PALO VERDE COLLEGE

STUDENT EQUITY PLAN

DECEMBER 9, 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

E. Transfer, By Gender, Age, Ethnicity, CalWORKS, and DSPS

1. Data Tables
2. Proportionality Index Tables
3. 80 Percent Index Tables
4. Analysis of Data Tables

F. Foster Youth, by Gender, Age, and Ethnicity

1. Data Tables
2. Proportionality Index Tables
3. 80 Percent Index Tables
4. Analysis of Data Tables

G. Veterans, by Gender, Age, and Ethnicity

1. Data Tables
2. Proportionality Index Tables
3. 80 Percent Index Tables
4. Analysis of Data Tables

PVC Student Equity Plan Budget, 2014-15

Evaluation Schedule and Process

Attachments

A. PVC Board Policy/Administrative Procedure 5300 Student Equity

B. PVC Student Success Plan 2014

C. PVC Integrated Strategic Plan 2013-2016

D. U.S. Census Bureau, American Fact Finder, DP-1, Profile of General Population and Housing Characteristics: 2010, Blythe, California

E. U.S. Census Bureau, American Fact Finder, DP-1, Profile of General Population and Housing Characteristics: 2010, Needles, California

F. Data Sources and Analysis

PALO VERDE COLLEGE

STUDENT EQUITY PLAN

December 9, 2014

SIGNATURE PAGE

Approved by the Palo Verde College Board of Trustees: December 9, 2014

College President: Donald G. Wallace, Ph.D.

Donald G. Wallace

Vice President Instruction and Student Services: Sean C. Hancock, Ed.D.

Sean C Hancock

Academic Senate President: Biju Raman

Biju Raman

Student Equity Coordinator/Contact Person: Brian Thiebaux

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Palo Verde College Student Equity Plan was prepared in response to SB 1456, the Student Success Act of 2012 and to SB 860, and is hereby presented to the PVC Board of Trustees for review and acceptance and for authorization to submit the Plan to the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (CCCCO). The Student Equity Plan is consistent with long-standing Board of Trustees' policies, including BP/AP 5300, supportive of student equity practices and principles.

The Plan was prepared by the Student Success and Support Program/Student Equity (SSSP/Student Equity) Committee, consisting of counselors, teaching faculty, support staff, administrators and the college's institutional researcher, and is chaired by Dr. Sean Hancock, Vice President of Instruction and Student Services. The SSSP/Student Equity Committee also prepared the Student Success and Support Plan accepted by the Board of Trustees and subsequently submitted to the CCCCO October 17, 2014.

The two plans, the present Student Equity Plan and the Student Success and Support Program Plan, are designed to increase the opportunities for student success and are, in fact, coordinated in terms of their purpose and goals. While the Student Success and Support Program Plan addresses changes and improvements to core student support services, the Student Equity Plan is meant to address and mitigate identified instances of disproportionate impact and to ensure equal opportunities of access and success at PVC.

Disproportionate impact is "a condition where access to key resources and supports or academic success may be hampered by inequitable practices, policies, and approaches to student support or instructional practices affecting a specific group..." (Title 5, Section 55502.e)

In accordance with CCCCO guidelines, the PVC Equity Plan provides an extensive analysis of each of the following indicators, defined specifically in the "Campus-Based Research" section of the Plan, to identify disproportionate impact:

A. Access
B. Course Completion
C. ESL and Basic Skills
D. Persistence, Completion of 30-Units, Student Progress and Achievement Report (SPAR)
E. Transfer
F. Foster Youth, Successful Completion
G. Veterans, Successful Completion

Also, in accordance with CCCCO guidelines, each of these indicators is evaluated in terms of students' gender, age, ethnicity, disability, and economic disadvantage, and is presented in a series of tables using two methods of analysis: Proportionality Index and 80-Percent Index.

The findings identify various areas of disproportionate impact. These specific cases are discussed fully in the "Campus-Based Research" and the "Recapitulation of Findings Resulting from Campus-Based Research" sections of the Plan.

Here are two examples of disproportionate impact described in the Plan, and strategies to mitigate it:

1. Table B-4 measures course completion by student age subgroups, and indicates that students in the subgroups "18 to 19" and "20 to 24" are experiencing disproportionate impact in course completion, compared to other age subgroups. Table B-4 also shows that the most successful age subgroup in course completion is "40 to 49".

2. Table C-33 measures the proportion of students, by gender, successfully completing a degree-applicable course in English after having completed a basic skills course in English. The results show disproportionate impact among Males compared to Females. Compare this finding with the opposite results, presented in Table C-18, showing that Females experience disproportionate impact in completing a degree applicable course in math.

The mitigation of these two instances of disproportionate impact is found in the "Annual Goals and Activities to Address Areas of Disproportionate Impact" and consists of: acquisition of learning materials for students; implementation of digital education plans; increase in tutoring services; and the provision of professional development for faculty and staff.

PVC's strategies to mitigate disproportionate impact are delineated in the "Annual Goals and Activities to Address Areas of Disproportionate Impact" section of the Plan, and are presented here in summary:

1. Access and acquisition of learning materials, such as textbooks and learning technologies, with emphasis on incarcerated students

2. Research and ongoing and evaluation of results

3. Full implementation of the digital education plan

4. Increased tutoring, including embedded tutors, especially for basic skills students

5. Professional development for faculty and staff, addressing disproportionate impact

6. Planning and evaluating the need for additional counseling and support

7. Planning and development of career and transfer services

The Plan spans three academic years, starting with the current year, 2014-2015.

The estimated funding coming to PVC for implementation of the Student Equity Plan is $200,000, with no required local match.

ANNUAL GOALS AND ACTIVITIES TO ADDRESS AREAS OF DISPROPORTIONATE IMPACT

*Denotes goals and activities that are integrated with Palo Verde College's 2014 Student Success and Support Program (SSSP) plan.

Year 1 Goals, 2014-2015

A. Access, 2014-2015

1. *Continue outreach and recruitment strategies to attract new students to PVC to expand the diversity of the college with special emphasis on populations experiencing disproportionate impact, including the following student cohort groups:

   - Male students (Table A-3)
   - Students age 25 and older (Table A-6)
   - Students of all ethnicities (Table A-9)

2. Continue efforts to identify and address unique access needs, such as access to learning materials, textbooks and learning technologies among all student populations including but not limited to, incarcerated students and economically disadvantages students, Tables A-9, B-1 through B-12, D-13 through D-15 and D-28 through D-30.

B. Course Completion, 2014-2015

1. *Convert fully to a digital, self-service education plan module for abbreviated and comprehensive education plans to increase the potential for course and program completion. This goal applies to all students in accordance with guidelines expressed in PVC's SSSP Plan, and with special emphasis on students experiencing disproportionate impact, namely:

   - Students age 18-19 and 20-24, Tables B-1 through B-4
   - Students of African-American and Hispanic ethnicity, Tables B-5 through B-8
   - Female students, Tables B-9 through B-12

2. As stated in Section A, Access, above, continue to identify and address unique needs, such as learning materials, textbooks and learning technologies among all student populations, in order to increase the potential for course completion.

C. ESL and Basic Skills, 2014-2015

1. The goals expressed in Section B, Course Completion, above, apply as well to the present Section C, ESL and Basic Skills, since both areas reflect similar student needs, namely, completion of basic skills courses and eventual completion of degree-applicable courses.

2. Evaluate the feasibility of increasing tutoring services, including embedded tutoring, principally for ESL and basic skills students. The purpose of the tutoring would be to increase the chances students will complete basic skills courses and eventually complete degree-applicable courses. Based on findings of the Student Equity Plan, special efforts should be made to address the tutoring needs of:

    - Female students enrolled in basic skills math, Tables C-16 through C-18
    - Students of all ethnicities enrolled in basic skills math, Tables C-19 through C-21
    - Students age 20 or less and 50 or more enrolled in basic skills math, Tables C-22 through C-24
    - All DSPS students enrolled in basic skills math, Tables C-25 through C-27
    - Male students enrolled in basic skills English, Tables C-31 through C-33
    - Students of all ethnicities enrolled in basic skills English, Tables C-34 through C-36
    - Students age 21-24 and 25-49 enrolled in basic skills English, Tables C-37 through C-39

3. Evaluate needs among PVC faculty and staff for professional development and inservice training in addressing disproportionate impact on ESL and basic skills students, evidenced in Tables B-1 through B-12 and C-1 through C-39.

D. Persistence, 30-Units, SPAR, 2014-2015

1. *Evaluate the need for additional counseling and advising support services, especially for at-risk students and students experiencing disproportionate impact in successful course and program completion, Tables D-3, D-6, D-9, and D-15.

2. Research the causes of disproportionate impact in persistence, the attainment of 30 units (SPAR), Table D-21.

3. *Convert fully to a digital, self-service education plan module for abbreviated and comprehensive education plans to increase the potential for course and program completion, Table D-36. This goal also applies to B. Course Completion, above.

4. As stated in Section A, Access, and B, Course Completion, above, continue to identify and address unique needs, such as learning materials, textbooks and learning technologies among all student populations, in order to increase the potential for course completion.

5. Evaluate needs for professional development and inservice training in addressing disproportionate impact in achieving persistence, 30-units, and SPAR, Tables D-3, D-6, D-9, D-15, D-18, D-21, D-30, D-36, D-39, and D-42.

E. Transfer, 2014-2015

*Examine disproportionate impact in career planning and transfer and formulate plans to address it, including conducting further research, identification of faculty or staff to develop and maintain the transfer program, acquisition of materials to support transfer, sponsorship of field trips to four-year colleges, and sponsorship of programs and speakers to promote transfer, Tables E-4, E-7, E-10, E-16, with emphasis on targeting students of all ethnicities experiencing disproportionate impact, and DSPS students.

F. Foster Youth, 2014-2015

1. Research causes of disproportionate impact indicators among Foster Youth with emphasis on the age 20-24 group, African-Americans and Males as evidenced in Tables F-3, F-6 and F-9.

2. Incorporate goals of Section B, Course Completion and Section D Persistence, 30-units and SPAR, in addressing disproportionate impact among Foster Youth.

G. Veterans, 2014-2015

1. Research causes of disproportionate impact indicators among Veterans with emphasis on the 20-24 and 25-29 age groups and African-American students, Tables G-3 and G-6.

2. Incorporate goals of Section B, Course Completion and Section D Persistence, 30-units, and SPAR in addressing disproportionate impact among Veterans.

Year 2 Goals, 2015-2016

A. Access, 2015-2016

1. *Continue outreach and recruitment strategies identified in the 2014-2015 program year to attract new students to PVC to expand the diversity of the college with special emphasis on populations experiencing disproportionate impact.

2. Continue efforts initiated in the 2014-2015 program year to identify and address unique access needs, such as access to learning materials, textbooks and learning technologies among all student populations including but not limited to, incarcerated students and economically disadvantages students.

3. Develop and implement research plans to evaluate the effectiveness of the efforts outlined in this section and make adjustments to these efforts where needed.

B. Course Completion, 2015-2016

*Based on the previous year's findings, implement additional counseling and advising support services, especially for at-risk students and students experiencing disproportionate impact in successful course completion. This applies also to D. Persistence, 30-units, and SPAR, below.

C. ESL and Basic Skills, 2015-2016

1. Based on previous year's findings, implement program of increased tutoring services, principally for basic skills students.

2. *Explore feasibility of a preparatory course to assist students in readying for the assessment test.

3. *Basis Skills Initiative Committee to assist in evaluating early alert systems and recommending improvements.

4. Implement professional development and inservice training to faculty and counseling services personnel to assist them in understanding the unique needs of ESL and basic skills students.

D. Persistence, 30-Units, SPAR, 2015-2016

1. *Implement additional counseling and advising support services, especially for at-risk students and students experiencing disproportionate impact in successful course and program completion.

2. Implement the plan of research, developed in the previous year, to identify the causes of disproportionate impact in persistence, the attainment of 30 units, and SPAR.

3. *Evaluate the effectiveness of the digital, self-service education plan module for abbreviated and comprehensive education plans to increase the potential for course and program completion

4. Provide professional development and inservice training to faculty and counseling services personnel to assist them in understanding how to help resolve disproportionate impact in persistence, the attainment of 30 units, and SPAR.

5. Conduct ongoing evaluation of services provided to determine the effectiveness of efforts to reduce or eliminate disproportionate impact.

E. Transfer, 2015-2016

Evaluate plans from preceding year and begin implementation career planning and transfer services.

F. Foster Youth, 2015-2016

Examine research evaluating the causes of disproportionate impact, and develop plans to address them.

G. Veterans, 2015-2016

Present results research evaluating the causes of disproportionate impact, and develop plans to address them.

