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# ST. PHILIP'S 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 St. Philip's 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 St. Philip's 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.

Of the five cohorts represented in this report, the largest cohort has been the Fall 2011 cohort with a headcount of 1,532. The cohort total declined from Fall 2011 to Fall 2012, increased in both the Fall 2013 and Fall 2014 cohorts, then decreased in Fall 2015. Overall, the cohorts averaged 1,211

|  | Fall 2011* <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2012 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2013 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2014 <br> FIIC Cohort | Fall 2015 <br> FTIC Cohort |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 752 | 530 | 595 | 598 | 534 |
| Female | 780 | 562 | 535 | 628 | 539 |
| Total FTIC | 1,532 | 1,092 | 1,130 | 1,226 | 1,073 | students per year.

## Gender

Male students constituted a slightly higher proportion of the FTIC population than did female students in the 2013 cohort. In all other cohorts, proportions were relatively similar with a slight female lead.


## Ethnicity

The proportion of African American students declined from year to year across most cohorts until Fall 2015. Consequently, the Fall 2014 FTIC cohort population of African American students is 5.74 percentage points lower than it was in the 2011 cohort. The ethnic composition (1\%-2\%) of Asian students remained relatively unchanged from the 2011 to the 2015 cohort. The majority ( $64 \%-69 \%$ ) of students in each cohort identified themselves as being Hispanic. The second most represented ethnic group was White (14\%-18\%). Less than $6 \%$ of students identified as being any other (Other) ethnicity.

|  | Fall 2011* <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2012 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2013 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2014 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2015 <br> FTIC Cohort |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African American | 259 | 150 | 133 | 137 | 141 |
| Asian | 15 | 19 | 26 | 25 | 17 |
| Hispanic | 975 | 738 | 719 | 780 | 735 |
| Other | 23 | 16 | 61 | 66 | 30 |
| White | 260 | 169 | 191 | 218 | 150 |
| Total FTIC | 1,532 | 1,092 | 1,130 | 1,226 | 1,073 |



[^0]
## Age

In Fall 2015, over 78\% of FTIC students were age 21 or younger when they first enrolled at St. Philip's College. The large majority ( $66 \%-77 \%$ ) of students in each cohort were between 18 and 21 years old when they first enrolled. The second most represented age group included 25 to 35 year olds ( $10 \%-14 \%$ ). The proportion of students in the 25-35 and 36-50 age groups fluctuated from year to year, but decreased overall from Fall 2011 to Fall 2015. The percentage of students in the 18-21 age group increased each year from Fall 2011 to Fall 2014, then decreased slightly in Fall 2015. Students over the age of 51 had the lowest representation among the cohorts, comprising less than $2 \%$ 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 | 44 | 38 | 36 | 43 | 34 |
| $18-21$ | 1,005 | 817 | 847 | 945 | 806 |
| $22-24$ | 115 | 69 | 55 | 76 | 76 |
| $25-35$ | 221 | 115 | 124 | 118 | 123 |
| $36-50$ | 125 | 47 | 55 | 34 | 28 |
| $51+$ | 22 | 6 | 13 | 10 | 6 |
| Total FTIC | 1,532 | 1,092 | 1,130 | 1,226 | 1,073 |



[^1]
## Enrollment Status

In all cohorts, part-time students attended at higher rates than full-time students. Full-time students were defined as those enrolled in 12 or more hours at census date. Part-time enrollment has steadily increased from Fall 2012 to Fall 2015. Since 2011, part-time students represented more than half ( $57 \%-67 \%$ ) of the Fall FTIC cohort population at St. Philip's College.

|  | 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 | 616 | 470 | 481 | 425 | 353 |
| Part-Time | 916 | 622 | 649 | 801 | 720 |
| Total FTIC | 1,532 | 1,092 | 1,130 | 1,226 | 1,073 |



[^2]
## Pell Status

The proportion of Fall FTIC students receiving the Pell grant during their first term decreased over most cohorts from Fall 2011 to Fall 2015. In Fall 2014, the proportion of FTIC students receiving the Pell grant increased slightly over the previous cohort. Overall, the proportion of FTIC students receiving the Pell grant decreased 11.84 percentage points from Fall 2011 to Fall 2015.

|  | Fall 2011* <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2012 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2013 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2014 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2015 <br> FTIC Cohort |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pell Grant | 1,098 | 742 | 743 | 815 | 642 |
| No Pell Grant | 434 | 350 | 387 | 411 | 431 |
| Total FTIC | 1,532 | 1,092 | 1,130 | 1,226 | 1,073 |

## Fall FTIC Cohorts by Pell Grant Status at Entry



[^3]
## Veteran Status

A small percentage of all FTIC students in each cohort (6\%-8\%) were designated as veterans upon initial enrollment. Trends are not evident across cohorts, as the percentage has alternately increased or decreased from one cohort to the next over the last five years.

|  | Fall 2011* <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2012 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2013 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2014 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2015 <br> FTIC Cohort |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vet | 114 | 67 | 90 | 78 | 83 |
| Non-Vet | 1,418 | 1,025 | 1,040 | 1,148 | 990 |
| Total FTIC | 1,532 | 1,092 | 1,130 | 1,226 | 1,073 |

## Fall FTIC Cohorts by Veteran Status at Entry



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

## Developmental Education Referral Status

From the 2011 to 2012 FTIC cohorts, the large majority ( $85 \%-89 \%$ ) of students in each cohort were referred to developmental education (DE) courses. However, a significant shift in referral levels is reflected starting with the Fall 2013 FTIC student cohort. From Fall 2012 to Fall 2013, students referred to DE courses decreased by $19.5 \%$. There was a small percentage of students ( $1 \%-2 \%$ ) in each cohort whose referral status could not be determined due to a 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 | 1,360 | 926 | 741 | 784 | 786 |
| Not Referred | 148 | 145 | 366 | 415 | 270 |
| Unknown | 24 | 21 | 23 | 27 | 17 |
| Total FTIC | 1,532 | 1,092 | 1,130 | 1,226 | 1,073 |

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 first-time in college and credential-seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBMOO1).
(3) Developmental education (DE) referral levels are based on formal student assessment outcomes for the subject area or DE course enrollment. Students designated as "Unknown" did not have an assessment on file or could not be placed within referral range and could not be categorized based on DE course enrollment.
(4) Sources: FTIC Demographics-ACIRES.CBM001; Course Enrollment-ACCDIR.EXTENDEDENROLLMENT;

DE Referrals: Fall 2011: ACCDODS1.ATD_F10_F11_ODS_TASP, Fall 2012: ACCDODS1.ATD_F10_F13_ODS_TASP, Fall 2013-Fall 2015:
ACDODS1.XST_ATD_ACCD

# ST. PHILIP'S 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 St. Philip's College. Students in each cohort were referred to English and Math DE courses based on assessment scores for that subject. Students at each level then were tracked as they progressed through the DE and "gatekeeper" sequences within each subject. These rates were examined by various student and academic characteristics.
$\diamond$ For English and Math, female students compared to male students generally had greater success in both DE and "gatekeeper" courses.
$\diamond$ For English, there were no trends evident for "gatekeeper" success among racial/ethnic groups. For Math, White students experienced greater "gatekeeper" success than did students from other racial/ethnic groups.
$\diamond$ For English and Math, no differences among the age categories was evident.
$\diamond$ For English and Math, full-time students compared to part-time students generally had greater success in DE and "gatekeeper" courses.
$\diamond \quad$ For English and Math, non-referred Pell recipients compared to non-Pell recipients generally had greater success in "gatekeeper" courses.
$\diamond \quad$ For English and Math, non-referred veterans compared to non-veterans generally had greater success 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).

Notes:

1) Attempted = student received a grade for course (includes variations of W); Completed = student received a grade of A, B, C, D, F, I, IP, or P for course; Success = student received a grade of $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}$, or C for course.
2) $\quad$ High $D E=$ last course in $D E$ sequence (Level 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.

## English Developmental Education Progression of Referred

After 3 years, approximately $30 \%-34 \%$ of referred students in each cohort attempted the highest course in the English DE sequence, with $20 \%-23 \%$ of the cohort successfully passing the course. Approximately $25 \%-39 \%$ of referred students in each cohort attempted the English "gatekeeper" course, with $16 \%-28 \%$ students in that cohort successfully passing the "gatekeeper" course. In comparing the 2011 and 2013 cohorts, success in any DE increased by 10.6 percentage points.


## English "Gatekeeper" Progression of Non-Referred

After 3 years, 59\%-68\% of non-referred students in each cohort attempted the English "gatekeeper" course, with 39\%$47 \%$ of the cohort successfully completing the course, which is nearly twice the rate of referred students.


## Total English Progression

Overall, $26 \%-51 \%$ of all referred students in each cohort successfully passed any English DE course within the first year, 20\%-23\% successfully passed the highest DE course in the English sequence within 3 years, and approximately 16\%$26 \%$ successfully passed the English "gatekeeper" course within 3 years. Of the non-referred students, 39\%-47\% successfully passed the English "gatekeeper" course within 3 years. Of the total cohort, $25 \%-37 \%$ successfully passed the English "gatekeeper" course within 3 years. Those who were referred to Level 2 had higher success rates in the English highest DE and "gatekeeper" courses than did those referred to Level 1. Non-referred students had higher success rates in the English "gatekeeper" course than did referred students. When comparing the 2011 cohort to the 2013 cohort, students referred to Level 2 experienced a significant increase in "gatekeeper" success.

|  | Referral Level | Attempted Any DE (1st Year) | Success in Any DE (1st Year) | Attempted RSG (1st Year) | Success in RSG (1st Year) | Success in High DE (3rd Year) | Success in RSG (3rd Year) | Success in GK (3rd Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{4}{t} \\ & 0 \\ & \frac{1}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{I} \\ & \stackrel{N}{N} \\ & \overline{i n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DE Level } 1 \\ & 281(18.3 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 139 (49.5\%) | 77 (27.4\%) | Not Applicable |  | 27 (9.6\%) | Not Applicable | 28 (10.0\%) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DE Level 2 } \\ & 657(42.9 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 282 (42.9\%) | 164 (25.0\%) |  |  | 162 (24.7\%) |  | 120 (18.3\%) |
|  | Total Referred 938 (61.2\%) | 421 (44.9\%) | 241 (25.7\%) |  |  | 189 (20.1\%) |  | 148 (15.8\%) |
|  | College Level 576 (37.6\%) |  |  | Not | able |  |  | 226 (39.2\%) |
|  | Unknown $18 \text { (1.2\%) }$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ | Not Applicable |  | $0(0.0 \%)$ | Not Applicable | 1 (5.6\%) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cohort Total } \\ & 1,532(100.0 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 438 (28.6\%) | 253 (16.5\%) |  |  | 200 (13.1\%) |  | 375 (24.5\%) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DE Level } 1 \\ & 151 \text { (14.2\%) } \end{aligned}$ | 88 (58.3\%) | 50 (33.1\%) | Not Applicable |  | 17 (11.3\%) | 1 (0.7\%) | 18 (11.9\%) |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 2 \\ 417(39.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 162 (38.8\%) | 100 (24.0\%) |  |  | 100 (24.0\%) | 2 (0.5\%) | 78 (18.7\%) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total Referred } \\ & 568 \text { ( } 53.5 \% \text { ) } \end{aligned}$ | 250 (44.0\%) | 150 (26.4\%) |  |  | 117 (20.6\%) | 3 (0.5\%) | 96 (16.9\%) |
|  | College Level 488 (46.0\%) |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  | 210 (43.0\%) |
|  | Unknown 5 (0.5\%) | $0(0.0 \%)$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  | $0(0.0 \%)$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ | 1 (20.0\%) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cohort Total } \\ & 1,061(100.0 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 266 (25.1\%) | 161 (15.2\%) |  |  | 126 (11.9\%) | 4 (0.4\%) | 307 (28.9\%) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{t}{0} \\ & \frac{0}{\circ} \\ & 0 \\ & \frac{m}{i} \\ & \stackrel{N}{4} \\ & \overline{i n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DELevel 1 } \\ & 257(22.7 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 114 (44.4\%) | 66 (25.7\%) | Not Applicable |  | 26 (10.1\%) | 4 (1.6\%) | 44 (17.1\%) |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 2 \\ 277(24.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 132 (47.7\%) | 101 (36.5\%) |  |  | 99 (35.7\%) | 6 (2.2\%) | 94 (33.9\%) |
|  | Total Referred $534 \text { (47.3\%) }$ | 246 (46.1\%) | 167 (31.3\%) |  |  | 125 (23.4\%) | 10 (1.9\%) | 138 (25.8\%) |
|  | College Level $572 \text { (50.6\%) }$ |  |  | Not | able |  |  | 269 (47.0\%) |
|  | Unknown $24 \text { (2.1\%) }$ | 1 (4.2\%) | $0(0.0 \%)$ | Not Applicable |  | $0(0.0 \%)$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ | 8 (33.3\%) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cohort Total } \\ & 1,130(100.0 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 260 (23.0\%) | 178 (15.8\%) |  |  | 134 (11.9\%) | 14 (1.2\%) | 415 (36.7\%) |

## Notes:

1) Attempted = student received a grade for course (includes variations of W); Completed = student received a grade of $A, B, C, D, F, I, I P$, or $P$ for course; Success = student received a grade of A, B, or C for course.
2) High $D E=$ last course in $D E$ 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)

|  | Referral Level | Attempted Any DE (1st Year) | Success in Any DE <br> (1st Year) | Attempted RSG <br> (1st Year) | Success in RSG <br> (1st Year) | Success in High DE (3rd Year) | Success in RSG <br> (3rd Year) | Success in GK (3rd Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { t } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \stackrel{H}{U} \\ & \stackrel{N}{N} \\ & \bar{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { DELevel } 1 \\ 218(17.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 147 (67.4\%) | 94 (43.1\%) | 13 (6.0\%) | 8 (3.7\%) |  | 3 rd Year Data Not Yet Available |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DELevel 2 } \\ 207 \text { (16.9\%) } \end{gathered}$ | 117 (56.5\%) | 77 (37.2\%) | 13 (6.3\%) | $8(3.9 \%)$ |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DELevel 3 } \\ 122(10.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 34 (27.9\%) | 26 (21.3\%) | 18 (14.8\%) | 13 (10.7\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DELevel 4 <br> 1 (0.1\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | $0(0.0 \%)$ | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Total Referred $548 \text { (44.7\%) }$ | 298 (54.4\%) | 197 (35.9\%) | 44 (8.0\%) | 29 (5.3\%) |  |  |  |
|  | College Level $617 \text { (50.3\%) }$ | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Unknown 61 (5.0\%) | 1 (1.6\%) | $0(0.0 \%)$ | 1 (1.6\%) | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cohort Total } \\ & 1,226(100.0 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 311 (25.4\%) | 208 (17.0\%) | 54 (4.4\%) | 37 (3.0\%) |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \text { in } \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{N} \\ & \stackrel{N}{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { DELevel 1 } \\ 157(14.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 111 (70.7\%) | 78 (49.7\%) | 8 (5.1\%) | $6(3.8 \%)$ |  | 3rd Year Data Not Yet Available |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DELevel 2 } \\ 214(19.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 141 (65.9\%) | 104 (48.6\%) | 13 (6.1\%) | $8(3.7 \%)$ |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DELevel 3 } \\ 239(22.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 164 (68.6\%) | 126 (52.7\%) | 146 (61.1\%) | 110 (46.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DELevel 4 $1(0.1 \%)$ | 1 (100.0\%) | 1 (100.0\%) | 1 (100.0\%) | 1 (100.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Total Referred 611 (56.9\%) | 417 (68.2\%) | 309 (50.6\%) | 168 (27.5\%) | 125 (20.5\%) |  |  |  |
|  | College Level $442(41.2 \%)$ | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Unknown $20(1.9 \%)$ | 1 (5.0\%) | 1 (5.0\%) | $0(0.0 \%)$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cohort Total } \\ & 1,073(100.0 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 433 (40.4\%) | 320 (29.8\%) | 180 (16.8\%) | 134 (12.5\%) |  |  |  |

Sources:
FTIC Demographics:
DE Referrals:

Course Enrollment::

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

## English Progression by Gender

Across most cohorts and levels, females compared to males successfully passed any DE, highest DE, and "gatekeeper" courses at higher rates. When comparing the 2011 cohort to the 2013 cohort, Level 2 females experienced the greatest increase in "gatekeeper" success.

