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This report seeks to examine the use and impact of the Math Success Center (MSC) in Academic Year (AY) 2016 (Fall 2015 and Spring 2016) on students enrolled in Math courses at Cerritos College that participated MSC services. Students enrolled in Math courses were able to visit the MSC for tutoring or to complete Directed Learning Activities (DLAs).

## Executive Summary

It appears that the students using the Math Success Center's tutoring and directed learning activities may be more successful in passing and completing their Math courses than those that do not. Based on the data, it is recommended that students should use the MSC more, frequent users of the MSC had higher success and completion rates in their Math courses. It is difficult to draw specific cause and effect conclusions due to the large difference in the number of students using the MSC and DLAs compared to all the students enrolled in a math course. If MSC attendance could be increased in future semesters more sophisticated statistical analyses could be conducted.

## Detailed Analysis Math Success Center

The MSC served 1,828 unique students in Fall 2015, and 1,616 unique students in Spring 2016. The students were responsible for 13,959 visits and 24,661 hours spent in the MSC during Fall 2015, and 13,155 visits and 23,188 hours spent in Spring 2016 (see Table 1). Approximately $27 \%$ of students enrolled in a Math class visited the MSC at least once in Fall 2015 (1,828 students out of the 6,862 total students enrolled in a Math course), and $27 \%$ in Spring 2016 ( 1,616 students out of 6,068 ). Of the students who visited the MSC during AY 2016, most students visited two to five times, for both Fall 2015 and Spring 2016 (table 2). Of the students who visited the MSC during the two terms, Math 60 students utilized MSC most frequently (table 3).

Table 1. Frequencies for MSC Student Visits

|  | Minimum | Maximum | Total | Average |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fall 2015 |  |  |  |  |
| Visits to the MSC | 1 | 103 | 13,959 | 7.6 |
| Minutes Spent in the MSC | 1.1 | $18,728.8$ | $1,479,630.5$ | 809.4 |
| Hours Spent in the MSC | 0.02 | 312.2 | $24,660.5$ | 13.5 |
| Spring 2016 |  |  |  |  |
| Visits to the MSC | 1 | 119 | 13,155 | 8.1 |
| Minutes Spent in the MSC | 1.1 | $22,217.7$ | $1,391,256.9$ | 860.9 |
| Hours Spent in the MSC | 0.02 | 370.3 | $23,187.6$ | 14.4 |

Table 2. Counts of MSC Student Visits

| Number of Visits | Count of <br> Students <br> Fall 2015 | Count of <br> Students <br> Spring 2016 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 585 | 475 |
| $\mathbf{2 - 5}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{5 4 0}$ |
| $6-10$ | 255 | 240 |
| $11-20$ | 215 | 197 |
| 21 and up | 172 | 164 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 , 8 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 6 1 6}$ |

Table 3. Counts of MSC Students by Math Course

| Math <br> Enrollment | Fall 2015 |  | Spring 2016 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total <br> Enrolled | Visited <br> MSC | Total <br> Enrolled | Visited <br> MSC |
| MATH 5 | 108 | 24 | 87 | 18 |
| MATH 40 | 926 | 137 | 568 | 85 |
| MATH 60 | 1708 | 418 | 1357 | 316 |
| MATH 70 | 117 | 33 | 152 | 18 |
| MATH 75 | 38 | 7 | 76 | 17 |
| MATH 80 | 1239 | 258 | 1029 | 218 |
| MATH 80A | 377 | 69 | 398 | 88 |
| MATH 80B | 313 | 80 | 258 | 45 |
| MATH 105 | 31 | 15 | N/A | N/A |
| MATH 110A | 43 | 7 | 36 | 6 |
| MATH 110B | N/A | N/A | 31 | 11 |
| MATH 112 | 433 | 135 | 568 | 162 |
| MATH 114 | 477 | 148 | 487 | 136 |
| MATH 115 | 12 | 2 | 18 | 2 |
| MATH 116 | 114 | 47 | 140 | 43 |
| MATH 140 | 300 | 76 | 212 | 77 |
| MATH 150 | 198 | 74 | 199 | 86 |
| MATH 170 | 202 | 120 | 209 | 74 |
| MATH 190 | 102 | 35 | 123 | 77 |
| MATH 220 | 85 | 28 | 78 | 31 |
| MATH 250 | 39 | 7 | 42 | 15 |
| Total | $\mathbf{6 , 8 6 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 7 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 , 0 6 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 5 2 5}$ |

Demographic information is provided for Math students who visited the MSC in Fall 2015 and Spring 2016 semesters.

