The following analyses were completed by USHE research analysts using data from students enrolled at all eight USHE institutions whose first math class between Summer 2012-Spring $2015^{1}$ was Math 1010, Math 1030, Math/Stat 1040, or Math 1050.

- Validating Math ACT and Accuplacer for Placement (February 2016)
- Predicting Probability for Success (March 2016)

Along with the studies, input from the following campus groups have helped inform recommendations:

- institutional research staff
- testing directors
- math faculty
- representatives from College Board (Accuplacer licensor).

Recommendations below are based on these studies and conversations.

## Findings

Previous term cumulative GPA is two times more predictive than placement test score for Math 1010 and Math 1050.

- $50 \%$ of students with a GPA of 3.4 or higher passed Math 1010 and Math/Stat 1040 with a C or better.
- $50 \%$ of students with a GPA of 3.7 or better passed Math 1050 with a C or better.
- Students were likely to pass the course with a 3.4 or 3.7 GPA, respectively, at scores lower than current cut scores utilized by many institutions.


## Recommendations

- Institutions should consider using multiple measures to place students into math courses, in particular GPA in combination with placement exam.
- Accuplacer has a multiple weighted measures function that can assist with this.
- Institutions should consider adjusting ACT Math cut scores, especially if using multiple measures.
- Institutions should adjust how Accuplacer exams are used on their campuses to be in line with how the exams are designed to be used, including:
- Utilizing Elementary Algebra for placement into QL courses.
- Allowing the use of the calculator function when it is available in the Accuplacer exam.
- Revisiting cut scores using institutional data on a three-year cycle.
- Regents should consider developing a policy related to the use of multiple measures to ensure consistent placement decisions at USHE institutions.
- At the request of institutions, OCHE should consider providing training for campusdesignated faculty and staff on cut score best practices.
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## Math Placement Scores: <br> Validating Math ACT and Accuplacer for Placement

February 2016

This study investigates student placement into math courses and subsequent student success in those courses. This study was done in conjunction with a working group of USHE staff and campus senior administrators working on implementation of SB 196, Math Competency Initiative (2015). Hence, the courses selected for study are those offered as concurrent enrollment courses at most USHE institutions (Math 1010, Math 1030, Math/Stat 1040, and Math 1050).

Students included in this study took any math course that is offered as concurrent enrollment, regardless of whether they were concurrent enrollment students or regular college students. Previous USHE research has shown that there are no statistically significant differences in performance between these two student types.

## Study Variables

This study looks at all students, regardless of registration status ${ }^{1}$, whose first math class was Math 1010, Math 1030, Math/Stat 1040, or Math 1050 between Summer 2012-Spring $2015^{2}$ at any of the eight USHE institutions. This includes students who took their first math course as a concurrent enrollment student or as a regular college student. Total population studied was 57,572 students.

Student-level variables collected included:

- Course grade
- Gender
- Race/ethnicity
- Previous term cumulative GPA ${ }^{3}$
- Math ACT
- ACT test date
- Accuplacer test score including, if used at the institution,:
- Accuplacer Arithmetic
- Accuplacer Elementary Algebra
- Accuplacer College-Level Math
- Accuplacer test date

A breakdown by institution at an overall system-level percentage of first enrollments in Math 1010, 1030, 1040, and 1050 is provided in the following chart. This includes all students enrolled at course end, regardless of grade earned.

[^1]

## Pass Rates by Institution

For the purpose of this study, a grade of $C$ or better is considered a 'Pass'. A grade of C- or lower was considered a 'Fail'. Grades of Withdrawal, Unofficial Withdrawal, Credit, Pass, and Incomplete were not included. Only students who completed the course with a grade (whether passing or failing) were included when calculating pass rates. To determine if differences exist between institutions for pass rates for math courses, chi-square tests were performed with the following results.

All courses: $X^{2}(7, \mathrm{~N}=53,633)=822.364, \mathrm{p}<.01$
Math 1010: $X^{2}(7, \mathrm{~N}=34,004)=773.893, \mathrm{p}<.01$
Math 1030: $X^{2}(6, \mathrm{~N}=1,525)=35.269, \mathrm{p}<.01$
Math/Stat 1040: $X^{2}(7, N=3,809)=15.938, \mathrm{p}<.05$
Math 1050: $X^{2}(7, \mathrm{~N}=14,134)=123.336, \mathrm{p}<.01$

For students whose first math class is between Math 1010 and 1050, the majority have Math 1010 as their first class.

