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# SAN ANTONIO COLLEGE <br> DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE \& ACADEMIC CHARACTERISTICS 

## Student Characteristics at First Entry

San Antonio College measures student data in three ways: by campus section location, by campus section owner, and by unduplicated headcounts. Data measured by campus section location refers to reporting student metrics by the college where the student attends class while campus section owner refers to the college through which the student registered for class. The third method, measuring data by unduplicated headcount, is the method used to coalesce five college data sets into one set of metrics for the Alamo Colleges. This method allows for the measure of student outcomes across the five colleges without duplicating students who chose to attend classes at more than one location. This report for San Antonio College uses student data by campus section location (for progression and productive grade rates) and campus section owner (for persistence and graduation rates).

When discussing student characteristics that may vary over time (e.g., age, full-time/part-time, Pell status), students at San Antonio College were categorized based on their first semester status. Students remain in this category for subsequent years regardless of status change. Therefore, characteristics are as of first entry.

## Fall First-Time-in-College (FTIC) Cohorts by Campus Section Owner

Fall first-time-in-college (FTIC) student cohorts are defined as any student who is first-time-in-college and credentialseeking. A credential seeking student has declared an intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to a declared intent as reported on the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) Student Report CBM001.

| nrolled at San Antonio College as declined over each cohort |  | Fall 2011* <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2012 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2013 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2014 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2015 <br> FTIC Cohort |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fall 2011 to Fall 2015. Over- | Male | 1,691 | 1,521 | 1,446 | 1,210 | 1,143 |
| y 1295 | Female | 2,226 | 1,965 | 1,891 | 1,548 | 1,479 |
| dents from Fall 2011 to Fall | Total FTIC | 3,917 | 3,486 | 3,337 | 2,758 | 2,622 | 2015.

*See notes, next page

## Gender

Female students constituted a higher proportion of the FTIC population than did male students in each cohort. The percent of female students across the cohorts ranged from $56 \%-57 \%$. The percent of male students ranged from $43 \%-44 \%$.


## Ethnicity

The ethnic composition of African American and Asian students in each cohort remained relatively unchanged. The majority ( $62 \%-69 \%$ ) of students in each cohort identified themselves as being Hispanic. The second most represented ethnic group was White (19\%-26\%). Less than $3 \%$ of students identified as being any other (Other) race or ethnicity.

|  | Fall 2011* <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2012 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2013 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2014 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2015 <br> FTIC Cohort |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African American | 312 | 236 | 232 | 199 | 193 |
| Asian | 97 | 88 | 71 | 65 | 73 |
| Hispanic | 2,417 | 2,257 | 2,193 | 1,831 | 1,801 |
| Other | 90 | 68 | 70 | 64 | 52 |
| White | 1,001 | 837 | 771 | 599 | 503 |
| Total FTIC | 3,917 | 3,486 | 3,337 | 2,758 | 2,622 |



[^0]
## Age

The large majority ( $74 \%-82 \%$ ) of FTIC students in each cohort were between $18-21$ years old when they first enrolled at San Antonio College. The second most represented age group included $25-35$ year olds ( $7 \%-10 \%$ ). Students over the age of 51 had the lowest representation among the cohorts comprising less than $1 \%$ of FTIC students annually.

|  | Fall 2011* <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2012 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2013 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2014 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2015 <br> FTIC Cohort |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 17 or less | 160 | 149 | 131 | 102 | 89 |
| $18-21$ | 2,915 | 2,687 | 2,710 | 2,266 | 2,152 |
| $22-24$ | 249 | 180 | 169 | 135 | 131 |
| $25-35$ | 407 | 333 | 239 | 192 | 176 |
| $36-50$ | 155 | 117 | 75 | 52 | 63 |
| $51+$ | 31 | 20 | 13 | 11 | 11 |
| Total FTIC | 3,917 | 3,486 | 3,337 | 2,758 | 2,622 |



[^1]
## Enrollment Status

Across all FTIC cohorts, part-time students attended at higher rates than did full-time students. Full-time students were defined as those enrolled in 12 or more hours at census date. The percentage of part-time students increased each year from the Fall 2011 cohort to the Fall 2015 cohort. During this period part-time students represented more than half ( $56 \%$ $76 \%$ ) of the Fall FTIC cohort population at San Antonio College.

|  | Fall 2011* | Fall 2012 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2013 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2014 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2015 <br> FTIC Cohort |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Full-Time | 1,731 | 1,522 | 1,415 | 1,049 | 621 |
| Part-Time | 2,186 | 1,964 | 1,922 | 1,709 | 2,001 |
| Total FTIC | 3,917 | 3,486 | 3,337 | 2,758 | 2,622 |



[^2]
## Pell Status

The number of Fall FTIC cohort students receiving the Pell grant during their first term decreased over most cohorts from Fall 2011 to Fall 2015. In all cohorts, more than half of Fall FTIC cohort students received the Pell grant (50\% - 56\%). Overall, the percentage of FTIC cohort students receiving the Pell grant has decreased by 5.96 percentage points from Fall 2011 to Fall 2015.

|  | Fall 2011* <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2012 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2013 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2014 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2015 <br> FTIC Cohort |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pell Grant | 2,210 | 1,855 | 1,860 | 1,511 | 1,323 |
| No Pell Grant | 1,707 | 1,631 | 1,477 | 1,247 | 1,299 |
| Total FTIC | 3,917 | 3,486 | 3,337 | 2,758 | 2,622 |

Fall FTIC Cohorts by Pell Grant Status at Entry


## Notes:

(1) Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC cohort methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using the THECB methodology.
(2) Fall 2012 FTIC student cohort is defined by a combination of THECB (demographic profile, persistence rates, and graduation rates) and True FTIC (productive grade rates, progression through developmental and gatekeeper courses) methodologies.
(3) Fall 2013, 2014, and 2015 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is firsttime in college and credential-seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBMOO1).
(4) Pell status as reported at the Fall semester of the cohort year.
(5) Source FTIC Demographics: ACIRES.CBM001, Pell Status: ACCDIR.FADS

## Veteran Status

A small percentage of all FTIC students in each cohort (5\%-7\%) were designated as veterans upon initial enrollment. Trends are not evident across cohorts, as the percentage has alternately increased or decreased from one cohort to the next over the last five years.

|  | Fall 2011* <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2012 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2013 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2014 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2015 <br> FTIC Cohort |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vet | 242 | 205 | 240 | 177 | 197 |
| Non-Vet | 3,675 | 3,281 | 3,097 | 2,581 | 2,425 |
| Total FTIC | 3,917 | 3,486 | 3,337 | 2,758 | 2,622 |

## Fall FTIC Cohorts by Veteran Status at Entry



## Notes:

(1) Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC cohort methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using the THECB methodology.
(2) Fall 2012 FTIC student cohort is defined by a combination of THECB (demographic profile, persistence rates, and graduation rates) and True FTIC (productive grade rates, progression through developmental and gatekeeper courses) methodologies.
(3) Fall 2013, 2014, and 2015 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is firsttime in college and credential-seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBM001).
(4) Veteran status as reported at the Fall semester of the cohort year.

Source: FTIC Demographics-ACCDODS1.XCT_IRES_SC

## Developmental Education Referral Status

From the Fall 2011 to Fall 2012 FTIC cohorts, the large majority ( $50 \%-82 \%$ ) of students in each cohort were referred to developmental education (DE) courses. However, a significant shift in referral levels is reflected in the Fall 2013 cohort. The gap between referred students and those who were not referred decreased significantly, though the majority of students continued to be referred. There was a small percentage of students ( $1 \%-3 \%$ ) in each cohort whose referral status could not be determined due to lack of assessment scores or DE course enrollment.

|  | Fall 2011* <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2012 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2013 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2014 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2015 <br> FTIC Cohort |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Referred | 3,197 | 2,698 | 1,969 | 1,389 | 1,777 |
| Not Referred | 638 | 695 | 1,325 | 1,304 | 803 |
| Unknown | 82 | 93 | 43 | 65 | 42 |
| Total FTIC | 3,917 | 3,486 | 3,337 | 2,758 | 2,622 |

Fall FTIC Cohorts by Referral to DE Courses
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# SAN ANTONIO COLLEGE PROGRESSION THROUGH DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION AND "GATEKEEPER" COURSES 

## AtD Indicator \#1: Complete College Remedial or "Developmental" Courses <br> AtD Indicator \#2: Complete "Gatekeeper" or "Gateway" Courses Particularly the First College-Level or Degree-Credit Courses in Math and English

This report compares the 1- to 5-year developmental education (DE) and "gatekeeper" progression rates for English and Math for the Fall 2011 through Fall 2015 FTIC cohorts at San Antonio College. Students in each cohort were referred to English and Math DE courses based on assessment scores for that subject. Students at each level then were tracked as they progressed through the DE and "gatekeeper" sequences within each subject. These rates were examined by various student and academic characteristics.
$\diamond$ For English and Math female students compared to male students generally had greater success in DE and "gatekeeper" courses.
$\diamond$ For English and Math, African-American students had some of the lowest success rates.
$\diamond$ For English and Math, no trend across age groups in DE or "gatekeeper" success was evident.
$\diamond$ For English and Math, full-time students compared to part-time students generally had greater success in DE and "gatekeeper" courses.
$\diamond$ For English and Math, non-referred Pell recipients compared to non-Pell recipients generally had greater success in "gatekeeper" courses.
$\diamond$ For English and Math, veterans compared to non-veterans generally had greater success in DE and "gatekeeper" courses.

## Progression Through English Developmental Education \& "Gatekeeper" Courses

English developmental education referral levels were based on formal student assessment outcomes for English or on English DE course enrollment. From Fall 2011 through Fall 2013, Alamo Colleges offered two levels of English developmental education--ENGL 0300 (Basic English I) and ENGL 0301 (Basic English II). From Fall 2014 onward, Alamo Colleges offered three levels of English developmental education--INRW 0305 (Integrated Reading and Writing I), INRW 0420 (Integrated Reading and Writing II), and Ready, Set, Go ENGL 1301 (Level 3; ENGL 1301 with a 1-hour support course). Students placed in ENGL 0300/INRW 0305 (Level 1) had to earn a grade of "C" or better to be successful and move up to ENGL 0301/INRW 0420 (Level 2), which served as the highest developmental education course in the English sequence. Students designated as "Unknown" did not have an assessment on file or could not be placed within referral range and could not be categorized based on DE course enrollment. Students placed at college level or who successfully passed ENGL 0301/INRW 0420 could then take the "gatekeeper" English course, which was ENGL 1301 (Composition I).

## Notes:

1) Attempted = student received a grade for course (includes variations of W); Completed = student received a grade of A, B, C, D, F, I, IP, or P for course; Success = student received a grade of A, B, or C for course.
2) High $D E=$ last course in $D E$ sequence (Level 2).
3) English "gatekeeper" course is ENGL 1301.
4) Fall 2012-Fall 2015 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is first-time in college and credential seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBMO01). Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using THECB methodology.
5) Developmental education (DE) referral levels are based on formal student assessment outcomes for the subject area of DE course enrollment. Students designated as "Unknown" did not have an assessment on file or could not be placed within referral range and could not be categorized based on DE course enrollment.
6) Years of progression refer to the period between initial Fall semester (cohort year) and time of measurement. Data are cumulative over time.
7) Referral level percentages are based on the total cohort (denominator = cohort size).
8) Progression percentages are based on the referral level (denominator = number referred to level).
9) Students who transfer or leave Alamo Colleges are not removed from denominators.
10) In some instances, data have been updated to reflect the most current data at time of publication. Slight variations in data as recorded in prior publications may appear. However, these updates do not impact overall trends or outcomes.

## English Developmental Education Progression of Referred

After 3 years, approximately $39 \%-46 \%$ of referred students in each cohort attempted the highest course in the English DE sequence, with $29 \%-34 \%$ of the cohort successfully passing the course. Approximately $39 \%-53 \%$ of referred students in each cohort attempted the English "gatekeeper" course, with $30 \%-41 \%$ students in that cohort successfully passing the "gatekeeper" course. In comparing the 2011 cohort to the 2013 cohort, success in "gatekeeper" increased by 11.4 percentage point.


## English "Gatekeeper" Progression of Non-Referred

After 3 years, approximately 69\%-79\% of non-referred students in each cohort attempted the English "gatekeeper" course, with $51 \%-61 \%$ of the cohort successfully passing the course.

$1^{\text {st }}$ Year $\quad 2^{\text {nd }}$ Year $\quad 3^{\text {rd }}$ Year $\quad 4^{\text {th }}$ Year $\square 5^{\text {th }}$ Year

## Total English Progression

Overall, $35 \%-51 \%$ of all referred students in each cohort successfully passed any English DE course within the first year, 29\%-34\% successfully passed the highest DE course in the English sequence within 3 years, and approximately 30\%$39 \%$ successfully passed the English "gatekeeper" course within 3 years. Of the non-referred students, 51\%-61\% successfully passed the English "gatekeeper" course within 3 years. Of the total cohort, 41\%-52\% successfully passed the English "gatekeeper" course within 3 years. Those who were referred to Level 2 had higher success rates in the English highest DE and "gatekeeper" courses than did those referred to Level 1. Non-referred students had higher success rates in the English "gatekeeper" course than did referred students. When comparing the 2011 cohort to the 2013 cohort, students referred to Level 1 had a significant increase in "gatekeeper" success.

|  | Referral Level | Attempted Any DE (1st Year) | Success in Any DE (1st Year) | Attempted RSG (1st Year) | Success in RSG (1st Year) | Success in High DE (3rd Year) | Success in RSG (3rd Year) | Success in GK (3rd Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{*}{5} \\ & \frac{1}{0} \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & \stackrel{7}{7} \\ & \sim \\ & \stackrel{\pi}{4} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DE Level } 1 \\ & 419(13.5 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 266 (63.5\%) | 163 (38.9\%) | Not Applicable |  | 90 (21.5\%) | Not Applicable | 80 (19.1\%) |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 2 \\ 1,041(33.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 598 (57.4\%) | 425 (40.8\%) |  |  | 408 (39.2\%) |  | 354 (34.0\%) |
|  | Total Referred $1,460(47.0 \%)$ | 864 (59.2\%) | 588 (40.3\%) |  |  | 498 (34.1\%) |  | 434 (29.7\%) |
|  | College Level 1,613 (51.9\%) |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  | 828 (51.3\%) |
|  | Unknown $36 \text { (1.2\%) }$ | 1 (2.8\%) | $0(0.0 \%)$ | Not Applicable |  | $0(0.0 \%)$ | Not Applicable | 1 (2.8\%) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cohort Total } \\ & \mathbf{3 , 1 0 9}(100.0 \%)^{2} \end{aligned}$ | 962 (30.9\%) | 661 (21.3\%) |  |  | 568 (18.3\%) |  | 1,263 (40.6\%) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DE Level } 1 \\ & 331(12.9 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 191 (57.7\%) | 129 (39.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | 99 (29.9\%) | 1 (0.3\%) | 88 (26.6\%) |
|  | DELevel 2 $650(25.3 \%)$ | 271 (41.7\%) | 216 (33.2\%) |  |  | 210 (32.3\%) | 3 (0.5\%) | 208 (32.0\%) |
|  | Total Referred 981 (38.2\%) | 462 (47.1\%) | 345 (35.2\%) |  |  | 309 (31.5\%) | 4 (0.4\%) | 296 (30.2\%) |
|  | College Level 1,551 (60.3\%) |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  | 869 (56.0\%) |
|  | Unknown $39 \text { (1.5\%) }$ | 3 (7.7\%) | 3 (7.7\%) |  |  | 3 (7.7\%) | $0(0.0 \%)$ | 8 (20.5\%) |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cohort Total } \\ 2,571(100.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 512 (19.9\%) | 380 (14.8\%) |  |  | 343 (13.3\%) | 6 (0.2\%) | 1,173 (45.6\%) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{1}{0} \\ & \frac{m}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\sim} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{4} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DE Level } 1 \\ & 513 \text { (19.0\%) } \end{aligned}$ | 297 (57.9\%) | 212 (41.3\%) | Not Applicable |  | 110 (21.4\%) | 12 (2.3\%) | 154 (30.0\%) |
|  | DELevel 2 $571 \text { (21.1\%) }$ | 273 (47.8\%) | 220 (38.5\%) |  |  | 209 (36.6\%) | 8 (1.4\%) | 272 (47.6\%) |
|  | Total Referred $1,084(40.0 \%)$ | 570 (52.6\%) | 432 (39.9\%) |  |  | 319 (29.4\%) | 20 (1.8\%) | 426 (39.3\%) |
|  | College Level 1,581 (58.4\%) |  |  | Not | able |  |  | 968 (61.2\%) |
|  | Unknown $42 \text { (1.6\%) }$ | 4 (9.5\%) | 2 (4.8\%) | Not Applicable |  | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | 16 (38.1\%) |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cohort Total } \\ \underline{2,707}(100.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 593 (21.9\%) | 448 (16.5\%) |  |  | 329 (12.2\%) | 31 (1.1\%) | 1,410(52.1\%) |

## Notes:

1) Attempted = student received a grade for course (includes variations of $W$ ); Completed = student received a grade of $A, B, C, D, F, I, I P$, or $P$ for course; Success = student received a grade of A, B, or C for course.
2) High DE = last course in DE sequence (Level 2).
3) English "gatekeeper" course is ENGL 1301.
4) Fall 2012 through Fall 2015 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is firsttime in college and credential seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBM001). Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using THECB methodology.
5) Developmental education (DE) referral levels are based on formal student assessment outcomes for the subject area of DE course enrollment. Students designated as "Unknown" did not have an assessment on file or could not be placed within referral range and could not be categorized based on DE course enrollment.
6) Years of progression refer to the period between initial Fall semester (cohort year) and time of measurement. Data are cumulative over time.
7) Referral level percentages are based on the total cohort (denominator = cohort size).
8) Progression percentages are based on the referral level (denominator = number referred to level).
9) Students who transfer or leave Alamo Colleges are not removed from denominators.
10) In some instances, data have been updated to reflect the most current data at time of publication. Slight variations in data as recorded in prior publications may appear. However, these updates do not impact overall trends or outcomes.

## Total English Progression (continued)

|  | Referral Level | Attempted Any DE (1st Year) | Success in Any DE (1st Year) | Attempted RSG (1st Year) | Success in RSG <br> (1stYear) | Success in High DE (3rd Year) | Success in RSG <br> (3rd Year) | Success in GK (3rd Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { t } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \stackrel{1}{0} \\ & \stackrel{1}{2} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{7} \end{aligned}$ | DELevel 1 $194 \text { (8.6\%) }$ | 123 (63.4\%) | 75 (38.7\%) | 5 (2.6\%) | $1(0.5 \%)$ |  | 3rd Year Data Not Yet Available |  |
|  | DELevel 2 <br> 295 (13.0\%) | 179 (60.7\%) | 134 (45.4\%) | 6 (2.0\%) | 6(2.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DELevel 3 $304 \text { (13.4\%) }$ | 173 (56.9\%) | 135 (44.4\%) | 145 (47.7\%) | 116 (38.2\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DELevel 4 $2(0.1 \%)$ | 2 (100.0\%) | 1 (50.0\%) | $2(100.0 \%)$ | 1 (50.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Total Referred 795 (35.1\%) | 477 (60.0\%) | 345 (43.4\%) | 158 (19.9\%) | 124 (15.6\%) |  |  |  |
|  | College Level 1,368 (60.5\%) | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Unknown <br> 99 (4.4\%) | 5 (5.1\%) | 1 (1.0\%) | 4 (4.0\%) | 1 (1.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cohort Total } \\ \text { 2,262 (100.0\%) } \end{gathered}$ | 541 (23.9\%) | 385 (17.0\%) | 211 (9.3\%) | 156 (6.9\%) |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { t } \\ & 0 \\ & \stackrel{f}{0} \\ & \text { U } \\ & \text { n } \\ & \text { N } \\ & \bar{W} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DELevel } 1 \\ & 238(10.8 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 157 (66.0\%) | 106 (44.5\%) | 6 (2.5\%) | 4 (1.7\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DELevel 2426 (19.3\%) | 265 (62.2\%) | 205 (48.1\%) | 17 (4.0\%) | $13(3.1 \%)$ |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DELevel 3 } \\ 452(20.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 322 (71.2\%) | 259 (57.3\%) | 267 (59.1\%) | 210 (46.5\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Total Referred $1,116(50.7 \%)$ | 744 (66.7\%) | 570 (51.1\%) | 290 (26.0\%) | 227 (20.3\%) |  | 3rd Year Data Not |  |
|  | College Level $1,056 \text { (47.9\%) }$ | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Unknown <br> 31 (1.4\%) | 2 (6.5\%) | 2 (6.5\%) | $1(3.2 \%)$ | $1(3.2 \%)$ |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cohort Total } \\ 2,203(100.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 799 (36.3\%) | 614 (27.9\%) | 337 (15.3\%) | 266 (12.1\%) |  |  |  |

Sources:
FTIC Demographics:
DE Referrals:

Course Enrollment::

ACCDODS1.XST_ATD_ACCD, ACCDODS1.XST_CBM001_ACCD, ACCDODS1.XST_FADS_ACCD, ACCDODS1.XST.IRES_SC Fall 2011: ACCDODS1.ATD_F10_F11_ODS_TASP, Fall 2012: ACCDODS1.ATD_F10_F13_ODS_TASP, Fall 2013-Fall 2015: ACCDODS1.XST_ATD_ACCD
ACCDODS1.XST.IRES_SC

## English Progression by Gender

Across most cohorts and levels, females successfully passed the English DE and "gatekeeper" courses at higher rates than did males. When comparing the 2011 cohort to the 2013 cohort, males referred to Level 1 experienced an increase in "gatekeeper" success.