|  |  | Referral Level |  | Attempted Any DE <br> (1st Year) |  | Success in Any DE (1st Year) |  | Attempted RSG <br> (1st Year) | Success in RSG <br> (1st Year) |  | in High DE <br> Year) | Success in RSG <br> (3rd Year) |  | ccess in GK 3rd Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & 0 \\ & \frac{1}{0} \\ & 0 \\ & \frac{1}{8} \\ & \stackrel{1}{0} \\ & \hline 0 \end{aligned}$ | DE Level 1 | M | 159 (56.6\%) | M | 70 (44.0\%) | M | 37 (23.3\%) | Not Applicable |  | M | 11 (6.9\%) | Not Applicable | M | 12 (7.5\%) |
|  | 281 (18.3\%) | F | 122 (43.4\%) | F | 69 (56.6\%) | F | 40 (32.8\%) |  |  | F | 16 (13.1\%) |  | F | 16 (13.1\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | M | 331 (50.4\%) | M | 125 (37.8\%) | M | 74 (22.4\%) |  |  | M | 77 (23.3\%) |  | M | 52 (15.7\%) |
|  | 657 (42.9\%) | F | 326 (49.6\%) | F | 157 (48.2\%) | F | 90 (22.6\%) |  |  | F | 85 (26.1\%) |  |  | 68 (20.9\%) |
|  | Total Referred | M | 490 (52.2\%) | M | 195 (39.8\%) | M | 111 (22.7\%) |  |  | M | 88 (18.0\%) |  | M | 64 (13.1\%) |
|  | 938 (61.2\%) | F | 448 (47.8\%) | F | 226 (50.4\%) | F | 130 (29.0\%) |  |  | F | 101 (22.5\%) |  | F | 84 (18.8\%) |
|  | College Level | M | 249 (43.2\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | M | 73 (29.3\%) |
|  | 576 (37.6\%) | F | 327 (56.8\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F | 153 (46.8\%) |
|  | Unknown | M | 13 (72.2\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | M | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable | M | 1 (7.7\%) |
|  | 18(1.2\%) | F | 5 (27.8\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | F | 0 (0.0\%) |  | F | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | M | 752 (49.1\%) | M | 202 (26.9\%) | M | 116 (15.4\%) |  |  | M | 91 (12.1\%) |  | M | 138 (18.4\%) |
|  | .1,532 $1000 \%$, | F | 780(50.\%) | F | 236 (30.3\%) | F | 137 (17.6\%) |  |  | F | $109114.0 \%$ ) |  |  | 237(30.4\%) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{y}{0} \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & \stackrel{y}{n} \\ & \stackrel{1}{8} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \end{aligned}$ | DE Level 1 | M | 89 (58.9\%) | M | 43 (48.3\%) | M | 19 (21.3\%) | Not Applicable |  | M | 6 (6.7\%) | $1(1.1 \%)$ | M | 9 (10.1\%) |
|  | 151 (14.2\%) | F | 62 (41.1\%) | F | 45 (72.6\%) | F | 31 (50.0\%) |  |  | F | 11 (17.7\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | F | 9 (14.5\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | M | 206 (49.4\%) | M | 69 (33.5\%) | M | 40 (19.4\%) |  |  | M | 43 (20.9\%) | 1 (0.5\%) | M | 27 (13.1\%) |
|  | 417 (39.3\%) | F | 211 (50.6\%) | F | 93 (44.1\%) | F | 60 (28.4\%) |  |  | F | 57 (27.0\%) | 1 (0.5\%) | F | 51 (24.2\%) |
|  | Total Referred | M | 295 (51.9\%) | M | 112 (38.0\%) | M | 59 (20.0\%) |  |  | M | 49 (16.6\%) | 2 (0.7\%) | M | 36 (12.2\%) |
|  | 568 (53.5\%) | F | 273 (48.1\%) | F | 138 (50.5\%) | F | $91(33.3 \%)$ |  |  | F | 68 (24.9\%) | 1 (0.4\%) | F | 60 (22.0\%) |
|  | College Level | M | 216 (44.3\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | M | 81 (37.5\%) |
|  | 488 (46.0\%) | F | 272 (55.7\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F | 129 (47.4\%) |
|  | Unknown | M | 2 (40.0\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | M | 0 (0.0\%) | M 0 (0.0\%) | M | 1 (50.0\%) |
|  | 5(0.5\%) | F | 3(60.0\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | F | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | M | 513 (48.4\%) | M | 122 (23.8\%) | M | 66 (12.9\%) |  |  | M | 54 (10.5\%) | M 3 (0.6\%) | M | 118 (23.0\%) |
|  | 1061 (100.0\%) | F | 5488(51.6\%) | F | 144 (26.3\%) | F | 95 (17.3\%) |  |  | F | 72 (13.1\%) | 10.2\%) |  | 189934.5\%) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{4}{0} \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & 0 \\ & \stackrel{y}{8} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | DE Level 1 | M | 164 (63.8\%) | M | 68 (41.5\%) | M | 38 (23.2\%) | Not Applicable |  | M | 20 (12.2\%) | 1 (0.6\%) | M | 23 (14.0\%) |
|  | 257 (22.7\%) | F | 93 (36.2\%) | F | 46 (49.5\%) | F | 28 (30.1\%) |  |  | F | 6(6.5\%) | 3 (3.2\%) | F | 21 (22.6\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | M | 154 (55.6\%) | M | 71 (46.1\%) | M | $52(33.8 \%)$ |  |  | M | 52 (33.8\%) | 3 (1.9\%) | M | 47 (30.5\%) |
|  | 277 (24.5\%) | F | 123 (44.4\%) | F | 61 (49.6\%) | F | 49 (39.8\%) |  |  | F | 47 (38.2\%) | 3 (2.4\%) | F | 47 (38.2\%) |
|  | Total Referred | M | 318 (59.6\%) | M | 139 (43.7\%) | M | 90 (28.3\%) |  |  | M | $72(22.6 \%)$ | 4 (1.3\%) | M | 70 (22.0\%) |
|  | 534 (47.3\%) | F | 216 (40.4\%) | F | 107 (49.5\%) | F | 77 (35.6\%) |  |  | F | 53 (24.5\%) | $6(2.8 \%)$ | F | 68 (31.5\%) |
|  | College Level | M | 259 (45.3\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  | 104 (40.2\%) |
|  | 572 (50.6\%) | F | 313 (54.7\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 165 (52.7\%) |
|  | Unknown | M | 18 (75.0\%) | M | 1 (5.6\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | M | 0 (0.0\%) | M 0 (0.0\%) | M | 6 (33.3\%) |
|  | 24 (2.1\%) | F | 6 (25.0\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | F | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | F | 2(33.3\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | M | 595 (52.7\%) | M | 147 (24.7\%) | M | 96 (16.1\%) |  |  | M | 77 (12.9\%) | M 8(1.3\%) |  | 180(30.3\%) |
|  | 1,1130 (100.0\%) |  | 535 (47.3\%) |  | 113(21.1\%) |  | 82(15.3\%) |  |  | F | 57]10.7\%) | 6(1.1\%) |  | 235 [43.9\% ${ }^{\text {l }}$ |

$\mathrm{M}=$ Male $\quad \mathrm{F}=$ Female

## English Progression by Gender

|  |  | 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 <br> (3rd Year) | Success in GK (3rd Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DE Level 1 | M | 125 (57.3\%) | M | 80 (64.0\%) | M | 45 (36.0\%) | M | 11 (8.8\%) | M | 8 (6.4\%) | 3rd Year Data Not Yet Available |  |  |
|  | 218 (17.8\%) | F | 93 (42.7\%) | F | 67 (72.0\%) | F | 49 (52.7\%) | F | 2 (2.2\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 2 | M | 108 (52.2\%) | M | 58 (53.7\%) | M | 32 (29.6\%) | M | 8 (7.4\%) | M | 4 (3.7\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 207 (16.9\%) | F | 99 (47.8\%) | F | 59 (59.6\%) | F | 45 (45.5\%) | F | 5 (5.1\%) | F | 4 (4.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 3 | M | 69 (56.6\%) | M | 22 (31.9\%) | M | 15 (21.7\%) | M | 12 (17.4\%) | M | 8 (11.6\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 122 (10.0\%) | F | 53 (43.4\%) | F | 12 (22.6\%) | F | 11 (20.8\%) | $F$ | 6 (11.3\%) | F | 5 (9.4\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 4 | M | 1 (100.0\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) | M | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  |  |
|  | 1 (0.1\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) | $F$ | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Total Referred | M | 303 (55.3\%) | M | 160 (52.8\%) | M | 92 (30.4\%) | M | 31 (10.2\%) | M | 20 (6.6\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 548 (44.7\%) | F | 245 (44.7\%) | F | 138 (56.3\%) | F | 105 (42.9\%) | F | 13 (5.3\%) | F | 9 (3.7\%) |  |  |  |
|  | College Level | M | $268 \text { (43.4\%) }$ | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $617(50.3 \%)$ | F | $349 \text { (56.6\%) }$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Unknown | M | 27 (44.3\%) | M | 1 (3.7\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) | M | 1 (3.7\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 61 (5.0\%) | F | 34 (55.7\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Cohort Total | M | 598 (48.8\%) | M | 166 (27.8\%) | M | 97 (16.2\%) | M | 37 (6.2\%) | M | 25 (4.2\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 1,226 (100.0\%) | F | 628 (51.2\%) | F | 145 (23.1\%) , | F | 111 (17.7\%) | F | 17. $2.7 \%$ ) | F | 12 (1.9\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 1 | M | 90 (57.3\%) | M | 62 (68.9\%) | M | 39 (43.3\%) | M | 4 (4.4\%) | M | 3 (3.3\%) | 3rd Year Data Not Yet Available |  |  |
|  | 157 (14.6\%) | F | 67 (42.7\%) | F | 49 (73.1\%) | F | 39 (58.2\%) | F | 4 (6.0\%) | F | 3 (4.5\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 2 | M | 98 (45.8\%) | M | 58 (59.2\%) | M | 40 (40.8\%) | M | 4 (4.1\%) | M | 2 (2.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 214 (19.9\%) | F | 116 (54.2\%) | F | 83 (71.6\%) | F | 64 (55.2\%) | F | $9(7.8 \%)$ | F | 6 (5.2\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 3 | M | 106 (44.4\%) | M | 64 (60.4\%) | M | 46 (43.4\%) | M | 59 (55.7\%) | M | 40 (37.7\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 239 (22.3\%) | F | 133 (55.6\%) | F | 100 (75.2\%) | F | 80 (60.2\%) | F | 87 (65.4\%) | F | 70 (52.6\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 4 | M | 1 (100.0\%) | M | 1 (100.0\%) | M | 1 (100.0\%) | M | 1 (100.0\%) | M | 1 (100.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | $1 \text { (0.1\%) }$ | F | 0 (0.0\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Total Referred | M | 295 (48.3\%) | M | 185 (62.7\%) | M | 126 (42.7\%) | M | 68 (23.1\%) | M | 46 (15.6\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 611 (56.9\%) | F | 316 (51.7\%) | F | 232 (73.4\%) | F | 183 (57.9\%) | F | 100 (31.6\%) | F | 79 (25.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | College Level | M | 229 (51.8\%) | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 442 (41.2\%) | F | 213 (48.2\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Unknown | M | 10 (50.0\%) | M | $0(0.0 \%)$ | M | $0(0.0 \%)$ | M | $0(0.0 \%)$ | M | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  |  |
|  | 20 (1.9\%) | F | 10 (50.0\%) | F | 1 (10.0\%) | F | 1 (10.0\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Cohort Total | M | 534 (49.8\%) | M | 193 (36.1\%) | M | 132 (24.7\%) | M | 74 (13.9\%) | M | 51 (9.6\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 1,073 (100.0\%) | F | $539(50.2 \%)$ | F | 240 (44.5\%). | F | 188 (34.9\%) | F | 106 (19.7\%). | F | 83 (15.4\%) |  |  |  |

$\mathrm{M}=$ Male $\quad \mathrm{F}=$ Female

Notes:

1) Attempted = student received a grade for course (includes variations of W); Completed = student received a grade of $A, B, C, D, F, I, I P$, or $P$ for course; Success = student received a grade of $A, B$, or $C$ for course.
2) High $D E=$ last course in $D E$ 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:
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:
Course Enrollment::
ACCDODS1.XST_ATD_ACCD
ACCDODS1.XST.IRES_SC

## English Progression by Ethnicity

Across all cohorts and levels, a strong trend was not evident regarding which racial/ethnic groups successfully completed "gatekeeper" courses at the highest rates.


Notes:

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

Sources:

FTIC Ethnicity:
DE Referrals:

Course Enrollment::

