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# NORTHWEST VISTA COLLEGE DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE \& ACADEMIC CHARACTERISTICS 

## Student Characteristics at First Entry

Alamo Colleges 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 Northwest Vista 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/part-time, Pell status), students at Northwest Vista 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.

The number of students enrolled at Northwest Vista College increased over most cohorts from 2011 to 2015. Although the Fall 2013 cohort total declined from the previous fall cohort, there was an increase of $7.9 \%$ from the Fall

|  | Fall 2011* <br> FIIC Cohort | Fall 2012 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2013 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2014 <br> FIIC Cohort | Fall 2015 <br> FTIC Cohort |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 1,212 | 1,279 | 1,187 | 1,184 | 1,319 |
| Female | 1,394 | 1,356 | 1,200 | 1,425 | 1,492 |
| Total FTIC | 2,606 | 2,635 | 2,387 | 2,609 | 2,811 |

*See notes, next page 2011 cohort to the Fall 2015 cohort.

## Gender

There were slightly higher proportions of female students than male students across all cohorts. Percentages remained fairly consistent across all cohorts.


## Ethnicity

The majority (63\%-69\%) of students in each cohort identified themselves as being Hispanic. The second most represented ethnic group was White (20\%-24\%). White student enrollment decreased consistently in each FTIC cohort from Fall 2011 ( $22.9 \%$ ) to Fall 2013 ( $20.7 \%$ ), but increased by 2.8 percentage points from the Fall 2013 to the Fall 2014 FTIC cohort. This number dropped again by 3.6 percentage points from Fall 2014 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 |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African American | 184 | 138 | 161 | 158 | 174 |
| Asian | 65 | 46 | 40 | 78 | 72 |
| Hispanic | 1,670 | 1,829 | 1,561 | 1,655 | 1,937 |
| Other | 89 | 48 | 131 | 105 | 68 |
| White | 598 | 574 | 494 | 613 | 560 |
| Total FTIC | 2,606 | 2,635 | 2,387 | 2,609 | 2,811 |



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

## Age

The majority of students in each cohort were age 21 or younger. Of this majority, most students ( $80 \%-88 \%$ ) were between 18 and 21 years old when they first enrolled. The second most represented age group included 25 to 35 year olds, comprising $3 \%-7 \%$ of each cohort. 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 | 122 | 105 | 89 | 86 | 110 |
| $18-21$ | 2,091 | 2,196 | 2,091 | 2,296 | 2,481 |
| $22-24$ | 123 | 117 | 68 | 75 | 89 |
| $25-35$ | 173 | 157 | 101 | 116 | 104 |
| $36-50$ | 86 | 53 | 35 | 35 | 25 |
| $51+$ | 11 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| Total FTIC | 2,606 | 2,635 | 2,387 | 2,609 | 2,811 |



## 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

## Enrollment Status

The composition of Fall FTIC cohort enrollment status reflects only minor variations over most cohorts from Fall 2011 to Fall 2014. The percentage of full-time students has increased slightly in each cohort from Fall 2012 to Fall 2014. The number of full-time students increased much more significantly from Fall 2014 (39.06\%) to Fall 2015 (46.53\%). Full-time students were defined as those enrolled in 12 or more hours at census date.

|  | 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 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Full-Time | 976 | 949 | 930 | 1,019 | 1,308 |
| Part-Time | 1,630 | 1,686 | 1,457 | 1,590 | 1,503 |
| Total FTIC | 2,606 | 2,635 | 2,387 | 2,609 | 2,811 |



## 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) Full-Time/Part-time status as reported at the Fall semester of the cohort year.
(5) Source FTIC Demographics: ACIRES.CBM001

## Pell Status

The percentage of Fall FTIC students receiving the Pell grant during their first term decreased each cohort from Fall 2011 to Fall 2013, increased 5.07\% in Fall 2014, then decreased $5.45 \%$ in Fall 2015, reflecting a return to rates similar to those seen in cohorts prior to Fall 2014.

|  | 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 | 1,334 | 1,229 | 1,085 | 1,318 | 1,267 |
| No Pell Grant | 1,272 | 1,406 | 1,302 | 1,291 | 1,544 |
| Total FTIC | 2,606 | 2,635 | 2,387 | 2,609 | 2,811 |



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) 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. Though trends are not evident across cohorts, an increase in students designated as veterans ( 1.84 percentage points) was seen from the Fall 2014 cohort to the Fall 2015 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 |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vet | 159 | 167 | 132 | 146 | 209 |
| Non-Vet | 2,447 | 2,468 | 2,255 | 2,463 | 2,602 |
| Total FTIC | 2,606 | 2,635 | 2,387 | 2,609 | 2,811 |

## 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 CBMOO1).
(4) Veteran status as reported at the Fall semester of the cohort year.

Source: FTIC Demographics-ACCDODS1.XCT_IRES_SC

## Developmental Education Referral Status

Fall 2011 was the peak year for student developmental education (DE) course referrals. However, the Fall 2013 and Fall 2014 cohorts reflect a significant shift in referral levels, as less than half of cohort students were referred to DE. There was a small percentage of students ( $1 \%-2 \%$ ) 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 | 1,864 | 1,848 | 1,121 | 1,216 | 1,780 |
| Not Referred | 686 | 725 | 1,238 | 1,355 | 995 |
| Unknown | 56 | 62 | 28 | 38 | 36 |
| Total FTIC | 2,606 | 2,635 | 2,387 | 2,609 | 2,811 |

Fall FTIC Cohorts by Referral to DE Courses


## 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 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) 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.
(5) Source FTIC Demographics: ACIRES.CBM001, Course Enrollment: ACCDIR.EXTENDEDENROLLMENT, DE Referrals: Students.V_StuTaspAlldIS

# NORTHWEST VISTA COLLEGE PROGRESSION THROUGH DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION AND "GATEKEEPER" COURSES 

## AtD Indicator \#1: Complete College Remedial or "Developmental" Courses 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 Northwest Vista 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.
$\diamond \quad$ For English and Math, Across all cohorts and levels females had higher success rate in English highest DE and "gatekeeper" courses than did males.
$\diamond$ For Math, non-referred students younger than 21 years old generally had greater success in "gatekeeper" courses.
$\diamond$ 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, Pell recipients compared to non-Pell recipients generally had greater success in DE courses. However, for English, non-Pell recipients generally had greater success in "gatekeeper" courses.
$\diamond$ For English, no consistent pattern for ethnicity on success rate in DE or "gatekeeper" after 3 years was evident. For Math, referred Asian students had higher success rates in "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).

[^0]
## English Developmental Education Progression of Referred

After 3 years, approximately 36\%-53\% of referred students in each cohort attempted the highest course in the English DE sequence, with $29 \%-43 \%$ of the cohort successfully passing the course. Approximately $29 \%-50 \%$ of referred students in each cohort attempted the English "gatekeeper" course their first year, with $23 \%-62 \%$ students in that cohort successfully passing the "gatekeeper" course. In comparing the 2011 and 2013 cohorts, success in year two "gatekeeper" increased by $10 \%$.


## English "Gatekeeper" Progression of Non-Referred

After 3 years, approximately 67\%-88\% of non-referred students in each cohort attempted the English "gatekeeper" course, with $55 \%-77 \%$ 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 $\quad 5^{\text {th }}$ Year

## Total English Progression

Overall, $42 \%-58 \%$ of all referred students in each cohort successfully passed any English DE course within the first year, $29 \%-43 \%$ successfully passed the highest DE course in the English sequence within 3 years, and approximately 43\%$51 \%$ successfully passed the English "gatekeeper" course within 3 years. Of the non-referred students, 55\%-70\% successfully passed the English "gatekeeper" course within 3 years. Of the total cohort, $51 \%-70 \%$ successfully passed the English "gatekeeper" course within 3 years. Those who were referred to Level 2 had higher success rates in the highest DE and "gatekeeper" English 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, both level 1 and level 2 experienced an 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) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DE Level } 1 \\ & 192(7.4 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 129 (67.2\%) | 107 (55.7\%) | Not Applicable |  | 75 (39.1\%) | Not Applicable | 60 (31.3\%) |
|  | DELevel 2 $631(24.2 \%)$ | 376 (59.6\%) | 304 (48.2\%) |  |  | 281 (44.5\%) |  | 296 (46.9\%) |
|  | Total Referred $823 \text { (31.6\%) }$ | 505 (61.4\%) | 411 (49.9\%) |  |  | 356 (43.3\%) |  | 356 (43.3\%) |
|  | College Level $1,746 \text { (67.0\%6) }$ |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  | 955 (54.7\%) |
|  | Unknown 37 (1.4\%) | $0(0.0 \%)$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ | Not Applicable |  | $0(0.0 \%)$ | Not Applicable | 4 (10.8\%) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cohort Total } \\ & 2,606(100.0 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 584 (22.4\%) | 478 (18.3\%) |  |  | 419 (16.1\%) |  | 1,315 (50.5\%) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{t} \\ & 0 \\ & \frac{0}{O} \\ & \stackrel{1}{N} \\ & \stackrel{1}{N} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{W} \end{aligned}$ | DE Level 1 $148 \text { (5.7\%) }$ | 98 (66.2\%) | 79 (53.4\%) | Not Applicable |  | 44 (29.7\%) | $0(0.0 \%)$ | 46 (31.1\%) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DE Level } 2 \\ & 520(20.2 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 268 (51.5\%) | 199 (38.3\%) |  |  | 185 (35.6\%) | $0(0.0 \%)$ | 205 (39.4\%) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total Referred } \\ & 668 \text { (25.9\%) } \end{aligned}$ | 366 (54.8\%) | 278 (41.6\%) |  |  | 229 (34.3\%) | $0(0.0 \%)$ | 251 (37.6\%) |
|  | College Level 1,881 (73.0\%) |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  | 1,131 (60.1\%) |
|  | Unknown $27 \text { (1.0\%) }$ | 2 (7.4\%) | 2 (7.4\%) |  |  | 1 (3.7\%) | $0(0.0 \%)$ | 13 (48.1\%) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cohort Total } \\ & , 2,576(100.0 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 406 (15.8\%) | 308 (12.0\%) |  |  | 253 (9.8\%) | 1 (0.0\%) | 1,395 (54.2\%) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\hbar}{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & 0 \\ & m \\ & \stackrel{1}{0} \\ & \stackrel{N}{\pi} \\ & \stackrel{1}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 1 \\ 263 \text { (11.0\%) } \end{gathered}$ | 142 (54.0\%) | 118 (44.9\%) | Not Applicable |  | 47 (17.9\%) | 6 (2.3\%) | 119 (45.2\%) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DE Level } 2 \\ & 322 \text { (13.5\%) } \end{aligned}$ | 156 (48.4\%) | 134 (41.6\%) |  |  | 125 (38.8\%) | 2 (0.6\%) | 178 (55.3\%) |
|  | Total Referred 585 (24.5\%) | 298 (50.9\%) | 252 (43.1\%) |  |  | 172 (29.4\%) | 8 (1.4\%) | 297 (50.8\%) |
|  | College Level $1,771(74.2 \%)$ |  |  | Not | able |  |  | 1,360 (76.8\%) |
|  | Unknown $31 \text { (1.3\%) }$ | 1 (3.2\%) | 1 (3.2\%) | Not Applicable |  | 1 (3.2\%) | $0(0.0 \%)$ | 18 (58.1\%) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cohort Total } \\ & \underline{2,387}(100.0 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 324 (13.6\%) | 272 (11.4\%) |  |  | 188 (7.9\%) | 10 (0.4\%) | 1,675 (70.2\%) |

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.

## Total English Progression (continued)



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 all cohorts and levels females had higher success rate in English highest DE and "gatekeeper" courses than did males. When comparing the 2011 cohort to the 2013 cohort, both, males and females, 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 Year) | Success in RSG (3rd Year) |  | cess in GK <br> 3rd Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 4 \\ & \frac{4}{0} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & -7 \\ & \frac{7}{8} \\ & \overline{6} \end{aligned}$ | DE Level 1 | M | 102 (53.1\%) | M | 69 (67.6\%) | M | 56 (54.9\%) | Not Applicable |  | M | 35 (34.3\%) | Not Applicable | M | 24 (23.5\%) |
|  | 192 (7.4\%) | F | 90 (46.9\%) | F | 60 (66.7\%) | F | 51 (56.7\%) |  |  | F | 40 (44.4\%) |  | F | 36 (40.0\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | M | 320 (50.7\%) | M | 195 (60.9\%) | M | 156 (48.8\%) |  |  | M | 135 (42.2\%) |  | M | 131 (40.9\%) |
|  | 631 (24.2\%) | F | 311 (49.3\%) | F | 181 (58.2\%) | F | 148 (47.6\%) |  |  | F | 146 (46.9\%) |  | F | 165 (53.1\%) |
|  | Total Referred | M | 422 (51.3\%) | M | 264 (62.6\%) | M | 212 (50.2\%) |  |  | M | 170 (40.3\%) |  | M | 155 (36.7\%) |
|  | 823 (31.6\%) | F | 401 (48.7\%) | $F$ | 241 (60.1\%) | F | 199 (49.6\%) |  |  | F | 186 (46.4\%) |  | F | 201 (50.1\%) |
|  | College Level | M | 764 (43.8\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | M | 412 (53.9\%) |
|  | $1,746(67.0 \%)$ | F | 982 (56.2\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F | 543 (55.3\%) |
|  | Unknown | M | 26 (70.3\%) | M | 0 0.0\%) | M | $0(0.0 \%)$ | Not Applicable |  | M | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable | M | 3 (11.5\%) |
|  | 37 (1.4\%) | F | 11 (29.7\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | F | 0 (0.0\%) |  | F | 1 (9.1\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | M | 1,212 (46.5\%) | M | 298 (24.6\%) | M | 240 (19.8\%) |  |  | M | 196 (16.2\%) |  | M | 570 (47.0\%) |
|  | 2,606 (100.0\%) | F | 1,394 (53.5\%) | F | 286(20.5\%) | F | 238(17.1\%) |  |  | F | 223 $316.0 \%$ ) |  |  | 745 (53.4\%) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{4}{0} \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & \tilde{N} \\ & \tilde{R} \\ & \bar{N} \end{aligned}$ | DE Level 1 | M | 89 (60.1\%) | M | 56 (62.9\%) | M | 43 (48.3\%) | Not Applicable |  | M | 21 (23.6\%) | M ${ }^{\text {a }}$ (0.0\% | M | 25 (28.1\%) |
|  | 148 (5.7\%) | F | 59 (39.9\%) | F | 42 (71.2\%) | F | 36 (61.0\%) |  |  | F | 23 (39.0\%) | $\mathrm{F} \quad 000 \%$ | F | 21 (35.6\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | M | 270 (51.9\%) | M | 150 (55.6\%) | M | 110 (40.7\%) |  |  | M | 102 (37.8\%) | M $\quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | M | 99 (36.7\%) |
|  | 520 (20.2\%) | F | 250 (48.1\%) | $F$ | 118 (47.2\%) | F | 89 (35.6\%) |  |  | F | 83 (33.2\%) | $\mathrm{F} \quad 00.0 \%)$ | F | 106 (42.4\%) |
|  | Total Referred | M | 359 (53.7\%) | M | 206 (57.4\%) | M | 153 (42.6\%) |  |  | M | 123 (34.3\%) | $\mathrm{M} \quad 000 \%$ | M | 124 (34.5\%) |
|  | 668 (25.9\%) | F | 309 (46.3\%) | $F$ | 160 (51.8\%) | F | 125 (40.5\%) |  |  | F | 106 (34.3\%) | F 0 (0.0\%) | F | 127 (41.1\%) |
|  | College Level | M | 877 (46.6\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | M | 521 (59.4\%) |
|  | $1,881 \text { (73.0\%) }$ | F | 1,004 (53.4\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F | 610 (60.8\%) |
|  | Unknown | M | 13 (48.1\%) | M | 1 (7.7\%) | M | 1 (7.7\%) | Not Applicable |  | M | 0 (0.0\%) | M $\quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | M | 5 (38.5\%) |
|  | 27 (1.0\%) | F | 14 (51.9\%) | F | 1(7.1\%) | F | 1 (7.1\%) |  |  | F | 1 (7.1\%) | $\mathrm{F} \quad 000 \%$ | F | 8 (57.1\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | M | 1,249 (48.5\%) | M | 219 (17.5\%) | M | 161 (12.9\%) |  |  | M | 129 (10.3\%) | M $\quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | M | 650 (52.0\%) |
|  | . 2,576 (100.0\%) | F | _1,327(51.5\%) | F | $187(14.1 \%)$ | F | 147 (11.1\%) |  |  | F | 124 (9.3\%) | F--- $1(0.1 \%)$ |  | 745 (56.1\%) |
|  | DE Level 1 | M | 143 (54.4\%) | M | 78 (54.5\%) | M | 62 (43.4\%) | Not Applicable |  | M | 22 (15.4\%) | M ${ }^{---\frac{1}{2}(1.4 \%)}$ | M | 64 (44.8\%) |
|  | 263 (11.0\%) | F | 120 (45.6\%) | F | 64 (53.3\%) | F | 56 (46.7\%) |  |  | F | 25 (20.8\%) | $F \quad 4(3.3 \%)$ | F | 55 (45.8\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | M | 160 (49.7\%) | M | 74 (46.3\%) | M | 59 (36.9\%) |  |  | M | 58 (36.3\%) | M $\quad 2(1.3 \%)$ | M | 81 (50.6\%) |
|  | 322 (13.5\%) | F | 162 (50.3\%) | F | 82 (50.6\%) | F | 75 (46.3\%) |  |  | F | 67 (41.4\%) | F $\quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | F | 97 (59.9\%) |
|  | Total Referred | M | 303 (51.8\%) | M | 152 (50.2\%) | M | 121 (39.9\%) |  |  | M | 80 (26.4\%) | M $\quad 4$ (1.3\%) | M | 145 (47.9\%) |
|  | 585 (24.5\%) | F | 282 (48.2\%) | F | 146 (51.8\%) | F | 131 (46.5\%) |  |  | F | 92 (32.6\%) | F $\quad 4(1.4 \%)$ | F | 152 (53.9\%) |
|  | College Level | M | 862 (48.7\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | M | 659 (76.5\%) |
|  | 1,771 (74.2\%) | F | 909 (51.3\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F | 701 (77.1\%) |
|  | Unknown | M | 22 (71.0\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) | M | $0(0.0 \%)$ | Not Applicable |  | M | 0 (0.0\%) | M 0 (0.0\%) | M | 12 (54.5\%) |
|  | 31 (1.3\%) | F | 9 (29.0\%) | F | 1 (11.1\%) | F | 1 (11.1\%) |  |  | F | 1 (11.1\%) | F 0 (0.0\%) | $F$ | 6 (66.7\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | M | 1,187 (49.7\%) | M | 165 (13.9\%) | M | 129 (10.9\%) |  |  | M | 88 (7.4\%) | M $\quad 5(0.4 \%)$ | M | 816 (68.7\%) |
|  | .2,387(100.0\%) | - | 1,200 (50.3\%) | F | 159 (13.3\%) | - | 143 (11.9\%) |  |  | F | 100 (8.3\%) | F_-- $50.0 .4 \%)$ |  | 859 ${ }^{(71.6 \% 1}$ |