Table 4. Academic Information for DLA Users and All Math Students

$\left.$| Academic <br> Information | Fall 2015 |  | Spring 2016 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | MSC | All Math |  |  |
| Users |  |  |  |  |
| Students |  |  |  |  | | MSC |
| :---: |
| Users | | All Math |
| :---: |
| Students | \right\rvert\, | Cum GPA | 2.87 | 2.67 |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |


| Cum Units | 56.1 | 47.6 | 60.9 | 53.1 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Units Taken | 7.9 | 6.7 | 8.1 | 6.7 |

Table 5. Comparison of MSC Users and All Students Enrolled in a Math Course by Gender

| Gender | Fall 2015 |  |  |  | Spring 2016 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ALL Math <br> Students |  | MSC Users |  | ALL Math <br> Students |  | MSC Users |  |
|  | Count | $\%$ | Count | $\%$ | Count | $\%$ | Count | $\%$ |
| Female | 1,520 | $51.5 \%$ | 942 | $51.5 \%$ | 1,343 | $51.6 \%$ | 302 | $51.7 \%$ |
| Male | 1,369 | $46.3 \%$ | 836 | $45.7 \%$ | 1,212 | $46.6 \%$ | 268 | $45.9 \%$ |
| Unknown | 65 | $2.2 \%$ | 50 | $2.7 \%$ | 48 | $1.8 \%$ | 14 | $2.4 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 , 9 5 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0} \%$ | $\mathbf{1 , 8 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0} \%$ | $\mathbf{2 , 6 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0} \%$ | $\mathbf{5 8 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

Table 6. Comparison of MSC Users and All Students Enrolled in a Math Course by Race/Ethnicity

| Race/Ethnicity | Fall 2015 |  |  |  | Spring 2016 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ALL Math Students |  | MSC Users |  | ALL Math Students |  | MSC Users |  |
|  | Count | \% | Count | \% | Count | \% | Count | \% |
| African-Americans | 107 | 3.6\% | 76 | 4.2\% | 95 | 3.6\% | 28 | 4.8\% |
| Alaskans/Native American | 104 | 3.5\% | 107 | 5.9\% | 106 | 4.1\% | 35 | 6.0\% |
| Asian | 375 | 12.7\% | 240 | 13.1\% | 354 | 13.6\% | 66 | 11.3\% |
| Hispanic/Latino | 2,005 | 67.9\% | 1,212 | 66.3\% | 1,737 | 66.7\% | 391 | 67.0\% |
| Other, Non-White | 3 | 0.1\% | 1 | 0.1\% | 2 | 0.1\% | 1 | 0.2\% |
| Pacific Islander | 16 | 0.5\% | 9 | 0.5\% | 8 | 0.3\% | 2 | 0.3\% |
| White | 149 | 5.0\% | 64 | 3.5\% | 115 | 4.4\% | 27 | 4.6\% |
| Unknown/Non-Response | 195 | 6.6\% | 119 | 6.5\% | 186 | 7.1\% | 34 | 5.8\% |
| Total | 2,954 | 100\% | 1,828 | 100\% | 2,603 | 100\% | 584 | 100\% |

Table 7. Comparison of MSC Users and All Students Enrolled in a Math Course by Age Range

| Age | Fall 2015 |  |  |  | Spring 2016 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ALL Math <br> Students |  | MSC Users |  | ALL Math <br> Students |  | MSC Users |  |
|  | Count | $\%$ | Count | $\%$ | Count | $\%$ | Count | $\%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 9}$ or younger | 728 | $24.6 \%$ | 562 | $30.7 \%$ | 503 | $19.3 \%$ | 85 | $14.6 \%$ |
| $20-24$ | 1,268 | $42.9 \%$ | 733 | $40.1 \%$ | 1,222 | $46.9 \%$ | 247 | $42.3 \%$ |
| $25-29$ | 496 | $16.8 \%$ | 261 | $14.3 \%$ | 478 | $18.4 \%$ | 108 | $18.5 \%$ |
| $30-34$ | 204 | $6.9 \%$ | 92 | $5.0 \%$ | 163 | $6.3 \%$ | 54 | $9.2 \%$ |
| $35-39$ | 114 | $3.9 \%$ | 64 | $3.5 \%$ | 92 | $3.5 \%$ | 25 | $4.3 \%$ |
| $40-49$ | 100 | $3.4 \%$ | 70 | $3.8 \%$ | 108 | $4.1 \%$ | 50 | $8.6 \%$ |
| 50 or older | 44 | $1.5 \%$ | 46 | $2.5 \%$ | 37 | $1.4 \%$ | 15 | $2.6 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 , 9 5 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 8 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 6 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 8 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

