

College Applicants Who Took the COMPASS Test in 2006 (Part 1): Applicant Data

Rockingham Community College

Michael Preuss

January 9, 2008

College applicants who took the COMPASS Test in 2006: Applicant Data

Executive summary

This report is the first installment in a three part report regarding college applicants who took the COMPASS placement test in 2006. Using information gathered during COMPASS placement testing in 2006, applicant demographics and need for Developmental Education was identified. In addition, enrollment patterns and outcomes in developmental studies were gathered. This installment of the report considers only the characteristics of the applicant pool.

The majority of applicants to the college in every age category were female. The majority of applicants to the college were under the age of 25, 65.5%, and nearly 85% of applicants were under the age of 36. Overall the racial mix of applicants was similar to that of the county. However, dual enrollment applicants were skewed toward the White population and applicants in the 25-35 year old category skewed toward Blacks.

Approximately 4 of every 5 applicants to the college required developmental studies with developmental mathematics need nearly three times that of other developmental disciplines. Only 28% of applicants tested out of developmental mathematics. In general, female applicants were less academically prepared than males and Black applicants were less academically prepared than White applicants. Patterns associated with particular gender, race and age groups were identified which should be considered when registering students. More Black applicants require developmental mathematics and a large number of these applicants require a greater extent of remediation than their White counterparts. This situation also existed in respect to developmental reading and English. Developmental mathematics, required by 71.7% of applicants is the primary gateway to the institution and, as a result, the greatest potential hindrance to student success at the college.

Method:

The information gathered by the college when administering the COMPASS placement test to applicants in 2006 was accessed to provide the data set for the first part of this study. The items accessed and utilized were student name and college identification number, self reported demographic data, the results of the COMPASS test in the areas pre-algebra, algebra, reading and English and the semester the applicant had indicated they wished to enroll. These data were placed in an Excel spreadsheet. Excel functions were employed to sort the data. The first sort was by intended semester of enrollment. Within the semester groupings, the data was further sorted by gender, then racial group, then age. The number of applicants exhibiting characteristics, for example need for a given course in developmental education, was identified and posted in a second Excel spreadsheet. The tables which appear in this report are summations of the data gathered and posted on the second Excel spreadsheet.

The second source of data for the study was college academic records. Course enrollment and outcomes for the first academic year were gathered for each enrollee. These records were integrated in an Excel workbook with those gathered from the COMPASS placement test. These data were sorted in the manner described above.

Overview: Applicants

RCC applicants exhibited a pronounced need for developmental studies, approximately 4 out of 5 applicants needed Developmental Education (Table 1). The need for math remediation among applicants was nearly three times greater than that for Reading and English (Table 1). The percentage of need for developmental education increased as applicants move into enrollee status (Table 1). This characteristic will be addressed in the enrollee section of this report (Part II).

Demographics: Applicants

Nearly 65% of the RCC applicants taking the COMPASS test in 2006 were female (Table 2). When considered by age groupings, the percentage of females in the applicant pool was below 60% through traditional college age but increased to over 75% beginning at the 25-35 year old age category and continued at this level (Table 3).

The majority of applicants to the college were under the age of 25 in 2006 and nearly all were under the age of 36. Over 65% of the RCC applicants were under the age of 25 (Table 3). Over 84% of the RCC applicants were under the age of 36 (Table 3).

The racial composition of the applicant pool was similar to that of the county but did not match county demographics exactly. Whites and Hispanics were under represented by 2% while Blacks were over represented by 3% in the applicant pool (Table 4). When considered by age groupings, White males and females were over represented in the applicant pool by ten percentage points among 16 to 17 year olds, reflect county demographics at age 18 to 24, and were under represented in the 25 to 35 age category (Table 5). Above the age of 36, the racial composition of the applicant pool returned to an approximation of county demographics (Table 5).

Academic Preparation: Applicants

When considered as aggregate groups of COMPASS test takers in the year 2006, female applicants were less academically prepared than male applicants (Table 6). The only exceptions in seven areas of comparison were more males required ENG 085 and the need among male and female applicants for ENG 090 which was roughly equivalent (Table 6).

When the data is sorted by gender and again by race, White male applicants were more prepared academically than males in other racial groups and White female applicants were more academically prepared than females in other groups (Table 6). The differences

between Whites and other racial groups in respect to academic preparation ranged from several percentage points to 25 percentage points (Tables 6, 9 and 10).

The total number of persons in the White and Black groupings was large enough to provide reliable data when sorted by gender, race and age (Table 6). However, the total number of persons in the remaining racial groups was not sufficient to provide reliable data when sorted into smaller groups based upon gender, race and age (Table 6). The remainder of this portion of the report will discuss the two primary racial groups in the RCC applicant pool, Whites and Blacks.

