DATE: 2/14/2019<br>TO: AB 705 Implementation Team<br>FROM: Doreen Finkelstein, Research Analyst<br>RE: $\quad$ Math enrollment under AB 705 for Fall 2018

## Introduction:

The passage of Assembly Bill (AB) 705 removed barriers for the placement of students into gateway, transfer-level math (e.g., Math 10, Math 48A), with the goal of increasing the number of students who enroll in, and successfully complete, these courses within one year. In compliance with AB 705, as of Fall 2018, all Foothill College students are eligible to enroll directly into these courses. Depending upon a student's high school achievement (GPA and course grades), students may be required to take a corequisite, Math 248A, along with Math 48A.

While students are no longer being placed into math courses below transfer-level (e.g., Math 105), they may still elect to take these courses.

This study looked at 1) enrollment into Math 10 and Math 48A compared to the previous year (Fall 2017); 2) differences between students who enrolled in Math 10 and Math 48A vs. those who enrolled in below-transfer-level math coursework; and 3) placement and enrollment patterns for the Math 48A corequisite, Math 248A.

## Results Overview:

- Enrollment patterns were in line with the goals of $A B 705$. Enrollment in Math 10 increased by 277 students over the previous year, for a gain of 45\%, while enrollment in Math 48A increased by 100 students, for a gain of $38 \%$. There were significant gains in the proportion of Latinx students enrolled in Math $10(+9 \%)$ and Math 48A ( $+13 \%$ ).
- Students who enrolled in below-transfer-level math coursework (Math 105, Math 180, and Math 217) were more likely to be African-American (+4\%), Latinx (+5\%), or Pacific Islander (+3\%) than were students who enrolled in Math 10 or Math 48A. They were also more likely to be female ( $+3 \%$ ). Future research into these enrollment patterns can help determine whether these student groups are more likely to enroll in below-transfer-level coursework due to different educational goals - in which case the enrollment patterns are appropriate - or for some other reason (e.g., unawareness of their eligibility for higher-level math or lack of confidence in their ability to succeed in higher-level math).
- Students taking the corequisite with Math 48A were more likely to be Latinx (+19\%) and AfricanAmerican (+3\%) than were students taking Math 48A without the corequisite. They were also
more likely to be male (+6\%). Awareness of these trends may help inform future pedagogy and curriculum in the Math 48A corequisite.
- Out of the 364 students who enrolled in Math 48A, 53 (15\%) underplaced themselves by taking the corequisite when they were not required to take it. These students were more likely to be White ( $+9 \%$ ) and female ( $+8 \%$ ). A survey of Math 48A students suggests that the primary reasons for self-underplacement were 1) a seeming lack of awareness of higher-level math eligibility, 2) an interest in additional academic support to pass the class, and 3) a desire to take the class with a specific instructor who was only teaching Math 48A with Math 248A. Ongoing research is required to monitor the underplacement trends as more data are needed before any conclusions or implications can be identified.


## Results Detail:

## Enrollment in Math 10

Math 10 enrollment increased by 277 students (45\%) in Fall 2018 as compared to Fall 2017. If the increase in Math 10 enrollment was proportionately equal for all student groups, we would expect to see no change in the proportions across the two years. As shown in Table 1, there was a greater increase in Math 10 enrollment among Latinx students than for other groups, especially Asian students. There was an increase in the relative proportion of Latinx students among the Math 10 student population, going from 30\% in Fall 2017 to 39\% in Fall 2018 (+9\%) and a decrease in the relative proportion of Asian students, going from 30\% in Fall 2017 to 22\% in Fall 2018 (-8\%). The relative proportion of female students also declined slightly (-3\%).

Table 1: Math 10 Enrollment by Student Group

|  | Fall 2017 |  | Fall 2018 |  | F18-F17 <br> Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Student Group | Head Count | \% | Head Count | \% |  |
| By Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |  |
| African American | 23 | 4\% | 54 | 6\% | +2\% |
| Asian | 185 | 30\% | 196 | 22\% | -8\% |
| Filipinx | 41 | 7\% | 63 | 7\% | 0\% |
| Latinx | 185 | 30\% | 345 | 39\% | +9\% |
| Native American | 2 | 0\% | 1 | 0\% | 0\% |
| Pacific Islander | 9 | 1\% | 5 | 1\% | 0\% |
| White | 162 | 26\% | 219 | 24\% | -2\% |
| Decline to State | 12 | 2\% | 13 | 1\% | -1\% |
| By Gender |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 369 | 60\% | 507 | 57\% | -3\% |
| Male | 249 | 40\% | 381 | 42\% | +2\% |
| Decline to State | 1 | 0\% | 8 | 1\% | +1\% |
| Total | 619 | 100\% | 896 | 100\% |  |

