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# ALAMO COLLEGES 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 using 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 uses unduplicated headcounts as the basis for reporting Fall first-time-in-college (FTIC) cohorts.

When discussing student characteristics that may vary over time (e.g., age, full/part-time, Pell status), Alamo Colleges categorized students 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 into Alamo Colleges.

## Unduplicated Fall First-Time-in-College (FTIC) Cohorts

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.

After experiencing declining enrollment from Fall 2011 to 2013, Fall FTIC cohort totals increased from Fall 2013 to 2014. This trend continued from Fall 2014 to 2015 as enrollment increased 1.59\%.

|  | 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 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 4,106 | 3,820 | 3,593 | 3,517 | 3,636 |
| Female | 5,065 | 4,465 | 4,235 | 4,361 | 4,368 |
| Total FTIC | 9,171 | 8,285 | 7,828 | 7,878 | 8,004 |

*See notes, next page

## Gender

There was a slightly higher proportion of female students than male students in each cohort. The percentages of females in each cohort ranged from $53 \%$ to $55 \%$.


## Ethnicity

The majority of students across the cohorts (67.66\% on average) identified themselves as Hispanic. The second most represented ethnic group across all cohorts was White ( $20.41 \%$ on average). White student enrollment, however, decreased 3.6 percentage points from the 2011 cohort ( $21.95 \%$ ) to the 2014 cohort ( $18.32 \%$ ). African American students consistently made up $6 \%-8 \%$ of each cohort and Asian students were the lowest represented ethnicity comprising approximately $2 \%$ 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 |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African American | 764 | 544 | 538 | 542 | 552 |
| Asian | 182 | 156 | 136 | 170 | 166 |
| Hispanic | 5,982 | 5,726 | 5,266 | 5,195 | 5,662 |
| Other | 230 | 146 | 318 | 314 | 158 |
| White | 2,013 | 1,713 | 1,570 | 1,657 | 1,466 |
| Total FTIC | 9,171 | 8,285 | 7,828 | 7,878 | 8,004 |



## 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).
Source: FTIC Demographics-ACIRES.CBM001

## Age

The majority of students across the cohorts ( $81.41 \%$ on average) were 18-21 years old when they first enrolled. The second most represented age group included $25-35$ year olds ( $7.08 \%$ on average). This age group has experienced a decline in enrollment of 3.89 percentage points from Fall 2011 to Fall 2015. Students over the age of 51 had the lowest representation among the cohorts, comprising less than $1 \%$ of FTIC students annually. Overall, FTIC students who entered the Alamo Colleges at age 21 or less represented $88.05 \%$ of the population in Fall 2015, while the remaining $11.95 \%$ were represented by students who entered at age 22 or greater.

|  | Fall 2011* <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2012 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2013 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2014 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2015 <br> FIIC Cohort |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 17 or less | 384 | 337 | 297 | 265 | 288 |
| $18-21$ | 6,952 | 6,592 | 6,482 | 6,651 | 6,759 |
| $22-24$ | 503 | 412 | 333 | 329 | 349 |
| $25-35$ | 872 | 656 | 508 | 461 | 450 |
| $36-50$ | 387 | 245 | 177 | 142 | 141 |
| $51+$ | 73 | 43 | 31 | 30 | 17 |
| Total FTIC | 9,171 | 8,285 | 7,828 | 7,878 | 8,004 |



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. Source: FTIC Demographics-ACIRES.CBM001

## Enrollment Status

Full-time enrollment decreased over most cohorts from Fall 2011 to 2015. Part-time enrollment decreased over each cohort from Fall 2011 to 2013, but increased from Fall 2013 to 2014 and again from Fall 2014 to 2015. From Fall 2014 to 2015, FTIC full-time enrollment decreased by 3.25 percentage points. Full-time students were defined as those enrolled in 12 or more hours at census date.

|  | Fall 2011* FTIC <br> Cohort | Fall 2012 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2013 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2014 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2015 <br> FTIC Cohort |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Full-Time | 4,060 | 3,551 | 3,643 | 3,457 | 3,252 |
| Part-Time | 5,111 | 4,734 | 4,185 | 4,421 | 4,752 |
| Total FTIC | 9,171 | 8,285 | 7,828 | 7,878 | 8,004 |

Fall FTIC Cohorts by Enrollment 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) Full-Time/Part-Time status as reported at the Fall semester of the cohort year. Source: FTIC Demographics-ACIRES.CBM001

## Pell Status

More than half of all FTIC students in each cohort (50\%-59\%) received a Pell grant in their first year at Alamo Colleges. Percentages for both Pell and Non-Pell grant recipient students remained relatively consistent across most cohorts from Fall 2011 to 2014. From Fall 2014 to 2015, however, there was a 5.48 percentage point decrease in students receiving a Pell grant.

|  | Fall 2011* FTIC <br> Cohort | Fall 2012 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2013 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2014 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2015 <br> FTIC Cohort |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pell Grant | 5,374 | 4,505 | 4,371 | 4,423 | 4,055 |
| No Pell Grant | 3,797 | 3,780 | 3,457 | 3,455 | 3,949 |
| Total FTIC | 9,171 | 8,285 | 7,828 | 7,878 | 8,004 |



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

Source: FTIC Demographics-ACIRES.CBM001; Pell Status-ACCDIR.FADS

## Veteran Status

A small percentage of all FTIC students in each cohort (5\%-7\%) were designated as veterans upon initial enrollment. While trends are not evident over the past five years, a steady percentage of students were designated as veterans across cohorts from Fall 2011 to 2015.

|  | Fall 2011* FTIC <br> Cohort | Fall 2012 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2013 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2014 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2015 <br> FTIC Cohort |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vet | 555 | 477 | 493 | 464 | 530 |
| Non-Vet | 8,616 | 7,808 | 7,335 | 7,414 | 7,474 |
| Total FTIC | 9,171 | 8,285 | 7,828 | 7,878 | 8,004 |



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

Source: FTIC Demographics-ACCDODS1.XCT_IRES_SC

## Developmental Education Referral Status

Greater than half of all FTIC students in each cohort (53\%-80\%) were referred to developmental education (DE) courses. After several terms of steady decrease, the percentage of students referred to DE increased in Fall 2015. The most significant shift occurred from the Fall 2011 cohort to the Fall 2014 cohort, with a decrease in DE referrals of just over 27\%. There was a small percentage of students ( $1 \%-2 \%$ ) in each cohort whose referral status could not be determined due to lack of assessment scores or DE course enrollment.

|  | Fall 2011* <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2012 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2013 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2014 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2015 <br> FTIC Cohort |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Referred | 7,363 | 6,374 | 4,416 | 4,184 | 5,472 |
| Not Referred | 1,616 | 1,717 | 3,312 | 3,538 | 2,423 |
| Unknown | 192 | 194 | 100 | 156 | 109 |
| Total FTIC | 9,171 | 8,285 | 7,828 | 7,878 | 8,004 |

Fall FTIC Cohorts by Referral to DE Courses


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

# ALAMO COLLEGES 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 unduplicated cohorts at Alamo Colleges. 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 successfully passed the English DE and "gatekeeper" courses at higher rates than male students.
$\diamond$ For English, of those students who were referred, Hispanic and Asian students successfully passed DE and "gatekeeper" courses at higher rates than students from other racial/ethnic groups. For Math, Asian students successfully passed highest DE and "gatekeeper" courses at higher rates.
$\diamond$ For English and Math, referred students older than 51 generally had less success in "gatekeeper" courses than did students of any other age group.
$\diamond$ For English and Math, full-time students compared to part-time students generally had greater success in DE and "gatekeeper" courses.
$\diamond$ For English, Pell recipients compared to non-Pell recipients generally had greater success in DE courses; however, Pell non-recipients compared to Pell recipients generally had greater success in "gatekeeper" courses.
$\diamond$ For English and Math, of those who were referred, veteran students successfully passed English DE and "gatekeeper" courses at higher rates than did non-veteran students.

## 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 $A, B, C, D, F, I, I P$, or $P$ for course; Success = student received a grade of A, B, or C for course.
2) $\quad$ High $D E=$ last course in $D E$ sequence (Level 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 $38 \%-47 \%$ of referred students in each cohort attempted the highest course in the English DE sequence, with $29 \%-34 \%$ of referred students successfully passing the course. Approximately $40 \%-63 \%$ of referred students in each cohort attempted the English "gatekeeper" course, with approximately $31 \%-48 \%$ of referred students successfully passing the "gatekeeper" course. In comparing the 2011 and 2013 cohorts, success in "gatekeeper" increased 17.3 percentage points.


## English "Gatekeeper" Progression of Non-Referred

After 3 years, $72 \%-88 \%$ of non-referred students in each cohort attempted the English "gatekeeper" course, with 56\%$71 \%$ of non-referred students successfully passing the course. In comparing the 2011 and 2013 cohorts, success in "gatekeeper" increased 15.4 percentage points.


## Total English Progression

Overall, $37 \%-51 \%$ of all referred students in each cohort successfully passed any English DE course within the first year, $29 \%-34 \%$ successfully passed the highest DE course in the English sequence within 3 years, and approximately 31\%$40 \%$ successfully passed the English "gatekeeper" course within 3 years. Of the non-referred students, 56\%-71\% successfully passed the English "gatekeeper" course within 3 years. Of the total cohort, 44\%-60\% successfully passed the English "gatekeeper" course within 3 years. For the 2011 through 2013 cohorts, those who were referred to Level 2 had higher success rates in the English 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, non-referred and referred students had increased rates of success in the "gatekeeper" course.

|  | 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) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level 1 } \\ 1,119(12.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 708 (63.3\%) | 457 (40.8\%) | Not Applicable |  | 249 (22.3\%) | Not Applicable | 219 (19.6\%) |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 2 \\ 2,956(32.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 1,703 (57.6\%) | 1,187 (40.2\%) |  |  | 1,132 (38.3\%) |  | 1,037 (35.1\%) |
|  | Total Referred $4,075(44.4 \%)$ | 2,411 (59.2\%) | 1,644 (40.3\%) |  |  | 1,381 (33.9\%) |  | 1,256 (30.8\%) |
|  | College Level $4,976(54.3 \%)$ |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  | 2,773 (55.7\%) |
|  | Unknown $120(1.3 \%)$ | 1 (0.8\%) | $0(0.0 \%)$ | Not Applicable |  | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable | 17 (14.2\%) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cohort Total } \\ & \text { 9,171(100.0\%) } \end{aligned}$ | 2,733 (29.8\%) | 1,897 (20.7\%) |  |  | 1,622 (17.7\%) |  | 4,046 (44.1\%) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DE Level 1 } \\ & 826(10.3 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 542 (65.6\%) | 379 (45.9\%) | Not Applicable |  | 232 (28.1\%) | 6 (0.7\%) | 212 (25.7\%) |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level 2 } \\ 2,118 \text { (26.4\%) } \end{gathered}$ | 979 (46.2\%) | 711 (33.6\%) |  |  | 683 (32.2\%) | 16 (0.8\%) | 694 (32.8\%) |
|  | Total Referred $2,944 \text { (36.7\%) }$ | 1,521 (51.7\%) | 1,090 (37.0\%) |  |  | 915 (31.1\%) | 22 (0.7\%) | 906 (30.8\%) |
|  | College Level 4,988 (62.3\%) |  |  | Not | able |  |  | 3,021 (60.6\%) |
|  | Unknown 79 (1.0\%) | 6 (7.6\%) | 6 (7.6\%) | Not Applicable |  | 5 (6.3\%) | $0(0.0 \% 6)$ | 27 (34.2\%) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cohort Total } \\ & 8,011(100.05 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 1,703 (21.3\%) | 1,224 (15.3\%) |  |  | 1,037 (12.9\%) | 35 (0.4\%) | 3,954 (49.4\%) |
|  | Students UnaccountedFor 274 (Cohort Total: $8,285)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{t}{0} \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & 0 \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{4} \\ & \stackrel{N}{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level 1 } \\ 1,299(16.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 752 (57.9\%) | 546 (42.0\%) |  |  | 223 (17.2\%) | 44 (3.4\%) | 382 (29.4\%) |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level 2 } \\ 1,532 \text { (19.6\%) } \end{gathered}$ | 847 (55.3\%) | 675 (44.1\%) |  | icable | 598 (39.0\%) | 41 (2.7\%) | 744 (48.6\%) |
|  | Total Referred 2,831 (36.2\%) | 1,599 (56.5\%) | 1,221 (43.1\%) |  |  | 821 (29.0\%) | 85 (3.0\%) | 1,126 (39.8\%) |
|  | College Level 4,889 (62.5\%) |  |  | Not | able |  |  | 3,478 (71.1\%) |
|  | Unknown $108 \text { (1.4\%) }$ | 6 (5.6\%) | 3 (2.8\%) | Not Applicable |  | 1 (0.9\%) | 1 (0.9\%) | 51 (47.2\%) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cohort Total } \\ & 7,828(100.0 \%) . \end{aligned}$ | 1,705 (21.8\%) | 1,295 (16.5\%) |  |  | 877 (11.2\%) | 124 (1.6\%) | 4,655 (59.5\%) |