When the COMPASS test results of White and Black applicants were sorted by gender, race and age, the data showed that White females tested as more academically prepared than Black females in 30 out of 35 points of comparison (Table 9). The same comparison between White males and Black males showed White males tested as more academically prepared than Black males in 33 of 35 points of comparison. For both females and males these comparisons exclude the 56+ age group in which there was limited numbers of applicants (Table 10).

Some group specific patterns were revealed when the COMPASS test results of White and Black applicants in 2006 were sorted by gender, race and age. In the White applicant pool, females were less academically prepared than males in all but one area of comparison between age 16 and 24 (Table 7). This is significant as these are dual enrollment and traditional college age students. Beginning at age 25, this pattern changed. The White male applicants over the age of 25 were more likely to need developmental studies than White female applicants and more likely to require Developmental Mathematics (Table 7). The White male applicants in the age group 25-35 were the weakest group of White male applicants academically (Table 7). Need for Developmental Education in general and the need for Developmental Mathematics increased with age among White females while the need for Developmental Reading decreased with age (Table 7). 18-24 and 46-55 year old White females had the greatest need for Developmental English of all age groups of White females (Table 7).

Black applicants exhibited different group specific patterns of need than White applicants when the data was sorted by gender, race and age. The distinctions are not as strong as those in the White population however, the trends are noteworthy. Black males were more likely to need Developmental Education and to require Developmental Mathematics than Black females (Table 8). To the age of 35, Black females were more likely to require Developmental Reading (Table 8). In the 36-45 age group, Black males become more likely to need Developmental Reading (Table 8). The groups above the age of 46 were too small for the data to be reliable (Table 8). Black females were more likely in every age group to require ENG 085 with the exception of the 18-24 age category (Table 8). No clear pattern was established in respect to ENG 090 (Table 8). This circumstance is explained by the overall deficit in academic preparedness of these groups. Support for this conclusion is found in the 10 to 20 percentage point higher need for developmental studies among Blacks than among their age group counterparts in the pool of White applicants (Tables 7 and 8).

Academic preparation: Mathematics. Overall, slightly more than 28% of applicants had COMPASS placement scores that exempted them from Developmental Mathematics. Within the applicant population, more females required Developmental Mathematics than males and more tested into the lower levels of Developmental Mathematics than male applicants (Table 11). Only one percent of RCC applicants, males and females, tested into the highest level of Developmental Mathematics, MAT 080 (Table 11).

When the comparison is narrowed to the two largest racial groups, Blacks and Whites, and the data is represented by gender, racial group and applicant age in a cross tabulation table, Black females were less prepared in mathematics than White females with the exception of the 16-17 age group in which they were roughly comparable (Table 12). In each age group from 18-24 on, Black females had a need for Developmental Mathematics similar to that of White females and in two cases 5% points or more higher (Table 12). In each age group from 18-24 Black females requiring Developmental Mathematics were skewed toward MAT 060, the lowest course level class, as were White females (Table 12). However, a far greater percentage of Black females were placed in the lowest level of Developmental Mathematics than White females in each age category above the age of 18 (Table 12). Only four of the gender, race and age groups included applicants placed into the highest level of Developmental Mathematics. Three of the four cases were White female groups and only one was a Black female group (Table 12). At each point of comparison, Black female applicants were less prepared in mathematics than their White counterparts.

The trends in the data related to need for Developmental Mathematics are more pronounced in the male applicant pool. In every age category in which there was a sufficient number of applicants for reliable data, Black males were less prepared in mathematics than White males (Table 13). In every age category from 16-17 through 36-45, Black males had a need for Developmental Mathematics which was the same as or up to twice the need among White male applicants (Table 13). When the levels of Developmental Mathematics are used to further segregate the data, Black male applicants were between one and one half and two times more likely to be placed in the lowest level of study while White applicants were as much as 5 times more likely to test into a higher level of Developmental Mathematics (Table 13). The only group of male applicants with representation in the highest level of Developmental Mathematics was 18-24 year old White males (Table 13). At each point of comparison, Black male applicants were less prepared in mathematics than their White contemporaries.

Academic preparation: Reading and English. Among 2006 COMPASS test takers, female applicants required more remediation than male applicants (Tables 6 and 14). With respect to Developmental Reading and Developmental English, female applicants were 5% more likely to require RED 090 while male applicants were twice as likely as female applicants to require the lowest level of instruction, ENG 085, and the need for ENG 090 was approximately the same for the two groups (Table 14). However, there were very few persons requiring ENG 085 and resulting descriptive statistics can not be considered to be representative of college population in general. The number of

applicants requiring ENG 085 was sufficient to populate only one section of the course in an entire calendar year.