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

|  |  | Referral Level |  | Attempted Any DE -- (1st Year) |  | Success in Any DE -- (1st Year) |  | Attempted RSG <br> (1st Year) <br> Success in RSG | Success in High DE -- (3rd Year) |  | Success in RSG <br> - (3rd Year) |  | Success in GK (3rd Year) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \frac{5}{0} \\ & \frac{1}{8} \\ & N \\ & \text { R } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | DE Level 1$151(14.2 \%)$ | AA | 28 (18.5\%) | AA | 17 (60.7\%) | AA | 8 (28.6\%) |  | AA | 4 (14.3\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | 3 (10.7\%) |
|  |  | A | 2 (1.3) | A | 1 (50.0\%) | A | 1 (50.0\%) | Not Applicable | A | 1 (50.0\%) | A | $0(0.0 \%)$ | A | 1 (50.05) |
|  |  | H | 105 (69.5\%) | H | 59 (56.2\%) | H | 36 (34.3\%) |  | H | 10 (9.5\%) | H | 1 (1.0\%) | H | 11 (10.5\%) |
|  |  | 0 | $0(0.0 \%)$ | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  | 0 | $0(0.0 \%)$ | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | $0(0.0 \%)$ |
|  |  | W | 16 (10.6\%) | W | 11 (688\%) | W | 5 (31.3\%) |  | W | 2 (12.58) | W | 0 O $0.0 \%$ ) | W | 3 (18.8\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 <br> 417 (39.3N) | AA | 61 (14.6\%) | AA | 29 (47.5\%) | AA | 16 (26.2\%) |  | AA | 17 (27.9\%) | AA | 0 O $0.0 \%$ ) | AA | 9 (14.8\%) |
|  |  | A | $9(22 \%)$ | A | 0 (0.05) | A | 0 (0.05) |  | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 1 (11.15) |
|  |  | H | 281 (67.4\%) | H | 117 (416\%) | H | 74 (26.3\%) |  | H | 73 (26.0\%) | H | $2(0.7 \%)$ | H | 54 (19.2\%) |
|  |  | 0 | 5 (1.2\%) | 0 | $2(40.0 \%)$ | 0 | $0(0.05)$ |  | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | $0(0.0 \%)$ |
|  |  | W | 61 (14.6\%) | w | 14 (23.0\%) | W | 10 (16.4\%) |  | W | 10 (16.4\%) | W | 0 (0.0\%) | W | 14 (23.05) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total Referred } \\ & 568(53.5 \%) \end{aligned}$ | AA | 89 (15.7\%) | AA | 46 (51.7\%) | AA | 24 (27.05) |  | AA | 21 (23.65) | AA | 0 O.0.0\%) | AA | 12 (13.5\%) |
|  |  | A | 11 (19\%) | A | 1 (9.1\%) | A | 1(9.1\%) |  | A | 1 (9.1\%) | A | 0 0.0.0\%) | A | 2 (18.2\%) |
|  |  | H | 386 (68.0\%) | H | 176 (45.6\%) | H | 110 (28.5\%) |  | H | 83 (21.5\%) | H | 3 (0.8\%) | H | 65 (16.8\%) |
|  |  | 0 | $5(0.9 \%)$ | 0 | $2(40.0 \%)$ | 0 | $0(0.05)$ |  | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 0 O $0.0 \%$ ) | 0 | $0(0.0 \%)$ |
|  |  | W | 77 (13.6\%) | W | 25 (32.5\%) | W | 15 (19.5\%) |  | W | 12 (15.6\%) | W | 0 (0.0\%) | W | 17 (22.15) |
|  | College Level 488 (46.0\%) | AA | 56 (11.5\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | AA | 22 (39.3\%) |
|  |  | A | 6 (1.2\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | A | 1 (16.7\%) |
|  |  | H | 329 (67.4\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | H | 148 (45.0\%) |
|  |  | 0 | 10 (20\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 3 (30.0\%) |
|  |  | W | 87 (17.8\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | W | 36 (41.4\%) |
|  | Unknown$5 \text { (0.5\%) }$ | AA | $0(0.0 \%)$ | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | $0(008)$ | Not Applicable | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | $0(0.0 \%)$ | AA | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.08) | A | $0(0.05)$ |  | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 O(0.0\%) | A | $0(0.0 \%)$ |
|  |  | H | $2(40.0 \%)$ | H | 0 (0.0\%) | H | 0 (0.0\%) |  | H | 0 (0.05) | H | 0 (0.0\%) | H | 1 (50.0\%) |
|  |  | 0 | 1 (20.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) |  | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | W | $2(40.0 \%)$ | W | 0 (0.0\%) | W | 0 (0.0\%) |  | W | 0 (0.0\%) | W | 0 (0.0\%) | W | $0(0.0 \%)$ |
|  | Cohort Total 1,061 (100.0\%6) | AA | 145 (13.7\%) | AA | 47 (32.4\%) | AA | 25 (17.2\%) |  | AA | 22 (15.2\%) | AA | 1 (0.7\%) | AA | 34 (23.4\%) |
|  |  | A | 17 (1.6\%) | A | 1 (5.9\%) | A | 1 (5.9\%) |  | A | 1 (5.9\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 3 (17.6\%) |
|  |  | H | 717 (67.6\%) | H | 191 (26.6\%) | H | 120 (16.7\%) |  | H | 90 (12.6\%) | H | 3 (0.4\%) | H | 214 (29.8\%) |
|  |  | 0 | 16 (1.5\%) | 0 | 2 (125\%) | 0 | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 3 (18.8\%) |
|  |  | W | 165 (15.6\%) | W | 25(1519) | W | 15-9\%\%). |  | W | 13 (789) | W | 0.0.0\%) | W | 53 (31.9\%) |
| $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & 0 \\ & \frac{5}{0} \\ & \frac{m}{8} \\ & \frac{1}{7} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DE Level } 1 \\ & 257 \text { (22.7\%) } \end{aligned}$ | AA | 39 (15.2\%) | AA | 12 (30.8\%) | AA | 6 (15.4\%) |  | AA | 2 (5.1\%) | AA | 2 (5.1\%) | AA | 6 (15.4\%) |
|  |  | A | 12 (4.7\%) | A | 8 (66.7\%) | A | 2 (16.7\%) |  | A | 1 (8.3\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 4 (33.3\%) |
|  |  | H | 153 (59.5\%) | H | 72 (47.1\%) | H | 46 (30.1\%) |  | H | 18 (11.8\%) | H | 1 (0.7\%) | H | 30 (19.6\%) |
|  |  | 0 | 23 (8.9\%) | 0 | 10 (43.5\%) | 0 | 6 (26.1\%) |  | 0 | 4 (17.4\%) | 0 | $0(0.0 \%)$ | 0 | $2(8.7 \%)$ |
|  |  | W | 30 (11.7\%) | W | 12 (40.0\%) | W | 6 (20.0\%) |  | W | 1 (3.3\%) | W | 1 (3.3\%) | W | 2 (6.7\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 <br> 277 ( $24.5 \%$ ) | AA | 42 (15.2\%) | AA | 19 (45.2\%) | AA | 11 (26.2\%) |  | AA | 10 (23.8\%) | AA | 0 0.0\%\%) | AA | 14 (33.3\%) |
|  |  | A | 3 (1.1\%) | A | 2 (66.7\%) | A | 2 (66.7\%) |  | A | 2 (66.7\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 1 (33.3\%) |
|  |  | H | 169 (61.0\%) | H | 84 (49.7\%) | H | 67 (39.6\%) | Not Applicable | H | 66 (39.1\%) | H | 3 (1.8\%) | H | 58 (34.3\%) |
|  |  | 0 | 14 (5.1\%) | 0 | 7 (50.0\%) | 0 | 6 (42.9\%) |  | 0 | 6 (42.9\%) | 0 | 0 O $0.0 \%$ ) | 0 | 5 (35.7\%) |
|  |  | W | 49 (17.7\%) | W | 20 (40.8\%) | W | 15 (30.6\%) |  | W | 15 (30.6\%) | W | 3 (6.1\%) | W | 16 (32.7\%) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total Referred } \\ & 534(47.3 \%) \end{aligned}$ | AA | 81 (15.2\%) | AA | 31 (38.3\%) | AA | 17 (21.0\%) |  | AA | 12 (14.8\%) | AA | 2 (2.5\%) | AA | 20 (24.7\%) |
|  |  | A | 15 (2.8\%) | A | 10 (66.7\%) | A | 4 (26.7\%) |  | A | 3 (20.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 5 (38.3\%) |
|  |  | H | 322 (60.3\%) | H | 156 (48.4\%) | H | 113 (35.1\%) |  | H | 84 (26.1\%) | H | 4 (1.2\%) | H | 88 (27.3\%) |
|  |  | 0 | 37 (6.9\%) | 0 | 17 (45.9\%) | 0 | 12 (32.4\%) |  | 0 | 10 (27.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 7 (18.9\%) |
|  |  | W | 79 (14.8\%) | W | 32 (40.5\%) | W | 21 (26.6\%) |  | W | 16 (20.3\%) | W | 4 (5.1\%) | W | 18 (228\%) |
|  | College Level$572 \text { ( } 50.6 \% \text { ) }$ | AA | 51 (8.9\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | AA | 24 (47.1\%) |
|  |  | A | 11 (1.9\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | A | 5 (45.5\%) |
|  |  | H | 388 (67.8\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | H | 180 (46.4\%) |
|  |  | 0 | 22 (3.8\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 14 (63.6\%) |
|  |  | w | 100 (17.5\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | W | 45 (46.0\%) |
|  | Unknown$24(21 \%)$ | AA | 1 (4.2\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | $0(0.0 \%)$ | Not Applicable | AA | 0 0.0\%) | AA | $0(0.0 \%)$ | AA | $0(0.0 \%)$ |
|  |  | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) |  | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | H | 9 (37.5\%) | H | 1 (11.1\%) | H | 0 (0.0\%) |  | H | 0 (0.0\%) | H | 0 O $0.0 \%$ ) | H | 3 (38.3\%) |
|  |  | 0 | 2 (8.3\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 0 0.0\%) |  | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 0 0.0\%\%) | 0 | 1 (50.0\%) |
|  |  | W | 12 (50.0\%) | W | 0 (0.0\%) | W | 0 (0.0\%) |  | W | 0 (0.0\%) | W | 0 (0.0\%) | W | 4 (33.3\%) |
|  | Cohort Total$1,130(100.0 \%)$ | AA | 133 (11.8\%) | AA | 33 (24.8\%) | $A A$ | 19 (14.3\%) |  | AA | 14 (10.5\%) | AA | 2 (1.5\%) | AA | 44 (33.1\%) |
|  |  | A | 26 (2.3\%) | A | 10 (38.5\%) | A | 4 (15.4\%) |  | A | 3 (11.5\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 10 (38.5\%) |
|  |  | H | 719 (63.6\%) | H | 166 (23.1\%) | H | 120 (16.7\%) |  | H | 89 (12.4\%) | H | 8 (1.1\%) | H | 271 (37.7\%) |
|  |  | 0 | 61 (5.4\%) | 0 | 18 (29.5\%) | 0 | 13 (21.3\%) |  | 0 | 11 (18.0\%) | 0 | 0 O.0\%) | 0 | 22 (36.1\%) |
|  |  | W- | $191(16.9 \%)$. | W | 33 117.392 | W | _ 22. $11.5 \%$ ) |  | W | -1718.9\%) | W | 4. $2.1 \%$ ) | W | 68(35.6\%) |

## English Progression by Ethnicity (continued)

|  |  | Referral level |  | Attempted Any DE (1st Year) |  | Success in Any DE (1st Year) |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Artempted RSG } \\ & \text { (1st Year) } \end{aligned}$ |  | Success in R5G (1st Year) |  | Success in High DE (3rd Year) | Success in RSG (3rd Year) | Success in GK (3rd Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \frac{4}{0} \\ & \frac{0}{8} \\ & \frac{\pi}{8} \\ & \frac{1}{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level 1 } \\ 218(17.8 \%) \end{gathered}$ | AA | 35 (16.1\%) | AA | 25 (71.4\%) | AA | 15 (42.9\%) | AA | 1 (29\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | A | $7(3.25)$ | A | 6 (35.78) | A | 5 (71.4\%) | A | $2(28.6 \%)$ | A | 1 (14.3\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | H | 127 (58.3\%) | H | 79 (62.28) | H | 48 (37.8\%) | H | 7 (55\%) | H | 4 (3.1\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | 0 | 12 (5.5\%) | 0 | 8 (66.7\%) | 0 | 5 (41.7\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | w | 37 (17.0\%) | w | 29 (78.4\%) | w | 21 (56.8\%) | w | 3 (8.1\%) | w | $318.1 \%)$ |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 2 \\ 207(16.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | AA | 18 (8.7\%) | AA | 13 (72.2\%) | AA | 8 (44.4\%) | AA | 1 (56\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | A | $9(43 \%)$ | A | 5 (55.6\%) | A | 4 (44.4\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | H | 138 (66.7\%) | H | 76 (55.1\%) | H | 45 (32.6\%) | H | 5 (3.6\%) | H | 2 (1.4\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | 0 | 12 (5.8\%) | 0 | 10 (83.3\%) | 0 | 8 (66.7\%) | 0 | 4 (33.3\%) | 0 | 3 (25.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | w | 30 (14.5\%) | w | 13 (43.3\%) | w | 12 (40.0\%) | w | 3 (10.0\%) | w | 3 (10.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 3$122(10.0 \%)$ | AA | 16 (13.1\%) | AA | 2 (12.5\%) | AA | $2(12.5 \%)$ | AA | 2 (125\%) | AA | 2 (125\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | A | 1 (0.8\%) | A | 1 (100.0\%) | A | 1 (100.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | H | 74 (60.7\%) | H | 21 (28.4\%) | H | 16 (21.6\%) | H | 11 (14.9\%) | H | 8 (10.8\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | 0 | 9 (7.4\%) | 0 | 4 (44.4\%) | 0 | 2 (222\%) | 0 | 3(33.3\%) | 0 | 1 (11.1\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | w | 22 (18.0\%) | w | 6 (27.3\%) | w | 5 (22.7\%) | w | 2 (9.1\%) | w | 219.1\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 4$1(0.1 \%)$ | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | $0(0.0 \%)$ | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | $0100 \%)$ | AA | $0(00 \%)$ |  |  |  |
|  |  | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | $0(0.0 \%)$ | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | H | 1 (100.0\%) | H | $0(0.08)$ | H | 0 (0.0\%) | H | 0 0.0\%6) | H | 0 0,00\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | $0(0.08)$ | 0 | 0 (0.0\%6) | 0 | 0 0,0\%\%) | 0 | 0 0,00\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | w | 0 (0.0\%) | w | 0 (0.05) | w | $0(0.065)$ | w | 0 (0.0\%) | w | 0 (0.0\%) | 3rd Year Data Not Yet Available |  |  |
|  | Total Referred 548 (44.7\%) | AA | 69 (12.6\%) | AA | 40 (58.0\%) | AA | 25 (36.2\%) | AA | 4 (5.8\%) | AA | 2 (29\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | A | 17 (3.1\%) | A | 12 (70.6\%) | A | 10 (58.8\%) | A | 2 (118\%) | A | 1 (5.9\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | H | 340 (620\%) | H | 176 (51.8\%) | H | 109 (32.1\%) | H | 23 (6.8\%) | H | 14 (4.1\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | 0 | 33 (6.0\%) | 0 | 22 (66.7\%) | 0 | 15 (45.5\%) | 0 | 7 (21.2\%) | 0 | 4 (121\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | w | 89 (16.2\%) | w | 48 (53.9\%) | w | 38 (42.7\%) | w | 8 (9.0\%) | w | 8 (9.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | College Level 617 (50.3\%) | AA | 60 (9.7\%) | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | A | 8 (1.3\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | H | 410 (66.5\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 0 | 27 (4.4\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | w | 112 (18.2\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Unknown 61 (5.0\%) | AA | 8 (13.1\%) | AA | $0(0.0 \%)$ | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | A | 0 (0.0\%6) | A | $0(0.0 \%)$ | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (00\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | H | 30 (49.2\%) | H | 0 (0.0\%) | H | 0 (0.0\%) | H | $0100 \% 1$ | H | $0100 \% 1$ |  |  |  |
|  |  | 0 | 6 (9.8\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | w | 17 (27.9\%) | w | 1(5.9\%) | w | 0 (0.0\%) | w | 1 (5.9\%) | w | 0 (0.0N) |  |  |  |
|  | Cohort Total 1,226(200.0\%) | AA | $137(112 \%)$ | AA | 42 (30.7\%) | AA | 25 (19.0\%) | AA | 6 (4.4\%) | AA | $3(220)$ |  |  |  |
|  |  | A | 25 (20\%) | A | 12 (48.0\%) | A | 10 (40.0\%) | A | 2 (8.0\%) | A | 1 (4.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | H | 780 (63.6\%) | H | 182 (23.3\%) | H | 115 (14.75) | H | 27 (3.5\%) | H | 18 (23\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | 0 | 66 (5.4\%) | 0 | 24 (36.4\%) | 0 | 17 (25.8\%) | 0 | $9(13.6 \%)$ | 0 | 6 (9.13) |  |  |  |
|  |  | W- | 218 (1788) | W | 51.23 23 21 | W | 40.18331. | W- | 10146\%) | W- | 2141821 |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \frac{5}{5} \\ & \frac{8}{8} \\ & \frac{A}{8} \\ & \frac{8}{6} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level 1 } \\ 157 \text { (14.6\%) } \end{gathered}$ | AA | 27 (17.28) | AA | 25 (92.6\%) | AA | 14 (51.9\%) | AA | 0 (0.05) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | A | 5 (3.25) | A | 3 (60.0\%) | A | 1 (20.05\%) | A | 0 (0.05) | A | 0 (0.05) |  |  |  |
|  |  | H | 102 (65.0\%) | H | 66 (64.7\%) | H | 47 (46.1\%) | H | 7 (6.9\%) | H | 5 (4.9\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | 0 | 9 (5.7\%) | 0 | 9 (100.0\%) | 0 | 9 (100.0\%) | 0 | 1 (111\%) | 0 | 1 (11.1\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | w | 14 (8.9\%) | w | 8 (57.15) | w | 7 (50.0\%) | w | 0 0.0.05) | w | 0 (0.05) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 2$214 \text { (19.9\%) }$ | AA | 31 (14.5\%) | AA | 21 (67.7\%) | AA | 15 (48.4\%) | AA | 0 0,0\%6) | AA | 0 (0.05) |  |  |  |
|  |  | A | 3(1.4\%) | A | 3 (100.0\%) | A | 3 (100.0\%) | A | 1 (33.3\%) | A | 1 (33.3\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | H | 155 (72.4\%) | H | 104 (67.15) | H | 77 (49.7\%) | H | 11 (7.15) | H | 6 (3.9\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | 0 | 3 (1.4\%) | 0 | 2 (65.7\%) | 0 | 1 (33.3\%) | 0 | 1 (33.3\%) | 0 | 1 [33.3\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | w | 22 (10.3\%) | w | 11 (50.05) | w | 8 (36.4\%) | w | 0 (0.05) | w | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 3 <br> 239 (22.3\%) | AA | 25 (10.5\%) | AA | 18 (72.05) | AA | $9(36.056)$ | AA | 16 (64.0\%) | AA | 8 (3205) |  |  |  |
|  |  | A | 3(1.3\%) | A | 2 (66.7\%) | A | 2 (66.7\%) | A | 2 (66.7\%) | A | 2 (66.7\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | H | 178 (74.5\%) | H | 128 (71.9\%) | H | 105 (59.0\%) | H | 112 (629\%) | H | 90 (50.6\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | 0 | 4 (1.7\%) | 0 | 2 (50.0\%) | 0 | 2 (50.0\%) | 0 | 2 (50.0\%) | 0 | 2 (50.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | w | 29 (12.18) | w | 14 (48.3\%) | w | 8 (27.6\%) | w | 14 (48.3\%) | w | 8 (27.6\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 4 1 (0.1\%) | AA | $0(0.05)$ | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | 0 0.0.0\%) | AA | 0 (0.05) |  |  |  |
|  |  | A | 0 (0.05) | A | $0(0.055)$ | A | $0(0.05)$ | A | $0(0.0 \mathrm{~N})$ | A | 0 (0.05) |  |  |  |
|  |  | H | 1 (100.0\%) | H | 1 (200.0\%) | H | 1 (100.0\%) | H | 1 (200.05) | H | 1 (100.05) |  |  |  |
|  |  | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | $0(0.05)$ | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.05) |  |  |  |
|  |  | w | $0(0.08)$ | W | 0 (0.05) | W | 0 (0.0\%) | w | 0 (0.0\%) | W | 0 (0.05) | 3rd Year Data Not Yet Available |  |  |
|  | Total Referred 611 (56.9\%) | AA | 83 (13.6\%) | AA | 64 (77.15) | AA | 38 (45.8\%) | AA | 16 (19.3\%) | AA | 8 (9.65) |  |  |  |
|  |  | A | 11 (1.85) | A | 8 (72.7\%) | A | 5 (54.5\%) | A | $3(27.3 \%)$ | A | 3 (27.3\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | H | 436 (71.45) | H | 299 (68.6\%) | H | 230 (528\%) | H | 131 (30.0\%) | H | 102 (23.4\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | 0 | 16 (2.6\%) | 0 | 13 (81.3\%) | 0 | 12 (75.0\%) | 0 | 4 (25.0N) | 0 | 4 (25.05) |  |  |  |
|  |  | w | 65 (10.6\%) | w | 33 (50.8\%) | w | 23 (35.4\%) | w | 14 (21.5\%) | w | 8 (12.3\%) |  |  |  |
|  | College level 442 (41.25) | AA | 55 (12.4\%) | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | A | 6(1.4\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | H | 288 (65.25) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 0 | 13 (2.9\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | w | 80 (18.1\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Unknown$20 \text { (1.9\%) }$ | AA | 3 (15.08) | AA | 1 (33.3\%) | AA | 1 (33.3\%) | AA | 0 0.00\%) | AA | 0 (0.05) |  |  |  |
|  |  | A | 0 (0.08) | A | 0 (0.05) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.05) | A | 0 (0.05) |  |  |  |
|  |  | H | 11 (55.08) | H | 0 (0.05) | H | 0 (0.0\%) | H | 0 (0.05) | H | 0 0,005) |  |  |  |
|  |  | 0 | 1 (5.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.05) |  |  |  |
|  |  | w | 5 (25.05) | w | 0 (0.0\%) | w | 0 (0.0\%) | w | 0 (0.05) | w | 0 (0.05) |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cohort Total } \\ & 1,073(100.0 \%) \end{aligned}$ | AA | 141 (13.15) | AA | 66 (46.85) | AA | 40 (28.4\%) | AA | 17 (12.15) | AA | 9 (6.45) |  |  |  |
|  |  | A | 17 (1.6\%) | A | 9 (52.9\%) | A | $7(4126)$ | A | 4 (23.5\%) | A | 4 (23.5\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | H | 735 (68.5\%) | H | 309 (42.05) | H | 236 (32 18) | H | 139 (18.9\%) | H | 108 (14.7\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | 0 | 30 (28\%) | 0 | 14 (46.7\%) | 0 | 12 (40.0\%) | 0 | 5 (16.7\%) | 0 | 4 (13.3\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 150(14.08) | W | 35.23351 | -W | 25.16720 |  | -15.10.0ㄴ. |  | -2(6051. |  |  |  |

