60% of Grossmont students are under 25.
- International students – Not applicable to this metric. This group was included in the access research because they also are studied in the student success research.
- Primary Language – Although the numbers do not meet the 80% guideline, this difference is probably explainable. The Census percentage of non-English speakers includes those with very little/no English-speaking ability. Such students would be encouraged to attend adult school and would not be counted among our college student English learners, which is one explanation for our lower percentages.
- Disability status – Although the numbers indicate a significant difference, we think this is explainable by factors relating to the college demographics. The census numbers include area residents with disabilities so severe that they would be unable to realistically pursue a college-level education. Also, disability is positively correlated with age, and, generally, the age of the college-going population is much younger than that of the surrounding area (see above discussion of age). Finally, the college numbers include only those disabled students who have registered with the DSPS office. This is not the entire population of disabled students on campus.
- Low income (Income information is not collected from students by the college. As a “proxy” for this information, we defined low-income as those students who received a Board of Governors Waiver) – The Census poverty rate (13.4%) is much lower than our proxy using BOGW (23.1%). Low income is not an access problem.

2. COURSE COMPLETION. The number of course enrollments in four types of courses (basic skills, degree-applicable, transfer level, and vocational), and the percentage of successful completion by students of various demographics and overall.

(Please refer to the charts *Success Rates by Type of Course and Student Demographic* in Attachment 3C.) We first looked at the data to see if ethnicity made any difference. The groups on these charts were measured against the comparison group of White non-Hispanic.

- Basic Skills Courses – There are two groups whose success rates do not meet the 80% guideline: Black non-Hispanic and Hispanic.*
- Degree Applicable courses – One group did not meet the 80% guideline: Black non-Hispanic.*
- Transfer Courses – We found no significant differences on this chart.
- Vocational Courses – One group did not meet the 80% guideline: Black non-Hispanic.*

*We controlled for socio-economic status (using BOGW as a proxy) and the discrepancies noted above reduced, but still did not reach 80% of the success rates shown for the White, non-Hispanic Group. (We also split-out EOPS students from the BOGW groups and got the same results). So there is a race/ethnicity discrepancy in success rates that is not entirely explained by socio-economic status.

We next looked at the different age groups. Although there are significant differences in the rates of student success, we attributed these differences to characteristics of the older students, and not to any conditions within the college. Such findings are consistent with other studies of student success rates in college courses, and appear to be due to endogenous characteristics of older students.

We then looked at the category marked *Other*. We compared these success rates against the overall Grossmont rates. In most cases, the success rates in the *Other* categories exceed the overall college rate and in no case did we find any significant difference relating to student equity issues.

Finally, we examined income status (please refer to the *Low Income Students* chart, Attachment 3B). The success rates of students who received a Board of Governors Waiver were examined to see if any differences attributable to low-income status could be found. The initial findings showed that differences were within the 80-20 threshold. Further, when EOPS students were removed from the BOGW group, the differences increased, although they still were within 80% of the success rates for non-BOGW students.

- 3. ESL and BASIC SKILLS COMPLETION.** The percentage of successful completions for each demographic group in pre-collegiate math and English courses. Successful completion represents the potential to proceed to the next level course.

(Please refer to the charts *Success Rates in Pre-Collegiate ESL/Math/English Courses* in Attachment 3D.) For this metric, each demographic group is compared against the majority group to see if that group falls within the 80% guideline.

- Pre-Collegiate ESL: Due to small sample sizes, data were combined across six academic years. Even so, some characteristics yielded samples too small to draw any conclusions, as noted below.
 - Pre-Collegiate ESL and Gender – No significant differences.
 - Pre-Collegiate ESL and Ethnicity – Students with “Unknown/Other” ethnic backgrounds succeeded at a rate less than 80% of the White non-Hispanic group. However, by definition no conclusions can be drawn about this group.
 - Pre-Collegiate ESL and Age – No significant differences.
 - Pre-Collegiate ESL and Disability – Disabled students succeeded at a rate less than 80% of the non-disabled students. However, only 21 disabled students enrolled in pre-collegiate ESL courses across six years. Thus, drawing conclusions about student equity from these data is inadvisable.
 - Pre-Collegiate and Income – No significant differences.
 - Pre-Collegiate ESL and International Students – Not studied due to small sample size.

- Pre-Collegiate Math and Gender – No significant differences.

- Pre-Collegiate Math and Ethnicity – The Black non-Hispanic and Hispanic groups succeed at a lower rate than the White non-Hispanic group.
- Pre-Collegiate Math and Age – As discussed earlier, older students succeed at a higher rate, but not because of college-related factors.
- Pre-Collegiate Math and Primary Language – No significant differences.
- Pre-Collegiate Math and Disability Status – No significant differences.
- Pre-Collegiate Math and Income Status – The initial study showed no significant differences. With EOPS students parsed out from the low-income students, there are still no apparent significant differences.
- Pre-Collegiate Math and International Students – Not studied due to small sample size.
- Pre-Collegiate English and Gender – No differences related to student equity.
- Pre-Collegiate English and Ethnicity – We noticed a large change in the success rates for all groups during more recent years. This may be due to a change in English placement methods at Grossmont College in spring 2002. However, even with the recent change, Black non-Hispanic students still succeed at a lower rate.
- Pre-Collegiate English and Age – No differences related to student equity. In some instances, an age group succeeded at less than 80% the rate of another age group; however, in terms of student equity, this is not a cause for concern.
- Pre-Collegiate English and Primary Language – No significant differences.
- Pre-Collegiate English and Disability Status – Although we did find one year (2001/02) that did not meet the 80% guideline, the other years did not show this degree of difference. Therefore, we are not identifying this measure as an equity issue.
- Pre-Collegiate English and Income Status – No significant differences.
- Pre-Collegiate English and International Students – Not studied due to small sample size.

4. DEGREE and CERTIFICATE COMPLETION. The demographic distribution of students who received a degree/certificate between Fall 1997 and Fall 2003, regardless of when they first enrolled at Grossmont College.

(Please refer to the chart *Demographic Distributions of Students Receiving a Degree/Certificate Between Fall 1997 and Fall 2003 in Attachment 3E.*)

The demographic distributions of students who received a degree or certificate from Grossmont College from Fall 1997 through Fall 2003 were examined. For comparison purposes, student enrollment for the 1995-1996 through 2000-2001 academic years were examined to determine whether degree/certificate awards reflected student enrollment on the demographics of interest. The time frame for enrollment comparisons was selected to encompass the years most likely to represent enrollments of these degree/certificate earners, given the lag between students' entry to the college and receipt of a degree or certificate.

Black non-Hispanic students earned both degrees and certificates at a rate less than 80% of their enrollment rates at the college. Hispanic students earned degrees at a rate less than 80% of their enrollment rates.

5. **TRANSFER.** Student transfer rates by demographic, for students who first attended the college five years before the latest possible transfer date studied.

(Please refer to the chart *Transfer Rates by Student Characteristics* in Attachment 3F.)

Using the same methods of comparison as with earlier metrics, we found two ethnic groups with a transfer rate that should be addressed by our student equity plan. These two groups are Black non-Hispanic and Hispanic.

Goals and Activities

GOALS AND ACTIVITIES

1. STUDENT SUCCESS INDICATOR FOR ACCESS

“Compare the percentage of each population group that is enrolled to the percentage of each group in the adult population within the community serve”

GOAL 1.

Campus-based research did not identify any issues under this student success indicator.

ACTIVITY 1.1

EXPECTED OUTCOME 1.1.1

2. STUDENT SUCCESS INDICATOR FOR COURSE COMPLETION

“Ratio of the number of credit courses that students by population group actually complete by the end of the term compared to the number of courses in which students in that group are enrolled on the census day of the term”

GOAL 2.

- A. Black non-Hispanic and Hispanic students will succeed in basic skills courses at a rate comparable to other student groups.

Black non-Hispanic basic skills success rate: 42.8%

Hispanic basic skills success rate: 48.3%

Target success rate: 48.7%

The Student Equity Plan seeks to reduce the differences in success rates by 1%-1.5% per year. The disparity for Black non-Hispanic student will be eliminated by 2009. The disparity for Hispanic students will be eliminated by 2006.

- B. Black non-Hispanic student will succeed in degree-applicable courses at a rate comparable to other student groups.

Black non-Hispanic degree-applicable success rate: 52.4%

Target success rate: 52.6%

The Student Equity Plan seeks to reduce the difference in success rates by 1% per year. The disparity for Black non-Hispanic students will be eliminated by 2006.

- C. Black non-Hispanic students will succeed in vocational courses at a rate comparable to other student groups.