## 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:
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
Course Enrollment::
ACCDODS1.XST.IRES_SC

## English Progression by Ethnicity

Across the 2011-2013 cohorts, of referred students, Asian students, compared to students of other racial/ethnic groups, successfully passed "gatekeeper" at the highest rates. When comparing the 2011 cohort to the 2013 cohort, Asian, Hispanic, and White students referred to Level 1 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 $D E=$ last course in DE sequence (Level 2 ).
3) English "gatekeeper" course is ENGL 1301.
4) Fall 2012 though 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

English Progression by Ethnicity (continued)

|  |  | Referal Lexal |  | AtterptedAy DE (1styear) |  | Successs in Ary DE (1stYear) |  | Attenpted RSG <br> (12tYear) | Succeass in Hight DE (3rdyear) |  | Success in RSG (3rdYear) |  | Suctess in GX (3idYear) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \frac{7}{0} \\ & \frac{1}{8} \\ & \stackrel{1}{n} \\ & \frac{0}{i} \\ & \bar{i} \end{aligned}$ | DELevel 1 148/5.7\% | A | 6\|4190] | A | 4 (66.78) | A | 3(50.03) |  | A | 2 (33.35) | A | 0 (0.050 | A | 4(66.78) |
|  |  | A | 714780\| | A | 571.43) | A | 5 (71.46) | NotApplicable | A | 4 (57.136) | A | 0 00.05) | A | 5(71.45) |
|  |  | H | 113 (76.45) | H | 75 (66.46) | H | 61 (54.066) |  | H | 35 (31.0\%) | H | $0(0.066)$ | H | 32 (28.35) |
|  |  | 0 | 32068) | 0 | 2(66.73) | 0 | 1 (33.36) |  | 0 | $0(0.06)$ | 0 | 0 (0.056) | 0 | 010.050 |
|  |  | W | 19(1286) | W | 12 [63.26] | W | 9(47.46) |  | W | $3(15.86$ ) | W | 0 00.065] | W | $5(26.3 \%)$ |
|  | DELerel 2 520 (20.24) | A | $37(763)$ | A | 14 (37.86) | A | 11 (29.76) |  | A | 10 (27.03\%) | A | 0 0(0.06) | A | 12 (32.45) |
|  |  | A | 11.2130] | A | 6(54.50] | A | 436.43) |  | A | 4 (36.45) | A | 0 0,0.08] | A | $6(54.55)$ |
|  |  | H | 370(71236) | H | $202(54.64)$ | H | 147 (39.76) |  | H | 134 (36.26) | H | 0 0(0.05] | H | 150(40.5\%) |
|  |  | 0 | 7(1336) | 0 | $3(42.98)$ | 0 | 3(42.98) |  | 0 | $3(42.956)$ | 0 | 0 0(0.05] | 0 | 4(57.15) |
|  |  | W | 95 (1836) | W | $43 / 4536]$ | W | 34 (35.86) |  | W | 34 (35.86) | W | 0 00.05] | W | 33(34.7\%) |
|  | Total Referred 568(25.94] | A | 43\|6.46] | A | 18(4.9\%) | A | 14 (32.65) |  | AA | 12 (27.9\%) | AA | 0 0(0.05) | A | 16 (37.25) |
|  |  | A | 18(273) | A | 11 [61.18] | A | 9 (50.03) |  | A | 8(44.46) | A | 0 0,0.08] | A | 11(61.15) |
|  |  | H | 483 (7233) | H | 277 (57.35) | H | 208(43.15) |  | H | 169 (35.0\%) | H | $0(0.058)$ | H | 182(37.7\%) |
|  |  | 0 | 10(156) | 0 | 5 (50.036] | 0 | 4(40.06\%) |  | 0 | 3(30.036) | 0 | 0 0(0.06) | 0 | 4(40.05\%) |
|  |  | w | 114(17.15) | W | 55 (4826) | w | 43 (37.76) |  | w | 37 (32.56) | w | 0 0(0.05] | W | 38(33.3\%) |
|  | College Lexal 1,881 (73.0\%) | A | 9014.86) |  |  |  |  | Nothaplicable |  |  |  |  | A | $53(58.980$ |
|  |  | A | $26(1.46)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | A | 20(76.9\%) |
|  |  | H | 1,295 (58886) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | H | $785(60.65)$ |
|  |  | 0 | 35 (1986) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 14(40.006) |
|  |  | W | 435 (23.150) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | W | $259(59.5 \%)$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Uninown } \\ & 27 \text { (1006) } \end{aligned}$ | A | 13.780 | A | 00.08i | A | 0 0,0065) | NatApplicable | AA | 0 00.056) | A | $0(0.065)$ | A | $0(0.056$ |
|  |  | A | 27.480] | A | 0 0,0.06 | A | 0 (0.0.6) |  | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 00.083] | A | 1(50.0\%6) |
|  |  | H | 16 (5930) | H | 1 (636) | H | 1 (636) |  | H | 0 (0.036) | H | 0 0,0.03] | H | $9(56.3 \%)$ |
|  |  | 0 | 0100\% | 0 | 000.06 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 0 | 0 (0.036) |  | 0 | 0 (0.036) | 0 | 0 0(0.06) | 0 | 0 (0.056) |
|  |  | w | 8 (29.66] | W | 1 [125\%] | W | 1 (12.56) |  | W | 1(12.55) | W | 0 00.083] | W | 3(37.5\%) |
|  | Cohort Total$2,576(100004)$ | A | 134 (5.26) | A 4 | 21 [15.7\%] | A | 16 (11.9\%) |  | AA | 14 (10.4\%) | AA | 0 0(0.05] | A | 69 (51.5\%) |
|  |  | A | 46(186) | A | 12 [26.18] | A | 10(217\%) |  | A | 8(17.46) | A | 0 0,0.08] | A | 32 (69.6\%) |
|  |  | H | 1,794(59.640) | H | 300 (16.7\%) | H | 225 (12.56) |  | H | $184(10.36)$ | H | 1(0.15] | H | 976 (54.450) |
|  |  | 0 | 45(177) | 0 | $6(1334)$ | 0 | 5 (11.14) |  | 0 | 3(6.7\%) | 0 | 0 0(0.08] | 0 | 18 (40.05) |
|  |  | W | 557]2169] | W | 6712081 | W- | 5219331 |  | W- | 447.936 | W | 010051 | W | 300153.930 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \frac{\pi}{0} \\ & \frac{2}{0} \\ & \frac{n}{0} \\ & \stackrel{1}{i} \\ & \bar{i} \end{aligned}$ | DELevel 1 263 (110\%) | A | $21(30 \%)$ | A | 16 (7620) | A | 9(42.9\%) | Not/eplicable | AA | $3(143 \%)$ | As | $0(0.08 \%)$ | A | 7 (33.3\%) |
|  |  | A | 9 (3.46) | A | 5 (55.64) | A | 5(35.64) |  | A | 3(33 36$)$ | A | 0 0(0.06) | A | $6(66.7 \%)$ |
|  |  | H | 182(69.28) | H | 55 (5220\%) | H | $80(44.06)$ |  | H | 26 (14.3\%) | H | 4(2.25) | H | 76 (41.8\%) |
|  |  | 0 | 15 (2.7\%) | 0 | 8 (53 3 6 ) | 0 | 6(40.06) |  | 0 | 3(200\%) | 0 | 0 0(0.08) | 0 | $9(60.0 \%$ ) |
|  |  | W | 36(13.76) | w | 18(500\%) | W | 18 (50.06) |  | W | 12 (333\%) | W | 2 (5.64] | W | 21 (58.3\%) |
|  | DELevel 2 <br> 322 (135\% | A | 26(3.15) | A | 15(57.7\%) | A | 11(4236) |  | A | $11(423 \%)$ | A | 0 O(0.04) | A | 15 (57.7\%) |
|  |  | A | 7 (224) | A | 3(429\%) | A | 3(429m) |  | A | 3(429\%) | A | $0(0.084)$ | A | 5(71.480) |
|  |  | H | 158(6155) | H | 95 (480\%) | H | 81 (40.90) |  | H | 76 (38.4\%) | H | 10.546 | H | 105 (53.0\%) |
|  |  | 0 | 24(754) | 0 | 14 (583\%) | 0 | 12 (50.06) |  | 0 | 11 (45.85) | 0 | 0 (0.04) | 0 | 15 (62.5\%) |
|  |  | W | 67 (20.84) | w | $29(4336)$ | W | 27(40.36) |  | W | 24(35.84) | W | 1(1.54) | W | 38 (56.7\%) |
|  | Total Refered 585 (24.50) | A | 47(3066) | A | 31 (56006) | A 4 | $20(42.601)$ |  | AA | 14 (29.86) | As | 0 0(0.04) | A | 22 (4.85\%) |
|  |  | A | 16(27*) | A | 8(50.0\%) | A | 8(50.04) |  | A | 6(37.54) | A | 0 0(0.04] | A | 11 (68.8\%) |
|  |  | H | 380 (65.08) | H | 190 (500\%) | H | 161(42.46) |  | H | 102 (2684) | H | 5(1.34) | H | 181(47.64) |
|  |  | 0 | 39(577) | 0 | 22 (56.46) | 0 | 18 (46.25) |  | 0 | 14(35.97\%) | 0 | 0 (0.04) | 0 | 24 (61.5\%) |
|  |  | w | 103 (17.66) | w | 47 (45.65) | w | 45 (43.70) |  | w | 36 (35.0\%) | W | 3(2.94) | W | 59(57.36) |
|  | Collegeteral$1,771(742 *)$ | A | 113(5.44) |  |  |  |  | NotApplicable |  |  |  |  | A | 84(74.35) |
|  |  | A | 24(148) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | A | 21 (87.50) |
|  |  | H | 1,161 (55.64) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | H | 889 (76.68) |
|  |  | 0 | 88(50\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 76(86.43) |
|  |  | w | 385 (21784) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | W | 290(75.3\%) |
|  | Uninown$31(1.36)$ | A | 1(326) | A | 010086 | Ah | 0 0.06\% | NotApplicable | A | 0 0.0\%\% | AA | 0 0(0.04) | A | $1(100.05$ ) |
|  |  | A | 0 (0.06\% | A | 0 000\% | A | 0000\% |  | A | 0 0,0\%\%) | A | 0 0(0.04) | A | $0(0.050$ |
|  |  | H | 20 (54.56) | H | 15.5080 | H | $15.068)$ |  | H | 1(5.0\%) | H | $0(0.056)$ | H | 12 (60.0\%) |
|  |  | 0 | (12.9\%) | 0 | 0 0006) | 0 | 0 00.0\% |  | 0 | 0 0,0\%s) | 0 | 0 (0.053) | 0 | 1 (25.0\%) |
|  |  | w | 6(19.46) | w | 0 0006 | w | 00.065) |  | w | 0 0,0\%\%) | W | 0 0(0.056) | W | 4(66.7\%) |
|  | CohortTotal 2,387 (100008) | A | 161(5.76) | AA | 35 (2178) | A | 24 (1498) |  | AA | 16 (9.9\%) | AA | 0 0(0.04) | AA | 107 (66.5\%) |
|  |  | A | 40(178) | A | $8(20.065)$ | A | 8(20.056) |  | A | 6 (15.0\%) | A | 0 0(0.05) | A | $32(80.05$ ) |
|  |  | H | 1,561 (55.456) | H | 204(13.13) | H | 170(10980) |  | H | 110 (7.0\%) | H | 6(0.45) | H | 1,082 (69.3\%) |
|  |  | 0 | 131(5.56) | 0 | 24 (1833) | 0 | 20 (15.30) |  | 0 | 16 (12.23) | 0 | $0(0.056)$ | 0 | 101 (77.15) |
|  |  | $w$ | 49420731 | W | 531107 ${ }^{14}$ | W | 50110130 |  | W | 4018139 | W | 41085 | W | 353.71.5\% |
|  | A $=$ African - A | meric | $\mathrm{A}=$ Asian |  | ispanic |  | er $\mathrm{W}=$ | Wite |  |  |  |  |  |  |

English Progression by Ethnicity (continued)


## English Progression by Age

Across cohort years, referral levels, and age groups, a consistent pattern in success rate in "gatekeeper" in 3 years was not evidenced. When comparing the 2011 cohort to the 2013 cohort, DE referred students between the ages of 18 and 21 experienced over 20 percentage point increase in "gatekeeper" success.

|  |  | Referral Level |  | Attempted Any DE <br> (1stYear) |  | Success in Any DE (1styear) |  | Attempted RSG <br> (1styear) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Success in RSG } \\ \text { (1st Year) } \end{gathered}$ | Success in High DE <br> (3rd Year) |  | Success in RSG <br> (3rdYear) | Success in GK (3rd Year) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DELevel 1$192(7.4 \%)$ | $<17$ | 7(3.6\%) | <17 | 5 (71.48) | <17 | 5(71.4\%) | Not Applicable |  | $<17$ | 3(42.9\%) | NotApplicable | $<17$ | 3 (42.9\%) |
|  |  | 18.21 | 150(78.1\%) | 18-21 | 105 (70.0\%) | 18.21 | 87(58.0\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 61 (40.7\%) |  | 18-21 | 49 (32.7\%) |
|  |  | 22.24 | 12(6.3\%) | 22-24 | 8(66.7\%) | 22.24 | 6(50.0\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 6 (50.0\%) |  | 22-24 | 2 (16.7\%) |
|  |  | 25.35 | 15 (7.8\%) | 25-35 | 8(53.3\%) | 25.35 | 7(46.7\%) |  |  | 25-35 | $4(26.7 \%)$ |  | 25-35 | 4 (26.7\%) |
|  |  | 36.50 | $7(3.6 \%)$ | 36.50 | 2(28.6\%) | 36.50 | 2(28.6\%) |  |  | $36-50$ | $1(14.3 \%)$ |  | 36.50 | $2(28.6 \%)$ |
|  |  | 51+ | 10.5\%) | 51+ | 1(100.0\%) | 51+ | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) |  | 51+ | 0(0.0\%) |
|  | DELevel2 <br> 631 (24.2\%) | $<17$ | 17(2.7\%) | $<17$ | 8(47.1\%) | $<17$ | 4(23.5\%) |  |  | $<17$ | 4(23.5\%) |  | $<17$ | 8(47.1\%) |
|  |  | 18.21 | 461 (73.1\%) | 18-21 | $284(61.6 \%)$ | 18.21 | 228 (49.5\%) |  |  | 18.21 | 211 (45.8\%) |  | 18.21 | 214 (46.4\%) |
|  |  | 22.24 | 55 (8.7\%) | 22.24 | 28 (50.9\%) | 22.24 | 25 (45.5\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 20 (36.48) |  | 22-24 | 23 (41.85) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 58 (9.28) | 25-35 | 33 (56.9\%) | 25-35 | 29 (50.0\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 29 (50.0\%) |  | 25-35 | 30(51.7\%) |
|  |  | 36.50 | 37(5.9\%) | 36-50 | 22 (59.5\%) | 36.50 | 18 (48.6\%) |  |  | 36-50 | 17 (45.9\%) |  | 36-50 | 20(54.1\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | $3(0.5 \%)$ | 51+ | 1(33.3\%) | 51+ | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  | $51+$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  | 51+ | 1(33.3\%) |
|  | Total Referred$823(31.6 \%)$ | $<17$ | $24(2.98 \%)$ | $<17$ | 13(54.2\%) | $<17$ | $9(37.5 \%)$ |  |  | $<17$ | 7 (29.2\%) |  | $<17$ | 11 (45.8\%) |
|  |  | 18.21 | $611(74.28)$ | 18.21 | 389 (63.7\%) | 18.21 | 315 (51.6\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 272 (44.5\%) |  | 18-21 | 263 (43.0\%) |
|  |  | 22.24 | 67 (8.1\%) | 22-24 | 36 (53.7\%) | 22.24 | $31(46.3 \%)$ |  |  | 22-24 | 26 (38.8\%) |  | 22-24 | 25 (37.3\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 73 (8.98) | 25-35 | 41 (56.2\%) | 25-35 | 36 (49.3\%) |  |  | 25-35 | $33(45.28)$ |  | 25-35 | 34(46.6\%) |
|  |  | 36.50 | 44(5.3\%) | 36-50 | 24 (54.5\%) | 36.50 | 20 (45.5\%) |  |  | 36.50 | 18(40.9\%) |  | 36-50 | 22 (50.0\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | $4(0.5 \%)$ | 51+ | 2(50.0\%) | 51+ | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  | 51+ | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  | 51+ | 1 (25.0\%) |
|  | College Level1,746 (67.0\%) | 47 | 97 (5.6\%) |  |  |  |  | NotApplicable |  |  |  |  | <17 | 57 (58.8\%) |
|  |  | 18.21 | 1,461 (83.7\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18.21 | 777 (53.2\%) |
|  |  | 22.24 | $55(3.2 \%)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 22-24 | 36 (65.5\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | $91(5.28)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 25-35 | 52 (57.1\%) |
|  |  | 36.50 | $39(2.25)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $36-50$ | 30 (76.9\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | $3(0.28)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 51+ | $3(100.0 \%)$ |
|  | Unknown <br> 37 (1.4\%) | $<17$ | 1(2.7\%) | <17 | $0(0.0 \%)$ | <17 | $0(0.0 \%)$ | NotApplicable |  | 47 | $0(0.0 \%)$ | NotApplicable | <17 | $0(0.0 \%)$ |
|  |  | 18.21 | 19 (51.4\%) | 18.21 | $0(0.0 \%)$ | 18.21 | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  | 18.21 | $0000 \%)$ |  | 18.21 | 3 (15.8\%) |
|  |  | 22.24 | 1(2.78) | 22.24 | 0 (0.0\%) | 22.24 | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  | 22.24 | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  | 22.24 | 0(0.0\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | $9(24.35)$ | 25-35 | $0(0.08)$ | 25-35 | $0(0.08)$ |  |  | 25-35 | 0 (0.0\%) |  | 25-35 | 1 (11.1\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | $3(8.1 \%)$ | 36-50 | $0(0.0 \%)$ | 36.50 | $0(0.05)$ |  |  | 36-50 | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  | 36-50 | 0(0.0\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | 4(10.8\%) | 51+ | $0(0.085)$ | 51+ | $0(0.08 \%)$ |  |  | 51+ | 0(0.0\%) |  | 51+ | $0(0.0 \%)$ |
|  | Cohort Total 2,606 (100.0\%) | $<17$ | 122 (4.7\%) | $<17$ | 14(11.5\%) | $<17$ | 10(8.2\%) |  |  | 47 | $8(6.6 \%)$ |  | $<17$ | 68 (55.7\%) |
|  |  | 18.21 | 2,091 (80.2\%) | 18-21 | 456 (21.8\%) | 18.21 | $372(17.88)$ |  |  | 18-21 | 324(15.5\%) |  | 18-21 | 1,043 (49.9\%) |
|  |  | 22.24 | 123 (4.7\%) | 22-24 | 42 (34.1\%) | 22.24 | 36 (29.3\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 31 (25.2\%) |  | 22-24 | 61 (49.6\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 173 (6.6\%) | 25-35 | 43 (24.9\%) | 25-35 | 38 (22.0\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 35 (20.2\%) |  | 25-35 | 87 (50.3\%) |
|  |  | 36.50 | 86(3.3\%) | 36-50 | 26 (30.2\%) | 36.50 | 22 (25.65) |  |  | 36-50 | 21 (24.48) |  | 36-50 | $52(60.5 \%)$ |
|  |  | - $51+$ | 11(0.45\% |  | 3 327.36 ] |  | 010.0\% |  |  | -51+ | -010.0\%). |  | 51+ | 4(36.4\%) |