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

## Total English Progression (continued)



Sources:
FTIC Demographics:
DE Referrals:
Course Enrollment::

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

## English Progression by Gender

Across most cohorts and levels, female students successfully passed the English DE and "gatekeeper" courses at higher rates than male students. When comparing the 2011 cohort to the 2013 cohort, both male and female students across all levels experienced increases 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) |  | in High DE Year) |  |  | cess in GK Srd Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DELevel 1 | M | 559 (50.0\%) | M | 344 (61.5\%) | M | 210 (37.6\%) | Not Applicable |  | M | 98 (17.5\%) | Not Applicable | M | 83 (14.8\%) |
|  | 1,119 (12.2\%) | F | 560 (50.0\%) | F | 364 (65.0\%) | F | 247 (44.1\%) |  |  | F | 151 (27.0\%) |  | F | 136 (24.3\%) |
|  | DELevel 2 | M | 1,393 (47.1\%) | M | 776 (55.7\%) | M | 503 (36.1\%) |  |  | M | 476 (34.2\%) |  | M | 422 (30.3\%) |
|  | 2,956 (32.2\%) | F | 1,563 (52.9\%) | F | 927 (59.3\%) | F | 684 (43.8\%) |  |  | F | 656 (42.0\%) |  | F | 615 (39.3\%) |
|  | Total Referred | M | 1,952 (47.9\%) | M | 1,120 (57.4\%) | M | 713 (36.5\%) |  |  | M | 574 (29.4\%) |  | M | 505 (25.9\%) |
|  | 4,075 (44.4\%) | F | 2,123 (52.1\%) | F | 1,291 (60.8\%) | F | 931 (43.9\%) |  |  | F | 807 (38.0\%) |  | F | 751 (35.4\%) |
|  | College Level | M | 2,087 (41.9\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | M | 1,121 (53.7\%) |
|  | $4,976(54.3 \%)$ | F | 2,889 (58.1\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F | 1,652 (57.2\%) |
|  | Unknown | M | 67 (55.8\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%\%) | Not Applicable |  | M | $0(0.0 \%)$ | Not Applicable | M | 9 (13.4\%) |
|  | 120 (1.3\%) | F | 53 (44.2\%) | F | 1 (1.9\%) | F | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  | F | 0 (0.0\%) |  | F | 8 (15.1\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | M | 4,106 (44.8\%) | M | 1,249 (30.4\%) | M | 809 (19.7\%) |  |  | M | 661 (16.1\%) |  | M | 1,635 (39.8\%) |
|  | 9,171 (100.0\%) | F | 5,065 (55.2\%) | F | 1,484(29.3\%) | F | 1.088(21.5\%) |  |  | F | 961 (19.0\%) |  | F | 2,411 (47.6\%) |
| $t$ <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br>  <br>  <br> $\sim$ | DELevel 1 | M | 457 (55.3\%) | M | 281 (61.5\%) | M | 179 (39.2\%) | Not Applicable |  | M | 105 (23.0\%) | M | M | $97(21.2 \%)$ |
|  | 826 (10.3\%) | F | 369 (44.7\%) | F | 261 (70.7\%) | F | 200 (54.2\%) |  |  | F | 127 (34.4\%) | F | F | 115 (31.2\%) |
|  | DELevel 2 | M | $998 \text { (47.1\%) }$ | M | $465(46.6 \%)$ | M | $328 \text { (32.9\%) }$ |  |  | M | 314 (31.5\%) | M | M | 288 (28.9\%) |
|  | $2,118(26.4 \%)$ | F | $1,120(52.9 \%)$ | F | $514 \text { (45.9\%) }$ | F | $383(34.2 \%)$ |  |  | F | 369 (32.9\%) | F | F | 406 (36.3\%) |
|  | Total Referred | M | 1,455 (49.4\%) | M | 746 (51.3\%) | M | 507 (34.8\%) |  |  | M | 419 (28.8\%) | M | M | 385 (26.5\%) |
|  | 2,944 (36.7\%) | F | 1,489 (50.6\%) | F | 775 (52.0\%) | F | 583 (39.2\%) |  |  | F | 496 (33.3\%) | F | F | 521 (35.0\%) |
|  | College Level | M | 2,196 (44.0\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | M | 1,279 (58.2\%) |
|  | 4,988 (62.3\%) | F | 2,792 (56.0\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F | 1,742 (62.4\%) |
|  | Unknown | M | 38 (48.1\%) | M | 3 (7.9\%) | M | 3 (7.9\%) | Not Applicable |  | M | 2 (5.3\%) | M | M | 13 (34.2\%) |
|  | 79 (1.0\%) | F | 41 (51.9\%) | F | 3 (7.3\%) | F | 3 (7.3\%) |  |  | F | 3 (7.3\%) | F | F | 14 (34.1\%) |
|  | Cohort Total |  | $3,689(46.0 \%)$ |  | $834(22.6 \%)$ | M | $573(15.5 \%)$ |  |  | M | $480(13.0 \%)$ | M | M | 1,677 (45.5\%) |
|  | 8,011 (100.0\%) | F | $4,322(54.0 \%)$ | F | $869(20.1 \%)$ | F | 651 (15.1\%) |  |  | F | 557 (12.9\%) | F | F | 2,277 (52.7\%) |
|  | Students Unaccounted For 274 (Cohort Total: 8,285) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| t <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 | DE Level 1 | M | 655 (50.4\%) | M | 365 (55.7\%) | M | 249 (38.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | M | 104 (15.9\%) | M | M | 168 (25.6\%) |
|  | 1,299 (16.6\%) | F | 644 (49.6\%) | F | 387 (60.1\%) | F | 297 (46.1\%) |  |  | F | 119 (18.5\%) | F | F | 214 (33.2\%) |
|  | DELevel 2 | M | 726 (47.4\%) | M | 404 (55.6\%) | M | 308 (42.4\%) |  |  | M | 282 (38.8\%) | M | M | 315 (43.4\%) |
|  | 1,532 (19.6\%) | F | 806 (52.6\%) | F | 443 (55.0\%) | F | 367 (45.5\%) |  |  | F | 316 (39.2\%) | $F$ | $F$ | 429 (53.2\%) |
|  | Total Referred | M | 1,381 (48.8\%) | M | 769 (55.7\%) | M | 557 (40.3\%) |  |  | M | 386 (28.0\%) | M | M | 483 (35.0\%) |
|  | $2,831(36.2 \%)$ | F | 1,450 (51.2\%) | F | 830 (57.2\%) | F | 664 (45.8\%) |  |  | F | 435 (30.0\%) | F | F | 643 (44.3\%) |
|  | College Level | M | 2,140 (43.8\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | M | 1,474 (68.9\%) |
|  | $4,889(62.5 \%)$ |  | 2,749 (56.2\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F | 2,004 (72.9\%) |
|  | Unknown | M | 72 (66.7\%) | M | 3 (4.2\%) | M | $0(0.0 \%)$ | Not Applicable |  | M | $0(0.0 \%)$ | M | M | 34 (47.2\%) |
|  | $108(1.4 \%)$ | F | 36 (33.3\%) | F | 3 (8.3\%) | F | 3 (8.3\%) |  |  | F | 1 (2.8\%) | F | F | 17 (47.2\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | M | 3,593 (45.9\%) | M | 819 (22.8\%) | M | 586 (16.3\%) |  |  | M | 407 (11.3\%) | M | M | 1,991 (55.4\%) |
|  | 7,828 (100.0\%) | F | 4,235 (54.1\%) | F | 886(20.9\%) | F | 709 (16.7\%) |  |  | F | 470(11.1\%) | F | F | 2,664 (62.9\%) |

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

## English Progression by Gender

|  |  | Referral Level |  | Attempted Any DE (1st Year) |  | Success in Any DE (1st Year) |  | Attempted RSG <br> (1st Year) |  | Success in RSG (1st Year) |  | Success in High DE - - (3rdYear) | Success in RSG - (3rd Year) | Success in GK (3rd Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DELevel 1 | M | 377 (52.1\%) | M | 254 (67.4\%) | M | 157 (41.6\%) | M | 20 (5.3\%) | M | 12 (3.2\%) | 3rd Year Data Not Yet Available |  |  |
|  | 724 (9.296) | F | 347 (47.9\%) | F | 247 (71.2\%) | F | 177 (51.0\%) | F | 15 (4.3\%) | F | 7 (2.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DELevel 2 | M | 427 (43.8\%) | M | 268 (62.8\%) | M | 169 (39.6\%) | M | 25 (5.9\%) | M | 15 (3.5\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 975 (12.4\%) | F | 548 (56.2\%) | F | 329 (60.0\%) | F | 268 (48.9\%) | F | 41 (7.5\%) | F | 28 (5.1\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DELevel 3 | M | 430 (44.8\%) | M | 273 (63.5\%) | M | 191 (44.4\%) | M | 233 (54.2\%6) | M | 165 (38.4\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 959 (12.2\%) | F | 529 (55.2\%) | F | 339 (64.1\%) | F | 284 (53.7\%) | F | 309 (58.4\%) | F | 257 (48.6\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DELevel 4 | M | 8 (61.5\%) | M | 6 (75.0\%) | M | 5 (62.5\%) | M | 6 (75.0\%6) | M | 5 (62.5\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 13 (0.2\%) | F | 5 (38.5\%) | F | 5 (100.0\%\%) | F | 5 (100.0\%) | F | 5 (100.0\%6) | F | 5 (100.0\%\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Total Referred | M | 1,242 (46.5\%) | M | 801 (64.5\%) | M | 522 (42.0\%) | M | 284 (22.9\%) | M | 197 (15.9\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 2,671 (33.9\%) | , | 1,429 (53.5\%) | F | 920 (64.4\%) | F | 734 (51.4\%) | F | 370 (25.9\%) | F | 297 (20.8\%) |  |  |  |
|  | College Level | M | 2,130 (44.3\%) |  |  |  | Not Applica |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 4,810(61.1\%) | F | 2,680 (55.7\%) |  |  |  | Not Applica |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Unknown | M | 145 (36.5\%) | M | 18 (12.4\%) | M | 7 (4.8\%) | M | 18 (12.4\%) | M | 7 (4.8\%6) |  |  |  |
|  | 397 (5.05\%) | F | 252 (63.5\%) | F | 30 (11.9\%) | F | 23 (9.1\%) | F | 29 (11.5\%) | F | 23 (9.1\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Cohort Total | M | 3,517 (44.6\%) | M | 1,069 (30.4\%) | M | 716 (20.4\%) | M | 545 (15.5\%) | M | 385 (10.9\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 7,878 (100.0\% ${ }^{\text {L }}$ | F | 4,361 (55.4\%) | F | 1,245 (28.5\%) . | F | 1,007 (23.196) | F | 677.(15.5\%) | F | 553(12.7\%) |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{t}{0} \\ & \stackrel{5}{0} \\ & \text { n } \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\sim} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | DELevel 1 | M | 352 (45.1\%) | M | 232 (65.9\%) | M | 158 (44.9\%) | M | 18 (5.1\%) | M | 13 (3.7\%) | 3rd Year Data Not Yet Available |  |  |
|  | 780 (9.7\%) | F | 428 (54.9\%) | F | 289 (67.5\%) | F | 208 (48.6\%) | F | 24 (5.6\%) | F | 15 (3.5\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DELevel 2 | M | 553 (40.8\%) | M | 320 (57.9\%) | M | 230 (41.6\%) | M | 36 (6.5\%) | M | 25 (4.5\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 1,356 (16.9\%) | F | 803 (59.2\%) | F | 516 (64.3\%) | F | 406 (50.6\%) | F | 71 (8.8\%) | F | 53 (6.6\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DELevel 3 | M | 757 (43.0\%) | M | 508 (67.1\%) | M | 387 (51.1\%) | M | 466 (61.6\%) | M | 348 (46.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 1,761 (22.0\%) | F | 1,004 (57.0\%) | F | 735 (73.2\%) | F | 612 (61.0\%) | F | 672 (66.9\%) | F | 557 (55.5\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DELevel 4 | M | 2 (66.7\%) | M | 1 (50.0\%) | M | 1 (50.0\%) | M | 1 (50.0\%6) | M | 1 (50.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 3 (0.0\%) | F | 1 (33.3\%) | F | 1 (100.0\%\%) | F | 1 (100.0\%\%) | F | 1 (100.0\%) | F | 1 (100.0\%\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Total Referred | M | 1,664 (42.7\%) | M | 1,061 (63.8\%) | M | 776 (46.6\%) | M | 521 (31.3\%) | M | 387 (23.3\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 3,900 (48.7\%) | F | 2,236 (57.3\%) | F | 1,541 (68.9\%) | F | 1,227 (54.9\%) | F | 768 (34.3\%) | F | 626 (28.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | College Level |  | 1,911 (48.3\%) | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3,960 (49.5\%) | F | 2,049 (51.7\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Unknown | M | 61 (42.4\%) | M | 2 (3.3\%) | M | 1 (1.6\%) | M | 2 (3.3\%) | M | 1 (1.6\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 144 (1.8\%6) | F | 83 (57.6\%) | F | 7 (8.456) | F | 7 (8.4\%) | F | 5 (6.0\%) | F | 5 (6.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Cohort Total | M | 3,636 (45.4\%) | M | 1,331 (36.6\%) | M | 978 (26.9\%) | M | 785 (21.6\%) | M | 585 (16.1\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 8,004 (100.095) |  | 4,368(54.6\%) |  | 1,813(41.5\%) . | F | 1,454(33.3\%) |  | ,027 (23.5\%) | F | 845.(19.396) |  |  |  |
|  | $\mathrm{F}=$ Femal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:

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

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

## English Progression by Ethnicity

Overall, of those students who were referred, Hispanic and Asian students successfully passed the English DE and "gatekeeper" courses at higher rates than students from other racial/ethnic groups. Of those students who were not referred, Asian students had higher success rates than students from other racial/ethnic groups in English "gatekeeper" in three years. When comparing the 2011 cohort to the 2013 cohort, all non-referred students experienced increases in "gatekeeper" success.


English Progression by Ethnicity (continued)
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## English Progression by Ethnicity (continued)

|  |  | Referral Level |  | Attempted Any DE (1st Year) |  | Success in Any DE (1st Year) |  | Attempted RSG (1st Year) |  | Success in RSG <br> (1st Year) |  | Success in High DE (3rd Year) | Success in RSG <br> (3rd Year) | Success in GK (3rd Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DE Level } 1 \\ & 780 \text { (9.7\%) } \end{aligned}$ | AA | 68 (8.7\%) | AA | 51 (75.0\%) | AA | 32 (47.1\%) | AA | 2 (2.9\%) | AA | 1 (1.5\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | A | 30 (3.8\%) | A | 22 (73.3\%) | A | 16 (53.3\%) | A | 3 (10.0\%) | A | 2 (6.7\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | H | 591 (75.8\%) | H | 390 (66.0\%) | H | 272 (46.0\%) | H | 34 (5.8\%) | H | 23 (3.9\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | 0 | 24 (3.1\%) | 0 | 17 (70.8\%) | 0 | 14 (58.3\%) | 0 | 1 (4.2\%) | 0 | $1(4.2 \%)$ |  |  |  |
|  |  | W | 67 (8.6\%) | W | 41 (61.2\%) | W | 32 (47.8\%) | W | 2 (3.0\%) | W | 1 (1.5\%) |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DE Level } 2 \\ & 1,356 \text { (16.9\%) } \end{aligned}$ | AA | 104 (7.7\%) | AA | 67 (64.4\%) | AA | 51 (49.0\%) | AA | 3 (2.9\%) | AA | 2 (1.9\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | A | 18 (1.3\%) | A | 12 (66.7\%) | A | 11 (61.1\%) | A | 4 (22.2\%) | A | 3 (16.7\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | H | 1,078 (79.5\%) | H | 667 (61.9\%) | H | 503 (46.7\%) | H | 81 (7.5\%) | H | 59 (5.5\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | 0 | 14 (1.0\%) | 0 | 9 (64.3\%) | 0 | 8 (57.1\%) | 0 | 2 (14.3\%) | 0 | 2 (14.3\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | W | 142 (10.5\%) | W | 81 (57.0\%) | W | 63 (44.4\%) | W | 17 (12.0\%) | W | 12 (8.5\%) |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DE Level } 3 \\ & 1,761 \text { (22.0\%) } \end{aligned}$ | AA | 111 (6.3\%) | AA | 77 (69.4\%) | AA | 52 (46.8\%) | AA | 70 (63.1\%) | AA | 46 (41.4\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | A | 37 (2.1\%) | A | 31 (83.8\%) | A | 26 (70.3\%) | A | 28 (75.7\%) | A | 23 (62.2\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | H | 1,312 (74.5\%) | H | 928 (70.7\%) | H | 751 (57.2\%) | H | 853 (65.0\%) | H | 681 (51.9\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | 0 | 33 (1.9\%) | 0 | 21 (63.6\%) | 0 | 17 (51.5\%) | 0 | 19 (57.6\%) | 0 | 16 (48.5\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | W | 268 (15.2\%) | W | 186 (69.4\%) | W | 153 (57.1\%) | W | 168 (62.7\%) | W | 139 (51.9\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 4 <br> 3 (0.0\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | A | 1 (33.3\%) | A | 1 (100.0\%) | A | 1 (100.0\%) | A | 1 (100.0\%) | A | 1 (100.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | H | 2 (66.7\%) | H | 1 (50.0\%) | H | 1 (50.0\%) | H | 1 (50.0\%) | H | 1 (50.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | W | 0 (0.0\%) | W | 0 (0.0\%) | W | 0 (0.0\%) | W | 0 (0.0\%) | W | $0(0.0 \%)$ | 3rd Year Data Not Yet Available |  |  |
|  | Total Referred$3,900(48.7 \%)$ | AA | 283 (7.3\%) | AA | 195 (68.9\%) | AA | 135 (47.7\%) | AA | 75 (26.5\%) | AA | 49 (17.3\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | A | 86 (2.2\%) | A | 66 (76.7\%) | A | 54 (62.8\%) | A | 36 (41.9\%) | A | 29 (33.7\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | H | 2,983 (76.5\%) | H | 1,986 (66.6\%) | H | 1,527 (51.2\%) | H | 969 (32.5\%) | H | 764 (25.6\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | 0 | 71 (1.8\%) | 0 | 47 (66.2\%) | 0 | 39 (54.9\%) | 0 | 22 (31.0\%) | 0 | 19 (26.8\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | W | 477 (12.2\%) | W | 308 (64.6\%) | W | 248 (52.0\%) | W | 187 (39.2\%) | W | 152 (31.9\%) |  |  |  |
|  | College Level3,960 (49.5\%) | AA | 256 (6.5\%) | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | A | 78 (2.0\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | H | 2,595 (65.5\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 0 | $83(2.1 \%)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | W | 948 (23.9\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Unknown <br> 144 (1.8\%) | AA | 13 (9.0\%) | AA | 2 (15.4\%) | AA | 2 (15.4\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | A | 2 (1.4\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | H | 84 (58.3\%) | H | 2 (2.4\%) | H | 2 (2.4\%) | H | 2 (2.4\%) | H | 2 (2.4\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | 0 | 4 (2.8\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | W | 41 (28.5\%) | W | 5 (12.2\%) | W | 4 (9.8\%) | W | 5 (12.2\%) | W | 4 (9.8\%) |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cohort Total } \\ & 8,004(100.0 \%) \end{aligned}$ | AA | 552 (6.9\%) | AA | 239 (43.3\%) | AA | 170 (30.8\%) | AA | 117 (21.2\%) | AA | 82 (14.9\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | A | 166 (2.1\%) | A | 77 (46.4\%) | A | 64 (38.6\%) | A | 47 (28.3\%) | A | 39 (23.5\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | H | 5,662 (70.7\%) | H | 2,264 (40.0\%) | H | 1,745 (30.8\%) | H | 1,233 | H | 975 (17.2\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | 0 | 158 (2.0\%) | 0 | 58 (36.7\%) | 0 | 44 (27.8\%) | 0 | 33 (20.9\%) | 0 | 24 (15.2\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | W- | 1,466 (18.3\%) | W | 506 (34.5\%) | W | 409 (27.9\%) | W | 382. $26.1 \%$ ) | W- | 310(21.1\%) |  |  |  |
| AA $=$ African-American |  |  | A A Asian | $\mathrm{H}=$ Hispanic O |  | O = Other $\quad \mathrm{W}=$ White |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

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 Ethnicity:
DE Referrals:

Course Enrollment::

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

## English Progression by Age

In general, of those who were referred, students who were 51 years of age or older successfully passed the English DE courses at the lowest rates. Otherwise, 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, nonreferred students who were age 17-50 experienced large increases in "gatekeeper" success.

