



2015 Student Equity Plan Summary

Los Angeles Trade-Technical College

December 16, 2015

Executive Summary

Introduction

For the past three years, Los Angeles Trade-Technical College has been embarking on a transformative journey focused on creating Pathways to Academic, Career, and Transfer Success (PACTS) for all students at LATTC. This college-wide movement maximizes student success by embracing an institutional approach to student and instructional support, with an emphasis on eliminating silos and barriers. As a college that serves the areas with significant educational attainment gaps, LATTC is committed to developing, piloting and assessing strategies to improve student success, given the historical achievement gaps related to the communities we serve. The Student Equity Plan is designed to enhance and enrich the PACTS framework and advance the college mission by addressing the specific needs of those student groups that are more significantly impacted than the traditionally underserved LATTC student.

Highest priority target groups with disproportionate impacts selected for intervention:

Success Indicator: Access

- 1) Students with disabilities (PI=0.37 and 6 percentage points difference)
- 2) Asian students (PI=0.38 and 7.3 percentage points difference)
- 3) Latino/Hispanic students (PI=0.85 and 8.5 percentage points difference)

Success Indicator: Course Completion

All Credit: 1) Foster youth students (PI=0.85 and 0.4 percentage points difference) and, 2) Black/African-American students (PI=0.88 and 2.7 percentage point difference)

Transfer: 1) Foster youth students (PI=0.85 and 0.4 percentage point difference) and, 2) Black/African-American students (PI=0.89 and 2.7 percentage point difference)

Vocational: 1) Foster youth students (PI=0.88 and 0.3 percentage point difference) and, 2) Black/African-American students (PI=0.91 and 2.1 percentage point difference)

Success Indicator: ESL and Basic Skills Math and English Completion

Basic Skills Math: 1) Black/African-American students (PI=0.47 and 22.1 percentage points difference) and, 2) Students with disabilities (PI=0.57 and 5.2 percentage points difference)

Basic Skills English: 1) Black/African-American students (PI=0.62 and 15.2 percentage points difference) and, 2) Students with disabilities (PI=0.62 and 3.9 percentage points difference)

Remedial ESL: 1) Hispanic/Latino students (PI=0.75 and 17.9 percentage points difference), 2) Male students (PI=0.79 and 8.7 percentage points difference), and 3) Students with disabilities (PI=0.90 and 1.1 percentage points difference)

Success Indicator: Degree and Certificate Completion

- 1) Students who are not economically disadvantaged (PI=0.32 and 7.2 percentage points difference)
- 2) White students (PI=0.41 and 2.1 percentage points difference)
- 3) Black/African-American students (PI=0.85 and 4.1 percentage points difference)

Success Indicator: Transfer

- 1) Students with disabilities (PI=0.80 and 1.1 percentage points difference)
- 2) Black/African-American students (PI=0.84 and 3.3 percentage points difference)
- 3) Hispanic/Latino students (PI=0.94 and 3.4 percentage points difference)
- 4) Students who are economically disadvantaged (PI=0.94 and 5.9 percentage points difference)

Expected impact on student success: For all target groups that were below equity (PI < .80), the goal is to address equity to bring these groups to “almost at equity (PI ≥ .80). For target groups that were almost at equity (.80 ≥ PI < 1.0), the goal is to bring these groups to equity (PI ≥ 1.0). These results will be achieved within five years, by 2020.



2015 Student Equity Plan Summary
 Los Angeles Trade-Technical College
 December 16, 2015

Disproportionate Impacts, College Analysis, and Plans for Improvement

I. Access

Impacted Group(s)	College Analysis	Plan(s) for Improvement	Expected Improvement(s)	Progress Toward Reducing Disproportionate Impact
<p>Students with disabilities (PI=0.37 and 6 percentage points difference)</p> <p>Asian students (PI=0.38 and 7.3 percentage points difference)</p> <p>White students (PI=0.83 and 1.2 percentage points difference)</p> <p>Latino/Hispanic students (PI=0.85 and 8.5 percentage points difference)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on campus research Students with Disabilities, and Asian students are below equity based on the proportionality index. White students and Hispanic/Latino Students are almost at equity and will be targeted as well. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conduct qualitative research (focus groups and interviews) with students to identify barriers to disclosure and/or enrollment in DSPS. Establish a DSPS college wide campaign (posters, fliers, web presence, video orientations, etc.) to increase visibility and awareness of DSPS categorical services and support. Review and revise LATTC outreach plan to include more active DSPS presence and involvement in the recruitment, orientation and student on-boarding process. 	<p>For all target groups that were below equity (PI < .80), the goal is to address equity to bring these groups to “almost at equity (PI ≥ .80). For target groups that were almost at equity (.80 ≥ PI < 1.0), the goal is to bring these groups to equity (PI ≥ 1.0).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initiated development of LATTC outreach campaign that includes K-12 and community agencies in key areas to reach impacted campaign. Provided additional evening course sections with start and end times to accommodate for more working adults including Latino immigrants.



2015 Student Equity Plan Summary
 Los Angeles Trade-Technical College
 December 16, 2015

Disproportionate Impacts, College Analysis, and Plans for Improvement

II. Course Completion

Impacted Group	College Analysis	Plan(s) for Improvement	Expected Improvement(s)	Progress Toward Reducing Disproportionate Impact
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Foster youth students (PI=0.85 and 0.4 percentage points difference) • Black/African-American students (PI=0.88 and 2.7 percentage point difference) • Students who identify as more than one race (PI=0.88 and 0.3 percentage point difference) 	<p>The proportionality index for all student groups are above 0.85. African-American students represent an impacted group for four of seven student equity categories: course completion, basic skills math and English, and transfer. This indicates the need for a more comprehensive and integrated approach.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct qualitative research to identify and specify the issues; • Provide targeted professional development for faculty and staff about research-informed and evidence based andragogy and counseling strategies to address the needs of Black/African-American students and foster youth students • Provide needed materials and supplies to Black/African-American students and Foster Youth students including uniforms, tools and supplies required for their programs of study • Based on results of the research mentioned above; develop support services for Black/African-American students and Foster Youth students to address unmet needs; • LATTC will integrate the <i>general principles</i> of Umoja and the evidence-based Umoja best practice activities into the PACTS framework to provide support services for targeted Black/African-American students; an “Umoja” Coordinator will be hired. 	<p>For all target groups that were almost at equity ($.80 \geq PI < 1.0$), the goal is to bring these groups to equity ($PI \geq 1.0$).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developed an Umoja program linking counseling and student support services. • Provided professional development to faculty and student travel for Umoja Conference. • Initiated focus groups to better understand targeted needs, strengths and challenges.



2015 Student Equity Plan Summary
 Los Angeles Trade-Technical College
 December 16, 2015

Disproportionate Impacts, College Analysis, and Plans for Improvement

III. ESL and Basic Skills Completion

Impacted Group(s)	College Analysis	Plan(s) for Improvement	Expected Improvement(s)	Progress Toward Reducing Disproportionate Impact
<p>Remedial ESL: The student groups experiencing the greatest gaps are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hispanic/Latino students (PI=0.75 and 17.9 percentage points difference) • Male students (PI=0.79 and 8.7 percentage points difference) • Students with disabilities (PI=0.90 and 1.1 percentage points difference) <p>Basic Skills Math: The student groups experiencing the greatest gaps are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • American Indian/Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islanders students combined (N=20; PI=0.00 and 0.9 percentage points difference) • Black/African-American students (PI=0.47 and 22.1 percentage points difference) 	<p><i>Remedial ESL</i> - The college has a credit ESL program with limited course offerings; non-credit ESL course sections have increased over the past three years providing for a larger student base to transition into credit ESL.</p> <p><i>Basic Skills Math & English:</i> African-Americans and students with disabilities are the most impacted student groups in both categories. The college recognizes the need for targeted strategies.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide books, workbooks, adaptive learning programs and other online materials to assist male students and Hispanic/Latino students with ESL courses. • Provide books, workbooks, adaptive learning programs and other online materials to assist Black/African-Americans and DSPS students with basic skills math and English courses • Professional development will be provided to faculty and staff to better address the needs of DSPS students' innovations. • Professional development will be provided to faculty and staff to better address the needs of Black/African-American students through curricular innovations and revising faculty instructional practices guided by the Center for Urban Education. • Provide additional tutoring for targeted students within 	<p>For all target groups that were below equity (PI < .80), the goal is to bring these groups to "almost at equity" (PI ≥ .80). For target groups that were almost at equity (.80 ≥ PI < 1.0), the goal is to bring these groups to equity (PI ≥ 1.0).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developed an institutional research tool that provides data on gender and ethnicity at the course and section level to better disaggregate data and allow for faculty. • Initiated professional development activities centered on reviewing data with an equity lens. • Convocation activities led by CUE provided the framework for equity discussion.



2015 Student Equity Plan Summary
 Los Angeles Trade-Technical College
 December 16, 2015

Disproportionate Impacts, College Analysis, and Plans for Improvement

Impacted Group(s)	College Analysis	Plan(s) for Improvement	Expected Improvement(s)	Progress Toward Reducing Disproportionate Impact
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students with disabilities (PI=0.57 and 5.2 percentage points difference) <p>Basic Skills English: The student groups experiencing the greatest gaps are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Black/African-American students (PI=0.62 and 15.2 percentage points difference) • Students with disabilities (PI=0.62 and 3.9 percentage points difference) 		<p>the pathways to address the needs for assistance in mastering Tier 2 competencies in basic skills English and math.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expand service hours of DSPS to accommodate the needs of all students, including those who attend classes during non-traditional hours. • Hire additional faculty who will focus on curricular re-design and special interventions and activities. 		