|  |  |  | rral Level |  | ted Any DE <br> Year) |  | in Any DE <br> Year) | Attempted RSG <br> (1st Year) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Success in RSG } \\ & \text { (1st Year) } \end{aligned}$ |  | in High DE d Year) | Success in RSG <br> (3rd Year) |  | cress in GK <br> 3rd Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{4}{4} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & -7 \\ & \stackrel{7}{8} \\ & \overline{\overline{1}} \end{aligned}$ | DE Level 1 | M | 188 (44.9\%) | M | 126 (67.0\%) | M | 68 (36.2\%) | Not Applicable |  | M | 34 (18.1\%) | Not Applicable | M | 28 (14.9\%) |
|  | 419 (13.5\%) | F | 231 (55.1\%) | $F$ | 140 (60.6\%) | F | 95 (41.1\%) |  |  | F | 56 (24.2\%) |  | F | 52 (22.5\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | M | 451 (43.3\%) | M | 256 (56.8\%) | M | 157 (34.8\%) |  |  | M | 151 (33.5\%) |  | M | 131 (29.0\%) |
|  | 1,041 (33.5\%) | F | 590 (56.7\%) | F | 342 (58.0\%) | F | 268 (45.4\%) |  |  | F | 257 (43.6\%) |  | F | 223 (37.8\%) |
|  | Total Referred | M | 639 (43.8\%) | M | 382 (59.8\%) | M | 225 (35.2\%) |  |  | M | 185 (29.0\%) |  | M | 159 (24.9\%) |
|  | 1,460 (47.0\%) | F | 821 (56.2\%) | F | 482 (58.7\%) | F | 363 (44.2\%) |  |  | F | 313 (38.1\%) |  | F | 275 (33.5\%) |
|  | College Level | M | 691 (42.8\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | M | 336 (48.6\%) |
|  | 1,613 (51.9\%) | F | 922 (57.2\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F | 492 (53.4\%) |
|  | Unknown | M | 20 (55.6\%) | M | $0(0.0 \%)$ | M | $0(0.0 \%)$ | Not Applicable |  | M | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable | M | 1 (5.0\%) |
|  | 36 (1.2\%) | F | 16 (44.4\%) | F | 1 (6.3\%) | F | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  | F | 0 (0.0\%) |  | F | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | M | 1,350 (43.4\%) | M | 422 (31.3\%) | M | 253 (18.7\%) |  |  | M | 210 (15.6\%) |  | M | 496 (36.7\%) |
|  | 3,109 (100.0\%) | F | 1,759 (56.6\%) | F | 540 (30.7\%) | F | 408 (23.2\%) |  |  | F | 358(20.4\%) |  | F | 767(43.6\%) |
|  | DE Level 1 | M | 170 (51.4\%) | M | 93 (54.7\%) | M | 54 (31.8\%) | Not Applicable |  | M | 42 (24.7\%) | $\mathrm{M} \quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | M | 35 (20.6\%) |
|  | 331 (12.9\%) | F | 161 (48.6\%) | $F$ | 98 (60.9\%) | F | 75 (46.6\%) |  |  | F | 57 (35.4\%) | 1 (0.6\%) | F | 53 (32.9\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | M | 296 (45.5\%) | M | 116 (39.2\%) | M | 89 (30.1\%) |  |  | M | 85 (28.7\%) | $\mathrm{M} \quad 1(0.3 \%)$ | M | 94 (31.8\%) |
|  | 650 (25.3\%) | F | 354 (54.5\%) | F | 155 (43.8\%) | F | 127 (35.9\%) |  |  | F | 125 (35.3\%) | $\mathrm{F} \quad 2(0.6 \%)$ | F | 114 (32.2\%) |
|  | Total Referred | M | 466 (47.5\%) | M | 209 (44.8\%) | M | 143 (30.7\%) |  |  | M | 127 (27.3\%) | M $\quad 1(0.2 \%)$ | M | 129 (27.7\%) |
|  | 981 (38.2\%) | F | 515 (52.5\%) | F | 253 (49.1\%) | F | 202 (39.2\%) |  |  | F | 182 (35.3\%) | F $3(0.6 \%)$ | F | 167 (32.4\%) |
|  | College Level | M | 653 (42.1\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | M | 353 (54.1\%) |
|  | 1,551 (60.3\%) | F | 898 (57.9\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F | 516 (57.5\%) |
|  | Unknown | M | 15 (38.5\%) | M | 1 (6.7\%) | M | 1 (6.7\%) | Not Applicable |  | M | 1 (6.7\%) | M 0 (0.0\%) | M | 3 (20.0\%) |
|  | 39 (1.5\%) | F | 24 (61.5\%) | F | 2(8.3\%) | F | 2(8.3\%) |  |  | F | 2 (8.3\%) | $F \quad 0$ (0.0\%) | F | 5 (20.8\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | M | 1,134 (44.1\%) | M | 231 (20.4\%) | M | 161 (14.2\%) |  |  | M | 145 (12.8\%) | M 3 (0.3\%) | M | 485 (42.8\%) |
|  | 2,571 (100.0\%) | F | 1,437 (55.9\%) |  | 281 (19.6\%) | F | 219 (15.2\%) |  |  | F | 198(13.8\%) | 3 3 $0.2 \%$ ) | F | 688 $447.9 \% 1$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{4}{0} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \text { m } \\ & \text { i } \\ & \overline{\bar{j}} \end{aligned}$ | DE Level 1 | M | 232 (45.2\%) | M | 133 (57.3\%) | M | 89 (38.4\%) | Not Applicable |  | M | 49 (21.1\%) | M 8 (3.4\%) | M | 62 (26.7\%) |
|  | 513 (19.0\%) | F | 281 (54.8\%) | F | 164 (58.4\%) | F | 123 (43.8\%) |  |  | F | 61 (21.7\%) | $F \quad 4(1.4 \%)$ | $F$ | 92 (32.7\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | M | 264 (46.2\%) | M | 127 (48.1\%) | M | 105 (39.8\%) |  |  | M | 96 (36.4\%) | M $\quad 4(1.5 \%)$ | M | 119 (45.1\%) |
|  | 571 (21.1\%) | F | 307 (53.8\%) | $F$ | 146 (47.6\%) | F | 115 (37.5\%) |  |  | F | 113 (36.8\%) | 4 (1.3\%) | F | 153 (49.8\%) |
|  | Total Referred | M | 496 (45.8\%) | M | 260 (52.4\%) | M | 194 (39.1\%) |  |  | M | 145 (29.2\%) | $\mathrm{M} \quad 12(2.4 \%)$ | M | 181 (36.5\%) |
|  | 1,084 (40.0\%) | F | 588 (54.2\%) | F | 310 (52.7\%) | F | 238 (40.5\%) |  |  | F | 174 (29.6\%) | 8 (1.4\%) | F | 245 (41.7\%) |
|  | College Level | M | 639 (40.4\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | M | 376 (58.8\%) |
|  | 1,581 (58.4\%) | F | 942 (59.6\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F | 592 (62.8\%) |
|  | Unknown | M | 22 (52.4\%) | M | 2 (9.1\%) | M | $0(0.0 \%)$ | Not Applicable |  | M | 0 (0.0\%) | $\mathrm{M} \quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | M | 8 (36.4\%) |
|  | 42 (1.6\%) | F | 20 (47.6\%) | F | 2 (10.0\%) | F | 2 (10.0\%) |  |  | F | 0 (0.0\%) | $\mathrm{F} \quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | F | 8 (40.0\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | M | 1,157 (42.7\%) | M | 271 (23.4\%) | M | 200 (17.3\%) |  |  | M | 147 (12.7\%) | M 20 (1.7\%) | M | 565 (48.8\%) |
|  | 2,707 (1000.0\%) |  | 1,550(57.3\%) |  | 322 (20.8\%) |  | 248(16.0\%) |  |  | F | 182(11.7\%) | F_-11(0.7\%) | F | 845 (54.5\%) |

## English Progression by Gender



Notes:

1) Attempted = student received a grade for course (includes variations of W); Completed = student received a grade of A, B, C, D, F, I, IP, or P for course; Success = student received a grade of A, B, or C for course.
2) High $D E=$ last course in $D E$ sequence (Level 2 ).
3) English "gatekeeper" course is ENGL 1301.
4) Fall 2012 through Fall 2015 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is firsttime in college and credential seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBM001). Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using THECB methodology.
5) Developmental education (DE) referral levels are based on formal student assessment outcomes for the subject area of DE course enrollment. Students designated as "Unknown" did not have an assessment on file or could not be placed within referral range and could not be categorized based on DE course enrollment.
6) Years of progression refer to the period between initial Fall semester (cohort year) and time of measurement. Data are cumulative over time.
7) Referral level percentages are based on the total cohort (denominator = cohort size).
8) Progression percentages are based on the referral level (denominator = number referred to level).
9) Students who transfer or leave Alamo Colleges are not removed from denominators.
10) In some instances, data have been updated to reflect the most current data at time of publication. Slight variations in data as recorded in prior publications may appear. However, these updates do not impact overall trends or outcomes.

Sources:
FTIC Gender:
DE Referrals:
Course Enrollment::
ACCDODS1.XST_ATD_ACCD
Fall 2011: ACCDODS1.ATD_F10_F11_ODS_TASP, Fall 2012: ACCDODS1.ATD_F10_F13_ODS_TASP, Fall 2013-Fall 2015:
ACCDODS1.XST_ATD_ACCD
ACCDODS1.XST.IRES_SC

## English Progression by Ethnicity

Across most cohorts and levels, African American students, compared to the other racial/ethnic groups, successfully passed the English highest DE and "gatekeeper" courses at the lowest rates. When comparing the 2011 cohort to the 2013 cohort, non-referred Asian students experienced a decrease in "gatekeeper" success.


Notes:

1) Attempted = student received a grade for course (includes variations of W); Completed = student received a grade of $A, B, C, D, F, I, I P$, or $P$ for course; Success = student received a grade of $A, B$, or $C$ for course.
2) High DE = last course in DE sequence (Level 2).
3) English "gatekeeper" course is ENGL 1301.
4) Fall 2012 through Fall 2015 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is firsttime in college and credential seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBM001). Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using THECB methodology.
5) Developmental education (DE) referral levels are based on formal student assessment outcomes for the subject area of DE course enrollment. Students designated as "Unknown" did not have an assessment on file or could not be placed within referral range and could not be categorized based on DE course enrollment.
6) Years of progression refer to the period between initial Fall semester (cohort year) and time of measurement. Data are cumulative over time.
7) Referral level percentages are based on the total cohort (denominator = cohort size).
8) Progression percentages are based on the referral level (denominator = number referred to level).
9) Students who transfer or leave Alamo Colleges are not removed from denominators.
10) In some instances, data have been updated to reflect the most current data at time of publication. Slight variations in data as recorded in prior publications may appear. However, these updates do not impact overall trends or outcomes.

Sources:

FTIC Ethnicity:
DE Referrals:

Course Enrollment::

ACCDODS1.XST_CBM001_ACCD
Fall 2011: ACCDODS1.ATD_F10_F11_ODS_TASP, Fall 2012: ACCDODS1.ATD_F10_F13_ODS_TASP, Fall 2013-Fall 2015: ACCDODS1.XST_ATD_ACCD ACCDODS1.XST.IRES_SC


## English Progression by Ethnicity (continued)



## English Progression by Age

In general, no trends among age groups were evident regarding success rates in "gatekeeper" courses. When comparing the 2011 cohort to the 2013 cohort, non-referred students between the ages of 22 and 24 or who were ages 51 and older experienced increases in "gatekeeper" success.

|  |  |  | al Level |  | d Any DE ear) |  | in Any DE Year) | Attempted RSG <br> (1st Year) | Success in RSG <br> (1st Year) |  | in High DE <br> Year) | Success in RSG <br> (3rd Year) |  | $\begin{aligned} & s \text { in } \mathrm{GK} \\ & \text { Year) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> -7 <br> 8 <br> 7 <br> 1 |  | $<17$ | 11 (2.6\%) | $<17$ | 6 (54.5\%) | $<17$ | 4 (36.4\%) |  |  | $<17$ | 3 (27.3\%) |  | $<17$ | 2 (18.2\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 311 (74.2\%) | 18-21 | 221 (71.1\%) | 18-21 | 135 (43.4\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 75 (24.1\%) |  | 18-21 | 60 (19.3\%) |
|  | DE Level 1 | 22-24 | 22 (5.3\%) | 22-24 | 8 (36.4\%) | 22-24 | 5 (22.7\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 1 (4.5\%) |  | 22-24 | 2 (9.1\%) |
|  | 419 (13.5\%) | 25-35 | 52 (12.4\%) | 25-35 | 21 (40.4\%) | 25-35 | 12 (23.1\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 7 (13.5\%) |  | 25-35 | 9 (17.3\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 15 (3.6\%) | 36-50 | 7 (46.7\%) | 36-50 | 5 (33.3\%) |  |  | 36-50 | 2 (13.3\%) |  | 36-50 | 5 (33.3\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | 8 (1.9\%) | 51+ | 3 (37.5\%) | 51+ | 2 (25.0\%) |  |  | 51+ | 2 (25.0\%) |  | 51+ | 2 (25.0\%) |
|  |  | $<17$ | 36 (3.5\%) | $<17$ | 17 (47.2\%) | <17 | 12 (33.3\%) |  |  | $<17$ | 11 (30.6\%) |  | $<17$ | 13 (36.1\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 754 (72.4\%) | 18-21 | 460 (61.0\%) | 18-21 | 323 (42.8\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 305 (40.5\%) |  | 18-21 | 258 (34.2\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | 22-24 | 74 (7.1\%) | 22-24 | 38 (51.4\%) | 22-24 | 31 (41.9\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 31 (41.9\%) | Not Applicable | 22-24 | 25 (33.8\%) |
|  | 1,041 (33.5\%) | $25 \cdot 35$ | 115 (11.0\%) | 25-35 | 54 (47.0\%) | 25-35 | 34 (29.6\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 36 (31.3\%) |  | 25-35 | 41 (35.7\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 49 (4.7\%) | 36-50 | 25 (51.0\%) | 36-50 | 22 (44.9\%) |  |  | 36-50 | 22 (44.9\%) |  | 36-50 | 14 (28.6\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | 13 (1.2\%) | $51+$ | 4 (30.8\%) | 51+ | 3 (23.1\%) |  |  | 51+ | 3 (23.1\%) |  | 51+ | 3 (23.1\%) |
|  |  | $<17$ | 47 (3.2\%) | $<17$ | 23 (48.9\%) | $<17$ | 16 (34.0\%) |  |  | $<17$ | 14 (29.8\%) |  | $<17$ | 15 (31.9\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 1,065 (72.9\%) | 18-21 | 681 (63.9\%) | 18-21 | 458 (43.0\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 380 (35.7\%) |  | 18-21 | 318 (29.9\%) |
|  | Total Referred | 22-24 | 96 (6.6\%) | 22-24 | 46 (47.9\%) | 22-24 | 36 (37.5\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 32 (33.3\%) |  | 22-24 | 27 (28.1\%) |
|  | 1,460 (47.0\%) | $25 \cdot 35$ | 167 (11.4\%) | $25 \cdot 35$ | 75 (44.9\%) | $25 \cdot 35$ | 46 (27.5\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 43 (25.7\%) |  | 25-35 | 50 (29.9\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 64 (4.4\%) | 36-50 | 32 (50.0\%) | 36-50 | 27 (42.2\%) |  |  | 36-50 | 24 (37.5\%) |  | 36-50 | 19 (29.7\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | 21 (1.4\%) | 51+ | 7 (33.3\%) | 51+ | 5 (23.8\%) |  |  | 51+ | 5 (23.8\%) |  | $51+$ | 5 (23.8\%) |
|  | College Level$1,613 \text { (51.9\%) }$ | $<17$ | 60 (3.7\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | $<17$ | 29 (48.3\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 1,201 (74.5\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18-21 | 606 (50.5\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | 108 (6.7\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 22-24 | 69 (63.9\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 177 (11.0\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 25-35 | 94 (53.1\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 61 (3.8\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 36-50 | 26 (42.6\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | 6 (0.4\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 51+ | 4 (66.7\%) |
|  | Unknown <br> 36 (1.2\%) | $<17$ | 3 (8.3\%) | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | $<17$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ | Not Applicable | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 15 (41.7\%) | 18-21 | 1 (6.7\%) | 18-21 | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 18-21 | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  | 18-21 | 1 (6.7\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | 4 (11.1\%) | 22-24 | 0 (0.0\%) | 22-24 | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 0 (0.0\%) |  | 22-24 | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 7 (19.4\%) | 25-35 | 0 (0.0\%) | 25-35 | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 25-35 | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  | 25-35 | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 7 (19.4\%) | 36.50 | 0 (0.0\%) | 36-50 | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 36-50 | 0 (0.0\%) |  | 36-50 | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) |  | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  | Cohort Total3,109 (100.0\%) | $<17$ | 110 (3.5\%) | $<17$ | 25 (22.7\%) | $<17$ | 17 (15.5\%) |  |  | $<17$ | 15 (13.6\%) |  | $<17$ | 44 (40.0\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 2,281 (73.4\%) | 18-21 | 757 (33.2\%) | 18-21 | 511 (22.4\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 431 (18.9\%) |  | 18-21 | 925 (40.6\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | 208 (6.7\%) | 22-24 | 55 (26.4\%) | 22-24 | 44 (21.2\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 40 (19.2\%) |  | 22-24 | 96 (46.2\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 351 (11.3\%) | 25-35 | 84 (23.9\%) | 25-35 | 55 (15.7\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 51 (14.5\%) |  | 25-35 | 144 (41.0\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 132 (4.2\%) | 36-50 | 34 (25.8\%) | 36-50 | 29 (22.0\%) |  |  | 36-50 | 26 (19.7\%) |  | 36-50 | 45 (34.1\%) |
|  |  | -51+ | 27(0.9\%) | 51+ | 7. $25.9 \%$ | 51+ | 5(18.5\%) |  |  | 51+ | 5 (18.5\%) |  | 51+ | 9 (33.3\%) |

Notes:

1) Attempted = student received a grade for course (includes variations of W); Completed = student received a grade of $A$, $B$, $C$, $D$, $F, I$, $I P$, or $P$ for course; Success = student received a grade of $A, B$, or $C$ for course.
2) High DE = last course in DE sequence (Level 2).
3) English "gatekeeper" course is ENGL 1301.
4) Fall 2012 through Fall 2015 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is firsttime in college and credential seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBM001). Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using THECB methodology.
5) Developmental education (DE) referral levels are based on formal student assessment outcomes for the subject area of DE course enrollment Students designated as "Unknown" did not have an assessment on file or could not be placed within referral range and could not be categorized based on DE course enrollment.
6) Years of progression refer to the period between initial Fall semester (cohort year) and time of measurement. Data are cumulative over time.
7) Referral level percentages are based on the total cohort (denominator = cohort size).
8) Progression percentages are based on the referral level (denominator = number referred to level).
9) Students who transfer or leave Alamo Colleges are not removed from denominators.
10) In some instances, data have been updated to reflect the most current data at time of publication. Slight variations in data as recorded in prior publications may appear. However, these updates do not impact overall trends or outcomes.

Sources:
FTIC Age:
DE Referrals:
ACCDODS1.XST_ATD_ACCD
ACCDODS1.XST_ATD_ACCD
Course Enrollment:: ACCDODS1.XST.IRES_SC

English Progression by Age (continued)


English Progression by Age (continued)


## English Progression by Enrollment Status

Across most cohorts and levels, full-time students compared to part-time students successfully passed both English DE and "gatekeeper" courses at higher rates after 3 years. When comparing the 2011 cohort to the 2013 cohort, an increase in success in the "gatekeeper" course was evident for referred full-time students.