|  |  | Referral Level |  | Attempted Any DE (1st Year) |  | Success in Any DE (1st Year) |  | Attempted RSG <br> (1st Year) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Success in RSG } \\ \text { (1st Year) } \end{gathered}$ | Success in High DE (3rd Year) |  | Success in RSG <br> (3rd Year) | Success in GK <br> (3rd Year) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $<17$ | 32 (2.9\%) | $<17$ | 19 (59.4\%) | $<17$ | 14 (43.8\%) | Not Applicable |  | $<17$ | 7 (21.9\%) | Not Applicable | $<17$ | 9 (28.1\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 845 (75.5\%) | 18-21 | 567 (67.1\%) | 18-21 | 358 (42.4\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 199 (23.6\%) |  | 18-21 | 161 (19.1\%) |
|  | DELevel 1 | 22-24 | 55 (4.9\%) | 22-24 | 26 (47.3\%) | 22-24 | 16 (29.1\%) |  |  | 22-24 | $8(14.5 \%)$ |  | $22-24$ | 6 (10.9\%) |
|  | 1,119 (12.2\%) | 25-35 | 120 (10.7\%) | 25-35 | 62 (51.7\%) | 25-35 | 44 (36.7\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 23 (19.2\%) |  | 25-35 | 27 (22.5\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 49 (4.4\%) | $36-50$ | 24 (49.0\%) | $36-50$ | 19 (38.8\%) |  |  | $36-50$ | 8(16.3\%) |  | $36-50$ | 12 (24.5\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | 18 (1.6\%) | 51+ | 10(55.6\%) | 51+ | 6 (33.3\%) |  |  | 51+ | 4 (22.2\%) |  | 51+ | 4 (22.2\%) |
|  |  | $<17$ | 95 (3.2\%) | <17 | 44 (46.3\%) | <17 | 27 (28.4\%) |  |  | <17 | 27 (28.4\%) |  | $<17$ | 32 (33.7\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 2,141 (72.4\%) | 18-21 | 1,297 (60.6\%) | 18-21 | 891 (41.6\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 853 (39.8\%) |  | 18-21 | 750(35.0\%) |
|  | DELevel2 | 22-24 | 200 (6.8\%) | 22-24 | 105 (52.5\%) | $22-24$ | $83(41.5 \%)$ |  |  | 22.24 | 77 (38.5\%) |  | 22.24 | 65 (32.5\%) |
|  | 2,956 (32.2\%) | 25-35 | 331 (11.2\%) | 25-35 | 169 (51.1\%) | 25-35 | 115 (34.7\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 113 (34.1\%) |  | 25-35 | 124 (37.5\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 159 (5.4\%) | $36-50$ | 76 (47.8\%) | $36-50$ | 62 (39.0\%) |  |  | 36-50 | 54 (34.0\%) |  | 36.50 | 54 (34.0\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | $30(1.0 \%)$ | 51+ | 12 (40.0\%) | 51+ | $9(30.0 \%)$ |  |  | 51+ | 8 (26.7\%) |  | 51+ | 12 (40.0\%) |
|  |  | <17 | 127 (3.1\%) | <17 | 63 (49.6\%) | <17 | 41 (32.3\%) |  |  | <17 | 34 (26.8\%) |  | <17 | 41 (32.3\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 2,986 (73.3\%) | 18-21 | 1,864 (62.4\%) | 18-21 | 1,249 (41.8\%) |  |  | 18.21 | 1,052 (35.2\%) |  | 18-21 | 911 (30.5\%) |
|  | Total Referred | 22-24 | 255 (6.3\%) | 22-24 | 131 (51.4\%) | 22-24 | 99 (38.8\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 85 (33.3\%) |  | 22-24 | 71 (27.8\%) |
|  | 4,075 (44.4\%) | 25-35 | 451 (11.1\%) | 25-35 | 231 (51.2\%) | 25-35 | 159 (35.3\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 136 (30.2\%) |  | 25-35 | 151 (33.5\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 208 (5.1\%) | $36-50$ | 100 (48.1\%) | $36-50$ | 81 (38.9\%) |  |  | $36-50$ | 62 (29.8\%) |  | $36-50$ | 66 (31.7\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | 48 (1.2\%) | 51+ | 22 (45.8\%) | 51+ | 15 (31.3\%) |  |  | 51+ | 12 (25.0\%) |  | 51+ | 16 (33.3\%) |
|  | College Level$4,976(54.3 \%)$ | $<17$ | 238 (4.8\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | $<17$ | 133 (55.9\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 3,925 (78.9\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18-21 | 2,139 (54.5\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | 240 (4.8\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 22-24 | 146 (60.8\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 398 (8.0\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 25-35 | 240 (60.3\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | $157(3.2 \%)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 36-50 | 101 (64.3\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | 18 (0.4\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $51+$ | 14 (77.8\%) |
|  | Unknown$120(1.3 \%)$ | <17 | 19 (15.8\%) | $<17$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ | $<17$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ | Not Applicable |  | $<17$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ | Not Applicable | $<17$ | $9(47.4 \%)$ |
|  |  | 18-21 | 41 (34.2\%) | 18-21 | 1 (2.4\%) | $18-21$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  | 18.21 | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  | 18-21 | 5 (12.2\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | 8(6.7\%) | 22-24 | $0(0.0 \%)$ | 22.24 | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  | 22-24 | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  | 22.24 | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 23 (19.2\%) | 25-35 | $0(0.0 \%)$ | 25-35 | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  | 25-35 | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  | 25-35 | 3 (13.0\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 22 (18.3\%) | $36-50$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ | 36.50 | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  | 36-50 | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  | 36.50 | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | 7 (5.8\%) | 51+ | 0(0.0\%) | 51+ | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  | 51+ | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  | Cohort Total9,171(100.0\%) | $<17$ | 384 (4.2\%) | <17 | 69 (18.0\%) | <17 | $46(12.0 \%)$ |  |  | <17 | $38(9.9 \%)$ |  | $<17$ | 183(47.7\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 6,952 (75.8\%) | 18-21 | 2,120 (30.5\%) | 18-21 | 1,441 (20.7\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 1,236 (17.8\%) |  | 18-21 | 3,055 (43.9\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | 503 (5.5\%) | 22-24 | 154 (30.6\%) | 22-24 | 119 (23.7\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 104 (20.7\%) |  | 22-24 | 217 (43.1\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 872 (9.5\%) | 25-35 | 255 (29.2\%) | 25-35 | 183 (21.0\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 159 (18.2\%) |  | 25-35 | 394 (45.2\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 387 (4.2\%) | $36-50$ | 112 (28.9\%) | $36-50$ | 93 (24.0\%) |  |  | 36-50 | 73 (18.9\%) |  | 36-50 | 167 (43.2\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | 73 $10.8 \% 1$ | 51+ | 23(31.5\%) | 51+ | 15(20.5\%) |  |  | 51+ | 12 (16.4\%). |  | 51+ | 30(41.1\%) |

## Notes:

1) Attempted = student received a grade for course (includes variations of W); Completed = student received a grade of A, B, C, D, F, I, 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 Age:
DE Referrals:
Course Enrollment::
ACCDODS1.XST_ATD_ACCD
Fall 2011: ACCDODS1.ATD_F10_F11_ODS_TASP, Fall 2012: ACCDODS1.ATD_F10_F13_ODS_TASP, Fall 2013-Fall 2015:
ACCDODS1.XST_ATD_ACCD
ACCDODS1.XST.IRES_SC