Year 3 Goals, 2016-2017

A. Access, 2016-2017

1. *Continue ongoing outreach and recruitment strategies identified in the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 program years to attract new students to PVC to expand the diversity of the college with special emphasis on populations experiencing disproportionate impact.

2. Continue efforts initiated in the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 program years to identify and address unique access needs, such as access to learning materials, textbooks and learning technologies among all student populations including but not limited to, incarcerated students and economically disadvantages students.

3. Conduct ongoing evaluation of the effectiveness of the efforts outlined in this section and make adjustments to these efforts where needed.

B. Course Completion, 2016-2017

*Continue implementation of additional counseling and advising support services, especially for at-risk students and students experiencing disproportionate impact in successful course completion. This applies also to D. Persistence, 30-units, and SPAR, below.

C. ESL and Basic Skills, 2016-2017

1. Continue increased tutoring services, principally for basic skills students.

2. *Depending on findings of the previous program year, implement preparatory course to assist students in readying for the assessment test.

3. Examine Basis Skills Initiative Committee's recommendations regarding early alert systems.

4. Continue professional development and inservice training to faculty and counseling services personnel to assist them in understanding the unique needs of ESL and basic skills students.

D. Persistence, 30-Units, SPAR, 2016-2017

1. *Continue additional counseling and advising support services, especially for at-risk students and students experiencing disproportionate impact in successful course and program completion.

2. Review research findings evaluating the causes of disproportionate impact in persistence, the attainment of 30 units, and SPAR.

3. *Act on recommendations to improve the effectiveness of the digital, self-service education plan module for abbreviated and comprehensive education plans to increase the potential for course and program completion.

4. Continue to provide professional development and inservice training to faculty and counseling services personnel to assist them in understanding how to help resolve disproportionate impact in persistence, the attainment of 30 units, and SPAR.

5. Conduct ongoing evaluation of services provided to determine the effectiveness of efforts to reduce or eliminate disproportionate impact.

E. Transfer, 2016-2017

Evaluate effectiveness of career planning and transfer services.

F. Foster Youth, 2016-2017

Implement plan to address disproportionate impact on Foster Youth.

G. Veterans, 2016-2017

Implement plans to address disproportionate impact on Veterans.

RECAPITULATION OF FINDINGS RESULTING FROM CAMPUS-BASED RESEARCH

A. Access, Measured by Gender, Age and Ethnicity

Analysis of Tables A-1 through A-9, Access By Gender, Age and Ethnicity:

The comparatively larger population of Male students compared to Female (Tables A-1, A-2 and A-3) reflects the presence of two large correctional facilities near the Blythe campus, consisting entirely of a male inmate population. The population of inmates near the Blythe campus is included in the census count; inmates enrolled in Palo Verde College's classes are included in the student population as well.

Interestingly, there is indication of disproportionate impact among Male students (Table A-3), since the proportion of Female students at PVC compared to the Female population in the area (14%) is higher than the proportion of Male students at PVC compared to the Male population in the area (9%). The difference is enough to place Male students on the disproportionate impact list.

As for age, there is evidence of disproportionate impact on students in all age categories from 25 years and up, Table A-6. Not surprisingly, disproportionate impact increases with each age category further away from the traditional college age categories.

The ethnicity measures are problematic since the census data available did not provide an age breakout for each ethnic group, Tables A-7 through A-9. The result is that the college population data, which would include students as young as 15, is compared to a general area population of all ages, including students younger than college age.

B. Course Completion, Measured by Age, Ethnicity and Gender

Analysis of Tables B-1 through B-4, Course Completion By Age:

Concern was expressed about using the Unknown subgroup as a reference group (Table B-3), and considering the small size of this subgroup the Student Equity Committee decided to use the next highest achieving subgroup, 40-49, as represented in Table B-4.

The 80 percent index finding corroborates the proportionality index finding in that the subgroups 18 to 19 and 20 to 24 are experiencing disproportionate impact in course completion.

Analysis of Tables B-5 through B-8, Course Completion By Ethnicity:

Concern was expressed about using the Unknown subgroup as a reference group (Table B-7), and instead the Student Equity Committee decided to use the next highest achieving subgroup, Asian as the reference group (Table B-8).

Disproportionate impact is evident among the African-American and Hispanic subgroups in both Tables B-7 and B-8.

Analysis of Tables B-9 through B-12, Course Completion By Gender:

Concern was expressed about using Unknown as the reference group (Table B-11) and decided to analyze this completion measure using Male as the reference subgroup (Table B-12).

The two analyses tend to suggest the Female subgroup is experiencing some degree of disproportionate impact. The disproportionate impact on Females in the course completion results may be attributed to the significant population of students enrolled in fire science (FST) courses, which are credit, inservice courses taught through instructional services agreements. The courses consist almost entirely of Male students, and nearly all enrollees pass with high grades. The large population of Male students in FST courses receiving high grades likely has an adverse impact on the rate of course completion seen among Females.

C. Completion of a Degree-Applicable Course After Completing an ESL, Basic Skills Math or Basic Skills English Course, Tables C-1 through C-45, Measured by Gender, Ethnicity, Age, DSPS, and Economic Disadvantage

Analysis of Tables C-1 through C-9, ESL, Completion of a Degree-Applicable Course, By Gender, Race and Age:

The 2007-2008 ESL cohort produced only three students who successfully completed ENG 101 (the lowest degree-applicable course in English), within six years. From 2007-2008 to 2013-2014, only 7 students completed ENG 101 after having completed a course, credit or noncredit, in English as a Second Language. The completion numbers are too small to permit a meaningful analysis, at least as far as disproportionate impact is concerned.

The College places great importance in ESL and other basic skills programs and is committed to further research in these areas to gain better understanding of students' motivations for taking ESL courses and to identify ways to enhance academic advancement among this population.

The following analyses in ESL are not available at this time:

Table C-10, ESL, Degree Applicable Course, By DSPS
Table C-11, ESL, Degree Applicable Course, By DSPS, Proportionality Index
Table C-12, ESL, Degree Applicable Course, By DSPS, 80 Percent Index
Table C-13, ESL, Degree Applicable, Course, By Economic Disadvantage
Table C-14, ESL, Degree Applicable Course, By Economic Disadvantage, Proportionality Index
Table C-15, ESL, Degree Applicable Course, By Economic Disadvantage, 80 Percent Index

Analysis of Tables C-16 through C-18, Basic Skills Math, Completion of a Degree-Applicable Course, By Gender:

The 80 percent index (Table C-18) indicates that the Female subgroup is experiencing disproportionate impact. This was noted earlier in Tables B-11 and B-12.

Analysis of Tables C-19 through C-21, Basic Skills Math, Completion of a Degree-Applicable Course, By Ethnicity:

There was concern about using Filipino as a reference subgroup considering the comparatively small size of the group. The Student Equity Committee performed further analyses with other subgroups and found little change in the disproportionate impact on other groups. Therefore, the committee decided to use Filipino as a reference subgroup, with the finding that all other subgroups are experiencing disproportionate impact.

Table C-21 clearly indicates that all ethnic subgroups are experiencing is disproportionate impact in terms of completing a degree applicable course at some point after completing a basic skills math course.

Analysis of Tables C-22 through C-24, Basic Skills Math, Degree App Course, By Age:

There is evidence of disproportionate impact in the 20 or less and 50 or more subgroups (Table C-23 and C-24). These findings are corroborated by comparatively low completion rates in these subgroups.

Analysis of Tables C-25 through C-27, Basic Skills Math, Degree Applicable Course, by DSPS:

The Committee found considerable disproportionate impact among DSPS students, evidenced in the proportionality index and 80 percent index, Tables C-26 and C-27.

Analysis of Tables C-28 through C-30, Basic Skills Math, Applicable Course, By Economic Disadvantage:

The Committee found no evidence of disproportionate impact in the economically disadvantaged group.

Analysis of Tables C-31 through C-33, Basic Skills English, Degree App Course, By Gender:

There is evidence of disproportionate impact in the Males in terms of eventually taking a degree-applicable course in English. Compare this finding with the opposite results, presented in Table C-18, showing that Females experience disproportionate impact in completing a degree applicable course in math.

Analysis of Tables C-34 through C-36, Basic Skills English, Degree Applicable Course, By Race:

The Committee found disproportionate impact among all other subgroups other than Filipino, which is the reference subgroup. This finding is comparable to the findings in the basic skills math analysis (Table C-21).

Analysis of Tables C-37 through C-39, Basic Skills English, Degree Applicable Course, By Age:

The Committee found evidence of disproportionate impact among the 21-24 and 25-49 age subgroups. This finding is just about the opposite of the corresponding analysis of basic skills math (Table 24).

Analysis of Tables C-40 through C-42, Basic Skills English, Degree Applicable Course, By DSPS:

The Committee found no evidence of disproportionate impact in this analysis.

Analysis of Tables C-43 through C-45, Basic Skills English, Degree Applicable Course, By Economic Disadvantage:

The Committee found no evidence of disproportionate impact in this analysis.

D. Persistence, 30-Units, Completion (SPAR), Measured by Gender, Race, Age, DSPS and Economic Disadvantage, Tables D-1 through D-45

Analysis of Tables D-1 through D-3, Persistence by Gender:

There is some evidence of disproportionate impact among Females in the Persistence measure.

Analysis of Tables D-3 through D-6, Persistence, By Race:

There is some evidence in the White subgroup in the Persistence measure.

Analysis of Tables D-7 through D-9, Persistence, By Age:

There is some evidence of disproportionate impact among the 20 or less subgroup in the Persistence measure.

Analysis of Tables D-10 through D-12, Persistence, By DSPS:

There is no evidence of disproportionate impact in this analysis.

Analysis of Tables D-13 through D-15, Persistence, By Economic Disadvantage:

Economically disadvantaged students seem to be experiencing disproportionate impact in terms of persistence when compared with non-economically disadvantaged students.

Analysis of Tables D-16 through D-18, Attainment of 30 Units By Gender:

There is no evidence of disproportionate impact in the Gender measure among students in attaining 30 units.

Analysis of Tables D-19 through D-21, 30 Units By Race:

There is evidence of disproportionate impact in the Hispanic and White subgroups in terms of attaining 30 units.

Analysis of Tables D-22 through D-24, 30 Units By Age:

There is no evidence of disproportionate impact in attaining 30 units in the Age measure.

Analysis of Tables D-25 through D-27, 30 Units By DSPS:

There is no evidence of disproportionate impact among DSPS students in attaining 30 units.

Analysis of Tables D-28 through D-30, 30 Units By Economic Disadvantage:

Some evidence of disproportionate impact among non-economically disadvantaged students is noted in attaining 30 units.

Analysis of Tables D-31 through D-33, SPAR, By Gender:

There is no indication of disproportionate impact is evident in students by Gender in achieving the SPAR outcome.

Analysis of Tables D-34 through D-36, SPAR, By Race:

Disproportionate impact is evident in all ethnic categories in terms of attaining the SPAR outcome.

Analysis of Tables D-37 through D-39, SPAR, By Age:

Evidence of disproportionate impact is noted in the age group 21-24 in attaining the SPAR outcome.

Analysis of Tables D-40 through D-42, SPAR, By DSPS:

Evidence of disproportionate impact is noted in DSPS students in terms of achieving the SPAR outcome.

Analysis of Tables D-43 through D-45, SPAR, By Economic Disadvantage:

No evidence of disproportionate impact is evident among disadvantaged students in terms of achieving the SPAR outcome.

E. Transfer, Measured by Age, Gender, Ethnicity, CalWORKS, and DSPS

Analysis of Tables E-1 through E-4, Transfer by Age:

The area of disproportionate impact for Transfer by Age was found in the 18-19, 25-29, 30-34, 35-39, and 40-49 age groups. The Committee decided to use the 1-17 group as the reference group, since the 50+ subgroup had only one student.

Analysis of Tables E-5 through E-7, Transfer by Gender:

Some evidence of disproportionate impact in Transfer was noted among the Male subgroup.

Analysis of Tables E-8 through E-10, Transfer by Ethnicity:

Considerable evidence of disproportionate impact in Transfer is noted in all ethnic groups except for Asian, the reference group.

Analysis of Tables E-11 through E-13, Transfer, By CalWORKS:

No evidence of disproportionate impact was noted in the Transfer, By CalWORKS group.

Analysis of Tables E-14 through E-16, Transfer, By DSPS:

Significant disproportionate impact in Transfer was noted in DSPS students.

F. Foster Youth, Attainment of 2.0 GPA, Measured by Age, Ethnicity and Race

Analysis of Tables F-1 through F-9, Foster Youth, Successful Completion of GPA of 2.0 or higher, By Age, Ethnicity, and Race:

With a total cohort of only 14 foster youth to begin with, and a successful completion cohort of half that number, it is difficult to draw meaningful conclusions about disproportionate impact. Nonetheless, it appears that in the age subgroup, the 20-24 group did not fare as well as the 25-29 group. In ethnicity, the Black/African American subgroup experienced disproportionate impact. And in the gender subgroup, Males experienced some disproportionate impact, compared with Females as the reference group.