## 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, IP, 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 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:

Course Enrollment::

## English Progression by Age (continued)



English Progression by Age (continued)


## English Progression by Enrollment Status

Across all cohorts and levels, part-time students compared to full-time students successfully passed English highest DE and "gatekeeper" courses at higher rates. When comparing referred students, full-time students had higher "gatekeeper" success rates than did part-time students.

|  |  |  | erral Level |  | ed Any DE <br> Year) |  | $s \text { in Any DE }$ <br> Year) | Attempted RSG (1st Year) | Success in RSG (1st Year) |  | in High DE <br> Year) | Success in RSGz <br> (3rd Year) |  | cess in GK <br> 3rd Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & \frac{1}{0} \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & \frac{7}{8} \\ & \overline{8} \\ & \overline{4} \end{aligned}$ | DE Level 1 | FT | 29 (15.1\%) | FT | 26 (89.7\%) | FT | 21 (72.4\%) | Not Applicable |  | FT | 14 (48.3\%) | Not Applicable | FT | 10 (34.5\%) |
|  | 192 (7.4\%) | PT | 163 (84.9\%) | PT | 103 (63.2\%) | PT | 86 (52.8\%) |  |  | PT | 61 (37.4\%) |  | PT | 50 (30.7\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | FT | 162 (25.7\%) | FT | 120 (74.1\%) | FT | 108 (66.7\%) |  |  | FT | 100 (61.7\%) |  | FT | 98 (60.5\%) |
|  | 631 (24.2\%) | PT | 469 (74.3\%) | PT | 256 (54.6\%) | PT | 196 (41.8\%) |  |  | PT | 181 (38.6\%) |  | PT | 198 (42.2\%) |
|  | Total Referred | FT | 191 (23.2\%) | FT | 146 (76.4\%) | FT | 129 (67.5\%) |  |  | FT | 114 (59.7\%) |  | FT | 108 (56.5\%) |
|  | 823 (31.6\%) | PT | 632 (76.8\%) | PT | 359 (56.8\%) | PT | 282 (44.6\%) |  |  | PT | 242 (38.3\%) |  | PT | 248 (39.2\%) |
|  | College Level | FT | 784 (44.9\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | FT | 452 (57.7\%) |
|  | 1,746 (67.0\%) | PT | 962 (55.1\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PT | 503 (52.3\%) |
|  | Unknown | FT | 1 (2.7\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT | $0(0.0 \%)$ | Not Applicable |  | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable | FT | 1 (100.0\%) |
|  | 37 (1.4\%) | PT | 36 (97.3\%) | PT | $0(0.0 \%)$ | PT | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  | PT | 0 (0.0\%) |  | PT | 3 (8.3\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | FT | 976 (37.5\%) | FT | 171 (17.5\%) | FT | 151 (15.5\%) |  |  | FT | 135 (13.8\%) |  | FT | 561 (57.5\%) |
|  | 2,606 (100.0\%) | PT | 1,630 (62.5\%) | PT | 413 (25.3\%) | PT | 327 ( $20.1 \%$ ) |  |  | PT | 284 (17.4\%) |  |  | 754 (46.3\%) |
|  | DE Level 1 | FT | 13 (8.8\%) | FT | 9 (69.2\%) | FT | 8 (61.5\%) | Not Applicable |  | FT | 5 (38.5\%) | FT 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 5 (38.5\%) |
|  | 148 (5.7\%) | PT | 135 (91.2\%) | PT | 89 (65.9\%) | PT | 71 (52.6\%) |  |  | PT | 39 (28.9\%) | PT $0(0.0 \%)$ | PT | 41 (30.4\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | FT | 107 (20.6\%) | FT | 66 (61.7\%) | FT | 53 (49.5\%) |  |  | FT | 50 (46.7\%) | FT $0(0.0 \%)$ | FT | 52 (48.6\%) |
|  | 520 (20.2\%) | PT | 413 (79.4\%) | PT | 202 (48.9\%) | PT | 146 (35.4\%) |  |  | PT | 135 (32.7\%) | PT $0(0.0 \%)$ | PT | 153 (37.0\%) |
|  | Total Referred | FT | 120 (18.0\%) | FT | 75 (62.5\%) | FT | 61 (50.8\%) |  |  | FT | 55 (45.8\%) | FT 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 57 (47.5\%) |
|  | 668 (25.9\%) | PT | 548 (82.0\%) | PT | 291 (53.1\%) | PT | 217 (39.6\%) |  |  | PT | 174 (31.8\%) | PT $0(0.0 \%)$ | PT | 194 (35.4\%) |
|  | College Level | FT | 810 (43.1\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | FT | 503 (62.1\%) |
|  | 1,881 (73.0\%) | PT | 1,071 (56.9\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PT | 628 (58.6\%) |
|  | Unknown | FT | 10 (37.0\%) | FT | $0(0.0 \%)$ | FT | $0(0.0 \%)$ | Not Applicable |  | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT $\quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | FT | 5 (50.0\%) |
|  | 27 (1.0\%) | PT | 17 (63.0\%) | PT | 2 (11.8\%) | PT | 2 (11.8\%) |  |  | PT | 1 (5.9\%) | PT $0(0.0 \%)$ | PT | 8 (47.1\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | FT | 940 (36.5\%) | FT | 88 (9.4\%) | FT | 73 (7.8\%) |  |  | FT | 63 (6.7\%) | FT $\quad 1(0.1 \%)$ | FT | 565 (60.1\%) |
|  | 2,576 (100.0\%) | PT | 1,636 (63.5\%) | PT | 318(19.4\%) | PT | 235 (14.4\%) |  |  | PT | 190 (11.6\%) | PI_-- $0000 \%$ | PT | 8330 $50.7 \%$ ) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{4}{0} \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & 0 \\ & \text { m } \\ & \stackrel{1}{8} \\ & \overline{0} \end{aligned}$ | DE Level 1 | FT | 20 (7.6\%) | FT | 13 (65.0\%) | FT | 10 (50.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | FT | 3 (15.0\%) | FT $0(0.0 \%)$ | FT | 12 (60.0\%) |
|  | 263 (11.0\%) | PT | 243 (92.4\%) | PT | 129 (53.1\%) | PT | 108 (44.4\%) |  |  | PT | 44 (18.1\%) | PT $6(2.5 \%)$ | PT | 107 (44.0\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | FT | 59 (18.3\%) | FT | 27 (45.8\%) | FT | 25 (42.4\%) |  |  | FT | 23 (39.0\%) | FT $\quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | FT | 35 (59.3\%) |
|  | 322 (13.5\%) | PT | 263 (81.7\%) | PT | 129 (49.0\%) | PT | 109 (41.4\%) |  |  | PT | 102 (38.8\%) | PT $2(0.8 \%)$ | PT | 143 (54.4\%) |
|  | Total Referred | FT | 79 (13.5\%) | FT | 40 (50.6\%) | FT | 35 (44.3\%) |  |  | FT | 26 (32.9\%) | FT $0(0.0 \%)$ | FT | 47 (59.5\%) |
|  | 585 (24.5\%) | PT | 506 (86.5\%) | PT | 258 (51.0\%) | PT | 217 (42.9\%) |  |  | PT | 146 (28.9\%) | PT $8(1.6 \%)$ | PT | 250 (49.4\%) |
|  | College Level | FT | 838 (47.3\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | FT | 703 (83.9\%) |
|  | $1,771(74.2 \%)$ | PT | 933 (52.7\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PT | 657 (70.4\%) |
|  | Unknown | FT | 13 (41.9\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT | $0(0.0 \%)$ | Not Applicable |  | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT $0(0.0 \%)$ | FT | 8 (61.5\%) |
|  | 31 (1.3\%) | PT | 18 (58.1\%) | PT | 1 (5.6\%) | PT | 1 (5.6\%) |  |  | PT | 1 (5.6\%) | PT $0(0.0 \%)$ | PT | 10 (55.6\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | FT | 930 (39.0\%) | FT | 50 (5.4\%) | FT | 43 (4.6\%) |  |  | FT | 33 (3.5\%) | FT $\quad 0(0.0 \%)$ |  | 758 (81.5\%) |
|  | . 2,387 (100.0\%) | PT | 1,457 (61.0\%) | PT | 274 (18.8\%) | PT | 229(15.7\%). |  |  | PT | 155 (10.6\%) | PI_-10 0 (0.7\%) |  | -917(62.9\%) |

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, IP, 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 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) |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Attempted RSG } \\ & \text { (1st Year) } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Success in RSG } \\ \text { (1st Year) } \end{gathered}$ |  | Success in High DE (3rd Year) | Success in RSGz (3rd Year) | Success in GK (3rd Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DE Level 1 | FT | 27 (15.5\%) | FT | 21 (77.8\%) | FT | 14 (51.9\%) | FT | 1 (3.7\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | 3rd Year Data Not Yet Available |  |  |
|  | 174 (6.7\%) | PT | 147 (84.5\%) | PT | 119 (81.0\%) | PT | 88 (59.9\%) | PT | 4 (2.7\%) | PT | 3 (2.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 2 | FT | 49 (20.2\%) | FT | 31 (63.3\%) | FT | 20 (40.8\%) | FT | 1 (2.0\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 243 (9.3\%) | PT | 194 (79.8\%) | PT | 123 (63.4\%) | PT | 101 (52.1\%) | PT | 10 (5.2\%) | PT | $9(4.6 \%)$ |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 3 | FT | 71 (25.8\%) | FT | 39 (54.9\%) | FT | 35 (49.3\%) | FT | 35 (49.3\%) | FT | 32 (45.1\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 275 (10.5\%) | PT | 204 (74.2\%) | PT | 152 (74.5\%) | PT | 123 (60.3\%) | PT | 144 (70.6\%) | PT | 117 (57.4\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 4 | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 4 (0.2\%) | PT | 4 (100.0\%) | PT | 4 (100.0\%) | PT | 3 (75.0\%) | PT | $4(100.0 \%)$ | PT | 3 (75.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Total Referred | FT | 147 (21.1\%) | FT | 91 (61.9\%) | FT | 69 (46.9\%) | FT | 37 (25.2\%) | FT | 32 (21.8\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 696 (26.7\%) | PT | 549 (78.9\%) | PT | 398 (72.5\%) | PT | 315 (57.4\%) | PT | 162 (29.5\%) | PT | 132 (24.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | College Level | FT | 849 (47.1\%) | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1,803 (69.1\%) | PT | 954 (52.9\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Unknown | FT | 23 (20.9\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 110 (4.2\%) | PT | 87 (79.1\%) | PT | 1 (1.1\%) | PT | 1 (1.1\%) | PT | 1 (1.1\%) | PT | 1 (1.1\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Cohort Total | FT | 1,019 (39.1\%) | FT | 99 (9.7\%) | FT | 76 (7.5\%) | FT | 42 (4.1\%) | FT | 36 (3.5\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 2,609 (100.0\%) | PT | -1,590 (60.9\%) | PT | 434.27.3\%) | PT | 342 (21.5\%) | PT | 192(12.1\%) | PT | 154(9.7\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 1 | FT | 44 (21.2\%) | FT | 37 (84.1\%) | FT | 31 (70.5\%) | FT | 4 (9.1\%) | FT | 4 (9.1\%) | 3rd Year Data Not Yet Available |  |  |
|  | 208 (7.4\%) | PT | 164 (78.8\%) | PT | 118 (72.0\%) | PT | 92 (56.1\%) | PT | 13 (7.9\%) | PT | 9 (5.5\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 2 | FT | 119 (31.6\%) | FT | 78 (65.5\%) | FT | 67 (56.3\%) | FT | 2 (1.7\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 376 (13.4\%) | PT | 257 (68.4\%) | PT | 152 (59.1\%) | PT | 113 (44.0\%) | PT | 24 (9.3\%) | PT | 19 (7.4\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 3 | FT | 336 (52.5\%) | FT | 265 (78.9\%) | FT | 238 (70.8\%) | FT | 259 (77.1\%) | FT | 232 (69.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 640 (22.8\%) | PT | 304 (47.5\%) | PT | 219 (72.0\%) | PT | 175 (57.6\%) | PT | 208 (68.4\%) | PT | 163 (53.6\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 4 | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | $1(0.0 \%)$ | PT | 1 (100.0\%) | PT | 0 (0.0\%) | PT | 0 (0.0\%) | PT | 0 (0.0\%) | PT | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Total Referred | FT | 499 (40.7\%) | FT | 380 (76.2\%) | FT | 336 (67.3\%) | FT | 265 (53.1\%) | FT | 236 (47.3\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 1,225 (43.6\%) | PT | 726 (59.3\%) | PT | 489 (67.4\%) | PT | 380 (52.3\%) | PT | 245 (33.7\%) | PT | 191 (26.3\%) |  |  |  |
|  | College Level | FT | 794 (52.0\%) | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1,528 (54.4\%) | PT | 734 (48.0\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Unknown | FT | 15 (25.9\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 58 (2.1\%) | PT | 43 (74.1\%) | PT | 0 (0.0\%) | PT | 0 (0.0\%) | PT | 0 (0.0\%) | PT | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Cohort Total | FT | 1,308 (46.5\%) | FT | 406 (31.0\%) | FT | 358 (27.4\%) | FT | 291 (22.2\%) | FT | 258 (19.7\%) |  |  |  |
|  | . $2.811 .1100 .0 \%$ ) | PT | -1,503 (53.5\%) |  | 509.33.9\%) | PT | 396(26.3\%) , |  | 262 (17.4\%) |  | 205 (13.6\%) |  |  |  |
| FT = Full-time $\quad$ PT = Part-time |  | PT = Part-time |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## English Progression by Pell Status

Of referred students, generally Pell recipients compared to non-Pell recipients successfully passed English DE courses at higher rates. Overall (except Cohort 2013), non-Pell recipients successfully passed the English "gatekeeper" course at higher rates when compared to Pell recipients. When comparing the 2011 cohort to the 2013 cohort, referred Pell experienced an increase in "gatekeeper" success.