## English Progression by Age (continued)

|  |  | Referral Level |  | Attempted Any DE (1st Year) |  | Succers in Any DE (1stYear) |  | Atte mptad RSG $\qquad$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Success in RSG } \\ \text { (1stYest) } \end{gathered}$ | Sucters in High DE (3rdYear) |  | Success in RSG (3rd Year) |  | Success in GK (3rdYear) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \frac{5}{2} \\ & \frac{2}{6} \\ & \stackrel{N}{2} \\ & \underset{2}{2} \end{aligned}$ | DELoval 1 826 (10.3\%) | 417 | 19 (2330) | 47 | 14(73764) | 47 | 9(47.46) | Not Applictile |  | 47 | 5(2636) | 47 | 0[006] | 47 | 3(15.846) |
|  |  | 18.21 | 635 (76.94) | 18.21 | $448770.666]$ | 18.21 | $314 / 49.456)$ |  |  |  | 18.21 | 189 [29.86) | 18.21 | 5 (0.86) | 18.21 | 169 (26.6\%) |
|  |  | 22.24 | 40(4.86) | 22.24 | 15 \|40.006 | 22.24 | 8(200\%) |  |  | 22.24 | 7 (17.56) | $22 \cdot 24$ | 010.06/ | 22.24 | 7 (17.56) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 82 (9930) | 25-35 | $40\|48836\|$ | 25-35 | $29(35.4 \times$ ) |  |  | 25-35 | 18 (2203) | 25-35 | 1(12w) | 25-35 | 22 (26.83) |
|  |  | 36.50 | 43 (5.26) | 36.50 | $21 / 48.86]^{\text {] }}$ | 36.50 | 18 [41.96] |  |  | 36.50 | 12 [27.936] | 36.50 | 010066 | 36.50 | 10(23.36) |
|  |  | $51+$ | 710.84) | $51+$ | 3/62.96) | $51+$ | 1(14.36) |  |  | $51+$ | 1(14.36) | $51+$ | 0 (0.06) | $51+$ | $1(14.36)$ |
|  | DELevel 2 2,118 [26.46) | 47 | $86(4.15)$ | 47 | 36 [4190] | 17 | 22 (25.66) |  |  | 47 | 22 (25.60) | 47 | 010.065 | 47 | 21 (24.46/9) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 1.523 (7198) | 18-21 | 757 (49.74) | 18-21 | $544(357 \%)$ |  |  | 18-21 | 513 (34064) | 18-21 | 15 (10\%) | 18-21 | 518 (34.04) |
|  |  | 22.24 | 158 (7.56) | 22.24 | 65 (41.84] | 22.24 | 51 (32.36) |  |  | 22.24 | 49 (31045] | 22.24 | 0 [0.04] | 22.24 | 41 (25.94) |
|  |  | 25.35 | 234 (11.04) | 25.35 | 82 [35.06] | 25.35 | 65 (27.85) |  |  | 25.35 | $65[28.2 \mathrm{~W}]$ | 25.35 | $10.465)$ | 25.35 | $71(30.36)$ |
|  |  | $36-50$ | $98(4.6 \mathrm{M}]$ | 36.50 | 34 (34.76] | 36-50 | 26 (26.5\%) |  |  | 36-50 | $24.24 .50]$ | 36-50 | 010.06\% | 36.50 | 36 (36.7\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | 19 (0.90) | 51+ | 4\|21.15] | 51+ | 3(15.83) |  |  | $51+$ | 4 [21.150] | 51+ | 010063] | 51+ | 7 (36.844) |
|  | Total Referred 2.944 (36.7\%) | 47 | 105 (3.64) | 47 | 50\|67.66| | 47 | $31.29 .56 / 4$ |  |  | 47 | 27 [25.76] | d7 | 0 0,0.06 $]$ | d7 | 24 (22.96) |
|  |  | 18.21 | 2,158(73.36) | 18.21 | 1,205 (35.86) | 18.21 | 858 (19.04) |  |  | 18.21 | 707 (32.8W) | 18.21 | 20 (0.9\%) | 18.21 | 687 (31.86\%) |
|  |  | 22.24 | 198 (670) | 22-24 | $82\|41.4 \times 3\|$ | 22.24 | 59 (29.834) |  |  | 22-24 | 55 (28.36) | $22 \cdot 24$ | 0, $00 \times 31$ | 22-24 | 48 (24.296) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 316 (20.74) | 25-35 | 122 (38.64) | 25-35 | 94(29.74) |  |  | 25-35 | $84(26.6 \mathrm{~W})$ | 25-35 | 210.6 6 ) | 25-35 | 93( 29.446 ) |
|  |  | 3650 | 141/4.84] | 3650 | 55 (39.006] | 36.50 | $44(31.26)$ |  |  | 3650 | 36 [25.56] | 3650 | $010.0 \mathrm{~m} \mid$ | 3650 | 46 (32.66) |
|  |  | 51 * | 26 (0.93) | 51. | $7(26.96)$ | 51. | 4 (15.460) |  |  | 51. | 5 (19.2w) | 51. | 010.06\% | 51. | $8(30.854)$ |
|  | Collage Leval <br> 4,908 (62.3W) | 47 | 225 (4.56) |  |  |  |  | Net Applicable |  |  |  |  |  | 47 | 125 (55.64) |
|  |  | 18.21 | 4,337 $136.96{ }^{\text {m }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18.21 | 2,574 (59.36) |
|  |  | 22.24 | $131(2.6 \mathrm{k})$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 22.24 | $92(70.26)$ |
|  |  | $25-35$ | $216(4,33)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 25-35 | 170 (78.74) |
|  |  | $36-50$ | 70 (1.45) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 36.50 | $54(77.14)$ |
|  |  | $51+$ | $9(0.2 \mathrm{k})$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $51+$ | 6(66.2\%) |
|  | Uninown 79(1.06) | 47 | 1(133) | 47 | 010.061 | 47 | 010.0 NW | Not/pplicable |  | 47 | 010.0w | 47 | 010.061 | 47 | $010.067)$ |
|  |  | 18-21 | $3814814 \mid$ | 18-21 | 6(15884) | 18.21 | 6(15 8m) |  |  | 18.21 | $5(1324)$ | 18-21 | 0100041 | 18-21 | 19 (50.04) |
|  |  | 22.24 | $7(896]$ | 22.24 | Opown | 22.24 | O10.0W |  |  | 22.24 | 010.0.w | 22.24 | 010.061 | 22.24 | 2 (28.644) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 17 [21.56) | 25.35 | 0 0,0.0w | 25.35 | $010.06)$ |  |  | 25.35 | O10.0w] | 25.35 | 010.061 | 25-35 | $5(29.469)$ |
|  |  | 36-50 | $10[12.7 \mathrm{~m} \mid$ | 36.50 | 010061 | 36.50 | 0100 w |  |  | 36-50 | 0100 W | 36-50 | 0100 m | 36.50 | $1(10.046)$ |
|  |  | $51+$ | 6(7.64) | 51- | 0 0,004] | 51- | $0[00 \mathrm{~m}]$ |  |  | $51 \cdot$ | $010.06 \mid$ | $51+$ | $0100 \mathrm{~m})$ | $51 \cdot$ | $010.04)$ |
|  | Cohert Total $8.011(100006)$ | 47 | $3314.14]$ | 47 | 57 [27.24] | 47 | 35 (20.64) |  |  | 47 | 3199.46 | 47 | 01006 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 47 | 149 (45.044) |
|  |  | 18.21 | 6,533 (101.64) | 18.21 | 1,376 [21.19] | 18.21 | 944 (15:13) |  |  | 18.21 | 821 (12.66) | 1021 | $330.5 \mathrm{~W})$ | 10.21 | 3,200 (50.26) |
|  |  | 22.24 | $336(42 \mathrm{w})$ | $22 \cdot 24$ | $84350 \mathrm{~cm}]$ | 22.24 | $61(882 \mathrm{~W})$ |  |  | 22.24 | 58 [17. 3m] | $22-24$ | $0 \cdot 0040$ | 22.24 | 142 (42.34) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 549 [694] | 25.35 | 123 (22.46) | 25-35 | 95 (17.34) |  |  | 25-35 | 85 (25 54) | 25-35 | 2 (0.44) | 25-35 | 268 (48.84) |
|  |  | 36.50 | $221 / 2 \mathrm{MW\mid}$ | 3650 | $56.253 \mathrm{3W}$ | 36.50 | 45 [20.4.6) |  |  | 3650 | $37(26.76)$ | 3650 | $010.06)$ | 3650 | 101 (45.76) |
|  |  | 51. | 410.5 M | 51. | 7 (177.15) | 51. | $4(9.8 \mathrm{~W})$ |  |  | 51. | $5(12.2 \mathrm{~W})$ | 51. | $010.0 \mathrm{~W})$ | 51. | 14434.15) |
|  | Students Unactounted For 274 \|Cohort Tota: 1,205) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \frac{5}{9} \\ & \frac{1}{8} \\ & \frac{n}{0} \\ & \frac{2}{5} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DELEval 1 } \\ & 1,299(16.6 \mathrm{~W}) \end{aligned}$ | 47 | $32(2.56)$ | 47 | 18 (56.36) | 47 | 15 (46.96) | NotApplicable |  | 47 | 8 (25.046) | 47 | 1(3.16) | 47 | 11-34.45] |
|  |  | 1821 | 963 (74.16) | 1821 | 578150.066 | 1821 | 422 [43.86) |  |  | 18.21 | $166(17.26)$ | 18.21 | $37(3.864)$ | 18.21 | 205 (29.6\%) |
|  |  | 22.24 | 3416.56) | 22.24 | 45 (53.606) | 22.24 | 29 (34.56) |  |  | 22-24 | 13 (15.55) | 22-24 | 1 (1.26) | 22.24 | 14 (16.7\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 140 (10.84) | 25.35 | 75 (53.654) | 25.35 | $54(38.651)$ |  |  | 25-35 | 25 (17.941) | 25-35 | $5(3.654)$ | 25-35 | 48 (34.36) |
|  |  | 36.50 | 65 (5.16) | 36.50 | 29 (43.96) | 36.50 | 23 (34.85] |  |  | 36.50 | 21 (16.76) | 36.50 | $010.066)$ | 36-50 | 22 (33.35) |
|  |  | $51+$ | $14(1.16)$ | $51+$ | 7 (50.0\%6) | $51+$ | $3(21.400$ |  |  | $51+$ | 010.065 | $51+$ | 010.065 | $51+$ | 2(14.36) |
|  | DE Level2 1,532 (19.64) | 47 | $60(3.94)$ | 47 | 36(60.086) | 47 | $28146.7 \% \mid$ |  |  | 47 | 23 (38.33) | 47 | 2(3.36) | 47 | 31 (51.7\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 1,887(7104) | 1821 | 614(56.54) | 18.21 | 439 (45.086) |  |  | 18-21 | $437(40.24)$ | 18.21 | $31(2.946)$ | 18.21 | 520 [47.840] |
|  |  | 22.24 | 125 (826) | 22.24 | 58 (45.46) |  |  |  |  | 22.24 | 40(32.06) | 22.24 | 10.846 | 22.24 | 65 (52.06) |
|  |  | 25.35 | 194 (12.76) | 2535 | 106 (54.646) | 2535 | 06(4.336) |  |  | 25.35 | 75 (38.7\%) | 25.35 | $3(1.54)$ | 25.35 | 99 (51.06) |
|  |  | 36-50 | $55(3.76)$ | 3650 | 30 (53.681) | 36-50 | 26 (4.438]) |  |  | 36.50 | 22 (39.36) | 36-50 | $3(5.46)$ | $36-50$ | 28 (50.0\%) |
|  |  | $51+$ | 1010.74) | 51- | 3(30.065) | 51+ | $3(30085)$ |  |  | $51+$ | 1 (1000\%) | $51+$ | 1(10.04) | 51+ | 1 (100\% $]$ |
|  | Total Referred 2,831 (36.23) | 47 | $92(3.26)$ | 47 | 54(58.76) | 47 | 43 (46.7\%) |  |  | 47 | 31 (33.7\%) | 47 | 3(3.36) | 47 | 42 [45.76] |
|  |  | 1821 | 2,050(72.46) | 1821 | 1,192 (58.160) | 1821 | 911/44.46\| |  |  | 18.21 | $603(29.46)$ | 18.21 | 68(3.36) | 18.21 | 005 (39.3\%) |
|  |  | 22.24 | 209 (7.44) | 22.24 | 103 (49.36) | 22-24 | 72 (34.439] |  |  | 22-24 | $53(25.436)$ | 22-24 | 2 (1.066) | 22-24 | 79 (37.83\% |
|  |  | 25-35 | 334 (11.84) | 25.35 | 181 (54.269) | 25.35 | 140(41.980) |  |  | 25.35 | 100 (29944) | 25.35 | $8(2.46)$ | 25-35 | 147 (44.08) |
|  |  | 36.50 | 122 (4,36) | 3650 | 59 (48.46) | 36.50 | 49 [40.25] |  |  | 3650 | $33(27.046)$ | 36.50 | $3(2.549$ | 36.50 | $50 / 41.0 \%$ ] |
|  |  | 51 | 2410.849 | 51. | 10(41.7\%) | $51+$ | 6 (25.0\%) |  |  | $51+$ | 14.26) | 51. | 1 (4.26) | 51. | $3(12.5 \%)$ |
|  | Collage Leval 4,889 (62.56) | 47 | 204 (4.294) |  |  |  |  | Not Appliceble |  |  |  |  |  | 47 | 151 (74.036) |
|  |  | 18.21 | 4,390(39884) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18-21 | 3,107 (70.85) |
|  |  | $22.24$ | 98 (206) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 22.24 | 74/75.54) |
|  |  | 25.35 | 145 (1.06) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 25-35 | 104(71.7\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 47 (1.06) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 36-50 | 39 (83.0\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | 5(0.3\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 51+ | 3(60.055] |
|  | Uninown$108(1.43)$ | 47 | 10.96) | 47 | 010.06 | 47 | 0 O(0.06) | Not Applicable |  | 47 | 010.046 | 47 | 010.064) | 47 | 1 (100.0\%) |
|  |  | 18.21 | 42 (1889\%) | 1821 | $4(19.536)$ | 18.21 | $2(4.366)$ |  |  | 18.21 | 1(2.46) | 18.21 | 010.065 ) | 18-21 | 14 (33.3\%) |
|  |  | 22.24 | 26 (24.197) | $22-24$ | 010.051 | 22-24 | 0 (0.056) |  |  | 22-24 | 010.081 | $22 \cdot 24$ | 010.036 | 22-24 | 16 (61.5\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 29 (26.94) | 25.35 | 1(3.46) | 25-35 | 0 [0.065) |  |  | 25.35 | 010.046 | 25.35 | 1(3.456) | 25-35 | 16 (55.25) |
|  |  | 3650 | 8 (7.44) | 3650 | 1(12.56) | 3650 | 1(12.56) |  |  | 3650 | $010.064)$ | 36.50 | 010.069 | 36.50 | 4 (50.0\%) |
|  |  | 51. | $2(1946)$ | 51. | 010.039 | $51 \cdot$ | $010.085)$ |  |  | 51. | 010.065 | 51. | 010.0619 | 51. | 0(0.0\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | 47 | 297 (3.84) | 47 | 55 (18.59]) | 47 | 43 (14.53) |  |  | 47 | $31(10.49)$ | 47 | 5 (1.76) | 47 | 194 [65.34] |
|  |  | 18.21 | 6,482(32.86) | 18.21 | 1,293(19.94) | 18.21 | 982 (15.15) |  |  | 18-21 | 658 (10.24) | 18-21 | 103 (1.64) | 18-21 | 3,926 (60.65) |
|  |  | 22.24 | 333(4.36) | 2224 | 103 (30.946) | 22.24 | 72 (21.64) |  |  | 22.24 | $53(15.946)$ | 22.24 | 310.969 | 22.24 | 169 (50.84) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 508 (6.5\%) | 25.35 | 184 (36.296) | 25-35 | 142 (28.036) |  |  | 25.35 | 101 (19.946) | 25-35 | $9(1.866)$ | 25-35 | 267 (52.6\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 177 (2,36) | 36.50 | 60, 33.596 | 36-50 | 50 (28.23) |  |  | 36-50 | 33 (18864) | 36-50 | $3(1.74)$ | 36.50 | 93(52.5m) |
|  |  | - $51+$ | -310.461 | - $51+$ | 10132 3 [4] | 51+ | 6612.45] |  |  | - 51\% | - 13.323. | - 51 | 113.241 |  | - 5 [19.436. |

English Progression by Age (continued)