G. Veterans, Attainment of 2.0 GPA, Measured by Age, Ethnicity and Race

Analysis of Tables G-1 through G-9, Veterans, Successful Completion of GPA of 2.0 or higher, By Age Ethnicity, and Gender:

Areas of disproportionate impact were found in Age and Ethnicity. As for Age, disproportionate impact was noted in the 20-24 and 25-29 groups, using the 35-39 group as the reference. For ethnicity the Committee decided to us the Hispanic subgroup as the reference, because Hawaiian/Pacific Islander was too small, with only one student. The resulting analysis showed disproportionate impact among the Black or African American subgroup and the Unknown subgroup.

CAMPUS-BASED RESEARCH

A. ACCESS

CCCCO Definition of Access: The percentage of each population group that is enrolled compared to that group's representation in the adult population within the community served. This percentage is frequently calculated as a participation rate.

Source of Blythe and Needles population characteristics: U.S. Census Bureau, American Fact Finder, DP-1, Profile of General Population and Housing Characteristics: 2010

Source of Palo Verde College student data: PVC Datatel, Fall 2010, unduplicated count. For comparability with census information for Blythe and Needles, the PVC student enrollment data excludes: students enrolled in prison locations outside the district and students enrolled in FST inservice courses located outside the district.

Gender: Census data was adjusted to reflect persons 15 and over for Male and Female in order to match the PVC Datatel age group.

Age: In order to correspond to 2010 census data, PVC Datatel data was selected as follows:

15-19 = students born 1991-1995
20-24 = students born 1990-1986
25-29 = students born 1985-1981
30-34 = students born 1980-1976
35-39 = students born 1975-1971
40-49 = students born 1970-1961
50 and over = students born 1960 or earlier

Ethnicity: Census data does not break out ethnicity in terms of age groups, so the ethnicity population represented in this report consists of all age groups (including below college age). Therefore, the resulting comparisons of ethnicity represented in the Blythe and Needles areas with comparable college ethnic populations may not be completely reliable.

Palo Verde College also has a comparatively small number of students enrolled in correspondence and online courses, and who may reside outside the district boundaries. The population characteristics of such students may not be reflected in the Blythe and Needles population characteristics.

Areas highlighted in yellow show potential areas of disproportionate impact.

Table A-1, Area Population Compared to College Population, By Gender

GENDER	Area Population	Area Population Percentage	PVC Population	PVC Population Percentage
Male	14,311	0.676	1,311	0.582
Female	6,871	0.324	937	0.416
Unknown	0	0.000	6	0.003
Total	21,182	1.000	2,254	1.000

Table A-2
Area Population Compared to PVC Population, By Gender, Proportionality Index

GENDER	Area Population Percentage	PVC Population Percentage	Proportionality Index
Male	0.680	0.582	0.855
Female	0.320	0.416	1.301
Unknown	0.000	0.003	

Table A-3
Area Population Compared to PVC Population, By Gender, 80 Percent Index

GENDER	Area Population	PVC Population	Area Compared to PVC	80-Percent Index
Male	**14,155**	**1,311**	**0.093**	**0.657**
Female	**6,649**	**937**	**0.141**	**1.000**
Unknown	0	6		

Table A-4, Area Population Compared to College Population, By Age

AGE	Area Population	Area Population Percentage	PVC Population	PVC Population Percentage
15-19	1,454	0.069	339	0.150
20-24	1,618	0.077	372	0.165
25-29	1,926	0.091	301	0.134
30-34	2,029	0.096	278	0.123
35-39	2,131	0.101	202	0.090
40-49	4,631	0.219	408	0.181
50 + over	7,333	0.347	354	0.157
Unknown	0	0.000	0	0.000
TOT	21,122	1.000	2,254	1.000

Table A-5
Area Population Compared to PVC Population, By Age, Proportionality Index

AGE	Area Population Percentage	PVC Population Percentage	Proportionality Index
15-19	0.069	0.150	2.185
20-24	0.077	0.165	2.154
25-29	0.091	0.134	1.465
30-34	0.096	0.123	1.284
35-39	0.101	0.090	0.888
40-49	0.219	0.181	0.826
50 + over	0.347	0.157	0.452
Unknown	0.000	0.000	

Table A-6
Area Population Compared to PVC, By Age, 80 Percent Index

AGE	Area Population	PVC Population	Area Compared to PVC	80-Percent Index
15-19	**1,454**	**339**	**0.233**	**1.000**
20-24	1,618	372	0.230	0.986
25-29	1,926	301	0.156	0.670
30-34	2,029	278	0.137	0.588
35-39	2,131	202	0.095	0.407
40-49	4,631	408	0.088	0.378
50 + over	7,333	354	0.048	0.207
Unknown	0	0		

Table A-7
Area Population Compared to PVC Population, By Ethnicity

ETHNICITY	Area Population	Area Population Percentage	PVC Population	PVC Population Percentage
Afric-Am	3,110	0.121	197	0.087
Amer Ind	443	0.017	19	0.008
Asian	325	0.013	21	0.009
Filipino	0	0.000	11	0.005
Hispanic	12,151	0.474	577	0.256
Multi-Eth	373	0.015	0	0.000
Pacific Is	31	0.001	10	0.004
Unknown	165	0.006	981	0.435
White	9,063	0.353	438	0.194
TOT	25,661	1.000	2,254	1.000

Table A-8
Area Population Compared to PVC Population, By Ethnicity, Proportionality Index

ETHNICITY	Area Population Percentage	PVC Population Percentage	Proportionality Index
Afric-Am	0.121	0.087	0.721
Amer Ind	0.017	0.008	0.488
Asian	0.013	0.009	0.736
Filipino	0.000	0.005	
Hispanic	0.474	0.256	0.541
Multi-Eth	0.015	0.000	0.000
Pacific Is	0.001	0.004	3.672
Unknown	0.006	0.435	67.687
White	0.353	0.194	0.550

Table A-9
Area Population Compared to PVC Population, By Ethnicity, 80 Percent Index

ETHNICITY	Area Population	PVC Population	Area Compared to PVC	80-Percent Index
Afric-Am	3,110	197	0.063	0.196
Amer Ind	443	19	0.043	0.133
Asian	325	21	0.065	0.200
Filipino	0	11		0.000
Hispanic	12,151	577	0.047	0.147
Multi-Eth	373	0	0.000	0.000
Pacific Is	**31**	**10**	**0.323**	**1.000**
Unknown	165	981	5.945	18.431
White	9,063	438	0.048	0.150

Analysis of Access Results:

The comparatively larger population of Male students compared to Female (Tables A-1, A-2 and A-3) reflects the presence of two large correctional facilities near the Blythe campus, consisting entirely of a male inmate population. The population of inmates near the Blythe campus is included in the census count; inmates enrolled in Palo Verde College's classes are included in the student population as well.

Interestingly, there is indication of disproportionate impact among Male students (Table A-3), since the proportion of Female students at PVC compared to the Female population in the area (14%) is higher than the proportion of Male students at PVC compared to the Male population in the area (9%). The difference is enough to place Male students on the disproportionate impact list.

As for age, there is evidence of disproportionate impact on students in all age categories from 25 years and up, Table A-6. Not surprisingly, disproportionate impact increases with each age category further away from the traditional college age categories.

The ethnicity measures are problematic since the census data available did not provide an age breakout for each ethnic group, Tables A-7 through A-9. The result is that the college population data, which would include students as young as 15, is compared to a general area population of all ages, including students younger than college age.

B. COURSE COMPLETION

CCCCO Definition of Course Completion: The ratio of the number of credit courses that students, by population group, complete, compared to the number of courses in which students in that group are enrolled on the census day of the term.

Success Count is number of course completions with a grade of A, B, C, or P. The Success Percentage is number of students receiving a grade of A, B, C, P divided by number of students receiving a grade of A, B, C, D, F, P, W.

The source of completion data is CCCCO Data Mart, for Fall Semester 2013.

Areas highlighted in yellow show potential areas of disproportionate impact.

Table B-1, Course Completion by Age

AGE	Enrollment by Age	Enrollment Percentage	Success Count	Success Percentage
1 to 17	212	0.035	175	0.039
18 to 19	756	0.126	447	0.100
20 to 24	1,023	0.170	593	0.132
25 to 29	683	0.114	484	0.108
30 to 34	754	0.125	600	0.134
35 to 39	637	0.106	505	0.113
40 to 49	1,208	0.201	1,050	0.234
50 +	712	0.118	602	0.134
Unknown	27	0.004	26	0.006
Total	6,012	1.000	4,482	1.000

Table B-2, Course Completion by Age, Proportionality Index

AGE	Enrollment Percentage	Success Percentage	Proportionality Index
1 to 17	0.035	0.039	1.107
18 & 19	0.126	0.100	0.793
20 to 24	0.170	0.132	0.778
25 to 29	0.114	0.108	0.951
30 to 34	0.125	0.134	1.067
35 to 39	0.106	0.113	1.063
40 to 49	0.201	0.234	1.166
50 +	0.118	0.134	1.134
Unknown	0.004	0.006	1.292

Table B-3, Course Completion by Age, 80 Percent Index, Using "Unknown" As Reference Group

AGE	Enrollment by Age	Success Count	Success Percentage	80-Percent Index
1 to 17	212	175	0.825	0.857
18 to 19	756	447	0.591	0.614
20 to 24	1,023	593	0.580	0.602
25 to 29	683	484	0.709	0.736
30 to 34	754	600	0.796	0.826
35 to 39	637	505	0.793	0.823
40 to 49	1,208	1,050	0.869	0.903
50 +	712	602	0.846	0.878
Unknown	**27**	**26**	**0.963**	**1.000**

Table B-4, Course Completion by Age, 80 Percent Index, Using "40 to 49" as Reference Group

AGE	Enrollment by Age	Success Count	Success Percentage	80-Percent Index
1 to 17	212	175	0.825	0.950
18 to 19	**756**	**447**	**0.591**	**0.680**
20 to 24	**1,023**	**593**	**0.580**	**0.667**
25 to 29	683	484	0.709	0.815
30 to 34	754	600	0.796	0.915
35 to 39	637	505	0.793	0.912
40 to 49	**1,208**	**1,050**	**0.869**	**1.000**
50 +	712	602	0.846	0.973
Unknown	27	26	0.963	1.108

Analysis of Tables B-1 through B-4, Course Completion By Age:

Concern was expressed about using the Unknown subgroup as a reference group (Table B-3), and considering the small size of this subgroup decided to use the next highest achieving subgroup, "40-49," as represented in Table B-4.

The 80 percent index finding corroborates the proportionality index finding in that the subgroups 18 to 19 and 20 to 24 are experiencing disproportionate impact in course completion

Table B-5, Course Completion by Ethnicity

ETHNICITY	Enrollment by Ethnicity	Enrollment Percentage	Success Count	Success Percentage
African-American	678	0.113	431	0.096
Amer Ind/Alaskan	68	0.011	57	0.013
Asian	234	0.039	213	0.048
Hispanic	2354	0.392	1,528	0.341
Multi-Ethnicity	128	0.021	96	0.021
Pacific Islander	28	0.005	23	0.005
Unknown	364	0.061	350	0.078
White Non-Hispanic	2158	0.359	1,784	0.398
Total	6012	1.000	4,482	1.000

Table B-6, Course Completion by Ethnicity, Proportionality Index

ETHNICITY	Enrollment Percentage	Success Percentage	Proportionality Index
African-American	0.113	0.096	0.853
Amer Ind/Alaskan	0.011	0.013	1.124
Asian	0.039	0.048	1.221
Hispanic	0.392	0.341	0.871
Multi-Ethnicity	0.021	0.021	1.006
Pacific Islander	0.005	0.005	1.102
Unknown	0.061	0.078	1.290
White Non-Hispanic	0.359	0.398	1.109

Table B-7, Course Completion by Ethnicity, 80 Percent Index, Using "Unknown" as Reference Group

ETHNICITY	Enrollment by Ethnicity	Success Count	Success Percentage	80-Percent Index
African-American	**678**	**431**	**0.636**	**0.661**
Amer Ind/Alaskan	68	57	0.838	0.872
Asian	234	213	0.910	0.947
Hispanic	**2354**	**1,528**	**0.649**	**0.675**
Multi-Ethnicity	**128**	**96**	**0.750**	**0.780**
Pacific Islander	28	23	0.821	0.854
Unknown	**364**	**350**	**0.962**	**1.000**
White Non-Hispanic	2158	1,784	0.827	0.860

Table B-8, Course Completion by Ethnicity, 80 Percent Index, Using "Asian" as Reference Group

ETHNICITY	Enrollment by Ethnicity	Success Count	Success Percentage	80-Percent Index
African-American	**678**	431	**0.636**	**0.698**
Amer Ind/Alaskan	68	57	0.838	0.921
Asian	**234**	**213**	**0.910**	**1.000**
Hispanic	2354	1,528	**0.649**	**0.713**
Multi-Ethnicity	128	96	0.750	0.824
Pacific Islander	28	23	0.821	0.902
Unknown	364	350	0.962	1.056
White Non-Hispanic	2158	1,784	0.827	0.908

Analysis of Tables B-5 through B-8, Course Completion By Ethnicity:

Concern was expressed about using the Unknown subgroup as a reference group (Table B-7), and instead decided to use the next highest achieving subgroup, Asian as the reference g (Table B-8).