2015 Student Equity Plan Summary
 Los Angeles Trade-Technical College
 December 16, 2015

Disproportionate Impacts, College Analysis, and Plans for Improvement

IV. Degree and Certificate Completion

Impacted Group	College Analysis	Plan(s) for Improvement	Expected Improvement(s)	Progress Toward Reducing Disproportionate Impact
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students who are not economically disadvantaged (PI=0.32 and 7.2 percentage points difference) White students (PI=0.41 and 2.1 percentage points difference) Black/African-American students (PI=0.85 and 4.1 percentage points difference) 	<p>There is a need for further research to identify and understand why students are not accessing financial aid.</p> <p>Based on college conversations that included faculty and staff, the incumbent worker student population seeking career enhancement are believed to impact the overall certificate and degree completion rates. Additional and more refined research will provide further responses.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conduct qualitative and quantitative research to determine the causes and continuing factors for the lower rates of course completion for white and non-low income students. “Umoja” Coordinator will develop strategies to assist Black/African-American students with degree completion, including encouraging the use of tutoring, faculty office hours, relevant “Umoja” activities and interventions and other available support services within the pathways. 	<p>For all target groups that were below equity (PI < .80), the goal is to address equity to bring these groups to “almost at equity (PI ≥ .80). For target groups that were almost at equity (.80 ≥ PI < 1.0), the goal is to bring these groups to equity (PI ≥ 1.0).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LATTC has launched six pathways (PACTS): Advanced Transportation and Manufacturing; Applied Sciences; Construction, Maintenance and Utilities; Design and Media Arts; Health Sciences; and Liberal Arts Pathway that provides a set of comprehensive and integrated instructional and student support services. The pathway practices include two-year scheduling (guided choices), cohorts, and contextualization. Over a four year period, LATTC completions have increased nearly 100% for certificates and over 15% for degrees.



2015 Student Equity Plan Summary
 Los Angeles Trade-Technical College
 December 16, 2015

Disproportionate Impacts, College Analysis, and Plans for Improvement

V. Transfer

Impacted Group	College Analysis	Plan(s) for Improvement	Expected Improvement(s)	Progress Toward Reducing Disproportionate Impact
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students with disabilities (PI=0.80 and 1.1 percentage points difference) • Black/African-American students (PI=0.84 and 3.3 percentage points difference) • Hispanic/Latino students (PI=0.94 and 3.4 percentage points difference) • Students who are economically disadvantaged (PI=0.94 and 5.9 percentage points difference) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proportionality index for all student groups are at 0.80 “almost at equity”. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hire a Pathway Navigator for the Liberal Arts Pathway; since the students with the intention of transferring are largely within the Liberal Arts Pathway. • The Pathway Navigator will work with the Transfer Center Director and the Liberal Arts Pathway Counselor to provide services to increase transfer rates for the targeted groups. • The Navigator will specifically coordinate services with DSPS, “Umoja”, and Puente to address the specific needs of the students with disabilities, Black/African-American Students and Latino students, three of the groups not at equity for transfer. • Provide needed books, workbooks, materials and adaptive learning software for low-income students. 	<p>For all target groups that were almost at equity ($.80 \geq PI < 1.0$), the goal is to bring these groups to equity ($PI \geq 1.0$).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LATTC launched the Liberal Arts Pathway that provides a set of comprehensive and integrated instructional and student support services within a cohort experience. Although transfer rates data represent a six-year cohort, the college anticipates making progress on transfer rates within two years based on the PACTS principles of guided choices, cohort-based year-round scheduling, and pathway (embedded) counseling.

Los Angeles Trade-Technical College

Student Equity Plan

December 2015

Los Angeles Trade Technical College
Student Success Committee

**LOS ANGELES TRADE-TECHNICAL COLLEGE
STUDENT EQUITY PLAN**

Table of Contents

Signature Page

Executive Summary

- Target Groups
- Goals
- Activities
- Student Equity Funding and Other Resources
- Contact Person/Student Equity Coordinator

Planning Committee and Collaboration

Access

Campus-Based Research

- Overview
- Indicator Definitions and Data
- Conclusions: Disproportionately Impacted Student Groups

Goals, Activities, Funding and Evaluation

- Access Baseline Data and Goals
- Activities to Improve Access for Target Student Groups
- Expected Outcomes for Target Student Groups

Course Completion

Campus-Based Research

- Overview
- Indicator Definitions and Data
- Conclusions: Disproportionately Impacted Student Groups

Goals, Activities, Funding and Evaluation

- Course Completion Baseline Data and Goals
- Activities to Improve Course Completion for Target Student Groups
- Expected Outcomes for Target Student Groups

ESL and Basic Skills Completion

Campus-Based Research

- Overview
- Indicator Definitions and Data
- Conclusions: Disproportionately Impacted Student Groups

Goals, Activities, Funding and Evaluation

ESL and Basic Skills Completion Baseline Data and Goals
Activities to Improve ESL and Basic Skills Completion for Target Student Groups
Expected Outcomes for Target Student Groups

Degree and Certificate Completion

Campus-Based Research

Overview
Indicator Definitions and Data
Conclusions: Disproportionately Impacted Student Groups

Goals, Activities, Funding and Evaluation

Degree and Certificate Completion Baseline Data and Goals
Activities to Improve Degree and Certificate Completion for Target Student Groups
Expected Outcomes for Target Student Groups

Transfer

Campus-Based Research

Overview
Indicator Definitions and Data
Conclusions: Disproportionately Impacted Student Groups

Goals, Activities, Funding and Evaluation

Transfer Baseline Data and Goals
Activities to Improve Transfer for Target Student Groups
Expected Outcomes for Target Student Groups

Other College- or District-wide Initiatives Affecting Several Indicators

Goals, Activities, Funding and Evaluation

Goals Addressed by Activities
Activities, Funding and Evaluation to Improve Outcomes for Target Student Groups

Summary Evaluation Plan

Attachments

Signature Page

*Los Angeles Trade-Technical College
Student Equity Plan Signature Page*

District: LACCD

**Board of Trustees Approval
Date:**

1/13/2016

I certify that this plan was reviewed and approved by the district board of trustees on the date shown above. I also certify that student equity categorical funding allocated to my college or district will be expended in accordance the student equity expenditure guidelines published by the California Community College Chancellor's Office (CCCCO).

[Signature]

Laurence B. Frank

franklb@lattc.edu

I certify that student equity categorical funding allocated to my college will be expended in accordance the student equity expenditure guidelines published by the CCCCCO.

[Signature]

Mary Gallagher

gallagmp@lattc.edu

[Signature]

Jeanette Gordon

gordonjl@email.laccd.edu

I certify that I was involved in the development of the plan and support the research goals, activities, budget and evaluation it contains.

[Signature]

Kaneesha Tarrant

tarrantk@lattc.edu

I certify that I was involved in the development of the plan and support the research goals, activities, budget and evaluation it contains.

[Signature]

Leticia L. Barajas

barajal@lattc.edu

I certify that Academic Senate representatives were involved in the development of the plan and the Senate supports the research goals, activities, budget and evaluation it contains.

Wallace Hanley

Hanleywd@lattc.edu

I certify that Associated Student Body representatives were involved in the development of the plan and supports the research goals, activities, budget and evaluation it contains.

[Signature]

Taqwe Beamon, President, Associated Students Beamont@lattc.edu

[Signature]

Leticia L. Barajas

barajal@lattc.edu

213 763 7071

DRAFT

Executive Summary

Introduction

As one of nine public two year colleges in the Los Angeles Community College District, Los Angeles Trade-Technical College (LATTC) offers specialized career technical education and academic, transfer-track programs. LATTC’s mission, in brief, is to provide high-quality academic, technical, and professional educational opportunities for the population it serves. The College’s primary district-defined service area is comprised of a 15 zip-code region that spans the Central, East, South, and Southeast areas of Los Angeles. However, LATTC also serves a multitude of students from across the Los Angeles Community College District’s (LACCD) 882-square mile region primarily due to its long history of preparing students for trade and technical careers in programs of study not offered by many other colleges. Our proud 90-year history stems from our roots in workforce preparation and a commitment to the Greater Los Angeles Community.

LATTC’s primary service area encompasses some of the most disadvantaged communities in Los Angeles. According to the U.S. Census, most of the zip codes within LATTC’s service area have high unemployment rates, high poverty rates and low levels of educational attainment when compared to the greater Los Angeles County region. Furthermore, LATTC’s service area has the lowest median income compared to the other LACCD colleges’ service areas.

For the past three years, Los Angeles Trade-Technical College has been embarking on a transformative journey focused on creating Pathways to Academic, Career, and Transfer Success (PACTS) for all students at LATTC. This college wide movement maximizes student success by embracing an *institutional* approach to student and instructional support, with an emphasis on eliminating silos and barriers. As a college that serves the areas with significant educational attainment gaps, LATTC is committed to developing, piloting and assessing strategies to improve student success, given the historical achievement gaps related to the communities we serve. The Student Equity Plan is designed to enhance and enrich the PACTS framework and advance the college mission by addressing the specific needs of those student groups that are more significantly impacted than the traditionally underserved LATTC student. The equity planning process involves collecting and analyzing student success data disaggregated by ethnicity, gender, and disability, foster youth, veteran, and low income statuses to identify areas of strength and need. From these data, a work plan was developed that leverages PACTS strategies and areas of strength and provides additional support and resources in areas of need.

Target Student Groups

LATTC used the “Proportionality Index” methodology for assessing disproportionate impact for each of the target groups. The interpretation of the proportionality index was adapted from the University of Southern California’s Center for Urban Education. The table below describes how the proportionality index was interpreted for this Student Equity Plan.

Proportionality Index	Interpretation
-----------------------	----------------

Greater or equal to 1	At or above equity
Greater or equal or 0.8 but less than 1.0	Almost at equity
Below 0.8	Below equity

Source: [“Measuring the State of Equity in Public High Education,” USC Center for Urban Education, October 2003.](#)

Based on these data, the groups with the highest equity gaps were selected for targeted for interventions. These are described below:

Access

The student groups experiencing the largest equity gaps in terms of participation rates are:

- Students with **disabilities** (PI=0.37 and 6 percentage points difference)
- **Asian** students (PI=0.38 and 7.3 percentage points difference)
- **White** students (PI=0.83 and 1.2 percentage points difference)
- **Latino/Hispanic** students (PI=0.85 and 8.5 percentage points difference)

Success Indicator: Course Completion

All Credit: While the proportionality index for **all student groups are above 0.85**, the three student groups experiencing the largest equity gaps are:

- **Foster youth** students (PI=0.85 and 0.4 percentage points difference)
- **Black/African-American** students (PI=0.88 and 2.7 percentage point difference)
- Students who identify as **more than one race** (PI=0.88 and 0.3 percentage point difference)

Transfer: While the proportionality index for **all student groups are above 0.85**, the three student groups experiencing the largest equity gaps are:

- **Foster youth** students (PI=0.85 and 0.4 percentage point difference)
- **Black/African-American** students (PI=0.89 and 2.7 percentage point difference)
- Students who identify as **more than one race** (PI=0.88 and 0.2 percentage point difference)

Basic Skills: The three student groups experiencing the largest equity gaps are:

- **Foster youth** students (PI=0.80 and 0.7 percentage point difference)
- **Black/African-American** students (PI=0.80 and 5.3 percentage point difference)
- **White** students (PI=0.87 and 0.4 percentage point difference)

Vocational: While the proportionality index for **all student groups are above 0.85**, the three student groups experiencing the largest equity gaps are:

- Students who identify as **more than one race** (PI=0.87 and 0.3 percentage point difference)
- **Foster youth** students (PI=0.88 and 0.3 percentage point difference)
- **Black/African-American** students (PI=0.91 and 2.1 percentage point difference)

Success Indicator: ESL and Basic Skills Math and English Completion

Basic Skills Math: The student groups experiencing the greatest gaps are:

- **Black/African-American** students (PI=0.47 and 22.1 percentage points difference)
- Students with **disabilities** (PI=0.57 and 5.2 percentage points difference)

Basic Skills English: The student groups experiencing the greatest gaps are:

- Black/African-American students (PI=0.62 and 15.2 percentage points difference)
- Students with disabilities (PI=0.62 and 3.9 percentage points difference)

Remedial ESL: The student groups experiencing the greatest gaps are:

- Hispanic/Latino students (PI=0.75 and 17.9 percentage points difference)
- Male students (PI=0.79 and 8.7 percentage points difference)
- Students with disabilities (PI=0.90 and 1.1 percentage points difference)

Success Indicator: Degree and Certificate Completion

The student groups experiencing the greatest gaps are:

- Students who are not economically disadvantaged (PI=0.32 and 7.2 percentage points difference)
- White students (PI=0.41 and 2.1 percentage points difference)
- Black/African-American students (PI=0.85 and 4.1 percentage points difference)

Success Indicator: Transfer

The student groups experiencing the greatest gaps are:

- Students with disabilities (PI=0.80 and 1.1 percentage points difference)
- Black/African-American students (PI=0.84 and 3.3 percentage points difference)
- Hispanic/Latino students (PI=0.94 and 3.4 percentage points difference)
- Students who are economically disadvantaged (PI=0.94 and 5.9 percentage points difference)

Goals and Activities

Funding and Budget

Budget allocation for Los Angeles Trade Technical College 2015-2016 (Carry-over until December 31, 2016) - **\$2,180,810**

Contact:

Leticia Barajas, V.P. of Academic Affairs and Workforce Development & Student Equity Coordinator

barajal@lattc.edu

213-763-7071

Kaneesha Tarrant, Vice President, Student Services and Co-Chair, Student Success Committee

<http://tarrankk@lattc.edu> 213-763-7076

Planning Committee and Collaboration

Student Equity Planning Process 2014-15 – Initial Year

The Student Success Committee was responsible for leading the dialogue among diverse stakeholders with regards to the development of the Student Equity Plan in 2014. The Student Success Committee's 2013 – 2014 goals included addressing student equity and managing the steps required by SB 860 to complete the Student Equity Plan. The Institutional Research office prepared campus research data in spring 2014. Starting in April 2014, data were presented at several Student Success and other committee meetings with the intent of brainstorming, gathering feedback, and sharing ideas about the need to further disaggregate and clearly present data. To ensure transparency and communication, a student equity web page was created on the Student Success Committee site; as feedback was received, documents were revised and posted on this website. Data were also presented and feedback was received at various college wide gatherings, such as the annual staff and faculty convocations. The September 2014 college wide Day of Dialogue focused exclusively on the SSSP and Equity Plans, with the expected outcome to increase college wide knowledge about the plans, encourage dialogue and elicit feedback about possible strategies to mitigate identified equity gaps among identified student subgroup populations. At the beginning of the fall 2014 semester, Student Success workgroup sessions were scheduled every Wednesday to further analyze the data, focusing on a small subset of indicators each week. Dates for these meetings and data were published on the website in advance. The purpose of these meetings was to solicit input in order to draft goals and action plans for the Student Equity Plan, as well as to ensure alignment of these goals with the strategic priorities of the college's Educational Master Plan, which is aligned with PACTS. These sessions were widely attended by students, faculty and staff, who provided meaningful and useful feedback that was incorporated into the draft of the plan. The final draft was presented to and approved by the Student Success Committee, Academic Senate and LACCD Board of Trustees and was ultimately successfully submitted to the Chancellor's Office.

Student Equity Planning Process – 2015-16

In light of the new 2015-16 Student Equity Plan Template, and in response to the meaningful feedback received from the California Community College Chancellor's office about the strengths and weaknesses of its 2104 Student Equity Plan, the College's Student Success Committee was tasked with revising and updating the college's Student Equity Plan in August 2015. The college followed a similar process as was used in 2014 and utilized the same constituent engagement strategies to update the Student Equity Plan. Further, although not required, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness provided updated data so the new plan could reflect the most recently available numbers.

Towards the goals of enhancing the College's ability to prepare the Student Equity Plan in the new template, and to strengthen the College's planning process, a core team from the College's Student Equity Plan Committee attended USC's Center for Urban Education Student Equity Plan Institute in September 2015. The two-day event resulted in a plan for the refinement of the engagement strategies, as well as in an initial draft of 2015 Plan. Further, two members of the committee attended the Chancellor's Office Student Equity/SSSP Directors Training in September/October 2015 to further enhance the quality of the Student Equity Plan draft.

Student Success Committee Membership & Student Equity Workgroup Attendee* List

Member Name	Title	Organization(s), Program(s) or Role(s) Represented
Kaneesha Tarrant	VP Student Services	Student Success Committee Administrative Co-Chair
Jess Guerra	Chair, Advanced Transportation & Manufacturing	Student Success Committee Faculty Co-Chair, Faculty Association
Leticia Barajas	VP of Academic Affairs and Workforce Development	Student Equity Coordinator; College Administration
Martin Diaz- Academic Senate	Vice Chair, Sciences and 1 st Vice President, Academic Senate	Academic Senate
Inhae Ahn – Academic Senate	Counselor	Academic Senate
Carole Anderson	Chair, Design and Media Arts and President, Faculty Guild	Faculty Association
Kookie Murray– AFT Staff Guild	Veterans Center Student Support Staff	AFT 1521A Staff Guild
Christina Anketell	Chair, <i>Academic Connections</i>	Department Chair & Basic Skills Representative
Jan Gangel-Vasquez	Chair, <i>English</i>	Department Chair
Taybeh Meftagh	Chair, Math	Department Chair & Basic Skills Initiative Faculty Lead
Tom Dawkins	Chair, <i>Counseling</i>	Department Chair & Student Services
Anna Badalyan	Dean, Institutional Effectiveness	Institutional Effectiveness
Henan Joof*	Dean, Student Services	Bridges to Success & Student Success and Support Program (SSSP) Coordinator
Nicole Albo-Lopez*	Dean, Academic Affairs & Workforce Development	Pathway Dean, Liberal Arts and Supervising Administrator – Basic Skills Initiative
Marcia Wilson*	Special Projects Program Director	Tier I Pathway Implementation Lead

Success Indicator: Access

Campus Based Research

Overview

LATTC used the “Proportionality Index” methodology for assessing disproportionate impact for this indicator. The interpretation of the proportionality index, as shown in the table below, was adapted from the University of Southern California’s Center for Urban Education.

Proportionality Index	Interpretation
Greater or equal to 1	At or above equity
Greater or equal or 0.8 but less than 1.0	Almost at equity
Below 0.8	Below equity

Source: [“Measuring the State of Equity in Public High Education,” USC Center for Urban Education, October 2003.](#)

LATTC is located on the southern edge of downtown Los Angeles, approximately two miles south of the Central Business District. The college’s primary district-delineated service area is comprised of a 15 zip-code region that spans the Central, East, South, and Southeast areas of Los Angeles. LATTC’s primary service area encompasses some of the most disadvantaged communities in Los Angeles. According to the U.S. Census, most of the zip codes within LATTC’s service area have high unemployment rates, high poverty rates and low levels of educational attainment when compared to the greater Los Angeles County region. Furthermore, LATTC’s service area has the lowest median income compared to the other LACCD colleges’ service areas.

The service area data that follows is based on the LATTC’s primary service area that encompasses the 15 zip codes identified by the District as the College’s primary service area. The data was obtained from various sources as cited at the bottom of the tables that follow. Important notes with short explanations of the methodologies used are also included at the bottom of the tables. The data on the student population is from the fall 2014 semester and was obtained from LACCD’s database.

Indicator Definitions and Data

A. Issues with **ACCESS** were computed by comparing the percentage of each population group that is enrolled to the percentage of each group in the adult population within the community served. This percentage is frequently calculated as a participation rate.

Access Rates, Fall 2014

	>=1.0 At or above Equity	=0.8 - <1.0 Almost at Equity	<0.8 Below Equity			
	Annual Participation Rate	Student Population (Fall 2014)	% of Student Population (Fall 2014)	Service Area Population	% of Service Area	Proportionality Index
TOTAL	5%	16,038	-	344,408	-	-
GENDER						
Female	5%	7,591	47.3%	161,005	46.7%	1.01
Male	5%	8,447	52.7%	183,403	53.3%	0.99
RACE/ETHNICITY						
American Indian/Alaska Native	18%	42	0.3%	234	0.1%	3.85
Asian	2%	710	4.4%	40,138	11.7%	0.38
Black/African-American	6%	3,440	21.4%	54,041	15.7%	1.37
Hispanic/Latino	4%	8,849	55.2%	222,998	64.7%	0.85
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	35%	33	0.2%	95	0.0%	7.46
White	4%	918	5.7%	23,731	6.9%	0.83
Some other race (Unknown)	NA	670	4.2%	NA	NA	NA
More than one race	43%	1,376	8.6%	3,172	0.9%	9.32
FOSTER YOUTH						
Yes	14%	152	1.2%	1,118	0.7%	1.63
No	8%	12,655	98.8%	152,043	99.3%	1.00

Notes:

Gender: The Service Area population for Gender includes residents between 15-64 years old in order to capture the adult population.

Race/Ethnicity: The Service Area Population for Race/Ethnicity includes residents between 15-64 years old in order to capture the adult population. Filipino counts are included in the “Asian” category. Service Area population data for the “Some other race” category was not available.

Foster Youth: Foster youth totals for the student population and service area population are not equal to the first “Total” row. The number of foster youth in the service area is approximated using a 0.73% foster youth rate for LA County residents ages 0-21 in 2014. This rate was calculated by dividing the number of foster youth in LA County by the population in LA County under 21 years old.

Sources:

Student population for all categories: Fall 2014, LACCD database (IRDS).

