## Spring 2020 Loaner Technology Report



The following report is only possible because of the insight and assistance provided by IT, the Library staff, Romelia Salinas, Eric Lara, and Tannia Robles. Thank you to all those who distributed this technology as well. When you are referring to the data from this report, please remember to acknowledge that it was done through the Research and Institutional Effectiveness office in collaboration with the aforementioned persons and that it was completed on 6/8/2020 .
Prepared By: Lisa DiDonato, ERAA (RIE).

## Spring 2020 Loaned Technology Report

The abrupt transition to online teaching during the Spring 2020 term due to the Covid-19 virus, left some students in immediate need of computers and internet connectivity in order to complete their coursework. As a result, Mt. SAC began loaning both types of technology to students on March 27, 2020, two days before classes would resume online exclusively, the first distribution of technology occurred. An additional five distributions occured thoughout the term. 711 students received technology as a result of these distributions. This report is intended to provide information about the Spring 2020 students who participated in the technology loaner program.

Distributions by Date and Student Type

| Distribution Dates | Students Served | Credit Students | Non-Credit Students | Not Registered Spring 2020** |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| March 27, 2020 | 145 | 145 |  |  |
| April 7, 2020 | 76 | 76 |  |  |
| April 15, 2020 | 194 | 183 | 10 | 1 |
| April 22, 2020 | 135 | 130 | 5 |  |
| April 29, 2020 | 99 | 62 | 34 | 3 |
| May 6, 2020 | 75 | 51 | 24 |  |
| Duplicated Count* | 724 | 647 | 73 | 4 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Unduplicated Count | 711 | 634 | 73 | 4 |
| Percentage of Total |  | 89\% | 12\% | 5\% |
| *14 Students attended multiple distribution dates |  |  |  |  |


**Or status unknown

A total of 711 students received technology at the six distribution dates. $89 \%$ of the 711 students were registered in credit classes during the sping 2020 term. $12 \%$ were enrolled in non-credit courses and $5 \%$ or 4 students were not registered in any classes during the term.

Requests for Technology and Technology Received


Types of Technology Received

| Student Type | Ipads | WiFi | Laptop | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Credit | 109 | 386 | 507 |  |
| Non-Credit | 6 | 33 | 70 | 1117 |
| No Units** | 1 | 2 | 3 |  |
| Total* | $\mathbf{1 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{4 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{5 8 0}$ |  |
| Percent of Total | $\mathbf{1 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 2 \%}$ |  |

1117 technology items were distributed during the spring 2020 term. Laptops accounted for $52 \%$ of the technology loaned to students. $38 \%$ of the technology loaned were wifi devices and $10 \%$ were Ipads.
**Or status unknown


## Demographics of Students Receiving Technology

Gender

| Student <br> Type | Female |  | Male |  | Unknown |  | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Count | Percent | Count | Percent | Count | Percent |  |
| Credit | 395 | $62 \%$ | 227 | $36 \%$ | 12 | $2 \%$ | 634 |
| Non-Credit | 48 | $66 \%$ | 24 | $33 \%$ | 1 | $1 \%$ | 73 |
| Total | $\mathbf{4 4 3}$ | $63 \%$ | $\mathbf{2 5 1}$ | $\mathbf{3 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 \%} \%$ | $\mathbf{7 0 7}$ |

Over 60\% of the students who were loaned technology were female both among the credit and non-credit students.


Age at Start of Spring 2020 Term

| Student Type | Under 22 |  | 22-25 |  | 26-30 |  | 31-39 |  | 40 or older |  | Total | Mean Age |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Count | Percent | Count | Percent | Count | Percent | Count | Percent | Count | Percent |  |  |
| Credit | 232 | 37\% | 112 | 18\% | 94 | 15\% | 98 | 15\% | 98 | 15\% | 634 | 28 |
| Non-Credit | 9 | 12\% | 2 | 3\% | 4 | 5\% | 8 | 11\% | 50 | 68\% | 73 | 50 |
| Total | 241 | 34\% | 114 | 16\% | 98 | 14\% | 106 | 15\% | 148 | 21\% | 707 |  |



The age distribution of students receiving technology among the credit and non-credit students were different. The majority, $55 \%$ of the credit students who received technology were under the age of 26 . The average or mean age was 28 . Whereas, $68 \%$ of the non-credit student were 40 years old or older at the start of the Spring 2020 term with an average age of 50 .

