



Student Equity Plan

2014 – 2017

First Reading by the Governing Board
October 14, 2014

PALOMAR COLLEGE STUDENT EQUITY PLAN

Table of Contents

Signature Page	2
Executive Summary	4
Campus-Based Research	7
Overview.....	8
Indicator Definitions and Data.....	8
Access	11
Course Completion (Retention)	13
ESL and Basic Skills Completion.....	15
Degree and Certificate Completion	21
Goals and Activities	30
Access	31
Course Completion (Retention)	32
ESL and Basic Skills Completion.....	34
Degree and Certificate Completion	36
Transfer	39
Budget (Sources of Funding)	40
Evaluation Schedule and Process	42
Attachments	44

*Palomar College
Student Equity Plan
Signature Page*

District: Palomar Community College District **Date Approved by Board of Trustees:** _____

College President: _____

Vice President of Student Services: _____

Vice President of Instruction: _____

Academic Senate President: _____

Student Equity Coordinator/Contact Person: _____

Executive Summary

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In developing Palomar College's Student Equity Plan for 2014 - 2017, the College utilized a collaborative, shared-governance process which included research, dialogue, and the development of proposed strategies to address areas of disproportionate impact. In the Spring of 2014 the College established a workgroup that was charged with the development of the Student Equity Plan. This workgroup consisted of representatives from faculty, staff, students and administrators. Mindful of the Student Success Act (SB 1456), the Student Equity Plan was developed to align with the district's Student Success and Support Program plan as well as the College's Strategic Plan 2016. To facilitate and monitor the implementation of the Student Success and Support Program plan and the Student Equity Plan, the college is integrating two existing governance groups into a single oversight committee.

To assist the workgroup with their charge, the Office of Institutional Research and Planning conducted research as prescribed by the California Community College Chancellor's Office Student Equity Plan guidelines. The result of the research analysis by the members of the workgroup revealed that there was clear evidence of disproportionate impact among veterans, foster youth, African Americans, and students with disabilities. Specific areas of impact included: *Access* (Veterans), *Course Completion* (Foster Youth), *ESL and Basic Skills Completion* (African Americans, students with disabilities, males, and Hispanics), and *Degree and Certificate Completion* (African Americans, students with disabilities, and students who entered college unprepared for college level work). Additionally, there appeared to be some evidence of disproportionate impact among Hispanic students throughout all student equity success indicators.

As a result of the analysis and dialogue among workgroup members, the following goals and activities were established:

Access

Goal A.1: Increase the percentage of veterans who attend Palomar by 5% over the next three years.

- Identify and implement outreach strategies to increase the number of veterans who apply and enroll in the College.
- Examine course rotation and scheduling patterns with special emphasis on evening offerings.
- Modify college website making it easier for students to navigate and access campus resources.
- Improve data collection and research on affected student subpopulations in the College's equity plan with special emphasis on the identification and tracking of veterans and foster youth.

Course Completion

Goal B.1: Increase course success rates of foster youth by 5% over the next three years.

- Accurately identify foster youth in the College's database.
- Expand the role and responsibility of the College's foster youth support liaison.
- Provide extensive outreach and support services for foster youth including but not limited to mentoring and advising, improved access to services, and face-to-face connections and support with faculty.
- Integrate support for foster youth in the Summer Bridge and First Year Experience programs.

ESL and Basic Skills Completion

Goal C.1: Increase the percentage of African American students who complete their basic skills course sequences by 5% over the next three years.

- Expand the College's Summer Bridge and First Year Experience programs with a special emphasis on increasing the number of African Americans students who participate.
- Provide extensive outreach and support services for African American students including but not limited to mentoring and advising, improved access to services, and face-to-face connections and support with faculty.
- Implement a set of mandatory orientation experiences for the College's underprepared students.

Goal C.2: Increase the percentage of males, students ages 25 - 49, and Hispanic students who complete the ESL basic skills sequences by 5% over the next three years.

- Increase the number of males, Hispanic, and students ages 20 - 24 who participate in the ESL Summer Bridge and First Year Experience programs.
- Expand the mentor program with an emphasis on increasing participation among ESL students and other underrepresented student groups.
- Develop and implement a set of mandatory orientation experiences for underprepared students.

Goal C.3: Increase the percentage of DSPS students who complete their English basic skills course sequences by 2% over the next three years.

- Complete research to identify the needs and barriers of DSPS students attempting to complete their studies, including their English basic skills course sequences.
- Utilize research findings and develop and implement strategies to support DSPS students to complete their studies including the basic skills course sequences at the College.
- Develop tools/resources and professional development activities that help faculty identify signs of potential learning disabilities and make appropriate campus referrals.

Degree and Certificate Completion

Goal D.1A: Increase the percentage of underprepared students ages 25 - 49 who complete their studies by 2% over the next three years.

Goal D.1B: Increase the percentage of African American students who earn degrees and certificates by 2% over the next three years.

- Implement a student portal that will provide students with a single sign-on access point and allow for direct communication between the college and the student.
- Implement an electronic education planning and degree audit system that will allow students to access, view, develop scenarios, and monitor their progress toward their goals.
- Conduct research on effective follow-up and early alert practices. Then implement strategic follow-up systems and approaches that provide timely interaction and "high touch" support for students based on their needs. Ensure that the system of follow up and support "closes the loop" and informs faculty of the support students have received when necessary.
- Develop and implement professional development activities and training to assist faculty and staff identify potential needs of students and refer them to appropriate support services.
- Develop, establish, and communicate clear career pathways for students.

Goal D2: Increase the percentage of DSPS students who are on track to complete their studies by 2% over the next three years.

- Complete research to identify the needs and barriers of DSPS students attempting to complete their studies, including their English basic skills course sequences.
- Implement strategies to support DSPS students complete their studies, including the English basic skills course sequences, at the College.

Resources to be Utilized

In addition to Student Equity funding, sources of funding that will be utilized to achieve the College's Student Equity goals include: general fund, EOPS, DSPS, TRIO, CARE, Title V - HSI, Student Success and Support Program (both credit and non-credit), Grant Funded Student Programs, and Financial Aid and Scholarship.

Contact Persons

Adrian Gonzales, Assistant Superintendent/Vice President for Student Services (Tri-Chair)

Berta Cuaron, Assistant Superintendent/Vice President for Instruction (Tri-Chair)

Greg Larson, Faculty Senate President (Tri-Chair)

Michelle Barton, Senior Director for Institutional Research and Planning

Campus-Based Research

Campus-Based Research

In Spring 2014, the College identified a Student Equity Plan Workgroup and tasked the workgroup with the development of the draft Student Equity Plan. The Student Equity Plan workgroup consisted of faculty, staff, administration, and students. The workgroup was chaired by the Vice President for Student Services, Vice President for Instruction and the Faculty Senate President.