As shown in charts below, while each level of analysis shows statistical significance, actual pass rates amongst institutions may not be practically significant, especially as other student factors (e.g. race/ethnicity, previous term cumulative GPA) are considered. The following charts show pass rates by institution for the math course in which each student first enrolled:



First Enrolled in Math 1050 Pass Rates by Institution


| Instifution | Count of 1050 <br> Students |
| :--- | ---: |
| UU | 1,523 |
| USU | 3,751 |
| WSU | 1,287 |
| SUU | 916 |
| SNOW | 1,102 |
| DSU | 1,187 |
| UVU | 2,206 |
| SLCC | 2,172 |
| Total | 14,144 |

## Withdrawal Rates

A withdrawal provides no information about a student's achievement in a course; therefore, withdrawals are excluded in the pass/fail calculation. However, because withdrawals are included in the overall enrollment percentages, withdrawal percentages by institution and course are shown below. This percentage includes both Withdrawals and Unofficial Withdrawals.


## Placement Exams ${ }^{4}$

Typically, USHE students can enroll in math classes in one of two ways: 1) Passing the prerequisite course with an acceptable grade (typically a C or better); 2) Earning an acceptable score on a placement exam. The two most broadly used placement exams are the ACT Math subscore and the Accuplacer series of exams. A table of typical placement scores for the courses examined in this study are below.

| Course | ACT Math <br> Subscore | Accuplacer <br> College Level <br> Math | Accuplacer <br> Elementary <br> Algebra | Accuplacer <br> Arithmetic |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Math 1010 | 18 or 19 | $20-49$ | $54-99$ | $100-120^{5}$ |
| Math 1030 | 23 | $43-89$ | $89-120$ | N/A |
| Math/Stat 1040 | 23 | $43-89$ | $80-120$ | N/A |
| Math 1050 | 23 | $43-89$ | $89-120^{6}$ | N/A |

Because exams from different series (i.e. ACT and Accuplacer) may be used to place students into their first math class at a USHE institution, correlations between exams were performed to investigate

[^2]their relationship to one another. Results indicated that while the Accuplacer Arithmetic and Elementary Algebra scores were related to the ACT math subscores for USHE students, the College Level Math scores showed almost no relationship to ACT math subscores.

Arithmetic and ACT Math r=.557, p<. 01
Elementary Algebra and ACT Math: $\mathrm{r}=.482, \mathrm{p}<.01$
College Level Math and ACT Math $\mathrm{r}=.01, \mathrm{p}<.01$
The finding that the most common Accuplacer exam to place students into their quantitative literacy course - College Level Math - had almost no relationship with the other exam used to place students was concerning. A follow up conversation with College Board which administers the Accuplacer exam provided insight into why this may be the case. The Accuplacer examination used most often and appropriately to place students into their quantitative literacy course is the Elementary Algebra exam. The College Level Math exam is typically used to place students into Calculus courses. ${ }^{7}$

## Cut Scores and Pass rates

While ACT cut scores for placement are generally consistent across institutions, more variation exists for those who place using Accuplacer exams. Knowing this and that the current ACT benchmark for readiness for College Algebra is a 22, pass rates by exam score were analyzed by course. Small sample sizes are noted with an *.

| ACT Math Subscore | Count of Failed | \% Failed | Count of Passed | \% Passed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 13 | 11* | 50\%* | 11* | 50\%* |
| 14 | 30 | 47\% | 34 | 53\% |
| 15 | 150 | 46\% | 173 | 54\% |
| 16 | 258 | 37\% | 440 | 63\% |
| 17 | 225 | 30\% | 530 | 70\% |
| 18 | 482 | $33 \%$ | 958 | 67\% |
| 19 | 444 | 30\% | 1,024 | 70\% |
| 20 | 272 | 24\% | 861 | 76\% |
| 21 | 259 | 22\% | 934 | 78\% |
| 22 | 238 | 20\% | 947 | 80\% |


| Arithmetic Exam | Count of Failed | \% Failed | Count of Passed | $\%$ Passed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $92-99$ | $4^{*}$ | $40 \%^{*}$ | $6^{*}$ | $60 \%^{*}$ |
| $101-108$ | $1^{*}$ | $1^{*}$ | $8 \%^{*}$ | $11^{*}$ |