Black non-Hispanic vocational success rate: 57.4%

Target success rate: 58.7%

The Student Equity Plan seeks to reduce the difference in success rates by 1% per year. The disparity for Black non-Hispanic students will be eliminated by 2006.

ACTIVITY 2.1 (Please include the target date in chronological order and identify the responsible person/group for each activity)

Project Success. This project links English composition classes with English reading classes, literature classes, and other courses from other instructional departments. The project is an instructional program that constitutes a learning community in which students are enrolled together in two classes concurrently. The instructors work together as a team to help students become better readers and writers. This program promotes cooperative learning that increases student ability in all language skills. The students who have enrolled in this program have a proven track record of increased units completed and increased grade point average.

Timeline: This activity is ongoing.

Person Responsible: The Project Success coordinator.

Evaluation: Previous research has demonstrated the effectiveness of Project Success in improving the success rates of its students. Future research will focus on the success rates of the target group students enrolled in Project Success.

EXPECTED OUTCOME 2.1.1

As noted above, this Project has demonstrated success in increasing the success rates of its students. Research has shown that Project Success students (a) complete more units than other students, (b) earn a higher GPA than average freshmen, and (c) experience a greater sense of academic involvement by being part of a group. Project Success can contribute to the goals of Student Equity by increasing the number of target group students enrolled in the program.

ACTIVITY 2.2

Friday ESL Workshops for Students. This ESL program offers 8-10 two-hour workshops during the spring semester each year. ESL instructors present topics that are particularly challenging for our students, such as article usage, prepositions, sentence combining, editing, and timed writing. The workshops are free and voluntary, but students can count them toward the required EOPS workshops, for extra credit, or toward their required hours in the English Writing Center.

Timeline: Workshops are offered throughout every spring semester.

Group Responsible: ESL Department.

Evaluation: Attendance at the workshops is tracked and considered when setting up subsequent programs; student feedback is also collected. Since student attendance at the workshop is tracked, this activity can be further examined to determine participation rates by targeted groups and to measure the effect these workshops have on student success.

EXPECTED OUTCOME 2.2.1

Students will strengthen weak language skills so that they will be more successful in their ESL classes.

ACTIVITY 2.3

ESL Workshops for Faculty. ESL faculty present workshops and panels on ESL students' characteristics and needs during staff development week. For example, Pat Bennett, an ESL instructor, led a panel of students from several different countries who talked about their languages, their challenges in their classes, and how instructors could help them be more successful.

Timeline: Workshops are offered as determined by the Professional Development Committee.

Group Responsible: ESL Department

Evaluation: Evaluation forms are collected at the workshops and reviewed. The evaluations help shape the content of future workshops. Further research is needed to determine the effect these workshops have in the classroom. To what degree do instructors change their teaching techniques, classroom materials, and other aspects of the class syllabus in response to these workshops?

EXPECTED OUTCOME 2.3.1

A greater awareness and knowledge of our diverse students' needs on the part of faculty and staff so that they can foster the students' success in their classes and in other interactions on campus.

ACTIVITY 2.4

Learning Assistance Centers. Grossmont College funds a number of programs and services on campus where students can receive personal assistance, computer access, and tutoring to help students succeed in their classes. Students receive help with their homework, help with study habits, additional time with instructors, and peer support. The Centers include:

Assistive Technology Center	Learning Development Center
Biology Learning Center	Math Study Center
Chemistry PC Network	Speech Language Services
Communication Lab	Student Educational Technology Lab
English Reading Center	Tutoring Center
English Writing Center	

Timeline: The Learning Assistance Centers operate throughout the instructional year.

Group Responsible: Each instructional department is responsible for its learning center.

Evaluation: The department evaluates their centers by looking at factors such as student use, student success, instructor and student satisfaction. Some centers, e.g. the Math Study Center and the English Writing Center, have undergone a formal review that demonstrates the effectiveness of the service. However, this research needs to be extended to all centers, with a particular emphasis on how these centers benefit the targeted student groups.

EXPECTED OUTCOME 2.4.1

Students who use the Learning Assistance Centers will complete more courses and earn a higher grade than students who do not. Success rates for all students who use the centers will meet the student equity goals.

ACTIVITY 2.5

Academic Achievement Workshops. (*Proposed New Activity*) Students with a record of success in instructional areas would be recruited to work as tutors. These tutors would be assigned to individual sections to work with the students in that class. A workshop format would be used so that one tutor would work with a number of students at one time. This format allows students to help each other under the guidance of the tutor and also keeps tutor costs down.

Timeline: Funds would first be identified for the 2005/06 year. Tutors would be identified and trained for a spring 2006 pilot program.

New Funds Required: Estimate \$5,000 for faculty reassigned time and tutor salaries.

Group Responsible: The Student Success committee would develop a pilot program with an instructional department. If the pilot is successful and made permanent, a project coordinator would be assigned.

Evaluation: Student use of this supplemental tutoring service can be tracked. The success rates of the participants can be compared with the success rates of (a) students in the same section who do not use the service, or (b) students in similar non-participating sections. Furthermore, the success rates of the target student groups can be examined to determine the degree to which this activity helps our equity goals.

EXPECTED OUTCOMES 2.5.1

Students who receive the extra tutoring will improve their success rates.

ACTIVITY 2.6

Student Success Strategies. (*Proposed new activity*) Students are asked to report their high school GPA on their Grossmont application. Students who report a GPA of 2.2 or lower have been defined as “at-risk”. This “at-risk” group can be further narrowed down to those at-risk students within our target groups. These students will be sent a flyer that briefly presents student success strategies. The flyer will also invite them to a special new student orientation, assessment, and advisement session that concentrates on the obstacles faced by at-risk students. The session will give students information on programs, services, study habits and time management techniques that can help them overcome these obstacles.

Timeline: The activity will start with the fall 2005 semester and continue every semester thereafter.

New Funds Required: Additional costs will be minimal. Once the Datatel Colleague system is implemented, notification can occur via an “electronic flyer” sent through the student’s e-mail.

Group Responsible: This activity will be carried out by the Counseling department.

Evaluation: Student attendance at the special “at-risk” session will be tracked. The success rates of the participants will be examined for any significant differences with the at-risk population

EXPECTED OUTCOMES 2.6

“At-risk” students will be able to correct their habits and patterns that have led to failure in the past. Connecting these students with support services and teaching them success techniques will lead to improved course completion.

3. STUDENT SUCCESS INDICATOR FOR ESL AND BASIC SKILLS COMPLETION

“Ratio of the number of students by population group who complete a degree-applicable course after having completed the final ESL or basic skills course to the number of those students who complete such a final course”

GOAL 3.

- A. Black non-Hispanic and Hispanic students will succeed in pre-collegiate math courses at a rate comparable to other student groups.

Black non-Hispanic pre-collegiate math success rate: 35.7%

Hispanic pre-collegiate math success rate: 38.5%

Target success rate: 40.7%

The Student Equity Plan seeks to reduce the difference in success rates by 1%-1.5% per year. The disparity for Black non-Hispanic students will be eliminated by 2009. The disparity for Hispanic students will be eliminated by 2007.

- B. Black non-Hispanic students will succeed in pre-collegiate English courses at a rate comparable to other student groups.

Black non-Hispanic pre-collegiate English success rate: 53.9%

Target success rate: 56.0%

The Student Equity Plan seeks to reduce the difference in success rates by 1% per year. The disparity for Black non-Hispanic students will be eliminated by 2007.

ACTIVITY 3.1

Math 299 Strategies for Success in Math. This is a relatively new course to help developmental math students develop and improve math study skills. It presents topics such as note taking, test taking, learning how to study for an exam, relieving test anxiety, etc. It is co-taught by a math instructor and a counselor.

Timeline: This course is taught every semester.

Groups Responsible: Mathematics Department and Counseling Department.

Evaluation: The proposed evaluation will match the success of Math 299 students in their basic skills classes against the success of other students in basic skills math classes.

EXPECTED OUTCOME 3.1.1

Students who take this course concurrently with a basic skills math course are more likely to succeed in their math courses.

ACTIVITY 3.2

Friday Tutoring for Developmental Math Students. Every Friday, beginning at week 3 of the semester, the Math Department offers free tutoring from 9:00 – 10:30 a.m. for Math 080 – 090 in one room of the Math Study Center. No other students are allowed in the lab during that time slot. There is one instructor and one tutor in the room helping the students. The instructors are math faculty (both full and part-time) who are volunteers.

Timeline: Fall and spring semester – ongoing.

Group Responsible: Math Department (Developmental Math Coordinator organizes the tutoring).

