

Educational Planning Committee
Report for Academic Year 2017-2018
Student Success 1.5: Reduce Financial Aid Disqualification
Presented by Jonathan Eldridge

Please keep the report to a maximum of 2 pages for each objective.

1. EMP Recommendation and Objective (Include narrative from 2015-2018 strategic plan)

EMP Recommendation Student Success 1: Develop, implement and evaluate a college-wide plan for student retention and success, including mechanisms to connect SLO assessment to program review.

Objective SS1.5: Reduce financial aid disqualification by 5 percentage points each year from AY 2014-15 baseline to AY 2016-17.

2. What actions have been taken toward achieving the objective? Please describe (reference action steps when relevant).

[Action Step 5.1](#) Expand Early Alert program usage and trained respondents.

[Action Step 5.2](#) Provide financial literacy workshops and other means of delivery to students.

[Action Step 5.3](#) Embed orientation topics in key courses.

These action steps have been implemented—yet neither the performance indicator nor the objective have been met.

3. Are you on track to achieve this objective? What evidence supports your judgment of progress made toward this objective?

No, we are not on track per the performance indicator below.

Performance Indicator SS1.5: Number and percentage of students on financial aid warning or disqualification each year as compared with AY 2014-15, with trend data showing declining percentage.

[Number and Percentage of Students on Financial Aid Warning Receiving Federal Funds](#)

	Fall 2014	Spring 2015	Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017
	Baseline		Performance				
Number of Students	146	115	123	132	86	101	107
% of Students	11.9	10.7	15.8	18.1	12.6	15.3	14.8

Source: Argos, FA SAP Group Total (Federal Funds Only); Argos, FA_Student_v2

4. Have you achieved this objective? Yes ___ No X If not, why not?

There has not been time to adequately research the reasons why the % has not decreased. That work will occur and can be provided at a future date. It will involve looking at the demographics of students on warning in relation to those not on warning, any trends in the reasons why students are being placed on warning, the % in relation to other similar institutional rates, and other factors which will give a better picture of whether the current percentage is too high or is reasonable.