|  |  |  | rral Level |  | ed Any DE <br> Year) |  | in Any DE <br> Year) | Attempted RSG (1st Year) | Success in RSG (1st Year) |  | in High DE Year) | Success in RSG <br> (3rd Year) |  | cess in GK <br> (3rd Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & \frac{1}{0} \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & \overline{7} \\ & \stackrel{8}{7} \\ & \bar{N} \end{aligned}$ | DE Level 1 | FT | 153 (36.5\%) | FT | 116 (75.8\%) | FT | 74 (48.4\%) | Not Applicable |  | FT | 44 (28.8\%) | Not Applicable | FT | 35 (22.9\%) |
|  | 419 (13.5\%) | PT | 266 (63.5\%) | PT | 150 (56.4\%) | PT | 89 (33.5\%) |  |  | PT | 46 (17.3\%) |  | PT | 45 (16.9\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | FT | 427 (41.0\%) | FT | 302 (70.7\%) | FT | 227 (53.2\%) |  |  | FT | 223 (52.2\%) |  | FT | 184 (43.1\%) |
|  | 1,041 (33.5\%) | PT | 614 (59.0\%) | PT | 296 (48.2\%) | PT | 198 (32.2\%) |  |  | PT | 185 (30.1\%) |  | PT | 170 (27.7\%) |
|  | Total Referred | FT | 580 (39.7\%) | FT | 418 (72.1\%) | FT | 301 (51.9\%) |  |  | FT | 267 (46.0\%) |  | FT | 219 (37.8\%) |
|  | 1,460 (47.0\%) | PT | 880 (60.3\%) | PT | 446 (50.7\%) | PT | 287 (32.6\%) |  |  | PT | 231 (26.3\%) |  | PT | 215 (24.4\%) |
|  | College Level | FT | 806 (50.0\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | FT | 457 (56.7\%) |
|  | 1,613 (51.9\%) | PT | 807 (50.0\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PT | 371 (46.0\%) |
|  | Unknown | FT | 4 (11.1\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable | FT | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  | 36 (1.2\%) | PT | 32 (88.9\%) | PT | 1 (3.1\%) | PT | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | PT | 0 (0.0\%) |  | PT | 1 (3.1\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | FT | 1,390 (44.7\%) | FT | 473 (34.0\%) | FT | 343 (24.7\%) |  |  | FT | 306 (22.0\%) |  | FT | 676 (48.6\%) |
|  | 3,109 (100.0\%) | PT | 1,719 (55.3\%) | PT | 489.(28.4\%) | PT | 318(18.5\%) |  |  | PT | 262 (15.2\%) |  |  | -587.34.1\%) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{4}{0} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \tilde{0} \\ & \stackrel{1}{8} \\ & \bar{\omega} \end{aligned}$ | DE Level 1 | FT | 105 (31.7\%) | FT | 87 (82.9\%) | FT | 61 (58.1\%) | Not Applicable |  | FT | 45 (42.9\%) | FT 1 (1.0\%) | FT | 32 (30.5\%) |
|  | 331 (12.9\%) | PT | 226 (68.3\%) | PT | 104 (46.0\%) | PT | 68 (30.1\%) |  |  | PT | 54 (23.9\%) | PT 0 (0.0\%) | PT | 56 (24.8\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | FT | 226 (34.8\%) | FT | 117 (51.8\%) | FT | 94 (41.6\%) |  |  | FT | 92 (40.7\%) | FT 1 (0.4\%) | FT | 84 (37.2\%) |
|  | 650 (25.3\%) | PT | 424 (65.2\%) | PT | 154 (36.3\%) | PT | 122 (28.8\%) |  |  | PT | 118 (27.8\%) | PT $2(0.5 \%)$ | PT | 124 (29.2\%) |
|  | Total Referred | FT | 331 (33.7\%) | FT | 204 (61.6\%) | FT | 155 (46.8\%) |  |  | FT | 137 (41.4\%) | FT $2(0.6 \%)$ | FT | 116 (35.0\%) |
|  | 981 (38.2\%) | PT | 650 (66.3\%) | PT | 258 (39.7\%) | PT | 190 (29.2\%) |  |  | PT | 172 (26.5\%) | PT $2(0.3 \%)$ | PT | 180 (27.7\%) |
|  | College Level | FT | 808 (52.1\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | FT | 504 (62.4\%) |
|  | 1,551 (60.3\%) | PT | 743 (47.9\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PT | 365 (49.1\%) |
|  | Unknown | FT | 13 (33.3\%) | FT | 1 (7.7\%) | FT | 1(7.7\%) | Not Applicable |  | FT | 1 (7.7\%) | FT 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 4 (30.8\%) |
|  | 39 (1.5\%) | PT | 26 (66.7\%) | PT | 2 (7.7\%) | PT | 2 (7.7\%) |  |  | PT | 2 (7.7\%) | PT 0 (0.0\%) | PT | 4 (15.4\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | FT | 1,152 (44.8\%) | FT | 221 (19.2\%) | FT | 167 (14.5\%) |  |  | FT | 149 (12.9\%) | FT 3 (0.3\%) | FT | 624 (54.2\%) |
|  | 2,571 (100.0\%) | PT | 1,419(55.2\%) | PT | 291 (20.5\%) | PT | 213 (15.0\%) |  |  | PT | 194 (13.7\%) | PI _-- $30.02 \%$ | PT | 549 (38.7\%) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{4}{0} \\ & \frac{1}{0} \\ & 0 \\ & \stackrel{y}{8} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\omega} \end{aligned}$ | DE Level 1 | FT | 148 (28.8\%) | FT | 133 (89.9\%) | FT | 91 (61.5\%) | Not Applicable |  | FT | 35 (23.6\%) | FT 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 47 (31.8\%) |
|  | 513 (19.0\%) | PT | 365 (71.2\%) | PT | 164 (44.9\%) | PT | 121 (33.2\%) |  |  | PT | 75 (20.5\%) | PT $12(3.3 \%)$ | PT | 107 (29.3\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | FT | 187 (32.7\%) | FT | 125 (66.8\%) | FT | 105 (56.1\%) |  |  | FT | 89 (47.6\%) | FT $2(1.1 \%)$ | FT | 102 (54.5\%) |
|  | 571 (21.1\%) | PT | 384 (67.3\%) | PT | 148 (38.5\%) | PT | 115 (29.9\%) |  |  | PT | 120 (31.3\%) | PT 6 (1.6\%) | PT | 170 (44.3\%) |
|  | Total Referred | FT | 335 (30.9\%) | FT | 258 (77.0\%) | FT | 196 (58.5\%) |  |  | FT | 124 (37.0\%) | FT $2(0.6 \%)$ | FT | 149 (44.5\%) |
|  | 1,084 (40.0\%) | PT | 749 (69.1\%) | PT | 312 (41.7\%) | PT | 236 (31.5\%) |  |  | PT | 195 (26.0\%) | PT $\quad 18(2.4 \%)$ | PT | 277 (37.0\%) |
|  | College Level | FT | 838 (53.0\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | FT | 566 (67.5\%) |
|  | 1,581 (58.4\%) | PT | 743 (47.0\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PT | 402 (54.1\%) |
|  | Unknown | FT | 12 (28.6\%) | FT | 2 (16.7\%) | FT | 1(8.3\%) | Not Applicable |  | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 6 (50.0\%) |
|  | 42 (1.6\%) | PT | 30 (71.4\%) | PT | 2 (6.7\%) | PT | 1 (3.3\%) |  |  | PT | 0 (0.0\%) | PT 0 (0.0\%) | PT | 10 (33.3\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | FT | 1,185 (43.8\%) | FT | 264 (22.3\%) | FT | 201 (17.0\%) |  |  | FT | 126 (10.6\%) | FT 8 (0.7\%) | FT | 721 (60.8\%) |
|  | .2,707(100.0\%) | PT | 1,522 (56.2\%) | PT | 329 (21.6\%) | PT | 247 (16.2\%) |  |  | PT | 203 (13.3\%) | PT |  | 689(45.3\%) |

Notes:

1) Attempted = student received a grade for course (includes variations of W); Completed = student received a grade of A, B, C, D, F, I, IP, or P for course; Success = student received a grade of A, B, or C for course.
2) High DE = last course in DE sequence (Level 2).
3) English "gatekeeper" course is ENGL 1301.
4) Fall 2012 through Fall 2015 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is firsttime in college and credential seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBM001). Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using THECB methodology.
5) Developmental education (DE) referral levels are based on formal student assessment outcomes for the subject area of DE course enrollment. Students designated as "Unknown" did not have an assessment on file or could not be placed within referral range and could not be categorized based on DE course enrollment.
6) Years of progression refer to the period between initial Fall semester (cohort year) and time of measurement. Data are cumulative over time.
7) Referral level percentages are based on the total cohort (denominator = cohort size).
8) Progression percentages are based on the referral level (denominator = number referred to level).
9) Students who transfer or leave Alamo Colleges are not removed from denominators.
10) In some instances, data have been updated to reflect the most current data at time of publication. Slight variations in data as recorded in prior publications may appear. However, these updates do not impact overall trends or outcomes.

Sources:
FTIC FT/PT Status: ACCDODS1.XST_CBM001_ACCD
DE Referrals:
Fall 2011: ACCDODS1.ATD_F10_F11_ODS_TASP, Fall 2012: ACCDODS1.ATD_F10_F13_ODS_TASP, Fall 2013-Fall 2015: ACCDODS1.XST_ATD_ACCD
Course Enrollment:: ACCDODS1.XST.IRES_SC

## English Progression by Enrollment Status (Continued)

|  |  | Referral Level |  | Attempted Any DE (1st Year) |  | Success in Any DE (1st Year) |  | Attempted RSG <br> (1st Year) |  | Success in RSG <br> (1st Year) |  | Success in High DE <br> (3rd Year) | Success in RSG <br> (3rd Year) | Success in GK (3rd Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DE Level 1 | FT | 42 (21.6\%) | FT | 28 (66.7\%) | FT | 20 (47.6\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | 3rd Year Data Not Yet Available |  |  |
|  | 194 (8.6\%) | PT | 152 (78.4\%) | PT | 95 (62.5\%) | PT | 55 (36.2\%) | PT | 5 (3.3\%) | PT | 1 (0.7\%) |  |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 2 | FT | 88 (29.8\%) | FT | 53 (60.2\%) | FT | 41 (46.6\%) | FT | 2 (2.3\%) | FT | 2 (2.3\%) |  |  |  |  |
|  | 295 (13.0\%) | PT | 207 (70.2\%) | PT | 126 (60.9\%) | PT | 93 (44.9\%) | PT | 4 (1.9\%) | PT | 4 (1.9\%) |  |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 3 | FT | 55 (18.1\%) | FT | 17 (30.9\%) | FT | 14 (25.5\%) | FT | 11 (20.0\%) | FT | 8 (14.5\%) |  |  |  |  |
|  | 304 (13.4\%) | PT | 249 (81.9\%) | PT | 156 (62.7\%) | PT | 121 (48.6\%) | PT | 134 (53.8\%) | PT | 108 (43.4\%) |  |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 4 | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2 (0.1\%) | PT | 2 (100.0\%) | PT | 2 (100.0\%) | PT | 1 (50.0\%) | PT | 2 (100.0\%) | PT | 1 (50.0\%) |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total Referred | FT | 185 (23.3\%) | FT | 98 (53.0\%) | FT | 75 (40.5\%) | FT | 13 (7.0\%) | FT | 10 (5.4\%) |  |  |  |  |
|  | 795 (35.1\%) | PT | 610 (76.7\%) | PT | 379 (62.1\%) | PT | 270 (44.3\%) | PT | 145 (23.8\%) | PT | 114 (18.7\%) |  |  |  |  |
|  | College Level | FT | 722 (52.8\%) | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1,368 (60.5\%) | PT | 646 (47.2\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Unknown | FT | 19 (19.2\%) | FT | 1 (5.3\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 1 (5.3\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |  |
|  | $99(4.4 \%)$ | PT | 80 (80.8\%) | PT | 4 (5.0\%) | PT | 1 (1.3\%) | PT | 3 (3.8\%) | PT | 1 (1.3\%) |  |  |  |  |
|  | Cohort Total | FT | 926 (40.9\%) | FT | 114 (12.3\%) | FT | 84 (9.1\%) | FT | 25 (2.7\%) | FT | 16 (1.7\%) |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2,262 (100.0\%) | PT | 1,336 (59.1\%) | PT | 427 (32.0\%) | PT | 301 (22.5\%) | PT | 186 (13.9\%) | PT | 140 (10.5\%) |  |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 1 | FT | 29 (12.2\%) | FT | 25 (86.2\%) | FT | 19 (65.5\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 238 (10.8\%) | PT | 209 (87.8\%) | PT | 132 (63.2\%) | PT | 87 (41.6\%) | PT | 6 (2.9\%) | PT | 4 (1.9\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 2 | FT | 67 (15.7\%) | FT | 43 (64.2\%) | FT | 38 (56.7\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 426 (19.3\%) | PT | 359 (84.3\%) | PT | 222 (61.8\%) | PT | 167 (46.5\%) | PT | 17 (4.7\%) | PT | 13 (3.6\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 3 | FT | 43 (9.5\%) | FT | 16 (37.2\%) | FT | 14 (32.6\%) | FT | 8 (18.6\%) | FT | 6 (14.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 452 (20.5\%) | PT | 409 (90.5\%) | PT | 306 (74.8\%) | PT | 245 (59.9\%) | PT | 259 (63.3\%) | PT | 204 (49.9\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Total Referred | FT | 139 (12.5\%) | FT | 84 (60.4\%) | FT | 71 (51.1\%) | FT | 8 (5.8\%) | FT | 6 (4.3\%) | 3rd Year Data Not Yet Available |  |  |
|  | 1,116 (50.7\%) | PT | 977 (87.5\%) | PT | 660 (67.6\%) | PT | 499 (51.1\%) | PT | 282 (28.9\%) | PT | 221 (22.6\%) |  |  |  |  |
|  | College Level | FT | 435 (41.2\%) | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1,056 (47.9\%) | PT | 621 (58.8\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Unknown | FT | 3 (9.7\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | $31(1.4 \%)$ | PT | 28 (90.3\%) | PT | 2 (7.1\%) | PT | 2 (7.1\%) | PT | 1 (3.6\%) | PT | 1 (3.6\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Cohort Total | FT | 577 (26.2\%) | FT | 88 (15.3\%) | FT | 75 (13.0\%) | FT | 11 (1.9\%) | FT | 9 (1.6\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 2,203 (100.0\%) | PT | 1,626(73.8\%) | PT | 711 (43.7\%) | PT | 539(33.1\%) | PT | 326(20.0\%). |  | 257(15.8\%) |  |  |  |

## English Progression by Pell Status

Referred Pell recipients successfully passed English DE courses at higher rates than did referred non-Pell recipients. Pell recipients who were non-referred successfully passed the English "gatekeeper" course at generally higher rates than did non-Pell recipients. When comparing the 2011 cohort to the 2013 cohort, referred Pell recipients experienced an increase in "gatekeeper" success.

|  |  | Referral Level |  | Attempted Any DE (1st Year) |  | Success in Any DE (1st Year) |  | Attempted RSG <br> (1st Year) | Success in RSG (1st Year) |  | in High DE <br> Year) | Success in RSG <br> (3rd Year) |  | cess in GK <br> 3rd Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DE Level 1 | Y | 240 (57.3\%) | $Y$ | 165 (68.8\%) | Y | 95 (39.6\%) | Not Applicable |  | Y | $59(24.6 \%)$ | Not Applicable | Y | 56 (23.3\%) |
|  | 419 (13.5\%) | N | 179 (42.7\%) | N | 101 (56.4\%) | N | 68 (38.0\%) |  |  | N | 31 (17.3\%) |  | N | 24 (13.4\%) |
|  |  | Y | 558 (53.6\%) | Y | 372 (66.7\%) | Y | 262 (47.0\%) |  |  | Y | 250 (44.8\%) |  | Y | 215 (38.5\%) |
|  | 1,041 (33.5\%) | N | 483 (46.4\%) | N | 226 (46.8\%) | N | 163 (33.7\%) |  |  | N | 158 (32.7\%) |  | N | 139 (28.8\%) |
|  | Total Referred | $Y$ | 798 (54.7\%) | Y | 537 (67.3\%) | Y | 357 (44.7\%) |  |  | Y | 309 (38.7\%) |  | Y | 271 (34.0\%) |
|  | 1,460 (47.0\%) | N | 662 (45.3\%) | N | 327 (49.4\%) | N | 231 (34.9\%) |  |  | N | 189 (28.5\%) |  | N | 163 (24.6\%) |
|  | College Level | Y | 759 (47.1\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | Y | 413 (54.4\%) |
|  | 1,613 (51.9\%) | N | 854 (52.9\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | N | 415 (48.6\%) |
|  | Unknown | Y | $9(25.0 \%)$ | $Y$ | 0 (0.0\%) | $Y$ | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | Y | $0(0.0 \%)$ | Not Applicable | Y | 1 (11.1\%) |
|  | 36 (1.2\%) | N | 27 (75.0\%) | N | 1(3.7\%) | N | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | N | 0 (0.0\%) |  | N | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | Y | 1,566 (50.4\%) | $Y$ | 591 (37.7\%) | Y | 398 (25.4\%) |  |  | Y | 347 (22.2\%) |  | Y | 685 (43.7\%) |
|  | 3,109 (100.0\%) | N | 1,543 (49.6\%) | N | 371 (24.0\%) , | N | 263 (17.0\%) |  |  | N | 221 $114.3 \%$ |  | N | 578(37.5\%) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{5}{0} \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & \stackrel{1}{0} \\ & \stackrel{1}{8} \\ & \stackrel{N}{N} \end{aligned}$ | DE Level 1 | Y | 203 (61.3\%) | Y | 132 (65.0\%) | Y | 94 (46.3\%) | Not Applicable |  | Y | 73 (36.0\%) | $1(0.5 \%)$ | Y | 57 (28.1\%) |
|  | 331 (12.9\%) | N | 128 (38.7\%) | N | 59 (46.1\%) | N | 35 (27.3\%) |  |  | N | 26 (20.3\%) | $\mathrm{N} \quad 00.0 \%)$ | N | 31 (24.2\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | Y | 358 (55.1\%) | $Y$ | 178 (49.7\%) | Y | 148 (41.3\%) |  |  | $Y$ | 142 (39.7\%) | 1 (0.3\%) | $Y$ | 129 (36.0\%) |
|  | 650 (25.3\%) | N | 292 (44.9\%) | N | 93 (31.8\%) | N | 68 (23.3\%) |  |  | N | 68 (23.3\%) | $\mathrm{N} \quad 2(0.7 \%)$ | N | 79 (27.1\%) |
|  | Total Referred | Y | 561 (57.2\%) | $Y$ | 310 (55.3\%) | $Y$ | 242 (43.1\%) |  |  | Y | 215 (38.3\%) | Y 2 (0.4\%) | Y | 186(33.2\%) |
|  | 981 (38.2\%) | N | 420 (42.8\%) | N | 152 (36.2\%) | N | 103 (24.5\%) |  |  | N | 94 (22.4\%) | $\mathrm{N} \quad 2(0.5 \%)$ | N | 110 (26.2\%) |
|  | College Level | Y | 690 (44.5\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | Y | 418 (60.6\%) |
|  | $1,551(60.3 \%)$ | N | 861 (55.5\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | N | 451 (52.4\%) |
|  | Unknown | Y | 12 (30.8\%) | $Y$ | 2 (16.7\%) | Y | 2 (16.7\%) | Not Applicable |  | Y | 2 (16.7\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 3 (25.0\%) |
|  | 39 (1.5\%) | N | 27 (69.2\%) | N | 1 (3.7\%) | N | 1 (3.7\%) |  |  | N | 1(3.7\%) | $\mathrm{N} \quad 000 \%$ | N | 5 (18.5\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | Y | 1,263 (49.1\%) | $Y$ | 338 (26.8\%) | Y | 260 (20.6\%) |  |  | Y | 232 (18.4\%) | Y $\quad 2(0.2 \%)$ | Y | 607 (48.1\%) |
|  | 2,571 (100.0\%) | N | 1,308 (50.9\%) | N | 174 (13.3\%) , | N | 120 (9.2\%) |  |  | N | 111 (8.5\%) | N_-- $40.0 .3 \%)$ | N | 566(43.3\%) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{5}{0} \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \stackrel{8}{8} \\ & \stackrel{N}{\omega} \end{aligned}$ | DE Level 1 | Y | 361 (70.4\%) | Y | 226 (62.6\%) | Y | 160 (44.3\%) | Not Applicable |  | $\bar{Y}$ | 87 (24.1\%) | Y | Y | 101 (28.0\%) |
|  | 513 (19.0\%) | N | 152 (29.6\%) | N | 71 (46.7\%) | N | 52 (34.2\%) |  |  | N | 23 (15.1\%) | $\mathrm{N} \quad 5(3.3 \%)$ | N | 53 (34.9\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | Y | 362 (63.4\%) | $Y$ | 182 (50.3\%) | Y | 147 (40.6\%) |  |  | Y | 132 (36.5\%) | Y 3(0.8\%) | Y | 158 (43.6\%) |
|  | 571 (21.1\%) | N | 209 (36.6\%) | N | 91 (43.5\%) | N | 73 (34.9\%) |  |  | N | 77 (36.8\%) | $\mathrm{N} \quad 5(2.4 \%)$ | N | 114 (54.5\%) |
|  | Total Referred | Y | 723 (66.7\%) | $Y$ | 408 (56.4\%) | Y | 307 (42.5\%) |  |  | Y | 219 (30.3\%) | Y 10 (1.4\%) | Y | 259 (35.8\%) |
|  | 1,084 (40.0\%) | N | 361 (33.3\%) | N | 162 (44.9\%) | N | 125 (34.6\%) |  |  | N | 100 (27.7\%) | $\mathrm{N} \quad 10(2.8 \%)$ | N | 167 (46.3\%) |
|  | College Level | Y | 865 (54.7\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | Y | 529 (61.2\%) |
|  | $1,581 \text { (58.4\%) }$ | N | 716 (45.3\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | N | 439 (61.3\%) |
|  | Unknown | Y | 20 (47.6\%) | $Y$ | 3 (15.0\%) | Y | 1 (5.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | Y | 0 (0.0\%) | Y 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 9 (45.0\%) |
|  | 42 (1.6\%) | N | 22 (52.4\%) | N | 1 (4.5\%) | N | 1 (4.5\%) |  |  | N | 0 (0.0\%) | $\mathrm{N} \quad 00.0 \%)$ | N | 7 (31.8\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | Y | 1,608 (59.4\%) | Y | 418 (26.0\%) | r | 311 (19.3\%) |  |  | Y | 224 (13.9\%) | Y 17 (1.1\%) | Y | 797 (49.6\%) |
|  | 2,707(100.0\%). | N | 1,099 (40.6\%) | N | 175 (15.9\%) | N | 137 (12.5\%) |  |  | N | 105 (9.6\%) | N | N | 613(55.8\%) |