When the largest racial groups, Whites and Blacks, are compared by race, sex, and age groupings, Black males and females were less prepared than their White counterparts with the exception of three age groups in which White females required ENG 085 more frequently than other groups (Table 15 and 16) and one age group in which White males had a slightly higher general need for Developmental Education and a higher need for ENG 085 than their Black counterparts (Table 16). Depending upon the age category Black females are two to two and one half times more likely to require Developmental Reading and slightly to three times more likely to require Developmental English than their White counterparts (Table 15). The circumstance is similar for Black males who are between nearly twice as likely to three times as likely to require Developmental Reading and slightly more likely to nearly 50% more likely to require Developmental English than their White peers (Table 16).

Academic preparation: By semester. When applicants are considered in aggregate groups by the semester in which they intended to enroll, the fall applicant group had the lowest overall need for Developmental Education (Table 17). No other pattern was discerned in the seven areas of comparison (Table 17).

Literature: Community college applicants

The following information from the literature sheds light on the data described above and presented in the tables that follow.

1. A predominance of females in community college populations is common (Phillipe & Sullivan, 2005). Since females make up the majority of community college students, it follows that they are the majority of applicants.
2. Needs for Developmental Education that reach or exceed 80% of applicants are not uncommon among community colleges (Schoenecker, Bollman, & Evens, 1996; Puyear, 1998; Finkelstein, 2002).
3. Efrid notes that the National Center for Educational Statistics “reported that in the year 2000, only 17 percent of high school graduates were considered ‘proficient’ in mathematics. ‘Proficient’ is defined as the level of intellect expected of a high school graduate” (2005).
4. For Developmental Mathematics need to exceed the need for other developmental disciplines among college applicants is common (Moore, 2002).
5. Johnson and Kuennen (2004) reported that women and minorities were more likely to require Developmental Mathematics than Whites and that these results paralleled other research.
6. Walker and Plata (2000) reported that Blacks were placed more frequently in the lower levels of Developmental Mathematics than their white counterparts.
7. Garcia found that students applying for and entering her institution in the fall were academically stronger than those entering in the spring (2003).

Conclusions and recommendations: Applicants

Demographics

1. White students were over represented among dual enrolled students (age 16-17). The Student Development division may wish to investigate reasons for this imbalance and seek to strengthen initiatives to attract minority dual enrolled students.
2. Blacks were over represented in the 25-35 age group. High School graduation rates and county employment data and household statistics should be gathered to pursue an understanding of this circumstance.
3. The college attracted an applicant pool that reflected County demographics among traditional age students. While this is a positive outcome, one must consider this in light of the number of high school graduates who leave the County to attend college. If a significant number of the potential students in one group move away to attend college, the college's seemingly balanced applicant pool would include an over representation of the remaining students in that group.

Academic preparation

1. The RCC applicant pool follows national patterns with respect to the academic preparation levels of females and minorities. This information should be combined with that to be produced in the second and third portions of this investigation to sharpen the focus of programming for underprepared students.
2. The need for Developmental Mathematics among RCC applicants in 2006 was in the upper quartile of national spectrum (Schoenecker, Bollman & Evens, 1996; Seon & King, 1997; Puyear, 1998; Germanna CC, 2002; Texas State Higher Education Coordinating Board, 2002) as reported previously. Developmental Mathematics should be and remain an institutional priority. The effectiveness of all programming and instruction related to meeting the needs of this group, over 70% of the applicants, should be monitored closely. Developmental Mathematics functions as the primary gateway or obstacle to further study at the college.
3. Blacks had a greater need for developmental reading and English than Whites in every age category. In some instances the rate was three times that of White applicants. This is a potential hindrance for students as many Black applicants face a need to complete remediation in multiple academic disciplines simultaneously, a significant academic challenge which is compounded by the limited number of courses in which a student can enroll at the college when facing such academic deficits. Parts two and three of this study will include details of the impact this situation has on student schedules and outcomes.

References:

- Dixon, P.S., Gribbons, B.C. & Mueschke, D.M. (2002). Applicants who did not enroll – Fall 1999, Fall 2000, Fall 2001. Santa Clarita, CA: Office of Institutional Development, College of the Canyons. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED474567). Retrieved September 4, 2007 from the Educational Resources Information Center database on Ebscohost.
- Efrid, C. (2005). The effects of Developmental Mathematics on student performance at an open admissions university. *National Association for Developmental Education Digest*, 1(2), 19-25. Retrieved September 11, 2007 from <http://www.nade.net/publications/digest.html> .
- Finkelstein, J.A. (2002). Maximizing retention for at-risk freshmen: The Bronx Community College model. Bronx, NY: Bronx Community College. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED469657). Retrieved March 5, 2007 from the Educational Resources Information Center database on Ebscohost.
- Garcia, H. (2003). From theory to practice: A case for developmental mathematics. *Research & Teaching in Developmental Education*, 20(1), 53- 67.
- Germanna Community College. (2002). Student outcomes in developmental education 1994-1995 through 1999-2000. Locust Grove, VA: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED459900). Retrieved March 6, 2007 from the Educational Resources Information Center database on Ebscohost.
- Johnson, M. & Kuennen, E. (2004). Delaying developmental mathematics: The characteristics and costs. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 28(2), 24-29. Retrieved June 24, 2007 from the Academic Search Premier database.
- Moore, R. (2002). The fates of developmental education students at two-year and four-year colleges. In Higbee, J.L. & Lundell, D.B. (Eds.). *Developmental Education: Policy and practice*, Auburn, CA: National Association for Developmental Education.
- Phillippe, K.A. & Sullivan, L.G. (2005). *National profile of community colleges: Trends & statistics* (4th Edition). Washington, D.C.: Community College Press.
- Puyear, D. (1998). Developmental and remedial education in Arizona community colleges: A status report. Phoenix, AZ: Arizona State Board of Directors for Community Colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED423931). Retrieved March 3, 2007 from the Educational Resources Information Center database on Ebscohost.
- Schoenecker, C., Bollman, L. & Evens, J. (1996). Developmental education outcomes at Minnesota community colleges. Paper presented at the Annual Forum for the Association of Institutional Research. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED397712). Retrieved March 3, 2007 from the Educational Resources Information Center database on Ebscohost.
- Seon, Y. & King, R. (1997). Study skills can make a major difference. Paper presented at the 23rd Annual Conference of the American Mathematical Association of Two-Year Colleges in Atlanta, GA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED417791). Retrieved March 5, 2007 from the Educational Resources Information Center database on Ebscohost.
- Texas State Higher Education Coordinating Board. (2002). Mathematics developmental

education in Texas public institutions of higher education performance assessment. Austin, TX: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED480191). Retrieved March 6, 2007 from the Educational Resources Information Center database on Ebscohost.

Walker, W. & Plata, M. (2000). Race/gender/age differences in college mathematics students. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 23(3), 24-30. Retrieved June 24, 2007 from the Academic Search Premier database.

Table 1

2006 COMPASS applicant pool and developmental education: Overview of applicants and enrollees

| | N | DE need? | 2+ needs | MAT | RED | 085 | ENG | Seats |
|------------|------|----------|----------|-------|-------|------|-------|-------|
| Applicants | 1079 | 81.9% | 32.6% | 71.7% | 25% | 1.9% | 25.7% | 1.24 |
| Enrollees | 515 | 85.0% | 33.0% | 80.4% | 23.1% | 1.7% | 26.8% | 1.32 |

Key: DE need? is % placed in developmental education; 2+ needs is % of applicants placed in 2 or more developmental disciplines; MAT is % of applicants placed in developmental mathematics; RED is % of applicants placed in developmental reading; 085 is % of applicants placed in English 085; ENG is % of applicants placed in English 090; and, Seats is the total number of seats applicants would occupy in developmental classes if each enrolled in every discipline they required divided by the total number of applicants.

Table 2

2006 COMPASS applicant pool and developmental education: Applicants and enrollees compared to county composition by sex

| | <u>Applicants</u> | | <u>Enrollees</u> | | | <u>County</u> |
|------------|-------------------|------------|------------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|
| | N | % of total | N | % applicants | % enrollees | |
| Applicants | 1079 | | | | | |
| Females | 695 | 64.4% | 301 | 43.3% | 58.4% | 51.6% |
| Males | 384 | 35.6% | 214 | 55.7% | 41.5% | 48.4% |

Table 3

2006 COMPASS applicant pool and developmental education: Age distribution of applicants and the percentage of males and females in each category

| | Applicant N | % Applicants | % Male | % Female |
|------------|-------------|--------------|--------|----------|
| Applicants | 1079 | | | |
| 16-17 | 154 | 14.4% | 40.3% | 59.7% |
| 18-24 | 547 | 51.1% | 42.6% | 57.4% |
| 25-35 | 201 | 18.8% | 22.9% | 77.1% |
| 36-45 | 118 | 11.1% | 23.7% | 76.3% |
| 46-55 | 51 | 4.8% | 27.5% | 72.5% |
| 56+ | 8 | 0.7% | 12.5% | 87.5% |

Table 4

2006 COMPASS applicant pool and developmental education: Applicants and enrollees compared to county composition by race

| | <u>Applicants</u> | | <u>Enrollees</u> | | <u>County</u> |
|------------|-------------------|------------|------------------|--------------|---------------|
| | N | % of total | N | % enrollment | |
| Applicants | 1079 | | | | |
| White | 780 | 72.3% | 385 | 74.8% | 74.9% |
| Black | 242 | 22.4% | 104 | 20.2% | 19.6% |
| Amer. Ind. | 5 | 0.5% | 4 | 0.8% | 0.3% |
| Hispanic | 20 | 1.9% | 10 | 1.9% | 4.5% |
| Asian | 4 | 0.4% | 1 | 0.2% | 0.3% |
| Other | 28 | 2.6% | 11 | 2.1% | 0.1% |