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

## English Progression by Age

Across cohort years, referral levels, and age groups, a consistent pattern on success rate in "gatekeeper" in 3 years was not evident. When comparing the 2011 cohort to the 2013 cohort, referred students up to the age of 50 experienced increases in "gatekeeper" success.

|  |  | Referral Level |  | Attempted Any DE (1st Year) |  | Success in Any DE (1st Year) |  | Attempted RSG <br> (1st Year) | Success in RSG <br> (1st Year) |  | High DE <br> Year) | Success in RSG (3rd Year) |  | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \text { in GK } \\ & \text { Year) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 4 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 7 \\ & \hline 8 \\ & \overline{0} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $<17$ | 6 (2.1\%) | $<17$ | 1 (16.7\%) | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | $<17$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  | $<17$ | 1 (16.7\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 194 (69.0\%) | 18-21 | 103 (53.1\%) | 18-21 | 51 (26.3\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 21 (10.8\%) |  | 18-21 | 16 (8.2\%) |
|  | DE Level 1 | 22-24 | 17 (6.0\%) | 22-24 | 7 (41.2\%) | 22-24 | 4 (23.5\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 1 (5.9\%) |  | 22-24 | 2 (11.8\%) |
|  | 281 (18.3\%) | 25-35 | 34 (12.1\%) | 25-35 | 14 (41.2\%) | 25-35 | 13 (38.2\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 2 (5.9\%) |  | 25-35 | 5 (14.7\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 23 (8.2\%) | 36-50 | 11 (47.8\%) | 36-50 | 8 (34.8\%) |  |  | 36-50 | 3 (13.0\%) |  | 36-50 | 4 (17.4\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | 7 (2.5\%) | 51+ | 3 (42.9\%) | 51+ | 1 (14.3\%) |  |  | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) |  | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | $<17$ | 18 (2.7\%) | <17 | 4 (22.2\%) | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | $<17$ | 1 (5.6\%) |  | $<17$ | 2 (11.1\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 414 (63.0\%) | 18-21 | 193 (46.6\%) | 18-21 | 111 (26.8\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 113 (27.3\%) |  | 18-21 | 71 (17.1\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | 22-24 | 56 (8.5\%) | 22-24 | 24 (42.9\%) | 22-24 | 15 (26.8\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 15 (26.8\%) | Not Applicable | 22-24 | 10 (17.9\%) |
|  | 657 (42.9\%) | 25-35 | 103 (15.7\%) | 25-35 | 40 (38.8\%) | 25-35 | 23 (22.3\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 22 (21.4\%) | Not Applicable | 25-35 | 22 (21.4\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 56 (8.5\%) | 36-50 | 16 (28.6\%) | 36-50 | 11 (19.6\%) |  |  | 36-50 | 8 (14.3\%) |  | 36-50 | 11 (19.6\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | 10 (1.5\%) | 51+ | 5 (50.0\%) | 51+ | 4 (40.0\%) |  |  | 51+ | 3 (30.0\%) |  | 51+ | 4 (40.0\%) |
|  |  | $<17$ | 24 (2.6\%) | $<17$ | 5 (20.8\%) | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | $<17$ | $1(4.2 \%)$ |  | $<17$ | 3 (12.5\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 608 (64.8\%) | 18-21 | 296 (48.7\%) | 18-21 | 162 (26.6\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 134 (22.0\%) |  | 18-21 | 87 (14.3\%) |
|  | Total Referred | 22-24 | 73 (7.8\%) | 22-24 | 31 (42.5\%) | 22-24 | 19 (26.0\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 16 (21.9\%) |  | 22-24 | 12 (16.4\%) |
|  | 938 (61.2\%) | 25-35 | 137 (14.6\%) | 25-35 | 54 (39.4\%) | 25-35 | 36 (26.3\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 24 (17.5\%) |  | 25-35 | 27 (19.7\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 79 (8.4\%) | 36-50 | 27 (34.2\%) | 36-50 | 19 (24.1\%) |  |  | 36-50 | 11 (13.9\%) |  | $36-50$ | 15 (19.0\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | 17 (1.8\%) | 51+ | 8 (47.1\%) | 51+ | 5 (29.4\%) |  |  | 51+ | $3(17.6 \%)$ |  | 51+ | 4 (23.5\%) |
|  | College Level 576 (37.6\%) | $<17$ | 20 (3.5\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | $<17$ | 6 (30.0\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 390 (67.7\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18-21 | 140 (35.9\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | 41 (7.1\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 22-24 | 18 (43.9\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 82 (14.2\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 25-35 | 43 (52.4\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 39 (6.8\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 36-50 | 17 (43.6\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | 4 (0.7\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 51+ | 2 (50.0\%) |
|  | Unknown <br> 18 (1.2\%) | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | $<17$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ | Not Applicable | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 7 (38.9\%) | 18-21 | 0 (0.0\%) | 18-21 | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 0 (0.0\%) |  | 18-21 | 1 (14.3\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | 1 (5.6\%) | 22-24 | $0(0.0 \%)$ | 22-24 | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 22-24 | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  | 22-24 | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 2 (11.1\%) | 25-35 | 0 (0.0\%) | 25-35 | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 0 (0.0\%) |  | 25-35 | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 7 (38.9\%) | 36-50 | $0(0.0 \%)$ | 36-50 | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 36-50 | 0 (0.0\%) |  | $36-50$ | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | 1 (5.6\%) | 51+ | $0(0.0 \%)$ | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 51+ | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cohort Total } \\ & 1,532(100.0 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $<17$ | 44 (2.9\%) | $<17$ | 5 (11.4\%) | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | $<17$ | 1 (2.3\%) |  | $<17$ | 9 (20.5\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 1,005 (65.6\%) | 18-21 | 308 (30.6\%) | 18-21 | 169 (16.8\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 141 (14.0\%) |  | 18-21 | 228 (22.7\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | 115 (7.5\%) | 22-24 | 32 (27.8\%) | 22-24 | 20 (17.4\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 17 (14.8\%) |  | 22-24 | 30 (26.1\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 221 (14.4\%) | 25-35 | 55 (24.9\%) | 25-35 | 37 (16.7\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 25 (11.3\%) |  | 25-35 | 70 (31.7\%) |
|  |  | $36-50$ | 125 (8.2\%) | 36-50 | 30 (24.0\%) | 36-50 | 22 (17.6\%) |  |  | 36-50 | 13 (10.4\%) |  | $36-50$ | 32 (25.6\%) |
|  |  | -51+ | _22.1.4\%), | 51+ | 8 3 36.4\%) | 51+ | -5.22.7\%) |  |  | 51+ | 3 (13.6\%) |  | -51+ | 6 (27.3\%) |

Notes:

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

Sources:
FTIC 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

|  |  | Referral Level |  | Attempted Any DE (1st Year) |  | Success in Any DE (1st Year) |  | Attempted RSG (1st Year) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Success in RSG } \\ \text { (1st Year) } \end{gathered}$ |  | High DE <br> ear) | Success (3r | $\begin{aligned} & \text { in RSG } \\ & \text { ear) } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { is in GK } \\ & \text { Year) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 8 \\ & \frac{8}{8} \\ & 0 \\ & \frac{1}{8} \\ & = \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DE Level } 1 \\ & 151(14.2 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 47 | 1 (0.7\%) | $<17$ | 1 (100.0\%) | $<17$ | 1 (100.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | 47 | 1 (100.0\%) | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) | $<17$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ |
|  |  | 18-21 | 115 (76.2\%) | 18.21 | 71 (61.7\%) | 18.21 | 39 (33.9\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 11 (9.6\%) | 18-21 | 1 (0.9\%) | $18 \cdot 21$ | 13 (11.3\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | 10 (6.6\%) | 22-24 | 3 (30.0\%) | 22-24 | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  | 22-24 | 0 (0.0\%) | 22-24 | 0 (0.0\%) | 22-24 | 1 (10.0\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 14 (9.3\%) | 25-35 | 7 (50.0\%) | 25-35 | $5(35.7 \%)$ |  |  | 25-35 | 2 (14.3\%) | 25-35 | 0 (0.0\%) | 25-35 | 4 (28.6\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 10 (6.6\%) | $36-50$ | 6 (60.0\%) | $36-50$ | 5 (50.0\%) |  |  | 36-50 | $3(30.0 \%)$ | 36-50 | 0 (0.0\%) | 36-50 | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | 51 - | 1 (0.7\%) | 51. | 0 O.0\%) | 51* | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 51. | 0 (0.0\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) | 51. | $0(0.05)$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DE Level } 2 \\ & 417(39.3 \%) \end{aligned}$ | <17 | 20 (4.8\%) | $<17$ | 7 (35.0\%) | $<17$ | 5 (25.0\%) |  |  | <17 | 5 (25.0\%) | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) | $<17$ | 1 (5.0\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 282 (67.6\%) | 18-21 | 123 (43.6\%) | 18-21 | 72 (255\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 71 (25.2\%) | 18-21 | 2 (0.7\%) | 18-21 | 54 (19.1\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | 33 (7.9\%) | 22-24 | 12 (36.4\%) | 22-24 | 8 (24.2\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 9 (27.3\%) | 22-24 | 0 (0.0\%) | 22-24 | 7 (21.2\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 51 (12.2\%) | 25-35 | 11 (21.6\%) | 25-35 | 8 (15.7\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 8 (15.7\%) | 25-35 | 0 (0.0\%) | 25-35 | 5 (9.8\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 26 (6.2\%) | $36-50$ | 9 (34.6\%) | 36-50 | 7 (269\%) |  |  | 36-50 | 7 (26.9\%) | 36-50 | 0 (0.0\%) | 36-50 | 10 (38.5\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | 5 (1.2\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | $51+$ | 0 (0.0\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) | 51+ | 1 (20.0\%) |
|  | Total Referred 568 (53.5\%) | $<17$ | 21 (3.7\%) | $<17$ | 8 (38.1\%) | $<17$ | 6 (28.6\%) |  |  | <17 | 6 (28.6\%) | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) | $<17$ | 1 (4.8\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 397 (69.9\%) | 18-21 | 194 (48.9\%) | 18-21 | 111 (28.0\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 82 (20.7\%) | 18-21 | 3 (0.8\%) | 18-21 | 67 (16.9\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | 43 (7.6\%) | 22-24 | 15 (34.9\%) | 22-24 | 8 (18.6\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 9 (20.9\%) | 22-24 | 0 (0.0\%) | 22-24 | 8 (18.6\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 65 (11.4\%) | 25-35 | 18 (27.7\%) | 25-35 | 13 (20.0\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 10 (15.4\%) | 25-35 | 0 (0.0\%) | 25-35 | 9 (13.8\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 36 (6.3\%) | $36-50$ | 15 (41.7\%) | $36-50$ | 12 (33.3\%) |  |  | 36-50 | 10 (27.8\%) | $36-50$ | 0 (0.0\%) | 36-50 | 10 (27.8\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | 6 (1.1\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) | 51+ | 1 (16.7\%) |
|  | College Level 488 (46.0\%) | <17 | 17 (3.5\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  | $<17$ | 7 (412\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 408 (83.6\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18-21 | 169 (41.4\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | 11 (23\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 22-24 | 5 (45.5\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 44 (9.0\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 25-35 | 25 (56.8\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 8 (1.6\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 36-50 | 4 (50.0\%) |
|  |  | $51+$ | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 51+ | $0(0.0 \%)$ |
|  | Unknown 5 (0.5\%) | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | 47 | 0 (0.0\%) | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) | <17 | $0(0.0 \%)$ |
|  |  | 18-21 | 5 (100.0\%) | $18-21$ | 0 (0.0\%) | $18-21$ | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 18-21 | $0(0.0 \%)$ | 18-21 | 0 (0.0\%) | 18-21 | 1 (20.0\%) |
|  |  | 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\%) | 22-24 | $0(0.0 \%)$ |
|  |  | 25-35 | 0 (0.0\%) | 25-35 | 0 (0.0\%) | 25-35 | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 0 (0.0\%) | 25-35 | 0 (0.0\%) | 25-35 | 0 (0.05) |
|  |  | 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+ | $0(0.0 \%)$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cohort Total } \\ & 1,061(100.0 \%) \end{aligned}$ | <17 | 38 (3.6\%) | $<17$ | 8 (21.1\%) | <17 | 6 (158\%) |  |  | 47 | 6 (15.8\%) | <17 | 0 (0.0\%) | <17 | 8 (21.1\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 810 (76.3\%) | 18-21 | 210 (25.9\%) | 18-21 | 122 (15.1\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 91 (11.2\%) | 18-21 | 4 (0.5\%) | 18-21 | 237 (29.3\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | 54 (5.1\%) | 22-24 | 15 (27.8\%) | 22-24 | 8 (148\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 9 (16.7\%) | 22-24 | 0 (0.0\%) | 22-24 | 13 (24.1\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 109 (10.3\%) | 25-35 | 18 (16.5\%) | 25-35 | 13 (11.9\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 10 (9.2\%) | 25-35 | 0 (0.0\%) | 25-35 | 34 (31.2\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 44 (4.1\%) | 36-50 | 15 (34.1\%) | 36-50 | 12 (273\%) |  |  | 36-50 | 10 (22.7\%) | 36-50 | 0 (0.0\%) | 36-50 | 14 (31.8\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | $6(0.65)$ | 51* | $010.0 \%)$ | 51* | _0000\%2 |  |  | 51. | O. 0.005 | 51* | 0.10.0\%). | 51 | 1 (167\%) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \frac{5}{0} \\ & \frac{0}{8} \\ & \frac{m}{8} \\ & \stackrel{1}{5} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DE Level } 1 \\ & 257 \text { (22.7\%) } \end{aligned}$ | <17 | 2 (0.8\%) | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) | <17 | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | $<17$ | 1 (50.0\%) | <17 | $0(0.0 \%)$ | <17 | 1 (50.0\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 182 (70.8\%) | 18-21 | 81 (44.5\%) | 18-21 | 49 (26.9\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 20 (11.0\%) | 18-21 | 3 (1.6\%) | 18-21 | 28 (15.4\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | 9 (3.5\%) | 22-24 | 4 (44.4\%) | 22-24 | 1 (11.1\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 1 (11.1\%) | 22-24 | $0(0.0 \%)$ | 22-24 | 2 (22.2\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 37 (14.4\%) | 25-35 | 20 (54.1\%) | 25-35 | 11 (29.7\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 3 (8.1\%) | 25-35 | 1 (2.7\%) | 25-35 | 10 (27.0\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 22 (8.6\%) | 36-50 | 6 (27.3\%) | 36-50 | 5 (22.7\%) |  |  | 36-50 | 1 (4.5\%) | 36-50 | $0(0.0 \%)$ | $36-50$ | 3 (13.6\%) |
|  |  | 51 | 5 (1.9\%) | 51* | 3 (60.0\%) | 51 - | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 51* | 0 (0.0\%) | 51* | 0 (0.0\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  | DE Level 2$277(24.5 \%)$ | <17 | $9(3.2 \%)$ | $<17$ | 6 (66.7\%) | <17 | 5 (55.6\%) |  |  | <17 | 4 (44.4\%) | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) | <17 | 5 (55.6\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 180 (65.0\%) | 18-21 | 90 (50.0\%) | 18-21 | 70 (38.9\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 71 (39.4\%) | 18-21 | 4 (2.2\%) | 18-21 | 63 (35.0\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | 22 (7.9\%) | 22-24 | 8 (36.4\%) | 22-24 | 6 (27.3\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 6 (27.3\%) | 22-24 | $0(0.0 \%)$ | $22-24$ | 8 (36.4\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 47 (17.0\%) | 25-35 | 20 (42.6\%) | 25-35 | 13 (27.7\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 14 (29.8\%) | 25-35 | 1 (2.1\%) | 25-35 | 14 (29.8\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 14 (5.1\%) | 36-50 | 7 (50.0\%) | 36-50 | 6 (42.9\%) |  |  | 36-50 | 4 (28.6\%) | 36-50 | $0(0.0 \%)$ | 36-50 | 4 (28.6\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | 5 (1.8\%) | 51+ | 1 (20.0\%) | 51+ | 1 (20.0\%) |  |  | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) | 51+ | 1 (20.0\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  | Total Referred$534 \text { (47.3\%) }$ | $<17$ | 11 (2.1\%) | $<17$ | 6 (54.5\%) | <17 | 5 (45.5\%) |  |  | <17 | 5 (45.5\%) | $<17$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ | $<17$ | 6 (54.5\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 362 (67.8\%) | 18-21 | 171 (47.2\%) | 18-21 | 119 (32.9\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 91 (25.1\%) | 18-21 | 7 (1.9\%) | 18-21 | 91 (25.1\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | 31 (5.8\%) | 22-24 | 12 (38.7\%) | 22-24 | 7 (22.6\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 7 (22.6\%) | 22-24 | $0(0.0 \%)$ | 22-24 | 10 (32.3\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 84 (15.7\%) | 25-35 | 40 (47.6\%) | 25-35 | 24 (28.6\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 17 (20.2\%) | 25-35 | 2 (2.4\%) | 25-35 | 24 (28.6\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 36 (6.7\%) | 36-50 | 13 (36.1\%) | $36-50$ | 11 (30.6\%) |  |  | 36-50 | 5 (13.9\%) | 36-50 | 0 (0.0\%) | $36-50$ | 7 (19.4\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | 10 (1.9\%) | 51+ | 4 (40.0\%) | 51+ | 1 (10.0\%) |  |  | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) | 51+ | 1 (10.0\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | $<17$ | 25 (4.4\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  | $<17$ | 13 (52.0\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 481 (84.1\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18-21 | 224 (46.6\%) |
|  | College Level | 22-24 | 18 (3.1\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 22-24 | 7 (38.9\%) |
|  | 572 (50.6\%) | 25-35 | 30 (5.2\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 25-35 | 14 (46.7\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 17 (3.0\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 36-50 | 10 (58.8\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | 1 (0.2\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 51+ | 1 (100.0\%) |
|  | Unknown$24(2.1 \%)$ | <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 | 4 (16.7\%) | 18-21 | 1 (25.0\%) | 18-21 | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 0 (0.0\%) | 18-21 | 0 (0.0\%) | 18-21 | 1 (25.0\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | 6 (25.0\%) | 22-24 | 0 (0.0\%) | 22-24 | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  | 22-24 | $0(0.0 \%)$ | 22-24 | 0 (0.0\%) | 22-24 | 1 (16.7\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 10 (41.7\%) | 25-35 | 0 (0.0\%) | 25-35 | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 0 (0.0\%) | 25-35 | 0 (0.0\%) | 25-35 | 5 (50.0\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 2 (8.3\%) | $36-50$ | 0 (0.0\%) | 36-50 | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 36-50 | 0 0.0\%\%) | 36-50 | 0 O $0.0 \%$ ) | 36-50 | 1 (50.0\%) |
|  |  | $51+$ | 2 (8.3\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 51+ | $0(0.0 \%)$ | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) | $51+$ | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  | Cohort Total 1,130 (100.0\%) | $<17$ | 36 (3.2\%) | <17 | 6 (16.7\%) | <17 | 5 (13.9\%) |  |  | <17 | 5 (13.9\%) | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) | $<17$ | 19 (52.8\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 847 (75.0\%) | 18-21 | 185 (21.8\%) | 18.21 | 130 (15.3\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 100 (11.8\%) | 18-21 | 11 (1.3\%) | 18.21 | 316 (37.3\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | 55 (4.9\%) | 22-24 | 12 (21.8\%) | 22-24 | 7 (12.7\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 7 (12.7\%) | 22-24 | 0 (0.0\%) | 22-24 | 18 (32.7\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 124 (11.0\%) | 25-35 | 40 (32.3\%) | 25-35 | 24 (19.4\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 17 (13.7\%) | 25-35 | 2 (1.6\%) | 25-35 | 43 (34.7\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 55 (4.9\%) | 36-50 | 13 (23.6\%) | 36-50 | 11 (20.0\%) |  |  | 36-50 | 5 (9.1\%) | 36-50 | 0 (0.0\%) | 36-50 | 18 (32.7\%) |
|  |  | - 51. | 13.1.2\%). | - 51 - | 4.30.89\% | 51* | - 1 (77\%2) |  |  | -51. | 0(00\%) | 51* | 1.7.7\%) | - 51 | - 1 $17.7 \%$ |

English Progression by Age (continued)


## English Progression by Enrollment Status

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


Notes:

1) Attempted = student received a grade for course (includes variations of W); Completed = student received a grade of $A, B, C, D, F, I, I P$, or $P$ for course; Success = student received a grade of A, B, or C for course.
2) High $D E=$ last course in $D E$ 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:
DE Referrals:
Course Enrollment::

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

## English Progression by Enrollment Status (Continued)



## English Progression by Pell Status

Of those who were referred to Level 2, Pell recipients successfully passed English DE courses at higher rates than did non-Pell recipients. Of those who were non-referred, Pell recipients successfully passed English "gatekeeper" courses at higher rates than did non-Pell recipients. When comparing the 2011 cohort to the 2013 cohort, referred Pell recipients experienced increases in "gatekeeper" success.


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

## English Progression by Veteran Status

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


Notes:

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

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

## English Progression by Veteran Status (Continued)

|  |  | Referral Level |  | Attempted Any DE (1st Year) |  | Success in Any DE (1st Year) |  | Attempted RSG (1st Year) |  | Success in RSG (1st Year) |  | Success in High DE (3rd Year) | Success in RSG (3rd Year) | Success in GK <br> (3rd Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DE Level 1 | Y | 8 (3.7\%) | $Y$ | 5 (62.5\%) | Y | 4 (50.0\%) | $Y$ | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 0 (0.0\%) | 3rd Year Data Not Yet Available |  |  |
|  | 218 (17.8\%) | N | 210 (96.3\%) | N | 142 (67.6\%) | N | 90 (42.9\%) | N | 13 (6.2\%) | N | $8(3.8 \%)$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 2 | Y | 5 (2.4\%) | $Y$ | 4 (80.0\%) | $Y$ | 3 (60.0\%) | $Y$ | 2 (40.0\%) | Y | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |  |
|  | 207 (16.9\%) | N | 202 (97.6\%) | N | 113 (55.9\%) | N | 74 (36.6\%) | N | 11 (5.4\%) | N | 8 (4.0\%) |  |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 3 | Y | 4 (3.3\%) | Y | 1 (25.0\%) | Y | 0 (0.0\%) | $Y$ | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |  |
|  | 122 (10.0\%) | N | 118 (96.7\%) | N | 33 (28.0\%) | N | 26 (22.0\%) | N | 18 (15.3\%) | N | 13 (11.0\%) |  |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 4 | Y | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 0 0.0\%) | Y | 0 (0.0\%) | $Y$ | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1 (0.1\%) | N | 1 (100.0\%) | N | 0 0.0\%) | N | 0 0.0\%) | $N$ | 0 0.0\%) | N | 0 0.0\%) |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total Referred | Y | 17 (3.1\%) | Y | 10 (58.8\%) | $Y$ | 7 (41.2\%) | $Y$ | 2 (11.8\%) | Y | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |  |
|  | 548 (44.7\%) | N | 531 (96.9\%) | N | 288 (54.2\%) | N | 190 (35.8\%) | N | 42 (7.9\%) | N | 29 (5.5\%) |  |  |  |  |
|  | College Level <br> 617 (50.3\%) | Y | $\begin{array}{r} 59 \text { (9.6\%) } \\ 558 \text { (90.4\%) } \end{array}$ | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Unknown | Y | 2(3.3\%) | Y | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 0 (0.0\%) | $Y$ | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |  |
|  | 61 (5.0\%) | N | 59 (96.7\%) | N | 1 (1.7\%) | N | 0 (0.0\%) | N | 1 (1.7\%) | N | 0 0.0\%) |  |  |  |  |
|  | Cohort Total | Y | 78 (6.4\%) | $Y$ | 11 (14.1\%) | Y | 8 (10.3\%) | $Y$ | 3 (3.8\%) | Y | 1 (1.3\%) |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1,226(100.0\%) | N | 1,148 (93.6\%) | N | 300(26.1\%) | N | 200 (17.4\%) | N | 51 (4.4\%). | N | 36(3.1\%) |  |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 1 | Y | 5 (3.2\%) | Y | $4(80.0 \%)$ | Y | 2 (40.0\%) | Y | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 0 (0.0\%) | 3rd Year Data Not Yet Available |  |  |
|  | 157 (14.6\%) | N | 152 (96.8\%) | N | 107 (70.4\%) | N | 76 (50.0\%) | $N$ | 8 (5.3\%) | N | 6 (3.9\%) |  |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 2 | Y | 8 (3.7\%) | Y | 5 (62.5\%) | Y | 5 (62.5\%) | $Y$ | 1 (12.5\%) | Y | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |  |
|  | 214 (19.9\%) | N | 206 (96.3\%) | N | 136 (66.0\%) | N | 99 (48.1\%) | N | 12 (5.8\%) | N | $8(3.9 \%)$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 3 | Y | 14 (5.9\%) | Y | 12 (85.7\%) | Y | 11 (78.6\%) | $Y$ | 12 (85.7\%) | Y | 11 (78.6\%) |  |  |  |  |
|  | 239 (22.3\%) | N | 225 (94.1\%) | N | 152 (67.6\%) | N | 115 (51.1\%) | N | 134 (59.6\%) | N | $99(44.0 \%)$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 4 | Y | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 0 (0.0\%) | $Y$ | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1 (0.1\%) | N | 1 (100.0\%) | N | 1 (100.0\%) | N | 1 (100.0\%) | N | 1 (100.0\%) | N | 1 (100.0\%) |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total Referred | Y | 27 (4.4\%) | Y | 21 (77.8\%) | Y | 18 (66.7\%) | $Y$ | 13 (48.1\%) | Y | 11 (40.7\%) |  |  |  |  |
|  | 611 (56.9\%) | N | 584 (95.6\%) | N | 396 (67.8\%) | N | 291 (49.8\%) | N | 155 (26.5\%) | N | 114 (19.5\%) |  |  |  |  |
|  | College Level $442(41.2 \%)$ | Y | $\begin{array}{r} 54(12.2 \%) \\ 388(87.8 \%) \end{array}$ | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Unknown | Y | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 0 (0.0\%) | $Y$ | 0 0.0\%) | Y | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | 20 (1.9\%) | N | 20 (100.0\%) | N | 1 (5.0\%) | N | 1 (5.0\%) | N | 0 0.0\%) | N | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |  |
|  | Cohort Total | $Y$ | 81 (7.5\%) | Y | 22 (27.2\%) | Y | 19 (23.5\%) | $Y$ | 14 (17.3\%) | Y | 12 (14.8\%) |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1,232 (100.0\%) | N | 992. $92.5 \%$ ) | N | 411 (41.4\%) | N | 301(30.3\%) , |  | 166 (16.7\%) |  | 122 (12.3\%) |  |  |  |  |

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

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

## Math Developmental Education of Referred

After 3 years, approximately $22 \%-27 \%$ of referred students in each cohort attempted the highest DE course in the Math sequence, with $16 \%-18 \%$ of the cohort successfully passing the course. Approximately 22\%-33\% of referred students in each cohort attempted a Math "gatekeeper" course, with $15 \%-22 \%$ of the cohort successfully passing a "gatekeeper" course. When comparing the 2013 cohort to the 2011 cohort, success in "gatekeeper" increased by 7.6 percentage points.





## Math "Gatekeeper" Progression of Non-Referred

After 3 years, approximately 59\%-69\% of non-referred students in each cohort attempted one of the Math "gatekeeper" courses, with $38 \%-41 \%$ of that cohort successfully passing that course, which is about two times the rate of referred students.