Disproportionate impact is evident among the African-American and Hispanic subgroups in both Tables B-7 and B-8.

Table B-9, Course Completion By Gender

GENDER	Enrollment by Gender	Enrollment Percentage	Success Count	Success Percentage
Female	1,800	0.299	1,141	0.255
Male	4,161	0.692	3,292	0.734
Unknown	51	0.008	49	0.011
Total	6,012	1.000	4,482	1.000

Table B-10, Course Completion By Gender, Proportionality Index

GENDER	Enrollment Percentage	Success Percentage	Proportionality Index
Female	0.299	0.255	0.850
Male	0.692	0.734	1.061
Unknown	0.008	0.011	1.289

Table B-11, Course Completion By Gender: 80 Percent Index, Using "Unknown" as Reference Group

GENDER	Enrollment by Gender	Success Count	Success Percentage	80-Percent Index
Female	1,800	1,141	0.634	0.660
Male	4,161	3,292	0.791	0.823
Unknown	**51**	**49**	**0.961**	**1.000**

Table B-12, Course Completion By Gender: 80 Percent Index, Using "Male" as Reference Group

GENDER	Enrollment by Gender	Success Count	Success Percentage	80-Percent Index
Female	1,800	1,141	0.634	0.801
Male	**4,161**	**3,292**	**0.791**	**1.000**
Unknown	51	49	0.961	1.214

Analysis of Tables B-9 through B-12, Course Completion By Gender:

Concern was expressed about using Unknown as the reference group (Table B-11) and decided to analyze this completion measure using Male as the reference subgroup (Table B-12).

The two analyses tend to suggest the Female subgroup is experiencing some degree of disproportionate impact. The disproportionate impact on Females in the course completion results may be attributed to the significant population of students enrolled in fire science (FST) courses, which are credit, inservice courses taught through instructional services agreements. The courses consist almost entirely of Male students, and nearly all enrollees pass with high

grades. The large population of Male students in FST courses receiving high grades likely has an adverse impact on the rate of course completion seen among Females.

C. ESL and BASIC SKILLS (Math and English) COMPLETION OF A DEGREE-APPLICABLE COURSE

CCCCO Definition of Basic Skill Completion: The ratio of the number of students by population group who completed a degree-applicable course after having first completed the final ESL or basic skills courses compared to the number of those students who complete such a final ESL or basic skills course.

For ESL, the College found the data provided in CCCCO Data on Demand to be insufficient for analysis, so instead, the College used in-house data from Datatel. The cohort year selected was 2007-2008, and the starting cohort consisted of students who successfully completed at least one course in English as a Second Language, including credit and noncredit courses. Noncredit courses selected are: ABE 081, ABE 090, NBE 016, NBE 045, NBE 084, and the following credit courses with the ESL prefix: 054, 055, 056, 057, 058, 059, 060, 061, 083, and 088. The College's data permitted analysis of the cohort only by gender, race and age.

Of the 79 students who successfully completed at least one of the above-mentioned courses in 2007-2008, 3 students successfully completed within six years ENG 101, the lowest degree-applicable course in English. As part of its analysis, the College examined all English as a Second Language cohorts from 2007-2008 through 2013-2014, for evidence of any additional students who successfully completed ENG 101. The findings were that a total of 7 students, including the three identified in the 2007-2008 cohort, completed ENG 101.

Because the completion number is so small, no meaningful conclusions could be drawn, at least as far as disproportionate impact is concerned. Nonetheless, the College places great importance in ESL (and other basic skills) programs and courses, and has incorporated further research in this area as part of its Student Equity Plan goals and activities.

For basic skills math and English, the source of the data is CCCCO Data on Demand. Because of the small size of the data for each cohort year, the College decided to combine all available cohort years (2003-2004 through 2007-2008) in its analysis.

Each of the following tables compares the student population characteristics to the outcome of having completed a degree-applicable course.

Areas highlighted in yellow show potential areas of disproportionate impact.

Table C-1, ESL, Degree App Course, By Gender
Cohort Year 2007-
2008

GENDER	Cohort Count	Cohort Percentage	Completion Count	Completion Percentage
Male	21	0.266	0	0.000
Female	58	0.734	3	1.000
Unknown	0	0.000	0	
Total	79	1.000	3	1.000

Table C-2, ESL, Degree App Course, By Gender, Proportionality Index
Cohort Year 2007-2008

GENDER	Cohort Percentage	Completion Percentage	Proportionality Index
Male	0.266	0.000	0.000
Female	0.734	1.000	1.362
Unknown	0.000	0.000	

Table C-3, ESL, Degree App Course, By Gender, 80 Percent Index
Cohort Year 2007-
2008

GENDER	Cohort Count	Completion Count	Completion Rate	80-Percent
Male	21	0	0.000	0.000
Female	**58**	**3**	**0.052**	**1.000**
Unknown	0	0	0.000	0.000

Table C-4, ESL, Degree App Course, By Race
Cohort Year 2007-
2008

RACE	Cohort Count	Cohort Percentage	Completion Count	Completion Percentage
Asian	1	0.013	0	0.000
AfricanAm	1	0.013	0	0.000
Filipino	0	0.000	0	0.000
Hispanic	69	0.873	3	1.000
AmerInd	0	0.000	0	0.000
Pac Isl	0	0.000	0	0.000
White	2	0.025	0	0.000
Unknown	6	0.076	0	0.000
Total	79	1.000	3	1.000

Table C-5, ESL, Degree App Course, By Race, Proportionality Index
Cohort Year 2007-2008

RACE	Cohort Percentage	Completion Percentage	Proportionality Index
Asian	0.013	0.000	0.000
AfricanAm	0.013	0.000	0.000
Filipino	0.000	0.000	
Hispanic	0.873	1.000	1.145
AmerInd	0.000	0.000	
Pac Isl	0.000	0.000	
White	0.025	0.000	0.000
Unknown	0.076	0.000	0.000

Table C-6, ESL, Degree App Course, By Race, 80 Percent Index
Cohort Year 2007-
2008

RACE	Cohort Count	Completion Count	Completion Rate	80-Percent
Asian	1	0	0.000	0.000
AfricanAm	1	0	0.000	0.000
Filipino	0	0		0.000
Hispanic	**69**	**3**	**0.043**	**1.000**
AmerInd	0	0		0.000
Pac Isl	0	0		0.000
White	2	0	0.000	0.000
Unknown	6	0	0.000	0.000

Table C-7, ESL, Degree App Course, By Age
Cohort Year 2007-
2008

AGE	Cohort Count	Cohort Percentage	Completion Count	Completion Percentage
20 or less	13	0.165	3	1.000
21-24	7	0.089	0	0.000
25-49	39	0.494	0	0.000
50 or more	20	0.253	0	0.000
Unknown	0	0.000	0	0.000
Total	79	1.000	3	1.000

Table C-8, ESL, Degree App Course, By Age, Proportionality Index
Cohort Year 2007-2008

AGE	Cohort Percentage	Completion Percentage	Proportionality Index
20 or less	0.165	1.000	6.077
21-24	0.089	0.000	0.000
25-49	0.494	0.000	0.000
50 or more	0.253	0.000	0.000
Unknown	0.000	0.000	

Table C-9, ESL, Degree App Course, By Age, 80 Percent Index
Cohort Year 2007-2008

AGE	Cohort Count	Completion Count	Completion Rate	80-Percent
20 or less	13	3	0.231	1.000
21-24	7	0	0.000	0.000
25-49	39	0	0.000	0.000
50 or more	20	0	0.000	0.000
Unknown	0	0	0.000	0

Analysis of Tables C-1 through C-9, ESL, Completion of a Degree-Applicable Course, By Gender, Race and Age:

The 2007-2008 ESL cohort produced only three students who successfully completed ENG 101 (the lowest degree-applicable course in English), within six years. From 2007-2008 to 2013-2014, only 7 students completed ENG 101 after having completed a course, credit or noncredit, in English as a Second Language. The completion numbers are too small to permit a meaningful analysis, at least as far as disproportionate impact is concerned.

The College places great importance in ESL and other basic skills programs and is committed to further research in these areas to gain better understanding of students' motivations for taking ESL courses and to identify ways to enhance academic advancement among this population.

The following analyses in ESL are not available at this time:

Table C-10, ESL, Degree Applicable Course, By DSPS
Table C-11, ESL, Degree Applicable Course, By DSPS, Proportionality Index
Table C-12, ESL, Degree Applicable Course, By DSPS, 80 Percent Index
Table C-13, ESL, Degree Applicable, Course, By Economic Disadvantage
Table C-14, ESL, Degree Applicable Course, By Economic Disadvantage, Proportionality Index
Table C-15, ESL, Degree Applicable Course, By Economic Disadvantage, 80 Percent Index

Table C-16, Basic Sk Math, Degree App Course, By Gender
All Cohort Years

GENDER	Cohort Count	Cohort Percentage	Completion Count	Completion Percentage
Male	1151	0.651	174	0.716
Female	615	0.348	69	0.284
Unknown	1	0.001	0	0.000
Total	1767	1.000	243	1.000

Table C-17, Basic Sk Math, Degree
Applicable Course, By Gender,
Proportionality Index, All Cohort Years

GENDER	Cohort Percentage	Completion Percentage	Proportionality Index
Male	0.651	0.716	1.099
Female	0.348	0.284	0.816
Unknown	0.001	0.000	0.000

Table C-18, Basic Sk Math, Degree App Course, By Gender, 80 Percent Index
All Cohort Years

GENDER	Cohort Count	Completion Count	Completion Rate	80-Percent
Male	**1151**	**174**	**0.151**	**1.000**
Female	615	69	0.112	0.742
Unknown	1	0	0.000	0.000

Analysis of Tables C-16 through C-18, Basic Skills Math, Completion of a Degree-Applicable Course, By Gender:

The 80 percent index (Table C-18) indicates that the Female subgroup is experiencing disproportionate impact. This was noted earlier in Tables B-11 and B-12.

Table C-19, Basic Sk Math, Degree App Course, By Race
All Cohort Years

RACE	Cohort Count	Cohort Percentage	Completion Count	Completion Percentage
Asian	47	0.027	11	0.045
AfricanAm	357	0.202	46	0.189
Filipino	23	0.013	8	0.033
Hispanic	699	0.396	90	0.370
AmerInd	32	0.018	4	0.016
Pac Isl	15	0.008	3	0.012
White	504	0.285	67	0.276
Unknown	90	0.051	14	0.058
Total	1767	1.000	243	1.000

Table C-20, Basic Sk Math, Degree App Course, By Race, Proportionality Index
All Cohort Years

RACE	Cohort Percentage	Completion Percentage	Proportionality Index	
Asian	0.027	0.045	1.702	
AfricanAm	0.202	0.189	0.937	
Filipino	0.013	0.033	2.529	
Hispanic	0.396	0.370	0.936	
AmerInd	0.018	0.016	0.909	
Pac Isl	0.008	0.012	1.454	
White	0.285	0.276	0.967	
Unknown	0.051	0.058	1.131	

Table C-21, Basic Sk Math, Degree App Course, By Race, 80 Percent Index
All Cohort Years

RACE	Cohort Count	Completion Count	Completion Rate	80-Percent
Asian	47	11	0.234	0.673
AfricanAm	357	46	0.129	0.370
Filipino	**23**	**8**	**0.348**	**1.000**
Hispanic	699	90	0.129	0.370
AmerInd	32	4	0.125	0.359
Pac Isl	15	3	0.200	0.575
White	504	67	0.133	0.382
Unknown	90	14	0.156	0.447

Analysis of Tables C-19 through C-21, Basic Skills Math, Completion of a Degree-Applicable Course, By Ethnicity:

There was concern about using Filipino as a reference subgroup considering the comparatively small size of the group. The Student Equity Committee performed further analyses with other subgroups and found little change in the disproportionate impact on other groups. Therefore, the committee decided to use Filipino as a reference subgroup, with the finding that all other subgroups are experiencing disproportionate impact.