|  |  |  | erral Level |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { red Any DE } \\ & \text { Year) } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { in Any DE } \\ & \text { tYear) } \end{aligned}$ | Attempted RSG (1st Year) | Success in RSG <br> (1st Year) |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { in High DE } \\ & \text { d Year) } \end{aligned}$ | Success in RSG <br> (3rd Year) |  | ccess in GK <br> (3rd Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DE Level 1 | Y | 101 (52.6\%) | $Y$ | 83(82.2\%) | $Y$ | 68 (67.3\%) | Not Applicable |  | $Y$ | 49 (4.5\%) | Not Applicable |  | 38 (37.6\%) |
|  | 192 (7.4\%) | N | 91 (47.4\%) | N | 46 (50.5\%) | N | $39(42.9 \%)$ |  |  | N | 26 (28.6\%) |  |  | 22 (24.2\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | Y | 319 (50.6\%) | $\gamma$ | 210 (65.8\%) | Y | 167 (52.4\%) |  |  | Y | 157 (49.2\%) |  |  | 161 (50.5\%) |
|  | 631 (24.2\%) | N | 312 (49.4\%) | N | 166 (53.2\%) | N | 137 (43.9\%) |  |  | N | 124 (39.7\%) |  |  | 135 (43.3\%) |
|  | Total Referred | Y | 420 (51.0\%) | $Y$ | 293 (69.8\%) | Y | 235 (56.0\%) |  |  | Y | 206 (4.0\%) |  |  | 199 (47.4\%) |
|  | 823 (31.6\%) | N | 403 (49.0\%) | N | 212 (52.6\%) | N | 176 (43.7\%) |  |  | N | 150 (37.2\%) |  |  | 157 (39.0\%) |
|  | College Level | $Y$ | 792 (45.4\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  | 468 (59.1\%) |
|  | 1,746(67.0\%) | N | 954 (54.6\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 487( $51.0 \%$ ) |
|  | Unknown | $Y$ | 17 (45.9\%) | $Y$ | 0 (0.0\%) | $Y$ | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | Y | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | 4 (23.5\%) |
|  | $37(1.4 \%)$ | N | 20 (54.1\%) | N | 0 (0.0\%) | N | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | N | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 0(0.0\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | Y | 1,229 (47.2\%) | Y | 339 (27.6\%) | Y | 276 (22.5\%) |  |  | Y | 244 (19.9\%) |  |  | 671 (54.6\%) |
|  | 2.606 (1000\%) | N | 1,377152.8\%) |  | 245 (17.8\%) | N | 20214.7\%) |  |  | N | 175 (12.7\%) |  |  | _6444468\%) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{4}{0} \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & \stackrel{1}{n} \\ & \stackrel{1}{8} \\ & \overline{0} \end{aligned}$ | DE Level 1 | Y | 76 (51.4\%) | Y | $59(77.6 \%)$ | Y | 50 (65.8\%) | Not Applicable |  | Y | 27 (35.5\%) | 0 (0.0\%) |  | 24 (31.6\%) |
|  | 148 (5.7\%) | N | 72 (48.6\%) | N | 39(54.2\%) | N | 29 (40.3\%) |  |  | N | 17 (23.6\%) | $N \quad 0$ (0.0\%) |  | 22 (30.6\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | Y | 266 (51.2\%) | $Y$ | 152 (57.1\%) | Y | 115 (43.2\%) |  |  | Y | 107 (40.2\%) | 0 (0.0\%) |  | 107 (40.2\%) |
|  | 520 (20.2\%) | N | 254 (48.8\%) | N | 116 (45.7\%) | N | 84 (33.1\%) |  |  | N | 78(30.7\%) | $\mathrm{N} \quad 0$ (0.0\%) |  | 98 (38.6\%) |
|  | Total Referred | $Y$ | 342 (51.2\%) | $Y$ | 211 (61.7\%) | $Y$ | 165 (48.2\%) |  |  | Y | 134 (39.2\%) | 0 (0.0\%) |  | 131 (38.3\%) |
|  | 668 (25.9\%) | N | 326 (48.8\%) | N | 155 (47.5\%) | N | 113 (34.7\%) |  |  | N | 95 (29.1\%) | $N \quad 0$ (0.0\%) |  | 120 (36.8\%) |
|  | College Level | Y | 772 (41.0\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  | 481( $62.3 \%$ ) |
|  | 1,881 (73.0\%) | N | 1,109 (59.0\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 650 (58.6\%) |
|  | Unknown | Y | 13 (48.1\%) | $Y$ | 1 (7.7\%) | Y | 1 (7.7\%) | Not Applicable |  | Y | 1 (7.7\%) | 0 (0.0\%) |  | 7 (53.8\%) |
|  | 27 (1.0\%) | N | 14 (51.9\%) | N | 1 (7.1\%) | N | 1 (7.1\%) |  |  | N | 0 (0.0\%) | $N \quad 0$ (0.0\%) |  | 6 (42.9\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | Y | 1,127 (43.8\%) | $Y$ | 227 (20.1\%) | Y | 176 (15.6\%) |  |  | Y | 144 (12.8\%) | $1(0.1 \%)$ |  | 619 (54.9\%) |
|  | 2.576 (100.0\%) | N | 1.499 566.3\%) | N | 179 (12.4\%) | N | 1322 (9.1\%) |  |  | N | $109.7 .5 \%)$ | N |  | -776(53.6\%) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{4}{0} \\ & \frac{0}{8} \\ & \text { m } \\ & \stackrel{1}{8} \\ & = \end{aligned}$ | DE Level 1 | Y | 156 (59.3\%) | Y | 87 (55.8\%) | , | 68 (43.6\%) | Not Applicable |  | Y | 23 (14.7\%) | $1(0.6 \%)$ |  | 68 (4.6\%) |
|  | 263 (11.0\%) | N | 107 (40.7\%) | N | 55 (51.4\%) | N | 50 (46.7\%) |  |  | N | 24 (22.4\%) | $\mathrm{N} \quad 5(4.7 \%)$ |  | 51 (47.7\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | Y | 168 (52.2\%) | $Y$ | 93 (55.4\%) | Y | 79 (47.0\%) |  |  | Y | 65 (38.7\%) | $1(0.6 \%)$ |  | 92 (54.8\%) |
|  | 322 (13.5\%) | N | 154 (47.8\%) | N | 63 (40.9\%) | N | 55 (35.7\%) |  |  | N | 60(39.0\%) | $1(0.6 \%)$ |  | 86 (5.8\%) |
|  | Total Referred | Y | 324 (55.4\%) | $Y$ | 180 (55.6\%) | Y | 147 (4.4\%) |  |  | Y | 88 (27.2\%) | Y $2(0.6 \%)$ |  | 160 (49.4\%) |
|  | 585 (24.5\%) | N | 261 (44.6\%) | N | 118 (45.2\%) | N | 105 (40.2\%) |  |  | N | 84(32.2\%) | $N \quad 6(23 \%)$ |  | 137 (52.5\%) |
|  | College Level | Y | 749 (42.3\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  | 553 (73.8\%) |
|  | 1,771 (74.2\%) | N | 1,022 (57.7\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 807 (79.0\%) |
|  | Unknown | Y | 12 (38.7\%) | $Y$ | 18.3\%) | Y | 1 (8.3\%) | Not Applicable |  | Y | 18.3\%) | Y 0(0.0\%) |  | 6 (50.0\%) |
|  | 31 (1.3\%) | N | 19 (61.3\%) | N | 0 (0.0\%) | N | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | N | 0 (0.0\%) | $N \quad 0$ (0.0\%) |  | 12(63.2\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | Y | 1,085 (45.5\%) | $Y$ | 192 (17.7\%) | Y | 156 (14.4\%) |  |  | Y | 93(8.6\%) | 4 (0.4\%) |  | 719 (66.3\%) |
|  | 2.2387 (100.0\%) | - | 1,302254.5\%) | - | 132 $10.1 \%$, | , | 116(8.9\%) |  |  | N | 95 (7.3\%) | N |  | _956 (73.4\%) |

## English Progression by Pell Status (Continued)



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

## English Progression by Veteran Status

Of referred students, generally veteran students have higher success rates in English DE courses than do non-veteran students. Additionally, veteran students successfully passed the English "gatekeeper" course at higher rates than did non-veteran students. When comparing the 2011 cohort to the 2013 cohort, referred veteran students experienced a decrease in "gatekeeper" success.

|  | DE Level 1 <br> 192 (7.4\%) | Referral Level |  | Attempted Any DE <br> (1st Year) |  | Success in Any DE <br> (1st Year) |  | Attempted RSG <br> (1st Year) | Success in RSG <br> (1st Year) |  | in High DE <br> Year) | Success in RSG <br> (3rd Year) |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { cess in GK } \\ & 3 \text { rd Yearr } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 4 \\ & 0 \\ & \frac{1}{0} \\ & 0 \\ & \frac{1}{8} \\ & \stackrel{1}{1} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | Y | 11 (5.7\%) | $Y$ | $9(81.8 \%)$ | Y | 8 (72.7\%) |  |  | Y | 3(27.3\%) |  | $\gamma$ | 4 (36.4\%) |
|  |  | N | 181 (94.3\%) | N | 120 (66.3\%) | N | 99(54.7\%) |  |  | N | 72 (39.8\%) |  | N | 56 (30.9\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | Y | 53 (8.4\%) | Y | 34(64.2\%) | Y | 29 (54.7\%) | Not App | icable | $Y$ | 27 (50.9\%) | Not Applicable | Y | 32 (60.4\%) |
|  | 631 (24.2\%) | N | 578 (91.6\%) | N | 342 (59.2\%) | N | 275 (47.6\%) | Not App |  | N | 254 (43.9\%) | NotAppicable | N | 264 (45.7\%) |
|  | Total Referred | Y | 64 (7.8\%) | Y | 43 (67.2\%) | Y | 37 (57.8\%) |  |  | Y | 30 (46.9\%) |  | $\gamma$ | 36 (56.3\%) |
|  | 823 (31.6\%) | N | 759 (922.2\%) | N | $462(60.9 \%)$ | N | 374 (49.3\%) |  |  | N | 326 (43.0\%) |  | N | 320 (42.2\%) |
|  | College Level | Y | 94 (5.4\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Appli |  |  |  |  | Y | $51(54.3 \%)$ |
|  | 1,746(67.0\%) | N | 1,652 (94.6\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | N | 904 (54.7\%) |
|  | Unknown | Y | 1(2.7\%) | $Y$ | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | Y | 0 (0.0\%) |  | Y | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  | 37 (1.4\%) | N | 36 (97.3\%) | N | 0 (0.0\%) | N | 0 (0.0\%) | Not App |  | N | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Anplicale | N | 4 (11.1\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | Y | 159 (6.1\%) | Y | 47 (29.6\%) | , | 41 (25.8\%) |  |  | Y | 34 (21.4\%) | Notappicable | $\gamma$ | 87 (54.7\%) |
|  | .2,006 [100.0\%) |  | 2.447793.9\%) | N | 537121.9\%) | N | 437 (17.9\%) |  |  | N | 385 $15.7 \%$ ) |  |  | 1,228(50.2\%) |
|  | DE Level 1 | Y | 5(3.4\%) | Y | 4(80.0\%) | r | 4(80.0\%) |  |  | r | 1 (20.0\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | $3(60.0 \%)$ |
|  | 148 (5.7\%) | N | 143 (96.6\%) | N | 94 (65.7\%) | N | 75 (52.4\%) |  |  | N | 43 (30.1\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | N | 43 (30.1\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | Y | 47 (9.0\%) | $Y$ | 27 (57.4\%) | $Y$ | 19 (40.4\%) | Not App | icable | Y | 19 (40.4\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 20 (42.6\%) |
|  | 520 (20.2\%) | N | 473 (91.0\%) | N | 241 (51.0\%) | $N$ | 180 (38.1\%) |  |  | N | 166 (35.1\%) | 0 00.0\%) | N | 185 (39.1\%) |
|  | Total Referred | Y | 52(7.8\%) | Y | 31 (59.6\%) | $Y$ | 23 (44.2\%) |  |  | Y | 20 (38.5\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | $Y$ | 23 (44.2\%) |
|  | 668 (25.9\%) | N | 616 (92.2\%) | N | 335 (54.4\%) | N | 255 (41.4\%) |  |  | N | 209 (33.9\%) | $N \quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | N | 228 (37.0\%) |
|  | College Level | Y | 108 (5.7\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Appl |  |  |  |  | Y | 73 (67.6\%) |
|  | 1,881 (77.0\%) | N | 1,773 (94.3\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | N | 1,058 (59.7\%) |
|  | Unknown | Y | 0 (0.0\%) | $Y$ | 0 (0.0\%) | $Y$ | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | Y | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | $Y$ | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  | 27 (1.0\%) | N | 27 (1000\%) | N | 2(7.4\%) | N | 2(7.4\%) | Not App | icable | N | 1(3.7\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | N | 13 (48.1\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | Y | 160 (6.2\%) | $Y$ | 32 (20.0\%) | Y | 24 (15.0\%) |  |  | Y | 21 (13.1\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | $Y$ | 96 (60.0\%) |
|  | .2,576 (100.0\%) | N | 2.416 $193.8 \%$, | N | 374 $115.5 \%$, | N | $28411.8 \%)$ |  |  | N | $2329.9 .6 \%)$ | N | N | 1,299 (53.8\%) |
|  | DE Level 1 | Y | 13 (4.9\%) | Y | 12 (92.3\%) | Y | 9 (69.2\%) | Not Applicable |  | Y | 2 (15.4\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 6 (46.2\%) |
|  | 263 (11.0\%) | N | 250 (95.1\%) | N | 130 (52.0\%) | N | 109 (43.6\%) |  |  | N | 45 (18.0\%) | 6 (2.4\%) | N | 113 (45.2\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | Y | 13(4.0\%) | $Y$ | 7 (53.8\%) | Y | 5(38.5\%) |  |  | Y | 5(38.5\%) | 17.7\%) | Y | $8(61.5 \%)$ |
|  | 322 (13.5\%) | N | 309 (96.0\%) | N | 149 (48.2\%) | N | 129 (41.7\%) |  |  | N | 120 (38.8\%) | 1 (0.3\%) | N | 170 (55.0\%) |
|  | Total Referred | Y | 26 (4.4\%) | $Y$ | 19 (73.1\%) | $Y$ | 14 (53.8\%) |  |  | Y | 7 (26.9\%) | 1 (3.8\%) | Y | 14 (53.8\%) |
|  | 585 (24.5\%) | N | 559 (95.6\%) | N | 279 (49.9\%) | N | 238 (42.6\%) |  |  | N | 165 (29.5\%) | $\mathrm{N} \quad 7(1.3 \%)$ | N | 283 (50.6\%) |
|  | College Level | Y | $90(5.1 \%)$ |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | Y | 73 (81.1\%) |
|  | 1,771 (74.2\%) | N | 1,681 (94.9\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | N | 1,287 (76.6\%) |
|  | Unknown | Y | 16 (51.6\%) | $Y$ | 1 (6.3\%) | , | 1 (6.3\%) | Not Applicable |  | $Y$ | 1 (6.3\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 12 (75.0\%) |
|  | $31(1.3 \%)$ | N | 15 (48.4\%) | N | 0 (0.0\%) | N | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | N | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | N | $6(40.0 \%)$ |
|  | Cohort Total | Y | 132 (5.5\%) | Y | 22 (16.7\%) | Y | 17 (12.9\%) |  |  | Y | 10 (7.6\%) | 1 (0.8\%) | Y | $99(75.0 \%)$ |
|  | .2,387」100.0\%) |  | 2,255 (94.5\%) | N | 302 $113.4 \%$, |  | 255 (11.3\%) |  |  |  | 178(179\%) | $9(0.4 \%)$ |  | 1.576(69.9\%) |

## 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 (1st Year) |  | Success in High DE (3rd Year) | Success in RSG (3rd Year) | Success in GK (3rd Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{⿺}{0} \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & \vdots \\ & \stackrel{H}{8} \\ & \overline{10} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | DE Level 1 | Y | 6 (3.4\%) | $Y$ | 5 (83.3\%) | Y | 4 (66.7\%) | Y | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 0 (0.0\%) | 3rd Year Data Not Yet Available |  |  |
|  | 174 (6.7\%) | N | 168 (96.6\%) | N | 135 (80.4\%) | N | 98 (58.3\%) | N | 5 (3.0\%) | N | 3 (1.8\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 2 | Y | 13 (5.3\%) | Y | 11 (84.6\%) | Y | 10 (76.9\%) | $Y$ | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 243 (9.3\%) | N | 230 (94.7\%) | N | 143 (62.2\%) | N | 111 (48.3\%) | N | 11 (4.8\%) | N | $9(3.9 \%)$ |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 3 | Y | 14 (5.1\%) | Y | 13 (92.9\%) | Y | 10 (71.4\%) | Y | 12 (85.7\%) | Y | 9 (64.3\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 275 (10.5\%) | N | 261 (94.9\%) | N | 178 (68.2\%) | N | 148 (56.7\%) | N | 167 (64.0\%) | N | 140 (53.6\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 4 | Y | $0(0.0 \%)$ | Y | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 4 (0.2\%) | N | 4 (100.0\%) | N | 4 (100.0\%) | N | 3 (75.0\%) | N | 4 (100.0\%) | N | 3 (75.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Total Referred | Y | 33 (4.7\%) | $Y$ | 29 (87.9\%) | Y | 24 (72.7\%) | $Y$ | 12 (36.4\%) | $Y$ | 9 (27.3\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 696 (26.7\%) | N | 663 (95.3\%) | N | 460 (69.4\%) | N | 360 (54.3\%) | N | 187 (28.2\%) | N | 155 (23.4\%) |  |  |  |
|  | College Level | Y | $108(6.0 \%)$ | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $1,803 \text { (69.1\%) }$ | $\mathrm{N}$ | 1,695 (94.0\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Unknown | Y | 5 (4.5\%) | $Y$ | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 0 (0.0\%) | $Y$ | 0 (0.0\%) | $Y$ | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 110 (4.2\%) | N | 105 (95.5\%) | N | 1 (1.0\%) | N | 1 (1.0\%) | N | 1 (1.0\%) | N | 1 (1.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Cohort Total | Y | 146 (5.6\%) | $Y$ | 32 (21.9\%) | Y | 26 (17.8\%) | $Y$ | 15 (10.3\%) | $Y$ | 11 (7.5\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 2,609 (100.0\%) | N | 2,463 (94.4\%) | N | 501 (20.3\%) | N | 392 (15.9\%) | N | 219 (8.9\%) | N | 179 (7.3\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 1 | Y | 11 (5.3\%) | Y | 10 (90.9\%) | Y | 8 (72.7\%) | Y | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 0 (0.0\%) | 3rd Year Data Not Yet Available |  |  |
|  | 208 (7.4\%) | N | 197 (94.7\%) | N | 145 (73.6\%) | N | 115 (58.4\%) | N | 17 (8.6\%) | N | 13 (6.6\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 2 | Y | $14 \text { (3.7\%) }$ | Y | 10 (71.4\%) | Y | 7 (50.0\%) | Y | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | $0 \text { (0.0\%) }$ |  |  |  |
|  | $376 \text { (13.4\%) }$ | N | 362 (96.3\%) | N | 220 (60.8\%) | N | 173 (47.8\%) | N | 26 (7.2\%) | N | 19 (5.2\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 3 | Y | 38 (5.9\%) | $Y$ | 34 (89.5\%) | Y | 31 (81.6\%) | $Y$ | 33 (86.8\%) | Y | 30 (78.9\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 640 (22.8\%) | N | 602 (94.1\%) | N | 450 (74.8\%) | N | 382 (63.5\%) | N | 434 (72.1\%) | N | 365 (60.6\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 4 | Y | 0 (0.0\%) | $Y$ | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 1 (0.0\%) | $N$ | 1 (100.0\%) | N | 0 (0.0\%) | N | 0 (0.0\%) | N | 0 (0.0\%) | N | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Total Referred | Y | 63 (5.1\%) | $Y$ | 54 (85.7\%) | Y | 46 (73.0\%) | Y | 33 (52.4\%) | $Y$ | 30 (47.6\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 1,225 (43.6\%) | N | 1,162 (94.9\%) | N | 815 (70.1\%) | N | 670 (57.7\%) | N | 477 (41.0\%) | N | 397 (34.2\%) |  |  |  |
|  | College Level | Y | 134 (8.8\%) | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1,528 (54.4\%) | N | 1,394 (91.2\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Unknown | Y | 4 (6.9\%) | $Y$ | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | $58 \text { (2.1\%) }$ | $N$ | 54 (93.1\%) | N | 0 (0.0\%) | N | 0 (0.0\%) | N | 0 (0.0\%) | N | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Cohort Total | Y | 201 (7.2\%) | $Y$ | 59 (29.4\%) | Y | 50 (24.9\%) | Y | 37 (18.4\%) | $Y$ | 34 (16.9\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 2,811(100.0\%) | N | 2,610(92.8\%) | N- | 856 (32.8\%) | N | 704 (27.0\%) | N | 516 (19.8\%) | N | 429 (16.4\%) |  |  |  |

## 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, 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 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

## 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 2011through Fall 2013, Northwest Vista 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, Northwest Vista College offered four levels of Math developmental education - MATH 0305 (Pre-Algebra), MATH 0310/0442 (Elementary Algebra/Pre-Statistics), MATH 0320 (Intermediate Algebra), and Ready, Set, Go MATH 1314 (MATH 1314 with a 1-hour support course). Students placed in a $D E$ 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 $38 \%-47 \%$ of referred students in each cohort attempted the highest DE course in the Math sequence, with $29 \%-39 \%$ of the cohort successfully passing the course. Approximately $39 \%-48 \%$ of referred students in each cohort attempted a Math "gatekeeper" course, with $32 \%-38 \%$ of the cohort successfully passing a "gatekeeper" course. When comparing the 2013 cohort to the 2011 cohort, "gatekeeper" success increased by 4.7 percentage points.