## Total Math Progression

Overall, $35 \%-50 \%$ of all referred students in each cohort successfully passed any Math DE course within the first year, $16 \%-18 \%$ successfully passed the highest DE course in the Math sequence within 3 years, and approximately $15 \%-22 \%$ successfully passed the Math "gatekeeper" course within 3 years. Of the non-referred students, $38 \%-41 \%$ successfully passed the Math "gatekeeper" course within 3 years. Of the total cohort, $19 \%-30 \%$ successfully passed the Math "gatekeeper" course within 3 years. Those who were referred to Level 4 had higher success rates in the Math highest DE course than 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, referred students experienced the greatest increase 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) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DE Level 1 $366 \text { (23.9\%) }$ | 274 (74.9\%) | 143 (39.1\%) | Not Applicable |  | 22 (6.0\%) | Not Applicable | 22 (6.0\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 $367 \text { (24.0\%) }$ | 297 (80.9\%) | 184 (50.1\%) |  |  | 26 (7.1\%) |  | 52 (14.2\%) |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 3 \\ 345(22.5 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 255 (73.9\%) | 161 (46.7\%) |  |  | 82 (23.8\%) |  | 52 (15.1\%) |
|  | DE Level 4 $181 \text { (11.8\%) }$ | 111 (61.3\%) | 81 (44.8\%) |  |  | 84 (46.4\%) |  | 60 (33.1\%) |
|  | Total Referred 1,259 (82.2\%) | 937 (74.4\%) | 569 (45.2\%) |  |  | 214 (17.0\%) |  | 186 (14.8\%) |
|  | College Level $239 \text { (15.6\%) }$ |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  | 99 (41.4\%) |
|  | Unknown $34 \text { (2.2\%) }$ | 1 (2.9\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable | 1 (2.9\%) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cohort Total } \\ & 1,532(100.0 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 963 (62.9\%) | 589 (38.4\%) |  |  | 229 (14.9\%) |  | 286 (18.7\%) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DE Level } 1 \\ & 158 \text { (14.9\%) } \end{aligned}$ | 128 (81.0\%) | 74 (46.8\%) |  |  | 7 (4.4\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | 13 (8.2\%) |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 2 \\ 190 \text { (17.9\%) } \end{gathered}$ | 140 (73.7\%) | 74 (38.9\%) |  |  | 31 (16.3\%) | 1 (0.5\%) | 27 (14.2\%) |
|  | DE Level 3 $314 \text { (29.6\%) }$ | 210 (66.9\%) | 97 (30.9\%) | Not Ap | cable | 59 (18.8\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | 62 (19.7\%) |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 4 \\ 172(16.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 81 (47.1\%) | 48 (27.9\%) |  |  | 53 (30.8\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | 55 (32.0\%) |
|  | Total Referred 834 (78.6\%) | 559 (67.0\%) | 293 (35.1\%) |  |  | 150 (18.0\%) | 1 (0.1\%) | 157 (18.8\%) |
|  | College Level 183 (17.2\%) |  |  | Not A | icable |  |  | 69 (37.7\%) |
|  | Unknown 44 (4.1\%) | 21 (47.7\%) | 11 (25.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | 1 (2.3\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | 7 (15.9\%) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cohort Total } \\ & 1,061(100.0 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 589 (55.5\%) | 308 (29.0\%) |  |  | 155 (14.6\%) | 1 (0.1\%) | 233 (22.0\%) |

## 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 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 the Math highest DE and "gatekeeper" courses at higher rates. When comparing the 2013 cohort to the 2011 cohort, both referred and non-referred men 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.

## Math Progression by Gender (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 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:
Course Enrollment::

## Math Progression by Ethnicity

Of those referred and non-referred, generally White students successfully passed Math highest DE and "gatekeeper" courses at higher rates than did African-American and Hispanic students. When comparing the 2013 cohort to the 2011 cohort, referred and non-referred Asian students experienced increases in "gatekeeper" success.

|  |  |  |  |  | ed Any DE Year) |  | in Any DE Year) | Attempted RSG (1st Year) | Success in RSG (1st Year) |  | in High DE Year) | Success in RSG (3rd Year) |  | cess in GK d Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 1 \\ 366 \text { (23.9\%) } \end{gathered}$ | AA | 72 (19.7\%) | $A A$ | 65 (83.3\%) | AA | 26 (33.3\%) | Not Applicable |  | AA | 4 (5.1\%) | Not Applicable | AA | 2 (2.6\%) |
|  |  | A | 4(1.1\%) | A | 2 (50.0\%) | A | 2 (50.0\%) |  |  | A | 1 (25.0\%) |  | A | 1 (25.0\%) |
|  |  | H | 240 (65.6\%) | H | 178 (74.2\%) | H | 99 (41.3\%) |  |  | H | 13 (5.4\%) |  | H | 14 (5.8\%) |
|  |  | 0 | 11 (3.0\%) | 0 | 3 (60.0\%) | 0 | 1 (20.0\%) |  |  | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) |  | 0 | O(0.0\%) |
|  |  | w | 39 (10.7\%) | w | 26 (66.7\%) | w | 15 (38.5\%) |  |  | w | 4(10.3\%) |  | w | 5 (12.8\%) |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 2 \\ 367 \text { (24.0\%) } \end{gathered}$ | AA | 68 (18.5\%) | $A A$ | 64 (86.5\%) | AA | 36 (48.6\%) |  |  | AA | 5 (6.8\%) |  | AA | 4 (5.4\%) |
|  |  | A | 3 (0.8\%) | A | 1 (50.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | A | 0 (0.0\%) |  | A | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | H | 240 (65.4\%) | H | 193 (80.4\%) | H | 120 (50.0\%) |  |  | H | 18 (7.5\%) |  | H | 41 (17.1\%) |
|  |  | 0 | 10 (2.7\%) | 0 | 3 (75.0\%) | 0 | 2 (50.0\%) |  |  | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) |  | O | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | w | 46 (12.5\%) | w | 36 (76.6\%) | w | 26 (55.3\%) |  |  | w | 3 (6.4\%) |  | w | 7 (14.9\%) |
|  | DE Level 3 345 (22.5\%) | AA | 59 (17.1\%) | $A A$ | 49 (81.7\%) | $A A$ | 29 (48.3\%) |  |  | AA | 16 (26.7\%) |  | AA | 11 (18.3\%) |
|  |  | A | 2 (0.6\%) | A | 1 (50.0\%) | A | 1 (50.0\%) |  |  | A | 0 (0.0\%) |  | A | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | H | 226 (65.5\%) | H | 174 (77.0\%) | H | 112 (49.6\%) |  |  | H | 54 (23.9\%) |  | H | 33 (14.6\%) |
|  |  | 0 | 5(1.4\%) | 0 | 3 (100.0\%) | 0 | 1 (33.3\%) |  |  | O | 0 (0.0\%) |  | O | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | w | 53 (15.4\%) | w | 28 (51.9\%) | w | 18 (33.3\%) |  |  | w | 12 (22.2\%) |  | w | 8 (14.8\%) |
|  | DE Level 4 <br> 181 (11.8\%) | AA | 24 (13.3\%) | $A A$ | 18 (69.2\%) | AA | 10 (38.5\%) |  |  | AA | 10 (38.5\%) |  | AA | 7 (26.9\%) |
|  |  | A | 2 (1.1\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | A | 0(0.0\%) |  | A | 1 (50.0\%) |
|  |  | H | 106 (58.6\%) | H | 66 (62.3\%) | H | 50 (47.2\%) |  |  | H | 50 (47.2\%) |  | H | 39 (36.8\%) |
|  |  | O | 5 (2.8\%) | 0 | 2 (66.7\%) | o | 2 (66.7\%) |  |  | 0 | 2 (66.7\%) |  | o | 1 (33.3\%) |
|  |  | w | 44 (24.3\%) | W | 25 (56.8\%) | w | 19 (43.2\%) |  |  | w | 22 (50.0\%) |  | w | 12 (27.3\%) |
|  | Total Referred1,259 (82.2\%) | AA | 223 (17.7\%) | AA | 196 (82.4\%) | AA | 101 (42.4\%) |  |  | AA | 35 (14.7\%) |  | AA | 24 (10.1\%) |
|  |  | A | 11 (0.9\%) | A | 4 (40.0\%) | A | 3 (30.0\%) |  |  | A | 1 (10.0\%) |  | A | 2 (20.0\%) |
|  |  | H | 812 (64.5\%) | H | 611 (75.2\%) | H | 381 (46.9\%) |  |  | H | 135 (16.6\%) |  | H | 127 (15.6\%) |
|  |  | 0 | 31 (2.5\%) | 0 | 11 (73.3\%) | 0 | 6 (40.0\%) |  |  | 0 | 2 (13.3\%) |  | 0 | 1 (6.7\%) |
|  |  | w | 182 (14.5\%) | w | 115 (62.5\%) | w | 78 (42.4\%) |  |  | w | 41 (22.3\%) |  | w | 32 (17.4\%) |
|  | College Level 239 (15.6\%) | AA | 8 (3.3\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | AA | 7 (43.8\%) |
|  |  | A | 5 (2.1\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | A | 1 (20.0\%) |
|  |  | H | 146 (61.1\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | H | 60 (41.1\%) |
|  |  | 0 | 14 (5.9\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | O | 1(16.7\%) |
|  |  | w | 66 (27.6\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | w | 30 (45.5\%) |
|  | Unknown$34 \text { (2.2\%) }$ | AA | 5 (14.7\%) | $A A$ | 1 (20.0\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable | AA | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | A | 0 (0.0\%) |  | A | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | H | 17 (50.0\%) | H | 0 (0.0\%) | H | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | H | 0 (0.0\%) |  | H | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | 0 | 2 (5.9\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | O | 0 (0.0\%) |  | O | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | w | 10 (29.4\%) | w | 0 (0.0\%) | w | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | w | 0 (0.0\%) |  | w | 1 (10.0\%) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cohort Total } \\ & \text { 1,532 (100.0\%) } \end{aligned}$ | AA | 236 (15.4\%) | $A A$ | 198 (76.4\%) | $A A$ | 101 (39.0\%) |  |  | AA | 35 (13.5\%) |  | AA | 31 (12.0\%) |
|  |  | A | 16 (1.0\%) | A | 4 (26.7\%) | A | 3 (20.0\%) |  |  | A | 1 (6.7\%) |  | A | 3 (20.0\%) |
|  |  | H | 975 (63.6\%) | H | 630 (64.6\%) | H | 397 (40.7\%) |  |  | H | 147 (15.1\%) |  | H | 187 (19.2\%) |
|  |  | 0 | 47 (3.1\%) | 0 | 12 (52.2\%) | 0 | 6 (26.1\%) |  |  | 0 | 2 (8.7\%) |  | O | 2 (8.7\%) |
|  |  | w | 258 (16.8\%) | w | 119 (45.8\%) | w | 82 (31.5\%) |  |  | w | 44 (16.9\%) |  | w | 63 (24.2\%) |

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 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

No trend differences across the age categories was evident. When comparing the 2013 cohort to the 2011 cohort, referred students younger than 17 experienced large increases in "gatekeeper" success.

|  |  |  |  |  | d Any DE Year) |  | in Any DE Year) | Attempted RSG (1st Year) | Success in RSG (1st Year) |  | in High DE Year) | Success in RSG (3rd Year) |  | ess in GK d Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DE Level 1 <br> 366 (23.9\%) | $<17$ | 4(1.1\%) | <17 | 3 (75.0\%) | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | <17 | 0(0.0\%) | Not Applicable | <17 | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 250 (68.3\%) | 18-21 | 187 (74.8\%) | 18-21 | 86 (34.4\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 10 (4.0\%) |  | 18-21 | 14 (5.6\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | 21 (5.7\%) | 22-24 | 17 (81.0\%) | 22-24 | 8 (38.1\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 4 (19.0\%) |  | 22-24 | 1 (4.8\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 52 (14.2\%) | 25-35 | 42 (80.8\%) | 25-35 | 30 (57.7\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 5 (9.6\%) |  | 25-35 | 3 (5.8\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 32 (8.7\%) | 36-50 | 21 (65.6\%) | 36-50 | 16 (50.0\%) |  |  | 36-50 | 3 (9.4\%) |  | 36-50 | 4 (12.5\%) |
|  |  | $51+$ | 7 (1.9\%) | 51+ | 4 (57.1\%) | 51+ | 3 (42.9\%) |  |  | 51+ | 0(0.0\%) |  | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 <br> 367 (24.0\%) | <17 | $9(2.5 \%)$ | $<17$ | 5 (55.6\%) | <17 | 1(11.1\%) |  |  | <17 | 0 (0.0\%) |  | <17 | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 209 (56.9\%) | 18-21 | 173 (82.8\%) | 18-21 | 100 (47.8\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 15 (7.2\%) |  | 18-21 | 28 (13.4\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | 35 (9.5\%) | 22-24 | 30 (85.7\%) | 22-24 | 17 (48.6\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 3 (8.6\%) |  | 22-24 | 3 (8.6\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 70 (19.1\%) | 25-35 | 59 (84.3\%) | 25-35 | 48 (68.6\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 6 (8.6\%) |  | 25-35 | 17 (24.3\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 39 (10.6\%) | 36-50 | 27 (69.2\%) | 36-50 | 16 (41.0\%) |  |  | 36-50 | 2 (5.1\%) |  | 36-50 | 4 (10.3\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | 5(1.4\%) | 51+ | 3 (60.0\%) | 51+ | 2 (40.0\%) |  |  | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) |  | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  | DE Level 3 <br> 345 (22.5\%) | <17 | 10 (2.9\%) | <17 | 6 (60.0\%) | <17 | 2 (20.0\%) |  |  | <17 | 1(10.0\%) |  | <17 | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 220 (63.8\%) | 18-21 | 163 (74.1\%) | 18-21 | 95 (43.2\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 49 (22.3\%) |  | 18-21 | 35 (15.9\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | 32 (9.3\%) | 22-24 | 21 (65.6\%) | 22-24 | 14 (43.8\%) |  |  | 22-24 | $7(21.9 \%)$ |  | 22-24 | 4 (12.5\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 60 (17.4\%) | 25-35 | 49 (81.7\%) | 25-35 | 36 (60.0\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 17 (28.3\%) |  | 25-35 | 8 (13.3\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 21 (6.1\%) | 36-50 | 16 (76.2\%) | 36-50 | 14 (66.7\%) |  |  | 36-50 | 8(38.1\%) |  | 36-50 | 5 (23.8\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | 2 (0.6\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 51+ | 0(0.0\%) |  | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  | DE Level 4 <br> 181 (11.8\%) | $<17$ | $9(5.0 \%)$ | $<17$ | 6 (66.7\%) | $<17$ | 3 (33.3\%) |  |  | $<17$ | 3(33.3\%) |  | $<17$ | 4 (44.4\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 128 (70.7\%) | 18-21 | 80 (62.5\%) | 18-21 | 57 (44.5\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 60 (46.9\%) |  | 18-21 | 43 (33.6\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | 14 (7.7\%) | 22-24 | 10 (71.4\%) | 22-24 | 9 (64.3\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 8 (57.1\%) |  | 22-24 | 5 (35.7\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 18 (9.9\%) | 25-35 | 9 (50.0\%) | 25-35 | 8(44.4\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 8(44.4\%) |  | 25-35 | 6 (33.3\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 7 (3.9\%) | 36-50 | 4 (57.1\%) | 36-50 | 4 (57.1\%) |  |  | 36-50 | 4 (57.1\%) |  | 36-50 | 2 (28.6\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | 5 (2.8\%) | 51+ | $2(40.0 \%)$ | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 51+ | 1(20.0\%) |  | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  | Total Referred$1,259(82.2 \%)$ | $<17$ | 32 (2.5\%) | $<17$ | 20 (62.5\%) | <17 | 6 (18.8\%) |  |  | $<17$ | 4(12.5\%) |  | $<17$ | 4 (12.5\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 807 (64.1\%) | 18-21 | 603 (74.7\%) | 18-21 | 338 (41.9\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 134 (16.6\%) |  | 18-21 | 120 (14.9\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | 102 (8.1\%) | 22-24 | 78 (76.5\%) | 22-24 | 48 (47.1\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 22 (21.6\%) |  | 22-24 | 13 (12.7\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 200 (15.9\%) | 25-35 | 159 (79.5\%) | 25-35 | 122 (61.0\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 36 (18.0\%) |  | 25-35 | 34 (17.0\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | $99(7.9 \%)$ | 36-50 | 68 (68.7\%) | 36-50 | 50 (50.5\%) |  |  | 36-50 | 17 (17.2\%) |  | 36-50 | 15 (15.2\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | 19 (1.5\%) | 51+ | 9(47.4\%) | 51+ | 5 (26.3\%) |  |  | 51+ | 1(5.3\%) |  | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  | College Level 239 (15.6\%) | $<17$ | 12 (5.0\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | <17 | 5 (41.7\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 186 (77.8\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18-21 | 75 (40.3\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | 10 (4.2\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 22-24 | 7 (70.0\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 16 (6.7\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 25-35 | 6 (37.5\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 13 (5.4\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 36-50 | 5 (38.5\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | 2 (0.8\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 51+ | 1(50.0\%) |
|  | Unknown$34 \text { (2.2\%) }$ | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable |  |  |  | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 12 (35.3\%) | 18-21 | 0 (0.0\%) | 18-21 | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 0 (0.0\%) | 18-21 | 1 (8.3\%) |  |
|  |  | 22-24 | 3(8.8\%) | 22-24 | 0 (0.0\%) | 22-24 | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 0 (0.0\%) | 22-24 | 0 (0.0\%) |  |
|  |  | 25-35 | 5 (14.7\%) | 25-35 | 1 (20.0\%) | 25-35 | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 0 0 $0.0 \%$ ) | 25-35 | 0 (0.0\%) |  |
|  |  | 36-50 | 13 (38.2\%) | 36-50 | 0 (0.0\%) | 36-50 | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 36-50 | 0 (0.0\%) | 36-50 | 0 (0.0\%) |  |
|  |  | 51+ | 1(2.9\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cohort Total } \\ 1,532(100.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $<17$ | 44 (2.9\%) | $<17$ | 20 (45.5\%) | <17 | 6 (13.6\%) |  |  | $<17$ | 4 (9.1\%) | $<17$ | 9 (20.5\%) |  |
|  |  | 18-21 | 1,005 (65.6\%) | 18-21 | 621 (61.8\%) | 18-21 | 352 (35.0\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 145 (14.4\%) | 18-21 | 196 (19.5\%) |  |
|  |  | 22-24 | 115 (7.5\%) | 22-24 | 78 (67.8\%) | 22-24 | 48 (41.7\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 22 (19.1\%) | 22-24 | 20 (17.4\%) |  |
|  |  | 25-35 | 221 (14.4\%) | 25-35 | 163 (73.8\%) | 25-35 | 125 (56.6\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 38 (17.2\%) | 25-35 | 40 (18.1\%) |  |
|  |  | 36-50 | 125 (8.2\%) | 36-50 | 72 (57.6\%) | 36-50 | 53 (42.4\%) |  |  | 36-50 | 19 (15.2\%) | 36-50 | 20 (16.0\%) |  |
|  |  | . $51+$ | -22(1.4\%). | . $51+$ | -9 $40.9 \%$ ) | . $21+$ | -5 ${ }^{(22.7 \%}$ ) |  |  | 51+ | - 1 (4.5\%) | _51 | -14.5\%) |  |