Table 5

2006 COMPASS applicant pool and developmental education: Age distribution of applicants, the percentage of males and females in each category and the percentages of Black and White males and females in each category

| | Applicant N | % Applicants | % Male | % Female | Wh. Male | Bl. Male | Wh. Fem. | Bl. Fem. |
|------------|-------------|--------------|--------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Applicants | 1079 | | | | | | | |
| 16-17 | 154 | 14.4% | 40.3% | 59.7% | 83.8% | 12.9% | 84.8% | 9.8% |
| 18-24 | 547 | 51.1% | 42.6% | 57.4% | 73.0% | 21.0% | 73.2% | 20.7% |
| 25-35 | 201 | 18.8% | 22.9% | 77.1% | 54.3% | 37.0% | 66.5% | 31.0% |
| 36-45 | 118 | 11.1% | 23.7% | 76.3% | 78.9% | 17.9% | 65.6% | 28.9% |
| 46-55 | 51 | 4.8% | 27.5% | 72.5% | 64.3% | 28.6% | 75.7% | 18.9% |
| 56+ | 8 | 0.7% | 12.5% | 87.5% | 0% | 100% | 57.1% | 42.8% |

Table 6

2006 COMPASS applicant pool and developmental education: Comparison of the need for developmental education between all applicants, all applicants by sex and White, Black, Hispanic and minority applicants by sex

| | N | DE? | 2+ needs | MAT | RED | 085 | ENG | Seats |
|--------------------|------|-------|----------|-------|-------|------|-------|-------|
| Applicants | 1079 | 81.9% | 32.6% | 71.7% | 25.0% | 1.9% | 25.7% | 1.24 |
| Females | 695 | 83.0% | 34.0% | 73.8% | 26.9% | 1.4% | 25.5% | 1.27 |
| Males | 384 | 79.9% | 30.2% | 68.0% | 21.6% | 2.8% | 26.0% | 1.18 |
| White females | 502 | 81.1% | 29.9% | 73.1% | 21.5% | 1% | 22.3% | 1.18 |
| Black females | 158 | 91.8% | 45.6% | 77.8% | 44.3% | 4% | 35.4% | 1.6 |
| Hispanic fem. | 16 | 75.0% | 50.0% | 87.6% | 37.5% | 6.3% | 31.3% | 1.63 |
| Non-Bl. min. fem. | 21 | 81.0% | 52.4% | 85.7% | 38.1% | 4.8% | 38.1% | 1.67 |
| White males | 278 | 76.6% | 23.7% | 64.3% | 17.3% | 6% | 22.7% | 1.06 |
| Black males | 84 | 88.1% | 48.8% | 77.4% | 35.7% | 5% | 32.1% | 1.51 |
| Hispanic males | 4 | 100% | 50% | 75.0% | 25.0% | 0% | 50.0% | 1.50 |
| Non-Bl. min. males | 8 | 100% | 62.5% | 62.5% | 50.0% | 0% | 62.5% | 1.75 |

Table 7

2006 COMPASS applicant pool and developmental education: Comparison of the need for developmental education between all applicants, White female applicants sorted by age and White male applicants sorted by age

| | N | DE? | 2+ needs | MAT | RED | 085 | ENG | Seats |
|--------------|------|-------|----------|-------|-------|------|-------|-------|
| Applicants | 1079 | 81.9% | 32.6% | 71.7% | 25% | 1.9% | 25.7% | 1.24 |
| 16-17 W fem. | 78 | 57.7% | 23.1% | 46.2% | 19.2% | 1.3% | 15.4% | 0.82 |
| 16-17 W male | 25 | 48.1% | 23.1% | 34.6% | 13.5% | 0% | 28.8% | 0.77 |
| 18-24 W fem. | 230 | 83.5% | 34.3% | 74.8% | 24.3% | 0.4% | 28.3% | 1.28 |
| 18-24 W male | 170 | 80% | 25.3% | 65.9% | 20% | 2.4% | 24.7% | 1.13 |
| 25-35 W fem. | 103 | 89.3% | 28.2% | 80.6% | 22.3% | 0% | 15.5% | 1.18 |
| 25-35 W male | 25 | 96% | 32% | 88% | 12% | 8% | 16% | 1.24 |
| 36-45 W fem. | 59 | 81.4% | 22.0% | 79.6% | 13.6% | 5.1% | 16.9% | 1.12 |
| 36-45 W male | 22 | 86.4% | 9.1% | 81.8% | 13.6% | 0% | 4.5% | 1.00 |
| 46-55 W fem. | 28 | 92.9% | 35.7% | 89.3% | 17.9% | 0% | 32.1% | 1.39 |
| 46-55 W male | 9 | 100% | 11.1% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 11.1% | 1.11 |
| 56+ W fem. | 4 | 100% | 25% | 100% | 25% | 0% | 0% | 1.25 |
| 56+ W male | 0 | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |

Table 8

2006 COMPASS applicant pool and developmental education: Comparison of the need for developmental education between all applicants, Black female applicants sorted by age and Black male applicants sorted by age

| | N | DE? | 2+ needs | MAT | RED | 085 | ENG | Seats |
|---------------|------|-------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Applicants | 1079 | 81.9% | 32.6% | 71.7% | 25% | 1.9% | 25.7% | 1.24 |
| 16-17 Bl fem. | 9 | 66.7% | 55.6% | 44.4% | 44.4% | 0% | 44.4% | 1.33 |
| 16-17 Bl male | 8 | 75% | 62.5% | 75% | 37.5% | 0% | 37.5% | 1.50 |
| 18-24 Bl fem. | 65 | 93.8% | 41.5% | 73.8% | 47.7% | 0% | 32.3% | 1.54 |
| 18-24 Bl male | 49 | 85.7% | 49% | 69.4% | 38.8% | 6.1% | 36.7% | 1.51 |
| 25-35 Bl fem. | 48 | 91.7% | 45.8% | 85.4% | 41.7% | 2.1% | 35.4% | 1.65 |
| 25-35 Bl male | 17 | 94.1% | 41.2% | 88.3% | 35.3% | 5.9% | 17.6% | 1.47 |
| 36-45 Bl fem. | 26 | 92.3% | 42.3% | 76.9% | 34.6% | 3.8% | 34.6% | 1.50 |
| 36-45 Bl male | 5 | 100% | 60% | 100% | 40.0% | 0% | 40.0% | 1.80 |
| 46-55 Bl fem. | 7 | 100% | 85.7% | 100% | 57.1% | 28.6% | 57.1% | 2.43 |
| 46-55 Bl male | 4 | 100% | 50.0% | 100% | 0% | 25% | 25.0% | 1.50 |
| 56+ Bl fem. | 3 | 100% | 33.3% | 66.7% | 66.7% | 0% | 33.3% | 1.67 |
| 56+ Bl male | 1 | 100% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1.00 |

Table 9

2006 COMPASS applicant pool and developmental education: Comparison of the need for developmental education between all applicants, female applicants and White and Black female applicants sorted by race and age

| | N | DE? | 2+ needs | MAT | RED | 085 | ENG | Seats |
|---------------|------|-------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Applicants | 1079 | 81.9% | 32.6% | 71.7% | 25% | 1.9% | 25.7% | 1.24 |
| Females | 695 | 83% | 34% | 73.8% | 26.9% | 1.4% | 25.5% | 1.27 |
| 16-17 W fem. | 78 | 57.7% | 23.1% | 46.2% | 19.2% | 1.3% | 15.4% | 0.82 |
| 16-17 Bl fem. | 9 | 66.7% | 55.6% | 44.4% | 44.4% | 0% | 44.4% | 1.33 |
| 18-24 W fem. | 230 | 83.5% | 34.3% | 74.8% | 24.3% | 0.4% | 28.3% | 1.28 |
| 18-24 Bl fem. | 65 | 93.8% | 41.5% | 73.8% | 47.7% | 0% | 32.3% | 1.54 |
| 25-35 W fem. | 103 | 89.3% | 28.2% | 80.6% | 22.3% | 0% | 15.5% | 1.18 |
| 25-35 Bl fem. | 48 | 91.7% | 45.8% | 85.4% | 41.7% | 2.1% | 35.4% | 1.65 |
| 36-45 W fem. | 59 | 81.4% | 22.0% | 79.6% | 13.6% | 5.1% | 16.9% | 1.12 |
| 36-45 Bl fem. | 26 | 92.3% | 42.3% | 76.9% | 34.6% | 3.8% | 34.6% | 1.50 |
| 46-55 W fem. | 28 | 92.9% | 35.7% | 89.3% | 17.9% | 0% | 32.1% | 1.39 |
| 46-55 Bl fem. | 7 | 100% | 85.7% | 100% | 57.1% | 28.6% | 57.1% | 2.43 |
| 56+ W fem. | 4 | 100% | 25% | 100% | 25% | 0% | 0% | 1.25 |
| 56+ Bl fem. | 3 | 100% | 33.3% | 66.7% | 66.7% | 0% | 33.3% | 1.67 |