Yes $=$ Pell $\quad$ No $=$ No Pell

|  |  | Referral Level |  | Attempted Any DE (1st Year) |  | Success in Any DE (1st Year) |  | Attempted RSG (1st Year) |  | Success in RSG <br> (1st Year) |  | Success in High DE (3rd Year) | Success in RSG (3rd Year) | Success in GK (3rd Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{4}{0} \\ & 0 \\ & \frac{0}{3} \\ & \stackrel{t}{4} \\ & \frac{1}{7} \\ & \stackrel{1}{4} \end{aligned}$ | DE Level 1 | Y | 133 (68.6\%) | Y | 96 (72.2\%) | $Y$ | 57 (42.9\%) | $Y$ | 3 (2.3\%) | $Y$ | 0 (0.0\%) | 3rd Year Data Not Yet Available |  |  |
|  | 194 (8.6\%) | N | 61 (31.4\%) | N | 27 (44.3\%) | N | 18 (29.5\%) | N | 2 (3.3\%) | N | 1 (1.6\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 2 | Y | 208 (70.5\%) | $Y$ | 130 (62.5\%) | $Y$ | 90 (43.3\%) | Y | 3 (1.4\%) | $Y$ | 3 (1.4\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 295 (13.0\%) | N | 87 (29.5\%) | N | 49 (56.3\%) | N | 44 (50.6\%) | N | 3 (3.4\%) | N | 3 (3.4\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 3 | Y | 185 (60.9\%) | $Y$ | 111 (60.0\%) | $Y$ | 84 (45.4\%) | Y | 92 (49.7\%) | Y | 70 (37.8\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 304 (13.4\%) | N | 119 (39.1\%) | N | 62 (52.1\%) | N | 51 (42.9\%) | N | 53 (44.5\%) | N | 46 (38.7\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 4 | Y | 1 (50.0\%) | $Y$ | 1 (100.0\%) | $Y$ | 1 (100.0\%) | $Y$ | 1 (100.0\%) | $Y$ | 1 (100.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 2 (0.1\%) | N | 1 (50.0\%) | N | 1 (100.0\%) | N | 0 (0.0\%) | N | 1 (100.0\%) | N | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  |  |
|  | Total Referred | Y | 527 (66.3\%) | $Y$ | 338 (64.1\%) | $Y$ | 232 (44.0\%) | $Y$ | 99 (18.8\%) | $Y$ | 74 (14.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 795 (35.1\%) | N | 268 (33.7\%) | N | 139 (51.9\%) | N | 113 (42.2\%) | N | 59 (22.0\%) | N | 50 (18.7\%) |  |  |  |
|  | College Level | Y | 748 (54.7\%) | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $1,368(60.5 \%)$ | N | $620 \text { (45.3\%) }$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Unknown | Y | $53 \text { (53.5\%) }$ | $Y$ | 3 (5.7\%) | $Y$ | 1 (1.9\%) | Y | 2 (3.8\%) | $Y$ | 1 (1.9\%) |  |  |  |
|  | $99(4.4 \%)$ | N | $46 \text { (46.5\%) }$ | N | $2(4.3 \%)$ | N | $0 \text { (0.0\%) }$ | N | $2(4.3 \%)$ | N | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Cohort Total | Y | 1,328 (58.7\%) | $Y$ | 366 (27.6\%) | $Y$ | 248 (18.7\%) | $Y$ | 122 (9.2\%) | Y | 86 (6.5\%) |  |  |  |
|  | _ 2,262 (100.0\%) | N | 934 (41.3\%) | N- | 175 (18.7\%) | N | 137 (14.7\%) | N | 89 (9.5\%) | $\underline{N}$ | 70 (7.5\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 1 | Y | 137 (57.6\%) | Y | 108 (78.8\%) | Y | 68 (49.6\%) | Y | 5 (3.6\%) | Y | 3 (2.2\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 238 (10.8\%) | $N$ | 101 (42.4\%) | N | 49 (48.5\%) | N | 38 (37.6\%) | N | 1 (1.0\%) | N | 1 (1.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 2 | Y | 252 (59.2\%) | $Y$ | 174 (69.0\%) | $Y$ | 131 (52.0\%) | $Y$ | 8 (3.2\%) | Y | 6 (2.4\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 426 (19.3\%) | N | 174 (40.8\%) | N | 91 (52.3\%) | N | 74 (42.5\%) | N | $9(5.2 \%)$ | N | 7 (4.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 3 | Y | 267 (59.1\%) | Y | 201 (75.3\%) | $Y$ | 158 (59.2\%) | $Y$ | 167 (62.5\%) | Y | 127 (47.6\%) |  |  |  |
|  | $452(20.5 \%)$ | N | 185 (40.9\%) | N | 121 (65.4\%) | N | 101 (54.6\%) | N | 100 (54.1\%) | N | 83 (44.9\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Total Referred | Y | 656 (58.8\%) | $Y$ | 483 (73.6\%) | $Y$ | 357 (54.4\%) | Y | 180 (27.4\%) | Y | 136 (20.7\%) | 3rd Year Data Not Yet Available |  |  |
|  | 1,116 (50.7\%) | N | 460 (41.2\%) | N | 261 (56.7\%) | N | 213 (46.3\%) | N | 110 (23.9\%) | N | 91 (19.8\%) |  |  |  |
|  | College Level | Y | 514 (48.7\%) | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1,056 (47.9\%) | N | 542 (51.3\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Unknown | Y | 13 (41.9\%) | $Y$ | 1 (7.7\%) | $Y$ | 1 (7.7\%) | $Y$ | 1 (7.7\%) | Y | 1 (7.7\%) |  |  |  |
|  | $31 \text { (1.4\%) }$ | N | 18 (58.1\%) | N | 1 (5.6\%) | N | 1 (5.6\%) | N | $0(0.0 \%)$ | N | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  |  |
|  | Cohort Total | Y | 1,183 (53.7\%) | Y | 509 (43.0\%) | $Y$ | 375 (31.7\%) | Y | 201 (17.0\%) | Y | 151 (12.8\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 2,203 (100.0\%) | N | 1,020 (46.3\%) | N | 290 (28.4\%) | N | 239 (23.4\%) | N | 136 (13.3\%). | N | 115 (11.3\%) |  |  |  |

## Notes:

1) Attempted = student received a grade for course (includes variations of W); Completed = student received a grade of A, B, C, D, F, I, IP, or P for course; Success = student received a grade of A, B, or C for course.
2) High $D E=$ last course in $D E$ sequence (Level 2 ).
3) English "gatekeeper" course is ENGL 1301.
4) Fall 2012 through Fall 2015 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is firsttime in college and credential seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBM001). Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using THECB methodology.
5) Developmental education (DE) referral levels are based on formal student assessment outcomes for the subject area of DE course enrollment. Students designated as "Unknown" did not have an assessment on file or could not be placed within referral range and could not be categorized based on DE course enrollment.
6) Years of progression refer to the period between initial Fall semester (cohort year) and time of measurement. Data are cumulative over time.
7) Referral level percentages are based on the total cohort (denominator = cohort size).
8) Progression percentages are based on the referral level (denominator = number referred to level).
9) Students who transfer or leave Alamo Colleges are not removed from denominators.
10) In some instances, data have been updated to reflect the most current data at time of publication. Slight variations in data as recorded in prior publications may appear. However, these updates do not impact overall trends or outcomes.

Sources:
FTIC Pell Status: ACCDODS1.XST_FADS_ACCD
DE Referrals: Fall 2011: ACCDODS1.ATD_F10_F11_ODS_TASP, Fall 2012: ACCDODS1.ATD_F10_F13_ODS_TASP, Fall 2013-Fall 2015: ACCDODS1.XST_ATD_ACCD
Course Enrollment:: ACCDODS1.XST.IRES_SC

## English Progression by Veteran Status

Across most cohorts and levels, Veteran students compared to non-Veteran students successfully passed English "gatekeeper" courses at higher rates after 3 years. When comparing the 2011 cohort to the 2013 cohort, an increase in success in the "gatekeeper" course was evident for referred Veteran students.


Notes:

1) Attempted = student received a grade for course (includes variations of W); Completed = student received a grade of A, B, C, D, F, I, IP, or P for course; Success = student received a grade of A, B, or C for course.
2) High $D E=$ last course in $D E$ sequence (Level 2).
3) English "gatekeeper" course is ENGL 1301.
4) Fall 2012 through Fall 2015 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is firsttime in college and credential seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBM001). Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using THECB methodology.
5) Developmental education (DE) referral levels are based on formal student assessment outcomes for the subject area of DE course enrollment. Students designated as "Unknown" did not have an assessment on file or could not be placed within referral range and could not be categorized based on DE course enrollment.
6) Years of progression refer to the period between initial Fall semester (cohort year) and time of measurement. Data are cumulative over time.
7) Referral level percentages are based on the total cohort (denominator = cohort size).
8) Progression percentages are based on the referral level (denominator = number referred to level).
9) Students who transfer or leave Alamo Colleges are not removed from denominators.
10) In some instances, data have been updated to reflect the most current data at time of publication. Slight variations in data as recorded in prior publications may appear. However, these updates do not impact overall trends or outcomes.

Sources:
FTIC Veteran Status: ACCDODS1.XST.IRES_SC
DE Referrals:
Fall 2011: ACCDODS1.ATD_F10_F11_ODS_TASP, Fall 2012: ACCDODS1.ATD_F10_F13_ODS_TASP, Fall 2013-Fall 2015: ACCDODS1.XST_ATD_ACCD
Course Enrollment::
ACCDODS1.XST.IRES_SC

## English Progression by Veteran Status (Continued)

|  |  | Referral Level |  | Attempted Any DE (1st Year) |  | Success in Any DE (1st Year) |  | Attempted RSG (1st Year) |  | Success in RSG <br> (1st Year) |  | Success in High DE (3rd Year) | Success in RSG <br> (3rd Year) | Success in GK <br> (3rd Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DE Level 1 | Y | 3(1.5\%) | $\gamma$ | 3 (100.0\%) | $Y$ | 2 (66.7\%) | $Y$ | 0 0.0\%) | $\gamma$ | 0 (0.0\%) | 3rd Year Data Not Yet Available |  |  |
|  | 194 (8.6\%) | N | 191 (98.5\%) | N | 120 (62.8\%) | N | 73 (38.2\%) | N | $5(2.6 \%)$ | N | 1 (0.5\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 2 | Y | 7 (2.4\%) | $Y$ | 5 (71.4\%) | $Y$ | 5 (71.4\%) | $Y$ | 0 (0.0\%) | $Y$ | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 295 (13.0\%) | N | 288 (97.6\%) | N | 174 (60.4\%) | N | 129 (44.8\%) | N | 6 (2.1\%) | N | 6 (2.1\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 3 | Y | 8 (2.6\%) | Y | 3 (37.5\%) | Y | 2 (25.0\%) | $Y$ | 3 (37.5\%) | $\gamma$ | 2 (25.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 304 (13.4\%) | N | 296 (97.4\%) | N | 170 (57.4\%) | N | 133 (44.9\%) | N | 142 (48.0\%) | N | 114 (38.5\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 4 | Y | 0 (0.0\%) | $Y$ | 0 (0.0\%) | $Y$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ | $Y$ | 0 (0.0\%) | $Y$ | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 2 (0.1\%) | N | 2 (100.0\%) | N | 2 (100.0\%) | N | 1 (50.0\%) | N | 2 (100.0\%) | N | 1 (50.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Total Referred | Y | 18 (2.3\%) | Y | 11 (61.1\%) | $Y$ | $9(50.0 \%)$ | $Y$ | 3 (16.7\%) | $Y$ | 2 (11.1\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 795 (35.1\%) | N | 777 (97.7\%) | N | 466 (60.0\%) | N | 336 (43.2\%) | N | 155 (19.9\%) | N | 122 (15.7\%) |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { College Level } \\ & \text { 1,368 (60.5\%) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & Y \\ & N \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 101(7.4 \%) \\ 1,267(92.6 \%) \end{array}$ | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Unknown | Y | 3(3.0\%) | $Y$ | 1 (33.3\%) | Y | $0(0.0 \%)$ | $Y$ | 1 (33.3\%) | $Y$ | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 99 (4.4\%) | N | 96 (97.0\%) | N | 4 (4.2\%) | N | 1 (1.0\%) | N | 3(3.1\%) | N | 1 (1.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Cohort Total | Y | 122 (5.4\%) | $Y$ | 16 (13.1\%) | $Y$ | 12 (9.8\%) | $Y$ | 8 (6.6\%) | $Y$ | 5 (4.1\%) |  |  |  |
|  | .2,262 (100.0\%) | N | 2,140 (94.6\%) | N | 525 (24.5\%) | N | 373 (17.4\%) | N | 203 (9.5\%) | N | 151(7.1\%) |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{0} \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \stackrel{n}{0} \\ & \overline{10} \end{aligned}$ | DE Level 1 | Y | 3(1.3\%) | Y | 2(66.7\%) | Y | 2 (66.7\%) | $Y$ | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 0 (0.0\%) | 3rd Year Data Not Yet Available |  |  |
|  | 238 (10.8\%) | N | 235 (98.7\%) | N | 155 (66.0\%) | N | 104 (44.3\%) | N | $6(2.6 \%)$ | N | 4 (1.7\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 2 | Y | 11 (2.6\%) | $Y$ | 7 (63.6\%) | $Y$ | 5 (45.5\%) | $Y$ | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 426 (19.3\%) | N | 415 (97.4\%) | N | 258 (62.2\%) | N | 200 (48.2\%) | N | 17 (4.1\%) | N | 13 (3.1\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 3 | Y | 20 (4.4\%) | $Y$ | 15 (75.0\%) | $Y$ | 13 (65.0\%) | $Y$ | 12 (60.0\%) | $Y$ | 10 (50.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 452 (20.5\%) | N | 432 (95.6\%) | N | 307 (71.1\%) | N | 246 (56.9\%) | $N$ | 255 (59.0\%) | N | 200 (46.3\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Total Referred | Y | 34 (3.0\%) | $Y$ | 24 (70.6\%) | $Y$ | 20 (58.8\%) | $Y$ | 12 (35.3\%) | Y | 10 (29.4\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 1,116 (50.7\%) | N | 1,082 (97.0\%) | N | 720 (66.5\%) | N | 550 (50.8\%) | N | 278 (25.7\%) | N | 217 (20.1\%) |  |  |  |
|  | College Level | Y | 92 (8.7\%) | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1,056 (47.9\%) | N | 964 (91.3\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Unknown | Y | 3 (9.7\%) | $Y$ | 0 (0.0\%) | $Y$ | 0 (0.0\%) | $Y$ | 0 (0.0\%) | $Y$ | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 31 (1.4\%) | N | 28 (90.3\%) | N | 2(7.1\%) | N | 2 (7.1\%) | N | 1(3.6\%) | N | 1 (3.6\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Cohort Total | Y | 129 (5.9\%) | $Y$ | 31 (24.0\%) | $Y$ | 27 (20.9\%) | $Y$ | 18 (14.0\%) | $Y$ | 16 (12.4\%) |  |  |  |
|  | .2,203(100.0\%). |  | 2,074 (94.1\%) |  | 768(37.0\%) | N | 587 $128.3 \%$, |  | 319 (15.4\%). |  | 250 (12.1\%) |  |  |  |

Yes = Veteran

## Progression Through Math Developmental Education \& "Gatekeeper" Courses

Math developmental education referral levels were based on formal student assessment outcomes for Math or on Math DE course enrollment. From Fall 2011 through Fall 2013, San Antonio College offered four levels of Math developmental education - MATH 0300 (Basic Mathematics), MATH 0301 (Introduction to Algebra), MATH 0302 (Elementary Algebra), and MATH 0303 (Intermediate Algebra). From Fall 2014 onward, San Antonio College offered three levels of Math developmental education - MATH 0305 (Pre-Algebra), MATH 0310 (Elementary Algebra), and MATH 0320 (Intermediate Algebra). Students placed in a DE course had to earn a grade of " $C$ " or better to be successful and move up to the next DE course in the Math sequence until they reached MATH 0303/0320, which served as the highest developmental education course in the sequence. Students designated as "Unknown" did not have an assessment on file or could not be placed within referral range and could not be categorized based on DE course enrollment. Students placed at college level or who successfully passed MATH 0303/0320 could then take one of the "gatekeeper" Math courses, which were MATH 1314 (College Algebra), MATH 1324 (Mathematics for Business and Social Sciences I), MATH 1332 (Contemporary Math I-Math for Liberal Arts Majors I), MATH 1333 (Contemporary Math II—Math for Liberal Arts Majors II), MATH 1414 (College Algebra Pre-Cal track), and MATH 1442 (Elementary Statistical Methods).

## Math Developmental Education Progression of Referred

After 3 years, approximately $21 \%-27 \%$ of referred students in each cohort attempted the highest DE course in the Math sequence, with $15 \%-17 \%$ of the cohort successfully passing the course. Approximately $21 \%-33 \%$ of referred students in each cohort attempted a Math "gatekeeper" course, with $17 \%-25 \%$ of the cohort successfully passing a "gatekeeper" course. When comparing the 2013 cohort to the 2011 cohort, success in "gatekeeper" increased by 6.3 percentage points.



## Math "Gatekeeper" Progression of Non-Referred

After 3 years, $66 \%-77 \%$ of non-referred students in each cohort attempted one of the Math "gatekeeper" courses, with $49 \%-53 \%$ of that cohort successfully passing that course, which is two to three times the rate of referred students.


## Total Math Progression

Overall, $39 \%-47 \%$ of all referred students in each cohort successfully passed any Math DE course within the first year, $15 \%$ $-17 \%$ successfully passed the highest DE course in the Math sequence within 3 years, and approximately $17 \%-25 \%$ successfully passed the Math "gatekeeper" course within 3 years. Of the non-referred students, $49 \%-53 \%$ successfully passed the Math "gatekeeper" course within 3 years. Of the total cohort, $23 \%-38 \%$ successfully passed the Math "gatekeeper" course within 3 years. Those who were referred to Level 4 had higher success rates in the Math highest DE and "gatekeeper" courses than did those referred to lower levels. Non-referred students had higher success rates in the Math "gatekeeper" course than did referred students. When comparing the 2013 cohort to the 2011 cohort, all referred levels had increased success in the "gatekeeper" course.

|  |  | Attempted Any DE (1st Year) | Success in Any DE (1st Year) | Attempted RSG (1st Year) | Success in RSG (1st Year) | Success in High DE (3rd Year) | Success in RSG (3rd Year) | Success in GK (3rd Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 1 \\ 639(20.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 480 (75.1\%) | 277 (43.3\%) |  |  | 28 (4.4\%) |  | 43 (6.7\%) |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 2 \\ 503 \text { (16.2\%) } \end{gathered}$ | 371 (73.8\%) | 206 (41.0\%) |  |  | 46 (9.1\%) |  | 56 (11.1\%) |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 3 \\ 784 \text { ( } 25.2 \% \text { ) } \end{gathered}$ | 611 (77.9\%) | 304 (38.8\%) | Not Ap | cable | 156 (19.9\%) | Not Applicable | 147 (18.8\%) |
|  | DE Level 4 $516 \text { (16.6\%) }$ | 317 (61.4\%) | 175 (33.9\%) |  |  | 181 (35.1\%) |  | 163 (31.6\%) |
|  | Total Referred 2,442 (78.5\%) | 1,779 (72.9\%) | 962 (39.4\%) |  |  | 411 (16.8\%) |  | 409 (16.7\%) |
|  | College Level 605 (19.5\%) |  |  | Not A | icable |  |  | 298 (49.3\%) |
|  | Unknown $62 \text { (2.0\%) }$ | 8 (12.9\%) | 7 (11.3\%) | Not | ble | 4 (6.5\%) | Not Applicable | 3 (4.8\%) |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cohort Total } \\ \text { 3,109(100.0\%) } \end{gathered}$ | 1,838 (59.1\%) | 1,007 (32.4\%) |  |  | 448 (14.4\%) | 隹 Applicable | 710 (22.8\%) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DE Level } 1 \\ & 495 \text { (19.3\%) } \end{aligned}$ | 381 (77.0\%) | 243 (49.1\%) |  |  | 47 (9.5\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | 69 (13.9\%) |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 2 \\ 387 \text { (15.1\%) } \end{gathered}$ | 302 (78.0\%) | 179 (46.3\%) |  |  | 58 (15.0\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | 81 (20.9\%) |
|  | DE Level 3 $584 \text { (22.7\%) }$ | 426 (72.9\%) | 220 (37.7\%) | Not Ap | cable | 118 (20.2\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | 146 (25.0\%) |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 4 \\ 407 \text { (15.8\%) } \end{gathered}$ | 151 (37.1\%) | 85 (20.9\%) |  |  | 95 (23.3\%) | O(0.0\%) | 179 (44.0\%) |
|  | Total Referred 1,873 (72.9\%) | 1,260 (67.3\%) | 727 (38.8\%) |  |  | 318 (17.0\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | 475 (25.4\%) |
|  | College Level 613 (23.8\%) |  |  | Not A | icable |  |  | 300 (48.9\%) |
|  | Unknown 85 (3.3\%) | 43 (50.6\%) | 30 (35.3\%) | Not Applicable |  | 15 (17.6\%) | 0(0.0\%) | 19 (22.4\%) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cohort Total } \\ & 2,571(100.0 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 1,333 (51.8\%) | 778 (30.3\%) |  |  | 350 (13.6\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | 794 (30.9\%) |

## Notes:

1) Attempted = student received a grade for course (includes variations of W); Completed = student received a grade of $A, B, C, D, F, I, I P$, or $P$ for course; Success = student received a grade of A, B, or C for course.
2) $\quad$ High $D E=$ last course in $D E$ sequence (Level 4).
3) Math "gatekeeper" courses are MATH 1314, MATH 1324, MATH 1332, MATH 1333, MATH 1414, and MATH 1442.
4) Fall 2012 through Fall 2015 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is firsttime in college and credential seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBM001). Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using THECB methodology.
5) Developmental education (DE) referral levels are based on formal student assessment outcomes for the subject area of DE course enrollment. Students designated as "Unknown" did not have an assessment on file or could not be placed within referral range and could not be categorized based on DE course enrollment.

## Total Math Progression (Continued)

|  |  | Attempted Any DE (1st Year) | Success in Any DE (1st Year) | Attempted RSG (1st Year) | Success in RSG <br> (1st Year) | Success in High DE (3rd Year) | Success in RSG <br> (3rd Year) | Success in GK (3rd Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DE Level 1 $615 \text { (22.7\%) }$ | 497 (80.8\%) | 287 (46.7\%) | Not Applicable |  | 60 (9.8\%) | 2 (0.3\%) | 67 (10.9\%) |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 2 \\ 309 \text { (11.4\%) } \end{gathered}$ | 234 (75.7\%) | 156 (50.5\%) |  |  | 39 (12.6\%) | 1 (0.3\%) | 70 (22.7\%) |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 3 \\ 276 \text { (10.2\%) } \end{gathered}$ | 212 (76.8\%) | 134 (48.6\%) |  |  | 44 (15.9\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | 101 (36.6\%) |
|  | DE Level 4 $133 \text { (4.9\%) }$ | 74 (55.6\%) | 43 (32.3\%) |  |  | 50 (37.6\%) | 1 (0.8\%) | 65 (48.9\%) |
|  | Total Referred 1,333 (49.2\%) | 1,017 (76.3\%) | 620 (46.5\%) |  |  | 193 (14.5\%) | 4 (0.3\%) | 303 (22.7\%) |
|  | College Level 1,337 (49.4\%) |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  | 714 (53.4\%) |
|  | Unknown $37 \text { (1.4\%) }$ | 9 (24.3\%) | 3 (8.1\%) | Not Applicable |  | 1 (2.7\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | 9 (24.3\%) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cohort Total } \\ & \text { 2,707 (100.0\%) } \end{aligned}$ | 1,072 (39.6\%) | 651 (24.0\%) |  |  | 207 (7.6\%) | 4 (0.1\%) | 1,026 (37.9\%) |
|  | DE Level 1 $637 \text { (28.2\%) }$ | 515 (80.8\%) | 328 (51.5\%) | O(0.0\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | 3rd Year Data Not Yet Available |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DE Level } 2 \\ & 219(9.7 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 175 (79.9\%) | 106 (48.4\%) | 1 (0.5\%) | O(0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 3 $198 \text { (8.8\%) }$ | 112 (56.6\%) | 63 (31.8\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 4 \\ 1 \text { (0.0\%) } \end{gathered}$ | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Total Referred 1,055 (46.6\%) | 802 (76.0\%) | 497 (47.1\%) | 1 (0.1\%) | 0(0.0\%) | 3 rd | Data Not Yet Av |  |
|  | College Level 1,126 (49.8\%) | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Unknown 81 (3.6\%) | 3 (3.7\%) | 1 (1.2\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cohort Total } \\ & 2,262(100.0 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 838 (37.0\%) | 515 (22.8\%) | 1 (0.0\%) | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 1 \\ 793 \text { (36.0\%) } \end{gathered}$ | 535 (67.5\%) | 352 (44.4\%) | 1 (0.1\%) | 1 (0.1\%) |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 2 \\ 293 \text { (13.3\%) } \end{gathered}$ | 182 (62.1\%) | 117 (39.9\%) | 1 (0.3\%) | 1 (0.3\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 3 $319 \text { (14.5\%) }$ | 160 (50.2\%) | 103 (32.3\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 4 \\ 4(0.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 1 (25.0\%) | 1 (25.0\%) | 1 (25.0\%) | 1 (25.0\%) | 3rd Year Data Not Yet Available |  |  |
|  | Total Referred 1,409 (64.0\%) | 878 (62.3\%) | 573 (40.7\%) | 3 (0.2\%) | 3 (0.2\%) |  |  |  |
|  | College Level $759 \text { (34.5\%) }$ | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Unknown $35 \text { (1.6\%) }$ | 1 (2.9\%) | 1 (2.9\%) | O(0.0\%) | 0(0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Cohort Total 2,203 (100.0\%) | 902 (40.9\%) | 591 (26.8\%) | 3 (0.1\%) | 3 (0.1\%) |  |  |  |

6) Years of progression refer to the period between initial Fall semester (cohort year) and time of measurement. Data are cumulative over time.
7) Referral level percentages are based on the total cohort (denominator = cohort size).
8) Progression percentages are based on the referral level (denominator = number referred to level).
9) Students who transfer or leave Alamo Colleges are not removed from denominators.
10) In some instances, data have been updated to reflect the most current data at time of publication. Slight variations in data as recorded in prior publications may appear. However, these updates do not impact overall trends or outcomes.