Evaluation: The program is evaluated through student feedback over the semester. Research into the effectiveness of the Math Study Center has shown its effectiveness in improving the math success rates of its students.

EXPECTED OUTCOME 3.2.1

Students who attend the Friday tutoring sessions will improve their performance in their math class.

ACTIVITY 3.3

Expanded PDC and ESL/Basic Skills Links. (*Proposed New Activity*) Currently the Counseling and Math Departments jointly offer a 299 class in success strategies for Math 88/90. This activity would expand this concept to other basic skills and ESL courses. The course offers proven success strategies that are tailored to fit the content of the “parent” basic skills/ESL course. The course is team-taught by a counselor and faculty member of the instructional department.

Timeline: Expansion of this activity depends on the ability of departments to expand their section offerings and the availability of instructors willing to teach this type of course.

New Funds Required: The cost of this program would be borne by the instructional salary budgets of each department.

Group Responsible: The Counseling Department will take the lead in expanding this concept to additional course and departments.

Evaluation: Enrollment in these classes can be examined to determine the number of target group students who enroll. This activity will also be evaluated by examining the success rates of students in the “parent” class.

EXPECTED OUTCOME 3.3.1

Students who enroll in these classes will receive information on both general strategies for student success and specific strategies on how to succeed in the basic skills courses. These students will gain the basic skills needed to progress to degree-applicable and transferable courses.

ACTIVITY 3.4

Expanded Early Alert. (*Proposed New Activity*) Our existing Early Alert System, used in English 101 and 110, notifies students that they are in danger of failing their class. The notice also recommends that the student speak with the instructor and/or a counselor for help with the class. The new Datatel Colleague student/instructional information system includes an Early Alert system. This new capability will allow us to expand Early Alert to all ESL and basic skills courses. Furthermore, the system automates the process so that it will require only minimal additional staff time once it has been set up.

Timeline: Discussions with the instructional departments about expanding Early Alert will occur in the 2005/06 year. Simultaneously, the Datatel implementation will include an expanded Early Alert. The new system will be ready to roll out in the fall 2006 semester.

New Funds Required: The system is automated and should not require any additional funds once it is implemented.

Group Responsible: The expansion of Early Alert will be coordinated by the Student Success Committee in conjunction with the Datatel Colleague implementation working teams.

Evaluation: The system will be evaluated by instructor satisfaction with Early Alert. We will also poll instructors to see how many students follow-up on the Early Alert notice. We will measure what effect this intervention had on the classroom performance of our target group.

EXPECTED OUTCOME 3.4.1

Early Alert will provide the means to help students succeed in their classes before they find themselves too far down the road to failure. We can provide referrals to instructional and service support. We will increase the success rate in basic skills and ESL courses.

4. STUDENT SUCCESS INDICATOR FOR DEGREE AND CERTIFICATE COMPLETION

“Ratio of the number of students by population group who receive a degree or certificate to the number of students in that group with the same informed matriculation goal”

GOAL 4.1

- A. Black non-Hispanic students will earn degrees and certificates at a rate comparable to other student groups.

Black non-Hispanic degree received rate: 4.5%

Target rate: 5.0%

Black non-Hispanic certificate received rate: 4.0%

Target rate: 5.0%

The Student Equity Plan seeks to reduce the difference in success rates by 1% per year.

The disparity for Black non-Hispanic students will be eliminated by 2006.

- B. Hispanic students will earn degrees at a rate comparable to other student groups.

Hispanic degree received rate: 11.3%

Target rate: 12.2%

The Student Equity Plan seeks to reduce the difference in success rates by 1% per year.

The disparity for Hispanic students will be eliminated by 2006.

ACTIVITY 4.1

New Student Orientation/Advisement for Target Groups. (*Proposed New Activity*) Each semester, the Counseling Department holds orientation and advisement sessions for new students. These sessions help students identify their degree and certificate goals and start students along the path of developing an educational goal. Certificate and degree requirements are explained. Special orientation/advisement sessions will be scheduled for students in the target groups. Students from ethnic and culture-based clubs will participate and share their strategies for success.

Timeline: These sessions are held prior to the start of every semester.

New Funds Required: Additional costs will be minimal.

Group Responsible: Counseling Department.

Evaluation: Students at the orientation/advisement sessions are asked to complete an evaluation form. Their comments are used to shape the format and content of the next semester's sessions. Additional research would be needed to evaluate (a) how many of the target students attend the special sessions and (b) the effect these sessions have on success rates.

EXPECTED OUTCOME 4.1.1

Students will know what courses are needed to meet degree/certificate requirements. They will be given a Success Checklist with information on how to excel in the courses. They will be able to plan a class schedule that will guide them through prerequisite sequences that lead to a degree/certificate. They will hear the success stories and strategies of other Hispanic and Black non-Hispanic students.

ACTIVITY 4.2

Student Clubs and Organizations. Grossmont College supports a wide range of student clubs and organizations that focus on cultural concerns and identity. These groups provide a means for students to participate in co-curricular activities designed to promote leadership, intellectual, ethical, and personal development. The current roster of clubs includes the Black Student Union, International Student Club, the Puente Club, and the Latino Association.

Timeline: These clubs are available for membership every semester.

Person Responsible: Jack Peters, Associate Dean, Student Affairs.

Evaluation: Club activities are regulated via the Inter-Club Council.

EXPECTED OUTCOME 4.2.1

Participation in clubs increases student interest in their education, builds relationships with faculty and peers, and strengthens their commitment to their goals. These factors increase student persistence and attainment of degrees and certificates.

ACTIVITY 4.3

Student Ambassadors. (*Proposed New Activity*) The job descriptions of our current outreach student ambassadors would be expanded to include student equity. The ambassadors will call every student in our target groups and check on the student's progress. If all is well, the ambassadors will give congratulations and encouragement. If any problems are discovered, the ambassadors will give information about campus resources that can help the student.

Timeline: Selection and training of the ambassadors will take place in fall 2005. The first round of phone calls will occur that semester.

New Funds Required: Additional funds would be needed to pay the hourly salaries of the ambassadors for this activity - \$1,000.

Group Responsible: This activity will be monitored by the Counseling Department.

Evaluation: The ambassador will be surveyed for their perceptions of this activity and its effectiveness for students. The ambassadors will provide recommendations for expansion or creation of programs and services that would help the target students.

EXPECTED OUTCOME 4.3.1

Ambassadors will provide a personal contact with the student at a peer level. Students will receive positive reinforcement for the successes. They will receive more information about support services. Retention rates will improve and more students will complete their educational goals.

ACTIVITY 4.4

Automatic Degree Audit. (*Proposed New Activity*) Students often start off their college courses with no clear major in mind. Or, they may start with one major but switch to another. As they begin to accumulate units, they are unsure of their eventual goal and unsure of the remaining requirements to attain a certificate or degree. We will use the new student record system to monitor units completed by students in the target groups. Once a student has completed 30 units and again at 45 units, we will run a degree audit for that student. The results of the audit will be mailed to students along with an invitation to see a counselor and complete a long-term educational plan.

Timeline: This activity will begin once the implementation of the Datatel student record system is complete (approximately fall 2006).

New Funds Required: This activity should be fully automated and not require any new funding.

Group Responsible: This activity will be coordinated by the Admissions & Records and Counseling Departments.

Evaluation: The number of degrees and certificates awarded to students in the target groups will be examined.

EXPECTED OUTCOME 4.4.1

When students have a clear path to follow that will lead them to their goal, they will be more motivated to finish their plans, take fewer courses that do not contribute to their goal, and complete the degree and certificate requirements.

5. STUDENT SUCCESS INDICATOR FOR TRANSFER

“Ratio of the number of students by population group who complete a minimum of 12 units and have attempted a transfer level course in mathematics or English to the number of students in that group who actually transfer after one or more (up to six) years”

GOAL 5

- A. Black non-Hispanic and Hispanic students transfer at a rate comparable to other student groups.

Black non-Hispanic transfer rate: 21.6%

Hispanic transfer rate: 24.8%

Target rate: 25.4%

The Student Equity Plan seeks to reduce the difference in success rates by 1% per year. The disparity for Black non-Hispanic students will be eliminated by 2009. The disparity for Hispanic students will be eliminated by 2006.

ACTIVITY 5.1

Puente Program. Grossmont College will continue its participation in the Puente Program. Puente is designed to increase the transfer rate of Hispanic students. It consists of two components: (a) an English writing course with emphasis on literature from a Latino perspective and (b) a counselor assigned to Puente students with the responsibility of helping them achieve their transfer goals.

Timeline: Grossmont has participated in Puente since 1991 and will continue to do so in the future.