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

## Math "Gatekeeper" Progression of Non-Referred

After 3 years, approximately $71 \%-79 \%$ of non-referred students in each cohort attempted one of the Math "gatekeeper" courses, with $60 \%-63 \%$ of that cohort successfully passing that course, which is approximately double the rate of referred students.


## Total Math Progression

Overall, $50 \%-60 \%$ of all referred students in each cohort successfully passed any Math DE course within the first year, $29 \%$ $-39 \%$ successfully passed the highest DE course in the Math sequence within 3 years, and approximately $32 \%-38 \%$ successfully passed the Math "gatekeeper" course within 3 years. Of the non-referred students, $60 \%-63 \%$ successfully passed the Math "gatekeeper" course within 3 years. Of the total cohort, $41 \%-53 \%$ successfully passed the Math "gatekeeper" course within 3 years. Those who were referred to Level 4 had higher success rates in the highest DE Math and gatekeeper" courses than did those who were referred to lower levels. Non-referred students had higher success rates in Math "gatekeeper" courses than did referred students. When comparing the 2013 cohort to the 2011 cohort, students referred to Levels 3 and 4 experienced an increase in "gatekeeper" success. In Fall 2014 and Fall 2015, approximately $75 \%$ of those placed in MATH 1314 Ready Set Go successfully passed the 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) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & * \\ & \stackrel{*}{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & 0 \\ & \underset{\sim}{1} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{N} \\ & \bar{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 1 \\ 411 \text { (15.8\%) } \end{gathered}$ | 264 (64.2\%) | 195 (47.4\%) | Not Applicable |  | 79 (19.2\%) | Not Applicable | 78 (19.0\%) |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 2 \\ 460 \text { (17.7\%) } \end{gathered}$ | 352 (76.5\%) | 262 (57.0\%) |  |  | 140 (30.4\%) |  | 119 (25.9\%) |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 3 \\ 518 \text { (19.9\%) } \end{gathered}$ | 409 (79.0\%) | 319 (61.6\%) |  |  | 223 (43.1\%) |  | 177 (34.2\%) |
|  | DE Level 4 $364 \text { (14.0\%) }$ | 288 (79.1\%) | 232 (63.7\%) |  |  | 235 (64.6\%) |  | 190 (52.2\%) |
|  | Total Referred 1,753 (67.3\%) | 1,313 (74.9\%) | 1,008 (57.5\%) |  |  | 677 (38.6\%) |  | 564 (32.2\%) |
|  | College Level 809 (31.0\%) |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  | 485 (60.0\%) |
|  | Unknown $44 \text { (1.7\%) }$ | 4 (9.1\%) | 2 (4.5\%) | Not Applicable |  | 3 (6.8\%) | Not Applicable | 11 (25.0\%) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cohort Total } \\ & 2,606(100.0 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 1,409 (54.1\%) | 1,093 (41.9\%) |  |  | 751 (28.8\%) |  | 1,060 (40.7\%) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DE Level } 1 \\ & 422(16.4 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 300 (71.1\%) | 203 (48.1\%) |  |  | 87 (20.6\%) | 4 (0.9\%) | 103 (24.4\%) |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 2 \\ 368 \text { (14.3\%) } \end{gathered}$ | 279 (75.8\%) | 197 (53.5\%) |  |  | 137 (37.2\%) | 1 (0.3\%) | 141 (38.3\%) |
|  | DE Level 3 $532 \text { (20.7\%) }$ | 399 (75.0\%) | 280 (52.6\%) | Not Ap | icable | 239 (44.9\%) | 1 (0.2\%) | 209 (39.3\%) |
|  | DE Level 4 $326 \text { (12.7\%) }$ | 182 (55.8\%) | 135 (41.4\%) |  |  | 144 (44.2\%) | 1 (0.3\%) | 173 (53.1\%) |
|  | Total Referred 1,648 (64.0\%) | 1,160 (70.4\%) | 815 (49.5\%) |  |  | 607 (36.8\%) | 7 (0.4\%) | 626 (38.0\%) |
|  | College Level $852 \text { (33.1\%) }$ |  |  | Not | licable |  |  | 511 (60.0\%) |
|  | Unknown $76 \text { (3.0\%) }$ | 40 (52.6\%) | 31 (40.8\%) | Not Applicable |  | 17 (22.4\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | 24 (31.6\%) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cohort Total } \\ & 2,576(100.0 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 1,234 (47.9\%) | 871 (33.8\%) |  |  | 649 (25.2\%) | 7 (0.3\%) | 1,161 (45.1\%) |

## 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 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.

## Total Math Progression (Continued)


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: ACCDODS1.XST_ATD_ACCD, ACCDODS1.XST_CBM001_ACCD, ACCDODS1.XST_FADS_ACCD, 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

## Math Progression by Gender

In general, women compared to men successfully passed both DE and "gatekeeper" courses at higher rates. When comparing the 2013 cohort to the 2011 cohort, women referred to Level 2 experienced an increase in "gatekeeper" success. In addition, in Fall 2014 and Fall 2015, women compared to men had higher rates of successfully completing MATH 1314 Ready Set Go.


## 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 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.

## Math Progression by Gender (Continued)

|  | DE Level 1 |  |  | 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) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | M | 225 (39.5\%) | M | 168 (74.7\%) | M | 99 (44.0\%) | M | 4(1.8\%) | M | 3(1.3\%) | 3rd Year Data Not Yet Available |  |  |
|  | 569 (21.8\%) | F | 344 (60.5\%) | F | 289 (84.0\%) | F | 210 (61.0\%) | F | 12 (3.5\%) | F | 8 (2.3\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 2 | M | 94 (41.6\%) | M | 65 (69.1\%) | M | 50 (53.2\%) | M | 4 (4.3\%) | M | 4 (4.3\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 226 (8.7\%) | F | 132 (58.4\%) | F | 97 (73.5\%) | F | 71 (53.8\%) | F | 6 (4.5\%) | F | 6 (4.5\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 3 | M | 98 (48.8\%) | M | 63 (64.3\%) | M | 43 (43.9\%) | M | 2 (2.0\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 201 (7.7\%) | F | 103 (51.2\%) | F | 70 (68.0\%) | F | 49 (47.6\%) | F | 5(4.9\%) | F | 5(4.9\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 4 | M | 13 (33.3\%) | M | 12 (92.3\%) | M | 10 (76.9\%) | M | 12 (92.3\%) | M | 10 (76.9\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 39 (1.5\%) | F | 26 (66.7\%) | F | 25 (96.2\%) | F | 19 (73.1\%) | F | 25 (96.2\%) | F | 19 (73.1\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Total Referred | M | 430 (41.5\%) | M | 308 (71.6\%) | M | 202 (47.0\%) | M | 22 (5.1\%) | M | 17 (4.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 1,035 (39.7\%) | F | 605 (58.5\%) | F | 481 (79.5\%) | F | 349 (57.7\%) | F | 48 (7.9\%) | F | 38 (6.3\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | M | 698 (47.1\%) | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1,481 (56.8\%) | F | $783 \text { (52.9\%) }$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Unknown | M | 56 (60.2\%) | M | 3 (5.4\%) | M | 1(1.8\%) | M | 1(1.8\%) | M | 1(1.8\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 93 (3.6\%) | F | 37 (39.8\%) | F | 1(2.7\%) | F | 0(0.0\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Cohort Total | M | 1,184 (45.4\%) | M | 330 (27.9\%) | M | 218 (18.4\%) | M | 23 (1.9\%) | M | 18 (1.5\%) |  |  |  |
|  | $-2,609(100.0 \%)$ | F | 1,425 (54.6\%) | F | 500(35.1\%) | F | 359 (25.2\%) | F | $52(3.6 \%)$ | F | 41 (2.9\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 1 | M | 301 (40.6\%) | M | 228 (75.7\%) | M | 137 (45.5\%) | M | 2 (0.7\%) | M | 2 (0.7\%) | 3rd Year Data Not Yet Available |  |  |
|  | 741 (26.4\%) | F | 440 (59.4\%) | F | 365 (83.0\%) | F | 271 (61.6\%) | F | 20 (4.5\%) | F | 17 (3.9\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 2 | M | 146 (44.9\%) | M | 109 (74.7\%) | M | 75 (51.4\%) | M | 4 (2.7\%) | M | 3 (2.1\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 325 (11.6\%) | F | 179 (55.1\%) | F | 145 (81.0\%) | F | 118 (65.9\%) | F | 17 (9.5\%) | F | 11 (6.1\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 3 | M | 162 (47.2\%) | M | 92 (56.8\%) | M | 65 (40.1\%) | M | 3(1.9\%) | M | 2 (1.2\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 343 (12.2\%) | F | 181 (52.8\%) | F | 92 (50.8\%) | F | 69 (38.1\%) | F | 11 (6.1\%) | F | 9 (5.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 4 | M | 17 (22.1\%) | M | 17 (100.0\%) | M | 11 (64.7\%) | M | 16 (94.1\%) | M | 11 (64.7\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 77 (2.7\%) | F | 60 (77.9\%) | F | 60 (100.0\%) | F | 48 (80.0\%) | F | 60 (100.0\%) | F | 48 (80.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Total Referred | M | 626 (42.1\%) | M | 446 (71.2\%) | M | 288 (46.0\%) | M | 25 (4.0\%) | M | 18 (2.9\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 1,486 (52.9\%) | F | 860 (57.9\%) | F | 662 (77.0\%) | F | 506 (58.8\%) | F | 108(12.6\%) | F | 85 (9.9\%) |  |  |  |
|  | College Level | M | 675 (52.6\%) | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $1,283(45.6 \%)$ | F | 608 (47.4\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Unknown | M | 18 (42.9\%) | M | 1(5.6\%) | M | 1(5.6\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 42 (1.5\%) | F | 24 (57.1\%) | F | 1(4.2\%) | F | 1(4.2\%) | F | 1(4.2\%) | F | 1 (4.2\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Cohort Total | M | 1,319 (46.9\%) | M | 505 (38.3\%) | M | 333 (25.2\%) | M | 26 (2.0\%) | M | 19 (1.4\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 2,811(100.0\%) | F | 1,492 (53.1\%) | F | 700(46.9\%). | F | 538(36.1\%) | F | 112(7.5\%) | F | 89(6.0\%) |  |  |  |

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:
ACCDODS1.XST_ATD_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

## Math Progression by Ethnicity

In general, of those referred to developmental education, Asian students, compared to other racial/ethnic groups, successfully passed the "gatekeeper" courses at higher rates. When comparing the 2013 cohort to the 2011 cohort, nonreferred Asian and White students experienced increases in "gatekeeper" success.

|  |  |  | 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) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 1 \\ 411(15.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | AA | 28 (6.8\%) | $A A$ | 25 (75.8\%) | $A A$ | 17 (51.5\%) |  |  | AA | 3 (9.1\%) |  | AA | 5 (15.2\%) |
|  | A | 5(1.2\%) | A | 2 (40.0\%) | A | 2 (40.0\%) |  |  | A | 1 (20.0\%) |  | A | 2 (40.0\%) |
|  | H | 299 (72.7\%) | H | 186 (62.2\%) | H | 135 (45.2\%) |  |  | H | 58 (19.4\%) |  | H | 48 (16.1\%) |
|  | 0 | 14 (3.4\%) | 0 | 7 (77.8\%) | O | 6 (66.7\%) |  |  | O | 2 (22.2\%) |  | O | 1 (11.1\%) |
|  | w | 65 (15.8\%) | W | 44 (67.7\%) | W | 35 (53.8\%) |  |  | W | 15 (23.1\%) |  | W | 22 (33.8\%) |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 2 \\ 460(17.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | AA | 30 (6.5\%) | $A A$ | 31 (83.8\%) | $A A$ | 22 (59.5\%) |  |  | AA | 14 (37.8\%) |  | AA | 10 (27.0\%) |
|  | A | 5 (1.1\%) | A | 3 (60.0\%) | A | 2 (40.0\%) |  |  | A | 2 (40.0\%) |  | A | 2 (40.0\%) |
|  | H | 324 (70.4\%) | H | 256 (79.0\%) | H | 190 (58.6\%) |  |  | H | 98 (30.2\%) |  | H | 83 (25.6\%) |
|  | 0 | 22 (4.8\%) | 0 | 8 (53.3\%) | 0 | 6 (40.0\%) |  |  | O | 3 (20.0\%) |  | O | 4 (26.7\%) |
|  | w | 79 (17.2\%) | W | 54 (68.4\%) | W | 42 (53.2\%) |  |  | W | 23 (29.1\%) |  | W | 20 (25.3\%) |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 3 \\ 518(19.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | AA | 30 (5.8\%) | $A A$ | 33 (82.5\%) | AA | 21 (52.5\%) | Not Applicable |  | AA | 18 (45.0\%) |  | AA | 10 (25.0\%) |
|  | A | 10 (1.9\%) | A | 9 (90.0\%) | A | 9 (90.0\%) |  |  | A | 7 (70.0\%) |  | A | 5 (50.0\%) |
|  | H | 340 (65.6\%) | H | 275 (80.9\%) | H | 212 (62.4\%) |  |  | H | 150 (44.1\%) | Not Applicable | H | 126 (37.1\%) |
|  | 0 | 21 (4.1\%) | 0 | 7 (63.6\%) | 0 | 7 (63.6\%) |  |  | O | 5 (45.5\%) |  | O | 6 (54.5\%) |
|  | w | 117 (22.6\%) | w | 85 (72.6\%) | w | 70 (59.8\%) |  |  | W | 43 (36.8\%) |  | w | 30 (25.6\%) |
| DE Level 4$364 \text { (14.0\%) }$ | AA | 25 (6.9\%) | $A A$ | 32 (94.1\%) | AA | 26 (76.5\%) |  |  | AA | 26 (76.5\%) |  | AA | 17 (50.0\%) |
|  | A | 16(4.4\%) | A | 11 (68.8\%) | A | 11 (68.8\%) |  |  | A | 11 (68.8\%) |  | A | 13 (81.3\%) |
|  | H | 208 (57.1\%) | H | 175 (84.1\%) | H | 137 (65.9\%) |  |  | H | 138 (66.3\%) |  | H | 107 (51.4\%) |
|  | O | 22 (6.0\%) | 0 | 9 (69.2\%) | 0 | 7 (53.8\%) |  |  | o | 8 (61.5\%) |  | 0 | 6 (46.2\%) |
|  | w | 93 (25.5\%) | w | 61 (65.6\%) | W | 51 (54.8\%) |  |  | W | 52 (55.9\%) |  | W | 47 (50.5\%) |
| Total Referred1,753 (67.3\%) | AA | 113 (6.4\%) | $A A$ | 121 (84.0\%) | $A A$ | 86 (59.7\%) |  |  | AA | 61 (42.4\%) |  | AA | 42 (29.2\%) |
|  | A | 36 (2.1\%) | A | 25 (69.4\%) | A | 24 (66.7\%) |  |  | A | 21 (58.3\%) |  | A | 22 (61.1\%) |
|  | H | 1,171 (66.8\%) | H | 892 (76.2\%) | H | 674 (57.6\%) |  |  | H | 444 (37.9\%) |  | H | 364 (31.1\%) |
|  | 0 | 79 (4.5\%) | 0 | 31 (64.6\%) | 0 | 26 (54.2\%) |  |  | O | 18 (37.5\%) |  | 0 | 17 (35.4\%) |
|  | w | 354 (20.2\%) | w | 244 (68.9\%) | W | 198 (55.9\%) |  |  | W | 133 (37.6\%) |  | W | 119 (33.6\%) |
| College Level 809 (31.0\%) | AA | 27 (3.3\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | AA | 27 (71.1\%) |
|  | A | 28 (3.5\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | A | 17 (60.7\%) |
|  | H | 470 (58.1\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | H | 295 (62.8\%) |
|  | 0 | 51 (6.3\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 20 (50.0\%) |
|  | w | 233 (28.8\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | W | 126 (54.1\%) |
| Unknown$44 \text { (1.7\%) }$ | AA | 1 (2.3\%) | $A A$ | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable | AA | O(0.0\%) |
|  | A | 1 (2.3\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | A | 0 (0.0\%) |  | A | 1 (100.0\%) |
|  | H | 29 (65.9\%) | H | 4 (13.8\%) | H | 2 (6.9\%) |  |  | H | 2 (6.9\%) |  | H | 8 (27.6\%) |
|  | 0 | 2 (4.5\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) |  | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  | w | 11 (25.0\%) | W | 0 (0.0\%) | W | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | W | 1 (9.1\%) |  | w | 2 (18.2\%) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cohort Total } \\ & \text { 2,606(100.0\%) } \end{aligned}$ | AA | 141 (5.4\%) | $A A$ | 124 (67.4\%) | AA | 89 (48.4\%) |  |  | AA | 64 (34.8\%) |  | AA | 69 (37.5\%) |
|  | A | 65 (2.5\%) | A | 32 (49.2\%) | A | 31 (47.7\%) |  |  | A | 27 (41.5\%) |  | A | 40 (61.5\%) |
|  | H | 1,670 (64.1\%) | H | 950 (56.9\%) | H | 722 (43.2\%) |  |  | H | 483 (28.9\%) |  | H | 667 (39.9\%) |
|  | 0 | 132 (5.1\%) | 0 | 32 (36.0\%) | 0 | 27 (30.3\%) |  |  | 0 | 19 (21.3\%) |  | 0 | 37 (41.6\%) |
|  | w | 598(22.9\%) | w | 271(45.3\%) | w | 224(37.5\%) |  |  | W | 158(26.4\%) |  | W | 247 (41.3\%) |