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)


Math Progression by Age
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## Math Progression by Enrollment Status

Across all cohorts and most 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, referred part-time students experienced increases in "gatekeeper" success.

|  |  |  |  |  | d Any DE Year) |  | in Any DE Year) | Attempted RSG (1st Year) | Success in RSG <br> (1st Year) |  | in High DE Year) | Success in RSG (3rd Year) |  | ess in GK <br> d Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DE Level 1 | FT | 130 (35.5\%) | FT | 123 (94.6\%) | FT | 65 (50.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | FT | 10 (7.7\%) | Not Applicable | FT | 11 (8.5\%) |
|  | 366 (23.9\%) | PT | 236 (64.5\%) | PT | 151 (64.0\%) | PT | 78 (33.1\%) |  |  | PT | 12 (5.1\%) |  | PT | 11 (4.7\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | FT | 153 (41.7\%) | FT | 144 (94.1\%) | FT | 89 (58.2\%) |  |  | FT | 15 (9.8\%) |  | FT | 33 (21.6\%) |
|  | 367 (24.0\%) | PT | 214 (58.3\%) | PT | 153 (71.5\%) | PT | 95 (44.4\%) |  |  | PT | 11 (5.1\%) |  | PT | 19 (8.9\%) |
|  | DE Level 3 | FT | 144 (41.7\%) | FT | 130 (90.3\%) | FT | 78 (54.2\%) |  |  | FT | 44 (30.6\%) |  | FT | 25 (17.4\%) |
|  | 345 (22.5\%) | PT | 201 (58.3\%) | PT | 125 (62.2\%) | PT | 83 (41.3\%) |  |  | PT | 38 (18.9\%) |  | PT | 27 (13.4\%) |
|  | DE Level 4 | FT | 80 (44.2\%) | FT | 57 (71.3\%) | FT | 44 (55.0\%) |  |  | FT | 47 (58.8\%) |  | FT | 32 (40.0\%) |
|  | 181 (11.8\%) | PT | 101 (55.8\%) | PT | 54 (53.5\%) | PT | 37 (36.6\%) |  |  | PT | 37 (36.6\%) |  | PT | 28 (27.7\%) |
|  | Total Referred | FT | 507 (40.3\%) | FT | 454 (89.5\%) | FT | 276 (54.4\%) |  |  | FT | 116 (22.9\%) |  | FT | 101 (19.9\%) |
|  | 1,259 (82.2\%) | PT | 752 (59.7\%) | PT | 483 (64.2\%) | PT | 293 (39.0\%) |  |  | PT | 98 (13.0\%) |  | PT | 85 (11.3\%) |
|  | College Level | FT | 101 (42.3\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | FT | 52 (51.5\%) |
|  | 239 (15.6\%) | PT | 138 (57.7\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PT | 47 (34.1\%) |
|  | Unknown | FT | 8 (23.5\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable | FT | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  | 34 (2.2\%) | PT | 26 (76.5\%) | PT | 1 (3.8\%) | PT | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | PT | 0 (0.0\%) |  | PT | 1 (3.8\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | FT | 616 (40.2\%) | FT | 467 (75.8\%) | FT | 287 (46.6\%) |  |  | FT | 125 (20.3\%) |  | FT | 153 (24.8\%) |
|  | 1,532 (100.0\%) | PT | 916 (59.8\%) | PT | 496 (54.1\%) | PT | 302 (33.0\%) |  |  | PT | 104 (11.4\%) |  | PT | 133(14.5\%). |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ㄷ } \\ & \text { 응 } \\ & \text { O} \\ & \text { I } \\ & \\ & \bar{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | DE Level 1 | FT | 62 (39.2\%) | FT | 58 (93.5\%) | FT | 37 (59.7\%) | Not Applicable |  | FT | 5(8.1\%) | FT 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 6 (9.7\%) |
|  | 158 (14.9\%) | PT | 96 (60.8\%) | PT | 70 (72.9\%) | PT | 37 (38.5\%) |  |  | PT | 2 (2.1\%) | PT $\quad 0$ (0.0\%) | PT | 7 (7.3\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | FT | 82 (43.2\%) | FT | 70 (85.4\%) | FT | 40 (48.8\%) |  |  | FT | 17 (20.7\%) | FT $\quad 1$ (1.2\%) | FT | 17 (20.7\%) |
|  | $190 \text { (17.9\%) }$ | PT | 108 (56.8\%) | PT | 70 (64.8\%) | PT | 34 (31.5\%) |  |  | PT | 14 (13.0\%) | PT $\quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | PT | 10 (9.3\%) |
|  | DE Level 3 | FT | 135 (43.0\%) | FT | 107 (79.3\%) | FT | 54 (40.0\%) |  |  | FT | 35 (25.9\%) | FT $\quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | FT | 30 (22.2\%) |
|  | 314 (29.6\%) | PT | 179 (57.0\%) | PT | 103 (57.5\%) | PT | 43 (24.0\%) |  |  | PT | 24 (13.4\%) | PT $\quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | PT | 32 (17.9\%) |
|  | DE Level 4 | FT | 78 (45.3\%) | FT | 48 (61.5\%) | FT | 30 (38.5\%) |  |  | FT | 33 (42.3\%) | FT $\quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | FT | 34 (43.6\%) |
|  | 172 (16.2\%) | PT | 94 (54.7\%) | PT | 33 (35.1\%) | PT | 18 (19.1\%) |  |  | PT | 20 (21.3\%) | PT $\quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | PT | 21 (22.3\%) |
|  | Total Referred | FT | 357 (42.8\%) | FT | 283 (79.3\%) | FT | 161 (45.1\%) |  |  | FT | 90 (25.2\%) | FT $\quad 1$ (0.3\%) | FT | 87 (24.4\%) |
|  | 834 (78.6\%) | PT | 477 (57.2\%) | PT | 276 (57.9\%) | PT | 132 (27.7\%) |  |  | PT | 60 (12.6\%) | PT 0 (0.0\%) | PT | 70 (14.7\%) |
|  |  | FT |  |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  | $45 \text { (52.9\%) }$ |
|  | $183 \text { (17.2\%) }$ | PT | $98 \text { (53.6\%) }$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PT | $24 \text { (24.5\%) }$ |
|  | Unknown | FT | 22 (50.0\%) | FT | 15 (68.2\%) | FT | 8 (36.4\%) | Not Applicable |  | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT $\quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | FT | 4 (18.2\%) |
|  | $44 \text { (4.1\%) }$ | PT | 22 (50.0\%) | PT | 6 (27.3\%) | PT | 3 (13.6\%) |  |  | PT | 1 (4.5\%) | PT 0 (0.0\%) | PT | 3 (13.6\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | FT | 464 (43.7\%) | FT | 304 (65.5\%) | FT | 173 (37.3\%) |  |  | FT | 93 (20.0\%) | FT $\quad 1$ (0.2\%) | FT | 136 (29.3\%) |
|  | 1,061 (100.0\%) | PT | 597(56.3\%) | PT | 285 (47.7\%) | PT | 135 (22.6\%) |  |  | PT | 62 (10.4\%) | PT-_-_0(0.0\%) | PT | 97(16.2\%). |

Notes:

1) Attempted = student received a grade for course (includes variations of W); Completed = student received a grade of $A, B, C, D, F, I, I P$, 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 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.
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)



## Math Progression by Pell Status

For the Fall 2012 and Fall2013 cohorts, both referred and non-referred Pell non-recipients compared to Pell recipients successfully passed "gatekeeper" courses at higher rates. When comparing the 2013 cohort to the 2011 cohort, Pell nonrecipients experienced the greatest increase in "gatekeeper" success.


## Notes:

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

Sources:

FTIC Pell Status:
DE Referrals:
Course Enrollment::

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


## Math Progression by Veteran Status

Non-referred veterans successfully passed Math "gatekeeper" courses at higher rates. When comparing the 2013 cohort to the 2011 cohort, non-referred veterans experienced the greatest increase in "gatekeeper" success.

|  |  |  |  |  | ed Any DE Year) |  | in Any DE Year) | Attempted RSG (1st Year) | Success in RSG <br> (1st Year) |  | n High DE Year) | Success in RSG <br> (3rd Year) |  | cess in GK rd Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DE Level 1 | Y | 21 (5.7\%) | Y | 17 (81.0\%) | Y | 13 (61.9\%) | Not Applicable |  | Y | 4 (19.0\%) | Not Applicable | Y | 6 (28.6\%) |
|  | 366 (23.9\%) | N | 345 (94.3\%) | N | 257 (74.5\%) | N | 130 (37.7\%) |  |  | N | 18 (5.2\%) |  | N | 16 (4.6\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | Y | 29 (7.9\%) | Y | 22 (75.9\%) | Y | 21 (72.4\%) |  |  | Y | 1 (3.4\%) |  | Y | 3 (10.3\%) |
|  | 367 (24.0\%) | N | 338 (92.1\%) | N | 275 (81.4\%) | N | 163 (48.2\%) |  |  | N | 25 (7.4\%) |  | N | 49 (14.5\%) |
|  | DE Level 3 | Y | 33 (9.6\%) | Y | 22 (66.7\%) | Y | 17 (51.5\%) |  |  | Y | 9 (27.3\%) |  | Y | 5 (15.2\%) |
|  | 345 (22.5\%) | N | 312 (90.4\%) | N | 233 (74.7\%) | N | 144 (46.2\%) |  |  | N | 73 (23.4\%) |  | N | 47 (15.1\%) |
|  | DE Level 4 | Y | 11 (6.1\%) | Y | 10 (90.9\%) | Y | 7 (63.6\%) |  |  | Y | 7 (63.6\%) |  | Y | 3 (27.3\%) |
|  | 181 (11.8\%) | N | 170 (93.9\%) | N | 101 (59.4\%) | N | 74 (43.5\%) |  |  | N | 77 (45.3\%) |  | N | 57 (33.5\%) |
|  | Total Referred | Y | 94 (7.5\%) | Y | 71 (75.5\%) | Y | 58 (61.7\%) |  |  | Y | 21 (22.3\%) |  | Y | 17 (18.1\%) |
|  | 1,259 (82.2\%) | N | 1,165 (92.5\%) | N | 866 (74.3\%) | N | 511 (43.9\%) |  |  | N | 193 (16.6\%) |  | N | 169 (14.5\%) |
|  | College Level | Y | 17 (7.1\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | Y | 9 (52.9\%) |
|  | 239 (15.6\%) | N | 222 (92.9\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | N | 90 (40.5\%) |
|  | Unknown | Y | 3 (8.8\%) | Y | O (0.0\%) | Y | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | Y | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable | Y | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  | 34 (2.2\%) | N | 31 (91.2\%) | N | 1 (3.2\%) | N | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | N | 0 (0.0\%) |  | N | 1(3.2\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | Y | 114 (7.4\%) | Y | 72 (63.2\%) | Y | 59 (51.8\%) |  |  | Y | 22 (19.3\%) |  | Y | 26 (22.8\%) |
|  | 1,532 (100.0\%) | N | 1,418(92.6\%) | N | 891 (62.8\%) | N | 530 (37.4\%) |  |  | N | 207 (14.6\%) |  | N | 260 (18.3\%). |
|  | DELevel 1 | Y | 8 (5.1\%) | Y | 5(62.5\%) | Y | 3 (37.5\%) | Not Applicable |  | Y | 2 (25.0\%) | 0(0.0\%) | Y | 1 (12.5\%) |
|  | 158 (14.9\%) | N | 150 (94.9\%) | N | 123 (82.0\%) | N | 71 (47.3\%) |  |  | N | 5 (3.3\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | N | 12 (8.0\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | Y | 9 (4.7\%) | Y | 7 (77.8\%) | Y | 7 (77.8\%) |  |  | Y | 2 (22.2\%) | 1(11.1\%) | $Y$ | 3 (33.3\%) |
|  | 190 (17.9\%) | N | 181 (95.3\%) | N | 133 (73.5\%) | N | 67 (37.0\%) |  |  | N | 29 (16.0\%) | $\mathrm{N} \quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | N | 24 (13.3\%) |
|  | DE Level 3 | Y | 18 (5.7\%) | Y | 15 (83.3\%) | Y | 10 (55.6\%) |  |  | Y | 7 (38.9\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | $Y$ | 6 (33.3\%) |
|  | 314 (29.6\%) | N | 296 (94.3\%) | N | 195 (65.9\%) | N | 87 (29.4\%) |  |  | N | 52 (17.6\%) | $\mathrm{N} \quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | N | 56 (18.9\%) |
|  | DE Level 4 | Y | 19 (11.0\%) | Y | 6 (31.6\%) | Y | 4 (21.1\%) |  |  | Y | 4 (21.1\%) | $Y \quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | Y | 10 (52.6\%) |
|  | 172 (16.2\%) | N | 153 (89.0\%) | N | 75 (49.0\%) | N | 44 (28.8\%) |  |  | N | 49 (32.0\%) | $\mathrm{N} \quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | N | 45 (29.4\%) |
|  | Total Referred | Y | 54 (6.5\%) | Y | 33 (61.1\%) | Y | 24 (44.4\%) |  |  | Y | 15 (27.8\%) | 1(1.9\%) | Y | 20 (37.0\%) |
|  | 834 (78.6\%) | N | 780 (93.5\%) | N | 526 (67.4\%) | N | 269 (34.5\%) |  |  | N | 135 (17.3\%) | $\mathrm{N} \quad 0$ (0.0\%) | N | 137 (17.6\%) |
|  | College Level | Y | 5 (2.7\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | Y | 4 (80.0\%) |
|  | 183 (17.2\%) | N | 178 (97.3\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | N | 65 (36.5\%) |
|  | Unknown | Y | 3 (6.8\%) | Y | 1 (33.3\%) | Y | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | Y | 0 (0.0\%) | $\mathrm{Y} \quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | Y | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  | 44 (4.1\%) | N | 41 (93.2\%) | N | 20 (48.8\%) | N | 11 (26.8\%) |  |  | N | 1 (2.4\%) | $\mathrm{N} \quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | N | 7 (17.1\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | Y | 62 (5.8\%) | Y | 34 (54.8\%) | Y | 24 (38.7\%) |  |  | Y | 15 (24.2\%) | $\mathrm{Y} \quad 1(1.6 \%)$ | $Y$ | 24 (38.7\%) |
|  | 1,061 (100.0\%) | N | 999 (94.2\%) | N | 555 (55.6\%) | N | 284 (28.4\%) |  |  | N | 140(14.0\%) | N | N | 209 (20.9\%). |

Yes = Veteran
No $=$ Non-Veteran

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: DE Referrals:

Course Enrollment::

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

## Math Progression by Veteran Status (Continued)



Yes $=$ Veteran
No = Non-Veteran

# ST. PHILIP'S COLLEGE PRODUCTIVE GRADE RATES (PGR) 

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

This report compares the 1- to 5-year productive grade rates (PGR) of the Fall 2010 through Fall 2014 FTIC cohorts for St. Philip's 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 St. Philip's College fluctuated between 67\%-75\% across all cohorts and all years.
$\diamond \quad$ Productive grade rates fluctuated between male and female students.
$\diamond$ Productive grade rates of Asian and White students were higher than other student groups.
$\diamond$ First year African American student productive grade rates climbed 9.3 percentage points from the Fall 2011 cohort to the Fall 2015 cohort.
$\diamond$ Overall, students in the 25 and older age groups exhibited higher productive grade rates than did students in younger age groups.
$\diamond$ Productive grade rates fluctuated between full- and part-time students.
$\diamond$ Productive grade rates among non-Pell grant recipients were higher than Pell grant recipients
$\diamond \quad$ Veteran students demonstrated higher productive grade rates than non-veteran students.
$\diamond$ Across the cohorts, productive grade rates were higher among students not referred to developmental education compared to students referred to developmental education.