## English Progression by Enrollment Status

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

|  |  |  | rral Level |  | pted Any DE <br> st Year) |  | in Any DE Year) | Attempted RSG (1st Year) | Success in RSG (1st Year) |  | in High DE <br> Year) | Success in RSG <br> (3rd Year) |  | cess in GK (3rd Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{7}{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\sim} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | DELevel 1 | FT | 337 (30.1\%) | FT | 262 (77.7\%) | FT | 167 (49.6\%) | Not Applicable |  | FT | 87 (25.8\%) | Not Applicable | FT | 71 (21.1\%) |
|  | 1,119 (12.2\%) | PT | 782 (69.99\%) | PT | 446 (57.0\%) | PT | 290 (37.1\%) |  |  | PT | 162 (20.7\%) |  | PT | 148 (18.9\%) |
|  | DELevel 2 | FT | 1,110(37.6\%) | FT | 772 (69.5\%) | FT | 552 (49.7\%) |  |  | FT | 536 (48.3\%) |  | FT | 466 (42.0\%) |
|  | 2,956 (32.2\%) | PT | 1,846 (62.4\%) | PT | 931 (50.4\%) | PT | 635 (34.4\%) |  |  | PT | 596 (32.3\%) |  | PT | 571 (30.9\%) |
|  | Total Referred | FT | 1,447 (35.5\%) | FT | 1,034 (71.5\%) | FT | 719 (49.7\%) |  |  | FT | 623 (43.1\%) |  | FT | 537 (37.1\%) |
|  | 4,075 (44.4\%) | PT | 2,628(64.5\%) | PT | 1,377 (52.4\%) | PT | 925 (35.2\%) |  |  | PT | 758 (28.8\%) |  | PT | 719 (27.4\%) |
|  | College Level | FT | 2,560 (51.4\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | FT | 1,484 (58.0\%) |
|  | 4,976 (54.3\%) | PT | 2,416 (48.6\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PT | 1,289 (53.4\%) |
|  | Unknown | FT | 16 (13.3\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable | FT | 1 (6.3\%) |
|  | 120 (1.3\%) | PT | 104 (86.7\%) | PT | 1(1.0\%) | PT | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | PT | 0 (0.0\%6) |  | PT | 16 (15.4\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | FT | 4,023 (43.9\%) | FT | 1,171(29.1\%) | FT | 821 (20.4\%) |  |  | FT | 721 (17.9\%) |  | FT | 2,022 (50.3\%) |
|  | 9,171(100.0\% | PT | 5,148(56.1\%) | PT | 1,562 (30.3\%) | PT | ,076 (20.9\%) |  |  | PT | 901 (17.5\%) |  | PT | 2,024 (39.3\%) |
|  | DELevel 1 | FT | 203 (24.6\%) | FT | 168 (82.8\%) | FT | 115 (56.7\%) | Not Applicable |  | FT | 72 (35.5\%) | FT $10.5 \%)$ | FT | 60 (29.6\%) |
|  | 826 (10.3\%) | PT | 623 (75.4\%) | PT | 374 (60.0\%) | PT | 264 (42.4\%) |  |  | PT | 160 (25.7\%) | PT $\quad 5(0.8 \%)$ | PT | 152 (24.4\%) |
|  | DELevel 2 | FT | 668 (31.5\%) | FT | 365 (54.6\%) | FT | 270 (40.4\%) |  |  | FT | 263 (39.4\%) | FT $\quad 7(1.0 \%)$ | FT | 242 (36.2\%) |
|  | 2,118 (26.4\%) | PT | 1,450(68.5\%) | PT | 614 (42.3\%) | PT | 441 (30.4\%) |  |  | PT | 420 (29.0\%) | PT $\quad 9(0.6 \%)$ | PT | 452 (31.2\%) |
|  | Total Referred | FT | 871 (29.6\%) | FT | 533 (61.2\%) | FT | 385 (44.2\%) |  |  | FT | 335 (38.5\%) | FT 8 (0.9\%) | FT | 302 (34.7\%) |
|  | 2,944 (36.7\%) | PT | 2,073 (70.4\%) | PT | 988 (47.7\%) | PT | 705 (34.0\%) |  |  | PT | 580 (28.0\%) | PT $14(0.7 \%)$ | PT | 604 (29.1\%) |
|  | College Level | FT | 2,560 (51.3\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | FT | 1,628 (63.6\%) |
|  | 4,988 (62.3\%) | PT | 2,428 (48.7\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PT | 1,393 (57.4\%) |
|  | Unknown | FT | 30 (38.0\%) | FT | 1(3.3\%) | FT | 1(3.3\%) | Not Applicable |  | FT | 1 (3.3\%) | FT 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 13 (43.3\%) |
|  | 79 (1.0\%) | PT | 49 (62.0\%) | PT | 5 (10.2\%) | PT | 5 (10.2\%) |  |  | PT | 4(8.2\%) | PT 0 (0.0\%) | PT | 14 (28.6\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | FT | 3,461 (43.2\%) | FT | 611 (17.7\%) | FT | 446 (12.9\%) |  |  | FT | 390 (11.3\%) | FT 14 (0.4\%) | FT | 1,943 (56.1\%) |
|  | 8,011 (100.0\%) | PT | 4,550 (56.8\%) | PT | 1,092 (24.0\%) | PT | 778 (17.1\%) |  |  | PT | 647 (14.2\%) | PT 21 (0.5\%) | PT | 2,011 (44.2\%) |
|  | Students Unaccounted For 274 (Cohort Total: 8,285) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | DELevel 1 | FT | 318(24.5\%) | FT | 263 (82.7\%) | FT | 171(53.8\%) | Not Applicable |  | FT | 57 (17.99\%) | FT - 5(1.6\%) | FT | 88 (27.7\%) |
|  | 1,299 (16.6\%) | PT | 981 (75.5\%) | PT | 489 (49.8\%) | PT | 375 (38.2\%) |  |  | PT | 166 (16.9\%) | PT 39 (4.0\%) | PT | 294 (30.0\%) |
|  | DELevel2 | FT | 514 (33.6\%) | FT | 348 (67.7\%) | FT | 280(54.5\%) |  |  | FT | 244 (47.5\%) | FT $12(2.3 \%)$ | FT | 265 (51.6\%) |
|  | 1,532 (19.6\%) | PT | 1,018 (66.4\%) | PT | 499 (49.0\%) | PT | 395 (38.8\%) |  |  | PT | 354 (34.8\%) | PT $\quad 29(2.8 \%)$ | PT | 479 (47.1\%) |
|  | Total Referred | FT | 832 (29.4\%) | FT | 611 (73.4\%\%) | FT | 451 (54.2\%) |  |  | FT | 301 (36.2\%) | FT 17 (2.086) | FT | 353 (42.4\%) |
|  | 2,831 (36.2\%) | PT | 1,999 (70.6\%) | PT | 988 (49.4\%) | PT | 770 (38.5\%) |  |  | PT | 520 (26.0\%) | PT 68 (3.4\%) | PT | 773 (38.7\%) |
|  | College Level | FT | 2,765 (56.6\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | FT | 2,061 (74.5\%) |
|  | 4,889 (62.5\%) | PT | 2,124 (43.4\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PT | 1,417 (66.7\%) |
|  | Unknown | FT | 46 (42.6\%) | FT | 2 (4.3\%) | FT | 1(2.28) | Not Applicable |  | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT $0(0.0 \%)$ | FT | 27 (58.7\%) |
|  | 108 (1.4\%) | PT | 62 (57.4\%) | PT | 4 (6.5\%) | PT | 2 (3.2\%) |  |  | PT | 1 (1.6\%) | PT 1(1.6\%) | PT | 24 (38.7\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | FT | 3,643 (46.5\%) | FT | 654 (18.0\%) | FT | 483 (13.3\%) |  |  | FT | 326 (8.9\%) | FT 39 (1.1\%) | FT | 2,441 (67.0\%) |
|  | 7.8288(100.0\%\% | PT | 4,185 (53.5\%) |  | 1,051(25.1\%) | PT | 812 (19.4\%9) |  |  | PT | 551 (13.2\%) | PT-_85 (2.0\%) |  | 2,214(52.9\%) |

Notes:

1) Attempted = student received a grade for course (includes variations of W); Completed = student received a grade of $A, B, C, D, F, I, I P$, or $P$ for course; Success = student received a grade of A, B, or C for course.
2) 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_ATD_ACCD
Fall 2011: ACCDODS1.ATD_F10_F11_ODS_TASP, Fall 2012: ACCDODS1.ATD_F10_F13_ODS_TASP, Fall 2013-Fall 2015:
ACCDODS1.XST_ATD_ACCD
ACCDODS1.XST.IRES_SC

## English Progression by Enrollment Status (Continued)

|  |  | Referral Level |  | Attempted Any DE (1st Year) |  | Success in Any DE (1st Year) |  | Attempted RSG <br> (1st Year) |  | Success in RSG <br> (1st Year) |  | Success in High DE (3rdYear) | Success in RSG (3rd Year) | Success in GK <br> (3rd Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DELevel 1 | FT | 161 (22.2\%) | FT | 117 (72.7\%) | FT | 81(50.3\%) | FT | 6 (3.7\%) | FT | $1(0.6 \%)$ | 3rd Year Data Not Yet Available |  |  |
|  | 724 (9.2\%) | PT | 563 (77.8\%) | PT | 384 (68.2\%) | PT | 253 (44.9\%) | PT | 29 (5.2\%) | PT | 18 (3.2\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DELevel 2 | FT | 282 (28.9\%) | FT | 181 (64.2\%) | FT | 137 (48.6\%) | FT | 18 (6.4\%) | FT | $12(4.3 \%)$ |  |  |  |
|  | 975 (12.4\%) | PT | 693 (71.1\%) | PT | 416 (60.0\%) | PT | 300 (43.3\%) | PT | 48 (6.9\%) | PT | 31 (4.5\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DELevel 3 | FT | 301 (31.4\%) | FT | 175 (58.1\%) | FT | 135 (44.9\%) | FT | 154 (51.2\%) | FT | 116 (38.5\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 959 (12.2\%) | PT | 658 (68.6\%) | PT | 437 (66.4\%) | PT | 340 (51.7\%) | PT | 388 (59.0\%) | PT | 306 (46.5\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DELevel 4 | FT | $3(23.1 \%)$ | FT | 3 (100.0\%) | FT | 3 (100.0\%) | FT | 3 (100.0\%) | FT | 3 (100.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 13 (0.2\%) | PT | 10 (76.9\%) | PT | 8 (80.0\%) | PT | 7 (70.0\%) | PT | 8 (80.0\%) | PT | 7 (70.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Total Referred | FT | 747 (28.0\%) | FT | 476 (63.7\%) | FT | 356 (47.7\%) | FT | 181 (24.2\%) | FT | 132 (17.7\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 2,671 (33.9\%) | PT | 1,924 (72.0\%) | PT | 1,245 (64.7\%) | PT | 900 (46.8\%) | PT | 473 (24.6\%) | PT | 362 (18.8\%) |  |  |  |
|  | College Level | FT | 2,613 (54.3\%) | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 4,810(61.1\%) | PT | 2,197 (45.7\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Unknown | FT | 97 (24.4\%) | FT | 11(11.3\%) | FT | 6(6.2\%) | FT | 11 (11.3\%) | FT | $6(6.2 \%)$ |  |  |  |
|  | 397 (5.0\%) | PT | 300 (75.6\%) | PT | 37 (12.3\%) | PT | 24 (8.0\%) | PT | 36 (12.0\%) | PT | 24 (8.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Cohort Total | FT | 3,457 (43.9\%) | FT | 795 (23.0\%) | FT | 619 (17.9\%) | FT | 491 (14.2\%) | FT | 385 (11.1\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 7,878 (100.0\%) | PT | -4.421 (56.1\%) | PT | 1,519(34.45\%) | PT- | 1,104 (25.0\%) | PT | 731 (16.5\%) | PT | 553 (12.5\%). |  |  |  |
|  | DELevel 1 | FT | 143 (18.3\%) | FT | 114 (79.7\%) | FT | 88 (61.5\%) | FT | 10 (7.0\%) | FT | $8(5.6 \%)$ | 3rd Year Data Not Yet Available |  |  |
|  | 780(9.7\%) | PT | 637 (81.7\%) | PT | 407 (63.9\%) | PT | 278 (43.6\%) | PT | 32 (5.0\%) | PT | 20 (3.1\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DELevel2 | FT | 335 (24.7\%) | FT | 219 (65.4\%\%) | FT | 187 (55.8\%) | FT | 17 (5.1\%) | FT | 13 (3.9\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 1,356 (16.9\%) | PT | 1,021 (75.3\%) | PT | 617 (60.4\%) | PT | 449 (44.0\%) | PT | 90 (8.8\%) | PT | 65 (6.4\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DELevel 3 | FT | 673 (38.2\%) | FT | 495 (73.6\%) | FT | 421 (62.6\%) | FT | 471 (70.0\%) | FT | 399 (59.3\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 1,761 (22.0\%) | PT | 1,088(61.8\%) | PT | 748 (68.8\%) | PT | 578 (53.1\%) | PT | 667 (61.3\%) | PT | 506 (46.5\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DELevel 4 | FT | 1(33.3\%) | FT | 1 (100.0\%) | FT | 1 (100.0\%) | FT | 1 (100.0\%) | FT | 1 (100.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 3 (0.0\%) | PT | 2(66.7\%) | PT | 1 (50.0\%) | PT | 1 (50.0\%) | PT | 1(50.0\%) | PT | 1 (50.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Total Referred | FT | 1,152 (29.5\%) | FT | 829 (72.0\%) | FT | 697 (60.5\%) | FT | 499 (43.3\%) | FT | 421 (36.5\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 3,900 (48.7\%) | PT | 2,748 (70.5\%) | PT | 1,773 (64.5\%) | PT | 1,306 (47.5\%) | PT | 790 (28.7\%) | PT | 592 (21.5\%) |  |  |  |
|  | College Level | FT | 2,070 (52.3\%) | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3,960 (49.5\%) | PT | 1,890 (47.7\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Unknown | FT | 30 (20.8\%) | FT | 2(6.7\%) | FT | 2(6.7\%) | FT | 2 (6.7\%) | FT | $2(6.7 \%)$ |  |  |  |
|  | $144(1.8 \%)$ | PT | 114 (79.2\%) | PT | 7 (6.1\%) | PT | 6(5.3\%) | PT | 5(4.4\%) | PT | 4(3.5\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Cohort Total | FT | 3,252 (40.6\%) | FT | 1,118 (34.4\%) | FT | 937 (28.8\%) | FT | 785 (24.1\%) | FT | 659 (20.3\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 8,004 (100.0\%) | PT | 4,752 (59.4\%) | PT | 2,026 (42.6\%\%) | PT | 1.495 (31.5\%) | _PI | 1,027(21.6\%) | PT | 771 (16.2\%). |  |  |  |