Persons Responsible: English component – Joe Medina, English Instructor.
Counseling component – Yesenia Gonzales, Counselor.

Evaluation: An initial evaluation of the Puente Program was conducted in the spring of 2003. However, due to small sample sizes, no conclusions were drawn. The study will be repeated in the future once a larger sample size is available.

EXPECTED OUTCOME 5.1.1

The transfer rate of Hispanic students will match the 30.2% rate for the college overall as described in Campus Based Research section.

ACTIVITY 5.2

Band of Brothers and Sisters. (*Proposed New Activity*) The Puente program exists to promote the transfer of Hispanic students. A similar program for Black students should be created. The program would follow the Puente program by a) linking basic skills and transferable courses in sequential semesters; b) linking student success and transferable courses in the same semester; and c) linking two transferable courses in the same semester. Support staff would be assigned to the program.

Timeline: The development of the program would occur in the 2005/06 year. Recruitment of students would begin in spring 2006 for a fall 2007 semester start-up.

New Funds Required: Approximately \$20,000 for faculty reassigned and/or adjunct time and miscellaneous costs.

Group Responsible: This program will be coordinated through the Transfer Center and the participating instructional departments. An advisory group and staff for this activity will need to be identified.

Evaluation: The activity will be evaluated on the number of Black non-Hispanic students who transfer.

EXPECTED OUTCOME 5.2.1

Black non-Hispanic students will complete basic skills courses and progress to transferable level courses. They will complete the requirements for UC/CSU transfer and successfully move on to four-year institutions.

Budget

District : Grossmont - Cuyamaca

College : Grossmont

SOURCES OF FUNDING

Listed below are the sources of funding used to implement the activities of the Student Equity Plan. Following each entry is the number of the Plan's activity that is funded from this source.

ESL Department Budget (2.2, 2.3)

English Department Budget (2.1, 5.1)

Math Department Budget (3.1, 3.2)

Associated Students Grossmont College (4.2)

Puente Budget (5.1)

Transfer Center Budget (5.1)

College General Fund (2.4, 3.3)

Grossmont College Student Equity Fund (*proposed*) (2.5, 2.6, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.3, 4.4, 5.2)

District Institutional Research, Planning, and Academic Services

Evaluation Schedule and Process

EVALUATION SCHEDULE AND PROCESS

The Grossmont College Student Equity committee plans to meet once each semester to evaluate our Student Equity plan. At each meeting, the committee will discuss the following agenda:

1. **Campus-based Research.** The committee will look at the latest findings from the District Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Academic Services. We will look for progress toward meeting the student equity goals identified in our plan.
2. **Goals and Activities.** The committee will review the status of our goals and activities. We will look at our ongoing activities to ensure they are still contributing to the success indicators. We will look at our planned activities to ensure they are still on track for implementation.
3. **Chancellor Office Updates.** The committee will discuss the latest information from the Chancellor's Office. This information may include the publication of "best practices" in student equity.
4. **Student Equity Funding.** Funding for student equity activities is an immediate problem that needs attention and will remain an ongoing issue. The committee will seek funding sources that can be used to implement the student equity plan.

Finally, the committee will give all the above factors due consideration and then integrate them into a progress report for the college. This report will include recommendations on updates to the existing plan that will strengthen our response to student equity and recommendations on new additions to the plan that will expand our student equity activities.

Attachments

ATTACHMENT #1
Student Equity Plan Members 2004

Leslie Arnold	Student Services Specialist, Tutoring
Virginia Berger	Faculty, ESL
Janet Castanos	Dean, Hum/Soc & Behv Sci/Int'l Prog/Eng.
Barbara Clark	International Student Specialist/Counseling
Darlene Cole	Manager, Instit Research & Planning
Dean Colli	Vice President, Academic Affairs
Jim Fenningham	Dean, Counseling, Student Dev & Matric
Cathy Harvey	Faculty, English
Peg Hovde	Faculty, Math
Teresa Jacob	Faculty, Psychology
Linda Mitchell	Faculty, English
Jane Nolan	Learning Disabilities Specialist, DSPS
Margarita Noriega	Associated Students of GC Representative
Maria Pak	Faculty, Psychology
Jack Peters	Assistant Dean, Student Affairs
Natalie Ray	Coordinator, Tech Prep
Mary Rider	Counselor
Curtis Stevens	Interim Assoc. Dean, Learning Resources
Roxanne Tuscany	Faculty, Communication/Speech
Peter White	Vice President, Student Services
Susan Working	Faculty, Math

ATTACHMENT 2A

Student Equity Plan Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District Definitions of Success Indicators (Metrics)

A. Access

Research & Planning definition:

The number and percentage of students at the College within each demographic for six academic years, along with available demographic information for the GCCCD district boundaries and commonly-served zip codes.

B. Course Completion (Retention)

Research & Planning definition:

The number of course enrollments in four types of courses (basic skills, degree-applicable, transfer level, and vocational), and the percentage of successful completions by students of various demographics and overall.

C. ESL and Basic Skills Completion

Research & Planning definition:

The percentage of successful completions for each demographic group in precollegiate math and English courses. Successful completion represents the potential to proceed to the next level course.

D. Degree and Certificate Completion

Research & Planning definition:

The demographic distribution of students who received a degree/certificates between Fall 1997 and Fall 2003, regardless of when they first enrolled at Grossmont College.

E. Transfer

Research & Planning definition:

Student transfer rates by demographic, for students who first attended the College five years before the latest possible transfer date studied.

ATTACHMENT 2B

Student Equity Plan Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District

Basic Skills Courses: All courses (in all subjects) that are not applicable towards the AA/AS degree.

Degree Applicable Courses: All courses that are applicable towards the AA/AS degree but are not applicable towards transfer to a CSU or UC university.

Transfer Courses: All courses that are applicable towards transfer to a CSU or UC university.

Vocational Courses: Courses labeled as “Advanced Occupational,” “Clearly Occupational,” or “Possibly Occupational.”

PreCollegiate: Equal to Basic Skills in this report. All courses in the particular subject that are not applicable towards the AA/AS degree.

% Success: Enrollments resulting in grades of A, B, C, or Credit, of all enrollments attempted.

BOGW: Board of Governors Waiver. Used in this study as a proxy for low-income students.

EOPS: Extended Opportunity Programs and Services. Assistance offered to low-income students.