[^3]| Elementary Algebra Exam | Count of Failed | \% Failed | Count of Passed | \% Passed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $49-53$ | 150 | $37 \%$ | 251 | $63 \%$ |
| $54-58$ | 506 | $48 \%$ | 541 | $52 \%$ |
| $59-63$ | 876 | $46 \%$ | 1,021 | $54 \%$ |
| $64-68$ | 745 | $40 \%$ | 1,101 | $60 \%$ |
| $69-73$ | 662 | $37 \%$ | 1,134 | $63 \%$ |
| $74-78$ | 511 | $34 \%$ | 1,006 | $66 \%$ |
| $79-83$ | 332 | 256 | $28 \%$ | 857 |
| $84-88$ | 113 | $25 \%$ | 757 | $72 \%$ |
| $89-93$ | 71 | $23 \%$ | 373 | $75 \%$ |
| $94-98$ |  | $25 \%$ | 218 | $77 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  | $75 \%$ |


| College Level Math Exam | Count of Failed | \% Failed | Count of Passed | \% Passed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| $20-24$ | 402 | $27 \%$ | 1,096 | $73 \%$ |
| $25-29$ | 257 | $21 \%$ | 986 | $79 \%$ |
| $30-34$ | 204 | $17 \%$ | 1,024 | $83 \%$ |
| $35-39$ | 157 | $16 \%$ | 823 | $84 \%$ |
| $40-44$ | 141 | $14 \%$ | 867 | $86 \%$ |
| $45-49$ | 84 | $12 \%$ | 616 | $88 \%$ |
| $50-54$ | 42 | $9 \%$ | 434 | $91 \%$ |
| $55-59$ | 39 | $10 \%$ | 338 | $90 \%$ |
| $60-64$ | 6 | $7 \%$ | 75 | $93 \%$ |

Math 1030 - Placement Exam Scores and Pass Rates

| ACT Math Subscore | Count of Failed | \% Failed | Count of Passed | \% Passed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 18 | $3^{*}$ | $13 \%^{*}$ | $21^{*}$ | $88 \%^{*}$ |
| 19 | $3^{*}$ | $13 \%^{*}$ | $21^{*}$ | $88 \%^{*}$ |
| 20 | $2^{*}$ | $13 \%^{*}$ | $14^{*}$ | $88 \%^{*}$ |
| 21 | 4 | $13 \%$ | 28 | $88 \%$ |
| 22 | 7 | $15 \%$ | 40 | $85 \%$ |
| 23 | 19 | $11 \%$ | 152 | $89 \%$ |
| 24 | 17 | $10 \%$ | 147 | $90 \%$ |
| 25 | 15 | $12 \%$ | 110 | 88 |
| 26 | 8 | $8 \%$ | 87 | $92 \%$ |
| 27 | 2 | 4 | $16 \%$ | 21 |


| Elementary Algebra Exam | Count of Failed | \% Failed | Count of Passed | \% Passed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $74-83$ | $2^{*}$ | $18 \%^{*}$ | $9^{*}$ | $82 \%^{*}$ |
| $84-93$ | $3^{*}$ | $18 \%^{*}$ | $14^{*}$ | $82 \%^{*}$ |
| $97-109$ | $0^{*}$ | $0 \%^{*}$ | $12^{*}$ | $100 \%^{*}$ |


| College Level Math Exam | Count of Failed | \% Failed | Count of Passed | \% Passed |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $40-49$ | 13 | $29 \%$ | 32 | $71 \%$ |
| $50-59$ | 6 | $10 \%$ | 57 | $90 \%$ |
| $60-69$ | 5 | $13 \%$ | 34 | $87 \%$ |