Service Area population for Gender and Race/Ethnicity: 2014 demographics data for LATTC 15 zip codes, Economic Modeling Specialist, Inc. (EMSI), <http://www.economicmodeling.com/>.

Service Area population for Foster Youth: 2014 Number of Children in Foster Care in Los Angeles County, Kidsdata, <http://www.kidsdata.org/topic/4/foster-care/summary>; 2014 LA County population estimate, U.S. Census Bureau: State and County QuickFacts. <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/06/06037.html>.

Access Rates, Fall 2014

>=1.0 At or above Equity			=0.8 - <1.0 Almost at Equity			<0.8 Below Equity
	Annual Participation Rate	Student Population (Fall 2014)	% of Student Population (Fall 2014)	Service Area Population	% of Service Area	Proportionality Index
TOTAL	5%	16,038	-	344,408	-	-
DISABILITY STATUS (DSPS)						
Yes	2%	552	3.4%	33,955	9.4%	0.37
No	5%	15,486	96.6%	327,270	90.6%	1.07
LOW-INCOME						
Yes	3%	8,506	53.0%	270,695	55.5%	0.95
No	3%	7,532	47.0%	216,617	44.5%	1.06
VETERANS						
Yes	3%	471	8.3%	16,230	4.2%	1.94
No	1%	5,233	91.7%	365,979	95.8%	0.96

Notes:

Disability Status (DSPS): The number of individuals with a disability status in the service area is approximated using a 9.4% reported disability rate from a 2005-2007 sample of LA County residents ages 16-64. The service area population includes residents between 15-64 years old in order to capture the adult population. The total for the service area population is not equal to the first “Total” row.

Low-Income: Low-Income students are defined as BOGG recipients, which includes individuals who are 150% of the federal poverty level. Low-income numbers in the service area are calculated using 150% federal poverty rates for each zip code in the service area. The service area population includes individuals whose poverty status is determined, and therefore is not equal to the first “Total” row.

Veterans: Students with a military status are included in the “Veteran” category. The total for the student population is not equal to the first “Total” row because there are unknown veteran statuses. The number of veterans the service area is approximated using a 4.2% veteran rate for LA County residents. This rate was calculated by dividing the number of veterans in LA County by the population in LA County over 18 years old. The total for the service area population is not equal to the first “Total” row because individuals over 64 years old are accounted for.

Sources:

Student population for all categories: Fall 2014, LACCD database (IRDS).

Service Area population for Disability Status (DSPS): Disability Population Statistics for Los Angeles County, California from Pooled 2005-2007 ACS PUMS Data,

http://www.disabilityplanningdata.com/site/county_population_table.php?state=california&cntyname=Los%20Angeles. **Service Area population for Low Income:** 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey, U.S. Census Bureau,

http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/community_facts.xhtml.

Service Area population for Veterans: 2009-2013 Veteran, U.S. Census Bureau: State and County QuickFacts. <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/06/06037.html>.

Conclusions: Disproportionately Impacted Student Groups

The student groups experiencing the largest equity gaps in terms of participation rates are:

- Students with disabilities (PI=0.37 and 6 percentage points difference)
- Asian students (PI=0.38 and 7.3 percentage points difference)
- Hispanic students (PI=0.85 and 8.5 percentage points difference)

The section that follows details the goals and activities to address equity gaps for the target populations at LATTC.

DRAFT

GOALS, ACTIVITIES, FUNDING AND EVALUATION: ACCESS

GOAL A.

The goal is to improve access for the following target populations identified in the college research as experiencing a disproportionate impact:

Target Population(s)	Current gap, year	Goal*	Goal Year
<i>Example Group</i>	<i>-6, 2014</i>	<i>No gap</i>	<i>2020</i>
• Students with disabilities	(PI=0.37 and 6 percentage points difference)	PI ≥ 0.8	2020
• Asian students	(PI=0.38 and 7.3 percentage points difference)	PI ≥ 0.8	2020
• Hispanic students	(PI=0.85 and 8.5 percentage points difference)	PI ≥ 1.0	2020

*Expressed as either a percentage or number

**Benchmark goals are to be decided by the institution.

ACTIVITIES: A. ACCESS

A.1

- *Activity Type(s)*

X	Outreach		Student Equity Coordination/Planning		Instructional Support Activities
X	Student Services or other Categorical Program		Curriculum/Course Development or Adaptation		Direct Student Support
X	Research and Evaluation	x	Professional Development		

- *Target Student Group(s) & # of Each Affected**:

ID	Target Group	# of Students Affected
A.1	Students with Disabilities	Institutional Effectiveness

• **Activity Implementation Plan**

Activities:

- 1) Conduct qualitative research (focus groups and interviews) with students to identify barriers to disclosure and/or enrollment in DSPS
- 2) Establish a DSPS college wide campaign (posters, fliers, web presence, video orientations, e+tc.) to increase visibility and awareness of DSPS categorical services and support
- 3) Review and revise LATTC outreach plan to include more active DSPS presence and involvement in the recruitment, orientation and student on-boarding process

The Committee’s hypothesis about the reason for the equity gap for students with disabilities is that it is most likely due to the lack of student identification of their disability status, and not an actual lack of enrollment of this population. There are a number of reasons students might fail to disclose their learning and other disabilities (lack of awareness they have one, fear of stigma, lack of verification of disability, etc.). Qualitative research will be conducted to test this hypothesis and identify the actual barriers to self-disclosure. Simultaneously, increased outreach and increased referrals for testing and enrollment in DSPS during the recruitment and orientation process will occur.

ID	Planned Start and End Date(s)	Student Equity Funds	Other Funds**
A.1	January 2016-December 2016	\$40,740	

• **Link to Goal**

These activities will likely increase the number of students who self-disclose disabilities, as well as increase awareness of students who might have an undiagnosed disability. If the awareness campaign does not lead to an increase in the proportionality index to “almost at equity” ($PI \geq .80$), the strategy will be re-evaluated.

• **Evaluation**

- Process evaluations will occur to document and list trainings held for faculty and staff, including topics and feedback from participants
- Process evaluation will document the number of outreach, recruitment and orientation activities DSPS staff attend.
- Data will be collected on the number of DSPS students are enrolled at the beginning of each semester.
- Data will be collected each semester and analyzed for equity yearly.

A.2

• **Activity Type(s)**

X	Outreach		Student Equity Coordination/Planning	X	Instructional Support Activities
X	Student Services or other Categorical Program		Curriculum/Course Development or Adaptation		Direct Student Support
	Research and Evaluation	X	Professional Development		

• **Target Student Group(s) & # of Each Affected*:**

ID	Target Group	# of Students Affected
A.2	Asian and Latino Students	Institutional Effectiveness

• **Activity Implementation Plan**

Activities

- 1) Conduct targeted recruitment through outreach to K-12 schools, community and faith-based organizations in LATTC’s service area to recruit more Asian and Hispanic/Latino students
- 2) Conduct qualitative research with Asian and Hispanic/Latino students who are currently enrolled to consider perceptions and potential barriers to enrollment
- 3) Review and revise LATTC outreach strategies that includes college branding and imaging to target Asian and Hispanic/Latino residents in the community
- 4) Recruit from service area K-12 schools and conduct intergenerational outreach to parents
- 5) Provide special AB540 support services
- 6) Outreach to immigrant population

ID	Timeline(s)	Student Equity Funds	Other Funds**
-----------	--------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------

A.2	January 2016 – December 2016	\$125,000	
-----	------------------------------	-----------	--

- ***Link to Goal***

These activities specifically address outreach to targeted under-represented populations at LATTC. The College has not re-imagined its outreach and branding strategies in over 15 years.

- ***Evaluation***

- Process evaluation data will provide information on the number of outreach and recruitment events attended in the community; a list of all materials developed will be memorialized
- Data on the number of students enrolled who identify as Asian or Hispanic/Latino will be collected each fall after census
- Data will be evaluated for to determine equity by calculating the proportionality index each year

DRAFT

Success Indicator: Course Completion

Campus-Based Research

Overview

LATTC used the “Proportionality Index” methodology for assessing disproportionate impact. The interpretation of the proportionality index, as shown in the table below, was adapted from the University of Southern California’s Center for Urban Education.

Proportionality Index	Interpretation
Greater or equal to 1	At or above equity
Greater or equal or 0.8 but less than 1.0	Almost at equity
Below 0.8	Below equity

Source: [“Measuring the State of Equity in Public High Education,” USC Center for Urban Education, October 2003.](#)

Since LATTC attracts students who attend the college for a myriad of purposes, the college looked each of the four different course status types and reported each type of course status separately:

- **All Credit**
- **Transfer**
- **Basic Skills**
- **Vocational**

All credit and transfer courses are relevant to the analysis because they encompass a large amount of the courses offered by LATTC. Transfer courses also cover a large amount of the academic courses offered by the LATTC. Additionally, basic skills courses are relevant to the analysis because these courses traditionally have shown equity gaps between different demographics. Lastly, vocational courses are relevant because LATTC is primarily recognized for offering quality career technical education.

Indicator Definitions and Data

B. Data on **COURSE COMPLETION** were calculated based on the ratio of the number of credit courses that students completed, by population group, compared to the number of courses in which students in that group are enrolled on the census day of the term.

The rate of course completion is calculated as follows:

Rate	Denominator	Numerator
Rate of Course Completion	The number of courses students enrolled in and were present in on census day in the base term.	The number of courses in which students earned an A, B, C, or credit in the term.

All Credit Course Completion, Fall 2014

	>=1.0 At or above Equity	=0.8 - <1.0 Almost at Equity	<0.8 Below Equity			
	Course Completion Rate	Number of Courses Enrolled	% of Courses Enrolled	Number of Courses Completed	% of Courses Completed	Proportionality Index
TOTAL	67.6%	34,344	100.0%	23,224	100.0%	-
GENDER						
Female	65.5%	16,009	46.6%	10,482	45.1%	0.97
Male	69.5%	18,335	53.4%	12,742	54.9%	1.03
RACE/ETHNICITY						
American Indian/Alaska Native	62.3%	77	0.2%	48	0.2%	1.00
Asian	80.8%	1,579	4.6%	1,276	5.5%	1.20
Black/African-American	59.7%	8,013	23.3%	4,784	20.6%	0.88
Hispanic/Latino	68.7%	20,943	61.0%	14,389	62.0%	1.02
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	83.6%	61	0.2%	51	0.2%	1.00
White	80.1%	1,736	5.1%	1,391	6.0%	1.18
Some other race (Unknown)	70.7%	1,205	3.5%	852	3.7%	1.05
More than one race	59.3%	730	2.1%	433	1.9%	0.88
FOSTER YOUTH						
Yes	57.3%	986	2.9%	565	2.4%	0.85
No	67.9%	33,358	97.1%	22,659	97.6%	1.00
DISABILITY STATUS (DSPS)						
Yes	64.6%	1,582	4.6%	1,022	4.4%	0.96
No	67.8%	32,762	95.4%	22,202	95.6%	1.00
LOW-INCOME*						
Yes	67.6%	24,658	69.9%	16,659	69.9%	1.00
No	67.5%	10,640	30.1%	7,182	30.1%	1.00
VETERANS						
Yes	74.5%	1,574	4.6%	1,172	5.0%	1.10
No	67.3%	32,770	95.4%	22,052	95.0%	1.00

Notes: Filipino counts are included in the “Asian” category. The “Unknown” and “Some other race” categories are assumed to be equivalent.