## Enrollment in Math 48A

Math 48A enrollment increased by 100 students (38\%) in Fall 2018 as compared to Fall 2017. If the increase in Math 48A enrollment was proportionately equal for all student groups, we would expect
to see no change in the proportions across the two years. As shown in Table 2, there was a greater increase in Math 48A enrollment among Latinx students than for other groups, especially Asian students. There was an increase in the relative proportion of Latinx students among the Math 48A student population, going from 28\% in Fall 2017 to $41 \%$ in Fall 2018 (+13\%) and a decrease in the relative proportion of Asian students, going from 33\% in Fall 2017 to 20\% in Fall 2018 (-13\%). The relative proportion of female students also declined slightly (-3\%).

Table 2: Math 48A Enrollment by Student Group

| Student Group | Fall 2017 |  | Fall 2018 |  | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Head Count | \% | Head Count | \% |  |
| By Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |  |
| African American | 5 | 2\% | 9 | 2\% | 0\% |
| Asian | 88 | 33\% | 72 | 20\% | -13\% |
| Filipinx | 14 | 5\% | 19 | 5\% | 0\% |
| Latinx | 74 | 28\% | 151 | 41\% | +13\% |
| Native American | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0\% |
| Pacific Islander | 7 | 3\% | 8 | 2\% | -1\% |
| White | 72 | 27\% | 97 | 27\% | 0\% |
| Decline to State | 4 | 2\% | 8 | 2\% | 0\% |
| By Gender |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 112 | 42\% | 141 | 39\% | -3\% |
| Male | 150 | 57\% | 219 | 60\% | +3\% |
| Decline to State | 2 | 1\% | 4 | 1\% | 0\% |
| Total | 264 | 100\% | 364 | 100\% |  |

Note: Percents do not always sum to 100 due to rounding.

## Enrollment in Math 10 and Math 48A vs. Below-Transfer-Level Math Coursework

Table 3 shows Fall 2018 enrollment in Math 10 and Math 48A vs. enrollment in below-transferlevel math coursework (Math 105, Math 180, and Math 217), disaggregated by student ethnicity and gender. While there were over four times as many enrollments in Math 10 and Math 48A as in the lower-level courses ( 1260 vs. 305), students who chose to enroll in the below-transfer-level courses were more likely to be African-American (+4\%), Latinx (+5\%), or Pacific Islander (+3\%). They were also more likely to be female (+3\%).

Table 3: Fall 2018 Enrollment in
Math 10 and Math 48A vs. Below-Transfer-Level Math by Student Group

|  | Below-Transfer-Level ${ }^{1}$ |  | Math 10 and Math 48A |  | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Student Group | Head Count | \% | Head Count | \% |  |
| By Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |  |
| African American | 26 | 9\% | 63 | 5\% | +4\% |
| Asian | 38 | 12\% | 268 | 21\% | -9\% |
| Filipinx | 22 | 7\% | 82 | 7\% | 0\% |
| Latinx | 135 | 44\% | 496 | 39\% | +5\% |
| Native American | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 0\% | 0\% |
| Pacific Islander | 12 | 4\% | 13 | 1\% | +3\% |
| White | 71 | 23\% | 316 | 25\% | -2\% |
| Decline to State | 1 | 0\% | 21 | 2\% | -2\% |
| By Gender |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 164 | 54\% | 648 | 51\% | +3\% |
| Male | 136 | 45\% | 600 | 48\% | -3\% |
| Decline to State | 5 | 2\% | 12 | 1\% | +1\% |
| Total | 305 | 100\% | 1260 | 100\% |  |

${ }^{1}$ Three below-transfer-level courses were offered in Fall 2018: Math 105, Math 180, and Math 217.
Note: Counts are duplicated for students enrolled in more than one course. Percents do not always sum to 100 due to rounding.

## Enrollment in Math 48A Corequisite

Depending on a student's high school GPA and coursework, they may be required to enroll in a corequisite course, Math 248A, when they enroll in Math 48A. In Fall 2018, five sections of Math 48A were paired with the corequisite, while five were stand-alone Math 48A sections.

Table 4 shows Fall 2018 enrollment in the Math 48A sections paired with the corequisite vs. the stand-alone sections, disaggregated by student ethnicity and gender. Students taking the corequisite were more likely to be Latinx (+19\%) and African-American (+3\%). They were also more likely to be male (+6\%).