The Student Equity Plan Workgroup reviewed and discussed campus-based research conducted to determine evidence of disproportionate impact in seven student subpopulations. Based on the research and review of effective strategies, the workgroup developed the Palomar College Student Equity Plan. This section of the plan contains the methods and results of the college-based research.

METHODS

Subpopulations

The following subpopulations were examined to determine evidence of disproportionate impact.

- Gender
- Age
- Race/Ethnicity
- Students with disabilities
- Foster youth
- Economically disadvantaged
- Veterans

Success Indicators

The success indicators, identified by the CCCCCO Equity Plan, are given focus in this report. These indicators are described briefly below.

1. Access – Access refers to the proportion of a given subpopulation enrolled in the college relative to that subpopulation’s size in the district’s service area.
2. Course Completion – Course completion refers to the ratio of successful completion of credit course with a grade of A, B, C, or Pass by subpopulation to the total credit enrollments resulting in a transcript grade.
3. ESL and Basic Skills Completion – This indicator represents the proportion of students in different subpopulations that successfully complete a degree applicable course after having started at levels below transfer.
4. Degree and Certificate Completion – This is the ratio of the number of students within a subpopulation who receive a degree or certificate to the larger subpopulation.
5. Transfer – This is the number of students, by subpopulation, who transfer to a four-year institution.

Campus-Based Research

Data

Three data sources were used for this report. The data used to assess Access came from SANDAG and our own MIS files. The Course Completion analysis in this report also relies on MIS data. All other data was from the California Community Colleges' Student Success Scorecard. The Student Success Scorecard data was retrieved through Data on Demand.

Many of the metrics examined are based on cohorts formed six years ago as time must be allotted to track students to completion of basic skills sequences or their studies. Unfortunately, the College's method for identifying and flagging foster youth in its databases six years ago was not reliable and resulted in the identification of a very small number of foster youth students. Recently, the College has improved its data collection processes. Therefore, the only foster youth metric the college was able to evaluate was the course success metric. In addition, the identification of the number of the low income and veteran population residing within the district was problematic. Low income students identified in the Scorecard metric are identified by meeting a set of criteria or services received which is different than low income as defined by SANDAG within the population served by the College. Therefore, an access metric for low income was not available at the time of the analysis.

Assessing Disproportionate Impact

Two models are used to assess Disproportionate Impact: Proportionality and the 80% Rule. The *Proportionality Index* is a ratio of the representation of a subpopulation on a given measure relative to the size of the subpopulation within the larger population. For example, females make up 44.8% of our student population, and 50.8% of the population of Palomar College's service area. So, the proportionality of females is $44.8\% \div 50.8\%$, or 0.88. A value of less than 1.0 indicates a degree of under-representation.

The *80% Rule* specifies that the category with the highest percentage be used as a standard for a given outcome, and 80% of that standard serves as the threshold to indicate disproportional impact. For example, the successful course completion rate for females is 71.6%, and for males is 70.5%. As 71.6% is the higher value, it is used as the standard, and 80% of that value, that is, 57.3% is used as the threshold to determine if the other subpopulation has been disproportionately impacted.

For the issue of access, the Proportionality Index is used. The advantage of using the Proportionality Index for the access indicator is that it allows for assessing impact while considering other factors that might constrain the use of the college by some populations even if it is accessible. For example, the college may have a number of programs that feed traditionally gendered occupations, such as Fire Technology. The proportionality index could be considered in light of such information. On the other hand, the clear-cut nature of the 80% Rule allows for a more unambiguous interpretation of the results. However, when implementing the 80% Rule, the highest category is not always the most reasonable to use as a standard. Sometimes the largest category, or the overall average, may make more sense, particularly when the highest category is a relatively small subpopulation. Therefore, for all success indicators except access, three disproportionate impact gauges are used: (1) the proportionality index, (2) the 80% rule

Campus-Based Research

using the highest category to compute the threshold, and (3) the 80% rule using the overall average to compute the threshold.

When assessing indicators and determining the presence of disproportionate impact, the Student Equity Plan Work Group considered all three gauges. However, if a subpopulation did not meet the 80% threshold using the highest category, the Workgroup did not deem it as evidence of disproportionate impact due to the issues described above. The Workgroup determined that the proportionality index and the 80% rule using the overall average to compute the threshold were better indicators of evidence of disproportionate impact.

In the tables on the following pages, specific subpopulations highlighted in red indicate clear evidence of disproportionate impact. Specific subpopulations highlighted in blue indicate possible or potential disproportionate impact. The Workgroup developed goals for the equity plan for subpopulations that had clear evidence of disproportionate impact. The Workgroup determined that the College would continue to closely monitor those subpopulations showing possible disproportionate impact.

Campus-Based Research

A. ACCESS. Compare the percentage of each population group that is enrolled to the percentage of each group in the adult population within the community served.

Proportionality by Gender, Age, Race & Ethnicity, and Veterans for Fall, 2013			
	Palomar	District*	Proportionality Index
Gender			
Female	44.8%	50.8%	0.88
Male	55.2%	49.2%	1.12
Age			
Under 20	22.0%	4.7%	4.67
20 to 24	38.0%	10.3%	3.68
25 to 49	33.0%	42.3%	0.78
50 or Over	7.0%	42.6%	0.16
Race & Ethnicity			
African American	3.0%	2.0%	1.48
American Indian/ Alaska Native	0.7%	0.7%	1.01
Asian	5.1%	10.0%	0.51
Hispanic	39.6%	28.3%	1.40
White	41.7%	56.6%	0.74
Veterans			
No	95.7%	88.4%	1.08
Yes	4.3%	11.6%	0.37
* Data for Veterans is available only at the county level.			

Summary

Older adults, Asians, and veterans are not represented in the college at the same proportion as they are in within the district's service area, or the county in the case of Veterans.

It is not realistic to expect a similar representation of students over 50. In addition, a proportionality index of .78 within the 25-49 age group is not necessarily unacceptable given that individuals within this category are more likely to have completed their education and make up the significant portion of the workforce.

The district's service area is very large. Asians residing within the service area are concentrated in the southern portion of the district. The College has plans to open a South education center and will monitor enrollment to see if this affects the proportionality index for our Asian student population.