Sources:
FTIC Demographics: DE Referrals:

Course Enrollment::
ACCDODS1.XST_ATD_ACCD, ACCDODS1.XST_CBM001_ACCD, ACCDODS1.XST_FADS_ACCD, ACCDODS1.XST.IRES_SC Fall 2011: ACCDODS1.ATD_F10_F11_ODS_TASP, Fall 2012: ACCDODS1.ATD_F10_F13_ODS_TASP, Fall 2013-Fall 2015: ACCDODS1.XST_ATD_ACCD
ACCDODS1.XST.IRES_SC

## Math Progression by Gender

In general, women compared to men successfully passed DE and "gatekeeper" courses at higher rates. When comparing the 2013 cohort with the 2011 cohort, both referred and non-referred males and females experienced increases in "gatekeeper" success.

|  |  |  |  |  | pted Any DE st Year) |  | in Any DE Year) | Attempted RSG (1st Year) | Success in RSG (1st Year) |  | in High DE Year) | Success in RSG (3rd Year) |  | ess in GK (3rd Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DE Level 1 | M | 242 (37.9\%) | M | 188 (77.7\%) | M | 98 (40.5\%) | Not Applicable |  | M | 2 (0.8\%) | Not Applicable | M | 7 (2.9\%) |
|  | 639 (20.6\%) | F | 397 (62.1\%) | F | 292 (73.6\%) | F | 179 (45.1\%) |  |  | F | 26 (6.5\%) |  | F | 36 (9.1\%) |
|  | DELevel 2 | M | 199 (39.6\%) | M | 138 (69.3\%) | M | 69 (34.7\%) |  |  | M | 14 (7.0\%) |  | M | 16 (8.0\%) |
|  | 503 (16.2\%) | F | 304 (60.4\%) | F | 233 (76.6\%) | F | 137 (45.1\%) |  |  | F | 32 (10.5\%) |  | F | 40 (13.2\%) |
|  | DE Level 3 | M | 288 (36.7\%) | M | 218 (75.7\%) | M | 101 (35.1\%) |  |  | M | 48 (16.7\%) |  | M | 44 (15.3\%) |
|  | 784 (25.2\%) | F | 496 (63.3\%) | F | 393 (79.2\%) | F | 203 (40.9\%) |  |  | F | 108 (21.8\%) |  | F | 103 (20.8\%) |
|  | DELevel 4 | M | 266 (51.6\%) | M | 161 (60.5\%) | M | 80 (30.1\%) |  |  | M | 82 (30.8\%) |  | M | 80 (30.1\%) |
|  | 516 (16.6\%) | F | 250 (48.4\%) | F | 156 (62.4\%) | F | 95 (38.0\%) |  |  | F | 99 (39.6\%) |  | F | 83 (33.2\%) |
|  | Total Referred | M | 995 (40.7\%) | M | 705 (70.9\%) | M | 348 (35.0\%) |  |  | M | 146 (14.7\%) |  | M | 147 (14.8\%) |
|  | 2,442 (78.5\%) | F | 1,447 (59.3\%) | F | 1,074 (74.2\%) | F | 614 (42.4\%) |  |  | F | 265 (18.3\%) |  | F | 262 (18.1\%) |
|  | College Level | M | 329 (54.4\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | M | 154 (46.8\%) |
|  | 605 (19.5\%) | F | 276 (45.6\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F | 144 (52.2\%) |
|  | Unknown | M | 26 (41.9\%) | M | 4 (15.4\%) | M | 3 (11.5\%) | Not Applicable |  | M | 1 (3.8\%) | Not Applicable | M | 1 (3.8\%) |
|  | 62 (2.0\%) | F | 36 (58.1\%) | F | 4(11.1\%) | F | 4 (11.1\%) |  |  | F | 3 (8.3\%) |  | F | 2 (5.6\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | M | 1,350 (43.4\%) | M | 735 (54.4\%) | M | 371 (27.5\%) |  |  | M | 163 (12.1\%) |  | M | 302 (22.4\%) |
|  | 3,109 (100.0\%) | F | 1,759 (56.6\%) | F | 1,103 (62.7\%). | F | 636(36.2\%) |  |  | F | 285 (16.2\%) |  | - | 408 (23.2\%) |
|  | DELevel 1 | M | 180 (36.4\%) | M | 133 (73.9\%) | M | 81 (45.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | M | 16 (8.9\%) | M 0 (0.0\%) | M | 21 (11.7\%) |
|  | 495 (19.3\%) | F | 315 (63.6\%) | F | 248 (78.7\%) | F | 162 (51.4\%) |  |  | F | 31 (9.8\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | F | 48 (15.2\%) |
|  | DELevel 2 | M | 170 (43.9\%) | M | 123 (72.4\%) | M | 58 (34.1\%) |  |  | M | 24 (14.1\%) | M $\quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | M | 30 (17.6\%) |
|  | 387 (15.1\%) | , | 217 (56.1\%) | F | 179 (82.5\%) | F | 121 (55.8\%) |  |  | F | 34 (15.7\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | 仡 | 51 (23.5\%) |
|  | DELevel 3 | M | 228 (39.0\%) | M | 170 (74.6\%) | M | 83 (36.4\%) |  |  | M | 44 (19.3\%) | M $\quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | M | 50 (21.9\%) |
|  | 584 (22.7\%) | F | 356 (61.0\%) | F | 256 (71.9\%) | F | 137 (38.5\%) |  |  | F | 74 (20.8\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | F | 96 (27.0\%) |
|  | DELevel 4 | M | $193 \text { (47.4\%) }$ | M | 72 (37.3\%) | M | 38 (19.7\%) |  |  | M | 44 (22.8\%) | M $\quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | M | 76 (39.4\%) |
|  | $407 \text { (15.8\%) }$ | F | $214 \text { (52.6\%) }$ | F | 79 (36.9\%) | F | 47 (22.0\%) |  |  | F | 51 (23.8\%) | F $0(0.0 \%)$ | F | 103 (48.1\%) |
|  | Total Referred | M | 771 (41.2\%) | M | 498 (64.6\%) | M | 260 (33.7\%) |  |  | M | 128 (16.6\%) | M $\quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | M | 177 (23.0\%) |
|  | 1,873 (72.9\%) | F | 1,102 (58.8\%) | F | 762 (69.1\%) | F | 467 (42.4\%) |  |  | F | 190 (17.2\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | F | 298 (27.0\%) |
|  | College Level | M | 325 (53.0\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | M | 150 (46.2\%) |
|  | 613 (23.8\%) | F | 288 (47.0\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F | 150 (52.1\%) |
|  | Unknown | M | 38 (44.7\%) | M | 23 (60.5\%) | M | 17 (44.7\%) | Not Applicable |  | M | 8 (21.1\%) | M $\quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | M | 8 (21.1\%) |
|  | 85 (3.3\%) | F | 47 (55.3\%) | F | 20 (42.6\%) | F | 13 (27.7\%) |  |  | F | 7 (14.9\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | F | 11 (23.4\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | M | 1,134 (44.1\%) | M | 536 (47.3\%) | M | 288 (25.4\%) |  |  | M | 146 (12.9\%) | M $\quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | M | 335 (29.5\%) |
|  | 2,571 (100.0\%) | F | 1,437 (55.9\%) | F | 797(55.5\%). | F | 490(34.1\%) |  |  | F | 204 (14.2\%) | O(0.0\%) | F | 459(31.9\%) |
|  | DELevel 1 | M | 208 (33.8\%) | M | 169 (81.3\%) | M | 81 (38.9\%) | Not Applicable |  | M | 12 (5.8\%) | M ${ }^{\text {a }}$ (0.0\%) | M | 17(8.2\%) |
|  | 615 (22.7\%) | F | 407 (66.2\%) | F | 328 (80.6\%) | F | 206 (50.6\%) |  |  | F | 48 (11.8\%) | 2 (0.5\%) | F | 50 (12.3\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | M | 139 (45.0\%) | M | 104 (74.8\%) | M | 63 (45.3\%) |  |  | M | 13 (9.4\%) | M $\quad 1(0.7 \%)$ | M | 26 (18.7\%) |
|  | 309 (11.4\%) | F | 170 (55.0\%) | F | 130 (76.5\%) | F | 93 (54.7\%) |  |  | F | 26 (15.3\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | F | 44 (25.9\%) |
|  | DE Level 3 | M | 115 (41.7\%) | M | 86 (74.8\%) | M | 54 (47.0\%) |  |  | M | 17 (14.8\%) | M $\quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | M | 40 (34.8\%) |
|  | 276 (10.2\%) | F | 161 (58.3\%) | F | 126 (78.3\%) | F | 80 (49.7\%) |  |  | F | 27 (16.8\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | F | 61 (37.9\%) |
|  | DE Level 4 | M | 54 (40.6\%) | M | 29 (53.7\%) | M | 16 (29.6\%) |  |  | M | 16 (29.6\%) | M $\quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | M | 28 (51.9\%) |
|  | $133 \text { (4.9\%) }$ | F | 79 (59.4\%) | F | 45 (57.0\%) | F | 27 (34.2\%) |  |  | F | 34 (43.0\%) | 1(1.3\%) | F | 37 (46.8\%) |
|  | Total Referred | M | 516 (38.7\%) | M | 388 (75.2\%) | M | 214 (41.5\%) |  |  | M | 58 (11.2\%) | M $\quad 1(0.2 \%)$ | M | 111 (21.5\%) |
|  | 1,333 (49.2\%) | F | $817 \text { (61.3\%) }$ | F | 629 (77.0\%) | F | 406 (49.7\%) |  |  | F | 135 (16.5\%) | 3 (0.4\%) | F | 192 (23.5\%) |
|  | College Level | M | 618 (46.2\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | M | 310 (50.2\%) |
|  | 1,337 (49.4\%) | F | 719 (53.8\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F | 404 (56.2\%) |
|  | Unknown | M | 23 (62.2\%) | M | 5 (21.7\%) | M | 1(4.3\%) | Not Applicable |  | M | 0(0.0\%) | M $\quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | M | 3 (13.0\%) |
|  | 37 (1.4\%) | F | 14 (37.8\%) | F | 4 (28.6\%) | F | 2 (14.3\%) |  |  | F | 1(7.1\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | F | 6 (42.9\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | M | 1,157 (42.7\%) | M | 412 (35.6\%) | M | 227 (19.6\%) |  |  | M | 67 (5.8\%) | M $\quad 1$ (0.1\%) | M | 424 (36.6\%) |
|  | 2,707(100.0\%) | F | 1,550(57.3\%) | F | 660(42.6\%). | F | 424 (27.4\%) |  |  | F | 140(9.0\%) | F_-_- ${ }^{3}(0.2 \%$ ) | F | 602(38.8\%) |
| Ma | $\mathrm{F}=$ Female |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

1) Attempted = student received a grade for course (includes variations of W); Completed = student received a grade of A, B, C, D, F, I, IP, or P for course; Success = student received a grade of $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}$, or C for course.
2) $\quad$ High $D E=$ last course in $D E$ sequence (Level 4).
3) Math "gatekeeper" courses are MATH 1314, MATH 1324, MATH 1332, MATH 1333, MATH 1414 , and MATH 1442.
4) Fall 2012 through Fall 2015 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is firsttime in college and credential seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBM001). Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using THECB methodology.
5) Developmental education (DE) referral levels are based on formal student assessment outcomes for the subject area of DE course enrollment. Students designated as "Unknown" did not have an assessment on file or could not be placed within referral range and could not be categorized based on DE course enrollment.

## Math Progression by Gender (Continued)

|  |  |  |  |  | ed Any DE Year) |  | in Any DE Year) |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ted RSG } \\ & \text { Year) } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { in RSG } \\ & \text { rear) } \end{aligned}$ | Success in High DE (3rd Year) | Success in RSG (3rd Year) | Success in GK (3rd Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DE Level 1 | M | 261 (41.0\%) | M | 197 (75.5\%) | M | 114 (43.7\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) | 3rd Year Data Not Yet Available |  |  |
|  | 637 (28.2\%) | F | 376 (59.0\%) | F | 318 (84.6\%) | F | 214 (56.9\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) | + | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 2 | M | 76 (34.7\%) | M | 60 (78.9\%) | M | 31 (40.8\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 219 (9.7\%) | F | 143 (65.3\%) | F | 115 (80.4\%) | F | 75 (52.4\%) | F | 1 (0.7\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 3 | M | 75 (37.9\%) | M | 35 (46.7\%) | M | 17 (22.7\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 198 (8.8\%) | F | 123 (62.1\%) | F | 77 (62.6\%) | F | 46 (37.4\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 4 | M | 1(100.0\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 1 (0.0\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) | F | 0(0.0\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) | F | 0 0 $0.0 \%$ ) | F | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Total Referred | M | 413 (39.1\%) | M | 292 (70.7\%) | M | 162 (39.2\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 1,055 (46.6\%) | F | 642 (60.9\%) | F | 510 (79.4\%) | F | 335 (52.2\%) | F | 1 (0.2\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | M |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1,126 (49.8\%) | F | $594 \text { (52.8\%) }$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Unknown | M | 35 (43.2\%) | M | 2 (5.7\%) | M | 1 (2.9\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 81 (3.6\%) | F | 46 (56.8\%) | F | 1 (2.2\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Cohort Total | M | 980 (43.3\%) | M | 310 (31.6\%) | M | 168 (17.1\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 2,262 (100.0\%) | F | 1,282 (56.7\%) | F | 528(41.2\%) | F | 347( $27.1 \%$ ) | F | 1 (0.1\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DELevel 1 | M | 284 (35.8\%) | M | 175 (61.6\%) | M | 105 (37.0\%) | M | 0(0.0\%) | M | 0(0.0\%) | 3rd Year Data Not Yet Available |  |  |
|  | 793 (36.0\%) | F | 509 (64.2\%) | F | 360 (70.7\%) | F | 247 (48.5\%) | F | 1 (0.2\%) | F | 1 (0.2\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 2 | M | 115 (39.2\%) | M | 78 (67.8\%) | M | 49 (42.6\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 293 (13.3\%) | F | 178 (60.8\%) | F | 104 (58.4\%) | F | 68 (38.2\%) | F | 1 (0.6\%) | F | 1 (0.6\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 3 | M | 142 (44.5\%) | M | 66 (46.5\%) | M | 42 (29.6\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 319 (14.5\%) | F | 177 (55.5\%) | F | 94 (53.1\%) | F | 61 (34.5\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 4 | M | 2 (50.0\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | $4(0.2 \%)$ | F | $2(50.0 \%)$ | F | 1 (50.0\%) | F | 1 (50.0\%) | F | 1 (50.0\%) | F | 1 (50.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Total Referred | M | 543 (38.5\%) | M | 319 (58.7\%) | M | 196 (36.1\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 1,409 (64.0\%) | F | 866 (61.5\%) | F | 559 (64.5\%) | F | 377 (43.5\%) | F | 3 (0.3\%) | F | 3 (0.3\%) |  |  |  |
|  | College Level | M | 375 (49.4\%) | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 759 (34.5\%) | F | 384 (50.6\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Unknown | M | 23 (65.7\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 35 (1.6\%) | F | 12 (34.3\%) | F | 1(8.3\%) | F | 1 (8.3\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Cohort Total | M | 941 (42.7\%) | M | 333 (35.4\%) | M | 205 (21.8\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 2,203 (100.0\%) | F | 1,262 (57.3\%) | F | 569(45.1\%) | F | 386(30.6\%) | F | 3(0.2\%) | F | 3(0.2\%) |  |  |  |

6) Years of progression refer to the period between initial Fall semester (cohort year) and time of measurement. Data are cumulative over time.
7) Referral level percentages are based on the total cohort (denominator = cohort size).
8) Progression percentages are based on the referral level (denominator = number referred to level).
9) Students who transfer or leave Alamo Colleges are not removed from denominators.
10) In some instances, data have been updated to reflect the most current data at time of publication. Slight variations in data as recorded in prior publications may appear. However, these updates do not impact overall trends or outcomes.

Sources:
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { FTIC Gender: } & \text { ACCDODS1.XST_ATD_ACCD } \\ \text { DE Referrals: } & \text { Fall 2011: ACCDODS1.ATD_F10_F11_ODS_TASP, Fall 2012: ACCDODS1.ATD_F10_F13_ODS_TASP, Fall 2013-Fall 2015: }\end{array}$
Course Enrollment:: ACCDODS1.XST_ATD_ACCD
ACCDODS1.XST.IRES_SC

## Math Progression by Ethnicity

Of those who were referred, generally African-American students, compared to students of other racial/ethnic groups, successfully passed Math DE and "gatekeeper" courses at the lowest rates. When comparing the 2013 cohort to the 2011 cohort, non-referred African-American students experienced a large increase in "gatekeeper" success.


Notes:

1) Attempted = student received a grade for course (includes variations of W); Completed = student received a grade of $A$, $B$, $C$, $D$, $F$, I, IP, or $P$ for course; Success = student received a grade of A, B, or C for course.
2) High DE = last course in DE sequence (Level 4 for Fall 2011-Fall 2013; Level 3 for Fall 2014 onward).
3) Math "gatekeeper" courses are MATH 1314, MATH 1324, MATH 1332, MATH 1333, MATH 1414 , and MATH 1442.
4) Fall 2012 through Fall 2015 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is firsttime in college and credential seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBM001). Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using THECB methodology.
5) Developmental education (DE) referral levels are based on formal student assessment outcomes for the subject area of DE course enrollment. Students designated as "Unknown" did not have an assessment on file or could not be placed within referral range and could not be categorized based on DE course enrollment.
6) Years of progression refer to the period between initial Fall semester (cohort year) and time of measurement. Data are cumulative over time.
7) Referral level percentages are based on the total cohort (denominator $=$ cohort size).
8) Progression percentages are based on the referral level (denominator = number referred to level).
9) Students who transfer or leave Alamo Colleges are not removed from denominators.
10) In some instances, data have been updated to reflect the most current data at time of publication. Slight variations in data as recorded in prior publications may appear. However, these updates do not impact overall trends or outcomes.