Table 4: Fall 2018 Enrollment in Math 48A with and without Corequisite by Student Group

|  | With Corequisite |  | Stand-Alone |  | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Student Group | Head Count | \% | Head Count | \% |  |
| By Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |  |
| African American | 7 | 4\% | 2 | 1\% | +3\% |
| Asian | 23 | 13\% | 49 | 27\% | -14\% |
| Filipinx | 10 | 6\% | 9 | 5\% | +1\% |
| Latinx | 92 | 51\% | 59 | 32\% | +19\% |
| Native American | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0\% |
| Pacific Islander | 3 | 2\% | 5 | 3\% | -1\% |
| White | 42 | 23\% | 55 | 30\% | -7\% |
| Decline to State | 4 | 2\% | 4 | 2\% | 0\% |
| By Gender |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 66 | 36\% | 75 | 41\% | -5\% |
| Male | 114 | 63\% | 105 | 57\% | +6\% |
| Decline to State | 1 | 1\% | 3 | 2\% | -1\% |
| Total | 181 | 100\% | 183 | 100\% |  |

Note: Percents do not always sum to 100 due to rounding.

These students may not have been aware of their higher-level math placement, or they may have enrolled in a section paired with the corequisite because of a preference for the instructor or the day and time the section was offered, or else they may have been forced into a corequisite section because other sections were full. A final possibility is that these students were not confident in their math ability, and deliberately chose to underplace themselves in the math sequence. In order to help investigate why these students were underplaced, a survey of Fall 2018 Math 48A students was conducted in December 2018; among the questions asked of students taking the Math 48A corequisite was why they were taking it. Of the 53 students who were underplaced, 19 (36\%) responded to the survey. Table 6 shows the reasons they gave for taking the corequisite.

Around half of the survey respondents ( 10 students, $53 \%$ ) said they were unaware of their eligibility for a higher-level placement. The next most common reasons for enrolling in the corequisite were a desire for the increased support ( 7 students, $37 \%$ ) and a desire to take the course with the instructor who was teaching the corequisite ( 5 students, 26\%).

Table 5: Fall 2018 Underplacement into Math 48A with Corequisite by Student Group

| Student Group | Count of Underplaced Students | Percent of Underplaced Students | Count of Students in Math 48A (all) | Percent of Students in Math 48A (all) | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| By Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |  |
| African American | 1 | 2\% | 9 | 2\% | 0\% |
| Asian | 8 | 15\% | 72 | 20\% | -5\% |
| Filipinx | 3 | 6\% | 19 | 5\% | +1\% |
| Latinx | 20 | 38\% | 151 | 41\% | -3\% |
| Native American | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% | 0\% |
| Pacific Islander | 1 | 2\% | 8 | 2\% | 0\% |
| White | 19 | 36\% | 97 | 27\% | +9\% |
| Decline to State | 1 | 2\% | 8 | 2\% | 0\% |
| By Gender |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 25 | 47\% | 141 | 39\% | +8\% |
| Male | 28 | 53\% | 219 | 60\% | -7\% |
| Decline to State | 0 | 0\% | 4 | 1\% | -1\% |
| Total | 53 | 100\% | 364 | 100\% |  |

Note: Percents do not always sum to 100 due to rounding.

Table 6: Fall 2018 Underplacement into Math 48A with Corequisite:
Reasons Given for Taking the Corequisite (Survey Results)

| Reason | Count | \% |
| ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Believed was ineligible to enroll in Math 48A without the corequisite | 10 | $53 \%$ |
| Wanted the extra support from the corequisite | 7 | $37 \%$ |
| Wanted to take the course with the corequisite's instructor | 5 | $26 \%$ |
| Corequisite section was the best fit for the student's schedule | 2 | $11 \%$ |
| Enrolled in STEM Core | 2 | $11 \%$ |
| Unaware it was possible to enroll in Math 48A without the corequisite | 1 | $5 \%$ |

Note: Students could give more than one reason, so percents do not sum to 100.

## Methodology

Course enrollments were obtained from the ODS table Registration_Analysis, while student ethnicity and gender were obtained from the ODS table SS_Student_Term_Attributes. Eligibliity to enroll into Math 48A without the corequisite was determined through a combination of their math placement (obtained from the ODS table Test) and whether they had previously passed Math 105, Math 108, or a transfer-level math course (obtained from the ODS table Registration_Analysis).