Note: Economically Disadvantaged as defined in the Scorecard metric is different than Economically Disadvantaged within the population served by the College. Therefore, an access

Campus-Based Research

metric for low income was not available at the time of the analysis. In addition, the College was not able to identify an accurate count of Foster Youth residing within the district's boundaries. Therefore, access data is not available for Foster Youth and Economically Disadvantaged categories.

Campus-Based Research

B. 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.

Tables

Successful Course Completion by Gender for Fall 2013				
Gender	Completion Rate	Proportionality Index	Below 80% Threshold	
			Highest	Overall
Female	71.6%	1.01	No	No
Male	70.5%	0.99	No	No
<i>Threshold</i>			57.3%	56.8%

Successful Course Completion by Age Category for Fall 2013				
Age Category	Completion Rate	Proportionality Index	Below 80% Threshold	
			Highest	Overall
Under 20	68.6%	0.97	No	No
20 to 24	68.8%	0.97	No	No
25 to 49	76.2%	1.07	No	No
50 or Over	79.7%	1.12	No	No
<i>Threshold</i>			63.8%	56.8%

Successful Course Completion by Ethnicity for Fall 2013				
Ethnicity	Completion Rate	Proportionality Index	Below 80% Threshold	
			Highest	Overall
African American	59.8%	0.84	Yes	No
Asian or Pacific Islander	76.0%	1.07	No	No
Filipino	68.9%	0.97	No	No
Hispanic	66.6%	0.94	No	No
Multi Ethnic	67.6%	0.95	No	No
Native American	71.3%	1.00	No	No
White	75.5%	1.06	No	No
<i>Threshold</i>			60.8%	56.8%

Campus-Based Research

Successful Course Completion by DSPS for Fall 2013				
DSPS	Completion Rate	Proportionality Index	Below 80% Threshold	
			Highest	Overall
No	71.1%	1.00	No	No
Yes	69.5%	0.98	No	No
<i>Threshold</i>			56.9%	56.9%

Successful Course Completion by Veteran Status for Fall 2013				
Veteran	Completion Rate	Proportionality Index	Below 80% Threshold	
			Highest	Overall
No	71.1%	1.00	No	No
Yes	69.9%	0.98	No	No
<i>Threshold</i>			56.9%	56.9%

Successful Course Completion by Foster Youth for Fall 2013				
Foster	Completion Rate	Proportionality Index	Below 80% Threshold	
			Highest	Overall
No	71.4%	1.00	No	No
Yes	47.1%	0.66	Yes	Yes
<i>Threshold</i>			57.1%	56.9%

Summary

The Student Equity Planning Workgroup noted disproportionate impact for the course success indicator for foster youth. The Workgroup also noted possible disproportionate impact for African Americans.

Campus-Based Research

C. 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 compared to the number of those students who complete such a final course.

Tables

English

English: Completed Degree Applicable English by Gender for the 2006-2007 Cohort				
Gender	Completion Rate	Proportionality Index	Below 80% Threshold	
			Highest	Overall
Female	33.8%	1.10	No	No
Male	28.0%	0.91	No	No
<i>Threshold</i>			27.0%	24.5%

English: Percent Who Completed Degree Applicable English by Age for the 2006-2007 Cohort				
Age	Completion Rate	Proportionality Index	Below 80% Threshold	
			Highest	Overall
Under 20	32.8%	1.07	No	No
20 to 24	26.1%	0.85	Yes	No
25 to 49	28.3%	0.92	No	No
50 or Over	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40
<i>Threshold</i>			26.2%	24.5%

English: Percent Who Completed Degree Applicable English by Race for the 2006-2007 Cohort				
Race	Completion Rate	Proportionality Index	Below 80% Threshold	
			Highest	Overall
African American	22.0%	0.71	Yes	Yes
American Indian/ Alaska Native	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40
Asian	59.0%	1.90	No	No
Filipino	34.7%	1.12	Yes	No
Hispanic	26.6%	0.86	Yes	No
Pacific Islander	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40
White	33.8%	1.09	Yes	No
<i>Threshold</i>			47.2%	24.9%

Campus-Based Research

English: Percent Who Completed Degree Applicable English by DSPS for the 2006-2007 Cohort				
DSPS	Completion Rate	Proportionality Index	Below 80% Threshold	
			Highest	Overall
No	32.0%	1.05	No	No
Yes	22.5%	0.74	Yes	Yes
<i>Threshold</i>			25.6%	24.5%

English: Percent Who Completed Degree Applicable English by Economically Disadvantaged for the 2006-2007 Cohort				
Economically Disadvantaged	Completion Rate	Proportionality Index	Below 80% Threshold	
			Highest	Overall
No	31.5%	1.03	No	No
Yes	29.2%	0.95	No	No
<i>Threshold</i>			25.2%	24.5%

English: Completed Degree Applicable English by Veteran Benefits Received for the 2006-2007 Cohort				
Veteran Benefits Received	Completion Rate	Proportionality Index	Below 80% Threshold	
			Highest	Overall
No	30.0%	0.97	No	No
Yes	N < 40	1.10	No	No
<i>Threshold</i>			24.0%	24.8%

Campus-Based Research

Math

Math: Percent Who Completed Degree Applicable Math by Gender for the 2006-2007 Cohort				
Gender	Completion Rate	Proportionality Index	Below 80% Threshold	
			Highest	Overall
Female	29.7%	1.11	No	No
Male	23.0%	0.86	Yes	No
<i>Threshold</i>			23.8%	21.3%

Math: Percent Who Completed Degree Applicable Math by Age for the 2006-2007 Cohort				
Age	Completion Rate	Proportionality Index	Below 80% Threshold	
			Highest	Overall
Under 20	27.1%	1.01	No	No
20 to 24	27.1%	1.01	No	No
25 to 49	25.6%	0.96	No	No
50 or Over	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40
<i>Threshold</i>			21.7%	21.4%

Math: Percent Who Completed Degree Applicable Math by Race for the 2006-2007 Cohort				
Race	Completion Rate	Proportionality Index	Below 80% Threshold	
			Highest	Overall
African American	13.8%	0.52	Yes	Yes
American Indian/ Alaska Native	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40
Asian	37.3%	1.41	No	No
Filipino	35.6%	1.35	No	No
Hispanic	22.1%	0.84	Yes	No
Pacific Islander	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40
White	30.2%	1.14	No	No
<i>Threshold</i>			29.8%	21.2%