ATTACHMENT 3A

**Grossmont College
Number of Students by Student Demographic**

		<u>Academic Year</u>						-	GCCCD area overall¹
		97-98	98-99	99-00	00-01	01-02	02-03		
Gender	Female	14522 <i>56.6</i>	15051 <i>56.4</i>	14858 <i>56.3</i>	15180 <i>56.7</i>	16618 <i>56.9</i>	16856 <i>59.0</i>		51.3
	Male	11153 <i>43.4</i>	11628 <i>43.6</i>	11512 <i>43.7</i>	11582 <i>43.3</i>	12592 <i>43.1</i>	11701 <i>41.0</i>		48.7
Ethnicity	Asian	1755 <i>6.8</i>	1834 <i>6.9</i>	1868 <i>7.1</i>	1988 <i>7.4</i>	2251 <i>7.7</i>	2135 <i>7.5</i>		8.0 ²
	Black non-Hispanic	1561 <i>6.1</i>	1685 <i>6.3</i>	1620 <i>6.1</i>	1646 <i>6.1</i>	1890 <i>6.5</i>	1884 <i>6.6</i>		7.5
	Filipino	722 <i>2.8</i>	736 <i>2.8</i>	771 <i>2.9</i>	767 <i>2.9</i>	880 <i>3.0</i>	933 <i>3.3</i>		<i>see Asian²</i>
	Hispanic	3639 <i>14.2</i>	3889 <i>14.6</i>	4011 <i>15.2</i>	4076 <i>15.2</i>	4720 <i>16.2</i>	4626 <i>16.1</i>		21.0 ³
	Amer Ind / Alas Nat	381 <i>1.5</i>	348 <i>1.3</i>	336 <i>1.3</i>	341 <i>1.3</i>	355 <i>1.2</i>	350 <i>1.2</i>		0.7
	Pacific Islander	227 <i>0.9</i>	251 <i>0.9</i>	246 <i>0.9</i>	277 <i>1.0</i>	312 <i>1.1</i>	342 <i>1.2</i>		0.5
	White non-Hispanic	16153 <i>62.9</i>	16639 <i>62.3</i>	16110 <i>61.1</i>	16220 <i>60.6</i>	17109 <i>58.6</i>	16278 <i>56.8</i>		59.4
	Other/Unknown	1242 <i>4.8</i>	1309 <i>4.9</i>	1420 <i>5.4</i>	1451 <i>5.4</i>	1703 <i>5.8</i>	2103 <i>7.3</i>		3.0
	Age	<20	6903 <i>26.9</i>	7327 <i>27.5</i>	7568 <i>28.7</i>	7542 <i>28.2</i>	8208 <i>28.1</i>	7838 <i>27.4</i>	
20-24		8323 <i>32.4</i>	8839 <i>33.1</i>	9067 <i>34.4</i>	9279 <i>34.7</i>	10234 <i>35.0</i>	10392 <i>36.3</i>		9.8
25-29		3443 <i>13.4</i>	3396 <i>12.7</i>	3305 <i>12.5</i>	3212 <i>12.0</i>	3424 <i>11.7</i>	3549 <i>12.4</i>		9.2
30-49		5941 <i>23.1</i>	5969 <i>22.4</i>	5356 <i>20.3</i>	5555 <i>20.8</i>	5972 <i>20.4</i>	5685 <i>19.8</i>		37.9
50+		1070 <i>4.2</i>	1160 <i>4.3</i>	1086 <i>4.1</i>	1178 <i>4.4</i>	1382 <i>4.7</i>	1187 <i>4.1</i>		33.1
Internat'l Students	International	797 <i>3.1</i>	904 <i>3.4</i>	962 <i>3.6</i>	1042 <i>3.9</i>	1067 <i>3.7</i>	967 <i>3.4</i>		<i>N/A</i>
	Not international	24883 <i>96.9</i>	25787 <i>96.6</i>	25420 <i>96.4</i>	25724 <i>96.1</i>	28153 <i>96.3</i>	27684 <i>96.6</i>		<i>N/A</i>
Primary Language	English	22600 <i>88.0</i>	23477 <i>88.0</i>	23090 <i>87.5</i>	23209 <i>86.7</i>	25384 <i>86.9</i>	24750 <i>86.4</i>		72.5 ⁴
	Not English	2928 <i>11.4</i>	3099 <i>11.6</i>	3200 <i>12.1</i>	3452 <i>12.9</i>	3751 <i>12.8</i>	3822 <i>13.3</i>		27.5
Disability Status	Disability	783 <i>3.0</i>	802 <i>3.0</i>	815 <i>3.1</i>	832 <i>3.1</i>	984 <i>3.4</i>	1076 <i>3.8</i>		18.7
	No disability	24897 <i>97.0</i>	25889 <i>97.0</i>	25567 <i>96.9</i>	25934 <i>96.9</i>	28236 <i>96.6</i>	27575 <i>96.2</i>		81.3
Overall		25680 100.0	26691 100.0	26382 100.0	26766 100.0	29220 100.0	28651 100.0		

¹ GCCCD area includes all zip codes within the District boundary as well as zip codes in which 200 or more Fall 2003 Grossmont students resided. Gender, age, and ethnicity percentages are based on 2003 Census estimates from SANDAG for ages 15 and above; others are 2000 Census data for all ages.

² Census/SANDAG data combined Asian and Filipino.

³ Hispanic includes people of any race.

⁴ Census asked about language spoken in the home. Responses of 'English only' are provided here.

ATTACHMENT 3B

**Student Equity
Grossmont College
Low Income Students**

Low Income Students: Defined as those who received a Board of Governor’s waiver (BOGW).

Number of students enrolled

	<u>Academic Year</u>						<u>GCCCD Area Overall¹</u>
	97-98	98-99	99-00	00-01	01-02	02-03	
BOGW + EOPS	997 <i>3.9%</i>	1042 <i>3.9%</i>	943 <i>3.6%</i>	1201 <i>4.5%</i>	1407 <i>4.8%</i>	1437 <i>5.0%</i>	13.4%
BOGW no EOPS	5232 <i>20.4%</i>	5014 <i>18.8%</i>	4912 <i>18.6%</i>	4413 <i>16.5%</i>	4739 <i>16.2%</i>	5169 <i>18.0%</i>	
No BOGW	19451 <i>75.7%</i>	20635 <i>77.3%</i>	20527 <i>77.8%</i>	21152 <i>79.0%</i>	23074 <i>79.0%</i>	22045 <i>76.9%</i>	86.6%

¹ GCCCD area includes all zip codes within the District boundary as well as zip codes in which 200 or more Fall 2003 Grossmont students resided. Based on 2000 Census data for all ages. Percentages reflect those in the population below the poverty level (to compare with all BOGW students) and above the poverty level (to compare with other students).

Success rates by type of course

	97-98		98-99		99-00		00-01		01-02		02-03		80% of No BOGW	
	# <u>Attempted</u>	% <u>Success</u>	# <u>Attempted</u>	% <u>Success</u>	# <u>Attempted</u>	% <u>Success</u>	# <u>Attempted</u>	% <u>Success</u>	# <u>Attempted</u>	% <u>Success</u>	# <u>Attempted</u>	% <u>Success</u>		
Basic Skills Courses	BOGW + EOPS	1286	68.0	1306	65.8	1133	63.5	1178	65.4	1259	62.3	1347	64.3	43.4
	BOGW no EOPS	1340	49.1	1286	49.7	1101	47.0	829	50.4	860	48.5	1068	52.2	
	No BOGW	1826	54.8	1867	52.5	1871	49.0	1857	54.6	2163	51.7	2205	54.2	
Degree- Applicable Courses	BOGW + EOPS	1205	62.9	1433	63.5	1367	61.0	1633	62.5	1596	64.6	1511	62.8	51.5
	BOGW no EOPS	2886	55.1	3024	57.1	2724	58.0	2497	56.1	2473	60.8	2732	61.8	
	No BOGW	7172	64.6	7509	65.2	7263	64.0	8049	64.5	8309	68.1	7135	64.4	
Transfer Courses	BOGW + EOPS	6022	67.5	6220	62.3	5638	66.2	6959	66.5	8373	63.9	8720	67.0	54.1
	BOGW no EOPS	23668	61.7	22821	62.1	22345	60.6	19066	62.5	20625	62.7	22818	62.9	
	No BOGW	60563	66.3	64030	66.6	66910	67.0	67307	68.0	72546	67.0	74351	67.6	
Vocational Courses	BOGW + EOPS	2701	69.4	3032	65.7	2716	67.5	2934	68.3	3107	66.6	3160	68.7	58.7
	BOGW no EOPS	6889	66.0	6805	66.1	6103	65.6	5280	66.9	5692	66.5	6523	66.3	
	No BOGW	15181	73.4	16371	74.6	16664	73.2	17108	74.1	18171	73.5	18711	73.4	

ATTACHMENT 3C

Grossmont College
Success Rates by Type of Course and Student Demographic

Basic Skills Courses	97-98		98-99		99-00		00-01		01-02		02-03		80 % of Majority Group
	# Attempted	% Success	# Attempted	% Success	# Attempted	% Success	# Attempted	% Success	# Attempted	% Success	# Attempted	% Success	
<u>Gender</u>													
Female	2785	60.1	2725	59.1	2543	53.3	2434	57.1	2619	57.7	2905	58.7	42.6
Male	1667	51.6	1734	50.2	1562	51.1	1430	56.8	1663	48.5	1707	53.2	
<u>Ethnicity</u>													
Asian	286	68.9	314	69.7	308	64.9	277	64.3	345	58.6	338	59.9	48.7
Black non-Hisp	367	39.8	389	42.4	389	38.8	316	42.4	418	39.1	450	42.8	
Filipino	76	43.4	68	54.4	65	53.8	80	47.5	78	55.1	81	64.2	
Hispanic	675	48.3	716	45.1	713	41.9	687	49.8	820	46.3	845	48.3	
Amer Ind/Al Nat	75	50.7	47	23.4	42	50.0	53	52.8	62	53.2	41	53.7	
Other	237	61.2	212	53.8	217	58.1	213	57.7	236	57.6	272	60.1	
Pacific Islander	23	52.2	46	41.3	38	50.0	41	41.5	43	53.5	33	53.1	
White non-Hisp	2609	60.6	2563	59.9	2236	56.0	2087	61.6	2172	58.7	2407	60.9	
Unknown	104	54.8	104	54.8	97	50.5	110	51.8	108	58.3	153	59.9	
<u>Age</u>													
<20	856	40.9	1022	42.3	977	37.7	979	46.1	1249	41.9	1250	49.9	45.4
20-24	893	48.0	982	44.8	977	44.1	924	48.1	1045	49.0	1151	48.7	
25-29	610	59.3	571	63.0	538	57.1	414	56.5	483	57.8	510	57.1	
30-49	1730	66.5	1548	63.9	1312	61.3	1265	68.2	1219	64.2	1436	65.1	
50+	363	66.9	336	76.8	301	80.7	282	74.5	286	77.6	273	75.8	
<u>Other</u>													
Int'l student	61	73.3	72	76.4	68	75.0	73	67.1	102	64.7	71	68.6	
Not Engl spkr	1362	69.1	1245	69.5	1204	70.3	1246	68.1	1242	67.1	1308	66.6	
Disability	786	69.6	789	64.1	608	67.1	567	69.7	721	67.0	837	68.0	
Overall	4452	56.9	4459	55.6	4105	52.4	3864	57.0	4282	54.2	4620	56.7	