Low-income data was not available for course completion in CCCCCO Data Mart. Low-Income is defined as BOGG recipients, which includes individuals who are 150% below the federal poverty level. Low Income totals are not equal to the first “Total” row.

Individuals with a military status are included in the “Veteran” category.

Source: Fall 2014 Course Retention/Success Rate Summary Report, CCCCCO, http://datamart.cccc.edu/Outcomes/Course_Ret_Success.aspx.

**Source: Fall 2014, LACCD database (IRDS).*

Transfer Course Completion, Fall 2014

	>=1.0 At or above Equity	= 0.8 - <1.0 Almost at Equity	<0.8 Below Equity			
	Course Completion Rate	Number of Courses Enrolled	% of Courses Enrolled	Number of Courses Completed	% of Courses Completed	Proportionality Index
Total	67.7%	22,904	100.0%	15,517	100.0%	-
GENDER						
Female	66.3%	11,913	52.0%	7,900	50.9%	0.98
Male	69.3%	10,991	48.0%	7,617	49.1%	1.02
RACE/ETHNICITY						
American Indian/Alaskan Native	59.6%	52	0.2%	31	0.2%	1.00
Asian	80.3%	985	4.3%	791	5.1%	1.19
Black/African-American	60.2%	5,446	23.8%	3,278	21.1%	0.89
Hispanic/Latino	68.8%	13,996	61.1%	9,631	62.1%	1.02
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	80.9%	47	0.2%	38	0.2%	1.00
White	80.4%	1,057	4.6%	850	5.5%	1.19
Some other race (Unknown)	72.6%	842	3.7%	611	3.9%	1.07
More than one race	59.9%	479	2.1%	287	1.8%	0.88
FOSTER YOUTH						
Yes	57.4%	667	2.9%	383	2.5%	0.85
No	68.1%	22,237	97.1%	15,134	97.5%	1.00
DISABILITY STATUS (DSPS)						
Yes	67.5%	1,022	4.5%	690	4.4%	1.00
No	67.8%	21,882	95.5%	14,827	95.6%	1.00
LOW-INCOME*						
Yes	64.5%	14,672	71.3%	9,469	72.0%	1.01
No	62.4%	5,897	28.7%	3,679	28.0%	0.98
VETERANS						
Yes	70.1%	903	3.9%	633	4.1%	1.03
No	67.7%	22,001	96.1%	14,884	95.9%	1.00

Notes: Filipino counts are included in the "Asian" category. The "Unknown" and "Some other race" categories are assumed to be equivalent.

Low-income data was not available for course completion in CCCCCO Data Mart. Low-Income is defined as BOGG recipients, which includes individuals who are 150% below the federal poverty level. Low Income totals are not equal to the first "Total" row.

Individuals with a military status are included in the "Veteran" category.

Source: Fall 2014 Course Retention/Success Rate Summary Report, CCCCCO, http://datamart.cccco.edu/Outcomes/Course_Ret_Success.aspx.

**Source: Fall 2014, LACCD database (IRDS).*

Basic Skills Course Completion, Fall 2014

	>=1.0 At or above Equity	=0.8 - <1.0 Almost at Equity	<0.8 Below Equity			
	Course Completion Rate	Number of Courses Enrolled	% of Courses Enrolled	Number of Courses Completed	% of Courses Completed	Proportionality Index
Total	53.5%	3,675	100.0%	1,966	100.0%	-
GENDER						
Female	52.4%	2,118	57.6%	1,109	56.4%	0.98
Male	55.0%	1,557	42.4%	857	43.6%	1.03
RACE/ETHNICITY						
American Indian/Alaskan Native	55.6%	9	0.2%	5	0.3%	1.04
Asian	72.2%	90	2.4%	65	3.3%	1.35
Black/African-American	42.8%	979	26.6%	419	21.3%	0.80
Hispanic/Latino	57.3%	2,345	63.8%	1,343	68.3%	1.07
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	100.0%	1	0.0%	1	0.1%	1.87
White	46.5%	101	2.7%	47	2.4%	0.87
Some other race (Unknown)	67.9%	56	1.5%	38	1.9%	1.27
More than one race	51.1%	94	2.6%	48	2.4%	0.95
FOSTER YOUTH						
Yes	42.7%	131	3.6%	56	2.8%	0.80
No	53.9%	3,544	96.4%	1,910	97.2%	1.01
DISABILITY STATUS (DSPS)						
Yes	48.5%	324	8.8%	157	8.0%	0.91
No	54.0%	3,351	91.2%	1,809	92.0%	1.01
LOW-INCOME*						
Yes	50.4%	1,452	78.6%	732	78.2%	0.99
No	51.6%	395	21.4%	204	21.8%	1.02
VETERANS						
Yes	61.7%	133	3.6%	82	4.2%	1.15
No	53.2%	3,542	96.4%	1,884	95.8%	0.99

Notes: Filipino counts are included in the “Asian” category. The “Unknown” and “Some other race” categories are assumed to be equivalent.

Low-income data was not available for course completion in CCCCO Data Mart. Low-Income is defined as BOGG recipients, which includes individuals who are 150% below the federal poverty level. Low Income totals are not equal to the first “Total” row.

Individuals with a military status are included in the “Veteran” category.

Source: Fall 2014 Course Retention/Success Rate Summary Report, CCCCO,

http://datamart.ccco.edu/Outcomes/Course_Ret_Success.aspx.

**Source: Fall 2014, LACCD database (IRDS).*

Vocational Course Completion, Fall 2014

>=1.0 At or above Equity		=0.8 - <1.0 Almost at Equity		<0.8 Below Equity		
	Course Completion Rate	Number of Courses Enrolled	% of Courses Enrolled	Number of Courses Completed	% of Courses Completed	Proportionality Index
Total	73.3%	18,921	100.0%	13,878	100.0%	-
GENDER						
Female	73.0%	6,971	36.8%	5,091	36.7%	1.00
Male	73.5%	11,950	63.2%	8,787	63.3%	1.00
RACE/ETHNICITY						
American Indian/Alaskan Native	63.0%	46	0.2%	29	0.2%	1.00
Asian	83.4%	1053	5.6%	878	6.3%	1.14
Black/African-American	66.7%	4267	22.6%	2844	20.5%	0.91
Hispanic/Latino	73.9%	10957	57.9%	8095	58.3%	1.01
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	85.7%	56	0.3%	48	0.3%	1.00
White	82.0%	1392	7.4%	1142	8.2%	1.12
Some other race (Unknown)	78.2%	740	3.9%	579	4.2%	1.07
More than one race	64.1%	410	2.2%	263	1.9%	0.87
FOSTER YOUTH						
Yes	64.4%	508	2.7%	327	2.4%	0.88
No	73.6%	18,413	97.3%	13,551	97.6%	1.00
DISABILITY STATUS (DSPS)						
Yes	3.0%	755	4.0%	536	3.9%	0.97
No	73.4%	18,166	96.0%	13,342	96.1%	1.00
LOW-INCOME*						
Yes	75.7%	8,534	66.3%	6,458	66.2%	1.00
No	75.8%	4,340	33.7%	3,291	33.8%	1.00
VETERANS						
Yes	79.5%	1,072	5.7%	852	6.1%	1.08
No	73.0%	17,849	94.3%	13,026	93.9%	0.99

Notes:

Race/Ethnicity: Filipino counts are included in the “Asian” category. The “Unknown” and “Some other race” categories are assumed to be equivalent.

Low-income data was not available for course completion in CCCCO Data Mart. Low-Income is defined as BOGG recipients, which includes individuals who are 150% below the federal poverty level. Low Income totals are not equal to the first “Total” row.

Veterans: Individuals with a military status are included in the “Veteran” category.

Source: Fall 2014 Course Retention/Success Rate Summary Report, CCCCO, http://datamart.cccco.edu/Outcomes/Course_Ret_Success.aspx.

***Source:** Fall 2014, LACCD database (IRDS).

Conclusions: Disproportionately Impacted Student Groups

All Credit: While the proportionality index for all student groups are above 0.85, the three student groups experiencing the largest equity gaps are:

- Foster youth students (PI=0.85 and 0.4 percentage points difference)
- Black/African-American students (PI=0.88 and 2.7 percentage point difference)
- Students who identify as more than one race (PI=0.88 and 0.3 percentage point difference)

Transfer: While the proportionality index for all student groups are above 0.85, the three student groups experiencing the largest equity gaps are:

- Foster youth students (PI=0.85 and 0.4 percentage point difference)
- Black/African-American students (PI=0.89 and 2.7 percentage point difference)
- Students who identify as more than one race (PI=0.88 and 0.2 percentage point difference)

Basic Skills: The three student groups experiencing the largest equity gaps are:

- Foster youth students (PI=0.80 and 0.7 percentage point difference)
- Black/African-American students (PI=0.80 and 5.3 percentage point difference)
- White students (PI=0.87 and 0.4 percentage point difference)

Vocational: The three student groups experiencing the largest equity gaps are:

- Students who identify as more than one race (PI=0.87 and 0.3 percentage point difference)
- Foster youth students (PI=0.88 and 0.3 percentage point difference)
- Black/African-American students (PI=0.91 and 2.1 percentage point difference)

Overall: While various student groups show equity gaps, the student groups that are disproportionately impacted in all four course status types (all credit, transfer, basic skills, and vocational) are foster youth students and Black/African-American students. These findings have prompted discussions on developing and implementing effective strategies to ensure equity on course completion for all student subgroups at LATTC. Programs and services for these two groups are detailed in the next section of the Plan.