Math/Stat 1040 - Placement Exam Scores and Pass Rates

| ACT Math Subscore | Count of Failed | \% Failed | Count of Passed | \% Passed |
| :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 19 | $8^{*}$ | $8^{*}$ | $35 \%^{*}$ | $15^{*}$ |
| 20 | $0^{*}$ | $32 \%^{*}$ | $0 \%^{*}$ | $17^{*}$ |
| 21 | 7 | $23 \%$ | $17^{*}$ | $68 \%^{*}$ |
| 22 | 31 | $24 \%$ | 27 | $100 \%^{*}$ |
| 23 | 24 | $13 \%$ | 97 | $77 \%$ |
| 24 | 21 | $13 \%$ | 157 | $76 \%$ |
| 25 | 18 | $14 \%$ | 135 | $87 \%$ |
| 26 | 8 | $8 \%$ | 115 | $87 \%$ |
| 27 | 7 | $9 \%$ | 93 | $86 \%$ |
| 28 |  |  | 75 | $92 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  | $91 \%$ |


| Elementary Algebra Exam | Count of Failed | \% Failed | Count of Passed | \% Passed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $79-83$ | 66 | $34 \%$ | 128 | $66 \%$ |
| $84-88$ | 63 | $28 \%$ | 162 | $72 \%$ |
| $89-93$ | 40 | $16 \%$ | 210 | $84 \%$ |
| $94-98$ | 53 | $22 \%$ | 188 | $78 \%$ |
| $99-103$ | 42 | $19 \%$ | 177 | $81 \%$ |
| $104-108$ | 24 | $13 \%$ | 166 | $87 \%$ |
| $109-113$ | 22 | $13 \%$ | 149 | $87 \%$ |


| College Level Math Exam | Count of Failed | \% Failed | Count of Passed | \% Passed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $40-44$ | $1^{*}$ | $6 \%^{*}$ | $15^{*}$ | $94 \%^{*}$ |
| $45-49$ | 19 | $22 \%$ | 69 | $78 \%$ |
| $50-54$ | 17 | $18 \%$ | 80 | $82 \%$ |
| $55-59$ | 14 | $21 \%$ | 53 | $79 \%$ |
| $60-64$ | 8 | $14 \%$ | 49 | $86 \%$ |
| $65-69$ | 3 | $7 \%$ | 39 | $93 \%$ |

## Math 1050 - Placement Exam Scores and Pass Rates

| ACT Math Subscore | Count of Failed | \% Failed | Count of Passed | \% Passed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 18 | 11 | $20 \%$ | 44 | $80 \%$ |
| 19 | 23 | $26 \%$ | 66 | $74 \%$ |
| 20 | 16 | $25 \%$ | 48 | $75 \%$ |
| 21 | 26 | $19 \%$ | 110 | $81 \%$ |
| 22 | 46 | $22 \%$ | 160 | $78 \%$ |
| 23 | 383 | $23 \%$ | 1,289 | $77 \%$ |
| 24 | 334 | $19 \%$ | 1,444 | $81 \%$ |
| 25 | 182 | $12 \%$ | 1,322 | $88 \%$ |
| 26 | 135 | $12 \%$ | 1,017 | $88 \%$ |
| 27 | 55 | $7 \%$ | 689 | $93 \%$ |
| 28 | 27 | $7 \%$ | 366 | $93 \%$ |


| Elementary Algebra Exam | Count of Failed | \% Failed | Count of Passed | \% Passed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $74-78$ | 12 | $26 \%$ | 34 | $74 \%$ |
| $79-83$ | 15 | $37 \%$ | 26 | $63 \%$ |
| $84-88$ | 10 | $24 \%$ | 32 | $76 \%$ |
| $89-93$ | 18 | $19 \%$ | 79 | $81 \%$ |
| $94-98$ | 13 | $13 \%$ | 91 | $88 \%$ |
| $99-103$ | 14 | $14 \%$ | 86 | $86 \%$ |
| $104-108$ | 14 | $17 \%$ | 67 | $83 \%$ |
| $109-113$ | 5 | $9 \%$ | 49 | $91 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |


| College Level Math Exam | Count of Failed | \% Failed | Count of Passed | \% Passed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $40-44$ | 29 | $20 \%$ | 115 | $80 \%$ |
| $45-49$ | 55 | $21 \%$ | 205 | $79 \%$ |
| $50-54$ | 47 | $17 \%$ | 230 | $83 \%$ |
| $55-59$ | 33 | $13 \%$ | 212 | $87 \%$ |
| $60-64$ | 105 | $13 \%$ | 713 | $87 \%$ |
| $65-69$ | 57 | $10 \%$ | 530 | $90 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |

## Other factors affecting pass rates

A score on a placement test is only one measure by which success in a course can be predicted. Research indicates that other demographic and student-level factors may predict success in a course ${ }^{8}$. Using logistic regression, the following variables were used to predict success of passing each course: gender, race/ethnicity, age, previous term cumulative GPA, and placement test score. Initial results indicated that gender was not a significant predictor ( $\mathrm{p}<.95$ ) so it was removed from further analysis. When using the eight race/ethnicity categories, some showed as significant and others did not. Further analysis revealed that pass rates by ethnicity were bimodal so ethnicity was recoded into two categories with ethnicities with similar pass rates in each category. (Ethnicity 0 contained Black, Hispanic, American Indian/Alaska Native, and Pacific Islander; Ethnicity 1 contained White, Unspecified, Nonresident Alien, and Asian.)