Overall, the MSC students have slightly higher success and completion rates than the regular math students. Table 8 shows the overall Math course success and completion rates for students that visited the MSC compared to all students enrolled in a Math course. Success was defined as a
student earning a grade of $A, B, C$, or $P$ (passing). Not passing was defined as a student earning a grade of W, D, F, or NP (not passing). Success rates are further broken down for MSC users and all students enrolled in a Math course by course in Table 9. MSC users had higher success rates in all math courses except Math 80, 80A, 116, and 140 in Fall 2015; Math 110B, 115, and 170 for Spring 2016. However, with such a large difference in the size of the groups, direct comparisons should be made with caution.

Table 8. Overall Success \& Completion Rate Comparison

$\left.$| Overall <br> Math Rates | Fall 2015 |  | Spring 2016 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Courses |  |  |  | | MSC |
| :---: |
| Students |
| Only |$\quad$| All Math |
| :---: |
| Courses | | MSC |
| :---: |
| Students |
| Only | \right\rvert\,

Table 9. Course Breakdown of Success Rates for MSC Users and All Students Enrolled in a Math Course

| Success <br> Rates | Fall 2015 <br> Enrolled |  |  |  | All <br> Student <br> Rate | Visited <br> MSC | MSC <br> Student <br> Rate | Total <br> Enrolled |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 108 | $75.0 \%$ | 24 | All <br> Student <br> Rate | Visited <br> MSC | MSC <br> Students <br> Only |  |  |
| MATH 40 | 926 | $55.3 \%$ | 137 | $67.9 \%$ | 568 | $53.3 \%$ | 18 | $72.2 \%$ |
| MATH 60 | 1,708 | $39.2 \%$ | 418 | $43.1 \%$ | 1357 | $41.6 \%$ | 316 | $50.3 \%$ |
| MATH 70 | 117 | $57.3 \%$ | 33 | $66.1 \%$ | 152 | $66.4 \%$ | 18 | $83.3 \%$ |
| MATH 75 | 38 | $52.6 \%$ | 7 | $71.4 \%$ | 76 | $56.6 \%$ | 17 | $64.7 \%$ |
| MATH 80 | 1,239 | $47.9 \%$ | 258 | $46.5 \%$ | 1029 | $44.1 \%$ | 218 | $51.4 \%$ |
| MATH 80A | 377 | $58.6 \%$ | 69 | $58.0 \%$ | 398 | $57.0 \%$ | 88 | $67.0 \%$ |
| MATH 80B | 313 | $62.9 \%$ | 80 | $73.8 \%$ | 258 | $51.2 \%$ | 45 | $64.4 \%$ |
| MATH 105 | 31 | $51.6 \%$ | 15 | $73.3 \%$ | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| MATH 110A | 43 | $90.7 \%$ | 7 | $100 \%$ | 36 | $97.2 \%$ | 6 | $100 \%$ |
| MATH 110B | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 31 | $74.2 \%$ | 11 | $63.6 \%$ |
| MATH 112 | 433 | $55.0 \%$ | 135 | $63.7 \%$ | 568 | $60.4 \%$ | 162 | $66.7 \%$ |
| MATH 114 | 477 | $40.0 \%$ | 148 | $51.4 \%$ | 487 | $38.0 \%$ | 136 | $49.3 \%$ |
| MATH 115 | 12 | $66.7 \%$ | 2 | $100 \%$ | 18 | $44.4 \%$ | 2 | $0.0 \%$ |
| MATH 116 | 114 | $77.2 \%$ | 47 | $74.5 \%$ | 140 | $55.7 \%$ | 43 | $69.8 \%$ |
| MATH 140 | 300 | $54.0 \%$ | 76 | $61.8 \%$ | 212 | $42.0 \%$ | 77 | $46.8 \%$ |
| MATH 150 | 198 | $62.1 \%$ | 74 | $63.5 \%$ | 199 | $57.3 \%$ | 86 | $62.8 \%$ |
| MATH 170 | 202 | $44.6 \%$ | 120 | $55.7 \%$ | 209 | $50.7 \%$ | 74 | $50.0 \%$ |
| MATH 190 | 102 | $48.0 \%$ | 35 | $54.3 \%$ | 123 | $65.0 \%$ | 77 | $74.0 \%$ |
| MATH 220 | 85 | $57.6 \%$ | 28 | $75.0 \%$ | 78 | $34.6 \%$ | 31 | $54.8 \%$ |
| MATH 250 | 39 | $56.4 \%$ | 7 | $71.4 \%$ | 42 | $66.7 \%$ | 15 | $80.0 \%$ |