Sources:
FTIC Ethnicity: ACCDODS1.XST_CBM001_ACCD
DE Referrals:
Fall 2011: ACCDODS1.ATD_F10_F11_ODS_TASP, Fall 2012: ACCDODS1.ATD_F10_F13_ODS_TASP, Fall 2013-Fall 2015:
ACCDODS1.XST_ATD_ACCD
Course Enrollment::
ACCDODS1.XST.IRES_SC

## Math Progression by Ethnicity (Continued)

|  |  |  |  |  | ted Any DE Year) |  | in Any DE Year) | Attempted RSG (1st Year) | Success in RSG (1st Year) |  | in High DE Year) |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { in RSG } \\ & \text { ear) } \end{aligned}$ |  | ess in GK d Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 1 \\ 495 \text { (19.3\%) } \end{gathered}$ | AA | 26 (5.3\%) | $A A$ | 19 (73.1\%) | AA | 11 (42.3\%) | Not Applicable |  | AA | 2 (7.7\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | 3(11.5\%) |
|  |  | A | 6(1.2\%) | A | 1 (16.7\%) | A | 1 (16.7\%) |  |  | A | 1(16.7\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | $A$ | 1(16.7\%) |
|  |  | H | 398 (80.4\%) | H | 323 (81.2\%) | H | 203 (51.0\%) |  |  | H | 38 (9.5\%) | H | 0 (0.0\%) | H | 54 (13.6\%) |
|  |  | - | 6(1.2\%) | 0 | 2 (33.3\%) | 0 | 1 (16.7\%) |  |  | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | w | 59 (11.9\%) | w | 36 (61.0\%) | W | 27 (45.8\%) |  |  | w | 6 (10.2\%) | w | 0 (0.0\%) | w | 11 (18.6\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 <br> 387 (15.1\%) | AA | 24 (6.2\%) | $A A$ | 17 (70.8\%) | AA | 7 (29.2\%) |  |  | AA | 2 (8.3\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | 1 (4.2\%) |
|  |  | A | 2 (0.5\%) | A | 1 (50.0\%) | A | 1 (50.0\%) |  |  | A | 1(50.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | $A$ | 1(50.0\%) |
|  |  | H | 300 (77.5\%) | H | 241 (80.3\%) | H | 141 (47.0\%) |  |  | H | 41 (13.7\%) | H | 0 (0.0\%) | H | 64 (21.3\%) |
|  |  | 0 | 4 (1.0\%) | 0 | 3 (75.0\%) | 0 | 1 (25.0\%) |  |  | o | 1 (25.0\%) | $\bigcirc$ | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | w | 57 (14.7\%) | w | 40 (70.2\%) | W | 29 (50.9\%) |  |  | w | 13 (22.8\%) | w | 0 (0.0\%) | w | 15 (26.3\%) |
|  | DE Level 3 <br> 584 (22.7\%) | AA | 31 (5.3\%) | $A A$ | 19 (61.3\%) | AA | 8 (25.8\%) |  |  | AA | 4(12.9\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | 6(19.4\%) |
|  |  | A | 13 (2.2\%) | A | 11 (84.6\%) | A | 7 (53.8\%) |  |  | A | 4 (30.8\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 5(38.5\%) |
|  |  | H | 408 (69.9\%) | H | 316 (77.5\%) | H | 157 (38.5\%) |  |  | H | 86 (21.1\%) | H | 0 (0.0\%) | H | 94 (23.0\%) |
|  |  | O | 8(1.4\%) | 0 | 6 (75.0\%) | 0 | 4 (50.0\%) |  |  | 0 | 1 (12.5\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | O | 4(50.0\%) |
|  |  | w | 124 (21.2\%) | w | 74 (59.7\%) | w | 44 (35.5\%) |  |  | w | 23 (18.5\%) | W | 0(0.0\%) | W | 37 (29.8\%) |
|  | DE Level 4 407 (15.8\%) <br> Total Referred 1,873 (72.9\%) | AA | 30 (7.4\%) | $A A$ | 14 (46.7\%) | AA | 6 (20.0\%) |  |  | AA | 7 (23.3\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | 15 (50.0\%) |
|  |  | A | 15 (3.7\%) | A | 2 (13.3\%) | A | 2 (13.3\%) |  |  | A | 2 (13.3\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | $A$ | 7 (46.7\%) |
|  |  | H | 243 (59.7\%) | H | 93 (38.3\%) | H | 54 (22.2\%) |  |  | H | 60 (24.7\%) | H | 0 (0.0\%) | H | 109 (44.9\%) |
|  |  | 0 | 5(1.2\%) | 0 | 1 (20.0\%) | 0 | 1 (20.0\%) |  |  | 0 | 1 (20.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | o | 2 (40.0\%) |
|  |  | w | 114 (28.0\%) | w | 41 (36.0\%) | w | 22 (19.3\%) |  |  | w | 25 (21.9\%) | w | 0 (0.0\%) | W | 46 (40.4\%) |
|  |  | AA | 111 (5.9\%) | AA | 69 (62.2\%) | AA | 32 (28.8\%) |  |  | AA | 15 (13.5\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | 25 (22.5\%) |
|  |  | A | 36 (1.9\%) | A | 15 (41.7\%) | A | 11 (30.6\%) |  |  | A | 8 (22.2\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 14 (38.9\%) |
|  |  | H | 1,349 (72.0\%) | H | 973 (72.1\%) | H | 555 (41.1\%) |  |  | H | 225 (16.7\%) | H | 0 (0.0\%) | H | 321 (23.8\%) |
|  |  | 0 | 23 (1.2\%) | 0 | 12 (52.2\%) | 0 | 7 (30.4\%) |  |  | 0 | 3 (13.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | O | 6 (26.1\%) |
|  |  | w | 354 (18.9\%) | w | 191 (54.0\%) | w | 122 (34.5\%) |  |  | w | 67 (18.9\%) | w | 0 (0.0\%) | w | 109 (30.8\%) |
|  | College Level 613 (23.8\%) | AA | 20 (3.3\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  | AA | 6 (30.0\%) |
|  |  | A | 24 (3.9\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | A | 10 (41.7\%) |
|  |  | H | 372 (60.7\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | H | 197 (53.0\%) |
|  |  | 0 | 16 (2.6\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | o | 9(56.3\%) |
|  |  | w | 181 (29.5\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | w | 78 (43.1\%) |
|  | Unknown 85 (3.3\%) | AA | 3(3.5\%) | $A A$ | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | A | 0(0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | H | 61 (71.8\%) | H | 35 (57.4\%) | H | 23 (37.7\%) |  |  | H | 10 (16.4\%) | H | 0 (0.0\%) | H | 13 (21.3\%) |
|  |  | - | 1(1.2\%) | 0 | 1(100.0\%) | 0 | 1 (100.0\%) |  |  | - | 1(100.0\%) | 0 | 0(0.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | w | 20 (23.5\%) | w | 7 (35.0\%) | w | 6 (30.0\%) |  |  | w | 4 (20.0\%) | w | 0 (0.0\%) | W | 6(30.0\%) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cohort Total } \\ & \text { 2,571 (100.0\%) } \end{aligned}$ | AA | 134 (5.2\%) | $A A$ | 70 (52.2\%) | $A A$ | 32 (23.9\%) |  |  | AA | 15 (11.2\%) | $A A$ | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | 31 (23.1\%) |
|  |  | A | 60 (2.3\%) | A | 15 (25.0\%) | A | 11 (18.3\%) |  |  | A | 8(13.3\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 24 (40.0\%) |
|  |  | H | 1,782 (69.3\%) | H | 1,028 (57.7\%) | H | 595 (33.4\%) |  |  | H | 247 (13.9\%) | H | 0 (0.0\%) | H | 531 (29.8\%) |
|  |  | O | 40 (1.6\%) | 0 | 13 (32.5\%) | 0 | 8 (20.0\%) |  |  | 0 | 4 (10.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 15 (37.5\%) |
|  |  | w | 555 (21.6\%) | w | 207 (37.3\%) | w | 132 (23.8\%) |  |  | w | 76 (13.7\%) | w | 0 (0.0\%) | w | 193(34.8\%) |
|  | DE Level 1 615 (22.7\%) | AA | 52 (8.5\%) | $A A$ | 45 (86.5\%) | AA | 19 (36.5\%) | Not Applicable |  | AA | 3 (5.8\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | 4 (7.7\%) |
|  |  | A | 7 (1.1\%) | A | 5 (71.4\%) | A | 4 (57.1\%) |  |  | A | 1(14.3\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 1(14.3\%) |
|  |  | H | 460 (74.8\%) | H | 387 (84.1\%) | H | 228 (49.6\%) |  |  | H | 46 (10.0\%) | H | 2 (0.4\%) | H | 47 (10.2\%) |
|  |  | O | 12 (2.0\%) | 0 | 5 (41.7\%) | 0 | 3 (25.0\%) |  |  | 0 | 2 (16.7\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 2 (16.7\%) |
|  |  | w | 84 (13.7\%) | w | 55 (65.5\%) | w | 33 (39.3\%) |  |  | w | 8 (9.5\%) | w | 0 (0.0\%) | w | 13 (15.5\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 <br> 309 (11.4\%) | AA | 22 (7.1\%) | $A A$ | 14 (63.6\%) | AA | 6 (27.3\%) |  |  | AA | 2 (9.1\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | 4(18.2\%) |
|  |  | A | 3(1.0\%) | A | 2 (66.7\%) | A | 1 (33.3\%) |  |  | A | 1 (33.3\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 1 (33.3\%) |
|  |  | H | 209 (67.6\%) | H | 168 (80.4\%) | H | 110 (52.6\%) |  |  | H | 27 (12.9\%) | H | 1 (0.5\%) | H | 38 (18.2\%) |
|  |  | - | 5 (1.6\%) | 0 | 3 (60.0\%) | 0 | 3 (60.0\%) |  |  | - | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 1 (20.0\%) |
|  |  | w | 70 (22.7\%) | w | 47 (67.1\%) | w | 36 (51.4\%) |  |  | w | 9(12.9\%) | w | 0 (0.0\%) | W | 26 (37.1\%) |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 3 \\ 276 \text { (10.2\%) } \end{gathered}$ | AA | 19 (6.9\%) | AA | 17 (89.5\%) | AA | 9 (47.4\%) |  |  | AA | 5 (26.3\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | 9 (47.4\%) |
|  |  | A | 6 (2.2\%) | A | 4 (66.7\%) | A | 3 (50.0\%) |  |  | A | 2 (33.3\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | $A$ | 4(66.7\%) |
|  |  | H | 179 (64.9\%) | H | 146 (81.6\%) | H | 88 (49.2\%) |  |  | H | 23 (12.8\%) | H | 0 (0.0\%) | H | 58 (32.4\%) |
|  |  | 0 | 3(1.1\%) | 0 | 1 (33.3\%) | 0 | 1 (33.3\%) |  |  | 0 | 1(33.3\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | O | 2 (66.7\%) |
|  |  | w | 69 (25.0\%) | w | 44 (63.8\%) | w | 33 (47.8\%) |  |  | w | 13 (18.8\%) | w | 0 (0.0\%) | w | 28 (40.6\%) |
|  | DE Level 4 <br> 133 (4.9\%) | AA | 8 (6.0\%) | AA | 4 (50.0\%) | AA | 3 (37.5\%) |  |  | AA | 4 (50.0\%) | AA | 0(0.0\%) | AA | 2 (25.0\%) |
|  |  | A | 7 (5.3\%) | A | 3 (42.9\%) | A | 3 (42.9\%) |  |  | A | 3 (42.9\%) | A | 0(0.0\%) | A | 4(57.1\%) |
|  |  | H | 87 (65.4\%) | H | 53 (60.9\%) | H | 27 (31.0\%) |  |  | H | 32 (36.8\%) | H | 1(1.1\%) | H | 38 (43.7\%) |
|  |  | O | 2 (1.5\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 2 (100.0\%) |
|  |  | w | 29 (21.8\%) | w | 14 (48.3\%) | w | 10 (34.5\%) |  |  | w | 11 (37.9\%) | w | 0 (0.0\%) | w | 19 (65.5\%) |
|  | Total Referred$1,333(49.2 \%)$ | AA | 101 (7.6\%) | AA | 80 (79.2\%) | AA | 37 (36.6\%) |  |  | AA | 14 (13.9\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | 19 (18.8\%) |
|  |  | A | 23 (1.7\%) | A | 14 (60.9\%) | A | 11 (47.8\%) |  |  | A | 7 (30.4\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 10 (43.5\%) |
|  |  | H | 935 (70.1\%) | H | 754 (80.6\%) | H | 453 (48.4\%) |  |  | H | 128 (13.7\%) | H | 4 (0.4\%) | H | 181 (19.4\%) |
|  |  | - | 22 (1.7\%) | 0 | 9(40.9\%) | 0 | 7 (31.8\%) |  |  | o | 3(13.6\%) | 0 | 0(0.0\%) | 0 | 7 (31.8\%) |
|  |  | w | 252 (18.9\%) | w | 160 (63.5\%) | w | 112 (44.4\%) |  |  | w | 41 (16.3\%) | w | 0 (0.0\%) | w | 86 (34.1\%) |
|  | College Level$1,337 \text { (49.4\%) }$ | AA | 61 (4.6\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  | AA | 32 (52.5\%) |
|  |  | A | 32 (2.4\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | A | 21 (65.6\%) |
|  |  | H | 925 (69.2\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | H | 477 (51.6\%) |
|  |  | o | 27 (2.0\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | o | 14 (51.9\%) |
|  |  | w | 292 (21.8\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | w | 170 (58.2\%) |
|  |  | AA | 5 (13.5\%) | AA | 2 (40.0\%) | AA | 1 (20.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | 1 (20.0\%) |
|  |  | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | H | 23 (62.2\%) | H | 7 (30.4\%) | H | 2 (8.7\%) |  |  | H | 0 (0.0\%) | H | 0 (0.0\%) | H | 7 (30.4\%) |
|  | Unknown | 0 | 3 (8.1\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  | 37 (1.4\%) | w | 6 (16.2\%) | w | 0 (0.0\%) | w | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | w | 1 (16.7\%) | w | 0 (0.0\%) | W | 1(16.7\%) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cohort Total } \\ & \text { 2,707 (100.0\%) } \end{aligned}$ | AA | 167 (6.2\%) | AA | 83 (49.7\%) | AA | 39 (23.4\%) |  |  | AA | 14 (8.4\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | 52 (31.1\%) |
|  |  | A | 55 (2.0\%) | A | 14 (25.5\%) | A | 11 (20.0\%) |  |  | A | 7 (12.7\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | $A$ | 31 (56.4\%) |
|  |  | H | 1,883 (69.6\%) | H | 796 (42.3\%) | H | 474 (25.2\%) |  |  | H | 137 (7.3\%) | H | 4 (0.2\%) | H | 665 (35.3\%) |
|  |  | O | 52 (1.9\%) | o | 11 (21.2\%) | 0 | $9(17.3 \%)$ |  |  | 0 | 4 (7.7\%) | $\bigcirc$ | 0 (0.0\%) | $\bigcirc$ | 21 (40.4\%) |
|  |  | w | 550 (20.3\%) | w | 168 (30.5\%) | w | 118(21.5\%) |  |  | w | 45 (8.2\%) | w | 0 (0.0\%) | w | 257 (46.7\%) |

$A A=$ African-American $\quad A=$ Asian $\quad H=$ Hispanic $\quad O=$ Other $\quad W=$ White

## Math Progression by Ethnicity (Continued)



## Math Progression by Age

Across all cohorts, levels, and age groups, after 3 years, no trend in "gatekeeper" success was evident. When comparing the 2013 cohort to the 2011 cohort, referred students between the ages of 22 and 50 experienced increases in "gatekeeper" success.


Notes:

1) Attempted = student received a grade for course (includes variations of W); Completed = student received a grade of $A, B, C, D, F, I, I P$, or $P$ for course; Success = student received a grade of A, B, or C for course.
2) High DE = last course in DE sequence (Level 4 for Fall 2011-Fall 2013; Level 3 for Fall 2014 onward).
3) Math "gatekeeper" courses are MATH 1314, MATH 1324, MATH 1332, MATH 1333, MATH 1414, and MATH 1442.
4) Fall 2012 through Fall 2015 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is firsttime in college and credential seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBM001). Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using THECB methodology.
5) Developmental education (DE) referral levels are based on formal student assessment outcomes for the subject area of DE course enrollment. Students designated as "Unknown" did not have an assessment on file or could not be placed within referral range and could not be categorized based on DE course enrollment.
6) Years of progression refer to the period between initial Fall semester (cohort year) and time of measurement. Data are cumulative over time.
7) Referral level percentages are based on the total cohort (denominator = cohort size).
8) Progression percentages are based on the referral level (denominator = number referred to level).
9) Students who transfer or leave Alamo Colleges are not removed from denominators.
10) In some instances, data have been updated to reflect the most current data at time of publication. Slight variations in data as recorded in prior publications may appear. However, these updates do not impact overall trends or outcomes.

Sources:
FTIC Age: ACCDODS1.XST_ATD_ACCD
DE Referrals:
Course Enrollment::
Fall 2011: ACCDODS1.ATD_F10_F11_ODS_TASP, Fall 2012: ACCDODS1.ATD_F10_F13_ODS_TASP, Fall 2013-Fall 2015: ACCDODS1.XST_ATD_ACCD
ACCDODS1.XST.IRES_SC

Math Progression by Age
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Math Progression by Age


## Math Progression by Enrollment Status

Across all cohorts, generally full-time students compared to part-time students, successfully passed both Math DE and "gatekeeper" courses at higher rates. When comparing the 2013 cohort to the 2011 cohort, referred and non-referred part-time students experienced an increase in "gatekeeper" success.

|  |  |  |  |  | ed Any DE Year) |  | in Any DE Year) | Attempted RSG (1st Year) | Success in RSG (1st Year) |  | in High DE Year) | Success in RSG (3rd Year) |  | cess in GK (rd Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DE Level 1 | FT | 246 (38.5\%) | FT | 207 (84.1\%) | FT | 132 (53.7\%) | Not Applicable |  | FT | 15 (6.1\%) | Not Applicable | FT | 22 (8.9\%) |
|  | 639 (20.6\%) | PT | 393 (61.5\%) | PT | 273 (69.5\%) | PT | 145 (36.9\%) |  |  | PT | 13 (3.3\%) |  | PT | 21 (5.3\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | FT | 234 (46.5\%) | FT | 199 (85.0\%) | FT | 122 (52.1\%) |  |  | FT | 31 (13.2\%) |  | FT | 39 (16.7\%) |
|  | 503 (16.2\%) | PT | 269 (53.5\%) | PT | 172 (63.9\%) | PT | 84 (31.2\%) |  |  | PT | 15 (5.6\%) |  | PT | 17 (6.3\%) |
|  | DE Level 3 | FT | 359 (45.8\%) | FT | 309 (86.1\%) | FT | 166 (46.2\%) |  |  | FT | 86 (24.0\%) |  | FT | 88 (24.5\%) |
|  | 784 (25.2\%) | PT | 425 (54.2\%) | PT | 302 (71.1\%) | PT | 138 (32.5\%) |  |  | PT | 70 (16.5\%) |  | PT | 59 (13.9\%) |
|  | DE Level 4 | FT | 218 (42.2\%) | FT | 159 (72.9\%) | FT | 94 (43.1\%) |  |  | FT | 98 (45.0\%) |  | FT | 78 (35.8\%) |
|  | 516 (16.6\%) | PT | 298 (57.8\%) | PT | 158 (53.0\%) | PT | 81 (27.2\%) |  |  | PT | 83 (27.9\%) |  | PT | 85 (28.5\%) |
|  | Total Referred | FT | 1,057 (43.3\%) | FT | 874 (82.7\%) | FT | 514 (48.6\%) |  |  | FT | 230 (21.8\%) |  | FT | 227 (21.5\%) |
|  | 2,442 (78.5\%) | PT | 1,385 (56.7\%) | PT | 905 (65.3\%) | PT | 448 (32.3\%) |  |  | PT | 181 (13.1\%) |  | PT | 182 (13.1\%) |
|  | College Level | FT | 322 (53.2\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | FT | 186 (57.8\%) |
|  | 605 (19.5\%) | PT | 283 (46.8\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PT | 112 (39.6\%) |
|  | Unknown | FT | 11 (17.7\%) | FT | 2 (18.2\%) | FT | 2 (18.2\%) | Not Applicable |  | FT | 2 (18.2\%) | Not Applicable | FT | 1 (9.1\%) |
|  | 62 (2.0\%) | PT | 51 (82.3\%) | PT | 6 (11.8\%) | PT | 5 (9.8\%) |  |  | PT | 2 (3.9\%) |  | PT | 2 (3.9\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | FT | 1,390 (44.7\%) | FT | 914 (65.8\%) | FT | 548 (39.4\%) |  |  | FT | 258 (18.6\%) |  | FT | 414 (29.8\%) |
|  | 3,109 (100.0\%) | PT | 1,719 (55.3\%) | PT | 924 (53.8\%). | PT | 459 (26.7\%) |  |  | PT | 190(11.1\%) |  | PT | 296(17.2\%) |
|  | DELevel 1 | FT | 195 (39.4\%) | FT | 173(88.7\%) | FT | 119 (61.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | FT | 31(15.9\%) | FT----0(0.0\%) | FT | 39 (20.0\%) |
|  | 495 (19.3\%) | PT | 300 (60.6\%) | PT | 208 (69.3\%) | PT | 124 (41.3\%) |  |  | PT | 16 (5.3\%) | PT $0000 \%$ | PT | 30 (10.0\%) |
|  | DELevel 2 | FT | 157 (40.6\%) | FT | 135 (86.0\%) | FT | 86 (54.8\%) |  |  | FT | 29 (18.5\%) | FT $0(0.0 \%)$ | FT | 43 (27.4\%) |
|  | 387 (15.1\%) | PT | 230 (59.4\%) | PT | 167 (72.6\%) | PT | 93 (40.4\%) |  |  | PT | 29 (12.6\%) | PT 0 (0.0\%) | PT | 38 (16.5\%) |
|  | DE Level 3 | FT | 258 (44.2\%) | FT | 215 (83.3\%) | FT | 111 (43.0\%) |  |  | FT | 64 (24.8\%) | FT $0(0.0 \%)$ | FT | 81 (31.4\%) |
|  | 584 (22.7\%) | PT | 326 (55.8\%) | PT | 211 (64.7\%) | PT | 109 (33.4\%) |  |  | PT | 54 (16.6\%) | PT 0 (0.0\%) | PT | 65 (19.9\%) |
|  | DE Level 4 | FT | 180 (44.2\%) | FT | 76 (42.2\%) | FT | 48 (26.7\%) |  |  | FT | 51 (28.3\%) | FT 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 100 (55.6\%) |
|  | $407 \text { (15.8\%) }$ | PT | 227 (55.8\%) | PT | 75 (33.0\%) | PT | 37 (16.3\%) |  |  | PT | 44 (19.4\%) | PT $0(0.0 \%)$ | PT | 79 (34.8\%) |
|  | Total Referred | FT | 790 (42.2\%) | FT | 599 (75.8\%) | FT | 364 (46.1\%) |  |  | FT | 175 (22.2\%) | FT 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 263 (33.3\%) |
|  | 1,873(72.9\%) | PT | 1,083 (57.8\%) | PT | 661 (61.0\%) | PT | 363 (33.5\%) |  |  | PT | 143 (13.2\%) | PT $0(0.0 \%)$ | PT | 212 (19.6\%) |
|  | College Level | FT | 334 (54.5\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | FT | 191 (57.2\%) |
|  | 613 (23.8\%) | PT | 279 (45.5\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PT | 109 (39.1\%) |
|  | Unknown | FT | 28 (32.9\%) | FT | 21 (75.0\%) | FT | 15 (53.6\%) | Applicable |  | FT | 7 (25.0\%) | FT 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 8(28.6\%) |
|  | 85 (3.3\%) | PT | 57 (67.1\%) | PT | 22 (38.6\%) | PT | 15 (26.3\%) |  |  | PT | 8(14.0\%) | PT $0(0.0 \%)$ | PT | 11 (19.3\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | FT | 1,152 (44.8\%) | FT | 637 (55.3\%) | FT | 388 (33.7\%) |  |  | FT | 189 (16.4\%) | FT $\quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | FT | 462 (40.1\%) |
|  | 2,571(100.0\%) | PT | 1,419 (55.2\%) | PT | 696(49.0\%). | PT | 390(27.5\%) |  |  | PT | 161(11.3\%) | PT | PT | 332 (23.4\%) |

Notes:

1) Attempted = student received a grade for course (includes variations of $W$ ); Completed = student received a grade of $A, B, C, D, F, I, I P$, or $P$ for course; Success = student received a grade of A, B, or C for course.
2) High DE = last course in DE sequence (Level 4).
3) Math "gatekeeper" courses are MATH 1314, MATH 1324, MATH 1332, MATH 1333, MATH 1414, and MATH 1442.
4) Fall 2012 through Fall 2015 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is firsttime in college and credential seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBM001). Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using THECB methodology.
5) Developmental education (DE) referral levels are based on formal student assessment outcomes for the subject area of DE course enrollment. Students designated as "Unknown" did not have an assessment on file or could not be placed within referral range and could not be categorized based on DE course enrollment.
6) Years of progression refer to the period between initial Fall semester (cohort year) and time of measurement. Data are cumulative over time.
7) Referral level percentages are based on the total cohort (denominator = cohort size).
8) Progression percentages are based on the referral level (denominator = number referred to level).
9) Students who transfer or leave Alamo Colleges are not removed from denominators.
10) In some instances, data have been updated to reflect the most current data at time of publication. Slight variations in data as recorded in prior publications may appear. However, these updates do not impact overall trends or outcomes.