Degree Applicable Courses	97-98		98-99		99-00		00-01		01-02		02-03		80 % of Majority Group
	# Attempted	% Success	# Attempted	% Success	# Attempted	% Success	# Attempted	% Success	# Attempted	% Success	# Attempted	% Success	
<u>Gender</u>													
Female	6392	63.0	6970	64.3	6713	62.8	7056	62.6	6938	67.3	6731	66.4	47.6
Male	4868	60.8	4993	61.2	4641	61.3	5122	62.4	5439	64.8	4626	59.5	
<u>Ethnicity</u>													
Asian	751	71.5	835	70.7	874	70.3	964	67.4	1067	70.7	900	68.1	52.6
Black non-Hisp	822	49.5	931	52.2	821	50.6	976	54.1	1018	56.7	948	52.4	
Filipino	247	62.8	332	67.8	319	64.5	319	67.1	372	65.3	394	68.3	
Hispanic	1757	55.2	1844	57.0	1866	56.0	2144	59.5	2339	63.6	2133	61.1	
Amer Ind/Al Nat	162	59.9	163	57.7	143	62.2	169	58.6	148	68.2	116	56.0	
Other	326	64.1	344	58.7	344	61.8	368	58.4	450	63.6	451	55.9	
Pacific Islander	105	58.1	111	62.2	127	65.4	161	56.5	150	63.3	169	57.7	
White non-Hisp	6850	64.2	7153	65.2	6594	64.2	6778	64.2	6549	68.2	5935	65.8	
Unknown	243	62.1	253	61.7	266	62.5	300	63.0	285	66.0	332	69.2	
<u>Age</u>													
<20	3589	57.9	3608	58.6	3529	56.8	4099	60.2	4328	61.1	4247	59.6	50.9
20-24	2615	56.5	2660	55.3	2823	57.5	3014	58.1	3171	60.1	3059	57.6	
25-29	1321	64.0	1490	67.9	1280	67.3	1242	64.1	1213	71.6	1217	68.4	
30-49	3085	68.4	3504	70.4	3071	68.8	3075	68.2	2900	74.1	2357	72.4	
50+	653	71.6	704	67.2	651	70.8	749	66.8	766	82.1	498	80.2	
<u>Other</u>													
Int'l student	309	77.3	380	77.4	366	80.3	407	75.9	453	79.9	334	79.8	50.9
Not Engl spkr	1683	68.1	1869	69.6	1852	69.0	2029	67.3	2323	68.9	2099	67.3	
Disability	550	57.7	685	55.6	786	66.7	781	64.5	658	59.3	686	64.8	
Overall	11263	62.0	11966	63.0	11354	62.2	12179	62.5	12378	66.2	11378	63.6	50.9

Note: Enrollments in zero-unit courses were not included.

Grossmont College

by Type of Course and Student Demographic

Success Rates

Transfer Courses	97-98		98-99		99-00		00-01		01-02		02-03		80 % of Majority Group
	# Attempted	% Success	# Attempted	% Success	# Attempted	% Success	# Attempted	% Success	# Attempted	% Success	# Attempted	% Success	
<u>Gender</u>													
Female	50166	66.8	51805	66.6	52785	67.1	52462	67.9	57806	67.5	60891	68.1	51.5
Male	40054	63.2	41224	63.4	42073	63.5	40862	65.3	43724	63.6	44824	64.4	
<u>Ethnicity</u>													
Asian	7983	71.4	8238	72.4	8747	74.8	8761	76.4	9803	72.4	10122	74.5	54.5
Black non-Hisp	5424	52.7	5623	53.7	5513	50.8	5133	53.4	6127	54.3	6564	55.2	
Filipino	2611	60.7	2826	64.8	2792	64.7	2727	65.8	3024	62.8	3207	65.4	
Hispanic	11849	58.2	12534	58.3	13239	59.0	13293	60.6	15210	59.3	15780	61.4	
Amer Ind/Al Nat	1266	61.7	1238	59.4	1178	57.5	1133	60.5	1137	62.7	1232	63.2	
Other	2440	63.6	2774	63.5	2830	61.7	2829	65.0	3401	64.4	3462	63.5	
Pacific Islander	937	55.8	920	56.9	909	63.8	868	59.6	1086	62.3	1257	60.6	
White non-Hisp	56014	67.4	57166	67.1	57655	67.4	56566	68.4	59588	68.0	60793	68.1	
Unknown	1729	68.4	1752	67.5	2030	64.9	2022	63.4	2168	64.2	3472	68.0	
<u>Age</u>													
<20	28014	60.6	29102	61.2	30888	61.1	29899	63.5	31509	62.6	32806	63.6	53.2
20-24	33217	63.0	35705	63.2	36756	64.4	36586	65.5	41384	64.8	42741	65.0	
25-29	10990	70.2	11175	70.1	10843	69.3	10435	69.5	11180	68.7	11712	69.9	
30-49	15890	73.5	14982	72.7	14288	73.5	14211	74.1	15059	72.2	15695	73.2	
50+	2142	72.0	2107	75.2	2118	74.5	2201	72.2	2412	71.5	2935	72.9	
<u>Other</u>													
Int'l student	4690	80.8	5516	82.5	6174	83.3	6406	84.9	6229	81.2	5977	84.4	53.2
Not Engl spkr	11999	72.2	12652	73.5	13510	74.3	14264	75.7	15171	71.8	15640	73.8	
Disability	3119	67.4	3294	63.6	3292	65.8	3349	65.4	3943	64.3	4433	66.3	
Overall	90253	65.2	93071	65.2	94893	65.5	93332	66.8	101544	65.8	105889	66.5	

Vocational Courses ¹	97-98		98-99		99-00		00-01		01-02		02-03		80 % of Majority Group
	# Attempted	% Success	# Attempted	% Success	# Attempted	% Success	# Attempted	% Success	# Attempted	% Success	# Attempted	% Success	
<u>Gender</u>													
Female	15022	71.8	15826	72.2	15405	71.8	15107	72.7	16421	72.9	17781	73.8	53.4
Male	9744	69.5	10378	70.0	10071	69.2	10214	70.8	10547	68.7	10565	66.8	
<u>Ethnicity</u>													
Asian	2376	77.8	2601	78.8	2697	80.6	2778	80.8	3041	77.1	3127	76.9	58.7
Black non-Hisp	1695	55.8	1781	54.8	1660	52.7	1605	58.6	1926	57.1	1954	57.4	
Filipino	682	74.5	876	81.5	853	78.2	893	80.3	1006	77.1	1005	77.9	
Hispanic	3182	63.8	3471	64.3	3564	64.1	3718	67.5	4175	66.2	4215	66.5	
Amer Ind/Al Nat	353	61.8	310	60.0	271	62.0	343	69.1	260	65.0	257	66.7	
Other	682	68.0	666	68.2	750	68.4	795	66.7	891	66.6	983	63.3	
Pacific Islander	179	52.5	208	60.6	205	66.3	204	62.7	261	71.3	300	63.3	
White non-Hisp	15217	73.3	15777	73.6	15000	72.6	14461	72.9	14845	73.3	15697	73.4	
Unknown	405	75.8	518	70.3	483	67.8	525	67.6	565	69.2	856	71.0	
<u>Age</u>													
<20	3407	58.7	3708	61.4	3951	59.4	3976	63.8	4273	60.7	4641	62.0	57.0
20-24	6867	68.5	7735	70.2	8032	69.6	7938	70.8	8680	69.7	9453	69.5	
25-29	4034	75.6	4302	76.3	3894	74.5	3916	75.9	4192	75.6	4332	74.8	
30-49	8968	75.0	8971	74.1	8191	75.1	8110	75.5	8251	75.7	8308	75.7	
50+	1495	72.2	1492	71.0	1415	73.7	1382	69.6	1574	73.7	1660	75.2	
<u>Other</u>													
Int'l student	1389	85.1	1739	85.0	1889	86.4	2047	85.3	2149	83.3	2013	83.6	57.0
Not Engl spkr	4865	74.6	5337	75.0	5310	76.9	5592	76.8	6076	74.6	6221	73.7	
Disability	1063	68.1	1264	60.3	1106	66.7	1153	68.4	1243	63.2	1383	64.1	
Overall	24771	70.9	26208	71.4	25483	70.7	25322	71.9	26970	71.2	28394	71.2	

¹ Vocational courses are courses labeled as "Advanced Occupational," "Clearly Occupational," or "Possibly Occupational."