Table 10

2006 COMPASS applicant pool and developmental education: Comparison of the need for developmental education between all applicants, male applicants and White and Black male applicants sorted by race and age

| | N | DE? | 2+ needs | MAT | RED | 085 | ENG | Seats |
|---------------|------|-------|----------|-------|-------|------|-------|-------|
| Applicants | 1079 | 81.9% | 32.6% | 71.7% | 25% | 1.9% | 25.7% | 1.24 |
| Males | 384 | 79.9% | 30.2% | 68% | 21.6% | 2.8% | 26% | 1.18 |
| 16-17 W male | 25 | 48.1% | 23.1% | 34.6% | 13.5% | 0% | 28.8% | 0.77 |
| 16-17 Bl male | 8 | 75% | 62.5% | 75% | 37.5% | 0% | 37.5% | 1.50 |
| 18-24 W male | 170 | 80% | 25.3% | 65.9% | 20% | 2.4% | 24.7% | 1.13 |
| 18-24 Bl male | 49 | 85.7% | 49% | 69.4% | 38.8% | 6.1% | 36.7% | 1.51 |
| 25-35 W male | 25 | 96% | 32% | 88% | 12% | 8% | 16% | 1.24 |
| 25-35 Bl male | 17 | 94.1% | 41.2% | 88.3% | 35.3% | 5.9% | 17.6% | 1.47 |
| 36-45 W male | 22 | 86.4% | 9.1% | 81.8% | 13.6% | 0% | 4.5% | 1.00 |
| 36-45 Bl male | 5 | 100% | 60% | 100% | 40.0% | 0% | 40.0% | 1.80 |
| 46-55 W male | 9 | 100% | 11.1% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 11.1% | 1.11 |
| 46-55 Bl male | 4 | 100% | 50.0% | 100% | 0% | 25% | 25.0% | 1.50 |
| 56+ W male | 0 | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| 56+ Bl male | 1 | 100% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1.00 |

Table 11

2006 COMPASS applicant pool and developmental education: Comparison of the need for developmental mathematics between all applicants, female applicants and male applicants

| | N | MAT | MAT 060 | MAT 070 | MAT 080 |
|------------|------|-------|---------|---------|---------|
| Applicants | 1079 | 71.7% | 43.1% | 27.6% | 1.0% |
| Females | 695 | 73.8% | 47.2% | 25.6% | 1.0% |
| Males | 384 | 68.0% | 35.7% | 31.3% | 1.0% |

Table 12

2006 COMPASS applicant pool and developmental education: Comparison of the need for developmental mathematics between all applicants, female applicants and White and Black female applicants sorted by race and age

| | N | MAT | MAT 060 | MAT 070 | MAT 080 |
|---------------|------|-------|---------|---------|---------|
| Applicants | 1079 | 71.7% | 43.1% | 27.6% | 1.0% |
| Females | 695 | 73.8% | 47.2% | 25.6% | 1.0% |
| 16-17 W fem. | 78 | 46.2% | 24.4% | 20.5% | 1.3% |
| 16-17 Bl fem. | 9 | 44.4% | 22.2% | 22.2% | 0% |
| 18-24 W fem. | 230 | 74.8% | 42.2% | 30.9% | 1.7% |
| 18-24 Bl fem. | 65 | 73.8% | 44.6% | 27.7% | 1.5% |
| 25-35 W fem. | 103 | 80.6% | 52.4% | 27.2% | 1.0% |
| 25-35 Bl fem. | 48 | 85.4% | 70.8% | 14.6% | 0% |
| 36-45 W fem. | 59 | 79.6% | 55.9% | 23.7% | 0% |
| 36-45 Bl fem. | 26 | 76.9% | 65.4% | 11.5% | 0% |
| 46-55 W fem. | 28 | 89.3% | 60.7% | 28.6% | 0% |
| 46-55 Bl fem. | 7 | 100% | 85.7% | 14.3% | 0% |
| 56+ W fem. | 4 | 100% | 50% | 50% | 0% |
| 56+ Bl fem. | 3 | 66.7% | 66.7% | 0% | 0% |

Table 13

2006 COMPASS applicant pool and developmental education: Comparison of the need for developmental mathematics between all applicants, male applicants and White and Black male applicants sorted by race and age

| | N | MAT | MAT 060 | MAT 070 | MAT 080 |
|---------------|------|-------|---------|---------|---------|
| Applicants | 1079 | 71.7% | 43.1% | 27.6% | 1.0% |
| Males | 384 | 68.0% | 35.7% | 31.3% | 1.0% |
| 16-17 W male | 25 | 34.6% | 11.1% | 23.1% | 0% |
| 16-17 Bl male | 8 | 75.0% | 50.0% | 25.0% | 0% |
| 18-24 W male | 170 | 65.9% | 27.6% | 36.5% | 1.8% |
| 18-24 Bl male | 49 | 69.4% | 53.1% | 16.3% | 0% |
| 25-35 W male | 25 | 88.0% | 36.0% | 52.0% | 0% |
| 25-35 Bl male | 17 | 88.3% | 76.5% | 11.8% | 0% |
| 36-45 W male | 22 | 81.8% | 40.9% | 40.9% | 0% |
| 36-45 Bl male | 5 | 100% | 60.0% | 40.0% | 0% |
| 46-55 W male | 9 | 89.3% | 55.6% | 33.3% | 11.1% |
| 46-55 Bl male | 4 | 100% | 100% | 0% | 0% |
| 56+ W male | 0 | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| 56+ Bl male | 1 | 100% | 100% | 0% | 0% |