## 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 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)



## Math Progression by Ethnicity (Continued)



## Math Progression by Age

In general, of those who were non-referred, students who were younger than 21 consistently had Math "gatekeeper" success rates nearing $60 \%-70 \%$. When comparing the 2013 cohort to the 2011 cohort, students over 22 years old 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: 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 Age

## (Continued)

|  |  |  |  | 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) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 1 \\ 422(16.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $<17$ | $9(2.1 \%)$ | $<17$ | 9 (100.0\%) | $<17$ | 6(66.7\%) | Not Applicable |  | $<17$ | 1(11.1\%) | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) | $<17$ | 2(22.2\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 386 (91.5\%) | 18-21 | 273 (70.7\%) | 18-21 | 184 (47.7\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 81 (21.0\%) | 18-21 | 3 (0.8\%) | 18-21 | 94 (24.4\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | 11 (2.6\%) | 22-24 | 7 (63.6\%) | 22-24 | 3(27.3\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 0 (0.0\%) | 22-24 | 0 (0.0\%) | 22-24 | 3(27.3\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | $9(2.1 \%)$ | 25-35 | 7 (77.8\%) | 25-35 | 6 (66.7\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 3 (33.3\%) | 25-35 | 0 (0.0\%) | 25-35 | 2(22.2\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | $7(1.7 \%)$ | 36-50 | 4 (57.1\%) | 36-50 | 4(57.1\%) |  |  | 36-50 | 2 (28.6\%) | 36-50 | 1 (14.3\%) | 36-50 | 2(28.6\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 2 \\ 368 \text { (14.3\%) } \end{gathered}$ | $<17$ | 14 (3.8\%) | $<17$ | 13 (92.9\%) | $<17$ | 8 (57.1\%) |  |  | $<17$ | 4 (28.6\%) | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) | $<17$ | 6(42.9\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 304 (82.6\%) | 18-21 | 233 (76.6\%) | 18-21 | 166 (54.6\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 121 (39.8\%) | 18-21 | 1 (0.3\%) | 18-21 | 122 (40.1\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | 13 (3.5\%) | 22-24 | 11 (84.6\%) | 22-24 | 8(61.5\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 6 (46.2\%) | 22-24 | 0 (0.0\%) | 22-24 | 4(30.8\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 21 (5.7\%) | 25-35 | 13 (61.9\%) | 25-35 | 10 (47.6\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 5 (23.8\%) | 25-35 | 0 (0.0\%) | 25-35 | 6 (28.6\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 14 (3.8\%) | 36-50 | 8 (57.1\%) | 36-50 | 5(35.7\%) |  |  | 36-50 | 1(7.1\%) | 36-50 | 0 (0.0\%) | 36-50 | 3(21.4\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | 2 (0.5\%) | 51+ | 1(50.0\%) | 51+ | 0(0.0\%) |  |  | 51+ | 0(0.0\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 3 \\ 532(20.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $<17$ | 24 (4.5\%) | $<17$ | 14 (58.3\%) | <17 | 8(33.3\%) |  |  | <17 | $9(37.5 \%)$ | <17 | 0 (0.0\%) | <17 | 10 (41.7\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 381 (71.6\%) | 18-21 | 287 (75.3\%) | 18-21 | 198 (52.0\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 173 (45.4\%) | 18-21 | 1 (0.3\%) | 18-21 | 146 (38.3\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | 43 (8.1\%) | 22-24 | 37 (86.0\%) | 22-24 | 26 (60.5\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 19 (44.2\%) | 22-24 | 0 (0.0\%) | 22-24 | 19 (44.2\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 64 (12.0\%) | 25-35 | 48 (75.0\%) | 25-35 | 37 (57.8\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 27 (42.2\%) | 25-35 | 0 (0.0\%) | 25-35 | 25 (39.1\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 16 (3.0\%) | 36-50 | 12 (75.0\%) | 36-50 | 11 (68.8\%) |  |  | 36-50 | 10 (62.5\%) | 36-50 | 0 (0.0\%) | 36-50 | 8(50.0\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | 4 (0.8\%) | 51+ | 1(25.0\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 51+ | 1 (25.0\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) | 51+ | 1(25.0\%) |
|  | DE Level 4 <br> 326 (12.7\%) | $<17$ | 16 (4.9\%) | <17 | 9 (56.3\%) | <17 | 7 (43.8\%) |  |  | $<17$ | $8(50.0 \%)$ | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) | $<17$ | 9(56.3\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 261 (80.1\%) | 18-21 | 144 (55.2\%) | 18-21 | 107 (41.0\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 112 (42.9\%) | 18-21 | 1 (0.4\%) | 18-21 | 142 (54.4\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | 18 (5.5\%) | 22-24 | 13 (72.2\%) | 22-24 | $8(44.4 \%)$ |  |  | 22-24 | $8(44.4 \%)$ | 22-24 | 0 (0.0\%) | 22-24 | 7 (38.9\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 24 (7.4\%) | 25-35 | 15 (62.5\%) | 25-35 | 12 (50.0\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 14 (58.3\%) | 25-35 | 0 (0.0\%) | 25-35 | 11 (45.8\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | $7(2.1 \%)$ | 36-50 | 1 (14.3\%) | 36-50 | 1(14.3\%) |  |  | 36-50 | 2 (28.6\%) | 36-50 | 0 (0.0\%) | 36-50 | 4(57.1\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) | 51+ | 0(0.0\%) |  |  | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  | Total Referred 1,648 (64.0\%) | $<17$ | 63 (3.8\%) | $<17$ | 45 (71.4\%) | $<17$ | 29 (46.0\%) |  |  | $<17$ | 22 (34.9\%) | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) | $<17$ | 27 (42.9\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 1,332 (80.8\%) | 18-21 | 937 (70.3\%) | 18-21 | 655 (49.2\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 487 (36.6\%) | 18-21 | 6 (0.5\%) | 18-21 | 504 (37.8\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | 85 (5.2\%) | 22-24 | 68 (80.0\%) | 22-24 | 45 (52.9\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 33 (38.8\%) | 22-24 | 0 (0.0\%) | 22-24 | 33 (38.8\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 118 (7.2\%) | 25-35 | 83 (70.3\%) | 25-35 | 65 (55.1\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 49 (41.5\%) | 25-35 | 0 (0.0\%) | 25-35 | 44 (37.3\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 44 (2.7\%) | 36-50 | 25 (56.8\%) | 36-50 | 21(47.7\%) |  |  | 36-50 | 15 (34.1\%) | 36-50 | 1(2.3\%) | 36-50 | 17 (38.6\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | 6 (0.4\%) | 51+ | 2 (33.3\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 51+ | 1(16.7\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) | 51+ | 1(16.7\%) |
|  | College Level 852 (33.1\%) | $<17$ | 41 (4.8\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  | $<17$ | 28 (68.3\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 798 (93.7\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18-21 | 475 (59.5\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | 6 (0.7\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 22-24 | 3(50.0\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 5 (0.6\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 25-35 | 4 (80.0\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 2 (0.2\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 36-50 | 1(50.0\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  | Unknown 76 (3.0\%) | <17 | 1(1.3\%) | $<17$ | 1(100.0\%) | $<17$ | 1(100.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | $<17$ | 1(100.0\%) | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) | $<17$ | 1 (100.0\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 61 (80.3\%) | 18-21 | 34 (55.7\%) | 18-21 | 25 (41.0\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 14 (23.0\%) | 18-21 | 0 (0.0\%) | 18-21 | 19 (31.1\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | 3(3.9\%) | 22-24 | 1 (33.3\%) | 22-24 | 1(33.3\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 0 (0.0\%) | 22-24 | 0 (0.0\%) | 22-24 | 1(33.3\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 7 (9.2\%) | 25-35 | 3(42.9\%) | 25-35 | 3(42.9\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 2 (28.6\%) | 25-35 | 0 (0.0\%) | 25-35 | 3(42.9\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 3(3.9\%) | 36-50 | 1(33.3\%) | 36-50 | 1(33.3\%) |  |  | 36-50 | 0 (0.0\%) | 36-50 | 0 (0.0\%) | 36-50 | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | 1(1.3\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cohort Total } \\ & \text { 2,576(100.0\%) } \end{aligned}$ | <17 | 105 (4.1\%) | $<17$ | 49 (46.7\%) | <17 | 33 (31.4\%) |  |  | <17 | 27 (25.7\%) | <17 | 0 (0.0\%) | <17 | 56 (53.3\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 2,191 (85.1\%) | 18-21 | 1,002 (45.7\%) | 18-21 | 702 (32.0\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 522 (23.8\%) | 18-21 | 6 (0.3\%) | 18-21 | 998 (45.5\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | 94 (3.6\%) | 22-24 | 69 (73.4\%) | 22-24 | 46 (48.9\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 33 (35.1\%) | 22-24 | 0 (0.0\%) | 22-24 | 37 (39.4\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 130 (5.0\%) | 25-35 | 86 (66.2\%) | 25-35 | 68 (52.3\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 51 (39.2\%) | 25-35 | 0 (0.0\%) | 25-35 | 51 (39.2\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 49 (1.9\%) | 36-50 | 26 (53.1\%) | 36-50 | 22 (44.9\%) |  |  | 36-50 | 15 (30.6\%) | 36-50 | 1(2.0\%) | 36-50 | 18 (36.7\%) |
|  |  | .51+ | 7 7 $0.3 \%$ ) | . $51+$ | - 2 (28.6\%) | 51+ | 0(0.0\%) |  |  | . $51+$ | 1(14.3\%) | - $51+$ | 0.0.0\%) | -51+ | 1114.3\%). |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 1 \\ 318(13.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | <17 | 5(1.6\%) | $<17$ | 4(80.0\%) | $<17$ | 3(60.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | <17 | 2 (40.0\%) | <17 | 0 (0.0\%) | $<17$ | 1(20.0\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 231 (72.6\%) | 18-21 | 163 (70.6\%) | 18-21 | 125 (54.1\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 33 (14.3\%) | 18-21 | 6 (2.6\%) | 18-21 | 54 (23.4\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | 25 (7.9\%) | 22-24 | 13 (52.0\%) | 22-24 | 11 (44.0\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 3(12.0\%) | 22-24 | 3(12.0\%) | 22-24 | 4(16.0\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 39 (12.3\%) | 25-35 | 25 (64.1\%) | 25-35 | 19 (48.7\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 10 (25.6\%) | 25-35 | 1 (2.6\%) | 25-35 | 9 (23.1\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 16 (5.0\%) | 36-50 | 10 (62.5\%) | 36-50 | 10(62.5\%) |  |  | 36-50 | 2 (12.5\%) | 36-50 | 2 (12.5\%) | 36-50 | 5 (31.3\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | 2 (0.6\%) | 51+ | 1(50.0\%) | 51+ | 1(50.0\%) |  |  | 51+ | 1(50.0\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) | 51+ | 1(50.0\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 209 (8.8\%) | $<17$ | 10 (4.8\%) | $<17$ | 8 (80.0\%) | $<17$ | 6 (60.0\%) |  |  | $<17$ | 3(30.0\%) | $<17$ | 1(10.0\%) | $<17$ | 2(20.0\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 147 (70.3\%) | 18-21 | 120 (81.6\%) | 18-21 | 100 (68.0\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 29 (19.7\%) | 18-21 | 5 (3.4\%) | 18-21 | 39 (26.5\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | 13 (6.2\%) | 22-24 | 11 (84.6\%) | 22-24 | 10 (76.9\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 5 (38.5\%) | 22-24 | 0 (0.0\%) | 22-24 | 2 (15.4\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 25 (12.0\%) | 25-35 | 15 (60.0\%) | 25-35 | 13 (52.0\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 7 (28.0\%) | 25-35 | 0 (0.0\%) | 25-35 | 10 (40.0\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 13(6.2\%) | 36-50 | 8 (61.5\%) | 36-50 | 8 (61.5\%) |  |  | 36-50 | 5(38.5\%) | 36-50 | 0 (0.0\%) | 36-50 | 5(38.5\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | 1(0.5\%) | 51+ | 1(100.0\%) | 51+ | 1(100.0\%) |  |  | 51+ | 1(100.0\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) | 51+ | 1 (100.0\%) |
|  | DE Level 3 220 (9.2\%) | $<17$ | 6 (2.7\%) | $<17$ | 5(83.3\%) | $<17$ | 5(83.3\%) |  |  | $<17$ | 3(50.0\%) | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) | $<17$ | 3(50.0\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 177 (80.5\%) | 18-21 | 144 (81.4\%) | 18-21 | 113 (63.8\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 68 (38.4\%) | 18-21 | 6 (3.4\%) | 18-21 | 73 (41.2\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | 17 (7.7\%) | 22-24 | 14 (82.4\%) | 22-24 | $11(64.7 \%)$ |  |  | 22-24 | 6 (35.3\%) | 22-24 | 1(5.9\%) | 22-24 | 5 (29.4\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 18 (8.2\%) | 25-35 | 15 (83.3\%) | 25-35 | 12 (66.7\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 12 (66.7\%) | 25-35 | 0 (0.0\%) | 25-35 | 13 (72.2\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 2 (0.9\%) | 36-50 | 1(50.0\%) | 36-50 | 1(50.0\%) |  |  | 36-50 | 2 (100.0\%) | 36-50 | 0 (0.0\%) | 36-50 | 2 (100.0\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) | 51+ | 0(0.0\%) | 51+ | 0(0.0\%) |  |  | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  | DE Level 4 <br> 79 (3.3\%) | $<17$ | $5(6.3 \%)$ | $<17$ | 5(100.0\%) | $<17$ | $5(100.0 \%)$ |  |  | $<17$ | 5 (100.0\%) | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) | $<17$ | 5 (100.0\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 63 (79.7\%) | 18-21 | 45 (71.4\%) | 18-21 | 39 (61.9\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 39 (61.9\%) | 18-21 | 1 (1.6\%) | 18-21 | 40 (63.5\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | 1(1.3\%) | 22-24 | 0 (0.0\%) | 22-24 | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 0 (0.0\%) | 22-24 | 0 (0.0\%) | 22-24 | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 8 (10.1\%) | 25-35 | 4 (50.0\%) | 25-35 | 4 (50.0\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 4 (50.0\%) | 25-35 | 0 (0.0\%) | 25-35 | 5(62.5\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 2 (2.5\%) | 36-50 | 1(50.0\%) | 36-50 | 0 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\%) | 51+ | $0(0.0 \%)$ |
|  | Total Referred 826 (34.6\%) | $<17$ | $26(3.1 \%)$ | $<17$ | 22 (84.6\%) | $<17$ | 19 (73.1\%) |  |  | $<17$ | 13 (50.0\%) | $<17$ | 1 (3.8\%) | $<17$ | 11(42.3\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 618 (74.8\%) | 18-21 | 472 (76.4\%) | 18-21 | 377 (61.0\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 169 (27.3\%) | 18-21 | 18 (2.9\%) | 18-21 | 206 (33.3\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | 56 (6.8\%) | 22-24 | 38 (67.9\%) | 22-24 | 32 (57.1\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 14 (25.0\%) | 22-24 | 4 (7.1\%) | 22-24 | 11(19.6\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 90 (10.9\%) | 25-35 | 59 (65.6\%) | 25-35 | 48 (53.3\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 33 (36.7\%) | 25-35 | 1(1.1\%) | 25-35 | 37 (41.1\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 33 (4.0\%) | 36-50 | 20 (60.6\%) | 36-50 | $19(57.6 \%)$ |  |  | 36-50 | $9(27.3 \%)$ | 36-50 | 2 (6.1\%) | 36-50 | 12 (36.4\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | 3 (0.4\%) | 51+ | 2(66.7\%) | 51+ | $2(66.7 \%)$ |  |  | 51+ | 2(66.7\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) | 51+ | 2(66.7\%) |
|  | College Level1,537 (64.4\%) | $<17$ | 63 (4.1\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  | $<17$ | 40 (63.5\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 1,462 (95.1\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18-21 | 928 (63.5\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | $4(0.3 \%)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 22-24 | 2 (50.0\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 6 (0.4\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 25-35 | 4(66.7\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 2 (0.1\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 36-50 | 1(50.0\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  | Unknown$24 \text { (1.0\%) }$ | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 11 (45.8\%) | 18-21 | 2 (18.2\%) | 18-21 | 2 (18.2\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 1 (9.1\%) | 18-21 | 0 (0.0\%) | 18-21 | 6 (54.5\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | 8 (33.3\%) | 22-24 | 1(12.5\%) | 22-24 | 1(12.5\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 1(12.5\%) | 22-24 | 0 (0.0\%) | 22-24 | 5(62.5\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 5 (20.8\%) | 25-35 | 1 (20.0\%) | 25-35 | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 1 (20.0\%) | 25-35 | 0 (0.0\%) | 25-35 | 2 (40.0\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 0 (0.0\%) | 36-50 | 0 (0.0\%) | 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\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cohort Total } \\ & \text { 2,387 (100.0\%) } \end{aligned}$ | $<17$ | 89 (3.7\%) | $<17$ | 22 (24.7\%) | $<17$ | 19 (21.3\%) |  |  | $<17$ | 13 (14.6\%) | $<17$ | 1(1.1\%) | $<17$ | 51(57.3\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 2,091 (87.6\%) | 18-21 | 529 (25.3\%) | 18-21 | 411 (19.7\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 200 (9.6\%) | 18-21 | 18 (0.9\%) | 18-21 | 1,140 (54.5\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | 68 (2.8\%) | 22-24 | 39 (57.4\%) | 22-24 | 33 (48.5\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 15 (22.1\%) | 22-24 | 4 (5.9\%) | 22-24 | 18 (26.5\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 101 (4.2\%) | 25-35 | 61 (60.4\%) | 25-35 | 49 (48.5\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 34 (33.7\%) | 25-35 | 1(1.0\%) | 25-35 | 43 (42.6\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 35 (1.5\%) | 36-50 | 20 (57.1\%) | 36-50 | $19(54.3 \%)$ |  |  | 36-50 | $9(25.7 \%)$ | 36-50 | 2 (5.7\%) | 36-50 | 13 (37.1\%) |
|  |  | . $51+$ | 3 ${ }^{(0.1 \%}$ ). | . $51+$ | - 2 (66.7\%) | -51+ | 2 2 (66.7\%) |  |  | -51+ | 2(66.7\%) | -51+ | 0.0.0\%) | _51+ | - $1666.7 \%$ ) |