Completion rates are further broken down for MSC users and all students enrolled in a Math course by course in Table 10. Completion was defined as the percentage of students that earned a grade in the course (A, B, C, D, F, P, or NP) and did not withdraw. MSC users had higher completion rates in all math courses with the exceptions of Math 75 and 80A in Fall 2015, and Math 115 in Spring 2016. MSC users had higher completion rates in all math courses in Spring 2016. Again, with such a large difference in the size of the groups direct comparisons should be made with caution.

Table 10. Course Breakdown of Completion Rates for MSC Users and All Students Enrolled in a Math Course

| $\begin{array}{c}\text { Completion } \\ \text { Rates }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Fall 2015 } \\ \text { Enrolled }\end{array}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{c}\text { All } \\ \text { Student } \\ \text { Rate }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Visited } \\ \text { MSC }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { MSC } \\ \text { Student } \\ \text { Rate }\end{array}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | \(\left.\begin{array}{c}Total <br>

Enrolled\end{array} $$
\begin{array}{c}\text { All } \\
\text { Students } \\
\text { Rate }\end{array}
$$ ~ $$
\begin{array}{c}\text { Visited } \\
\text { MSC }\end{array}
$$ $$
\begin{array}{c}\text { MSC } \\
\text { Students } \\
\text { Only }\end{array}
$$\right]\)

Students who visited the MSC were classified according to their total number of visits during AY 2016. The categories consist of: minimal user (1 visit), casual user (2-5 visits), moderate user (6-10 visits), frequent user (11-20 visits) and extreme user ( 21 and more visits). Frequent and extreme users show a marked increase in success and retention rates over the other types of users.

Table 11. MSC User Profile Data Fall 2015

| Type of MSC <br> User Fall <br> 2015 | \# of <br> Student <br> Visits | \# of MSC <br> Students | \% of <br> MSC <br> Students | Avg. \# <br> Visits | Avg. <br> Time <br> Spent <br> (hours) | Success <br> Rate | Completion <br> Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Minimal User | 1 | 585 | $32.0 \%$ | 1 | 1.3 | $68.7 \%$ | $82.8 \%$ |
| Casual User | $2-5$ | 601 | $32.9 \%$ | 3 | 4.7 | $72.9 \%$ | $87.0 \%$ |
| Moderate User | $6-10$ | 255 | $13.9 \%$ | 8 | 11.9 | $78.7 \%$ | $90.1 \%$ |
| Frequent User | $11-20$ | 215 | $11.8 \%$ | 15 | 23.8 | $70.2 \%$ | $87.0 \%$ |
| Extreme User | 21 and up | 172 | $9.4 \%$ | 37 | 75.2 | $87.2 \%$ | $92.4 \%$ |
| Total |  | $\mathbf{1 , 8 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 . 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{8 7 . 9 \%}$ |