Sources:
FTIC FT/PT Status: ACCDODS1.XST_CBM001_ACCD
DE Referrals: Fall 2011: ACCDODS1.ATD_F10_F11_ODS_TASP, Fall 2012: ACCDODS1.ATD_F10_F13_ODS_TASP, Fall 2013-Fall 2015: ACCDODS1.XST_ATD_ACCD
Course Enrollment::
ACCDODS1.XST.IRES_SC

## Math Progression by Enrollment Status (Continued)



## Math Progression by Pell Status

In general, non-referred Pell recipients generally successfully passed Math "gatekeeper" courses at higher rates than did non-referred Pell non-recipients. When comparing the 2013 cohort to the 2011 cohort, referred and non-referred Pell non -recipients experienced increases in "gatekeeper" success.

|  |  |  |  |  | pted Any DE <br> st Year) |  | in Any DE Year) | Attempted RSG <br> (1st Year) | Success in RSG <br> (1st Year) |  | in High DE Year) | Success in RSG <br> (3rd Year) |  | cess in GK <br> (3rd Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DE Level 1 | Y | 378 (59.2\%) | $Y$ | 316 (83.6\%) | Y | 189 (50.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | Y | 20 (5.3\%) | Not Applicable | Y | 28 (7.4\%) |
|  | 639 (20.6\%) | N | 261 (40.8\%) | N | 164 (62.8\%) | N | 88 (33.7\%) |  |  | N | 8 (3.1\%) |  | N | 15 (5.7\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | Y | 283 (56.3\%) | $Y$ | 242 (85.5\%) | Y | 122 (43.1\%) |  |  | Y | 29 (10.2\%) |  | Y | 35 (12.4\%) |
|  | 503 (16.2\%) | N | 220 (43.7\%) | N | 129 (58.6\%) | N | 84 (38.2\%) |  |  | N | 17 (7.7\%) |  | N | 21 (9.5\%) |
|  | DE Level 3 | Y | 436 (55.6\%) | $Y$ | 376 (86.2\%) | Y | 186 (42.7\%) |  |  | Y | 93 (21.3\%) |  | Y | 83 (19.0\%) |
|  | 784 (25.2\%) | N | 348 (44.4\%) | N | 235 (67.5\%) | N | 118 (33.9\%) |  |  | N | 63 (18.1\%) |  | N | 64 (18.4\%) |
|  | DE Level 4 | Y | 217 (42.1\%) | $Y$ | 158 (72.8\%) | $Y$ | 88 (40.6\%) |  |  | Y | 88 (40.6\%) |  | Y | 79 (36.4\%) |
|  | 516 (16.6\%) | N | 299 (57.9\%) | N | 159 (53.2\%) | N | 87 (29.1\%) |  |  | N | 93 (31.1\%) |  | N | 84 (28.1\%) |
|  | Total Referred | Y | 1,314 (53.8\%) | $Y$ | 1,092 (83.1\%) | Y | 585 (44.5\%) |  |  | Y | 230 (17.5\%) |  | Y | 225 (17.1\%) |
|  | 2,442 (78.5\%) | N | 1,128(46.2\%) | N | 687 (60.9\%) | N | 377 (33.4\%) |  |  | N | 181 (16.0\%) |  | N | 184 (16.3\%) |
|  | College Level | Y | 236 (39.0\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | Y | 136 (57.6\%) |
|  | $605 \text { (19.5\%) }$ | N | 369 (61.0\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | N | 162 (43.9\%) |
|  | Unknown | Y | 16 (25.8\%) | $Y$ | 3 (18.8\%) | Y | 3 (18.8\%) | Not Applicable |  | Y | 3 (18.8\%) | Not Applicable | Y | 2 (12.5\%) |
|  | $62 \text { (2.0\%) }$ | N | 46 (74.2\%) | N | 5(10.9\%) | N | 4 (8.7\%) |  |  | N | 1 (2.2\%) |  | N | 1 (2.2\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | Y | 1,566(50.4\%) | $r$ | 1,121 (71.6\%) | Y | 609 (38.9\%) |  |  | Y | 251 (16.0\%) |  | Y | 363 (23.2\%) |
|  | $3,109(100.0 \%)$ | N | 1,543(49.6\%) | N | 717 (46.5\%) | N | 398(25.8\%) |  |  | N | 197 (12.8\%) |  | N | 347 (22.5\%) |
|  | DELevel 1 | Y | 293 (59.2\%) | Y | 243 (82.9\%) | Y | 153 (52.2\%) | Not Applicable |  | $\overline{\mathrm{Y}}$ | 28 (9.6\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 35 (11.9\%) |
|  | $495 \text { (19.3\%) }$ | N | 202 (40.8\%) | N | 138 (68.3\%) | N | 90 (44.6\%) |  |  | N | 19 (9.4\%) | $\mathrm{N} \quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | N | 34 (16.8\%) |
|  |  | Y | $210 \text { (54.3\%) }$ | $Y$ | 182 (86.7\%) | $Y$ | 98 (46.7\%) |  |  | Y | 31 (14.8\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 40 (19.0\%) |
|  | $387 \text { (15.1\%) }$ | N | $177 \text { (45.7\%) }$ | N | $120 \text { (67.8\%) }$ | N | 81 (45.8\%) |  |  | N | 27 (15.3\%) | $\mathrm{N} \quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | N | 41 (23.2\%) |
|  | DE Level 3 | Y | 305 (52.2\%) | $Y$ | 252 (82.6\%) | Y | 123 (40.3\%) |  |  | Y | 71 (23.3\%) | $\mathrm{Y} \quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | Y | 75 (24.6\%) |
|  | 584 (22.7\%) | N | 279 (47.8\%) | N | 174 (62.4\%) | N | 97 (34.8\%) |  |  | N | 47 (16.8\%) | $\mathrm{N} \quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | N | 71 (25.4\%) |
|  | DE Level 4 | Y | 173 (42.5\%) | $Y$ | 69 (39.9\%) | Y | 38 (22.0\%) |  |  | Y | 40 (23.1\%) | Y - 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 78 (45.1\%) |
|  | 407 (15.8\%) | N | 234 (57.5\%) | N | 82 (35.0\%) | N | 47 (20.1\%) |  |  | N | 55 (23.5\%) | $\mathrm{N} \quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | N | 101 (43.2\%) |
|  | Total Referred | Y | 981 (52.4\%) | Y | 746 (76.0\%) | Y | 412 (42.0\%) |  |  | Y | 170 (17.3\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 228 (23.2\%) |
|  | 1,873 (72.9\%) | N | 892 (47.6\%) | N | 514 (57.6\%) | N | 315 (35.3\%) |  |  | N | 148 (16.6\%) | $\mathrm{N} \quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | N | 247 (27.7\%) |
|  | College Level | Y | 241 (39.3\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | Y | 134 (55.6\%) |
|  | 613 (23.8\%) | N | 372 (60.7\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | N | 166 (44.6\%) |
|  | Unknown | Y | 41 (48.2\%) | $Y$ | 28 (68.3\%) | Y | 16 (39.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | Y | 10 (24.4\%) | $\mathrm{Y} \quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | Y | 10 (24.4\%) |
|  | $85 \text { (3.3\%) }$ | N | 44 (51.8\%) | N | 15 (34.1\%) | N | 14 (31.8\%) |  |  | N | 5 (11.4\%) | $\mathrm{N} \quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | N | 9 (20.5\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | Y | 1,263 (49.1\%) | $Y$ | 791 (62.6\%) | Y | 441 (34.9\%) |  |  | Y | 189 (15.0\%) | Y $\quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | Y | 372 (29.5\%) |
|  | 2,571(100.0\%) | N | 1,308(50.9\%) | N | 542 (41.4\%) | N | 337 (25.8\%) |  |  | N | 161 (12.3\%) | N_--_- 0 (0.0\%) | N | 422 (32.3\%). |

Notes:

1) Attempted = student received a grade for course (includes variations of W); Completed = student received a grade of A, B, C, D, F, I, IP, or P for course; Success = student received a grade of A, B, or C for course.
2) High $D E=$ last course in $D E$ sequence (Level 4).
3) Math "gatekeeper" courses are MATH 1314, MATH 1324, MATH 1332, MATH 1333, MATH 1414, and MATH 1442.
4) Fall 2012 through Fall 2015 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is first -time in college and credential seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBM001). Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using THECB methodology.
5) Developmental education (DE) referral levels are based on formal student assessment outcomes for the subject area of DE course enrollment. Students designated as "Unknown" did not have an assessment on file or could not be placed within referral range and could not be categorized based on DE course enrollment.
6) Years of progression refer to the period between initial Fall semester (cohort year) and time of measurement. Data are cumulative over time.
7) Referral level percentages are based on the total cohort (denominator = cohort size).
8) Progression percentages are based on the referral level (denominator = number referred to level).
9) Students who transfer or leave Alamo Colleges are not removed from denominators.
10) In some instances, data have been updated to reflect the most current data at time of publication. Slight variations in data as recorded in prior publications may appear. However, these updates do not impact overall trends or outcomes.

Sources:

FTIC Pell Status:
DE Referrals:

Course Enrollment::

ACCDODS1.XST_FADS_ACCD
Fall 2011: ACCDODS1.ATD_F10_F11_ODS_TASP, Fall 2012: ACCDODS1.ATD_F10_F13_ODS_TASP, Fall 2013-Fall 2015:
ACCDODS1.XST_ATD_ACCD
ACCDODS1.XST.IRES_SC

## Math Progression by Pell Status (Continued)



Yes $=$ Pell $\quad$ No $=$ No Pell

## Math Progression by Veteran Status

Veterans generally successfully passed Math DE and "gatekeeper" courses at higher rates than did non-veterans. When comparing the 2013 cohort to the 2011 cohort, referred veterans experienced an increase in "gatekeeper" success.


## Notes:

1) Attempted = student received a grade for course (includes variations of W); Completed = student received a grade of A, B, C, D, F, I, IP, or P for course; Success = student received a grade of A, B, or C for course.
2) High $D E=$ last course in $D E$ sequence (Level 4).
3) Math "gatekeeper" courses are MATH 1314, MATH 1324, MATH 1332, MATH 1333, MATH 1414, and MATH 1442.
4) Fall 2012 through Fall 2015 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is firsttime in college and credential seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBM001). Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using THECB methodology.
5) Developmental education (DE) referral levels are based on formal student assessment outcomes for the subject area of DE course enrollment. Students designated as "Unknown" did not have an assessment on file or could not be placed within referral range and could not be categorized based on DE course enrollment.
6) Years of progression refer to the period between initial Fall semester (cohort year) and time of measurement. Data are cumulative over time.
7) Referral level percentages are based on the total cohort (denominator = cohort size).
8) Progression percentages are based on the referral level (denominator = number referred to level).
9) Students who transfer or leave Alamo Colleges are not removed from denominators.
10) In some instances, data have been updated to reflect the most current data at time of publication. Slight variations in data as recorded in prior publications may appear. However, these updates do not impact overall trends or outcomes.

Sources:

FTIC Veteran Status:
DE Referrals:

Course Enrollment::

ACCDODS1.XST.IRES_SC
Fall 2011: ACCDODS1.ATD_F10_F11_ODS_TASP, Fall 2012: ACCDODS1.ATD_F10_F13_ODS_TASP, Fall 2013-Fall 2015:
ACCDODS1.XST_ATD_ACCD
ACCDODS1.XST.IRES_SC

## Math Progression by Veteran Status (Continued)



# SAN ANTONIO COLLEGE PRODUCTIVE GRADE RATES (PGR) 

## AtD Indicator \#3: Successfully Complete the Courses They Attempt

This report compares the 1- to 5-year productive grade rates (PGR) of the Fall 2010 through Fall 2014 FTIC cohorts for San Antonio College. Productive grade rates represent grades of $C$ or higher based on all courses (cumulative) through the Fall semester of first, second, third, fourth, and fifth years by course section location. These rates were examined by various student and academic characteristics.
$\diamond$ Productive grade rates at San Antonio College fluctuated between 69\%-75\% across all cohorts and all years.
$\diamond$ Female students consistently demonstrated higher productive grade rates than did male students.
$\diamond$ Productive grade rates of Asian students were higher than other student groups across the cohorts and years.
$\diamond$ Overall, students in the 25 and older age groups had higher productive grade rates than did students in younger age groups.
$\diamond$ Full-time students consistently produced higher productive grade rates than part-students.
$\diamond$ Across the cohorts, productive grade rates among non-Pell recipients were higher than among Pell recipients.
$\diamond$ Productive grade rates were higher among veteran students than non-veteran students.
$\diamond$ Across the cohorts, productive grade rates were higher among students not referred to developmental education than among students referred to developmental education.

## Total Productive Grade Rates

Productive grade rates at San Antonio College fluctuated between $69 \%-75 \%$ across all cohorts and all years. Productive grade rates among all cohorts and all years peaked in the first year Fall 2015 cohort at $75 \%$. Productive grade rates remained relatively unchanged from the first year to the second year in all cohorts. Productive grade rates in the Fall 2011 cohort grew 2.2 percentage points from the first year (68.7\%) to the fifth year (70.9\%).


[^4]
## Productive Grade Rates by Gender

Across each cohort and each year, female students consistently demonstrated higher productive grade rates than did male students. Across the cohorts productive grade rates for both male and female students increased from the 2011 cohort to the most recent cohort each year. Overall, productive grade rates ranged from a low of $66.1 \%$ (male, 2014, 1st year) to a high of $76.6 \%$ (female, 2015, 1st year).


## Notes:

(1) Productive grade rates represent grades of $C$ or higher based on all courses (cumulative) through the Fall semester of the first, second, third, fourth, and fifth year.
(2) Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC cohort methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using the THECB methodology.
(3) Fall 2012 FTIC student cohort is defined by a combination of THECB (demographic profile, persistence rates, and graduation rates) and True FTIC (productive grade rates, progression through developmental and gatekeeper courses) methodologies.
(4) Fall 2013, 2014, and 2015 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is firsttime in college and credential-seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBMOO1).
(5) Sources: FTIC Demographics ACCDODS.XST_CBM001_ACCD; Course Enrollment ACCDODS1.XST_IRES_SC

## Productive Grade Rates by Ethnicity

Productive grade rates of Asian students were higher than all other student groups across the cohorts and years. Other and White students demonstrated higher productive grade rates than African American and Hispanic students. Most productive grade rates across all student groups increased from the 2011 cohort to the most recent cohort each year. First year Fall 2015 rates of Hispanic students ( $73.8 \%$ ) climbed 7.0 percentage points higher than the first year Fall 2011 cohort (66.8\%).


Notes:
(1) Productive grade rates represent grades of $C$ or higher based on all courses (cumulative) through the Fall semester of the first, second, third, fourth, and fifth year.
(2) Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC cohort methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using the THECB methodology.
(3) Fall 2012 FTIC student cohort is defined by a combination of THECB (demographic profile, persistence rates, and graduation rates) and True FTIC (productive grade rates, progression through developmental and gatekeeper courses) methodologies.
(4) Fall 2013, 2014, and 2015 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is firsttime in college and credential-seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBM001).
(5) African American includes Black or African American, and multiple racial categories of which one is Black or African American; Asian includes Asian and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander; Hispanic includes Hispanic or Latino; and Other includes American Indian or Alaskan Native, International, and Unknown.
(6) Sources: FTIC Demographics ACCDODS.XST_CBM001_ACCD; Course Enrollment ACCDODS1.XST_IRES_SC

## Productive Grade Rates by Age

Overall, students in the 25 and older age groups exhibited higher productive grade rates than did students in younger age groups. Students in the 17 or less and 18-21 age groups had lower productive grade rates than students in older age groups. Students in the Fall 2011 cohort in all age groups displayed increases in productive grade rates from the first year to the fifth year.


Notes:
(1) Productive grade rates represent grades of $C$ or higher based on all courses (cumulative) through the Fall semester of the first, second, third, fourth, and fifth year.
(2) and Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC cohort methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using the THECB methodology.
(3) Fall 2012 FTIC student cohort is defined by a combination of THECB (demographic profile, persistence rates, and graduation rates) and True FTIC (productive grade rates, progression through developmental and gatekeeper courses) methodologies.
(4) Fall 2013, 2014, and 2015 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is firsttime in college and credential-seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBMOO1).
(5) Age as reported at the Fall semester of the cohort year.
(6) Sources: FTIC Demographics ACCDODS.XST_CBM001_ACCD; Course Enrollment ACCDODS1.XST_IRES_SC

## Productive Grade Rates by Enrollment Status

Full-time students consistently produced higher productive grade rates than part-students in each cohort and each year. Productive grade rates increased from the Fall 2011 cohort to the most recent cohort each year. Productive grade rates of full-time students ranged from $70 \%$ to $78 \%$, while part-time student rates ranged from $66 \%$ to $74 \%$. Fall 2015 first year productive grade rates were among the highest throughout the cohorts and years.


[^5]
## Productive Grade Rates by Pell Status

Across each cohort and year, productive grade rates were higher among non-Pell grant recipients than Pell grant recipients. Productive grade rates of both Pell and non-Pell recipients increased from the 2011 cohort to the most recent cohort each year. Productive grade rates of both Pell and non-Pell grant recipients in the Fall 2011 cohort increased from the first year to the fifth year.


Notes:
(1) Productive grade rates represent grades of C or higher based on all courses (cumulative) through the Fall semester of the first, second, third, fourth, and fifth year.
(2) Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC cohort methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using the THECB methodology.
(3) Fall 2012 FTIC student cohort is defined by a combination of THECB (demographic profile, persistence rates, and graduation rates) and True FTIC (productive grade rates, progression through developmental and gatekeeper courses) methodologies.
(4) Fall 2013, 2014, and 2015 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is firsttime in college and credential-seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBM001).
(5) Pell status as reported at the Fall semester of the cohort year.
(6) Sources: Pell ACCDODS1.XST_FADS_ACCD; Course Enrollment ACCDODS1.XST_IRES_SC

## Productive Grade Rates by Veteran Status

Overall, across each cohort and each year, productive grade rates were higher among veteran students than non-veteran students. First year productive grade rates among veteran students exhibited an increase of 2.9 percentage points from the Fall 2011 cohort (73.9) to the Fall 2015 cohort (76.8\%). During the same period, non-veteran students' productive grade rates increased 6.7 percentage points.


## Notes:

(1) Productive grade rates represent grades of $C$ or higher based on all courses (cumulative) through the Fall semester of the first, second, third, fourth, and fifth year.
(2) Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC cohort methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using the THECB methodology.
(3) Fall 2012 FTIC student cohort is defined by a combination of THECB (demographic profile, persistence rates, and graduation rates) and True FTIC (productive grade rates, progression through developmental and gatekeeper courses) methodologies.
(4) Fall 2013, 2014, and 2015 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is firsttime in college and credential-seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBMOO1).
(5) Veteran status as reported at the Fall semester of the cohort year.
(6) Sources: Veteran ACCDODS1.XST_IRES_SC; Course Enrollment ACCDODS1.XST_IRES_SC

## Productive Grade Rates by Referral to English Developmental Education

FTIC students not referred to English developmental education had higher productive grade rates than did students who were referred to English developmental education. First year referred student productive grade rate of the Fall 2015 cohort ( $72.9 \%$ ) climbed 9.1 percentage points over the first year Fall 2011 cohort ( $63.8 \%$ ). Additionally, first year nonreferred student productive grade rates of the Fall 2015 cohort ( $76.7 \%$ ) grew 4.6 percentage points over the Fall 2011 cohort ( $72.1 \%$ ). In the Fall 2011 cohort, productive grade rates of referred students grew 3.3 percentage points from the first year to the fifth year, while rates for students not-referred to English DE grew 1.7 percentage points during the same period. INRW courses are reported as English courses from Fall 2014 cohort onward (see note below).


Notes:
(1) Productive grade rates represent grades of C or higher based on all courses (cumulative) through the Fall semester of the first, second, third, fourth, and fifth year.
(2) Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC cohort methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using the THECB methodology.
(3) Fall 2012 FTIC student cohort is defined by a combination of THECB (demographic profile, persistence rates, and graduation rates) and True FTIC (productive grade rates, progression through developmental and gatekeeper courses) methodologies.
(4) Fall 2013, 2014, and 2015 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is firsttime in college and credential-seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBMOO1).
(5) Beginning in Fall 2014, Integrated Reading and Writing (INRW) developmental education courses replaced English and Reading developmental courses. INRW 0305 combined READ 0301, READ 0302, and ENGL 0300. INRW 0420 combined READ 0303 and ENGL 0301. RSG (Ready, Set, Go; ENGL 1301+) is an accelerated English course that allows students to move right into ENGL 1301. It combines ENGL 1301 and INRW 0100. INRW courses are reported as English courses from Fall 2014 cohort onward. Reading courses are not reported from Fall 2014 onward.
(6) Sources: DE Referral ACCDODS1.XST_ATD_ACCD; Course Enrollment ACCDODS1.XST_IRES_SC

## Productive Grade Rates by Referral to Math Developmental Education

FTIC students not referred to Math developmental education (DE) had higher productive grade rates than did students who were referred to DE. First year referred student productive grade rates of the Fall 2015 cohort (71\%) grew 5.2 percentage points from the first year Fall 2011 cohort ( $65.8 \%$ ). Also, first year non-referred student productive grade rates of the Fall 2015 cohort ( $80.7 \%$ ) grew 2.4 percentage points from the first year Fall 2011 cohort ( $78.3 \%$ ). In the Fall 2011 cohort, productive grade rates of referred students grew 2.9 percentage points from the first year to the fifth year, while rates for non-referred students remained relatively unchanged during the same period.