Note: Enrollments in zero-unit courses were not included.

ATTACHMENT 3D

Grossmont College Success Rates in PreCollegiate ESL Courses* By Academic Year and Student Characteristic

	PreCollegiate ESL Success Rates						80% of Majority Group
	97-98	98-99	99-00	00-01	01-02	02-03	
<u>GENDER</u>							
Female	77.7	81.1	81.3	81.0	80.4	77.2	56.4
Male	70.3	74.5	74.7	73.6	65.9	70.5	
<u>ETHNICITY</u>							
Asian	80.1	86.5	85.5	84.9	78.6	82.6	62.4
Black non-Hispanic ¹	45.5	36.4	41.7	63.3	68.6	59.2	
Hispanic	66.3	62.3	66.3	75.4	68.8	61.2	
White non-Hispanic	74.3	78.3	78.8	75.7	74.2	78.0	
Unknown/Other	67.3	65.6	67.0	64.2	62.4	55.8	
<u>AGE</u>							
<20	83.7	78.4	81.0	85.9	68.8	74.1	
20-24	81.2	80.0	80.5	83.8	78.3	79.4	
25-29	75.0	86.5	80.1	80.5	76.7	76.4	
30-49	68.9	74.1	72.9	65.9	71.1	71.1	
50+	65.2	65.6	83.6	77.6	71.4	52.1	
<u>DISABILITY</u>							
Disability ¹	58.8	69.2	75.0	61.1	58.3	51.9	59.9
No disability	75.1	78.4	78.5	78.3	74.6	74.9	
<u>INCOME</u>							
BOGW + EOPS	69.4	78.0	74.8	73.1	70.7	70.8	63.6
BOGW no EOPS	63.1	54.7	58.1	62.0	62.7	61.6	
No BOGW	81.0	83.3	84.0	83.7	77.4	79.5	
Total	74.8	78.2	78.5	77.9	74.2	74.4	

* ESL 80, 96, 100, 103, 106

¹ Small sample size (<50) for each academic year

Grossmont College
Success Rates in PreCollegiate ESL Courses*
Fall 1997 – Spring 2003 Combined

	Success		No Success		Withdraw		Total		80% of Majority Group
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
<u>GENDER</u>									
Female	319	67.0%	94	19.7%	63	13.2%	476	100.0%	46.5
Male	190	58.1%	69	21.1%	68	20.8%	327	100.0%	
<u>ETHNICITY</u>									
Asian	71	59.2%	21	17.5%	28	23.3%	120	100.0%	56.6
Black non-Hispanic	18	62.1%	5	17.2%	6	20.7%	29	100.0%	
Hispanic	71	65.7%	22	20.4%	15	13.9%	108	100.0%	
White non-Hispanic	251	70.7%	59	16.6%	45	12.7%	355	100.0%	
Unknown/Other	98	51.3%	56	29.3%	37	19.4%	191	100.0%	
<u>AGE</u>									
<20	28	56.0%	16	32.0%	6	12.0%	50	100.0%	51.4
20-24	56	60.9%	17	18.5%	19	20.7%	92	100.0%	
25-29	77	69.4%	12	10.8%	22	19.8%	111	100.0%	
30-49	293	64.8%	91	20.1%	68	15.0%	452	100.0%	
50+	55	56.1%	27	27.6%	16	16.3%	98	100.0%	
<u>DISABILITY</u>									
Disability	7	33.3%	11	52.4%	3	14.3%	21	100.0%	51.4
No disability	502	64.2%	152	19.4%	128	16.4%	782	100.0%	
<u>INCOME</u>									
BOGW + EOPS	331	66.5%	90	18.1%	77	15.5%	498	100.0%	51.4
BOGW no EOPS	88	53.3%	43	26.1%	34	20.6%	165	100.0%	
No BOGW	90	64.3%	30	21.4%	20	14.3%	140	100.0%	
Total	509	63.4%	163	20.3%	131	16.3%	803	100.0%	

*ESL 80 and 96

Grossmont College
Success Rates in PreCollegiate Math Courses*
By Academic Year and Student Characteristic

	PreCollegiate Math Success Rate						80% of Majority Group
	97-98	98-99	99-00	00-01	01-02	02-03	
<u>GENDER</u>							
Female	44.9%	45.3%	40.2%	46.5%	45.4%	49.2%	34.3
Male	38.8%	38.4%	37.1%	46.8%	38.5%	42.9%	
<u>ETHNICITY</u>							
Asian	44.3%	47.3%	49.3%	46.5%	43.9%	49.7%	40.7
Black non-Hispanic	26.8%	28.2%	26.9%	31.3%	32.0%	35.7%	
Hispanic	34.2%	32.0%	30.5%	41.8%	34.9%	38.5%	
White non-Hispanic	46.6%	48.1%	43.5%	51.1%	48.3%	50.9%	
Unknown/Other	44.5%	36.6%	32.6%	44.2%	38.8%	52.8%	
<u>AGE</u>							
<20	31.1%	32.0%	28.5%	39.3%	30.4%	40.3%	
20-24	37.5%	37.2%	35.6%	40.9%	41.5%	43.6%	
25-29	48.2%	52.5%	48.4%	51.8%	51.6%	49.0%	
30-49	54.6%	55.7%	48.5%	58.5%	57.3%	56.9%	
50+	50.9%	62.3%	64.1%	71.4%	63.0%	70.0%	
<u>PRIMARY LANGUAGE</u>							
English	41.9%	41.3%	37.6%	46.1%	42.1%	45.8%	36.6
Not English	48.9%	51.3%	51.1%	50.7%	47.5%	54.4%	
<u>DISABILITY</u>							
Disability	40.1%	33.1%	38.0%	48.2%	40.7%	43.1%	37.8
No disability	42.7%	43.4%	39.1%	46.5%	42.8%	47.2%	
<u>INCOME</u>							
BOGW + EOPS	43.4%	44.7%	37.5%	44.3%	37.2%	45.8%	38.6
BOGW no EOPS	35.7%	36.7%	36.9%	41.4%	40.9%	44.5%	
No BOGW	45.9%	44.6%	40.5%	49.4%	44.9%	48.2%	
Total	42.5%	42.5%	39.0%	46.6%	42.7%	46.9%	

*Math 85, 88, 89, and 90

Grossmont College
Success Rates in PreCollegiate English Courses*
By Academic Year and Student Characteristic

	PreCollegiate English Success Rate						80% of Majority Group
	97-98	98-99	99-00	00-01	01-02	02-03	
<u>GENDER</u>							
Female	60.8%	62.1%	57.2%	56.4%	63.8%	69.5%	50.7
Male	49.5%	48.4%	47.0%	50.1%	55.5%	63.4%	
<u>ETHNICITY</u>							
Asian	69.0%	63.4%	59.7%	59.2%	64.5%	73.6%	56.0
Black non-Hispanic	44.3%	43.1%	44.6%	43.2%	48.3%	53.9%	
Hispanic	47.6%	51.5%	41.9%	48.5%	58.0%	62.6%	
White non-Hispanic	58.4%	60.2%	58.0%	57.8%	62.9%	70.0%	
Unknown/Other	56.7%	47.7%	52.7%	51.7%	61.7%	67.8%	
<u>AGE</u>							
<20	54.7%	57.7%	53.1%	55.0%	64.6%	71.6%	53.2
20-24	50.3%	46.9%	40.8%	50.5%	53.4%	56.5%	
25-29	60.6%	54.3%	60.4%	50.5%	57.6%	59.8%	
30-49	60.2%	62.3%	60.1%	56.0%	53.7%	64.7%	
50+	58.7%	66.7%	68.8%	57.1%	62.5%	78.9%	
<u>PRIMARY LANGUAGE</u>							
English	54.5%	54.8%	51.4%	52.7%	59.8%	66.5%	53.2
Not English	60.0%	62.2%	56.5%	58.1%	61.7%	68.3%	
<u>DISABILITY</u>							
Disability	47.2%	45.8%	52.9%	50.0%	43.6%	63.3%	54.2
No disability	56.4%	57.1%	52.3%	54.0%	61.4%	67.1%	
<u>INCOME</u>							
BOGW + EOPS	61.8%	54.8%	58.4%	51.7%	56.2%	63.5%	54.2
BOGW no EOPS	48.7%	54.5%	47.9%	50.3%	57.9%	66.9%	
No BOGW	57.7%	57.4%	53.0%	55.7%	62.1%	67.7%	
Total	55.6%	56.0%	52.4%	53.7%	60.1%	66.8%	