Math Progression by Age
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## Math Progression by Enrollment Status

In general, across all cohorts and levels, 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, full-time students referred to Level 3 experienced an increase in "gatekeeper" success.

|  |  |  |  |  | d Any DE Year) |  | 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) |  | sess in GK rd Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DE Level 1 | FT | 117 (28.5\%) | FT | 88 (75.2\%) | FT | 72 (61.5\%) | Not Applicable |  | 1 | 27 (23.1\%) | Not Applicable | FT | 32 (27.4\%) |
|  | 411 (15.8\%) | PT | 294 (71.5\%) | PT | 176 (59.9\%) | PT | 123 (41.8\%) |  |  | PT | 52 (17.7\%) |  | PT | 46 (15.6\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | FT | 143 (31.1\%) | FT | 121 (84.6\%) | FT | 85 (59.4\%) |  |  | FT | 50 (35.0\%) |  | FT | 50 (35.0\%) |
|  | 460 (17.7\%) | PT | 317 (68.9\%) | PT | 231 (72.9\%) | PT | 177 (55.8\%) |  |  | PT | 90 (28.4\%) |  | PT | 69 (21.8\%) |
|  | DE Level 3 | FT | 173 (33.4\%) | FT | 151 (87.3\%) | FT | 126 (72.8\%) |  |  | FT | 89 (51.4\%) |  | FT | 67 (38.7\%) |
|  | 518 (19.9\%) | PT | 345 (66.6\%) | PT | 258 (74.8\%) | PT | 193 (55.9\%) |  |  | PT | 134 (38.8\%) |  | PT | 110 (31.9\%) |
|  | DE Level 4 | FT | 125 (34.3\%) | FT | 104 (83.2\%) | FT | 81 (64.8\%) |  |  | FT | 83 (66.4\%) |  | FT | 72 (57.6\%) |
|  | 364 (14.0\%) | PT | 239 (65.7\%) | PT | 184 (77.0\%) | PT | 151 (63.2\%) |  |  | PT | 152 (63.6\%) |  | PT | 118 (49.4\%) |
|  | Total Referred | FT | 558 (31.8\%) | FT | 464 (83.2\%) | FT | 364 (65.2\%) |  |  | FT | 249 (44.6\%) |  | FT | 221 (39.6\%) |
|  | 1,753 (67.3\%) | PT | 1,195 (68.2\%) | PT | 849 (71.0\%) | PT | 644 (53.9\%) |  |  | PT | 428 (35.8\%) |  | PT | 343 (28.7\%) |
|  | College Level | FT | 409 (50.6\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | FT | 271 (66.3\%) |
|  | $809 \text { (31.0\%) }$ | PT | 400 (49.4\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PT | 214 (53.5\%) |
|  | Unknown | FT | 9 (20.5\%) | FT | 2 (22.2\%) | FT | 2 (22.2\%) | Not Applicable |  | FT | 3 (33.3\%) | Not Applicable | FT | 5 (55.6\%) |
|  | 44 (1.7\%) | PT | 35 (79.5\%) | PT | 2 (5.7\%) | PT | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | PT | 0 (0.0\%) |  | PT | 6 (17.1\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | FT | 976 (37.5\%) | FT | 507 (51.9\%) | FT | 403 (41.3\%) |  |  | FT | 281 (28.8\%) |  | FT | 497 (50.9\%) |
|  | 2,606 (100.0\%) | PT | 1,630 (62.5\%) | PT | 902 (55.3\%) | PT | 690 (42.3\%) |  |  | PT | 470 (28.8\%) |  | PT | 563 (34.5\%) |
|  | DELevel 1 | FT | 124 (29.4\%) | FT | 96 (77.4\%) | FT | 63 (50.8\%) | Not Applicable |  | FT | 27 (21.8\%) | FT 2 (1.6\%) | FT | 38 (30.6\%) |
|  | 422 (16.4\%) | PT | 298 (70.6\%) | PT | 204 (68.5\%) | PT | 140 (47.0\%) |  |  | PT | 60 (20.1\%) | PT $2(0.7 \%)$ | PT | 65 (21.8\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | FT | 100 (27.2\%) | FT | 86 (86.0\%) | FT | 62 (62.0\%) |  |  | FT | 41 (41.0\%) | FT $\quad 1(1.0 \%)$ | FT | 50 (50.0\%) |
|  | 368 (14.3\%) | PT | 268 (72.8\%) | PT | 193 (72.0\%) | PT | 135 (50.4\%) |  |  | PT | 96 (35.8\%) | PT $\quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | PT | 91 (34.0\%) |
|  | DE Level 3 | FT | 149 (28.0\%) | FT | 117 (78.5\%) | FT | 85 (57.0\%) |  |  | FT | 75 (50.3\%) | FT $\quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | FT | 68 (45.6\%) |
|  | 532 (20.7\%) | PT | 383 (72.0\%) | PT | 282 (73.6\%) | PT | 195 (50.9\%) |  |  | PT | 164 (42.8\%) | PT $\quad 1(0.3 \%)$ | PT | 141 (36.8\%) |
|  | DE Level 4 | FT | 120 (36.8\%) | FT | 63 (52.5\%) | FT | 47 (39.2\%) |  |  | FT | 49 (40.8\%) | FT $\quad 1$ (0.8\%) | FT | 74 (61.7\%) |
|  | 326 (12.7\%) | PT | 206 (63.2\%) | PT | 119 (57.8\%) | PT | 88 (42.7\%) |  |  | PT | 95 (46.1\%) | PT $\quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | PT | 99 (48.1\%) |
|  | Total Referred | FT | 493 (29.9\%) | FT | 362 (73.4\%) | FT | 257 (52.1\%) |  |  | FT | 192 (38.9\%) | FT $\quad 4(0.8 \%)$ | FT | 230 (46.7\%) |
|  | 1,648 (64.0\%) | PT | 1,155 (70.1\%) | PT | 798 (69.1\%) | PT | 558 (48.3\%) |  |  | PT | 415 (35.9\%) | PT 3 (0.3\%) | PT | 396 (34.3\%) |
|  | College Level | FT | 416 (48.8\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | FT | 278 (66.8\%) |
|  | $852 \text { (33.1\%) }$ | PT | 436 (51.2\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PT | 233 (53.4\%) |
|  | Unknown | FT | 31 (40.8\%) | FT | 14 (45.2\%) | FT | 11 (35.5\%) | Not Applicable |  | FT | 7 (22.6\%) | FT $\quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | FT | 11 (35.5\%) |
|  | 76 (3.0\%) | PT | 45 (59.2\%) | PT | 26 (57.8\%) | PT | 20 (44.4\%) |  |  | PT | 10 (22.2\%) | PT $\quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | PT | 13 (28.9\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | FT | 940 (36.5\%) | FT | 389 (41.4\%) | FT | 280 (29.8\%) |  |  | FT | 209 (22.2\%) | FT $\quad 4(0.4 \%)$ | FT | 519 (55.2\%) |
|  | 2,576(100.0\%) | PT | 1,636 (63.5\%) | PT | 845 (51.7\%). | PT | 591(36.1\%) |  |  | PT | 440(26.9\%) | PT-_-_3(0.2\%) | PT | 642(39.2\%). |
| $\mathrm{FT}=$ Full-time | PT = Part-time |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

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 FT/PT Status:
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

## Math Progression by Enrollment Status (Continued)

|  |  |  |  |  | d Any DE Year) |  | in Any DE Year) |  |  | in High DE <br> Year) |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { in RSG } \\ & \text { Year) } \end{aligned}$ |  | cess in GK <br> rd Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & 0 \\ & m \\ & 0 \\ & \\ & \bar{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | DE Level 1 | FT | 57 (17.9\%) | FT | 51 (89.5\%) | FT | 41 (71.9\%) | Not Applicable | FT | 8 (14.0\%) | FT | 3 (5.3\%) | FT | 19 (33.3\%) |
|  | 318 (13.3\%) | PT | 261 (82.1\%) | PT | 165 (63.2\%) | PT | 128 (49.0\%) |  | PT | 43 (16.5\%) | PT | 9 (3.4\%) | PT | 55 (21.1\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | FT | 49 (23.4\%) | FT | 43 (87.8\%) | FT | 37 (75.5\%) |  | FT | 15 (30.6\%) | FT | 1 (2.0\%) | FT | 16 (32.7\%) |
|  | 209 (8.8\%) | PT | 160 (76.6\%) | PT | 120 (75.0\%) | PT | 101 (63.1\%) |  | PT | 35 (21.9\%) | PT | 5 (3.1\%) | PT | 43 (26.9\%) |
|  | DE Level 3 | FT | 64 (29.1\%) | FT | 59 (92.2\%) | FT | 43 (67.2\%) |  | FT | 25 (39.1\%) | FT | 4 (6.3\%) | FT | 36 (56.3\%) |
|  | 220 (9.2\%) | PT | 156 (70.9\%) | PT | 120 (76.9\%) | PT | 99 (63.5\%) |  | PT | 66 (42.3\%) | PT | 3 (1.9\%) | PT | 60 (38.5\%) |
|  | DE Level 4 | FT | 22 (27.8\%) | FT | 17 (77.3\%) | FT | 13 (59.1\%) |  | FT | 15 (68.2\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 14 (63.6\%) |
|  | 79 (3.3\%) | PT | 57 (72.2\%) | PT | 38 (66.7\%) | PT | 35 (61.4\%) |  | PT | 33 (57.9\%) | PT | 1 (1.8\%) | PT | 36 (63.2\%) |
|  | Total Referred | FT | 192 (23.2\%) | FT | 170 (88.5\%) | FT | 134 (69.8\%) |  | FT | 63 (32.8\%) | FT | 8 (4.2\%) | FT | 85 (44.3\%) |
|  | 826 (34.6\%) | PT | 634 (76.8\%) | PT | 443 (69.9\%) | PT | 363 (57.3\%) |  | PT | 177 (27.9\%) | PT | 18 (2.8\%) | PT | 194 (30.6\%) |
|  | College Level | FT | 728 (47.4\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | FT | 534 (73.4\%) |
|  | 1,537 (64.4\%) | PT | 809 (52.6\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PT | 441 (54.5\%) |
|  | Unknown | FT | 10 (41.7\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable | FT | 1 (10.0\%) | FT | O(0.0\%) | FT | 5 (50.0\%) |
|  | 24 (1.0\%) | PT | 14 (58.3\%) | PT | 4 (28.6\%) | PT | 3 (21.4\%) |  | PT | 2 (14.3\%) | PT | 0 (0.0\%) | PT | 8(57.1\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | FT | 930 (39.0\%) | FT | 187 (20.1\%) | FT | 142 (15.3\%) |  | FT | 72 (7.7\%) | FT | 8 (0.9\%) | FT | 624 (67.1\%) |
|  | 2,387 (100.0\%) | PT | 1,457 (61.0\%) | PT | 486(33.4\%) | PT | 391 (26.8\%) |  | PT | 201 (13.8\%) | PT | 18(1.2\%) | PT | 643(44.1\%) |
|  | DE Level 1 | FT | 128 (22.5\%) | FT | 115 (89.8\%) | FT | 83 (64.8\%) | FT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $569 \text { (21.8\%) }$ | PT | 441 (77.5\%) | PT | 342 (77.6\%) | PT | 226 (51.2\%) | PT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 2 | FT | 68 (30.1\%) | FT | 52 (76.5\%) | FT | 43 (63.2\%) | FT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 226 (8.7\%) | PT | 158 (69.9\%) | PT | 110 (69.6\%) | PT | 78 (49.4\%) | PT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 3 | FT | 53 (26.4\%) | FT | 36 (67.9\%) | FT | 27 (50.9\%) | FT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 201 (7.7\%) | PT | 148 (73.6\%) | PT | 97 (65.5\%) | PT | 65 (43.9\%) | PT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 4 | FT | 1 (2.6\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 39 (1.5\%) | PT | 38 (97.4\%) | PT | 37 (97.4\%) | PT | 29 (76.3\%) | PT | 3rd Year Data Not Yet Available |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total Referred | FT | 250 (24.2\%) | FT | 203 (81.2\%) | FT | 153 (61.2\%) | FT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1,035 (39.7\%) | PT | 785 (75.8\%) | PT | 586 (74.6\%) | PT | 398 (50.7\%) | PT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | College Level | FT | 742 (50.1\%) | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1,481 (56.8\%) | PT | 739 (49.9\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Unknown | FT | 27 (29.0\%) | FT | 1 (3.7\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 93 (3.6\%) | PT | 66 (71.0\%) | PT | 3 (4.5\%) | PT | 1 (1.5\%) | PT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Cohort Total | FT | 1,019 (39.1\%) | FT | 220 (21.6\%) | FT | 162 (15.9\%) | FT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2,609 (100.0\%) | PT | 1,590 (60.9\%) | PT | 610(38.4\%) | PT | 415 (26.1\%) | PT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & 0 \\ & \stackrel{n}{n} \\ & \stackrel{0}{\bar{N}} \end{aligned}$ | DE Level 1 | FT | 239 (32.3\%) | FT | 216 (90.4\%) | FT | 162 (67.8\%) | FT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 741 (26.4\%) | PT | 502 (67.7\%) | PT | 377 (75.1\%) | PT | 246 (49.0\%) | PT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 2 | FT | 115 (35.4\%) | FT | 93 (80.9\%) | FT | 73 (63.5\%) | FT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $325 \text { (11.6\%) }$ | PT | 210 (64.6\%) | PT | 161 (76.7\%) | PT | 120 (57.1\%) | PT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 3 | FT | 169 (49.3\%) | FT | 91 (53.8\%) | FT | 65 (38.5\%) | FT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 343 (12.2\%) | PT | 174 (50.7\%) | PT | 93 (53.4\%) | PT | 69 (39.7\%) | PT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 4 | FT | 6 (7.8\%) | FT | 6 (100.0\%) | FT | 6 (100.0\%) | FT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 77 (2.7\%) | PT | 71 (92.2\%) | PT | 71 (100.0\%) | PT | 53 (74.6\%) | PT | 3rd Year Data Not Yet Available |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total Referred | FT | 529 (35.6\%) | FT | 406 (76.7\%) | FT | 306 (57.8\%) | FT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $1,486(52.9 \%)$ | PT | 957 (64.4\%) | PT | 702 (73.4\%) | PT | 488 (51.0\%) | PT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | College Level | FT | 766 (59.7\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1,283 (45.6\%) | PT | 517 (40.3\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Unknown | FT | 13 (31.0\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $42(1.5 \%)$ | PT | 29 (69.0\%) | PT | 2 (6.9\%) | PT | 2 (6.9\%) | PT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Cohort Total | FT | 1,308 (46.5\%) | FT | 453 (34.6\%) | FT | 346 (26.5\%) | FT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2,811(100.0\%) | PT | 1,503(53.5\%) | PT | 752 (50.0\%) | PT | 525 (34.9\%) | PT |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Math Progression by Pell Status

In general for the Fall 2011 and Fall 2012 cohorts, of those who were referred to Levels 3 and 4, Pell recipients compared to Pell non-recipients successfully passed both Math highest DE and "gatekeeper" courses at higher rates. For the Fall 2012 and Fall 2013 cohorts, of those who were non-referred, Pell recipients compared to Pell non-recipients successfully passed "gatekeeper" courses at slightly higher rates. When comparing the 2013 cohort to the 2011 cohort, referred Pell non-recipients 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, 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 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

## Math Progression by Pell Status (Continued)



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

## Math Progression by Veteran Status

In general, referred and veterans compared to non-veterans successfully completed Math DE and "gatekeeper" courses at higher rates. When comparing the 2013 cohort to the 2011 cohort, referred veterans experienced an increase in "gatekeeper" success.