Table C-21 clearly indicates that all ethnic subgroups are experiencing is disproportionate impact in terms of completing a degree applicable course at some point after completing a basic skills math course.

Table C-22, Basic Sk Math, Degree App Course, By Age
All Cohort Years

AGE	Cohort Count	Cohort Percentage	Completion Count	Completion Percentage
20 or less	450	0.255	50	0.206
21-24	377	0.213	48	0.198
25-49	890	0.504	140	0.576
50 or more	50	0.028	5	0.021
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Total	1767	1	243	1

Table C-23, Basic Sk Math, Degree App Course, By Age, Proportionality Index
All Cohort Years

AGE	Cohort Percentage	Completion Percentage	Proportionality Index	
20 or less	**0.255**	**0.206**	**0.808**	
21-24	0.213	0.198	0.926	
25-49	0.504	0.576	1.144	
50 or more	**0.028**	**0.021**	**0.727**	
Unknown	0.000	0		

Table C-24, Basic Sk Math, Degree App Course, By Age, 80 Percent Index
All Cohort Years

AGE	Cohort Count	Completion Count	Completion Rate	80-Percent
20 or less	450	50	0.111	0.706
21-24	377	48	0.127	0.809
25-49	**890**	**140**	**0.157**	**1.000**
50 or more	50	5	0.100	0.636
Unknown	0	0		

Analysis of Tables C-22 through C-24, Basic Skills Math, Degree App Course, By Age:

There is evidence of disproportionate impact in the 20 or less and 50 or more subgroups (Table C-23 and C-24). These findings are corroborated by comparatively low completion rates in these subgroups.

Table C-25, Basic Sk Math, Degree App Course, By DSPS
All Cohort Years

DSPS	Cohort Count	Cohort Percentage	Completion Count	Completion Percentage
Yes	231	0.131	18	0.074
No	1536	0.869	225	0.926
Total	1767	1.000	243	1.000

Table C-26, Basic Sk Math, Degree App Course, By DSPS, Proportionality Index
All Cohort Years

DSPS	Cohort Percentage	Completion Percentage	Proportionality Index
Yes	**0.131**	**0.074**	**0.567**
No	0.869	0.926	1.065

Table C-27, Basic Sk Math, Degree App Course, By DSPS, 80 Percent Index
All Cohort Years

DSPS	Cohort Count	Completion Count	Completion Rate	80-Percent
Yes	231	18	0.078	0.532
No	**1536**	**225**	**0.146**	**1.000**

Analysis of Tables C-25 through C-27, Basic Skills Math, Degree Applicable Course, by DSPS:

The Committee found considerable disproportionate impact among DSPS students, evidenced in the proportionality index and 80 percent index, Tables C-26 and C-26.

Table C-28, Basic Sk Math, Degree App Course, By Econ Disadv
All Cohort Years

ECON DISADV	Cohort Count	Cohort Percentage	Completion Count	Completion Percentage
Yes	1432	0.810	200	0.823
No	335	0.190	43	0.177
Total	1767	1.000	243	1.000

Table C-29, Basic Sk Math, Degree App Course, By Econ Disadv, Proportionality Index
All Cohort Years

ECON DISADV	Cohort Percentage	Completion Percentage	Proportionality Index
Yes	0.810	0.823	1.016
No	0.190	0.177	0.933

Table C-30, Basic Sk Math, Degree App Course, By Econ Disadv, 80 Percent Index
All Cohort Years

ECON DISADV	Cohort Count	Completion Count	Completion Rate	80-Percent
Yes	**1432**	**200**	**0.140**	**1.000**
No	335	43	0.128	0.919

Analysis of Tables C-28 through C-30, Basic Skills Applicable Course, By Economic Disadvantage:

The Committee found no evidence of disproportionate impact in the economically disadvantaged group.

Table C-31, Basic Sk English, Degree App Course, By Gender
All Cohort Years

GENDER	Cohort Count	Cohort Percentage	Completion Count	Completion Percentage
Male	830	0.642	143	0.540
Female	462	0.357	122	0.460
Unknown	1	0.001	0	0.000
Total	1293	1.000	265	1.000

Table C-32, Basic Sk English, Degree App Course, By Gender, Proportionality Index
All Cohort Years

GENDER	Cohort Percentage	Completion Percentage	Proportionality Index	
Male	0.642	0.540	0.841	
Female	0.357	0.460	1.288	
Unknown	0.001	0.000	0.000	

Table C-33, Basic Sk English, Degree App Course, By Gender, 80 Percent Index
All Cohort Years

GENDER	Cohort Count	Completion Count	Completion Rate	80-Percent
Male	830	143	0.172	0.652
Female	**462**	**122**	**0.264**	**1.000**
Unknown	1	0	0.000	0.000

Analysis of Tables C-31 through C-33, Basic Skills Math, Degree App Course, By Gender:

There is evidence of disproportionate impact in the Males in terms of eventually taking a degree-applicable course in English. Compare this finding with the opposite results, presented in Table

C-18, showing that Females experience disproportionate impact in completing a degree applicable course in math.

Table C-34, Basic Sk English, Degree App Course, By Race
All Cohort Years

RACE	Cohort Count	Cohort Percentage	Completion Count	Completion Percentage
Asian	39	0.030	10	0.038
AfricanAm	279	0.216	35	0.132
Filipino	13	0.010	5	0.019
Hispanic	566	0.438	121	0.457
AmerInd	25	0.019	8	0.030
Pac Isl	13	0.010	2	0.008
White	300	0.232	70	0.264
Unknown	58	0.045	14	0.053
Total	1293	1.000	265	1.000

Table C-35, Basic Sk English, Degree App Course, By Race, Proportionality Index
All Cohort Years

RACE	Cohort Percentage	Completion Percentage	Proportionality Index	
Asian	0.030	0.038	1.251	
AfricanAm	0.216	0.132	0.612	
Filipino	0.010	0.019	1.877	
Hispanic	0.438	0.457	1.043	
AmerInd	0.019	0.030	1.561	
Pac Isl	0.010	0.008	0.751	
White	0.232	0.264	1.138	
Unknown	0.045	0.053	1.178	

Table C-36, Basic Sk English, Degree App Course, By Race, 80 Percent Index
All Cohort Years

RACE	Cohort Count	Completion Count	Completion Rate	80-Percent
Asian	39	10	0.256	0.667
AfricanAm	279	35	0.125	0.326
Filipino	**13**	**5**	**0.385**	**1.000**
Hispanic	566	121	0.214	0.556
AmerInd	25	8	0.320	0.832
Pac Isl	13	2	0.154	0.400
White	300	70	0.233	0.607
Unknown	58	14	0.241	0.628

Analysis of Tables C-34 through C-36, Basic Skills English, Degree Applicable Course, By Race:

The Committee found disproportionate impact among all other subgroups other than Filipino, which is the reference subgroup. This finding is comparable to the findings in the basic skills math analysis (Table C-21).

Table C-37, Basic Sk English, Degree App Course, By Age
All Cohort Years

AGE	Cohort Count	Cohort Percentage	Completion Count	Completion Percentage
20 or less	383	0.296	103	0.389
21-24	264	0.204	43	0.162
25-49	613	0.474	111	0.419
50 or more	33	0.026	8	0.030
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Total	1293	1	265	1

Table C-38, Basic Sk English, Degree App Course, By Age, Proportionality Index
All Cohort Years

AGE	Cohort Percentage	Completion Percentage	Proportionality Index	
20 or less	0.296	0.389	1.312	
21-24	0.204	0.162	0.795	
25-49	0.474	0.419	0.884	
50 or more	0.026	0.030	1.183	
Unknown	0.000	0		

Table C-39, Basic Sk English, Degree App Course, By Age, 80 Percent Index
All Cohort Years

AGE	Cohort Count	Completion Count	Completion Rate	80-Percent
20 or less	383	103	0.269	1.109
21-24	264	43	0.163	0.672
25-49	613	111	0.181	0.747
50 or more	**33**	**8**	**0.242**	**1.000**
Unknown	0	0		

Analysis of Tables C-37 through C-39, Basic Skills English, Degree Applicable Course, By Age:

The Committee found evidence of disproportionate impact among the 21-24 and 25-49 age subgroups. This finding is just about the opposite of the corresponding analysis of basic skills math (Table 24).

Table C-40, Basic Sk English, Degree App Course, By DSPS
All Cohort Years

DSPS	Cohort Count	Cohort Percentage	Completion Count	Completion Percentage
Yes	186	0.144	37	0.140
No	1107	0.856	228	0.860
Total	1293	1.000	265	1.000

Table C-41, Basic Sk English, Degree App Course, By DSPS, Proportionality Index
All Cohort Years

DSPS	Cohort Percentage	Completion Percentage	Proportionality Index	
Yes	0.144	0.140	0.971	
No	0.856	0.860	1.005	

Table C-42, Basic Sk English, Degree App Course, By DSPS, 80 Percent Index
All Cohort Years

DSPS	Cohort Count	Completion Count	Completion Rate	80-Percent
Yes	186	37	0.199	0.966
No	**1107**	**228**	**0.206**	**1.000**

Analysis of Tables C-40 through C-42, Basic Skills English, Degree Applicable Course, By DSPS:

The Committee found no evidence of disproportionate impact in this analysis.

Table C-43, Basic Sk English, Degree App Course, By Econ Disadv
All Cohort Years

ECON DISADV	Cohort Count	Cohort Percentage	Completion Count	Completion Percentage
Yes	1070	0.828	218	0.823
No	223	0.172	47	0.177
Total	1293	1.000	265	1.000

Table C-44, Basic Sk English, Degree App Course, By Econ Disadv, Proportionality Index
All Cohort Years

ECON DISADV	Cohort Percentage	Completion Percentage	Proportionality Index	
Yes	0.828	0.823	0.994	
No	0.172	0.177	1.028	

Table C-45, Basic Sk English, Degree App Course, By Econ Disadv, 80 Percent Index
All Cohort Years

ECON DISADV	Cohort Count	Completion Count	Completion Rate	80-Percent
Yes	1070	218	0.204	0.967
No	**223**	**47**	**0.211**	**1.000**

Analysis of Tables C-43 through C-45, Basic Skills English, Degree Applicable Course, By Economic Disadvantage:

The Committee found no evidence of disproportionate impact in this analysis.

D. PERSISTENCE, 30-UNITS, COMPLETION (SPAR)

CCCCO Definition of Degree and Certificate Completion: The 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 as documented in the student educational plan developed with a counselor/advisor.

Note that the Data Procedures in Attachment D of the March 14, 2014 letter from Vice Chancellor Linda Michalowski, directs colleges to use the following measures of student completion (in which degree and certificate completion is included): Persistence, 30-Units, and SPAR. These measures are explained as follows:

Persistence measures first-time students with minimum of 6 units earned who attempted any Math or English in the first three years and achieved the following measure of progress (or momentum point):

- Enroll in first three consecutive primary semester terms (or four quarter terms) anywhere in the CCC system. (CCCCO, *Methodology for College Level Indicators*)

30-Units measures first-time students with minimum of 6 units earned who attempted any Math or English in the first three years and achieved the following measure of progress (or milestone) within six years of entry:

- Earned at least 30 units in the CCC system. (CCCCO, *Methodology for College Level Indicators*)

Completion (SPAR): measures first-time students with minimum of 6 units earned who attempted any Math or English in the first three years and achieved any of the following outcomes within six years of entry:

- Earned AA/AS or credit Certificate (Chancellor's Office approved)
- Transfer to four-year institution (students shown to have enrolled at any four-year institution of higher education after enrolling at a CCC)
- Achieved "Transfer Prepared" (student successfully completed 60 UC/CSU transferable units with a GPA >= 2.0) (CCCCO, *Methodology for College Level Indicators*)

Areas highlighted in yellow show potential areas of disproportionate impact.

Table D-1, Persistence, By Gender
All Cohort Years

GENDER	Cohort Count	Cohort Percentage	Completion Count	Completion Percentage
Male	831	0.676	601	0.738
Female	395	0.321	212	0.260

Unknown	3	0.002	1	0.001
Total	1229	1.000	814	1.000

Table D-2, Persistence, By Gender, Proportionality Index
All Cohort Years

GENDER	Cohort Percentage	Completion Percentage	Proportionality Index
Male	0.676	0.738	1.092
Female	0.321	0.260	0.810
Unknown	0.002	0.001	0.503

Table D-3, Persistence, By Gender, 80 Percent Index
All Cohort Years

GENDER	Cohort Count	Completion Count	Completion Rate	80-Percent
Male	**831**	**601**	**0.723**	**1.000**
Female	395	212	0.537	0.742
Unknown	3	1	0.333	0.461

Analysis of Tables D-1 through D-3, Persistence by Gender:

There is some evidence of disproportionate impact among Females in the Persistence measure.