Notes:
(1) Productive grade rates represent grades of C or higher based on all courses (cumulative) through the Fall semester of the first, second, third, fourth, and fifth year.
(2) Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC cohort methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using the THECB methodology.
(3) Fall 2012 FTIC student cohort is defined by a combination of THECB (demographic profile, persistence rates, and graduation rates) and True FTIC (productive grade rates, progression through developmental and gatekeeper courses) methodologies.
(4) Fall 2013, 2014, and 2015 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is firsttime in college and credential-seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBMOO1).
(5) Beginning in Fall 2014, Math 0300, 0301, 0302, and 0303 were replaced with Math 0305, 0310, 0320, and 0442.
(6) Sources: DE Referral ACCDODS1.XST_ATD_ACCD; Course Enrollment ACCDODS1.XST_IRES_SC

# SAN ANTONIO COLLEGE SEMESTER-TO-SEMESTER PERSISTENCE RATES 

## AtD Indicator \#4: Persist from Term-to-Term and Year-to-Year

This report compares the 1- to 5-year persistence rates of the Fall 2011 through Fall 2015 FTIC cohorts at San Antonio College. Persistence rate is the measure of FTIC students, excluding graduates, who continue from their initial Fall semester (cohort year) to a subsequent time of measure. The FTIC Cohort is the unduplicated first-time-in-college student as defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (excluding graduates). Data were reported by course section owner. These rates were examined by various student and academic characteristics.
$\diamond$ Across the cohorts, first year persistence rates alternately climbed and declined from year-to-year.
$\diamond \quad$ The Fall 2015 first year persistence rate ( $64.9 \%$ ) is 7.2 percentage points lower than it was three years ago (72.1\%).
$\diamond$ In each cohort and each year, female students consistently persisted at higher rates than did male students.
$\diamond$ Asian students generally had higher persistence rates than did all other student groups.
$\diamond$ First-year persistence rates varied little among the different age categories. However, in Fall 2015 rates declined with the Fall 2015 cohort (except 51+ students).
$\diamond$ Overall, in each cohort and each year, full-time students persisted at higher rates than did part-time students.
$\diamond$ Overall, Pell grant recipients exhibited higher persistence rates than non-Pell grant recipients in the first year.
$\diamond$ Persistence rates of students not referred to development education (DE) were higher than those of students referred to DE.

## Total Persistence Rates

Across the cohorts, first-year persistence rates alternately climbed and declined from year-to-year, ending with the lowest rate overall in Fall 2015 (65\%). Gaps in persistence rates were greater from year-to-year in the first three years than in the last two years.

## Persistence Rate by Fall Cohort



## Persistence Rates by Gender

In each cohort and each year, female students consistently persisted at higher rates than did male students. The gaps in persistence rates between male and female students were greater in years one and two. The Fall 2014 cohort at second year had the widest gap between male and female students ( $9.8 \%$ ) in the same cohort.
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## Persistence Rates by Ethnicity

Across the board, Asian students demonstrated higher persistence rates than did all other student groups. Fall 2011 and Fall 2012 African American students exhibited higher first year persistence rates than did Hispanic and White student groups in the same cohorts. Hispanic students had higher third-, fourth-, and fifth-year persistence rates than African American and White students.


5th Year: Fall to Any Term 5th Year

| 100\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 80\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 40\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0\% |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Fall 2011* | Fall 2012 | Fall 2013 | Fall 2014 | Fall 2015 |
| - African American | 10.4\% |  |  |  |  |
| - Asian | 17.3\% |  |  |  |  |
| - Hispanic | 12.0\% |  |  |  |  |
| - Other | 5.1\% |  |  |  |  |
| - White | 9.1\% |  |  |  |  |

Notes:
(1) Persistence rate is the measure of FTIC students, excluding graduates, who continue from their initial Fall semester (cohort year) to a subsequent time of measurement.
(2) Fall 2012 and 2013 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is first-time in college and credential-seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBM001). Persistence rates exclude graduates.
(3) Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC cohort methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using the THECB methodology. Persistence rates excludes graduates.
(4) Graduate Status: 2011-2015: ACCDODS1.XST_CBM009_ACCD

FTIC Demographics: 2011-2015: ACCDODS1.XST_CBM001_ACCD

## Persistence Rates By Age

First-year persistence rates varied little among the different age categories. However, in Fall 2015 rates declined with the Fall 2015 cohort (except 51+ students). In the third to fifth years, students in the 22-24 age group often exhibited lower persistence rates than did students younger or older than they were.


5th Year: Fall to Any Term 5th Year

| 100\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 80\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 40\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0\% | In] |  |  |  |  |
|  | Fall 2011* | Fall 2012 | Fall 2013 | Fall 2014 | Fall 2015 |
| - 17 or less | 10.7\% |  |  |  |  |
| - 18-21 | 11.3\% |  |  |  |  |
| - $\quad$ 22-24 | 6.9\% |  |  |  |  |
| - ${ }^{\text {- }}$ 25-35 | 11.6\% |  |  |  |  |
| - 36-50 | 12.3\% |  |  |  |  |
| - $51+$ | 18.5\% |  |  |  |  |
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## Persistence Rates by Enrollment Status

Overall, full-time students persisted at higher rates than did part-time students. The widest gap between full- and partstudents in the same cohort and year was first year, Fall 2015 (19\%). After five years, the gap between full-and part-time student persistence rates closed and these rates ended up relatively equal.


## Notes:

(1) Persistence rate is the measure of FTIC students, excluding graduates, who continue from their initial Fall semester (cohort year) to a subsequent time of measurement.
(2) Fall 2012 and 2013 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is first-time in college and credential-seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBM001). Persistence rates exclude graduates.
(3) Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC cohort methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using the THECB methodology. Persistence rates excludes graduates.
(4) Full-Time/Part-Time status as reported at the Fall semester of the cohort year.
(5) Graduate Status: 2011-2015: ACCDODS1.XST_CBM009_ACCD FTIC Demographics: 2011-2015: ACCDODS1.XST_CBM001_ACCD
(6) Preliminary numbers were used for Fall 2014, third year and Fall 2015, second year.

## Persistence Rates by Pell Status

Overall, Pell grant recipients exhibited higher persistence rates than non-Pell grant recipients in the first year. This changes in the second year when non-Pell grant recipients have higher persistence rates through all cohorts except Fall 2015. The Fall 2011 and Fall 2013 cohort Pell and non-Pell recipient students had alternate years of persistence. After five years, the persistence rate gap between Pell grant recipients and non-Pell grant recipient student persistence rates decreases and these rates ended up relatively close.
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## Persistence Rates by Veteran Status

Veteran first- and second-year persistence rates are higher than non-veteran rates for most cohorts and years. Nonveteran student persistence rates are higher than veteran persistence by the fourth year. By the fifth year, persistence rates are almost identical.

Persistence Rate by Veteran Status
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## Persistence Rates by Developmental Education Referral

Persistence rates of students not referred to development education (DE) were higher than those of students referred to $D E$. The widest gap in any year persistence rate was between students referred to DE and those college ready in the Fall 2013, second year. Gaps in persistence rates were more distinct from the first to second year than in other subsequent years.
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## SAN ANTONIO COLLEGE GRADUATION RATES

## AtD Indicator \#5: Complete Credentials

This report compares the 1- to 5-year graduation rates of the Fall 2011 through Fall 2015 FTIC cohorts at San Antonio College. To calculate graduation rates, cumulative associate and certificate graduates were divided by the total starting cohort. These rates were examined by various student and academic characteristics.
$\diamond \quad$ The percentages of FTIC students graduating after three years steadily increased among those starting in 2011 (8.1\%), 2012 (10.3\%), and 2013 (11.7\%).
$\diamond \quad$ Female students demonstrated higher graduation rates than did male students across most cohorts and years beyond year two.
$\diamond$ Four year student graduation rates across all ethnicities increased from the Fall 2011 FTIC cohort to the Fall 2012 cohort.
$\diamond$ Students in the Fall 2012 cohort, entering at age 51 and older, generally exhibited the highest rates of graduation in years three and four.
$\diamond$ Overall, the graduation rates of full-time students were higher than those of part-time students across most cohorts.
$\diamond$ Across all cohorts and years, graduation rates for Pell recipients were marginally lower than rates for nonPell students.
$\diamond$ Overall, FTIC students who identified as veterans had higher graduation rates than did students who did not identify as veterans.
$\diamond \quad$ In the Fall 2014 cohort, for year one graduation rates, the gap between referred students and those who were not referred had closed to 0.1 percentage points.

## Total Graduation Rates

The percentages of FTIC students graduating after three years steadily increased among those starting in 2011 (8.1\%), 2012 (10.3\%), and 2013 (11.7\%). The four year graduation rate among those in the 2012 cohort was higher than that of the 2011 cohort ( $17.7 \%$ to $14.2 \%$ ). Of the FTIC students who started at San Antonio College in 2011, 18.5\% received a degree or certificate after five years.


## Graduation Rates by Gender

Female students demonstrated higher graduation rates than did male students across most cohorts and years beyond year two. Of the FTIC students who started at San Antonio College in 2011, $15.7 \%$ of male and $20.7 \%$ of female students received a degree or certificate after five years.


Notes:
(1) Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC cohort methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using the THECB methodology.
(2) Fall 2012 FTIC student cohort is defined by a combination of THECB (demographic profile, persistence rates, and graduation rates) and True FTIC (productive grade rates, progression through developmental and gatekeeper courses) methodologies.
(3) Fall 2013, 2014, and 2015 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is firsttime in college and credential-seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBM001).
(4) Graduation rate based on Associates or Certificates received at any Alamo College. Data are cumulative over time. Students who transfer or leave Alamo Colleges are not removed from denominators.
(5) Source FTIC Demographics: ACIRES.CBM001, Graduates: ACCDIR.CBM009

## Graduation Rates by Ethnicity

White students generally exhibited higher graduation rates than did other students in years four and five. Four year student graduation rates across all ethnicities increased from the Fall 2011 FTIC cohort to the Fall 2012 cohort.


Notes:
(1) Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC cohort methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using the THECB methodology.
(2) Fall 2012 FTIC student cohort is defined by a combination of THECB (demographic profile, persistence rates, and graduation rates) and True FTIC (productive grade rates, progression through developmental and gatekeeper courses) methodologies.
(3) Fall 2013, 2014, and 2015 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is firsttime in college and credential-seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBMO01).
(4) Graduation rate based on Associates or Certificates received at any Alamo College. Data are cumulative over time. Students who transfer or leave Alamo Colleges are not removed from denominators.
(5) Source FTIC Demographics: ACIRES.CBM001, Graduates: ACCDIR.CBM009

## Graduation Rates by Age

Students entering between the ages of 18-21 graduated at lower rates than most other student groups in years one and two. Students in the Fall 2012 cohort, entering at age 51 and older, generally exhibited the highest rates of graduation in years three and four. Students in the Fall 2011 cohort, entering at age 36-50, generally exhibited the highest rates of graduation in years four and five.


Notes:
(1) Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC cohort methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using the THECB methodology.
(2) Fall 2012 FTIC student cohort is defined by a combination of THECB (demographic profile, persistence rates, and graduation rates) and True FTIC (productive grade rates, progression through developmental and gatekeeper courses) methodologies.
(3) Fall 2013, 2014, and 2015 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is firsttime in college and credential-seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBM001).
(4) Graduation rate based on Associates or Certificates received at any Alamo College. Data are cumulative over time. Students who transfer or leave Alamo Colleges are not removed from denominators.
(5) Age as reported at the Fall semester of the cohort year.
(6) Source FTIC Demographics: ACIRES.CBM001, Graduates: ACCDIR.CBM009

## Graduation Rates by Enrollment Status

Overall, the graduation rates of full-time students were higher than those of part-time students across most cohorts. Of the FTIC students who started at San Antonio College in 2011, $23.1 \%$ of full-time and $14.9 \%$ of part-time students received a degree or certificate after five years.

## Graduation Rate by Enrollment Status



## Notes:

(1) Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC cohort methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using the THECB methodology.
(2) Fall 2012 FTIC student cohort is defined by a combination of THECB (demographic profile, persistence rates, and graduation rates) and True FTIC (productive grade rates, progression through developmental and gatekeeper courses) methodologies.
(3) Fall 2013, 2014, and 2015 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is firsttime in college and credential-seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBM001).
(4) Graduation rate based on Associates or Certificates received at any Alamo College. Data are cumulative over time. Students who transfer or leave Alamo Colleges are not removed from denominators.
(5) Full-Time/Part-Time status as reported at the Fall semester of the cohort year.
(6) Source FTIC Demographics: ACIRES.CBM001, Graduates: ACCDIR.CBM009

## Graduation Rates by Pell Status

Across all cohorts and years, graduation rates for Pell recipients were marginally lower than rates for non-Pell students. Of the FTIC students who started at San Antonio College in 2011, 18.6\% of Pell students and $18.3 \%$ of non-Pell students received a degree or certificate after five years.

Graduation Rate by Pell Status
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## Graduation Rates by Veteran Status

Overall, FTIC students who identified as veterans had higher graduation rates than did students who did not identify as veterans. Of the FTIC students who started at San Antonio College in 2011, 24.4\% of students who identified as veterans and $18.1 \%$ of students who did not identify as veterans received a degree or certificate after five years.


Notes:
(1) Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC cohort methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using the THECB methodology.
(2) Fall 2012 FTIC student cohort is defined by a combination of THECB (demographic profile, persistence rates, and graduation rates) and True FTIC (productive grade rates, progression through developmental and gatekeeper courses) methodologies.
(3) Fall 2013, 2014, and 2015 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is firsttime in college and credential-seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBM001).
(4) Veteran status as reported at the Fall semester of the cohort year.
(5) Source: FTIC Demographics-ACCDODS1.XCT_IRES_SC

## Graduation Rates by Developmental Education Referral

Overall, students referred to developmental education had lower graduation rates than did students not requiring developmental education. Third-year graduation rates remained constant for the 2011, 2012, and 2013 cohorts.


## Notes:

(1) Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC cohort methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using the THECB methodology.
(2) Fall 2012 FTIC student cohort is defined by a combination of THECB (demographic profile, persistence rates, and graduation rates) and True FTIC (productive grade rates, progression through developmental and gatekeeper courses) methodologies.
(3) Fall 2013 and 2014 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is first-time in college and credential-seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBMOO1).
(4) Graduation rate based on Associates or Certificates received at any Alamo College. Data are cumulative over time. Students who transfer or leave Alamo Colleges are not removed from denominators.
(5) Developmental education (DE) referral levels are based on formal student assessment outcomes for the subject area or DE course enrollment. Students designated as "Unknown" did not have an assessment on file or could not be placed within referral range and could not be categorized based on DE course enrollment.
(6) Source FTIC Demographics: ACIRES.CBM001, Graduates: ACCDIR.CBM009, DE Referrals-Students.V_StuTaspALLDIS


[^0]:    Notes:
    (1) Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC cohort methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using the THECB methodology.
    (2) Fall 2012 FTIC student cohort is defined by a combination of THECB (demographic profile, persistence rates, and graduation rates) and True FTIC (productive grade rates, progression through developmental and gatekeeper courses) methodologies.
    (3) Fall 2013, 2014, and 2015 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is firsttime in college and credential-seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBMOO1).
    (4) Source FTIC Demographics: ACIRES.CBM001

[^1]:    Notes:
    (1) Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC cohort methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using the THECB methodology.
    (2) Fall 2012 FTIC student cohort is defined by a combination of THECB (demographic profile, persistence rates, and graduation rates) and True FTIC (productive grade rates, progression through developmental and gatekeeper courses) methodologies.
    (3) Fall 2013, 2014, and 2015 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is firsttime in college and credential-seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBM001).
    (4) Age as reported at the Fall semester of the cohort year.
    (5) Source FTIC Demographics: ACIRES.CBM001

[^2]:    Notes:
    (1) Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC cohort methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using the THECB methodology.
    (2) Fall 2012 FTIC student cohort is defined by a combination of THECB (demographic profile, persistence rates, and graduation rates) and True FTIC (productive grade rates, progression through developmental and gatekeeper courses) methodologies.
    (3) Fall 2013, 2014, and 2015 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is firsttime in college and credential-seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBMO01).
    (4) Full-Time/Part-time status as reported at the Fall semester of the cohort year.
    (5) Source FTIC Demographics: ACIRES.CBM001

[^3]:    Notes:
    (1) Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC cohort methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using the THECB methodology.
    (2) Fall 2012 FTIC student cohort is defined by a combination of THECB (demographic profile, persistence rates, and graduation rates) and True FTIC (productive grade rates, progression through developmental and gatekeeper courses) methodologies.
    (3) Fall 2013 and 2014 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is first-time in college and credential-seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBMOO1).
    (3) Developmental education (DE) referral levels are based on formal student assessment outcomes for the subject area or DE course enrollment. Students designated as "Unknown" did not have an assessment on file or could not be placed within referral range and could not be categorized based on DE course enrollment.
    (4) Source FTIC Demographics: ACIRES.CBM001, Course Enrollment: ACCDIR.EXTENDEDENROLLMENT, DE Referrals: Students.V_StuTaspAlldIS

[^4]:    *See notes, next page

[^5]:    Notes:

    1) Productive grade rates represent grades of $C$ or higher based on all courses (cumulative) through the Fall semester of the first, second, third, fourth, and fifth year.
    (2) Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC cohort methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using the THECB methodology.
    (3) Fall 2012 FTIC student cohort is defined by a combination of THECB (demographic profile, persistence rates, and graduation rates) and True FTIC (productive grade rates, progression through developmental and gatekeeper courses) methodologies.
    (4) Fall 2013, 2014, and 2015 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is firsttime in college and credential-seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBM001).
    (5) Full-Time/Part-Time status as reported at the Fall semester of the cohort year
    (6) Sources: FTIC Demographics ACCDODS.XST_CBM001_ACCD; Course Enrollment ACCDODS1.XST_IRES_SC
[^6]:    Notes:
    (1) Persistence rate is the measure of FTIC students, excluding graduates, who continue from their initial Fall semester (cohort year) to a subsequent time of measurement.
    (2) Fall 2012 and 2013 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is first-time in college and credential-seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBMO01). Persistence rates exclude graduates.
    (3) Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC cohort methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using the THECB methodology. Persistence rates excludes graduates.
    (4) Graduate Status: 2011-2015: ACCDODS1.XST_CBM009_ACCD

    FTIC Demographics: 2011-2015: ACCDODS1.XST_CBM001_ACCD

[^7]:    Notes:
    (1) Persistence rate is the measure of FTIC students, excluding graduates, who continue from their initial Fall semester (cohort year) to a subsequent time of measurement.
    (2) Fall 2012 and 2013 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is first-time in college and credential-seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBM001). Persistence rates exclude graduates.
    (3) Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC cohort methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using the THECB methodology. Persistence rates excludes graduates.
    (4) Age as reported at the Fall semester of the cohort year.
    (5) Graduate Status: 2011-2015: ACCDODS1.XST_CBM009_ACCD FTIC Demographics: 2011-2015: ACCDODS1.XST_CBM001_ACCD

[^8]:    Notes:
    (1) Persistence rate is the measure of FTIC students, excluding graduates, who continue from their initial Fall semester (cohort year) to a subsequent time of measurement.
    (2) Fall 2012 and 2013 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is first-time in college and credential-seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBM001). Persistence rates exclude graduates.
    (3) Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC cohort methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using the THECB methodology. Persistence rates excludes graduates.
    (4) Pell status as reported at the Fall semester of the cohort year.
    (4) Graduate Status: 2011-2015: ACCDODS1.XST_CBM009_ACCD FTIC Demographics: 2011-2015: ACCDODS1.XST_CBM001_ACCD

[^9]:    Notes:
    (1) Persistence rate is the measure of FTIC students, excluding graduates, who continue from their initial Fall semester (cohort year) to a subsequent time of measurement.
    (2) Fall 2012 and 2013 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is first-time in college and credential-seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBM001). Persistence rates exclude graduates.
    (3) Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC cohort methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using the THECB methodology. Persistence rates excludes graduates.
    (4) Graduate Status: 2011-2015: ACCDODS1.XST_CBM009_ACCD FTIC Demographics: 2011-2015: ACCDODS1.XST_CBM001_ACCD
    (5) Veteran Status as reported at the Fall semester of the cohort year.

[^10]:    Notes:
    (1) Persistence rate is the measure of FTIC students, excluding graduates, who continue from their initial Fall semester (cohort year) to a subsequent time of measurement.
    (2) Fall 2012 and 2013 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is first-time in college and credential-seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBM001). Persistence rates exclude graduates.
    (3) Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC cohort methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using the THECB methodology. Persistence rates excludes graduates.
    (4) Graduate Status: 2011-2015: ACCDODS1.XST_CBM009_ACCD

    FTIC Demographics: 2011-2015: ACCDODS1.XST_CBM001_ACCD

[^11]:    Notes:
    (1) Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC cohort methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using the THECB methodology.
    (2) Fall 2012 FTIC student cohort is defined by a combination of THECB (demographic profile, persistence rates, and graduation rates) and True FTIC (productive grade rates, progression through developmental and gatekeeper courses) methodologies.
    (3) Fall 2013, 2014, and 2015 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is firsttime in college and credential-seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBM001).
    (4) Graduation rate based on Associates or Certificates received at any Alamo College. Data are cumulative over time. Students who transfer or leave Alamo Colleges are not removed from denominators.
    (5) Pell status as reported at the Fall semester of the cohort year.
    (6) Source FTIC Demographics: ACIRES.CBM001, Graduates: ACCDIR.CBM009, Pell: ACCDIR.FADS