GOALS, ACTIVITIES, FUNDING AND EVALUATION: COURSE COMPLETION

GOAL B.

The goal is to improve course completion for the following target populations identified in the college research as experiencing a disproportionate impact:

Target Population(s)	Current gap, year	Goal*	Goal Year
<i>Example Group</i>	<i>-14, 2014</i>	<i>Gap no > -6</i>	<i>2020</i>
Foster Youth Students	All Credit: PI=0.85 and 0.4 percentage points difference Transfer: PI=0.85 and 0.4 percentage point difference Basic Skills: PI=0.80 and 0.7 percentage point difference Vocational: PI=0.88 and 0.3 percentage point difference	PI ≥ 1.0 PI ≥ 1.0 PI ≥ 1.0 PI ≥ 1.0	2020
Black/African-American Students	All Credit: PI=0.88 and 2.7 percentage point difference Transfer: PI=0.89 and 2.7 percentage point difference Basic Skills: PI=0.80 and 5.3 percentage point difference Vocational: 0.91 and 2.1 percentage point difference	PI ≥ 1.0 PI ≥ 1.0 PI ≥ 1.0 PI ≥ 1.0	2020

*Expressed as either a percentage or number.

**Benchmark goals are to be decided by the institution.

ACTIVITIES: B. COURSE COMPLETION

Suggested Activities/Actions

- 1) Conduct qualitative research to identify and specify the issues; this research will include the disaggregation of the data by gender, by course and by section. These disaggregated data will provide a clearer perspective on the issues with course completion for Black/African-American students and Foster youth students; focus groups and in-depth interviews with Black/African-American and Foster Youth students will be conducted to gain further insight into their needs, strengths and challenges (Research is budgeted in Section F, since this impacts a number of goals and equity issues)
- 2) Provide targeted professional development for faculty and staff about research-informed and evidence based pedagogical and counseling strategies to address the needs of Black/African-American students and foster youth students (Professional Development is budgeted in Section F since this impacts a number of goals and equity issues)
- 3) Furnish needed materials and supplies to Black/African-American students and Foster Youth students including uniforms, tools and supplies required for their programs of study

- 4) Based on results of the research mentioned above; develop support services for Black/African-American students and Foster Youth students to address unmet needs; Pathway Navigators and others will provide supportive services to Black/African-American Students and Foster Youth students. Pathway Navigators will work with the existing Guardian Scholars program (for foster youth students) and Umoja program (for Black/African-American Students) to determine best practices and avoid unnecessary duplication
- 5) LATTC will develop a strategy to integrate the *general principles* of Umoja and the evidence-based Umoja best practice activities into the PACTS framework to provide support services for Black/African-American students; an “Umoja” Coordinator will be hired

B.1

• *Activity Type(s)*

	Outreach	X	Student Equity Coordination/Planning	X	Instructional Support Activities
X	Student Services or other Categorical Program		Curriculum/Course Development or Adaptation	X	Direct Student Support
	Research and Evaluation	X	Professional Development		

• *Target Student Group(s) & # of Each Affected**:

ID	Target Group(s)	# of Students Affected
B.1	Foster Youth students and Black/African-American students	Institutional Effectiveness

• *Activity Implementation Plan*

ID	Planned Start and End Date(s)	Student Equity Funds	Other Funds**
B.1	January 2016- December 2016	\$391,316	

• *Link to Goal*

• *Evaluation*

Success Indicator: ESL and Basic Skills Completion

OVERVIEW

LATTC used the “Proportionality Index” methodology for assessing disproportionate impact. Proportionality compares the percentage of a subgroup in a cohort to its own percentage in a resultant outcome group. LATTC decided to use this methodology because subgroups are not compared to other subgroups, but rather to itself; and therefore reveal more accurate disproportionalities. The formula for proportionality is the percentage in the outcome group divided by the percentage in the original cohort (outcome percentage/cohort percentage). The higher the proportionality, the higher the rate at which a subgroup has attained a desired educational outcome; the lower the proportionality index, the lower the attainment rate. The interpretation of the proportionality index, as shown in the table below, was adapted from the University of Southern California’s Center for Urban Education.

Proportionality Index	Interpretation
Greater or equal to 1	At or above equity
Greater or equal or 0.8 but less than 1.0	Almost at equity
Below 0.8	Below equity

Source: “[Measuring the State of Equity in Public High Education,](#)” USC Center for Urban Education, October 2003.

Indicator Definitions and Data

C. ESL AND BASIC SKILLS COMPLETION. The ratio of the number of students by population group who complete a degree-applicable course after having completed the final ESL or basic skills course compared to the number of those students who complete such a final ESL or basic skills course. Calculate progress rates through basic skills by dividing:

Rate	Denominator (Initial Cohort)	Numerator (Outcome Group)
Rate of Basic Skills Math Completion	First attempt of a Math course in two to four levels below transfer	Completed college level Math course within six years of cohort entry
Rate of Basic Skills English Completion	First attempt of an English Writing course in one to four levels below transfer	Completed college level English course within six years of cohort entry
Rate of ESL Completion	First attempt of an ESL course in any levels below transfer	Completed college level ESL or English course within six years

Remedial ESL, 2006-2007 to 2008-2009 Cohort Years Combined

	>=1.0 At or above Equity	=0.8 - <1.0 Almost at Equity	<0.8 Below Equity			
	ESL Completion Rate	Initial Cohort (3 Cohorts Combined)	% of Initial Cohort	Outcome Group	% of Outcome Group	Proportionality Index
TOTAL	9%	422	100%	40	100%	-
GENDER						
Female	11%	248	58.8%	27	67.5%	1.15
Male	7%	174	41.2%	13	32.5%	0.79
RACE/ETHNICITY						
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0%	1	0.2%		0.0%	0.00
Asian	14%	43	10.2%	6	15.0%	1.47
Black/African-American	14%	57	13.5%	8	20.0%	1.48
Hispanic/Latino	7%	297	70.4%	21	52.5%	0.75
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	0%	2	0.5%		0.0%	0.00
White	33%	3	0.7%	1	2.5%	3.52
Some other race (Unknown)	21%	19	4.5%	4	10.0%	2.22
More than one race	N/A	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	N/A
FOSTER YOUTH						
Yes	N/A	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	N/A
No	N/A	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	N/A
DISABLED STUDENTS (DSPS)						
Yes	9%	47	11.1%	4	10.0%	0.90
No	10%	375	88.9%	36	90.0%	1.01
LOW-INCOME						
Yes	10%	280	66.4%	27	67.5%	1.02
No	9%	142	33.6%	13	32.5%	0.97
VETERANS						
Yes	N/A	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	N/A
No	N/A	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	N/A

Source: CCCCCO, Data on Demand, <https://misweb.cccco.edu/dataondemand/>.

Notes: Data for individuals who identify as more than one race, foster youth and veterans is not available on CCCCCO Data on Demand. Counts for one ESL cohort were too small for reliable conclusions; therefore 2006-2007, 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 cohort years were combined into one sample.

Basic Skills Math, 2008-2009 Cohort Year

>=1.0 At or above Equity			=0.8 - <1.0 Almost at Equity			<0.8 Below Equity
	Basic Skills Math Completion Rate	Initial Cohort	% of Initial Cohort	Outcome Group	% of Outcome Group	Proportionality Index
TOTAL	8%	2,399	100%	189	100%	-
GENDER						
Female	9%	1,332	55.5%	116	61.4%	1.11
Male	7%	1,067	44.5%	73	38.6%	0.87
RACE/ETHNICITY						
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0%	11	0.5%	-	0.0%	0.00
Asian	10%	60	2.5%	6	3.2%	1.27
Black/African-American	4%	999	41.6%	37	19.6%	0.47
Hispanic/Latino	11%	1,093	45.6%	123	65.1%	1.43
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	0%	9	0.4%	-	0.0%	0.00
White	8%	40	1.7%	3	1.6%	0.95
Some other race (Unknown)	11%	187	7.8%	20	10.6%	1.36
More than one race	N/A	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	N/A
FOSTER YOUTH						
Yes	N/A	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	N/A
No	N/A	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	N/A
DISABILITY STATUS (DSPS)						
Yes	4%	290	12.1%	13	6.9%	0.57
No	8%	2,109	87.9%	176	93.1%	1.06
LOW-INCOME						
Yes	8%	2,051	85.5%	170	89.9%	1.05
No	5%	348	14.5%	19	10.1%	0.69
VETERANS						
Yes	N/A	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	N/A
No	N/A	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	N/A

Source: CCCCCO, Data on Demand, <https://misweb.cccco.edu/dataondemand/>.

Notes: Data for individuals who identify as more than one race, foster youth and veterans is not available on CCCCCO Data on Demand.

Basic Skills English, 2008-2009 Cohort Year

	>=1.0 At or above Equity	=0.8 - <1.0 Almost at Equity	<0.8 Below Equity				
	Basic Skills English Completion Rate	Initial Cohort	% of Initial Cohort	Outcome Group	% of Outcome Group	Difference Between Groups	Proportionality Index
TOTAL	19%	2,355	100%	454	100%	-	-
GENDER							
Female	22%	1,383	58.7%	298	65.6%	6.9%	1.12
Male	16%	972	41.3%	156	34.4%	-6.9%	0.83
RACE/ETHNICITY							
American Indian/Alaskan Native	25%	8	0.3%	2	0.4%	0.1%	1.30
Asian	27%	94	4.0%	25	5.5%	1.5%	1.38
Black/African-American	12%	938	39.8%	112	24.7%	-15.2%	0.62
Hispanic/Latino	24%	1,089	46.2%	266	58.6%	12.3%	1.27
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	0%	6	0.3%	-	0.0%	-0.3%	0.00
White	23%	30	1.3%	7	1.5%	0.3%	1.21
Some other race (Unknown)	22%	190	8.1%	42	9.3%	1.2%	1.15
More than one race	N/A	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	0.0%	N/A
FOSTER YOUTH							
Yes	N/A	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	0.0%	N/A
No	N/A	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	0.0%	N/A
DISABILITY STATUS (DSPS)							
Yes	12%	242	10.3%	29	6.4%	-3.9%	0.62
No	20%	2,113	89.7%	425	93.6%	3.9%	1.04
LOW-INCOME							
Yes	20%	1,957	83.1%	393	86.6%	3.5%	1.04
No	15%	398	16.9%	61	13.4%	-3.5%	0.80
VETERANS							
Yes	N/A	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	0.0%	N/A
No	N/A	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	0.0%	N/A

Source: CCCCCO, Data on Demand, <https://misweb.cccco.edu/dataondemand/>.