Campus-Based Research

Math: Percent Who Completed Degree Applicable Math by DSPS for the 2006-2007 Cohort				
DSPS	Completion Rate	Proportionality Index	Below 80% Threshold	
			Highest	Overall
No	26.6%	0.99	No	No
Yes	28.0%	1.05	No	No
<i>Threshold</i>			22.4%	21.4%

Math: Percent Who Completed Degree Applicable Math by Economically Disadvantaged for the 2006-2007 Cohort				
Economically Disadvantaged	Completion Rate	Proportionality Index	Below 80% Threshold	
			Highest	Overall
No	27.3%	1.02	No	No
Yes	25.8%	0.96	No	No
<i>Threshold</i>			21.8%	21.4%

Math: Completed Degree Applicable Math by Veterans Benefits Received for the 2006-2007 Cohort				
Veterans Benefits Received	Completion Rate	Proportionality Index	Below 80% Threshold	
			Highest	Overall
No	26.0%	0.96	Yes	No
Yes	38.0%	1.41	No	No
<i>Threshold</i>			30.4%	21.6%

ESL

ESL: Percent Who Completed Degree Applicable English by Gender for the 2006-2007 Cohort				
Gender	Completion Rate	Proportionality Index	Below 80% Threshold	
			Highest	Overall
Female	15.8%	1.14	No	No
Male	10.3%	0.75	Yes	Yes
<i>Threshold</i>			12.6%	11.0%

Campus-Based Research

ESL: Completed Degree Applicable English by Age for the 2006-2007 Cohort				
Age	Completion Rate	Proportionality Index	Below 80% Threshold	
			Highest	Overall
Under 20	34.5%	2.51	No	No
20 to 24	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40
25 to 49	6.0%	0.44	Yes	Yes
50 or Over	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40
<i>Threshold</i>			27.6%	11.0%

ESL: Percent Who Completed Degree Applicable English by Race for the 2006-2007 Cohort				
Race	Completion Rate	Proportionality Index	Below 80% Threshold	
			Highest	Overall
African American	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40
Asian	30.8%	2.21	No	No
Filipino	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40
Hispanic	9.6%	0.69	Yes	Yes
White	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40
<i>Threshold</i>			24.6%	11.2%

ESL: Percent Who Completed Degree Applicable English by DSPS for the 2006-2007 Cohort				
DSPS	Completion Rate	Proportionality Index	Below 80% Threshold	
			Highest	Overall
No	13.8%	1.00	No	No
Yes	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40
<i>Threshold</i>			11.0%	11.0%

ESL: Percent Who Completed Degree Applicable English by Economically Disadvantaged for the 2006-2007 Cohort				
Economically Disadvantaged	Completion Rate	Proportionality Index	Below 80% Threshold	
			Highest	Overall
No	8.0%	0.58	Yes	Yes
Yes	27.2%	1.98	No	No
<i>Threshold</i>			21.8%	11.0%

Campus-Based Research

Summary

Summary of Findings Basic Skills / ESL Completion		
<i>Success Indicator/SubPopulation</i>	<i>Disproportionate Impact</i>	
	<i>Possible</i>	<i>Clear</i>
Basic Skills English Completion		
Age 20-24	✓	
African American		✓
Hispanic	✓	
DSPS		✓
Basic Skills Math Completion		
Males	✓	
African American		✓
Hispanic	✓	
ESL		
Male		✓
25-49		✓
Hispanic		✓

For basic skills course completion, the Workgroup noted clear evidence of disproportionate impact for African American and DSPS students. Possible disproportionate impact was evident within the Hispanic subpopulation. Performance of Hispanic students will continue to be monitored over time and many of the activities identified to address basic skills completion will help the college's Hispanic students.

In regards to ESL, the Workgroup noted clear disproportionate impact for males, Hispanics, and students ages 25-49. The Workgroup noted significant overlap of students within each of these categories. In other words, male ESL students are typically Hispanic and within 25-49 age range.

The basic skills and ESL completion metric is based on a cohort formed six years ago as time allotted to track students to completion. Unfortunately, the College's method for identifying and flagging foster youth in its databases six years ago was not reliable and resulted in the identification of a very small number of foster youth students. Therefore, basic skills and ESL completion data are not available for foster youth students at this time.

Campus-Based Research

D. 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.

SPAR

Completion as defined in the first set of tables includes the percentage of students who show intent and then continue on to earn a degree, certificate, transfer, or become transfer prepared within six years of entry. It is the SPAR (Student Progress and Achievement Rate) from the California Community College's Scorecard. Note, the number of Foster Youth in cohorts was deemed too small upon which to make a valid judgment.

Completion by Preparation Level and Gender for Cohort Year 2006-2007					
Preparation Level	Gender	Completion Rate	Proportionality Index	Below 80% Threshold	
				Highest	Overall
Prepared	Female	72.5%	1.06	No	No
	Male	65.0%	0.95	No	No
	<i>Threshold</i>			58.0%	54.6%
Unprepared	Female	48.3%	1.06	No	No
	Male	42.1%	0.93	No	No
	<i>Threshold</i>			38.6%	36.3%

Completion by Preparation Level and Age for Cohort Year 2006-2007					
Preparation Level	Age	Completion Rate	Proportionality Index	Below 80% Threshold	
				Highest	Overall
Prepared	Under 20	67.9%	1.00	No	No
	20 to 24	76.2%	1.12	No	No
	25 to 49	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40
	50 or Over	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40
	<i>Threshold</i>			61.0%	54.6%
Unprepared	Under 20	46.9%	1.03	No	No
	20 to 24	41.6%	0.92	No	No
	25 to 49	34.2%	0.75	Yes	Yes
	50 or Over	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40
	<i>Threshold</i>			37.5%	36.4%

Campus-Based Research

Completion by Preparation Level and Race for Cohort Year 2006-2007					
Preparation Level	Race	Completion Rate	Proportionality Index	Below 80% Threshold	
				Highest	Overall
Prepared	African American	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40
	American Indian/Alaska Native	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40
	Asian	81.4%	1.20	No	No
	Filipino	68.2%	1.00	No	No
	Hispanic	64.6%	0.95	Yes	No
	Pacific Islander	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40
	White	67.7%	1.00	No	No
	<i>Threshold</i>				65.1%
Unprepared	African American	46.6%	1.03	No	No
	American Indian/Alaska Native	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40
	Asian	56.2%	1.24	No	No
	Filipino	42.9%	0.95	Yes	No
	Hispanic	39.6%	0.87	Yes	No
	Pacific Islander	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40
	White	48.2%	1.06	No	No
	<i>Threshold</i>				45.0%