| Racial Ethnic Category | Credit |  | Non-Credit |  | All |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Count | Percent | Count | Percent | Count | Percent |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native | 33 | 5\% |  |  | 33 | 5\% |
| Asian | 59 | 9\% | 21 | 29\% | 80 | 11\% |
| Black or African American | 71 | 11\% | * |  | 71 | 10\% |
| Filipino | 23 | 4\% | * |  | 23 | 3\% |
| Hispanic, Latino | 444 | 70\% | 34 | 47\% | 478 | 68\% |
| Pacific Islander | 17 | 3\% |  |  | 17 | 2\% |
| White | 175 | 28\% | 16 | 22\% | 191 | 27\% |
| Total Student Type | 634 |  | 73 |  | 707 |  |

* Number too small to report

| Single Racial/Ethnic Category Reported | 467 | $74 \%$ | 70 | $96 \%$ | 537 | $76 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |



Students often identify with more than one racial or ethnic group. The chart and table above show the student responses regarding their racial/ethnic identity collapsed into standard categories. If a student reported both Asian Japanese and Asian Chinese as their racial/ethnic identity they are only counted once in the Asian category. However, if a student identified as Pacific Islander and White they were counted in both White and Pacific Islander Categories. Overall, $76 \%$ of the students were in only one category.

The Hispanic/Latino category was selected by the majority of students receiving technology, regardless of whether they were a credit or non-credit student. White was the next most selected category among all students. There was a greater percentage of Asian student among the non-credit students (29\%) than the credit students (9\%). Finally, the Black/African American Category was selected by $9 \%$ of the credit students and not at all among non-credit.

|  | Credit |  | Non-Credit |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Count | Percent | Count | Percent |
| Native American Pacific Region Tribes | $*$ |  |  |  |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native | 33 | $5 \%$ |  |  |
| Asian American | $*$ |  |  |  |
| Asian Cambodian | $*$ |  |  |  |
| Asian Chinese | 23 | $4 \%$ | 13 | $18 \%$ |
| Asian Indian | $*$ |  | $*$ |  |
| Asian Japanese | $*$ |  | $*$ |  |
| Asian Korean | $*$ |  |  |  |
| Asian Vietnamese | $*$ |  | $*$ |  |
| Asian, Other | 14 | $2 \%$ | $*$ |  |
| Black or African American | 71 | $11 \%$ | $*$ |  |
| Central American | 50 | $8 \%$ | $*$ |  |
| Chinese | $*$ |  |  |  |
| Egyptian | $*$ |  |  |  |
| Filipino | 23 | $4 \%$ | $*$ |  |
| Finno-Russian | $*$ |  |  |  |
| Great Britian | $*$ |  |  |  |
| Hispanic American | $*$ |  |  |  |
| Hispanic, Latino | 407 | $64 \%$ | 13 | $18 \%$ |
| Hispanic, Other | 114 | $18 \%$ | $*$ |  |
| Japanese | $*$ |  |  |  |
| Mexican, Mexican American, Chicano | 364 | $57 \%$ | 17 | $23 \%$ |
| Pacific Islander Hawaiian | $*$ |  |  |  |
| Pacific Islander Samoan | $*$ |  |  |  |
| Pacific Islander, Other | $*$ |  |  |  |
| Scottish | 1 | $0 \%$ |  |  |
| South American | 16 | $3 \%$ | $*$ |  |
| Spanish | $*$ |  |  |  |
| Tongan | $*$ |  |  |  |
| Western European (French/German) | $*$ |  |  |  |
| White | 174 | $27 \%$ | 16 | $22 \%$ |
| Total Student Type | 634 |  | 73 |  |
| Number too small to report |  |  |  |  |

This table shows the race/ethnicities selected by students who received technology during the spring 2020 term. Among noncredit students, Mexican, Mexican American, Chicano was the most often selected (23\%). Among the credit student Hispanic, Latino was the most selected by $64 \%$. Among both credit and noncredit students white was the next most selected after Hispanic or Mexican. 27\% of the credit student and 22\% of non-credit students selected white.

First Generation Student

| Student <br> Type | 1st Generation |  | Not 1st <br> Generation |  | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Count | Percent | Count | Percent |  |
| Credit | 462 | $89 \%$ | 60 | $11 \%$ | 522 |
| Total | 462 | $89 \%$ | 60 | $\mathbf{1 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 2 2}$ |

89\% of the credit students who were loaned technology identified themselves as first generation college students.