Table 12. MSC User Profile Data Spring 2016

| Type of MSC <br> User Spring <br> 2016 | \# of <br> Student <br> Visits | \# of MSC <br> Students | \% of <br> MSC <br> Students | Avg. \# <br> Visits | Avg. <br> Time <br> Spent <br> (hours) | Success <br> Rate | Completion <br> Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Minimal User | 1 | 475 | $29.4 \%$ | 1 | 1.2 | $72.2 \%$ | $88.4 \%$ |
| Casual User | $2-5$ | 540 | $33.4 \%$ | 3 | 4.8 | $73.5 \%$ | $85.6 \%$ |
| Moderate User | $6-10$ | 240 | $14.9 \%$ | 8 | 12.3 | $75.8 \%$ | $87.9 \%$ |
| Frequent User | $11-20$ | 197 | $12.2 \%$ | 14 | 24.4 | $75.6 \%$ | $87.3 \%$ |
| Extreme User | 21 and up | 164 | $10.1 \%$ | 38 | 74.7 | $84.8 \%$ | $94.5 \%$ |
| Total |  | $\mathbf{1 , 6 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{7 6 . 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{8 8 . 7 \%}$ |

## Detailed Analysis Directed Learning Activity

There were 1,611 Directed Learning Activity (DLA) visits from 227 unduplicated students in Fall 2015, 408 visits from 164 in Spring 2016. Many students worked on a DLA multiple times. For a list of DLA Type and count of students, please see Table 14.

Table 13. Number of DLA Visits in Academic Year 2015

| Number of <br> DLA visits | Count of Students <br> Fall 2015 | Count of Students <br> Spring 2016 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 94 | 90 |
| 2 | 40 | 24 |
| 3 | 29 | 17 |
| 4 | 16 | 12 |
| 5 | 12 | 6 |
| 6 | 8 | 3 |
| 7 | 8 | 4 |
| 8 | 5 | 2 |
| 9 | 4 | 1 |
| 10 | 4 | 3 |
| 11 | 2 | 0 |
| 12 | 1 | 0 |
| 13 | 2 | 0 |
| 16 | 1 | 0 |
| 17 | 0 | 1 |
| 19 | 1 | 1 |


| Total | 227 | 164 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |

Table 14. Counts of DLA visits by DLA type

| DLA Name | Fall 2015 <br> Count | Spring 2016 <br> Count |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Adding and Subtracting Decimals | 3 | 4 |
| Adding and Subtracting Fractions-Fraction Tiles | 9 | 3 |
| Adding and Subtracting Integers | 17 | 19 |
| Adding and Subtracting Whole Numbers | 9 | 3 |
| After-Exam Debriefing | 114 | 86 |
| Appyling The Concepts of Percent | 5 | 0 |
| Equivalent Fractions | 11 | 15 |
| Factoring Up to Four Terms | 31 | 22 |
| Factoring: 3-Terms ( does not equal 1) | 22 | 2 |
| Factoring: 3-Terms (a=1) | 17 | 15 |
| Factoring: 3-Terms (ac Method) | 17 | 12 |
| Factoring: Two Terms | 63 | 39 |
| Graphing Sine and Cosine Functions (Part One) | 1 | 0 |
| Linear Model Applications | 18 | 15 |
| Multiplying and Dividing Decimals | 2 | 5 |
| Multiplying and Dividing Whole Numbers | 3 | 4 |
| Order of Operations | 12 | 7 |
| Order of Operations - Scientific Calcula | 4 | 1 |
| Pharamacology Calculations | 3 | 41 |
| Proportional Reasoning | 3 | 0 |
| Pythagorean Theorem | 9 | 3 |
| Quadratic Formula | 47 | 23 |
| Scientific Notation | 23 | 30 |
| Simplifying Using Trigonometic Identities | 1 | 0 |
| Solving Basic Linear Equations Using Chips | 11 | 2 |
| Solving Linear Equations | 52 | 12 |
| Transformations Using Parent Graphs | 15 | 6 |
| Translating Algebraic Expressions | 23 | 9 |
| Unit Conversion | 5 | 1 |
| Word Problems (Coin) | 34 | 0 |
| Word Problems (Investments) | 39 | 10 |
| Word Problems (Mixtures) | 28 | 10 |
| Word Problems (Translation) | 9 | 3 |
| Word Problems: Uniform Motion | 300 | 405 |
| Total |  |  |
|  |  | 28 |
|  |  | 2 |

Demographic information is provided for Math students who used DLAs in AY 2016.