## Total Productive Grade Rates

Productive grade rates at St. Philip's College fluctuated between 67\%-75\% across all cohorts and all years. First year productive grade rates dipped slightly from the Fall 2011 to 2012 cohort then demonstrated increases in subsequent years. First year productive grade rates peaked in the Fall 2015 cohort at $75 \%$. Productive grade rates in the Fall 2011 cohort increased 2.8 percentage points from the first year ( $68.1 \%$ ) to the fifth year ( $70.9 \%$ ).


[^4]
## Productive Grade Rates by Gender

Productive grade rates fluctuated between male and female students across the cohorts and years. Male students in the 2011 and 2014 cohorts demonstrated higher productive grade rates than did female students. On the other hand, female students demonstrated higher rates than male students in the 2015 cohort. Across the cohorts, productive grade rates increased from the 2010 cohort to the most recent cohort each year. Overall, productive grade rates ranged from a low of $66.3 \%$ (male, 2013, first year) to a high of $77.2 \%$ (female, 2015, first year).


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

## Productive Grade Rates by Ethnicity

Productive grade rates of Asian and White students were higher than other student groups across most cohorts and years. Hispanic students exhibited higher productive grade rates than African American students across all cohorts and years. First year African American student productive grade rates climbed 9.3 percentage points from the Fall 2011 cohort ( $57.2 \%$ ) to the Fall 2015 cohort ( $66.5 \%$ ). Also, in the Fall 2011 cohort, African American student productive grade rates increased 5.2 percentage points from the first year ( $57.2 \%$ ) to the fifth year ( $62.4 \%$ ).


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

Asian includes Asian and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander; Hispanic includes Hispanic or Latino; and Other includes American Indian or Alaskan Native, International, and Unknown.
(6) Sources: FTIC Demographics ACCDODS.XST_CBM001_ACCD; Course Enrollment ACCDODS1.XST_IRES_SC

## Productive Grade Rates by Age

Overall, students in the 25 and older age groups exhibited higher productive grade rates than did students in younger age groups. Most student groups demonstrated improved productive grade rates from the Fall 2011 cohort to the most recent cohort each year. In the Fall 2011 cohort, the 17 or less age group displayed the largest increase in rates (8.4 percentage points) from the first year (59.0\%) to the fifth year (67.4\%).


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) 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

Productive grade rates fluctuated between full- and part-time students across the cohorts and years. Productive grade rates of full-time students ranged from $66 \%$ to $78 \%$, while part-time student rates ranged from $65 \%$ to $74 \%$. First year fulltime productive grade rates of the Fall 2015 cohort ( $78.4 \%$ ) were 12.2 percentage points higher than the first year Fall 2011 cohort (66.2\%). First year part-time productive grade rates of the Fall 2015 cohort ( $72.7 \%$ ) were 3.0 percentage points higher than the first year Fall 2011 cohort (69.7\%).


## 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

## Productive Grade Rates by Pell Status

Productive grade rates among non-Pell grant recipients were higher than Pell grant recipients. Productive grade rates ranged from $65.5 \%$ (Pell, Fall 2014, 1st year) to $79.9 \%$ (Non-Pell, Fall 2013, 3rd year). Productive grade rates of both Pell and non-Pell grant recipients increased from the 2011 cohort to the most recent cohort each year. Rates increased from the first year to the fifth year for both Pell and non-Pell students in 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) Pell status as reported at the Fall semester of the cohort year.
(6) Sources: Pell ACCDODS1.XST_FADS_ACCD; Course Enrollment ACCDODS1.XST_IRES_SC

## Productive Grade Rates by Veteran Status

Overall, across each cohort and each year, productive grade rates were higher among veteran students than non-veteran students. First year rates of non-veteran students exhibited an increase of 7.6 percentage points from the Fall 2011 cohort ( $67.2 \%$ ) to the Fall 2015 cohort ( $74.8 \%$ ). During the same period, veteran students' productive grade rates dropped slightly 0.7 percentage points from Fall 2011 ( $78.0 \%$ ) to Fall 2015 ( $77.3 \%$ ). In the Fall 2011 cohort, productive grade rates of veteran and non-veteran students remained stable or grew slightly from the first year to the third year. After the third year veteran rates declined slightly while non-veteran rates increased slightly.


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 English developmental education (DE) had higher productive grade rates than did students who were referred to English DE. First year referred student productive grade rate of the Fall 2015 cohort (72\%) climbed 8.3 percentage points higher than the first year Fall 2011 cohort ( $63.7 \%$ ). Also, first year non-referred student productive grade rates of the Fall 2015 cohort ( $78 \%$ ) increased 3.9 percentage points higher than the Fall 2011 cohort ( $74.1 \%$ ). In the Fall 2011 cohort, productive grade rates of referred students grew 3.1 percentage points from the first year to the fifth year, while rates for students not-referred grew 1.9 percentage points during the same period. INRW courses are reported as English courses from Fall 2014 cohort onward (see note below).


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

## Productive Grade Rates by Referral to Math Developmental Education

FTIC students not referred to Math developmental education (DE) had higher productive grade rates than did students who were referred to DE. First year referred student productive grade rates of the Fall 2015 cohort ( $72.8 \%$ ) increased 6.8 percentage points from the first year Fall 2011 cohort ( $66 \%$ ). Also, first year non-referred student productive grade rates of the Fall 2015 cohort ( $78.5 \%$ ) grew 3.4 percentage points from the first year Fall 2011 cohort ( $75.1 \%$ ). In the Fall 2011 cohort, productive grade rates of referred students grew 3.9 percentage points from the first year to the fifth year, while rates for non-referred students grew 0.9 percentage points 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) 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

# ST. PHILIP'S 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 St. Philip's 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 peaked in Fall 2011.
$\diamond$ Female students persisted at higher rates than did male students.
$\diamond$ The 2009 cohort experienced lower persistence rates across all ethnicities than did other cohorts in years one through four.
$\diamond$ Overall, Asian students persisted at higher rates than other students.
$\diamond$ Generally, students entering between the ages of 22-24 persisted at lower rates than those younger or older than they were.
$\diamond$ Overall, full-time students in each cohort and each year persisted at higher rates than did part-time students.
$\diamond$ Across the cohorts, persistence rates of Pell recipients were higher than those of non-Pell recipients.
$\diamond$ The first year persistence rate for students referred to developmental education decreased from the 2011 cohort to the 2015 cohort .

## Total Persistence Rates

Across the cohorts, first year persistence rates alternately climbed and declined from year-to-year. First year persistence rates peaked in Fall 2011 (68\%). Gaps in persistence rates were greater from year-to-year in the first three years, than in the last year.

## Persistence Rate by Fall Cohort



## Persistence Rates by Gender

Generally, female students persisted at higher rates than did male students. The widest gaps in persistence rates between male and female students in the same cohort and year, were Fall 2015 second year students. Although, persistence rate gaps between male and females students within the same cohort and persistence year were relatively close and by year five, were almost identical.


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 Ethnicity

Fall 2014 African American students had the highest one year persistence rate within their cohort and group. Fall 2014 and Fall 2015 Asian student one-year persistence rates decreased dramatically from Fall 2013. Third year persistence rates increased year-to-year for White students.

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\% | 4 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Fall 2011* | Fall 2012 | Fall 2013 | Fall 2014 | Fall 2015 |
| - African American | 8.4\% |  |  |  |  |
| - Asian | 20.0\% |  |  |  |  |
| - Hispanic | 8.8\% |  |  |  |  |
| - Other | 9.1\% |  |  |  |  |
| - White | 6.5\% |  |  |  |  |

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

One-year persistence rates for students seventeen years old or less, peaked in the Fall 2015 (75\%) from the lowest rate overall the previous Fall (56\%). Second year persistence rates for students $18-21$ years old were relatively constant through Fall 2013, peaked in Fall 2014 and dipped a little in Fall 2015. In the third year of persistence, students in the 2224 age group generally exhibited lower rates than did students younger or older than they were.

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 80\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 40\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{r} 20 \% \\ 0 \% \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Fall 2011* | Fall 2012 | Fall 2013 | Fall 2014 | Fall 2015 |
| - 17 or less | 10.0\% | 12.1\% |  |  |  |
| - 18-21 | 13.3\% | 16.6\% |  |  |  |
| - 22-24 | 12.6\% | 9.8\% |  |  |  |
| - 25-35 | 12.3\% | 18.2\% |  |  |  |
| - - $_{\text {- }}^{\text {- } 50}$ | 18.6\% | 17.6\% |  |  |  |
| - 51+ | 35.3\% | 0.0\% |  |  |  |

5th Year: Fall to Any Term 5th Year

| 100\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 80\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 40\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0\% |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Fall 2011* | Fall 2012 | Fall 2013 | Fall 2014 | Fall 2015 |
| - 17 or less | 5.1\% |  |  |  |  |
| -18-21 | 9.1\% |  |  |  |  |
| - $22-24$ | 8.8\% |  |  |  |  |
| - 25-35 | 6.8\% |  |  |  |  |
| - 36-50 | 6.5\% |  |  |  |  |
| - 51+ | 5.9\% |  |  |  |  |

Notes:
(1) Persistence rate is the measure of FTIC students, excluding graduates, who continue from their initial Fall semester (cohort year) to a subsequent time of measurement.
(2) Fall 2012 and 2013 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is first-time in college and credential-seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the 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) Age as reported at the Fall semester of the cohort year.
(5) Graduate Status: 2011-2015: ACCDODS1.XST_CBM009_ACCD FTIC Demographics: 2011-2015: ACCDODS1.XST_CBM001_ACCD

## Persistence Rates by Enrollment Status

Overall, full-time students persisted at higher rates than did part-time students. The greatest variation between persistence rates for full-time and part-time students occurred within the first, second, and third years. Variation in persistence rates decreases in the fourth and fifth years. Overall, both full-time and part-time one-year persistence rates have remained constant.

Persistence Rate by Enrollment 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 CBM001). Persistence rates exclude graduates.
(3) Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC cohort methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using the THECB methodology. Persistence rates excludes graduates.
(4) Full-Time/Part-Time status as reported at the Fall semester of the cohort year.
(5) Graduate Status: 2011-2015: ACCDODS1.XST_CBM009_ACCD FTIC Demographics: 2011-2015: ACCDODS1.XST_CBM001_ACCD
(6) Preliminary numbers were used for Fall 2014, third year and Fall 2015, second year.

## Persistence Rates by Pell Status

Overall, Pell grant recipient one-year persistence rates were higher than those of non-Pell grant recipients. However, in the second year non-Pell grant recipients have higher persistence rates (except Fall 2013). Pell grant recipients persist at higher rates than non-Pell grant recipients in alternate years by year three. By year five, the gap between Pell grant recipients and non-Pell grant recipient student persistence rates decreases and rates end up relatively close.


## Notes:

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

## Persistence Rates by Veteran Status

Overall, veteran persistence rates are higher than non-veteran rates. Gaps in persistence rates were greater from year-toyear in the first three years than in the last two. However, the widest persistence rate gap between veteran and nonveteran students was second year, Fall 2011 (19\%).


## 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.
(6) Source: Veteran status-ACCDODS1.XST_IRES_SC

## Persistence Rates by Developmental Education Referral

The Fall-to-Spring (1st year) persistence rate for students referred to developmental education (DE) decreased from the 2011 cohort ( $68 \%$ ) to the 2015 cohort ( $66 \%$ ). Persistence rates of students not referred to DE (college ready) increased from the 2011 cohort ( $57 \%$ ) to the 2015 cohort ( $66 \%$ ). The widest persistence rate gap between students referred to DE and those college ready was in the Fall 2011, first year.


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) Sources: FTIC Demographics-ACIRES.CBM001; Course Enrollment-ACCDIR.EXTENDEDENROLLMENT;

> DE Referrals: Fall 2011: ACCDODS1.ATD_F10_F11_ODS_TASP, Fall 2012: ACCDODS1.ATD_F10_F13_ODS_TASP, Fall 2013-Fall 2015: ACDODS1.XST_ATD_ACCD

## ST. PHILIP'S 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 St. Philip's 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.
$\diamond$ Of the FTIC students who started at St. Philip's College in 2011, 18.6\% of male students and $15.6 \%$ of female students received a degree or certificate after five years.
$\diamond$ Male students demonstrated higher graduation rates than did female students across most cohorts and all years.
$\diamond$ Asian and White students generally graduated at higher rates than did other student groups, across the majority of cohorts and years.
$\diamond$ Generally, students entering between the ages of 18 to 24 graduated at lower rates than did those younger or older than they were.
$\diamond$ Of the FTIC students who started at St. Philip's College in 2011, 19.8\% of full-time and $15.3 \%$ of part-time students received a degree or certificate after five years.
$\diamond$ Generally, FTIC Pell recipients and non-Pell recipients graduated at similar rates in years one and two.
$\diamond$ Overall, FTIC students who identified as veterans had higher graduation rates than did students who did not identify as veterans.
$\diamond$ After five years students not referred to developmental education graduated at an $11 \%$ higher rate than students who were referred to developmental education.

## Total Graduation Rates

The percentage of FTIC students graduating after three years increased across each cohort. The four year graduation rate among those in the 2012 cohort was higher than that of the 2011 cohort ( $16.3 \%$ to $14.9 \%$ ). Of the FTIC students who started at St. Philip's College in 2011, 17.1\% had received a degree or certificate after 5 years.


## Graduation Rates by Gender

Male students demonstrated higher graduation rates than did female students across most cohorts and all years. Of the FTIC students who started at St. Philip's College in 2011, $18.6 \%$ of male students and $15.6 \%$ of female students received a degree or certificate after five years.


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

## Graduation Rates by Ethnicity

Asian and White students generally graduated at higher rates than did other student groups, across the majority of cohorts and years. After five years, Asian and White students exhibited higher graduation rates than African American, Hispanic and 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

Generally, students entering between the ages of 18 to 24 graduated at lower rates than did those younger or older than they were. While older students had greater rates of graduation across the years, those entering under the age of 22 showed greater gains after year 2.


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

The graduation rates were generally higher among full-time students than part-time students over most cohorts and years. Of the FTIC students who started at St. Philip's College in 2011, 19.8\% of full-time and $15.3 \%$ 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 similar rates in years one and two. The three, four, and five year graduation rates of non-recipients were higher than those who had received the Pell grant across the majority of cohorts.


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

## 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 St. Philip's College in 2011, $24.6 \%$ of students who identified as veterans and $16.5 \%$ of students who did not identify as veterans received a degree or certificate after five years.


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

## Graduation Rates by Developmental Education Referral

Overall, FTIC students not referred to developmental education (DE) had higher graduation rates than did students requiring DE. After three years, students in the 2011, 2012, and 2013 cohorts not referred to DE graduated at more than twice the rate of students who were referred to DE.


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

DE Referrals: Fall 2011: ACCDODS1.ATD_F10_F11_ODS_TASP, Fall 2012: ACCDODS1.ATD_F10_F13_ODS_TASP, Fall 2013-Fall 2015:
ACDODS1.XST_ATD_ACCD


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

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

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

[^3]:    Notes:
    (1) Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC cohort methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using the THECB methodology.
    (2) Fall 2012 FTIC student cohort is defined by a combination of THECB (demographic profile, persistence rates, and graduation rates) and True FTIC (productive grade rates, progression through developmental and gatekeeper courses) methodologies.
    (3) Fall 2013, 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

[^4]:    *See notes, next page