Logistic regression was performed for each course and placement test used to place students into that course with the other variables. Tables of regression coefficients and significant variables are below. Ethnicity and age vary in their usefulness as a predictive factor. For every regression, previous term GPA was a significant predictor. Placement test was significant in all but three analyses. A further investigation of standardized coefficients for Math 1010 and Math 1050 predictors showed that previous term cumulative GPA was two times more predictive than placement test score.

## Math 1010 Logistic Regression Results

| Predictors | $\beta$ | SE $\beta$ | Wald's $\mathrm{X}^{2}$ | df | p | Odds Ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Constant | -5.944 | . 486 | 149.621 | 1 | . 000 | . 003 |
| Age | . 071 | . 016 | 19.935 | 1 | . 000 | 1.074 |
| Ethnicity (2 groups) | -. 059 | . 106 | . 306 | 1 | . 580 | . 943 |
| Cum GPA (prev. term) | 1.090 | . 061 | 317.079 | 1 | . 000 | 2.974 |
| ACT Math | . 117 | . 015 | 64.653 | 1 | . 000 | 1.124 |


| Predicłors | $\beta$ | SE $\beta$ | Wald's $\mathrm{X}^{2}$ | df | p | Odds Ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Constant | -5.622 | . 634 | 78.767 | 1 | . 000 | . 004 |
| Age | . 012 | . 009 | 1.791 | 1 | . 181 | 1.012 |
| Ethnicity (2 groups) | . 594 | . 167 | 12.628 | 1 | . 000 | 1.811 |
| Cum GPA (prev. term) | 1.317 | . 166 | 63.322 | 1 | . 000 | 3.734 |
| Arithmetic Accuplacer | . 015 | . 004 | 11.231 | 1 | . 001 | 1.015 |

[^4]| Predicłors | $\beta$ | SE $\beta$ | Wald's $\mathrm{X}^{2}$ | df |  | p | Odds Ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Constant | -4.419 | . 196 | 510.655 |  | 1 | . 000 | . 012 |
| Age | . 020 | . 004 | 27.143 |  | 1 | . 000 | 1.020 |
| Eihnicity (2 groups) | . 384 | . 069 | 31.034 |  | 1 | . 000 | 1.468 |
| Cum GPA (prev. term) | . 970 | . 039 | 628.996 |  | 1 | . 000 | 2.639 |
| Elementary Algebra Accuplacer | . 017 | . 001 | 147.048 |  | 1 | . 000 | 1.018 |
| Predicłors | $\beta$ | SE $\beta$ | Wald's $\mathrm{X}^{2}$ | df |  | p | Odds Ratio |
| Constant | -2.851 | . 300 | 90.104 |  | 1 | . 000 | . 058 |
| Age | . 017 | . 007 | 5.234 |  | 1 | . 022 | 1.017 |
| Eihnicity (2 groups) | . 557 | . 119 | 21.773 |  | 1 | . 000 | 1.745 |
| Cum GPA (prev. term) | . 830 | . 057 | 213.584 |  | 1 | . 000 | 2.294 |
| College Level Math Accuplacer | . 027 | . 004 | 47.822 |  | 1 | . 000 | 1.027 |


| Math 1010 Placement Test | ACT Math | Arithmetic <br> Accuplacer | Elementary <br> Algebra <br> Accuplacer | College Level Math <br> Accuplacer |
| :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Sample Size | 3,817 | 845 | 7,992 | 4,051 |