Notes: Data for individuals who identify as more than one race, foster youth and veterans is not available on CCCCCO Data on Demand.

CONCLUSIONS: DISPROPORTIONATELY IMPACTED STUDENT GROUPS

Remedial ESL: The student groups experiencing the greatest gaps are:

- Hispanic/Latino students (PI=0.75 and 17.9 percentage points difference)
- Male students (PI=0.79 and 8.7 percentage points difference)
- Students with disabilities (PI=0.90 and 1.1 percentage points difference)

Basic Skills Math: The student groups experiencing the greatest gaps are:

- American Indian/Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islanders students combined (N=20; PI=0.00 and 0.9 percentage points difference)
- Black/African-American students (PI=0.47 and 22.1 percentage points difference)
- Students with disabilities (PI=0.57 and 5.2 percentage points difference)

Basic Skills English: The student groups experiencing the greatest gaps are:

- Black/African-American students (PI=0.62 and 15.2 percentage points difference)
- Students with disabilities (PI=0.62 and 3.9 percentage points difference)
- American Indian/Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islanders students combined (N=14; PI=0.74 and 0.2 percentage points difference)

GOALS, ACTIVITIES, FUNDING AND EVALUATION: ESL AND BASIC SKILLS COURSE COMPLETION

GOAL C.

The goal is to improve ESL and basic skills completion for the following target populations identified in the college research as experiencing a disproportionate impact:

Target Population(s)	Current gap, year	Goal*	Goal Year
<i>Example Group</i>	<i>-7, 2014</i>	<i>No gap</i>	<i>2020</i>
Hispanic/Latino	ESL: PI=0.75 and 17.9 percentage points difference	PI \geq .80	2020
Males	ESL: PI=0.79 and 8.7 percentage points difference	PI \geq .80	2020
Black/African-American	Basic Skills Math: PI=0.47 and 22.1 percentage points difference Basic Skills English: PI=0.62 and 15.2 percentage points difference	PI \geq .80 PI \geq .80	2020
Students with Disabilities	ESL: PI=0.90 and 1.1 percentage points difference Basic Skills Math: PI=0.57 and 5.2 percentage points difference Basic Skills English: PI=0.62 and 3.9 percentage points difference	PI \geq 1.0 PI \geq .80 PI \geq .80	2020

*Expressed as either a percentage or number

**Benchmark goals are to be decided by the institution.

ACTIVITIES: C. ESL AND BASIC SKILLS COURSE COMPLETIONSuggested Activities/Actions

- 1) Conduct research to determine if there were certain courses or certain sections of courses that contributed to the low rates of completion by these four target groups. Further disaggregation by program of study, part-time and full-time status, and day and evening program enrollment will be completed; The results of this disaggregation might provide further insight. (Research is budgeted in Section F, since this impacts a number of goals and equity issues)
- 2) Provide books, workbooks, adaptive learning programs and other online materials to assist male students and Hispanic/Latino students with ESL courses
- 3) Provide books, workbooks, adaptive learning programs and other online materials to assist Black/African-Americans and DSPS students with basic skills math and English courses

- 4) Professional development will be provided to faculty and staff to better address the needs of DSPTS students innovations (Professional Development is budgeted in Section F, since it impacts a number of goals and equity issues)
- 5) Professional development will be provided to faculty and staff to better address the needs of Black/African-American students through curricular innovations (Professional Development is budgeted in Section F, since it impacts a number of goals and equity issues.)
- 6) Provide additional tutoring for targeted students within the pathways to address the needs for assistance in mastering Tier 2 competencies in basic skills English and math
- 7) Expand service hours of DSPTS to accommodate the needs of all students, including those who attend classes during non-traditional hours
- 8) The Student Equity Coordinator will maximize the impact of strategies to address the needs of these target populations without overlap and duplication of services; lack of coordinator between services provided within the pathways, within categorical programs and within other specially funded programs can sometimes be confusing for students; (Funds for the Coordinator are budgeted under Section F, since this impacts a number of goals and equity issues)
- 9) Learning Specialist will work with the pathway team to design instructional support materials, workshops and other interventions specifically tailored for students with disabilities.

C.1

• **Activity Type(s)**

Outreach		Student Equity Coordination/Planning	X	Instructional Support Activities
Student Services or other Categorical Program	X	Curriculum/Course Development or Adaptation	X	Direct Student Support
Research and Evaluation		Professional Development		

• **Target Student Group(s) & # of Each Affected*:**

ID	Target Group(s)	# of Students Affected
C.1	Males and Latinos	Institutional Effectiveness Data

ID	Planned Start and End Date(s)	Student Equity Funds	Other Funds**
C.1	January 2016- December 2016	\$95,550	

C.2

• **Activity Type(s)**

	Outreach		Student Equity Coordination/Planning	X	Instructional Support Activities
X	Student Services or other Categorical Program	X	Curriculum/Course Development or Adaptation	X	Direct Student Support
	Research and Evaluation		Professional Development		

• **Target Student Group(s) & # of Each Affected*:**

ID	Target Group	# of Students Affected
C.2	Black/African-Americans & Disabled Students	Institutional Effectiveness Data

ID	Timeline(s)	Student Equity Funds	Other Funds**
C.2	January 2016-December 2016	\$610,330	

Success Indicator: Degree and Certificate Completion

D. Degree and Certificate Completion

***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. Calculate degree and certificate completion rates by dividing:*

OVERVIEW

LATTC used the “Proportionality Index” methodology for assessing disproportionate impact. Proportionality compares the percentage of a subgroup in a cohort to its own percentage in a resultant outcome group. LATTC decided to use this methodology because subgroups are not compared to other subgroups, but rather to itself; and therefore reveal more accurate disproportionalities. The formula for proportionality is the percentage in the outcome group divided by the percentage in the original cohort (outcome percentage/cohort percentage). The higher the proportionality, the higher the rate at which a subgroup has attained a desired educational outcome; the lower the proportionality index, the lower the attainment rate. The interpretation of the proportionality index, as shown in the table below, was adapted from the University of Southern California’s Center for Urban Education.

Proportionality Index	Interpretation
Greater or equal to 1	At or above equity
Greater or equal or 0.8 but less than 1.0	Almost at equity
Below 0.8	Below equity

Source: [“Measuring the State of Equity in Public High Education,” USC Center for Urban Education, October 2003.](#)

Indicator Definitions and Data

D. 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. Calculate degree and certificate completion rates by dividing:

Rate	Denominator (Initial Cohort)	Numerator (Outcome Group)
Degree and Certificate Completion	The # of first-time students who enrolled in the base year and named certificates and degrees as their matriculation goal in their student educational plan or by taking degree or certificate applicable course(s) using the definitions outlined in the Scorecard.	The number of students out of the denominator who earned a degree or certificate within one or more years, as decided by the college.

Degree and Certificate Completion, 2008-2009 Cohort Year

>=1.0 At or above Equity		=0.8 - <1.0 Almost at Equity		<0.8 Below Equity		
	Degree and Certificate Completion Rate	Initial Cohort	% of Initial Cohort	Outcome Group	% of Outcome Group	Proportionality Index
TOTAL	16%	1,321	100%	206	100%	-
GENDER						
Female	15%	664	50.3%	100	48.5%	0.97
Male	16%	657	49.7%	106	51.5%	1.03
RACE/ETHNICITY						
American Indian/Alaskan Native	38%	8	0.6%	3	1.5%	2.40
Asian	24%	38	2.9%	9	4.4%	1.52
Black/African-American	13%	368	27.9%	49	23.8%	0.85
Hispanic/Latino	16%	723	54.7%	115	55.8%	1.02
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	33%	3	0.2%	1	0.5%	2.14
White	6%	47	3.6%	3	1.5%	0.41
Some other race (Unknown)	19%	134	10.1%	26	12.6%	1.24
More than one race	N/A	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	N/A
FOSTER YOUTH						
Yes	N/A	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	N/A
No	N/A	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	N/A
DISABILITY STATUS (DSPS)						
Yes	19%	116	8.8%	22	10.7%	1.22
No	15%	1,205	91.2%	184	89.3%	0.98
LOW-INCOME						
Yes	17%	1,181	89.4%	199	96.6%	1.08
No	5%	140	10.6%	7	3.4%	0.32
VETERANS						
Yes	N/A	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	N/A
No	N/A	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	N/A

Source: CCCCCO, Data on Demand, <https://misweb.cccco.edu/dataondemand/>.

Notes: Data for individuals who identify as more than one race, foster youth and veterans is not available on CCCCCO Data on Demand.

CONCLUSIONS: DISPROPORTIONATELY IMPACTED STUDENT GROUPS

The student groups experiencing the greatest gaps are:

- Students who are not economically disadvantaged (PI=0.32 and 7.2 percentage points difference)
- White students (PI=0.41 and 2.1 percentage points difference)
- Black/African-American students (PI=0.85 and 4.1 percentage points difference)

The section that follows details the goals and activities to address equity gaps for the target populations.

GOALS, ACTIVITIES, FUNDING AND EVALUATION: DEGREE AND CERTIFICATE COMPLETION

GOAL D.

The goal is to improve degree and certificate completion for the following target populations identified in the college research as experiencing a disproportionate impact:

Target Population(s)	Current gap, year	Goal*	Goal Year
<i>Example Group</i>	<i>-4, 2014</i>	<i>No gap</i>	<i>2020</i>
Students who are not economically disadvantaged	PI=0.32 and 7.2 percentage points difference	PI ≥ .80	2020
White students	PI=0.41 and 2.1 percentage points difference	PI ≥ .80	2020
Black/African-American	PI=0.85 and 4.1 percentage points difference	PI ≥ 1.0	2020

*Expressed as either a percentage or number

**Benchmark goals are to be decided by the institution.

- 1) Conduct qualitative and quantitative research to determine the causes and continuing factors for the lower rates of course completion for white and non-low income students.
- 2) “Umoja” Coordinator will develop strategies to assist Black/African-American students with degree completion, including encouraging the use of tutoring, faculty office hours, relevant “Umoja” activities and interventions and other available support services within the pathways.