Completion by Preparation Level and Economically Disadvantaged for Cohort Year 2006-2007					
Preparation Level	Economically Disadvantaged	Completion Rate	Proportionality Index	Below 80% Threshold	
				Highest	Overall
Prepared	No	68.7%	1.48	No	No
	Yes	67.4%	1.46	No	No
	<i>Threshold</i>			55.0%	37.0%
Unprepared	No	46.3%	1.02	No	No
	Yes	44.5%	0.98	No	No
	<i>Threshold</i>			37.0%	36.3%

Campus-Based Research

Completion by Preparation Level and DSPS Student for Cohort Year 2006-2007					
Preparation Level	DSPS	Completion Rate	Proportionality Index	Below 80%	
				Highest	Overall
Prepared	No	67.9%	1.46	No	No
	Yes	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40
	<i>Threshold</i>			54.3%	37.1%
Unprepared	No	46.4%	1.02	No	No
	Yes	35.1%	0.77	Yes	Yes
	<i>Threshold</i>			37.1%	36.3%

Completion by Preparation Level and Veteran Benefits Received for Cohort Year 2006-2007					
Preparation Level	Veteran Benefits Received	Completion Rate	Proportionality Index	Below 80% Threshold	
				Highest	Overall
Prepared	No	68.3%	1.50	No	No
	Yes	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40
	<i>Threshold</i>			54.6%	36.3%
Unprepared	No	45.4%	0.99	No	No
	Yes	54.3%	1.19	No	No
	<i>Threshold</i>			43.4%	36.6%

Count of Degrees and Certificates only

Degree or Certificate % by Gender for the 2006-2007 Cohort					
Preparation Level	Gender	Completion Rate	Proportionality Index	Below 80% Threshold	
				Highest	Overall
Prepared	Female	29.6%	1.21	No	No
	Male	20.4%	0.84	Yes	No
	<i>Threshold</i>			23.7%	19.5%
Unprepared	Female	18.4%	1.05	No	No
	Male	16.7%	0.95	No	No
	<i>Threshold</i>			14.7%	14.1%

Campus-Based Research

Degree or Certificate % by Age for the 2006-2007 Cohort					
Preparation Level	Age	Completion Rate	Proportionality Index	Below 80% Threshold	
				Highest	Overall
Prepared	Under 20	23.2%	0.95	Yes	No
	20 to 24	38.1%	1.56	No	No
	25 to 49	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40
	50 or Over	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40
	<i>Threshold</i>			<i>30.5%</i>	<i>19.5%</i>
Unprepared	Under 20	17.3%	0.98	No	No
	20 to 24	19.2%	1.09	No	No
	25 to 49	19.5%	1.10	No	No
	50 or Over	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40
	<i>Threshold</i>			<i>15.6%</i>	<i>14.1%</i>

Degree or Certificate % by Race for the 2006-2007 Cohort					
Preparation Level	Race	Completion Rate	Proportionality Index	Below 80% Threshold	
				Highest	Overall
Prepared	African American	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40
	American Indian/ Alaska Native	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40
	Asian	24.5%	0.99	No	No
	Filipino	20.5%	0.83	No	No
	Hispanic	25.2%	1.02	No	No
	Pacific Islander	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40
	White	25.6%	1.03	No	No
	<i>Threshold</i>			<i>20.5%</i>	<i>19.8%</i>
Unprepared	African American	12.9%	0.75	Yes	Yes
	American Indian/ Alaska Native	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40
	Asian	28.9%	1.67	No	No
	Filipino	14.3%	0.83	Yes	No
	Hispanic	16.3%	0.94	Yes	No
	Pacific Islander	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40
	White	17.3%	1.00	Yes	No
	<i>Threshold</i>			<i>23.1%</i>	<i>13.8%</i>

Campus-Based Research

Degree or Certificate by DSPS for the 2006-2007 Cohort					
Preparation Level	DSPS	Completion Rate	Proportionality Index	Below 80% Threshold	
				Highest	Overall
Prepared	No	24.3%	1.00	No	No
	Yes	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40
	<i>Threshold</i>			<i>19.4%</i>	<i>19.5%</i>
Unprepared	No	17.6%	1.00	No	No
	Yes	18.5%	1.05	No	No
	<i>Threshold</i>			<i>14.8%</i>	<i>14.1%</i>

Degree or Certificate % by Economically Disadvantaged for the 2006-2007 Cohort					
Preparation Level	Economically Disadvantaged	Completion Rate	Proportionality Index	Below 80% Threshold	
				Highest	Overall
Prepared	No	22.1%	0.91	Yes	No
	Yes	28.8%	1.18	No	No
	<i>Threshold</i>			<i>23.0%</i>	<i>19.5%</i>
Unprepared	No	16.2%	0.92	No	No
	Yes	19.3%	1.09	No	No
	<i>Threshold</i>			<i>15.4%</i>	<i>14.1%</i>

Summary

See Section E: Transfer for a summary of findings for all completion outcomes.

Campus-Based Research

E. 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.

See Section D Degrees and Certificates for a review of Disproportionate Impact of the Student Progress and Achievement Rate (SPAR) Scorecard Metric as this metric includes student transfer counts in the outcome.

Count of Transfers or Transfer Prepared only

Transfer-Related Outcome by Gender for the 2006-2007 Cohort					
Preparation Level	Gender	Transfer-Related Outcome %	Proportionality Index	Below 80% Threshold	
				Highest	Overall
Prepared	Female	71.0%	1.07	No	No
	Male	62.7%	0.94	No	No
	<i>Threshold</i>			56.8%	53.1%
Unprepared	Female	46.0%	1.07	No	No
	Male	39.5%	0.92	No	No
	<i>Threshold</i>			36.8%	34.4%

Transfer-Related Outcome by Age Category for the 2006-2007 Cohort					
Preparation Level	Age Category	Transfer-Related Outcome %	Proportionality Index	Below 80% Threshold	
				Highest	Overall
Prepared	Under 20	66.7%	1.01	No	No
	20 to 24	69.8%	1.05	No	No
	25 to 49	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40
	50 or Over	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40
	<i>Threshold</i>			55.8%	53.0%
Unprepared	Under 20	45.1%	1.05	No	No
	20 to 24	36.0%	0.84	Yes	No
	25 to 49	28.4%	0.66	Yes	Yes
	50 or Over	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40
	<i>Threshold</i>			36.1%	34.4%