## Math 1030 Logistic Regression Results ${ }^{9}$

| Predictors | $\beta$ | SE $\beta$ | Wald's $\mathrm{X}^{2}$ | df | p | Odds Ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Constant | -4.774 | 1.793 | 7.087 | 1 | . 008 | . 008 |
| Age | . 019 | . 047 | . 171 | 1 | . 679 | 1.019 |
| Ethnicity (2 groups) | . 792 | . 501 | 2.497 | 1 | . 114 | 2.207 |
| Cum GPA (prev. term) | 1.794 | . 263 | 46.429 | 1 | . 000 | 6.016 |
| ACT Math | . 017 | . 045 | . 142 | 1 | . 707 | 1.017 |


| Predictors | $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ | SE $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ | Wald's $X^{2}$ | df |  | $p$ | Odds Ratio |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Constant | -5.868 | 2.275 | 6.653 | 1 | .010 | .003 |  |
| Age | .043 | .044 | .982 | 1 | .322 | 1.044 |  |
| Ethnicity (2 groups) | 1.054 | .762 | 1.915 | 1 | .166 | 2.870 |  |
| Cum GPA (prev. term) | 1.309 | .528 | 6.139 | 1 | .013 | 3.704 |  |
| Elementary Algebra | .022 | .019 | 1.422 | 1 | .233 | 1.023 |  |
| Accuplacer |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^5]| Predictors | $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ | SE $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ | Wald's $X^{2}$ | df | p | Odds Ratio |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Constant | -10.462 | 3.119 | 11.254 | 1 | .001 | .000 |
| Age | .145 | .071 | 4.235 | 1 | .040 | 1.156 |
| Ethnicity (2 groups) | 1.813 | .777 | 5.443 | 1 | .020 | 6.127 |
| Cum GPA (prev. term) | 1.310 | .550 | 5.665 | 1 | .017 | 3.705 |
| College Level Math | .063 | .030 | 4.590 | 1 | .032 | 1.065 |
| Accuplacer |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Math 1030 Placement Test | ACT Math | Elementary Algebra <br> Accuplacer | College Level Math <br> Accuplacer |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample Size | 417 | 76 | 118 |

## Math/Stat 1040 Logistic Regression Results

| Predictors | $\beta$ | SE $\beta$ | Wald's $\mathrm{X}^{2}$ | df | $p$ | Odds Ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Constant | -12.439 | 2.583 | 23.188 | 1 | . 000 | . 000 |
| Age | . 324 | . 116 | 7.839 | 1 | . 005 | 1.382 |
| Ethnicity (2 groups) | -. 112 | . 534 | . 044 | 1 | . 834 | . 894 |
| Cum GPA (prev. term) | 1.375 | . 226 | 37.159 | 1 | . 000 | 3.957 |
| ACT Math | . 152 | . 041 | 13.549 | 1 | . 000 | 1.165 |


| Predicłors | $\beta$ | SE $\beta$ | Wald's ${ }^{2}$ | df | $p$ | Odds Ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Constant | -6.291 | . 746 | 71.160 | 1 | . 000 | . 002 |
| Age | . 017 | . 012 | 1.951 | 1 | . 162 | 1.017 |
| Ethnicity (2 groups) | -. 039 | . 268 | . 021 | 1 | . 885 | . 962 |
| Cum GPA (prev. term) | 1.624 | . 139 | 136.825 | 1 | . 000 | 5.071 |
| Elementary Algebra | . 024 | . 006 | 17.891 | 1 | . 000 | 1.025 |


| Predictors | $\beta$ | SE $\beta$ | Wald's ${ }^{2}$ | df | $p$ | Odds Ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Constant | -6.925 | 1.465 | 22.330 | 1 | . 000 | . 001 |
| Age | -. 011 | . 026 | . 169 | 1 | . 681 | . 989 |
| Ełhnicity (2 groups) | . 430 | . 584 | . 541 | 1 | . 462 | 1.537 |
| Cum GPA (prev. łerm) | 1.912 | . 290 | 43.418 | 1 | . 000 | 6.763 |
| College Level Math Accuplacer | . 042 | . 014 | 9.159 | 1 | . 002 | 1.043 |


| Math/Stat 1040 Placement Test | ACT Math | Elementary Algebra <br> Accuplacer | College Level Math <br> Accuplacer |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample Size | 474 | 1.393 | 351 |