|  |  |  |  |  | ted Any DE st Year) |  | in Any DE Year) | Attempted RSG (1st Year) | Success in RSG (1st Year) |  | in High DE Year) | Success in RSG <br> (3rd Year) |  | ess in GK d Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DE Level 1 | Y | 27 (6.6\%) | Y | 15 (55.6\%) | Y | 9 (33.3\%) |  |  | Y | 2 (7.4\%) |  | Y | 4 (14.8\%) |
|  | 411 (15.8\%) | N | 384 (93.4\%) | N | 249 (64.8\%) | N | 186 (48.4\%) |  |  | N | 77 (20.1\%) |  | N | 74 (19.3\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | Y | 29 (6.3\%) | Y | 25 (86.2\%) | Y | 22 (75.9\%) |  |  | Y | 15 (51.7\%) |  | Y | 10 (34.5\%) |
|  | 460 (17.7\%) | N | 431 (93.7\%) | N | 327 (75.9\%) | N | 240 (55.7\%) |  |  | N | 125 (29.0\%) |  | N | 109 (25.3\%) |
|  | DE Level 3 | Y | 41 (7.9\%) | Y | 36 (87.8\%) | Y | 26 (63.4\%) |  | ble | Y | 19 (46.3\%) |  | Y | 13 (31.7\%) |
|  | 518 (19.9\%) | N | 477 (92.1\%) | N | 373 (78.2\%) | N | 293 (61.4\%) | Not |  | N | 204 (42.8\%) | Not Applicable | N | 164 (34.4\%) |
|  | DE Level 4 | Y | 29 (8.0\%) | Y | 24 (82.8\%) | Y | 21 (72.4\%) |  |  | Y | 21 (72.4\%) |  | Y | 18 (62.1\%) |
|  | 364 (14.0\%) | N | 335 (92.0\%) | N | 264 (78.8\%) | N | 211 (63.0\%) |  |  | N | 214 (63.9\%) |  | N | 172 (51.3\%) |
|  | Total Referred | Y | 126 (7.2\%) | Y | 100 (79.4\%) | Y | 78 (61.9\%) |  |  | Y | 57 (45.2\%) |  | Y | 45 (35.7\%) |
|  | 1,753 (67.3\%) | N | 1,627 (92.8\%) | N | 1,213 (74.6\%) | N | 930 (57.2\%) |  |  | N | 620 (38.1\%) |  | N | 519 (31.9\%) |
|  | College Level | Y | 31 (3.8\%) |  |  |  |  | Not App |  |  |  |  | Y | 20 (64.5\%) |
|  | 809 (31.0\%) | N | 778 (96.2\%) |  |  |  |  | Not App |  |  |  |  | N | 465 (59.8\%) |
|  | Unknown | Y | 2 (4.5\%) | $Y$ | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | Y | 0 (0.0\%) |  | Y | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  | 44 (1.7\%) | N | 42 (95.5\%) | N | 4 (9.5\%) | N | 2 (4.8\%) | No |  | N | 3 (7.1\%) | Not Applicable | N | 11 (26.2\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | Y | 159 (6.1\%) | Y | 109 (68.6\%) | Y | 86 (54.1\%) | No |  | Y | 64 (40.3\%) | NotApplicable | Y | 65 (40.9\%) |
|  | 2,606 (100.0\%) | N | 2,447 (93.9\%) | N | 1,300 (53.1\%). | N | 1,007 (41.2\%) |  |  | N | 687 (28.1\%) |  | N | 995 (40.7\%) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \text { I } \\ & \stackrel{7}{0} \\ & \bar{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | DE Level 1 | Y | 14 (3.3\%) | Y | 9 (64.3\%) | Y | 6(42.9\%) | Not Applicable |  | Y | 5 (35.7\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 2 (14.3\%) |
|  | 422 (16.4\%) | N | 408 (96.7\%) | N | 291 (71.3\%) | N | 197 (48.3\%) |  |  | N | 82 (20.1\%) | $\mathrm{N} \quad 4(1.0 \%)$ | N | 101 (24.8\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | Y | 19 (5.2\%) | Y | 17 (89.5\%) | Y | 13 (68.4\%) |  |  | Y | 11 (57.9\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 7 (36.8\%) |
|  | 368 (14.3\%) | N | 349 (94.8\%) | N | 262 (75.1\%) | N | 184 (52.7\%) |  |  | N | 126 (36.1\%) | 1 (0.3\%) | N | 134 (38.4\%) |
|  | DE Level 3 | Y | 48 (9.0\%) | Y | 35 (72.9\%) | Y | 27 (56.3\%) |  |  | Y | 23 (47.9\%) | 1 (2.1\%) | Y | 27 (56.3\%) |
|  | 532 (20.7\%) | N | 484 (91.0\%) | N | 364 (75.2\%) | N | 253 (52.3\%) |  |  | N | 216 (44.6\%) | $\mathrm{N} \quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | N | 182 (37.6\%) |
|  | DE Level 4 | Y | 27 (8.3\%) | Y | 19 (70.4\%) | Y | 17 (63.0\%) |  |  | Y | 18 (66.7\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 16 (59.3\%) |
|  | 326 (12.7\%) | N | 299 (91.7\%) | N | 163 (54.5\%) | N | 118 (39.5\%) |  |  | N | 126 (42.1\%) | 1 (0.3\%) | N | 157 (52.5\%) |
|  | Total Referred | Y | 108 (6.6\%) | Y | 80 (74.1\%) | Y | 63 (58.3\%) |  |  | Y | 57 (52.8\%) | 1 (0.9\%) | Y | 52 (48.1\%) |
|  | 1,648 (64.0\%) | N | 1,540 (93.4\%) | N | 1,080 (70.1\%) | N | 752 (48.8\%) |  |  | N | 550 (35.7\%) | $\mathrm{N} \quad 6$ (0.4\%) | N | 574 (37.3\%) |
|  | College Level | Y | 50 (5.9\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | Y | 29 (58.0\%) |
|  | 852 (33.1\%) | N | 802 (94.1\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | N | 482 (60.1\%) |
|  | Unknown | Y | 2 (2.6\%) | Y | 1 (50.0\%) | Y | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | Y | 0 (0.0\%) | $Y \quad 0$ (0.0\%) | Y | 1 (50.0\%) |
|  | 76 (3.0\%) | N | 74 (97.4\%) | N | 39 (52.7\%) | N | 31 (41.9\%) |  |  | N | 17 (23.0\%) | $\mathrm{N} \quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | N | 23 (31.1\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | Y | 160 (6.2\%) | Y | 82 (51.3\%) | Y | 64 (40.0\%) |  |  | Y | 59 (36.9\%) | 1 (0.6\%) | Y | 82 (51.3\%) |
|  | 2,576 (100.0\%) | N | 2,416 (93.8\%) | N | 1,152 (47.7\%). | N | 807 (33.4\%) |  |  | N | 590 (24.4\%) | N | N | 1,079(44.7\%). |

## 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 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

## Math Progression by Veteran Status (Continued)



# NORTHWEST VISTA COLLEGE <br> 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 Northwest Vista 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 Northwest Vista College fluctuated between $73 \%-78 \%$ across all cohorts and all years.
$\diamond$ First-year productive grade rates at the college peaked in the Fall 2013 cohort at $78 \%$, then dipped in the Fall 2014 cohort to $74 \%$ before climbing up again in the Fall 205 cohort to $76.4 \%$. Female students consistently demonstrated higher productive grade rates than male students.
$\diamond$ Asian/Pacific Islander students exhibited predominantly higher productive grade rates than all other student groups across each cohort and each year.
$\diamond$ Students 25 and older displayed higher productive grade rates than those younger than they were.
$\diamond$ Full-time students consistently produced higher productive grade rates than part-time students.
$\diamond$ Across the cohorts, productive grade rates among non-Pell recipients were higher than among Pell recipients.
$\diamond$ In each cohort and year, 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 Northwest Vista College fluctuated between $73 \%-78 \%$ across all cohorts and all years. Firstyear productive grade rates at the college peaked in the Fall 2013 cohort at $78 \%$, then dipped in the Fall 2014 cohort to $74 \%$ before climbing up again in the Fall 205 cohort to $76.4 \%$. In each cohort, rates declined from the first year to the second year then remained relatively unchanged from year-to-year in subsequent years. Productive grade rates in the last year tended to exhibit lower rates than the first year. First year productive grade rates of the Fall 2015 cohort (76.4\%) remained relatively unchanged from the first year rate of the Fall 2011 cohort (76.2\%).

*See notes, next page

## Productive Grade Rates by Gender

Across each cohort and each year, females consistently had higher productive grade rates than did males. Female rates remained between $76 \%$ and $80 \%$ in all years of the Fall 2011 and 2012 cohorts, then peaked at $80 \%$ in the Fall 2013 cohort. However, these rates dipped 4.1 percentage points from the Fall 2013 cohort ( $80.4 \%$ ) to the Fall 2014 cohort ( $76.3 \%$ ). In all cohorts and all years, male productive grade rates ranged from $71 \%$ to $75 \%$. First year male productive grade rates of the Fall 2015 cohort ( $74.2 \%$ ) grew 3.1 percentage points from the first year Fall 2011 cohort ( $71.1 \%$ ). Overall, productive grade rates ranged from a low of $71 \%$ (male) to a high of $80 \%$ (female).


## 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) 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 predominantly higher than all other student groups across each cohort and each year. Other and White student groups had higher productive grade rates than African American and Hispanic student groups. At the conclusion of five years of tracking the Fall 2011 cohort, Asian, Hispanic, and White student groups showed declines in productive grade rates from the first year to fifth year. By the fifth year of the Fall 2011 cohort, African American and Hispanic students had achieved relatively equal productive grade rates (74\%).


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 25 and older displayed higher productive grade rates than those younger than they were. With few exceptions, this was a recurrent pattern throughout each cohort and each year. After five years of longitudinal tracking, students in the Fall 2011 cohort 17 or less and 51+ age group displayed an increase in productive grade rates from the first year to the fifth year, while all other groups displayed declining rates 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 CBM001).
(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-time students in each cohort and each year. First year full-time productive grade rates of the Fall 2015 cohort ( $80.4 \%$ ) changed 1.1 percentage points higher than the first year Fall 2011 cohort (79.3\%). And first year part-time productive grade rates of the Fall 2015 cohort (71.4\%) were 2 percentage points lower than the first year Fall 2011 cohort ( $73.4 \%$ ). After five years of tracking in the Fall 2011 cohort, productive grade rates of full-time students declined from the first year to the last year, while rates for part-time students remained relatively unchanged.

Productive Grade Rate by Enrollment Status
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## Productive Grade Rates by Pell Status

Across cohorts and years, productive grade rates were higher among non-Pell grant recipients than Pell grant recipients. Productive grade rates of Pell students exhibited first year declines from the Fall 2010 to 2012 cohort followed by a peak in the Fall 2013 cohort. However, this peak was followed by a drop in the Fall 2014 cohort. The Fall 2015 first year Pell student rates ( $75.3 \%$ ) declined 1.1 percentage points from the Fall 2011 cohort ( $76.4 \%$ ). Productive grade rates for NonPell students grew or remained unchaged from the Fall 2011 cohort to the most recent cohort each year.

Productive Grade Rate by Pell Status


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

Productive grade rates were higher among Veteran students than non-Veteran students in the 2012 and 2013 cohorts. First year productive grade rates of the Fall 2015 Veteran cohort ( $74.1 \%$ ) exhibited a decline of 3.5 percentage points from the Fall 2011 cohort ( $77.6 \%$ ). During the same period first year Fall 2015 non-Veteran student rates remained relatively unchanged from the Fall 2011 cohort.


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) 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 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 ( $74.7 \%$ ) grew 1.9 percentage points from the first year Fall 2011 cohort (72.8\%). First year non-referred student productive grade rates of the Fall 2015 cohort (77.9\%) remained relatively unchanged from the first year Fall 2011 cohort ( $77.5 \%$ ). In all cohorts and all years productive grade rates declined from the first year to the second year. After the first year, productive grade rates in the 2011 and 2012 cohorts remained relatively unchanged from year-to-year. INRW courses are reported as English courses from Fall 2014 cohort onward (see note below).
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## Productive Grade Rates by Referral to Math Developmental Education

FTIC students not referred to 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 (73\%) remained relatively unchanged from the first year Fall 2011 cohort ( $73.2 \%$ ). First year non-referred student productive grade rates of the Fall 2015 cohort ( $79.7 \%$ ) were 1.9 percentage points lower than the first year Fall 2011 cohort ( $81.6 \%$ ). In most cohorts and all years productive grade rates declined from the first year to the second year. After the first year, productive grade rates in the 2011 and 2012 cohorts exhibited little change from year-to-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) 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

# NORTHWEST VISTA 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 Northwest Vista 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.
$\diamond \quad$ First-year persistence rates had a slight dip in Fall 2013 and Fall 2014 and bounced back to Fall 2011 level the following term.
$\diamond$ Female students routinely persisted at higher rates than did male students.
$\diamond$ Overall, persistence rates among Asians were higher than all other ethnicities.
$\diamond$ First year persistence rates varied by age across all cohorts and all age groups.
$\diamond$ Full-time students persisted at higher rates than did part-time students.
$\diamond$ First-year persistence rates were higher among Pell grant recipients than among non-Pell grant recipients.
$\diamond$ Persistence rates among students referred to developmental education and not referred to developmental education varied from year to year.
$\diamond$ Overall, Veteran student persistence rates were higher than non-veteran students for all cohorts through the third year.

## Total Persistence Rates

First-year persistence rates from the Fall 2011 cohort to the most current cohort year vary slightly from year-to-year. At year two, more than 55\% of Fall FTIC students who started at Northwest Vista College were still enrolled. Gaps in persistence rates were greater from year-to-year in the first three years than in the last two years. Persistence rates were constant cohort-to-cohort and year-to-year.
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## Persistence Rates by Gender

Females routinely persisted at higher rates than did males. After a slight decline in Fall 2013, male first-year persistence rates increased year-to-year to almost identical rates in Fall 2011 ( $75.7 \%$ ) and Fall 2015 ( $75.6 \%$ ). Female persistence rates peaked in the Fall 2015 (81\%). Between the first- and second-year and second- and third-year, the drop in persistence rates is very similar.
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## Persistence Rates by Ethnicity

In general, first year persistence rates among Asian students were higher than other groups in each cohort and year-toyear. Through all years and cohorts, Hispanic students have higher rates of persistence than do White or African American students.


5th Year: Fall to Any Term 5th Year

| 100\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 80\% |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 40\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20\% |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0\% |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Fall 2011* | Fall 2012 | Fall 2013 | Fall 2014 | Fall 2015 |
| - African American | 9.5\% |  |  |  |  |
| - Asian | 16.3\% |  |  |  |  |
| - Hispanic | 13.2\% |  |  |  |  |
| - Other | 3.3\% |  |  |  |  |
| - White | 10.3\% |  |  |  |  |

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 across all cohorts and age groups. Students 17 or less had higher first-year persistence rates in the Fall 2011, 2012 and, 2014 cohorts. Students 18-21 years old had consistent rates of persistence year-to-year for year one through year three.

1st Year: Fall to Spring


3rd Year: Fall to Third Fall


2nd Year: Fall to Second Fall


4th Year: Fall to Any Term 4th Year


5th Year: Fall to Any Term 5th Year

| 100\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 80\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 40\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0\% | Inili |  |  |  |  |
|  | Fall 2011 * | Fall 2012 | Fall 2013 | Fall 2014 | Fall 2015 |
| - 17 or less | 13.5\% |  |  |  |  |
| -18-21 | 12.2\% |  |  |  |  |
| - 22-24 | 8.7\% |  |  |  |  |
| - 25-35 | 11.8\% |  |  |  |  |
| - 36-50 | 13.3\% |  |  |  |  |
| - - $_{\text {- }}$ + | 0.0\% |  |  |  |  |

## 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_AC

## Persistence Rates by Enrollment Status

Overall, across cohorts and years, full-time students persisted at higher rates than did their part-time counterparts. The Fall 2014 cohort had the widest first year persistence gap between groups in the same cohort. After five years, the difference in Fall 2011 persistence rates between full- and part-time students was close to $1 \%$.


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) 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

First-year persistence rates were higher among Pell grant recipients than among non-Pell grant recipients. However, this trend reversed in the second year from Fall 2011-Fall 2014 when non-Pell grant recipients persisted at higher rates than Pell grant recipients. Non-Pell grant recipients four- and five-year persistence rates are similar to Pell grant recipients.

## Persistence Rate by Pell Status



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 CBMOO1). 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.
(5) Graduate Status: 2011-2015: ACCDODS1.XST_CBM009_ACCD FTIC Demographics: 2011-2015: ACCDODS1.XST_CBM001_ACCD

## Persistence Rates by Veteran Status

Overall, Veteran student persistence rates were higher than non-veteran students for all cohorts through the third year, except first year Fall 2014. Veteran student persistence rates peaked in Fall 2012 ( $83 \%$ ). By year four, the Fall 2012 nonveteran cohort persistence rate was slightly higher than the veteran student persistence rate.


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.

## Persistence Rates by Developmental Education Referral

Persistence rates among students referred to developmental education (DE) and among those not referred to DE varied from year to year. By year three, gaps between persistence rates dramatically decrease between students referred to DE and those that were not. However in years four and five, persistence rates were higher among students referred to DE than those not referred to DE.


## 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 CBMOO1). 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

## NORTHWEST VISTA 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 Northwest Vista 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.
$\diamond$ The two-year, three-year, and four-year graduation rates increased from cohort-to-cohort.
$\diamond$ Of the FTIC students who started at Northwest Vista College in 2011, 19.7\% of male students and 29.6\% of female students received a degree or certificate after five years.
$\diamond$ Females had predominantly higher graduation rates than did males across most cohorts and years.
$\diamond$ Asian, Other, and White students generally graduated at higher rates than other student groups across most cohorts in year one.
$\diamond$ Overall, older age groups exhibited higher graduation rates than did younger age groups.
$\diamond \quad$ In most cohorts and years, the graduation rates of full-time students were higher than those of part-time students.
$\diamond$ By year five of the Fall 2011 FTIC cohort, Pell recipients were graduating at a higher rate than that of non-Pell recipients, by 3.9 percentage points.
$\diamond$ Overall, FTIC students who identified as veterans had higher graduation rates than did students who did not identify as veterans.
$\diamond$ Overall, FTIC students not referred to developmental education had higher graduation rates than did students referred to developmental education.

## Total Graduation Rates

The first year graduation rate has fluctuated over all cohorts, within a small margin. The two-year, three-year, and fouryear graduation rates have all consistently increased from cohort-to-cohort. Of the FTIC students who started at Northwest Vista College in 2011, $25.0 \%$ received a degree or certificate after five years.

*See notes, next page

## Graduation Rates by Gender

Females had predominantly higher graduation rates than did males across most cohorts and years. Of the FTIC students who started at Northwest Vista College in 2011, $19.7 \%$ of male students and $29.6 \%$ of female students received a degree or certificate after five years.

Graduation Rate by Gender
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## Graduation Rates by Ethnicity

Asian, Other, and White students generally graduated at higher rates than other student groups across most cohorts in year one. This pattern changed in year two where, across most cohorts, Asian students graduated at lower rates than White students. By the fifth year, Asian, Other, and Hispanic students were graduating at higher rates than other student groups.


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 Age

First year graduation rates were highest among 36-50 and 51+ year old students. This pattern generally continued in each remaining year. Students in the age group 22-24 had lower graduation rates than other student groups in years three, four and five. Overall, older age groups exhibited higher graduation rates than did younger age groups.


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, 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

In most cohorts and years, the graduation rates of full-time students were higher than those of part-time students. There was no variance in the performance of full- and part-time students in year one of the Fall 2012 or the Fall 2013 cohort. Of the FTIC students who started at Northwest Vista College in 2011, 34.2\% of full-time students and $19.5 \%$ 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

Generally, FTIC Pell recipients and non-Pell recipients graduated at fluctuating rates across the cohorts, reflecting a lead that shifted often. By year five of the Fall 2011 FTIC cohort, Pell recipients were graduating at a higher rate than that of non-Pell recipients, by 3.9 percentage points.

## Graduation Rate by Pell 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 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) Pell status as reported at the Fall semester of the cohort year.
(6) Source FTIC Demographics: ACIRES.CBM001, Graduates: ACCDIR.CBM009, Pell: ACCDIR.FADS

## 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 Northwest Vista College in 2011, 31.4\% of students who identified as veterans and $24.6 \%$ 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 CBMOO1).
(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, FTIC students not referred to developmental education (DE) had higher graduation rates than did students referred to DE. Of the FTIC students who started at Northwest Vista College in 2011, 20.9\% of referred students and 36.7\% of students who were not referred 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 and 2014 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) 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) 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.
[^1]:    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
[^2]:    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) 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

[^3]:    See notes, next page

[^4]:    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

[^5]:    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