## English Progression by Pell Status

Of those who were referred, Pell recipients successfully passed English DE courses at higher rates than did non-Pell recipients. Non-Pell recipients performed better in the English "gatekeeper" course than did Pell recipients (except 2011 cohort). When comparing the 2011 cohort to the 2013 cohort, referred and non-referred students (both Pell and non-Pell) experienced increases in "gatekeeper" success.

|  |  |  | erral Level |  | pted Any DE <br> st Year) |  | ss in Any DE <br> st Year) | Attempted RSG <br> (1st Year) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Success in RSG } \\ \text { (1st Year) } \end{gathered}$ |  | $s$ in High DE (Bd Year) | Success in RSG <br> (3rd Year) |  | cess in GK <br> (3rd Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DELevel 1 | $Y$ | 707 (63.2\%) | $Y$ | 506 (71.6\%) | Y | 320 (45.3\%) | Not Applicable |  | Y | 172 (24.3\%) | Not Applicable | Y | 149 (21.1\%) |
|  | 1,119 (12.2\%) | N | 412 (36.8\%) | N | 202 (49.0\%) | N | 137 (33.3\%) |  |  | N | 77 (18.7\%) |  | N | 70 (17.0\%) |
|  | DELevel 2 | $Y$ | 1,708 (57.8\%) | Y | 1,077 (63.1\%) | Y | 735 (43.0\%) |  |  | $Y$ | 698 (40.9\%) |  | Y | 621 (36.4\%) |
|  | 2,956 (32.2\%) | N | 1,248 (42.2\%) | N | 626 (50.2\%) | N | 452 (36.2\%) |  |  | N | 434 (34.8\%) |  | N | 416 (33.3\%) |
|  | Total Referred | Y | 2,415 (59.3\%) | Y | 1,583 (65.5\%) | $Y$ | 1,055 (43.7\%) |  |  | Y | 870 (36.0\%) |  | Y | 770 (31.9\%) |
|  | 4,075 (44.4\%) | N | 1,660 (40.7\%) | N | 828 (49.9\%) | N | 589 (35.5\%) |  |  | N | 511 (30.8\%) |  | N | 486 (29.3\%) |
|  | College Level | Y | 2,470 (49.6\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | Y | 1,438 (58.2\%) |
|  | 4,976 (54.3\%) | N | 2,506 (50.4\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | N | 1,335 (53.3\%) |
|  | Unknown | Y | 46 (38.3\%) | $Y$ | $0(0.0 \%$ ) | $Y$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ | Not Applicable |  | $Y$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ | Not Applicable | $Y$ | 7 (15.2\%) |
|  | 120 (1.3\%) | N | 74 (61.7\%) | N | 1 (1.4\%) | N | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  | N | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  | N | 10 (13.5\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | Y | 4,931 (53.8\%) | Y | 1,767 (35.8\%) | Y | 1,202 (24.4\%) |  |  | Y | 1,008 (20.4\%) |  | Y | 2,215 (44.9\%) |
|  | 9,171(100.0\%) | N | 4,240(46.2\%) | N | 966 (22.8\%) | N | 695 (16.4\%) |  |  | N | 614 (14.5\%) |  | N | 1,831 (43.2\%) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { to } \\ & 0 \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & N \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & N \\ & \bar{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | DELevel 1 | Y | 567 (68.6\%) | Y | 410 (72.3\%) | $Y$ | 282 (49.7\%) | Not Applicable |  | Y | 169 (29.8\%) | $Y$ Y 3 (0.5\%) | $Y$ | 137 (24.2\%) |
|  | 826 (10.3\%) | N | 259 (31.4\%) | N | 132 (51.0\%) | N | 97 (37.5\%) |  |  | N | 63 (24.3\%) | $\mathrm{N} \quad 3$ (1.2\%) | N | 75 (29.0\%) |
|  | DELevel 2 | Y | 1,313 (62.0\%) | Y | 677 (51.6\%) | $Y$ | 484 (36.9\%) |  |  | Y | 462 (35.2\%) | $Y \quad 5(0.4 \%)$ | $Y$ | 442 (33.7\%) |
|  | 2,118 (26.4\%) | N | 805 (38.0\%) | N | 302 (37.5\%) | N | 227 (28.2\%) |  |  | N | 221 (27.5\%) | $\mathrm{N} \quad 11(1.4 \%)$ | N | 252 (31.3\%) |
|  | Total Referred | Y | 1,880 (63.9\%) | Y | 1,087 (57.8\%) | Y | 766 (40.7\%) |  |  | $Y$ | 631 (33.6\%) | Y ) 8(0.4\%) | Y | 579 (30.8\%) |
|  | 2,944 (36.7\%) | N | 1,064 (36.1\%) | N | 434 (40.8\%) | N | 324 (30.5\%) |  |  | N | 284 (26.7\%) | $\mathrm{N} \quad 14$ (1.3\%) | N | 327 (30.7\%) |
|  | College Level | Y | 2,498 (50.1\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | Y | 1,546 (61.9\%) |
|  | 4,988 (62.3\%) | N | 2,490 (49.9\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | N | 1,475 (59.2\%) |
|  | Unknown | Y | 33 (41.8\%) | $Y$ | 3 (9.1\%) | $Y$ | 3 (9.1\%) | Not Applicable |  | $Y$ | 3 (9.1\%) | $Y \quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | Y | 12 (36.4\%) |
|  | 79 (1.0\%) | N | 46 (58.2\%) | N | 3 (6.5\%) | N | 3 (6.5\%) |  |  | N | 2 (4.3\%) | $\mathrm{N} \quad \mathrm{O}(0.0 \%)$ | N | 15 (32.6\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | Y | 4,411 (55.1\%) | Y | 1,189 (27.0\%) | Y | 839 (19.0\%) |  |  | Y | 696 (15.8\%) | $\mathrm{Y} \quad 11(0.2 \%)$ | Y | 2,137 (48.4\%) |
|  | 8,011 (100.0\%) | N | 3,600 (44.9\%) | N | 514 (14.3\%) | N | 385 (10.7\%) |  |  | N | 341 (9.5\%) | $\mathrm{N} \quad 24(0.7 \%)$ | N | 1,817 (50.5\%) |
|  | Students Unaccounted For 274 (Cohort Total: 8,285) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | DELevel 1 | Y | 885 (68.1\%) | Y | 550 (62.196) | Y | 387 (43.7\%) | Not Applicable |  | Y | 151 (17.1\%) | $Y$ Y-ース 27 (3.1\%) | Y | 235 (26.6\%) |
|  | 1,299 (16.6\%) | N | 414 (31.9\%) | N | 202 (48.8\%) | N | 159 (38.4\%) |  |  | N | 72 (17.4\%) | $\mathrm{N} \quad 17$ (4.1\%) | N | 147 (35.5\%) |
|  | DELevel 2 | Y | 950 (62.0\%) | Y | 540 (56.8\%) | $Y$ | 432 (45.5\%) |  |  | Y | 357 (37.6\%) | $Y \quad 22(2.3 \%)$ | $Y$ | 438 (46.1\%) |
|  | 1,532 (19.6\%) | N | 582 (38.0\%) | N | 307 (52.7\%) | N | 243 (41.8\%) |  |  | N | 241 (41.4\%) | $\mathrm{N} \quad 19$ (3.3\%) | N | 306 (52.6\%) |
|  | Total Referred | Y | 1,835 (64.8\%) | Y | 1,090 (59.4\%) | $Y$ | 819 (44.6\%) |  |  | Y | 508 (27.7\%) | $Y \quad 49(2.7 \%)$ | $Y$ | 673 (36.7\%) |
|  | 2,831 (36.2\%) | N | 996 (35.2\%) | N | 509 (51.1\%) | N | 402 (40.4\%) |  |  | N | 313 (31.4\%) | $\mathrm{N} \quad 36(3.6 \%)$ | N | 453 (45.5\%) |
|  | College Level | Y | 2,492 (51.0\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | $Y$ | 1,718 (68.9\%) |
|  |  | N | 2,397 (49.0\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | N | 1,760 (73.4\%) |
|  | Unknown | Y | 44 (40.7\%) | $\gamma$ | 4 (9.1\%) | $Y$ | 2 (4.5\%) | Not Applicable |  | Y | 1 (2.3\%) | $Y \quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | Y | 20 (45.5\%) |
|  | 108 (1.4\%) | N | 64 (59.3\%) | N | 2 (3.1\%) | N | 1 (1.6\%) |  |  | N | 0 (0.0\%) | $\mathrm{N} \quad 1(1.6 \%)$ | N | 31 (48.4\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | $Y$ | 4,371 (55.8\%) | Y | 1,146 (26.2\%) | Y | 854 (19.5\%) |  |  | Y | 538 (12.3\%) | $Y \quad 66(1.5 \%)$ | $Y$ | 2,411 (55.2\%) |
|  | 7.828(100.0\%6) | N | 3,457 (44.2\%) | N | 559 (16.2\%) | N | 441 (12.8\%) |  |  | N | 339 (9.8\%) | N - - 58(1.7\%) | N | 2,244 (64.9\%) |