## Math 1050 Logistic Regression Results

| Predicłors | $\beta$ | SE $\beta$ | Wald's $\mathrm{X}^{2}$ | df | p | Odds Ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Constant | -7.493 | . 964 | 60.464 | 1 | . 000 | . 001 |
| Age | . 074 | . 032 | 5.423 | 1 | . 020 | 1.077 |
| Ethnicity (2 groups) | -. 063 | . 208 | . 092 | 1 | . 762 | . 939 |
| Cum GPA (prev. term) | 1.238 | . 085 | 213.689 | 1 | . 000 | 3.450 |
| ACT Math | . 150 | . 023 | 43.484 | 1 | . 000 | 1.161 |


| Predictors | $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ | SE $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ | Wald's $X^{2}$ | df |  | $\boldsymbol{p}$ | Odds Ratio |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Constant | -4.811 | .996 | 23.319 | 1 | .000 | .008 |  |
| Age | .014 | .026 | .304 | 1 | .582 | 1.014 |  |
| Ethnicity (2 groups) | .830 | .372 | 4.966 | 1 | .026 | 2.293 |  |
| Cum GPA (prev. term) | 1.375 | .230 | 35.744 | 1 | .000 | 3.956 |  |
| Elementary Algebra | .007 | .006 | 1.362 | 1 | .243 | 1.007 |  |
| Accuplacer |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Predictors | $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ | SE $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ | Wald's $X^{2}$ | df |  | P | Odds Ratio |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Constant | -4.527 | .646 | 49.175 | 1 | .000 | .011 |  |
| Age | .025 | .016 | 2.428 | 1 | .119 | 1.025 |  |
| Ethnicity (2 groups) | .298 | .263 | 1.281 | 1 | .258 | 1.347 |  |
| Cum GPA (prev. term) | 1.145 | .101 | 127.788 | 1 | .000 | 3.142 |  |
| College Level Maih | .030 | .005 | 32.271 | 1 | .000 | 1.030 |  |
| Accuplacer |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Math $\mathbf{1 0 5 0}$ Placement Test | ACT Math | Elementary Algebra <br> Accuplacer | College Level Math <br> Accuplacer |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample Size | 2,933 |  | 406 |

## Recommendations

- Use multiple measures to place students into quantitative literacy courses, in particular GPA in combination with a placement exam
- Consider adjusting ACT Math cut scores based on current pass rates, especially if using multiple measures
- Adjust how Accuplacer tests are used to place students into math classes
- Utilize Elementary Algebra for placement into quantitative literacy courses
- Utilize multiple measures available within the Accuplacer product, in particular cumulative GPA
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## Math Placement Scores:

Predicting Probability for Success
March 2016

Following the completion of the study "Math Placement Scores: Validating Math ACT and Accuplacer for Placement", USHE completed a subsequent analysis looking at the predicted probability of success (i.e. earned a C or better) in first math class taken.

## Study Variables

This study looks at all students, regardless of registration status ${ }^{1}$, whose first math class was Math 1010, Math/Stat 1040, or Math 1050 between Summer 2012-Spring $2015^{2}$ at any of the eight USHE institutions.

Student-level variables collected included:

- Course grade
- Race/ethnicity split into two groups based on analysis of pass rates by race/ethnicity
- Ethnicity 1: Black, Hispanic, Native American, Pacific Islander (64\% pass rate, $\mathrm{N}=6,317$ )
- Ethnicity 2: Asian, Nonresident Alien, Unknown, White (78\% pass rate, N=47,346)
- Previous term cumulative GPA
- Math ACT
- Accuplacer test score:
- Accuplacer Arithmetic (ART)
- Accuplacer Elementary Algebra (EA)
- Accuplacer College-Level Math (CLM)

Students for each class were placed into one of four groups depending on which exam was used for their placement. Determination of which placement test was used was based on which scores were available for the student. The assumptions are detailed below.

- If College-Level Math score was provided, CLM was used to place the student.
- If no CLM score was provided and an Elementary Algebra score was, EA was used to place the student.
- If no CLM and no EA score was provided and an Arithmetic score was provided, ART was used to place.
- If no Accuplacer score was provided, ACT Math was used to place.

[^6]
## Grade Point Average within Courses and Placement Tests

Ogive graphs were constructed for each course to determine the previous term cumulative GPA at which $50 \%$ of the students in the sample earned a C or better in the math class. Based on those graphs, a previous term cumulative GPA of 3.4 for Math 1010, 3.5 for Math/Stat 1040, and a 3.7 for Math 1050 fell at the $50 \%$ cumulative frequency mark.