Table D-4, Persistence, By Race
All Cohort Years

RACE	Cohort Count	Cohort Percentage	Completion Count	Completion Percentage
Asian	32	0.026	23	0.028
AfricanAm	220	0.179	157	0.193
Filipino	14	0.011	11	0.014
Hispanic	470	0.382	322	0.396
AmerInd	24	0.020	19	0.023
Pac Isl	17	0.014	13	0.016
White	358	0.291	216	0.265
Unknown	94	0.076	53	0.065
Total	1229	1.000	814	1.000

Table D-5, Persistence, By Race, Proportionality Index
All Cohort Years

RACE	Cohort Percentage	Completion Percentage	Proportionality Index
Asian	0.026	0.028	1.085
AfricanAm	0.179	0.193	1.077
Filipino	0.011	0.014	1.186
Hispanic	0.382	0.396	1.034
AmerInd	0.020	0.023	1.195
Pac Isl	0.014	0.016	1.155
White	0.291	0.265	0.911
Unknown	0.076	0.065	0.851

Table D-6, Persistence, By Race, 80 Percent Index
All Cohort Years

RACE	Cohort Count	Completion Count	Completion Rate	80-Percent
Asian	32	23	0.719	0.908
AfricanAm	220	157	0.714	0.901
Filipino	14	11	0.786	0.992
Hispanic	470	322	0.685	0.865
AmerInd	**24**	**19**	**0.792**	**1.000**
Pac Isl	17	13	0.765	0.966
White	358	216	0.603	0.762
Unknown	94	53	0.564	0.712

Analysis of Tables D-3 through D-6, Persistence, By Race:

There is some evidence in the White subgroup in the Persistence measure.

Table D-7, Persistence, By Age
All Cohort Years

AGE	Cohort Count	Cohort Percentage	Completion Count	Completion Percentage
20 or less	463	0.377	253	0.311
21-24	180	0.146	126	0.155
25-49	561	0.456	416	0.511
50 or more	25	0.020	19	0.023
Unknown	0	0.000	0	0.000
Total	1229	1.000	814	1.000

Table D-8, Persistence, By Age, Proportionality Index
All Cohort Years

AGE	Cohort Percentage	Completion Percentage	Proportionality Index
20 or less	0.377	0.311	0.825
21-24	0.146	0.155	1.057
25-49	0.456	0.511	1.120
50 or more	0.020	0.023	1.147
Unknown	0.000	0.000	

Table D-9, Persistence, By Age, 80 Percent Index
All Cohort Years

AGE	Cohort Count	Completion Count	Completion Rate	80-Percent
20 or less	463	253	0.546	0.719
21-24	180	126	0.700	0.921
25-49	561	416	0.742	0.976
50 or more	**25**	**19**	**0.760**	**1.000**
Unknown	0	0	0.000	0

Analysis of Tables D-7 through D-9, Persistence, By Age:

There is some evidence of disproportionate impact among the 20 or less subgroup in the Persistence measure.

Table D-10, Persistence, By DSPS
All Cohort Years

DSPS	Cohort Count	Cohort Percentage	Completion Count	Completion Percentage
Yes	149	0.121	104	0.128
No	1079	0.879	710	0.872
Total	1228	1.000	814	1.000

Note: One student file was eliminated in the original cohort group due to an incorrect entry for DSPS.

Table D-11, Persistence, By DSPS, Proportionality Index
All Cohort Years

DSPS	Cohort Percentage	Completion Percentage	Proportionality Index
Yes	0.121	0.128	1.053
No	0.879	0.872	0.993

Table D-12, Persistence, By DSPS, 80 Percent Index
All Cohort Years

DSPS	Cohort Count	Completion Count	Completion Rate	80-Percent
Yes	**149**	**104**	**0.698**	**1.000**
No	1079	710	0.658	0.943

Analysis of Tables D-10 through D-12, Persistence, By DSPS:

There is no evidence of disproportionate impact in this analysis.

Table D-13, Persistence, By Econ Disadv
All Cohort Years

ECON DISADV	Cohort Count	Cohort Percentage	Completion Count	Completion Percentage
Yes	1021	0.831	712	0.875
No	208	0.169	102	0.125
Total	1229	1.000	814	1.000

Table D-14, Persistence, By Econ Disadv, Proportionality Index
All Cohort Years

ECON DISADV	Cohort Percentage	Completion Percentage	Proportionality Index
Yes	0.831	0.875	1.053
No	0.169	0.125	0.740

Table D-15, Persistence, By Econ Disadv, 80 Percent Index
All Cohort Years

ECON DISADV	Cohort Count	Completion Count	Completion Rate	80-Percent
Yes	**1021**	**712**	**0.697**	**1.000**
No	208	102	0.490	0.703

Analysis of Tables D-13 through D-15, Persistence, By Economic Disadvantage:

Economically disadvantaged students seem to be experiencing disproportionate impact in terms of persistence when compared with non-economically disadvantaged students.

Table D-16, 30 Units, By Gender
All Cohort Years

GENDER	Cohort Count	Cohort Percentage	Completion Count	Completion Percentage
Male	831	0.676	514	0.716

Female	395	0.321	204	0.284
Unknown	3	0.000	0	0.000
Total	1229	1.000	718	1.000

Table D-17, 30 Units, By Gender, Proportionality Index
All Cohort Years

GENDER	Cohort Percentage	Completion Percentage	Proportionality Index
Male	0.676	0.716	1.059
Female	0.321	0.284	0.885
Unknown	0.000	0.000	0.000

Table D-18, 30 Units, By Gender, 80 Percent Index
All Cohort Years

GENDER	Cohort Count	Completion Count	Completion Rate	80-Percent
Male	**831**	**514**	**0.619**	**1.000**
Female	395	204	0.516	0.835
Unknown	3	0	0.000	0.000

Analysis of Tables D-16 through D-18, Attainment of 30 Units By Gender:

There is no evidence of disproportionate impact in the Gender measure among students in attaining 30 units.

Table D-19, 30 Units, By Race
All Cohort Years

RACE	Cohort Count	Cohort Percentage	Completion Count	Completion Percentage
Asian	32	0.026	24	0.033
AfricanAm	220	0.179	133	0.185
Filipino	14	0.011	10	0.014
Hispanic	470	0.382	276	0.384
AmerInd	24	0.020	16	0.022
Pac Isl	17	0.014	12	0.017

White	358	0.291	204	0.284
Unknown	94	0.076	43	0.060
Total	1229	1.000	718	1.000

Table D-20, 30 Units, By Race, Proportionality Index
All Cohort Years

RACE	Cohort Percentage	Completion Percentage	Proportionality Index
Asian	0.026	0.033	1.284
AfricanAm	0.179	0.185	1.035
Filipino	0.011	0.014	1.223
Hispanic	0.382	0.384	1.005
AmerInd	0.020	0.022	1.141
Pac Isl	0.014	0.017	1.208
White	0.291	0.284	0.975
Unknown	0.076	0.060	0.783

Table D-21, 30 Units, By Race, 80 Percent Index
All Cohort Years

RACE	Cohort Count	Completion Count	Completion Rate	80-Percent
Asian	**32**	**24**	**0.750**	**1.000**
AfricanAm	220	133	0.605	0.806
Filipino	14	10	0.714	0.952
Hispanic	470	276	0.587	0.783
AmerInd	24	16	0.667	0.889
Pac Isl	17	12	0.706	0.941
White	358	204	0.570	0.760
Unknown	94	43	0.457	0.610

Analysis of Tables D-19 through D-21, 30 Units By Race:

There is evidence of disproportionate impact among in the Hispanic and White subgroups in terms of attaining 30 units.

Table D-22, 30 Units, By Age
All Cohort Years

AGE	Cohort Count	Cohort Percentage	Completion Count	Completion Percentage
20 or less	463	0.377	261	0.364
21-24	180	0.146	91	0.127
25-49	561	0.456	353	0.492
50 or more	25	0.020	13	0.018
Unknown	0	0.000	0	0.000
Total	1229	1.000	718	1.000

Table D-23, 30 Units, By Age, Proportionality Index
All Cohort Years

AGE	Cohort Percentage	Completion Percentage	Proportionality Index
20 or less	0.377	0.364	0.965
21-24	0.146	0.127	0.865
25-49	0.456	0.492	1.077
50 or more	0.020	0.018	0.890
Unknown	0.000	0	

Table D-24, 30 Units, By Age, 80 Percent Index
All Cohort Years

AGE	Cohort Count	Completion Count	Completion Rate	80-Percent
20 or less	463	261	0.564	0.896
21-24	180	91	0.506	0.803

25-49	**561**	**353**	**0.629**	**1.000**
50 or more	25	13	0.520	0.826
Unknown	0	0	0.000	0

Analysis of Tables D-22 through D-24, 30 Units By Age:

There is no evidence of disproportionate impact in attaining 30 units in the Age measure.

Table D-25, 30 Units, By DSPS
All Cohort Years

DSPS	Cohort Count	Cohort Percentage	Completion Count	Completion Percentage
Yes	149	0.121	86	0.120
No	1079	0.879	632	0.880
Total	1228	1.000	718	1.000

Note: One student file was eliminated in the original cohort group due to an incorrect entry for DSPS.

Table D-26, 30 Units By DSPS, Proportionality Index
All Cohort Years

DSPS	Cohort Percentage	Completion Percentage	Proportionality Index
Yes	0.121	0.120	0.987
No	0.879	0.880	1.002

Note: One student file was eliminated in the original cohort group due to an incorrect entry for DSPS.

Table D-27, 30 Units, By DSPS, 80 Percent Index
All Cohort Years

DSPS	Cohort Count	Completion Count	Completion Rate	80-Percent
Yes	149	86	0.577	0.985
No	**1079**	**632**	**0.586**	**1.000**

Note: One student file was eliminated in the original cohort group due to an incorrect entry for DSPS.

Analysis of Tables D-25 through D-27, 30 Units By DSPS:
There is no evidence of disproportionate impact among DSPS students in attaining 30 units.

Table D-28, 30 Units, By Econ Disadv
All Cohort Years

ECON DISADV	Cohort Count	Cohort Percentage	Completion Count	Completion Percentage
Yes	1021	0.831	624	0.869
No	208	0.169	94	0.131
Total	1229	1.000	718	1.000

Table D-29, 30 Units, By Econ Disadv, Proportionality Index
All Cohort Years

ECON DISADV	Cohort Percentage	Completion Percentage	Proportionality Index
Yes	0.831	0.869	1.046
No	0.169	0.131	0.774

Table D-30, 30 Units, By Econ Disadv, 80 Percent Index
All Cohort Years

ECON DISADV	Cohort Count	Completion Count	Completion Rate	80-Percent
Yes	**1021**	**624**	**0.611**	**1.000**
No	208	94	0.452	0.739

Analysis of Tables D-28 through D-30, 30 Units By Economic Disadvantage:
Some evidence of disproportionate impact among non-economically disadvantaged students is noted in attaining 30 units.

Table D-31, Completion (SPAR), By Gender
All Cohort Years

GENDER	Cohort Count	Cohort Percentage	Completion Count	Completion Percentage
Male	831	0.676	297	0.684
Female	395	0.321	137	0.316
Unknown	3	0.002	0	0.000
Total	1229	1.000	434	1.000

Table D-32, Completion (SPAR), By Gender, Proportionality Index
All Cohort Years

GENDER	Cohort Percentage	Completion Percentage	Proportionality Index
Male	0.676	0.684	1.012
Female	0.321	0.316	0.982
Unknown	0.002	0.000	0.000

Table D-33, Completion (SPAR), By Gender, 80 Percent Index
All Cohort Years

GENDER	Cohort Count	Completion Count	Completion Rate	80-Percent
Male	**831**	**297**	**0.357**	**1.000**
Female	395	137	0.347	0.970
Unknown	3	0	0.000	0.000

Analysis of Tables D-31 through D-33, SPAR, By Gender:

There is no indication of disproportionate impact is evident in students by Gender in achieving the SPAR outcome.