Table 15. Academic Information for DLA Users and All Math Students

| Academic <br> Information | Fall 2015 |  | Spring 2016 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DLA | All Math | DLA | All Math |
|  | Users | Students | Users | Students |


| Cum GPA | 2.80 | 2.67 | 3.01 | 2.70 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cum Units | 48.0 | 47.6 | 53.6 | 42.8 |
| Units Taken | 8.4 | 6.7 | 10.2 | 7.0 |

Table 16. Comparison of DLA Users and All Students Enrolled in a Math Course by Gender

| Gender | Fall 2015 |  |  |  | Spring 2016 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DLA User |  | All Math |  | DLA User |  | All Math |  |
|  | Count | $\%$ | Count | $\%$ | Count | $\%$ | Count | $\%$ |
| Female | 54 | $60.7 \%$ | 1,520 | $51.5 \%$ | 30 | $54.5 \%$ | 1,343 | $51.6 \%$ |
| Male | 34 | $38.2 \%$ | 1,369 | $46.3 \%$ | 24 | $43.6 \%$ | 1,212 | $46.6 \%$ |
| Unknown | 1 | $1.1 \%$ | 65 | $2.2 \%$ | 1 | $1.8 \%$ | 48 | $1.8 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{8 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 9 5 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0} \%$ | $\mathbf{5 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 6 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

Table 17. Comparison of DLA Users and All Students Enrolled in a Math Course by Race/Ethnicity

| Race/Ethnicity |  | Fall 2015 |  |  |  | Spring 2016 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | DLA User |  | All Math <br> Students |  | DLA User |  | All Math <br> Students |  |  |
|  |  | $\%$ | Count | $\%$ | Count | $\%$ | Count | $\%$ |  |
| African-Americans | 2 | $2.2 \%$ | 107 | $3.6 \%$ | 4 | $7.3 \%$ | 95 | $3.6 \%$ |  |
| Alaskans/Native American | 0 | $0.0 \%$ | 104 | $3.5 \%$ | 3 | $5.5 \%$ | 106 | $4.1 \%$ |  |
| Asian | 8 | $9.0 \%$ | 375 | $12.7 \%$ | 10 | $18.2 \%$ | 354 | $13.6 \%$ |  |
| Hispanic/Latino | 71 | $79.8 \%$ | 2,005 | $67.9 \%$ | 33 | $60.0 \%$ | 1,737 | $66.7 \%$ |  |
| Other, Non-White | 0 | $0.0 \%$ | 3 | $0.1 \%$ | 0 | $0.0 \%$ | 2 | $0.1 \%$ |  |
| Pacific Islander | 1 | $1.1 \%$ | 16 | $0.5 \%$ | 0 | $0.0 \%$ | 8 | $0.3 \%$ |  |
| Unknown/Non-Response | 5 | $5.6 \%$ | 149 | $5.0 \%$ | 4 | $7.3 \%$ | 186 | $7.1 \%$ |  |
| White | 2 | $2.2 \%$ | 195 | $6.6 \%$ | 1 | $1.8 \%$ | 115 | $4.4 \%$ |  |
| Total | $\mathbf{8 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 9 5 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 6 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |  |

Table 18. Comparison of DLA Users and All Students Enrolled in a Math Course by Age Group

| Age | Fall 2015 |  |  |  | Spring 2016 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DLA User |  | All Math |  | DLA User |  | All Math |  |
|  | Count | $\%$ | Count | $\%$ | Count | $\%$ | Count | $\%$ |
| 19 or younger | 19 | $21.3 \%$ | 728 | $24.6 \%$ | 9 | $16.4 \%$ | 503 | $19.3 \%$ |
| $20-24$ | 36 | $40.0 \%$ | 1,268 | $42.9 \%$ | 26 | $47.3 \%$ | 1,222 | $46.9 \%$ |
| $25-29$ | 18 | $20.2 \%$ | 496 | $16.8 \%$ | 10 | $18.2 \%$ | 478 | $18.4 \%$ |
| $30-34$ | 7 | $7.9 \%$ | 204 | $6.9 \%$ | 4 | $7.3 \%$ | 163 | $6.3 \%$ |
| $35-39$ | 4 | $4.5 \%$ | 114 | $3.9 \%$ | 1 | $1.8 \%$ | 92 | $3.5 \%$ |
| $40-49$ | 3 | $3.4 \%$ | 100 | $3.4 \%$ | 2 | $3.6 \%$ | 108 | $4.1 \%$ |
| 50 or older | 2 | $2.2 \%$ | 44 | $1.5 \%$ | 3 | $5.5 \%$ | 37 | $1.4 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{8 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 9 5 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 6 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

Overall the DLA students have slightly higher success and completion rates than the regular math students. Table 19 shows the overall Math course success and completion rates for students that used DLAs compared to all students enrolled in a Math course. Success was defined as a student
earning a grade of $A, B, C$, or $P$ (passing). Not passing was defined as a student earning a grade of W, D, F, or NP (not passing). Success and Completion rates are further broken down for DLA users and all students enrolled in a Math course by course in Table 20 and 21.