Econimically Disadvantaged

| Student <br> Type | Need Based Aid |  | No Need Based |  | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Count | Percent | Count | Percent |  |
| Credit | 574 | $91 \%$ | 60 | $9 \%$ | 634 |
| Non-Credit | 2 | $3 \%$ | 71 | $97 \%$ | 73 |
| Total | $\mathbf{5 7 6}$ | $\mathbf{8 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 0 7}$ |

91\% of the credit students who were loaned technology are also receiving need based financial aid. Among the non-credit students only 9\% are receiving need based financial aid.


Foster Youth

| Student <br> Type | Foster Youth |  | Not Foster Youth | Total |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Count | Percent | Count |  |  |
| Credit | 31 | $5 \%$ | 603 | $95 \%$ | 634 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 1}$ | $\mathbf{5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{9 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 3 4}$ |

$5 \%$ of the credit students who received technology were identified as a foster youth student.

| Credit |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 95\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0\% | 10\% | 20\% | 30\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% | 70\% | 80\% | 90\% | 100\% |
|  |  | - Not Foster Youth |  |  |  | - Foster Youth |  |  |  |  |

Students with Disabilities

| Student <br> Type | Disabled |  | Not Disabled |  | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Count | Percent | Count | Percent |  |
| Credit | 88 | $14 \%$ | 546 | $86 \%$ | 634 |
| Non-Credit | Numbers too small to display |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 88 | $\mathbf{1 4 \%}$ | 546 | $\mathbf{8 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 3 4}$ |

$14 \%$ of the credit students who received technology were identified as a student with disablities, while less than $5 \%$ of the non-credit students were identified as such.


Veteran Students

| Student <br> Type | Veteran |  | Not a Veteran |  | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Count | Percent | Count | Percent |  |
| Credit | 22 | $3 \%$ | 612 | $97 \%$ | 634 |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 2}$ | $\mathbf{3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{9 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 3 4}$ |

$14 \%$ of the credit students who received technology were identified as a student who is also a veteran of the military.


## AB540 Student (Dreamer)

| Student <br> Type | Dreamer |  | Not a Dreamer |  | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Count | Percent | Count | Percent |  |
| Credit | 50 | $8 \%$ | 584 | $92 \%$ | 634 |
| Total | $\mathbf{5 0}$ | $\mathbf{8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 8 4}$ | $\mathbf{9 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 3 4}$ |

$8 \%$ of the credit students who received technology were identified as an AB540 student, also known as a Dreamer student.


## Arise Program Student

| Student <br> Type | Arise |  | Not Arise |  | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Count | Percent | Count | Percent |  |
| Credit | 51 | $8 \%$ | 583 | $92 \%$ | 634 |
| Total | $\mathbf{5 1}$ | $\mathbf{8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 8 3}$ | $\mathbf{9 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 3 4}$ |

$8 \%$ of the credit students who received technology were identified as students in the Arise program.


## Aspire Program Student

| Student <br> Type | Aspire |  | Not Aspire |  | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Count | Percent | Count | Percent |  |
| Credit | 16 | $3 \%$ | 618 | $97 \%$ | 634 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 6}$ | $\mathbf{3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{9 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 3 4}$ |

$3 \%$ of the credit students who received technology were identified as students in the Aspire program.



## Average or Mean GPA

|  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Overall | 2.71 | 604 |
| Institutional | 2.71 | 596 |
| Transfer | 2.25 | 171 |

The average GPA of students who were provided technology during the spring term was above 2.0 for all GPA types.

Cummulative (Overall) Units Earned as of Spring 2020

|  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Below 13 | 89 | $15 \%$ |
| $13-24$ | 93 | $15 \%$ |
| $25-39$ | 82 | $14 \%$ |
| $40-59$ | 103 | $17 \%$ |
| $60-99$ | 156 | $26 \%$ |
| 100 or more | 81 | $13 \%$ |

Total Unduplicated
Students

Among the credit students who were loaned technology during the spring 2020 term, $26 \%$ had already earned 60 to 99 units. In fact, nearly $40 \%$ of these students had earned over 60 units by spring 2020.


[^0]
[^0]:    Prepared by Lisa DiDonato, Educational Research Assessment Analyst. Completed on 6/8/2020.