Table D-34, Completion (SPAR), By Race
All Cohort Years

RACE	Cohort Count	Cohort Percentage	Completion Count	Completion Percentage
Asian	32	0.026	14	0.032
AfricanAm	220	0.179	88	0.203
Filipino	14	0.011	9	0.021
Hispanic	470	0.382	151	0.348
AmerInd	24	0.020	9	0.021
Pac Isl	17	0.014	7	0.016
White	358	0.291	124	0.286
Unknown	94	0.076	32	0.074
Total	1229	1.000	434	1.000

Table D-35, Completion (SPAR), By Race, Proportionality Index
All Cohort Years

RACE	Cohort Percentage	Completion Percentage	Proportionality Index
Asian	0.026	0.032	1.239
AfricanAm	0.179	0.203	1.133
Filipino	0.011	0.021	1.820
Hispanic	0.382	0.348	0.910
AmerInd	0.020	0.021	1.062
Pac Isl	0.014	0.016	1.166
White	0.291	0.286	0.981
Unknown	0.076	0.074	0.964

Table D-36, Completion (SPAR), 80 Percent Index
All Cohort Years

RACE	Cohort Count	Completion Count	Completion Rate	80-Percent
Asian	32	14	0.438	0.681
AfricanAm	220	88	0.400	0.622
Filipino	**14**	**9**	**0.643**	**1.000**
Hispanic	470	151	0.321	0.500
AmerInd	24	9	0.375	0.583
Pac Isl	17	7	0.412	0.641
White	358	124	0.346	0.539
Unknown	94	32	0.340	0.530

Analysis of Tables D-34 through D-36, SPAR, By Race:

Disproportionate impact is evident in all ethnic categories in terms of attaining the SPAR outcome.

Table D-37, Completion (SPAR), By Age
All Cohort Years

AGE	Cohort Count	Cohort Percentage	Completion Count	Completion Percentage
20 or less	463	0.377	167	0.385
21-24	180	0.146	45	0.104
25-49	561	0.456	214	0.493
50 or more	25	0.020	8	0.018
Unknown	0	0.000	0	0.000
Total	1229	1.000	434	1.000

Table D-38, Completion (SPAR), By Age, Proportionality Index
All Cohort Years

AGE	Cohort Percentage	Completion Percentage	Proportionality Index
20 or less	0.377	0.385	1.021
21-24	0.146	0.104	0.708
25-49	0.456	0.493	1.080
50 or more	0.020	0.018	0.906
Unknown	0.000	0.000	0.000

Table D-39, Completion (SPAR), By Age, 80 Percent Index
All Cohort Years

AGE	Cohort Count	Completion Count	Completion Rate	80-Percent
20 or less	463	167	0.361	0.946
21-24	180	45	0.250	0.655
25-49	**561**	**214**	**0.381**	**1.000**
50 or more	25	8	0.320	0.839
Unknown	0	0		

Analysis of Tables D-37 through D-39, SPAR, By Age:

Evidence of disproportionate impact is noted in the age group 21-24 in attaining the SPAR outcome.

Table D-40, Completion (SPAR), By DSPS
All Cohort Years

DSPS	Cohort Count	Cohort Percentage	Completion Count	Completion Percentage
Yes	149	0.121	36	0.083
No	1079	0.879	398	0.917
Total	1228	1.000	434	1.000

Note: One student file was eliminated in the original cohort group due to an incorrect entry for DSPS.

Table D-41, Completion (SPAR), By DSPS, Proportionality Index
All Cohort Years

DSPS	Cohort Percentage	Completion Percentage	Proportionality Index
Yes	0.121	0.083	0.684
No	0.879	0.917	1.044

Table D-42, Completion (SPAR), By DSPS, 80 Percent Index
All Cohort Years

DSPS	Cohort Count	Completion Count	Completion Rate	80-Percent
Yes	149	36	0.242	0.655
No	**1079**	**398**	**0.369**	**1.000**

Analysis of Tables D-40 through D-42, SPAR, By DSPS:

Evidence of disproportionate impact is noted in DSPS students in terms of achieving the SPAR outcome.

Table D-43, Completion (SPAR), By Econ Disadv
All Cohort Years

ECON DISADV	Cohort Count	Cohort Percentage	Completion Count	Completion Percentage
Yes	1021	0.831	354	0.816
No	208	0.169	80	0.184
Total	1229	1.000	434	1.000

Table D-44, Completion (SPAR), By Econ Disadv, Proportionality Index
All Cohort Years

ECON DISADV	Cohort Percentage	Completion Percentage	Proportionality Index

Yes	0.831	0.816	0.982
No	0.169	0.184	1.089

Table D-45, Completion (SPAR), By Econ Disadv, 80 Percent Index
All Cohort Years

ECON DISADV	Cohort Count	Completion Count	Completion Rate	80-Percent
Yes	1021	354	0.347	0.901
No	**208**	**80**	**0.385**	**1.000**

Analysis of Tables D-43 through D-45, SPAR, By Economic Disadvantage:

No evidence of disproportionate impact is evident among disadvantaged students in terms of achieving the SPAR outcome.

E. TRANSFER

CCCCO Definition of Transfer: The 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.

For definitions and transfer methodology as discussed in the Transfer Cohort Report published by the CCCCO, please open the following link:

http://datamart.cccco.edu/App_Doc/Transfer%20Cohort%20Methodology.doc

Areas **highlighted in yellow** show potential areas of disproportionate impact.

Table E-1, Transfer, By Age
Cohort years 2006-07

AGE	Transfer Cohort Count	Cohort Percentage	Transfer Count	Transfer Percentage
17 or less	34	0.296	8	0.500
18 & 19	13	0.113	2	0.125
20 to 24	13	0.113	3	0.188
25 to 29	20	0.174	1	0.063
30 to 34	10	0.087	0	0.000
35 to 39	15	0.130	1	0.063
40 to 49	9	0.078	0	0.000
50 +	1	0.009	1	0.063
Total	115	1.000	16	1.000

Table E-2, Transfer, Proportionality Index, By Age
Cohort years 2006-07

AGE	Cohort Percentage	Transfer Percentage	Proportionality Index
1 to 17	0.296	0.500	1.691
18 & 19	0.113	0.125	1.106
20 to 24	0.113	0.188	1.659
25 to 29	0.174	0.063	0.359
30 to 34	0.087	0.000	0.000
35 to 39	0.130	0.063	0.479
40 to 49	0.078	0.000	0.000
50 +	0.009	0.063	7.188

Table E-3, Transfer, 80 Percent Index, By Age
Cohort years 2006-07

AGE	Transfer Cohort Count	Transfer Count	Transfer Percentage	80-Percent Index
1 to 17	34	8	0.235	0.235
18 & 19	13	2	0.154	0.154
20 to 24	13	3	0.231	0.231
25 to 29	20	1	0.050	0.050
30 to 34	10	0	0.000	0.000
35 to 39	15	1	0.067	0.067
40 to 49	9	0	0.000	0.000
50 +	**1**	**1**	**1.000**	**1.000**

Table E-4, Transfer, 80 Percent Index, by Age
Using Age 1 to 17 as the Reference Group
Cohort years 2006-07

	Tranfer Cohort Count	Transfer Count	Transfer Percentage	80-Percent Index
1 to 17	**34**	**8**	**0.235**	**1.000**
18 & 19	13	2	0.154	0.654
20 to 24	13	3	0.231	0.981
25 to 29	20	1	0.050	0.213
30 to 34	10	0	0.000	0.000
35 to 39	15	1	0.067	0.283
40 to 49	9	0	0.000	0.000
50 +	**1**	**1**	**1.000**	**4.250**

Analysis of Tables E-1 through E-4, Transfer by Age:

The area of disproportionate impact for Transfer by Age was found in the 18-19, 25-29, 30-34, 35-39, and 40-49 age groups. The Committee decided to use the 1-17 group as the reference group, since the 50+ subgroup had only one student.

Table E-5, Transfer, By Gender
Cohort years 2006-07

GENDER	Transfer Cohort Count	Cohort Percentage	Transfer Count	Transfer Percentage
Male	87	0.757	11	0.688
Female	28	0.243	5	0.313
Total	115	1.000	16	1.000

Table E-6, Transfer, By Gender
Cohort years 2006-07

GENDER	Cohort Percentage	Transfer Percentage	Proportionality Index
Male	0.757	0.688	0.909
Female	0.243	0.313	1.283

Table E-7, Transfer, By Gender
Cohort years 2006-07

GENDER	Transfer Cohort Count	Transfer Count	Transfer Percentage	80-Percent Index
Male	87	11	0.126	0.708
Female	**28**	**5**	**0.179**	**1.000**

Analysis of Tables E-5 through E-7, Transfer by Gender:

Some evidence of disproportionate impact in Transfer was noted among the Male subgroup.

Table E-8, Transfer, By Ethnicity
Cohort years 2006-07

ETHNICITY	Transfer Cohort Count	Cohort Percentage	Transfer Count	Transfer Percentage
African-American	21	0.183	3	0.188
Asian	5	0.043	2	0.125
Filipino	4	0.035	1	0.063
Hispanic	39	0.339	3	0.188
Pacific Islander	1	0.009	0	0.000
Unknown	5	0.043	0	0.000
White Non-Hispanic	40	0.348	7	0.438
Total	115	1.000	16	1.000

Table E-9, Transfer, Proportionality Index, By Ethnicity
Cohort years 2006-07

ETHNICITY	Cohort Percentage	Transfer Percentage	Proportionality Index
African-American	0.183	0.188	1.027
Asian	0.043	0.125	2.875
Filipino	0.035	0.063	1.797
Hispanic	0.339	0.188	0.553
Pacific Islander	0.009	0.000	0.000
Unknown	0.043	0.000	0.000
White Non-Hispanic	0.348	0.438	1.258

Table E-10, Transfer, 80 Percent Index, by Ethnicity
Cohort years 2006-07

ETHNICITY	Tranfer Cohort Count	Transfer Count	Transfer Percentage	80-Percent Index
African-American	21	3	0.143	0.357
Asian	**5**	**2**	**0.400**	**1.000**
Filipino	4	1	0.250	0.625
Hispanic	39	3	0.077	0.192
Pacific Islander	1	0	0.000	0.000
Unknown	5	0	0.000	0.000
White Non-Hispanic	40	7	0.175	0.438

Analysis of Tables E-8 through E-10, Transfer by Ethnicity:

Considerable evidence of disproportionate impact in Transfer is noted in all ethnic groups except for Asian, the reference group.

Table E-11, Transfer, By CalWORKS
Cohort years 2006-07

CalWORKS	Transfer Cohort Count	Cohort Percentage	Transfer Count	Transfer Percentage
No, Not a CalWORKS Participant	109	0.948	15	0.938

Yes, CalWORKS Participant	6	0.052	1	0.063
Total	115	1.000	16	1.000

Table E-12, Transfer, By CalWORKS
Cohort years 2006-07

CalWORKS	Cohort Percentage	Transfer Percentage	Proportionality Index
No, Not a CalWORKS Participant	0.948	0.938	0.989
Yes, CalWORKS Participant	0.052	0.063	1.198

Table E-13, Transfer, By CalWORKS
Cohort years 2006-07

CalWORKS	Transfer Cohort Count	Transfer Count	Transfer Percentage	80-Percent Index
No, Not a CalWORKS Participant	109	15	0.138	0.826
Yes, CalWORKS Participant	**6**	**1**	**0.167**	**1.000**

Analysis of Tables E-11 through E-13, Transfer, By CalWORKS:

No evidence of disproportionate impact was noted in the Transfer, By CalWORKS group.

Table E-14, Transfer, By DSPS
Cohort years 2006-07

DSPS	Transfer Cohort Count	Cohort Percentage	Transfer Count	Transfer Percentage
No, Not DSPS	101	0.878	16	1.000
Yes, DSPS	14	0.122	0	0.000
Total	115	1.000	16	1.000

Table E-15, Transfer, By DSPS
Cohort years 2006-07

DSPS	Cohort Percentage	Transfer Percentage	Proportionality Index
No, Not DSPS	0.878	1.000	1.139
Yes, DSPS	0.122	0.000	0.000

Table E-16, Transfer, By DSPS
Cohort years 2006-07

DSPS	Transfer Cohort Count	Transfer Count	Transfer Percentage	80-Percent Index
No, Not DSPS	**101**	**16**	**0.158**	**1.000**
Yes, DSPS	14	0	0.000	0.000

Analysis of Tables E-14 through E16, Transfer, By DSPS:

Significant disproportionate impact in Transfer was noted in DSPS students.

F. FOSTER YOUTH

The CCCCO did not provide guidelines on evaluating disproportionate impact among Foster Youth. Therefore, PVC conducted its analysis as follows:

The analysis of Foster Youth consists of an examination of transcripts for each student in the cohort, specifically the GPA earned from courses taken at PVC. Students with a GPA of 2.0 or higher, analyzed by age, ethnicity and gender, were considered part of the successful completion group.

Areas highlighted in yellow show potential areas of disproportionate impact.