Campus-Based Research

Transfer-Related Outcome by Race for the 2006-2007 Cohort					
Preparation Level	Race	Transfer-Related Outcome	Proportionality Index	Below 80% Threshold	
				Highest	Overall
Prepared	African American	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40
	American Indian/ Alaska Native	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40
	Asian	80.4%	1.22	No	No
	Filipino	65.9%	1.00	No	No
	Hispanic	64.6%	0.98	No	No
	Pacific Islander	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40
	White	65.2%	0.99	No	No
	<i>Threshold</i>			<i>64.3%</i>	<i>52.8%</i>
Unprepared	African American	46.6%	1.08	No	No
	American Indian/ Alaska Native	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40
	Asian	52.9%	1.23	No	No
	Filipino	42.0%	0.98	Yes	No
	Hispanic	36.9%	0.86	Yes	No
	Pacific Islander	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40
	White	45.8%	1.07	No	No
	<i>Threshold</i>			<i>42.3%</i>	<i>34.4%</i>

Campus-Based Research

Transfer-Related Outcome by Economically Disadvantaged for the 2006-2007 Cohort					
Preparation Level	Econ D	Related Outcome %	Proportionality Index	Below 80% Threshold	
				Highest	Overall
Prepared	No	66.9%	1.01	No	No
	Yes	65.3%	0.98	No	No
	<i>Threshold</i>			53.5%	53.0%
Unprepared	No	44.2%	1.03	No	No
	Yes	41.6%	0.97	No	No
	<i>Threshold</i>			35.4%	34.4%

Transfer Related Outcome by Preparation Level and Veteran Benefits Received for Cohort Year 2006-2007					
Preparation Level	Veteran Benefits Received	Completion Rate	Proportionality Index	Below 80% Threshold	
				Highest	Overall
Prepared	No	66.5%	1.54	No	No
	Yes	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40	N < 40
	<i>Threshold</i>			53.2%	34.5%
Unprepared	No	43.1%	1.00	No	No
	Yes	45.7%	1.06	No	No
	<i>Threshold</i>			36.6%	34.6%

Summary of ALL Completion Indicators

Summary of Findings SPAR, Degrees and Certificates, and Transfer Outcomes		
<i>Success Indicator/SubPopulation</i>	<i>Disproportionate Impact</i>	
	<i>Possible</i>	<i>Clear</i>
SPAR		
25-49		✓
Hispanic	✓	
DSPS		✓
Degrees and Certificates		
Filipino	✓	
Male	✓	
African American		✓
Transfer Outcome		
20-24	✓	
25-49		✓
Hispanic	✓	
DSPS		✓

Campus-Based Research

The Workgroup noted disproportionate impact under the completion indicators (overall, degrees and certificates, and transfers) for students ages 25-49, African American students, and DSPS students. The DSPS students were close to the cut off and the Workgroup suggested completing follow up research to further break down these students and evaluate their needs. In addition, the Workgroup noted that goals of students vary more within age group 25-49. It is possible that students age 25-49 are more likely to attend Palomar to complete just one or two courses related to their current profession. For example, the College offers a set of two drafting courses that provide instruction on the latest technology in the field. Students often attend these classes to improve their skills in their current profession without the intention of completing a certificate or degree.

The SPAR, degrees and certificates, and transfer related metrics are based on a cohort formed six years ago as time allotted to track students to completion. Unfortunately, the College's method for identifying and flagging foster youth in its databases six years ago was not reliable and resulted in the identification of a very small number of foster youth students. Therefore, completion data are not available for foster youth students at this time.

Goals and Activities

A. 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 served”

Goal A.1. Increase the percentage of veterans who attend Palomar College by 5% over the next three years.

<i>Activity</i>		<i>Outcome</i>	<i>Persons/Group Responsible</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
A.1.1	Identify and implement outreach strategies to increase the number of veterans who apply to and enroll in the college.	Number of veterans enrolled at the college will increase by 1-2% annually.	Dir. Enrollment Services, Dean Counseling Services, Dir. Institutional Research & Planning (IR&P)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct research and identify strategies by Summer 2015 • Begin to implement strategies by Spring 2016
A.1.2	Examine course rotation and scheduling patterns with special emphasis on evening offerings.	Course rotation and scheduling patterns reviewed and refined to ensure that students can complete their programs within a specified timeframe.	VP Instruction, Instructional Deans and Department Chairs & Directors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete review by Summer 2016 • Identify refinements Fall 2016
A.1.3	Modify college website making it easier for students to navigate and access campus resources.	Improved structure of college website with simplified navigation and access to campus resources.	Dir. Public Information, Dean Social and Behavioral Sciences (SBS), Mgr. Academic Technology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initiate improvement process by July 2015 • Hire webmaster by July 2015 • Complete improvement by July 2017
A.1.4	Improve data collection and research on affected student subpopulations in the college’s equity plan with a special emphasis on the identification and tracking of veterans and foster youth.	Veterans and foster youth reliably identified and flagged within the college’s data system. Ongoing research on student access and completion for affected subpopulations in the college’s equity plan.	VP Student Services, Dir. Institutional Research and Planning, Director of Enrollment Services.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify data collection and research needs by Spring 2015 • Implement processes to ensure accurate identification of veterans and foster youth by Summer 2015 • Hire institutional researcher by Summer 2015 • Conduct appropriate research studies to support the college’s efforts to address student equity. (Ongoing)

Goals and Activities

B. 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 B.1. Increase course success rates of foster youth by 5% over the next three years.

<i>Activity</i>		<i>Outcome</i>	<i>Persons/Group Responsible</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
B.1.1	Accurately identify foster youth in the college’s database.	Foster youth appropriately flagged within the database and reports generated.	VP Student Services, Dir. Enrollment Services, Dir. IR&P	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete by Spring 2015
B.1.2	Expand the role and responsibility of the College’s foster youth support liaison.	Foster youth will meet with support liaison(s) twice per year (or semester).	Dean of Counseling, Dir. Enrollment Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement by Fall 2015
B.1.3	Provide extensive outreach and support services for foster youth including but not limited to advising, mentoring, and tutoring; improved access to services; and face-to-face connections and support with faculty.	All foster youth will receive appropriate and strategic follow-up services.	Dean of Counseling, Foster Youth Support Liaison, Dean of LL, Dean of MNHS, FYE Coordinator, Faculty Resource (FR) Coordinator, and Basic Skills Committee, Dir EOPS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initiate faculty dialogue and identify related activities by Spring 2015 Begin implementation Fall 2015
B.1.4	Integrate support for foster youth in the Summer Bridge and First Year Experience (FYE) programs.	All foster youth will be directed to participate in a first year experience and/or summer bridge program.	Dean of Counseling, Foster Youth Support Liaison, Dean of LL, Dean of MNHS, FYE Coordinator, and Basic Skills Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Begin implementation Fall 2016

Goals and Activities

C. 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 C.1. Increase the percentage of African American students who complete their basic skills course sequences by 5% over the next three years.