ACTIVITIES: D. DEGREE AND CERTIFICATE COMPLETION

D.1

• *Activity Type(s)*

	Outreach	X	Student Equity Coordination/Planning		Instructional Support Activities
	Student Services or other Categorical Program		Curriculum/Course Development or Adaptation		Direct Student Support
X	Research and Evaluation		Professional Development		

• *Target Student Group(s) & # of Each Affected**:

ID	Target Group(s)	# of Students Affected
D.1	Students not economically disadvantaged, whites, blacks	Institutional Effectiveness Data

ID	Planned Start and End Date(s)	Student Equity Funds	Other Funds**
D.1	January 2016-December 2016	\$55,000	

DRAFT

Transfer

OVERVIEW

LATTC used the “Proportionality Index” methodology for assessing disproportionate impact. Proportionality compares the percentage of a subgroup in a cohort to its own percentage in a resultant outcome group. LATTC decided to use this methodology because subgroups are not compared to other subgroups, but rather to itself; and therefore reveal more accurate disproportionalities. The formula for proportionality is the percentage in the outcome group divided by the percentage in the original cohort (outcome percentage/cohort percentage). The higher the proportionality, the higher the rate at which a subgroup has attained a desired educational outcome; the lower the proportionality index, the lower the attainment rate. The interpretation of the proportionality index, as shown in the table below, was adapted from the University of Southern California’s Center for Urban Education.

Proportionality Index	Interpretation
Greater or equal to 1	At or above equity
Greater or equal or 0.8 but less than 1.0	Almost at equity
Below 0.8	Below equity

Source: “[Measuring the State of Equity in Public High Education,](#)” USC Center for Urban Education, October 2003.

Indicator Definitions and Data

- E. 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.

Rate	Denominator (Initial Cohort)	Numerator (Outcome Group)
Transfer	The # of students who complete a minimum of 12 units and have attempted a transfer level course in mathematics or English.	The number of students out of the denominator who actually transfer after one or more years.

Transfer Velocity, 2008-2009 Cohort Year (6 years period)

	>1.0 At or above Equity	=0.8 - <1.0 Almost at Equity	<0.8 Below Equity			
	Transfer Rate	Initial Cohort	% of Initial Cohort	Outcome Group	% of Outcome Group	Proportionality Index
TOTAL	19%	363	100.0%	68	100.0%	-
GENDER						
Female	18%	221	60.9%	40	58.8%	0.97
Male	20%	142	39.1%	28	41.2%	1.05
RACE/ETHNICITY						
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0%	1	0.3%	-	0.0%	0.00
Asian	20%	15	4.1%	3	4.4%	1.07
Black/African-American	16%	76	20.9%	12	17.6%	0.84
Hispanic/Latino	18%	226	62.3%	40	58.8%	0.94
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	0%	1	0.3%	-	0.0%	0.00
White	100%	1	0.3%	1	1.5%	5.34
Some other race (Unknown)	28%	43	11.8%	12	17.6%	1.49
More than one race	N/A	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	N/A
FOSTER YOUTH						
Yes	N/A	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	N/A
No	N/A	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	N/A
DISABILITY STATUS (DSPS)						
Yes	15%	20	5.5%	3	4.4%	0.80
No	19%	343	94.5%	65	95.6%	1.01
LOW-INCOME						
Yes	18%	331	91.2%	58	85.3%	0.94
No	31%	32	8.8%	10	14.7%	1.67
VETERANS						
Yes	N/A	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	N/A
No	N/A	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	N/A

Source: 2008-2009 Cohort (6 years period), CCCCO Data Mart,

http://datamart.cccco.edu/Outcomes/Transfer_Velocity.aspx.

Notes: Data for individuals who identify as more than one race, foster youth and veterans is not available on CCCCO Data on Demand. Low-income students are defined as BOGG recipients.

CONCLUSIONS: DISPROPORTIONATELY IMPACTED STUDENT GROUPS

The student groups experiencing the greatest gaps are:

- Students with disabilities (PI=0.80 and 1.1 percentage points difference)
- Black/African-American students (PI=0.84 and 3.3 percentage points difference)
- Hispanic/Latino students (PI=0.94 and 3.4 percentage points difference)
- Students who are economically disadvantaged (PI=0.94 and 5.9 percentage points difference)

Disclaimer: The size of American Indian/Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islanders, and White students are too small for reliable conclusions.

The section that follows details the goals and activities to address equity gaps for the target populations.

DRAFT

CAMPUS-BASED RESEARCH: TRANSFER

E. 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. Calculate transfer rates by dividing:

OALS, ACTIVITIES, FUNDING AND EVALUATION: TRANSFER

GOAL E.

The goal is to improve transfer for the following target populations identified in the college research as experiencing a disproportionate impact:

Target Population(s)	Current gap, year	Goal*	Goal Year
<i>Example Group</i>	<i>-4, 2014</i>	<i>No gap</i>	<i>2020</i>
Students with disabilities	PI=0.80 and 1.1 percentage points difference	PI \geq 1.0	2020
Black/African-American students	PI=0.84 and 3.3 percentage points difference	PI \geq 1.0	2020
Hispanic/Latino students	PI=0.94 and 3.4 percentage points difference	PI \geq 1.0	2020

*Expressed as either a percentage or number

**Benchmark goals are to be decided by the institution.

ACTIVITIES: E. TRANSFER

- 1) Hire a Pathway Navigator for the Liberal Arts Pathway; since the students with the intention of transferring are largely within the Liberal Arts Pathway.
- 2) The Pathway Navigator will work with the Transfer Counselor and the Pathway Counselor to provide services to increase transfer rates for the targeted groups.
- 3) The Navigator will specifically coordinate services with DSPS, “Umoja”, and Puente to address the specific needs of the students with disabilities, Black/African-American Students and Latino students, three of the groups not at equity for transfer.
- 4) Provide needed books, workbooks, materials and adaptive learning software for low-income students.

E.1

- *Activity Type(s)*

District: Los Angeles Community College District College: Los Angeles Trade Technical College

X	Outreach	X	Student Equity Coordination/Planning	X	Instructional Support Activities
X	Student Services or other Categorical Program		Curriculum/Course Development or Adaptation	X	Direct Student Support
	Research and Evaluation		Professional Development		

• **Target Student Group(s) & # of Each Affected*:**

ID	Target Group(s)	# of Students Affected
E.1	Disabled, Blacks and Latinos	Institutional Effectiveness Data

ID	Planned Start and End Date(s)	Student Equity Funds	Other Funds**
E.1	January 2016- December 2016	\$178,680	

Other College- or District-wide Initiatives Affecting Several Indicators

DRAFT

GOALS, ACTIVITIES, FUNDING AND EVALUATION: AFFECTING SEVERAL INDICATORS

ACTIVITIES: F. ACTIVITIES AFFECTING SEVERAL GOALS

F.1

- *Indicators/Goals to be affected by the activity*

X	Access	X	Degrees and Certificate Completion
X	Course Completion	X	Transfer
X	ESL and Basic Skills Course Completion		

- *Activity Type(s)*

	Outreach	X	Student Equity Coordination/Planning		Instructional Support Activities
	Student Services or other Categorical Program		Curriculum/Course Development or Adaptation		Direct Student Support
X	Research and Evaluation	X	Professional Development		

- *Target Student Group(s) & # of Each Affected*:*

ID	Target Group	# of Students Affected
F.1	All Targets in Student Equity Plan	Data from Institutional Effectiveness

F. There are several strategies that LATTC will employ that will impact a number of Student Equity gaps identified

Conduct additional research; several strategies require further disaggregation of the data, and to collect additional quantitative and qualitative data in order to inform the strategies needed to address the equity gaps. This will require hiring a Research Analyst.

A Student Equity Coordinator is needed to coordinate the work of the Student Equity Plan, collect data and monitor the College's Equity Plan and its efforts to achieve its equity goals. The Administrative Analyst works directly with the Student Equity Coordinator and the Vice President of Academic Affair and Workforce Development to assist in the monitoring and evaluation of equity activities and strategies.

The Center for Urban Education will provide professional development to faculty and staff. Throughout the planning of the Student Equity Plan, constituents agreed on the need to provide professional development to faculty and staff; topics are mentioned throughout the Students Equity Plan

Travel and other expenses are provided for student, staff, faculty and administrator travel to state-wide conferences and workshops including the AMEND conference, Umoja, UC Transfer Days, as well as other activities that promote best practices.

ID	Planned Start and End Date(s)	Student Equity Funds	Other Funds**
F.1	January 2016- December 2016	\$684,244	

DRAFT

DRAFT

Summary Budget

Student success is an institutional commitment at LATTC. The college's reform to positively transform the student college experience was incorporated as a main component of the Strategic and Educational Master Plans. At the core of the plans is the framework for student success: Pathways for Academic, Career and Transfer Success (PACTS). Thus, all student success efforts initiated within the past years have been guided by the PACTS model. This model is comprised of up to four distinct tiers, representing competencies students attain to reach key milestones in the completion of their unique college and career goal(s).

Through PACTS, the college is "reinventing itself," and positive factors contributing to the college's success efforts are the direct result of the transition into the pathways. During the last academic years, the college began a complete reorganization into the tier system. Through this model the college has also been able to align the new SSSP and Student Equity Plan requirements with the organizational changes occurring as a result of PACTS.

The goals and activities outlined in the Student Equity Plan have been strategically "braided" within the already existing goals of the college institutional and regulatory plans including the Student Educational Master Plan and Thus, in order to successfully implement the various activities associated the goals; the college will use existing resources by shifting emphasis in some programs and/or activities already under way. The main budget funding sources (internal and external) are:

- Categorical funding.
- General fund allocations.
- Student Equity and SSSP funding allocations.
- Grant funding.
- Administrative support from Academic Affairs and Workforce Development, Administrative Services, Institutional Effectiveness and Student Services.

Furthermore, integration of the Student Equity Plan into the College's already existing planning processes will be an institutional priority; thus the resource allocation and prioritization processes will be used as mechanisms to request any further funds required.

Summary Evaluation

A coordinated effort to eliminate duplicity of effort and to integrate the goals of other college plans was an integral consideration in this planning process, as such; each activity has been aligned with activities in existing college's plans.

The activities outlined under each goal are accompanied by responsible person/groups and lead administrator. The purpose of a Lead Administrator is to be the responsible accountable person reporting key milestones and achievements through the existing governance structure and institutional processes. In this role, they will be required to provide their reports in accordance with the specified target dates.

The LATTC Student Success Committee is charged with monitoring the implementation of the plan. The implementation plan is constructed from the list of goals and activities within the plan organized by the administrative lead. The Student Success Committee adopted to have a standing agenda item at which the admin leads will report out the progress of the implementation plan beginning January 2015.

This process will be evaluated in the fall of 2016.