Table F-1, Foster Youth, By Age
Cohort years 2006-07

AGE	Cohort Count	Cohort Percentage	Cohort Completion	Completion Percentage
17 or less	0	0.000	0	0.000
18 & 19	0	0.000	0	0.000
20 to 24	11	0.786	4	0.571
25 to 29	3	0.214	3	0.429
30 to 34	0	0.000	0	0.000
35 to 39	0	0.000	0	0.000
40 to 49	0	0.000	0	0.000
50 +	0	0.000	0	0.000
Total	14	1.000	7	1.000

Source: PVC Admissions and Records. Successful completion is attainment of GPA of 2.0 or higher.

Table F-2, Foster Youth, Proportionality Index, by Age
Cohort years 2006-07

AGE	Cohort Percentage	Completion Percentage	Proportionality Index
1 to 17	0.000	0.000	
18 & 19	0.000	0.000	
20 to 24	0.786	0.571	0.727
25 to 29	0.214	0.429	2.000
30 to 34	0.000	0.000	
35 to 39	0.000	0.000	

40 to 49	0.000	0.000	
50 +	0.000	0.000	

Source: PVC Admissions and Records. Successful completion is attainment of GPA of 2.0 or higher.

Table F-3, Foster Youth, 80 Percent Index, by Age
Cohort years 2006-07

AGE	Cohort Count	Completion Count	Completion Percentage	80-Percent Index
1 to 17	0	0		
18 & 19	0	0		
20 to 24	11	4	0.364	0.364
25 to 29	**3**	**3**	**1.000**	**1.000**
30 to 34	0	0		
35 to 39	0	0		
40 to 49	0	0		
50 +	0	0		

Source: PVC Admissions and Records. Successful completion is attainment of GPA of 2.0 or higher.

Table F-4, Foster Youth, By Ethnicity
Cohort years 2006-07

ETHNICITY	Cohort Count	Cohort Percentage	Cohort Completion	Completion Percentage
American Ind	1	0.071	0	0.000
Black or African-Am	4	0.286	2	0.286
Hispanic	3	0.214	2	0.286
Two or More Races	1	0.071	0	0.000
White	5	0.357	3	0.429
Total	14	1.000	7	1.000

Source: PVC Admissions and Records. Successful completion is attainment of GPA of 2.0 or higher.

Table F-5, Foster Youth, Proportionality Index, by Ethnicity
Cohort years 2006-07

ETHNICITY	Cohort Percentage	Completion Percentage	Proportionality Index
American Ind	0.071	0.000	0.000
Black or African-Am	0.286	0.286	1.000
Hispanic	0.214	0.286	1.333
Two or More Races	0.071	0.000	0.000
White	0.357	0.429	1.200

Source: PVC Admissions and Records. Successful completion is attainment of GPA of 2.0 or higher.

Table F-6, Foster Youth, 80 Percent Index, By Ethnicity
Cohort years 2006-07

ETHNICITY	Cohort Count	Completion Count	Completion Percentage	80-Percent Index
American Ind	1	0	0.000	0.000
Black or African-Am	4	2	0.500	0.750
Hispanic	**3**	**2**	**0.667**	**1.000**
Two or More Races	1	0	0.000	0.000
White	5	3	0.600	0.900

Source: PVC Admissions and Records. Successful completion is attainment of GPA of 2.0 or higher.

Table F-7, Foster Youth, By
Gender
Cohort years 2006-07

GENDER	Cohort Count	Cohort Percentage	Cohort Completion	Completion Percentage
Female	9	0.643	5	0.714
Male	5	0.357	2	0.286
Total	14	1.000	7	1.000

Source: PVC Admissions and Records. Successful completion is attainment of GPA of 2.0 or higher.

Table F-8, Foster Youth, Proportionality Index, By Gender
Cohort years 2006-07

GENDER	Cohort Percentage	Completion Percentage	Proportionality Index
Female	0.643	0.714	1.111
Male	0.357	0.286	0.800

Source: PVC Admissions and Records. Successful completion is attainment of GPA of 2.0 or higher.

Table F-9, Foster Youth, 80 Percent Index, By Gender
Cohort years 2006-07

GENDER	Cohort Count	Completion Count	Completion Percentage	80-Percent Index
Female	**9**	**5**	**0.556**	**1.000**
Male	5	2	0.400	0.720

Analysis of Tables F-1 through F-9, Foster Youth, Successful Completion of GPA of 2.0 or higher, By Age, Ethnicity, and Race:

With a total cohort of only 14 foster youth to begin with, and a successful completion cohort of half that number, it is difficult to draw meaningful conclusions about disproportionate impact. Nonetheless, it appears that in the age subgroup, the 20-24 group did not fare as well as the 25-29 group. In ethnicity, the Black/African American subgroup experienced disproportionate impact. And in the gender subgroup, Males experienced some disproportionate impact, compared with Females as the reference group.

G. VETERANS

The CCCCO did not provide guidelines on evaluating disproportionate impact among Veterans. Therefore, PVC conducted its analysis as follows:

The analysis of Veterans consists of an examination of transcripts for each student in the cohort, specifically the GPA earned from courses taken at PVC. Students with a GPA of 2.0 or higher, analyzed by age, ethnicity and gender, were considered part of the successful completion group.

Areas highlighted in yellow show potential areas of disproportionate impact

Table G-1, Veterans, By Age

AGE	Cohort Count	Cohort Percentage	Cohort Completion	Completion Percentage
17 or less	0	0.000	0	0.000
18 & 19	0	0.000	0	0.000
20 to 24	2	0.031	1	0.022
25 to 29	17	0.262	11	0.239
30 to 34	25	0.385	18	0.391
35 to 39	6	0.092	5	0.109
40 to 49	5	0.077	4	0.087
50 +	10	0.154	7	0.152
Total	65	1.000	46	1.000

Source: PVC Admissions and Records. Successful completion is attainment of GPA of 2.0 or higher.

Table G-2, Veterans, Proportionality Index, by Age

AGE	Cohort Percentage	Completion Percentage	Proportionality Index
1 to 17	0.000	0.000	
18 & 19	0.000	0.000	
20 to 24	0.031	0.022	0.707
25 to 29	0.262	0.239	0.914
30 to 34	0.385	0.391	1.017
35 to 39	0.092	0.109	1.178
40 to 49	0.077	0.087	1.130

50 +	0.154	0.152	0.989

Source: PVC Admissions and Records. Successful completion is attainment of GPA of 2.0 or higher.

Table G-3, Veterans, 80 Percent Index, by Age

AGE	Cohort Count	Completion Count	Completion Percentage	80-Percent Index
1 to 17	0	0		
18 & 19	0	0		
20 to 24	2	1	0.500	0.600
25 to 29	17	11	0.647	0.776
30 to 34	25	18	0.720	0.864
35 to 39	**6**	**5**	**0.833**	**1.000**
40 to 49	5	4	0.800	0.960
50 +	10	7	0.700	0.840

Source: PVC Admissions and Records. Successful completion is attainment of GPA of 2.0 or higher.

Table G-4, Veterans, By Ethnicity

ETHNICITY	Cohort Count	Cohort Percentage	Cohort Completion	Completion Percentage
Asian	3	0.046	2	0.043
Black or African-Am	4	0.062	1	0.022
Hispanic	28	0.431	22	0.478
White	27	0.415	19	0.413
Haw/Pac Islander	1	0.015	1	0.022
Unknown	2	0.031	1	0.022
Total	65	1.000	46	1.000

Source: PVC Admissions and Records. Successful completion is attainment of GPA of 2.0 or higher.

able G-5, Veterans, Proportionality Index, by Ethnicity

ETHNICITY	Cohort Percentage	Completion Percentage	Proportionality Index
Asian	0.046	0.043	0.942
Black or African-Am	0.062	0.022	0.353
Hispanic	0.431	0.478	1.110
White	0.415	0.413	0.994
Haw/Pac Islander	0.015	0.022	1.413
Unknown	0.031	0.022	0.707

Source: PVC Admissions and Records. Successful completion is attainment of GPA of 2.0 or higher.

Table G-6, Veterans, 80 Percent Index, By Ethnicity

ETHNICITY	Cohort Count	Completion Count	Completion Percentage	80-Percent Index
Asian	3	2	0.667	0.848
Black or African-Am	4	1	0.250	0.318
Hispanic	**28**	**22**	**0.786**	**1.000**
White	27	19	0.704	0.896
Haw/Pac Islander	1	1	1.000	1.273
Unknown	2	1	0.500	0.636

Source: PVC Admissions and Records. Successful completion is attainment of GPA of 2.0 or higher.

Table G-7, Veterans, By Gender

GENDER	Cohort Count	Cohort Percentage	Cohort Completion	Completion Percentage
Female	12	0.185	9	0.196
Male	53	0.815	37	0.804
Total	65	1.000	46	1.000

Source: PVC Admissions and Records. Successful completion is attainment of GPA of 2.0 or higher.

Table G-8, Veterans, Proportionality Index, By Gender

GENDER	Cohort Percentage	Completion Percentage	Proportionality Index
Female	0.643	0.714	1.111
Male	0.357	0.286	0.800

Source: PVC Admissions and Records. Successful completion is attainment of GPA of 2.0 or higher.

Table G-9, Veterans, 80 Percent Index, By Gender

GENDER	Cohort Count	Completion Count	Completion Percentage	80-Percent Index
Female	**12**	**9**	**0.750**	**1.000**
Male	53	37	0.698	0.931

Analysis of Tables G-1 through G-9, Veterans, Completion of 2.0 GPA, By Age Ethnicity, and Gender:

Areas of disproportionate impact were found in Age and Ethnicity. As for Age, disproportionate impact was noted in the 20-24 and 25-29 groups, using the 35-39 group as the reference. For ethnicity the Committee decided to us the Hispanic subgroup as the reference, because Hawaiian/Pacific Islander was too small, with only one student. The resulting analysis showed disproportionate impact among the Black or African American subgroup and the Unknown subgroup.

Palo Verde College Student Equity Plan 2014-15 Budget

Funds Allocated		**$ 200,000**

Proposed Expenditures

Goal 1 - Access		
Peer counselors	4 students	$ 15,000
Outreach		$ 12,000
Textbook libraries		$ 85,000
Goal 2 - Course Completion		
Self-service module-Training	4 students	$ 10,000
Textbook libraries	Above	
Goal 3 - ESL & Basic Skills		
Tutoring	8 tutors embedded	$ 30,000
Professional Development		$ 10,000
Goal 4 - Persistence		
Advisor	1	$ 20,000
Peer Counselors	Above	
Research		$ 10,000
Self-service Module	Above	
Textbook libraries	Above	
Professional Development	Above	
Goal 5 - Transfer		
Career Planning/Transfer support	To include trips to colleges	$ 8,000
Goal 6 - Foster Youth		
Research	Above	
Goal 7 - Veterans		
Research	Above	
Total Expenditures		**$ 200,000**

EVALUATION SCHEDULE AND PROCESS

The evaluation of progress in the PVC Student Equity Plan will be accomplished in various ways, including:

1. The Student Success and Support Program/Student Equity Committee will conduct ongoing assessment of the effectiveness of Student Equity Plan goals and activities implemented to address areas of disproportionate impact. The SSSP/Student Equity Committee, chaired by the Vice President of Instruction and Student Services, consists of counselors, teaching faculty, support staff, administrators and the college's institutional researcher. The broad representation on the SSSP/Student Equity Committee ensures institution-wide examination of the College's progress in achieving student equity.

2. The SSSP/Student Equity Committee prepared, and is responsible for monitoring, the Student Success and Support Program Plan, previously submitted to the CCCCO, October 17, 2014. The SSSP/Student Equity Committee thus provides integrated oversight of student success and equity and is in the position to make adjustments to either Plan to ensure effective coordination and effective implementation of goals expressed by each.

3. Several members of the SSSP/Student Equity Committee also serve on the PVC Program Review Committee, providing coordination between the two committees. At present the Program Review Committee is re-examining its long-standing program review process, therefore allowing for the timely inclusion of student equity in the program self-assessment process.

4. Several members of the SSSP/Student Equity Committee also serve on the PVC College Council/Strategic Planning Steering Committee, the College's key planning organization, chaired by the Superintendent/President. The participation of SSSP/Student Equity Committee members on the College Council provides for representation of student equity matters. The College Council consists of representation of all constituencies and, among other responsibilities, is charged with monitoring the *Integrated Strategic Plan 2013-16*, two initiatives of which have bearing on student success and equity:

   > Initiative 1: Deliver and continuously improve upon quality educational programs, emphasizing student learning leading to certification, conferral of associate degrees, transfer to four-year institutions, and personal growth and career enhancement.
   >
   > Initiative 2: Provide quality student support services to a diverse student population, providing opportunities for student success.

5. The PVC Board of Trustees has a long-standing commitment to student equity, described in Board Policy/Administrative Procedure 5300 Student Equity, thus ensuring ultimate accountability for the delivery of an effective student equity program.