<i>Activity</i>		<i>Outcome</i>	<i>Persons/Group Responsible</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
C.1.1	Expand the College’s Summer Bridge and First Year Experience (FYE) programs with a special emphasis on increasing the number of African American students who participate.	Number of African American and students participating in the Summer Bridge and First Year Experience will increase by 20% over the next three years.	Dean of Languages and Literature (LL), FYE Coordinator, Basic Skills Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan for expansion and increased outreach of programs to special populations by Spring 2015 • Implement Summer and Fall 2015
C.1.2	Provide extensive outreach and support services for foster youth including but not limited to advising, mentoring, and tutoring; improved access to services; and face-to-face connections and support with faculty	Number of underrepresented students participating in the mentor program will increase by 30% over the next three years.	Dean of Counseling, Dean of LL, Dean of Mathematics and the Natural and Health Sciences (MNHS), Faculty Resource (FR) Coordinator, Basic Skills Committee, STEM Coordinator, Director EOPS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initiate faculty dialogue and identify related activities by Fall 2015 • Plan for expansion and increased outreach to special populations by Spring 2016 • Begin implementation Fall 2016 • Continue implementation Spring 2017
C.1.3	Implement a set of mandatory orientation experiences for the College’s underprepared students.	80% of entering underprepared first-year students will complete a set of mandatory experiences by the end of the plan’s term.	Dean of Counseling, Dean of LL, Dean of MNHS, FYE Coordinator, and Basic Skills Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop by Summer 2015 • Begin implementation Fall 2016 • Continue implementation Spring 2017

Goals and Activities

Goal C.2. Increase the percentage of males, students ages 20-24, and Hispanic students who complete their ESL basic skills sequences by 5% over the next three years.

<i>Activity</i>		<i>Outcome</i>	<i>Persons/Group Responsible</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
C.2.1	Increase the number of males, Hispanic, and students ages 20-24 who participate in the ESL Summer Bridge (ESL Jam) and First Year Programs.	Number of males, Hispanics, and students ages 20-24 who participate in the ESL Summer Bridge and First Year Experience Program will increase over the next three years.	Dean of Languages and Literature (LL), FYE Coordinator, Basic Skills Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan for expansion and increased outreach of programs to special populations by Spring 2015 • Implement Summer and Fall 2015
C.2.2	Provide extensive outreach and support services for ESL students including but not limited to advising, mentoring, and tutoring; improved access to services; and face-to-face connections and support with faculty.	Number of underrepresented students participating in the mentor program will increase by 30% over the next three years.	Dean of LL, Dean of Mathematics and the Natural and Health Sciences (MNHS), FR Coordinator, Basic Skills Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan for expansion and increased outreach to special populations by Spring 2016 • Begin implementation Fall 2016 • Continue implementation Spring 2017
C.2.3	Develop and implement a set of mandatory orientation experiences for underprepared students.	80% of entering underprepared first-year students will complete a set of mandatory experiences by the end of the plan's term.	Dean of Counseling, Dean of LL, Dean of MNHS, FYE Coordinator, and Basic Skills Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop by Summer 2015 • Begin implementation Fall 2016 • Continue implementation Spring 2017

Goals and Activities

Goal C.3. Increase the percentage of DSPS students who complete their English basic skills course sequences by 2% over the next three years.

<i>Activity</i>	<i>Outcome</i>	<i>Persons/Group Responsible</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
C.3.1	Complete research to identify the needs and barriers of DSPS students attempting to complete their studies, including their English basic skills course sequences.	Research completed. Needs and barriers described. Strategies identified to address needs and barriers.	Dean of Counseling, Director DRC/DSPS, Director of Institutional Research and Planning • Research completed by Spring 2016
C.3.2	Utilize research findings and develop and implement strategies to support DSPS students to complete their studies, including the English basic skills course sequences, at the college.	By the end of the plan's term, the number of DSPS students on track to complete their English basic skills coursework and their studies will increase by 2%.	Dean of Counseling, Director DRC/DSPS, DRC/DSPS, Basic Skills Committee • Strategies implemented by Spring 2017
C.3.3	Develop tools/resources and professional development activities that help faculty identify signs of potential learning disabilities and make appropriate campus referrals.	Tools, resources, and professional development opportunities will be developed and provided to faculty.	Dean of Counseling, Faculty Development Coordinator, Dean of LL, Dean of MNHS, VP Instruction, Chairs, and Directors • Develop by Summer 2015 • Begin implementation Fall 2016 • Continue implementation Spring 2017

Goals and Activities

D. 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”

After reviewing the disproportionate impact data and research on best practices related to completion, the Student Equity Workgroup determined that strategic, timely, and ongoing follow-up is critical to help students complete their educational goals. Also, the Workgroup recognized that students in the affected subpopulations often need “high touch” and multiple types of support. However, as configured, the College’s current technology infrastructure and processes cannot support this approach. In order to establish an effective follow-up and strategic support system, the Workgroup recommended that the College complete two significant tasks. First, improve the technology infrastructure it uses to communicate with students. Second, partner this improvement with a strategic follow-up process that utilizes that infrastructure while allowing for significant targeted personal interaction between faculty, staff, and students, especially those students identified as “at risk.”

Goal D.1A. Increase the percentage of underprepared students ages 25-49 who complete their studies by 2% over the next three years.