Table 14

2006 COMPASS applicant pool and developmental education: Comparison of the need for developmental Reading and English between all applicants, female applicants and male applicants

| | N | DE? | RED 090 | ENG 085 | ENG 090 |
|------------|------|-------|---------|---------|---------|
| Applicants | 1079 | 81.9% | 25% | 1.9% | 25.7% |
| Females | 695 | 83.0% | 26.9% | 1.4% | 25.5% |
| Males | 384 | 79.9% | 21.6% | 2.8% | 26.0% |

Table 15

2006 COMPASS applicant pool and developmental education: Comparison of the need for developmental Reading and English between all applicants, female applicants and White and Black female applicants sorted by race and age

| | N | DE? | RED 090 | ENG 085 | ENG 090 |
|---------------|------|-------|---------|---------|---------|
| Applicants | 1079 | 81.9% | 25% | 1.9% | 25.7% |
| Females | 695 | 83.0% | 26.9% | 1.4% | 25.5% |
| 16-17 W fem. | 78 | 57.7% | 19.2% | 1.3% | 15.4% |
| 16-17 Bl fem. | 9 | 66.7% | 44.4% | 0% | 44.4% |
| 18-24 W fem. | 230 | 83.5% | 24.3% | 0.4% | 28.3% |
| 18-24 Bl fem. | 65 | 93.8% | 47.7% | 0% | 32.3% |
| 25-35 W fem. | 103 | 89.3% | 22.3% | 0% | 15.5% |
| 25-35 Bl fem. | 48 | 91.7% | 41.7% | 2.1% | 35.4% |
| 36-45 W fem. | 59 | 81.4% | 13.6% | 5.1% | 16.9% |
| 36-45 Bl fem. | 26 | 92.3% | 34.6% | 3.8% | 34.6% |
| 46-55 W fem. | 28 | 92.9% | 17.9% | 0% | 32.1% |
| 46-55 Bl fem. | 7 | 100% | 57.1% | 28.6% | 57.1% |
| 56+ W fem. | 4 | 100% | 25% | 0% | 0% |
| 56+ Bl fem. | 3 | 100% | 66.7% | 0% | 33.3% |

Table 16

2006 COMPASS applicant pool and developmental education: Comparison of the need for developmental Reading and English between all applicants, male applicants and White and Black male applicants sorted by race and age

| | N | DE? | RED 090 | ENG 085 | ENG 090 |
|---------------|------|-------|---------|---------|---------|
| Applicants | 1079 | 81.9% | 25% | 1.9% | 25.7% |
| Males | 384 | 79.9% | 21.6% | 2.8% | 26.0% |
| 16-17 W male | 25 | 48.1% | 13.5% | 0% | 28.8% |
| 16-17 Bl male | 8 | 75.0% | 37.5% | 0% | 37.5% |
| 18-24 W male | 170 | 80.0% | 20.0% | 2.4% | 24.7% |
| 18-24 Bl male | 49 | 85.7% | 38.8% | 6.1% | 36.7% |
| 25-35 W male | 25 | 96.0% | 12.0% | 8.0% | 16.0% |
| 25-35 Bl male | 17 | 94.1% | 35.3% | 5.9% | 17.6% |
| 36-45 W male | 22 | 86.4% | 13.6% | 0% | 4.5% |
| 36-45 Bl male | 5 | 100% | 40.0% | 0% | 40.0% |
| 46-55 W male | 9 | 100% | 0% | 0% | 11.1% |
| 46-55 Bl male | 4 | 100% | 0% | 25% | 25.0% |
| 56+ W male | 0 | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| 56+ Bl male | 1 | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

Table 17

2006 COMPASS applicant pool and developmental education: Comparison of the need for developmental education in the aggregate applicant pool with the applicant groups intending to enroll in the spring, summer and fall

| | N | DE? | 2+ needs | MAT | RED | 085 | ENG | Seats |
|------------|------|-------|----------|-------|-------|------|-------|-------|
| Applicants | 1079 | 81.9% | 32.6% | 71.7% | 25% | 1.9% | 25.7% | 1.24 |
| Spring | 268 | 88.1% | 32.8% | 78% | 19.8% | 1.9% | 20.1% | 1.20 |
| Summer | 103 | 85.4% | 25.2% | 77.7% | 24.3% | 0% | 18.4% | 1.20 |
| Fall | 708 | 79.1% | 33.6% | 68.5% | 27.1% | 2.1% | 28.8% | 1.27 |