In Fall 2015, DLA users did not enroll in many of the offered Math courses, except for Math 5, 40, 60, 70, 80, 80A, 80B, 114, and 150; DLA users had higher success rates with the exception of Math 80B and 150. In Spring, DLA users only enrolled in Math 5, 40, 60, 80, 80A, 80B, 114, and 150; DLA users had higher success rates in all courses except Math 60 and 80B. However, with such a large difference in the size of the groups, direct comparisons should be made with caution.

Table 19. Overall Success \& Completion Rate Comparison

| Overall <br> Math Rates | Fall 2015 |  | Spring 2016 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DLA <br> Users | All <br> Math | DLA <br> Users | All <br> Math |
| Success | $62.9 \%$ | $50.2 \%$ | $72.7 \%$ | $50.1 \%$ |
| Completion | $87.6 \%$ | $72.0 \%$ | $87.3 \%$ | $72.0 \%$ |

Table 20. Course Breakdown of Success Rates for DLA Users and All Students Enrolled in a Math Course

| Success Rates | Fall 2015 |  |  |  |  | Spring 2016 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DLA Users |  | All Math Students | DLA Users |  | All Math Students |  |  |  |
|  | Count | $\%$ | Count | $\%$ | Count | $\%$ | Count | $\%$ |  |
| MATH 5 | 13 | $92.3 \%$ | 108 | $75.0 \%$ | 6 | $83.3 \%$ | 87 | $55.2 \%$ |  |
| MATH 40 | 40 | $70.0 \%$ | 926 | $55.3 \%$ | 12 | $83.3 \%$ | 568 | $53.3 \%$ |  |
| MATH 60 | 80 | $56.3 \%$ | 1,708 | $39.2 \%$ | 20 | $40.0 \%$ | 1,357 | $41.6 \%$ |  |
| MATH 70 | 1 | $100.0 \%$ | 117 | $57.3 \%$ | N/A | N/A | 152 | $66.4 \%$ |  |
| MATH 75 | N/A | N/A | 38 | $52.6 \%$ | N/A | N/A | 76 | $56.6 \%$ |  |
| MATH 80 | 47 | $74.5 \%$ | 1,239 | $47.9 \%$ | 37 | $75.7 \%$ | 1,029 | $44.1 \%$ |  |
| MATH 80A | 1 | $100.0 \%$ | 377 | $58.6 \%$ | 11 | $90.9 \%$ | 398 | $57.0 \%$ |  |
| MATH 80B | 19 | $57.9 \%$ | 313 | $62.9 \%$ | 1 | $0.0 \%$ | 258 | $51.2 \%$ |  |
| MATH 105 | N/A | N/A | 31 | $51.6 \%$ | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |
| MATH 110A | N/A | N/A | 43 | $90.7 \%$ | N/A | N/A | 36 | $97.2 \%$ |  |
| MATH 110B | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 31 | $74.2 \%$ |  |
| MATH 112 | N/A | N/A | 433 | $55.0 \%$ | 1 | $100 \%$ | 568 | $60.4 \%$ |  |
| MATH 114 | 2 | $100.0 \%$ | 477 | $40.0 \%$ | N/A | N/A | 487 | $38.0 \%$ |  |
| MATH 115 | N/A | N/A | 12 | $66.7 \%$ | N/A | N/A | 18 | $44.4 \%$ |  |
| MATH 116 | N/A | N/A | 114 | $77.2 \%$ | N/A | N/A | 140 | $55.7 \%$ |  |
| MATH 140 | N/A | N/A | 300 | $54.0 \%$ | N/A | N/A | 212 | $42.0 \%$ |  |
| MATH 150 | 31 | $61.3 \%$ | 198 | $62.1 \%$ | 47 | $66.0 \%$ | 199 | $57.3 \%$ |  |
| MATH 170 | 1 | $100.0 \%$ | 202 | $44.6 \%$ | N/A | N/A | 209 | $50.7 \%$ |  |
| MATH 190 | N/A | N/A | 102 | $48.0 \%$ | N/A | N/A | 123 | $65.0 \%$ |  |
| MATH 220 | N/A | N/A | 85 | $57.6 \%$ | N/A | N/A | 78 | $34.6 \%$ |  |
| MATH 250 | N/A | N/A | 39 | $56.4 \%$ | N/A | N/A | 42 | $66.7 \%$ |  |