*English 50/90,
101/103

ATTACHMENT 3E

Grossmont College
Demographic Distributions of Students Receiving a Degree/Certificate
Between Fall 1997 and Fall 2003

	Received Degree		Received Certificate		97/98 - 99/00 Enrollment Rates	80% of Enroll. Rate
	#	%	#	%		
<u>GENDER</u>						
Female	3710	63.4	1485	64.5	56.3 - 56.6	45.0 - 45.3
Male	2144	36.6	817	35.5	43.4 - 43.7	34.7 - 35.0
<u>ETHNICITY</u>						
Asian	725	12.4	375	16.3	6.8 - 7.1	5.4 - 5.7
Black non-Hispanic	264	4.5	92	4.0	6.1 - 6.3	4.9 - 5.0
Filipino	223	3.8	50	2.2	2.8 - 2.9	2.2 - 2.3
Hispanic	660	11.3	283	12.3	14.2 - 15.2	11.4 - 12.2
American Indian/Alaskan Native	57	1.0	29	1.3	1.3 - 1.5	1.0 - 1.2
Pacific Islander	47	0.8	16	0.7	0.9	0.7
White non-Hispanic	3635	62.1	1380	59.9	61.1 - 62.9	48.9 - 50.3
Other/Unknown	245	4.2	77	3.3	4.8 - 5.4	3.8 - 4.3
<u>PRIMARY LANGUAGE</u>						
English	4782	82.2	1686	73.8	87.5 - 88.0	70.0 - 70.4
Not English	1039	17.8	598	26.2	11.4 - 12.1	9.1 - 9.7
<u>DISABILITY STATUS</u>						
Disability	201	3.4	86	3.7	3.0 - 3.1	2.4 - 2.5
No disability	5655	96.6	2216	96.3	96.9 - 97.0	77.5 - 77.6
<u>INTERNATIONAL</u>						
International	575	9.8	343	14.9	3.1 - 3.6	2.5 - 2.9
Not international	5281	90.2	1959	85.1	96.4 - 96.9	77.1 - 77.5
<u>INCOME STATUS</u>						
BOGW and EOPS	361	6.2	197	8.6	3.6 - 3.9	2.9 - 3.1
BOGW no EOPS	1317	22.5	510	22.2	18.6 - 20.4	14.9 - 16.3
No BOGW	4178	71.3	1595	69.3	75.7 - 77.8	60.6 - 62.2

Note: Students receiving degrees/certificates may have begun their studies at Grossmont College at any time. Rates of enrollment by student demographic are provided to allow for comparisons of the distributions of degrees/certificates awarded with student representation at the College.

ATTACHMENT 3F

**Transfer Rates by Student Characteristics
Grossmont College**

This table includes students who transferred to a four-year college or university by Fall 2002, after attending at least one semester at Grossmont College. Students who did not complete any units at Grossmont College were omitted. Students were included if they began at Grossmont College during the 1996-1997 academic years (i.e., they had five years to transfer).

Student Characteristics	Transfer		No Transfer		Total		80% of Majority Group
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Gender							
Male	507	29.2%	1229	70.8%	1736	100.0%	23.4
Female	475	31.4%	1037	68.6%	1512	100.0%	
Ethnicity							
Asian	134	33.2%	270	66.8%	404	100.0%	
Black non-Hispanic	50	21.6%	182	78.4%	232	100.0%	
Hispanic	116	24.8%	352	75.2%	468	100.0%	
White non-Hispanic	622	31.8%	1332	68.2%	1954	100.0%	25.4
Unknown/Other	60	31.6%	130	68.4%	190	100.0%	
Age							
Under 20	505	34.0%	981	66.0%	1486	100.0%	
20-24	304	30.3%	698	69.7%	1002	100.0%	
25-29	88	27.2%	235	72.8%	323	100.0%	
30-49	83	20.5%	322	79.5%	405	100.0%	
50 or above	2	6.3%	30	93.8%	32	100.0%	
Other Characteristics							
International Students	76	38.8%	120	61.2%	196	100.0%	
Non-Native English Speakers	144	32.5%	299	67.5%	443	100.0%	
Disabled Students	23	25.3%	68	74.7%	91	100.0%	
Low Income Students	271	31.8%	582	68.2%	853	100.0%	
OVERALL	982	30.2%	2266	69.8%	3248	100.0%	24.2

**CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE**

1102 Q STREET
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814-6511
(916) 445-8752
HTTP://WWW.CCCCO.EDU



June 6, 2003

Via E-mail Only

To: Student Equity Coordinators

From: Fusako Yokotobi
Vice Chancellor for Human Resources

Subject: Student Equity Plan

At their meeting in November 2002, the Board of Governors adopted the Task Force on Equity and Diversity Recommendations reflecting its continued interest to preserve and enhance the diversity and equity of students, faculty, and staff. With regards to Student Equity, the Task Force recommendations called on the Chancellor's Office to make available to Colleges guidelines for developing their Student Equity Plan. The Task Force also asked local governing boards to make a commitment to adopt a Student Equity Plan and submit it to the Chancellor's Office by March 2004. This timeline has been extended to **July 2004**. This memorandum provides the following guidelines and resources for developing the College Student Equity Plan.

College Student Equity Plan: Instructions for Completion. This document provides general guidelines, section-by-section instructions for developing a Student Equity plan that is focused on increasing access, retention, course completion, and transfer rates for all students (Attachment).

Student Equity: Guidelines for Developing a Plan. The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges paper, "[Student Equity: Guidelines for Developing a Plan](#)" provides a reference for creating Student Equity Plan. Click on the link above to access this document on the Academic Senate's website.

Model Student Equity Plan: The Academic Senate's paper includes a reference to a student equity plan that was developed by Modesto Junior College in 1993. In fact, the Modesto Junior College Plan was rated as "outstanding" by our office at the time because it demonstrated what a well-constructed plan might include. We must caution, however, that the Modesto Plan preceded the 1998 amendments to section 54220 of Title 5, which section describes the requirements for student equity plans. We must also point out that the Modesto Plan predated the passage of Proposition 209 in 1996 and the 2001 appellate decision that considered the scope of Proposition 209 and equal protection guarantees (*Connerly v. State Personnel Board*). Accordingly, while there is much to commend the Modesto Plan, districts should be mindful that the Plan addresses some student equity plan elements that are no longer in effect. Therefore, it should not be embraced in its entirety. As with many materials that predate the passage of Proposition 209, some elements may require special review as they are translated for current use. Districts that wish to consider the Modesto Plan as a guide should consult their legal counsel to determine which plan elements are appropriate under the revised regulation and consistent with Proposition 209.

Questions regarding the Task Force Recommendations and the development of the Student Equity Plan should be directed to Carmela Kelly-Batch at cbatch@cccco.edu or 916-324-2355.

Attachment
College Student Equity Plan: Instructions for Completion

**CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE**

1102 Q STREET
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814-6511
(916) 445-8752
HTTP://WWW.CCCCO.EDU



April 1, 2004

To: Chief Student Services Officers

From: Fusako Yokotobi, Vice Chancellor for Human Resources

Subject: Student Equity Plan Due Date Extension

This memo is to let you know that we have extended the due date for submitting the student equity plan to the State Chancellor's Office from July 2004 to January 31, 2005.

This extension does not mean we are backing away from the minimum condition requirement in Title 5 Section 51026 that "the governing board of a community college district shall adopt a student equity plan". We fully endorse and support the districts efforts to adopt a student equity plan. This due date extension simply reflects the need to adjust the timeline to meet the work demands at the district and state level. In addition, we have received suggestions about ways we might streamline the data collection requirements, take better advantage of MIS data and avoid duplication of data submissions. We will seek to incorporate those suggestions in what we are asking you to submit. We will send out a revised memorandum by September 1, 2004.

Once the student equity plans are submitted, we plan to ask for volunteers to assist us in reviewing these plans. Further details on the review process will be forthcoming as we near the new revised due date of January 31, 2005.

If you have any questions regarding this memorandum, please do not hesitate to contact Specialist Tosh Shikasho at tshikash@cccco.edu or (916) 323-4990.

CC: Chief Executive Officers
Student Equity Coordinators
Research and Planning Directors
Chancellor's Cabinet
Linda Michalowski
Tosh Shikasho