Goal D.1B. Increase the percentage of African American students who earn degrees and certificates by 2% over the next three years

<i>Activity</i>	<i>Outcome</i>	<i>Persons/Group Responsible</i>	<i>Timeline</i>	
D.1.1	Implement a student portal that will provide students with a single sign-on access point and allow for direct communication between the college and the student.	All students will access and interact with the college’s online system using a single sign on. Upon signing in, students will receive any relevant communication and be directed to support services if needed.	Vice President Student Services, Director Enrollment Services, Enrollment Services, Dean of Counseling, Counseling Services, Dir. Information Services, IT Project Manager, Dean of LL, Dean of Social and Behavioral Sciences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hire IT Project Manager by Summer 2015 • Research and identify software tool by Summer 2015 • Purchase, install, and test by Fall 2016 • Pilot Spring 2017 • Implement Fall 2017
D.1.2	Implement an electronic education planning and degree audit system that will allow students to access, view, develop scenarios, and monitor their progress toward their goals.	Students will use an electronic education system to help plan, track, and monitor their progress to goal completion.	Vice President Student Services, Director Enrollment Services, Enrollment Services, Dean of Counseling, Faculty Senate President, FYE Coordinator Counseling Services, Dean of Information Services, Dean of LL, Basic Skills Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review current planning and degree audit systems by Summer 2015 • Identify additional software needs by Summer 2015. • Install and test by Fall 2016 • Prototype Spring 2017 • Begin implementation Fall 2017

Goals and Activities

<i>Activity</i>	<i>Outcome</i>	<i>Persons/Group Responsible</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
D.1.3 Conduct research on effective follow-up and early alert practices. Then implement strategic follow-up systems and approaches that provide timely interaction and “high touch” support for students based on their needs. Ensure that the system of follow-up and support “closes the loop” and informs faculty of the support students have received when necessary.	Research completed. Strategies and processes defined and implemented. Faculty notified of follow-up services and support received by students when necessary.	Vice President Student Services, Director Enrollment Services, Dean of Counseling, Counseling Services, Information Services, Dean of LL, Dean of MNHS, Director of Research and Planning, FYE Coordinator, Basic Skills Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct research – initial by Summer 2015 (then ongoing) • Develop strategies by Fall 2016 • Prototype Spring 2017 • Begin implementation Fall 2017
D.1.4 Develop and implement professional development activities and training to assist faculty and staff identify potential needs of students and refer them to appropriate support services.	Faculty and staff will participate in training and/or related activities to learn about the support services available to students.	Vice President Student Services, Vice President Instruction, Vice President Human Resource Services, Faculty Senate President, Professional Development Coordinator, Professional and Staff Development Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop by Fall 2016 • Implement Spring 2017 and ongoing
D.1.5 Develop, establish, and communicate clear career pathways for students.	<p>The number of programs that will have defined career pathways will increase.</p> <p>Career pathways will be integrated into the Student Success and Support services provided to students.</p>	Vice President Instruction, Dean of Career and Technical Education, Dean of MNHS, Dean of Counseling, Chairs and Directors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify high demand CTE programs by Fall 2015 • Develop pathways by Summer 2016 • Develop outreach materials to communicate pathways with students by Fall 2016

Goals and Activities

Goal D.2. Increase the percentage of DSPS students who are on track to complete their studies by 2% over the next three years.

<i>Activity</i>		<i>Outcome</i>	<i>Persons/Group Responsible</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
D.2.1	Complete research to identify the needs and barriers of DSPS students attempting to complete their studies, including their English basic skills course sequences.	Research completed. Needs and barriers described. Strategies identified to address needs and barriers.	Dean of Counseling, Director DRC/DSPS, Director of Institutional Research and Planning, Basic Skills Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research completed by Spring 2016
D.2.2	Implement strategies to support DSPS students complete their studies, including the English basic skills course sequences, at the college.	By the end of the plan's term, the number of DSPS students on track to complete their English basic skills coursework and their studies will increase by 2%.	Dean of Counseling, Director DRC/DSPS, DRC/DSPS, Basic Skills Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategies implemented by Spring 2017

Goals and Activities

E. 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”

See Section D. Degrees and Certificates for the College’s goals around completion, including transfer.

Budget

SOURCES OF FUNDING

Sources of Funding

The sources of funding that will be utilized to support the proposed goals and activities will include both internal and external funding sources.

Funding sources will include: general fund, EOPS, DSPS, TRIO, CARE, Title V - HSI, Student Success and Support Program (both credit and non-credit), Grant Funded Student Programs, Financial Aid and Scholarship, and College Strategic Planning funds.

Evaluation Schedule and Process

Evaluation Schedule and Process

During each spring term, the Student Equity Committee will complete an evaluation of progress on the Plan's goals and activities. The Office of Institutional Research and Planning will collect baseline and performance data to track and monitor progress on activity outcomes and the Plan's stated goals. This information will be provided to teams leading the work on the plans and strategies and the Student Equity Committee. Teams leading each activity will provide a progress report describing their efforts to the Committee. In addition to a review of the baseline and performance data, progress reports will address work completed on an activity, resources allocated and expended, and an evaluation of the activity's status.

The Student Equity Committee will discuss the reports and make appropriate recommendations where needed to ensure that adequate progress is made on the plan. The report with recommendations will be presented to the campus community and integrated into the college's overall planning process which includes the preparation and implementation of a strategic plan and program reviews.

The Strategic Planning Council and the College's Board of Trustees annually reviews and discusses the institutional effectiveness of the College. The review includes a report on access, student progress, and completion metrics. In addition to providing data to monitor progress on the Student Equity Plan, the Office of Institutional Research and Planning will incorporate into the College's annual review of institutional effectiveness an ongoing equity report that assesses the disproportionate impact across the subpopulations addressed in this plan.

Attachments

**Palomar College
Student Equity Task Force
Spring 2014**

Membership List

Chairs:

Greg Larson, Faculty Senate President
Berta Cuaron, Vice President for Instruction
Adrian Gonzales, Vice President for Student Services

Members:

Sandra Andre, Faculty, Design & Consumer Education
Cynthia Anfinson, Faculty, Mathematics
Rosie Antoneccia, Faculty, Counseling
Michelle Barton, Senior Director, Institutional Research and Planning
Melinda Carrillo, Faculty, Reading
Shayla Fox, Specialist, Counseling Center
Anel Gonzalez, Specialist, Teaching and Learning Center
Mireya Gutierrez-Aguero, Supervisor, Title V-HSI (STEM)
Nimoli Madan, Faculty, English as a Second Language
Martha Martinez, Faculty, Mathematics
Wendy Nelson, Faculty, Communications
Patrick O'Brien, Faculty, Counseling
James Odom, Manager, ETV & KKSM Radio Operations
Wilma Owens, Dean, Career, Technical & Extended Education
Kathleen Sheahan, Faculty, World Languages
Gary Sosa, Faculty, English as a Second Language
Brian Stockert, Dean, Counseling Services
Diane Studinka, Faculty, Child Development
Rocco Versaci, Faculty, English
Lorie Waite, Faculty, DRC/DSPS