Completion rates are further broken down for DLA users and all students enrolled in a Math course by course in Table 21. Completion was defined as the percentage of students that earned a grade in the
course (A, B, C, D, F, P, or NP) and did not withdraw. DLA users had higher completion rates in all math courses with the exceptions of Math 80B in Spring. Again, with such a large difference in the size of the groups direct comparisons should be made with caution.

Table 21. Course Breakdown of Completion Rates for DLA Users and All Students Enrolled in a Math Course

| Course Completion | Fall 2015 |  |  |  |  | Spring 2016 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DLA Users |  | All Math Students |  | DLA Users |  | All Math Students |  |  |
|  | Count | $\%$ | Count | $\%$ | Count | $\%$ | Count | $\%$ |  |
| MATH 5 | 13 | $92.3 \%$ | 108 | $86.1 \%$ | 6 | $83.3 \%$ | 87 | $67.8 \%$ |  |
| MATH 40 | 40 | $97.5 \%$ | 926 | $79.3 \%$ | 12 | $91.7 \%$ | 568 | $73.8 \%$ |  |
| MATH 60 | 80 | $82.5 \%$ | 1,708 | $69.4 \%$ | 20 | $80.0 \%$ | 1,357 | $68.4 \%$ |  |
| MATH 70 | 1 | $100 \%$ | 117 | $79.5 \%$ | N/A | N/A | 152 | $79.6 \%$ |  |
| MATH 75 | N/A | N/A | 38 | $76.3 \%$ | N/A | N/A | 76 | $89.5 \%$ |  |
| MATH 80 | 47 | $95.7 \%$ | 1,239 | $70.1 \%$ | 37 | $100 \%$ | 1,029 | $73.0 \%$ |  |
| MATH 80A | 1 | $100 \%$ | 377 | $79.8 \%$ | 11 | $100 \%$ | 398 | $76.1 \%$ |  |
| MATH 80B | 19 | $100 \%$ | 313 | $82.7 \%$ | 1 | $0.0 \%$ | 258 | $72.9 \%$ |  |
| MATH 105 | N/A | N/A | 31 | $67.7 \%$ | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |
| MATH 110A | N/A | N/A | 43 | $95.3 \%$ | N/A | N/A | 36 | $100.0 \%$ |  |
| MATH 110B | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 31 | $87.1 \%$ |  |
| MATH 112 | N/A | N/A | 433 | $70.0 \%$ | 1 | $100 \%$ | 568 | $76.9 \%$ |  |
| MATH 114 | 2 | $100 \%$ | 477 | $60.0 \%$ | N/A | N/A | 487 | $57.9 \%$ |  |
| MATH 115 | N/A | N/A | 12 | $83.3 \%$ | N/A | N/A | 18 | $50.0 \%$ |  |
| MATH 116 | N/A | N/A | 114 | $91.2 \%$ | N/A | N/A | 140 | $75.7 \%$ |  |
| MATH 140 | N/A | N/A | 300 | $75.3 \%$ | N/A | N/A | 212 | $64.6 \%$ |  |
| MATH 150 | 31 | $83.9 \%$ | 198 | $76.3 \%$ | 47 | $83.0 \%$ | 199 | $70.4 \%$ |  |
| MATH 170 | 1 | $100 \%$ | 202 | $67.3 \%$ | N/A | N/A | 209 | $74.2 \%$ |  |
| MATH 190 | N/A | N/A | 102 | $62.7 \%$ | N/A | N/A | 123 | $77.2 \%$ |  |
| MATH 220 | N/A | N/A | 85 | $78.8 \%$ | N/A | N/A | 78 | $67.9 \%$ |  |
| MATH 250 | N/A | N/A | 39 | $74.4 \%$ | N/A | N/A | 42 | $73.8 \%$ |  |