## Predicted Probability Analysis

Utilizing the information on GPA and pass rate, two ideal types were created for each course and mode of placement. One type was set at the $50 \%$ cumulative frequency of passing ( 3.4 for Math 1010 and Math/Stat 1040 and 3.7 for Math 1050); the other type was set one standard deviation below the $50 \%$ cumulative frequency mark for that course and placement model. The other two elements of the model - Ethnicity and Age - were held constant at the group mean. Three example graphs shown below indicate the predicted probability of each type of student successfully passing the course with a C or better and various scores on the placement exam.

## Predicted Probabilities for Passing Math 1010 for Students who Tested into Math 1010 using ACT Math by ACT Math Subscore



Other model variables:

- Ethnicity set at .85
- Age set at 19.5

For example, for Math 1010, students with an ACT of 19 and a 3.4 GPA have an $80 \%$ probability of passing the course. At an ACT of 16, students with a 3.4 GPA have a $70 \%$ probability of passing the course. Students with a 2.73 GPA have lower probabilities ( $60 \%$ at a 19 and $55 \%$ at a 16 ).

Predicted Probabilities for Passing Math 1040 for Students who Tested into Math 1040 using the Elementary Algebra Accuplacer by Elementary Algebra Accuplacer Subscore


Other model variables:

- Ethnicity set at . 92
- Age set at 24.5

Percent in model passed math (C or better): $80.3 \%$
Accuplacer Elementary Algebra Subscore
-—— 2.92 GPA, rest(mean)
$\longrightarrow$ 3.50 GPA, rest(mean)

For Math/Stat 1040, students with a 3.5 GPA and even the lowest score on the Elementary Algebra Accuplacer have over a $50 \%$ probability of passing. Current cut scores, typically between 80 and 90, show an $80 \%$ probability or higher with a student at a 3.5 GPA. A student with an EA score of 89 and 2.92 GPA has a $70 \%$ probability of passing the course with a C or better.

Predicted Probabilities for Passing Math 1050 for Students who Tested into Math 1050 using the College Level Math Accuplacer by College Level Math Accuplacer Subscore


## Other model variables:

- Ethnicity set at . 93
$\longrightarrow$ 3.08 GPA, rest(mean)
- Age set at 21.3 3.70 GPA, rest(mean)

Finally, with Math 1050, students with a 3.7 GPA and even the lowest score on the College Level Math Accuplacer have nearly an $80 \%$ probability of passing. A student with a 3.08 GPA and score of 43 on the CLM has a $70 \%$ probability of passing.

## Conclusions

This analysis further supports recommendations made in the previous study that cumulative GPA significantly predicts student success in Quantitative Literacy courses and that the Elementary Algebra exam may be the most appropriate Accuplacer placement instrument for QL courses in USHE.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ For Utah State University, data was provided for Spring 2013 through Fall 2015.

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ For example, students may take their first math course as a high school student in concurrent enrollment or as continuing student with senior class standing.
    ${ }^{2}$ For Utah State University, data was provided for Spring 2013 through Fall 2015.
    ${ }^{3}$ Not available for students who took math in their first semester at the institution.

[^2]:    ${ }^{4}$ These cut scores represent data available when the study began. Many institutions are currently revisiting cut scores.
    ${ }^{5}$ Only at Dixie State University.
    ${ }^{6}$ Only at Snow College and Dixie State University.

[^3]:    7 Keith White and Cyd Grua, Personal Communication, February 2016. Since the CLM exam is used mostly to place students into calculus type courses, no remediation solution exists with Accuplacer products. Additionally, College Board's Accuplacer "Course Placement" document shows a wide range of scores from a random sampling of institutions who use Accuplacer for placement.

[^4]:    ${ }^{8}$ Fong, K., Melguizo, T., and Prather, G. (2015). Increasing Success Rates in Developmental Math: The Complementary Role of Individual and Institutional Characteristics. Research in Higher Education. (56), 719-749.

[^5]:    ${ }^{9}$ Sample sizes for Math 1030 are much lower than for other courses. Thus interpretations should be made with that in mind.

[^6]:    ${ }^{1}$ For example, students may take their first math course as a high school student in concurrent enrollment or as continuing student with senior class standing.
    ${ }^{2}$ For Utah State University, data was provided for Spring 2013 through Fall 2015.