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

## English Progression by Pell Status (Continued)

|  |  | Referral Level |  |  | pted Any DE (1st Year) |  | ss in Any DE (1st Year) |  | pted RSG <br> st Year) |  | ess in RSG <br> st Year) | Success in High DE (3rd Year) | Success in RSG (3rd Year) | Success in GK (3rd Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DELevel 1 | Y | 460 (63.5\%) | $Y$ | 345 (75.0\%) | $Y$ | 223 (48.5\%) | $Y$ | 19 (4.1\%) | $Y$ | 8 (1.7\%) | 3rd Year Data Not Yet Available |  |  |
|  | 724 (9.2\%) | N | 264 (36.5\%) | N | 156 (59.1\%) | N | 111 (42.0\%) | N | 16(6.1\%) | N | 11 (4.2\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DELevel 2 | $Y$ | 633 (64.9\%) | $Y$ | 412 (65.1\%) | $Y$ | 288 (45.5\%) | $Y$ | 38 (6.0\%) | $Y$ | 22 (3.5\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 975 (12.4\%) | N | 342 (35.1\%) | N | 185 (54.1\%) | N | 149 (43.6\%) | N | 28 (8.2\%) | N | 21 (6.1\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DELevel 3 | Y | 559 (58.3\%) | $Y$ | 359 (64.2\%) | $Y$ | 274 (49.0\%) | $Y$ | 316 (56.5\%) | $Y$ | 237 (42.4\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 959 (12.2\%) | N | 400 (41.7\%) | N | 253 (63.3\%) | N | 201 (50.3\%) | N | 226 (56.5\%) | N | 185 (46.3\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DELevel 4 | $Y$ | 9 (69.2\%) | $Y$ | 9 (100.0\%) | $Y$ | 9 (100.0\%) | $Y$ | 9 (100.0\%) | Y | 9 (100.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 13 (0.2\%) | N | 4 (30.8\%) | N | 2 (50.0\%) | N | 1 (25.0\%) | N | 2 (50.0\%) | N | 1 (25.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Total Referred | Y | 1,661 (62.2\%) | $Y$ | 1,125 (67.7\%) | $Y$ | 794 (47.8\%) | $Y$ | 382 (23.0\%) | $Y$ | 276 (16.6\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 2,671 (33.9\%) | N | 1,010 (37.8\%) | N | 596 (59.0\%) | N | 462 (45.7\%) | N | 272 (26.9\%) | N | 218 (21.6\%) |  |  |  |
|  | College Level | $Y$ | $2,552(53.1 \%)$ | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 4,810 (61.1\%) | N | 2,258 (46.9\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Unknown | $Y$ | 210 (52.9\%) | $Y$ | 19 (9.0\%) | $Y$ | 12 (5.7\%) | $Y$ | 18 (8.6\%) | $Y$ | 12 (5.7\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 397 (5.0\%) | N | 187 (47.1\%) | N | 29 (15.5\%) | N | 18 (9.6\%) | N | 29 (15.5\%) | N | 18 (9.6\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Cohort Total | $Y$ | 4,423 (56.1\%) | $Y$ | 1,345 (30.4\%) | Y | 962 (21.7\%) | $Y$ | 586 (13.2\%) | Y | 428 (9.7\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 7.878 (100.0\% $)$ | N | 3,455 (43.9\%) | N | 969 (28.0\%) | N | 761 (22.0\%) | N | 636(18.4\%) | N | 510(14.8\%). |  |  |  |
|  | DELevel 1 | $Y$ | 440 (56.4\%) | Y | 332 (75.5\%) | $Y$ | 221 (50.2\%) | $Y$ | 27 (6.1\%) | Y | 17 (3.9\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 780 (9.7\%) | N | 340 (43.6\%) | N | 189 (55.6\%) | N | 145 (42.6\%) | N | 15 (4.4\%) | N | 11 (3.2\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DELevel 2 | $Y$ | 786 (58.0\%) | $Y$ | 526 (66.9\%) | Y | 392 (49.9\%) | $Y$ | 53 (6.7\%) | Y | 40 (5.1\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 1,356 (16.9\%) | N | 570 (42.0\%) | N | 310 (54.4\%) | N | 244 (42.8\%) | N | 54 (9.5\%) | N | 38 (6.7\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DELevel 3 | $Y$ | 982 (55.8\%) | $Y$ | 741 (75.5\%) | $Y$ | 594 (60.5\%) | $Y$ | 670 (68.2\%) | $Y$ | 531 (54.1\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 1,761 (22.0\%) | N | 779 (44.2\%) | N | 502 (64.4\%) | N | 405 (52.0\%) | N | 468 (60.1\%) | N | 374 (48.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DELevel 4 | $Y$ | 1 (33.3\%) | $Y$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ | $Y$ | 0 0,0.0\%) | $Y$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ | Y | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 3 (0.0\%) | N | 2 (66.7\%) | N | 2 (100.0\%) | N | 2 (100.0\%) | N | 2 (100.0\%) | N | 2 (100.0\%) | 3rd Year Data Not Yet Available |  |  |
|  | Total Referred | Y | 2,209 (56.6\%) | $Y$ | 1,599 (72.4\%) | $Y$ | 1,207 (54.6\%) | $Y$ | 750 (34.0\%) | $Y$ | 588 (26.6\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 3,900 (48.7\%) | N | 1,691 (43.4\%) | N | 1,003 (59.3\%) | N | 796 (47.1\%) | N | 539 (31.9\%) | N | 425 (25.1\%) |  |  |  |
|  | College Level | Y | $1,788(45.2 \%)$ | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3,960 (49.5\%) | N | 2,172 (54.8\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Unknown | Y | 58 (40.3\%) | $Y$ | 5 (8.6\%) | $Y$ | 4 (6.9\%) | $Y$ | 4 (6.9\%) | $Y$ | 3 (5.2\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 144 (1.8\%) | N | 86 (59.7\%) | N | 4 (4.7\%) | N | 4 (4.7\%) | N | 3 (3.5\%) | N | 3 (3.5\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Cohort Total | $Y$ | 4,055 (50.7\%) | $Y$ | 1,784 (44.0\%) | $Y$ | 1,354 (33.4\%) | $Y$ | 922 (22.7\%) | Y | 727 (17.9\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 8,004 (100.0\%) | N | 3,949 (49.3\%) | N | 1,360(34.4\%) | N | 1,078 (27.3\%) | N | 890(22.5\%) | N | 703(17.8\%) |  |  |  |

## Notes:

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

Sources:

| FTIC Pell Status: | ACCDODS1.XST_FADS_ACCD |
| :--- | :--- |
| DE Referrals: | Fall 2011: ACCDODS1.ATD_F10_F11_ODS_TASP, Fall 2012: ACCDODS1.ATD_F10_F13_ODS_TASP, Fall 2013-Fall 2015: |
|  | ACCDODS1.XST_ATD_ACCD |

Course Enrollment:: ACCDODS1.XST.IRES_SC

## English Progression by Veteran Status

Of those who were referred, Veteran students successfully passed English DE and "gatekeeper" courses at higher rates than did non-Veteran students. When comparing the 2011 cohort to the 2013 cohort, referred and non-referred students (both Veteran and non-Veteran) experienced increases in "gatekeeper" success.

|  |  | Referral Level |  | Attempted Any DE (1st Year) |  |  | ass in Any DE <br> stYear) | Attempted RSG <br> (1st Year) | Success in RSG <br> (1st Year) | Success in High DE (3rd Year) |  | Success in RSG (3rd Year) | Success in GK (3rd Year) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br>  | DELevel 1 | $Y$ | 53 (4.7\%) | $\gamma$ | 39 (73.6\%) | $Y$ | 29 (54.7\%) | Not Applicable |  | Y | 14 (26.4\%) | Not Applicable | Y | 15 (28.3\%) |
|  | 1,119 (12.2\%) | N | 1,066 (95.3\%) | N | 669 (62.8\%) | N | 428 (40.2\%) |  |  | N | 235 (22.0\%) |  | N | 204 (19.1\%) |
|  | DELevel2 | $Y$ | 180(6.1\%) | $Y$ | 112 (62.2\%) | Y | 89 (49.4\%) |  |  | Y | 83 (46.1\%) |  | $\gamma$ | 99 (55.0\%) |
|  | 2,956(32.2\%) | N | 2,776 (93.9\%) | N | 1,591(57.3\%) | N | 1,098 (39.6\%) |  |  | N | 1,049 (37.8\%) |  | N | 938 (33.8\%) |
|  | Total Referred | $Y$ | 233 (5.7\%) | $Y$ | 151 (64.8\%) | Y | 118 (50.6\%) |  |  | $Y$ | 97 (41.6\%) |  | r | 114 (48.9\%) |
|  | 4,075 (44.4\%) | N | 3,842 (94.3\%) | N | 2,260 (58.8\%) | N | 1,526(39.7\%) |  |  | N | 1,284 (33.4\%) |  | N | 1,142 (29.7\%) |
|  | College Level | $Y$ | 318 (6.4\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | Y | 195 (61.3\%) |
|  | 4,976 (54.3\%) | N | 4,658 (93.6\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | N | 2,578 (55.3\%) |
|  | Unknown | Y | 4(3.3\%) | $Y$ | 0 0,0\%\%) | $Y$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ | Not Applicable |  | $Y$ | 0 0,0\%\%) | Not Applicable | Y | $0(0.0 \%)$ |
|  | 120 (1.3\%) | N | 116 (96.7\%) | N | 1 (0.9\%) | N | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  | N | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  | N | 17 (14.7\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | $Y$ | 555 (6.1\%) | $Y$ | 174 (31.4\%) | $Y$ | 141 (25.4\%) |  |  | Y | 119 (21.4\%) |  | $Y$ | 309 (55.7\%) |
|  | 9,171(100.0\%) | N | 8,616 (93.9\%) | N | 2,559 (29.7\%\%) |  | 1,756 (20.4\%) |  |  | N | 1,503 (17.48\%) |  | N | 3,737 (43.4\%) |
|  | DELevel1 | $Y$ | 29(3.5\%) | Y | 24 (82.8\%) |  | 19(65.5\%) | Not Applicable |  | Y | 13 (44.8\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | , | 11 (37.9\%) |
|  | 826 (10.3\%) | N | 797 (96.5\%) | N | 518 (65.0\%) | N | 360 (45.2\%) |  |  | N | 219 (27.5\%) | 6 (0.8\%) | N | 201 (25.2\%) |
|  | DELevel2 | Y | 132 (6.2\%) | r | 59(44.7\%) | Y | 42 (31.8\%) |  |  | $Y$ | 46 (34.8\%) | 2(1.5\%) | $Y$ | 58 (43.9\%) |
|  | 2,118 (26.4\%) | N | 1,986 (93.8\%) | N | 920 (46.3\%) | N | 669 (33.7\%) |  |  | N | 637 (32.1\%) | $\mathrm{N} \quad 14$ (0.7\%) | N | 636(32.0\%) |
|  | Total Referred | Y | 161(5.5\%) | Y | 83 (51.6\%) | Y | $61(37.9 \%)$ |  |  | $Y$ | 59 (36.6\%) | 2 (1.2\%) | $\gamma$ | 69 (42.9\%) |
|  | 2,944 (36.7\%) | N | 2,783 (94.5\%) | N | 1,438(51.7\%) | N | 1,029(37.0\%) |  |  | N | 856 (30.8\%) | N 20 (0.7\%) | N | 837 (30.1\%) |
|  | College Level | $\gamma$ | $283(5.7 \%)$ |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | $r$ | 204 (72.1\%) |
|  | $4,988(62.3 \%)$ | N | 4,705 (94.3\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | N | 2,817 (59.9\%) |
|  | Unknown | Y | $9(11.4 \%)$ | $Y$ | 0 0,0\%\%) | Y | $0(0.0 \%)$ | Not Applicable |  | $Y$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ | $Y$ | 3(33.3\%) |
|  | 79 (1.0\%) | N | 70(88.6\%) | N | 6 (8.6\%) | N | 6 (8.6\%) |  |  | N | 5 (7.1\%) | $\mathrm{N} \quad 000.0 \%)$ | N | 24 (34.3\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | $Y$ | 453(5.7\%) | $Y$ | 93 (20.5\%) | Y | 70 (15.5\%) |  |  | $Y$ | 67 (14.8\%) | 2 (0.4\%) | $\gamma$ | 276 (60.9\%) |
|  | 8.011 (100.0\%) | N | 7,558(94.3\%) | N | 1,610 (21.3\%) |  | 1,154 (15.3\%) |  |  | N | 970 (12.8\%) | N | N | 3,678(48.7\%) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { to } \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & 0 \\ & \text { m } \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{i} \\ & \overline{=} \end{aligned}$ | DELevel 1 | Y | 66 (5.1\%) | Y | 52 (78.8\%) | r | 39 (59.1\%) | Not Applicable |  | Y | 15 (22.7\%) | 1(1.5\%) | Y | 23 (34.8\%) |
|  | 1,299 (16.6\%) | N | 1,233 (94.9\%) | N | 700 (56.8\%) | N | 507 (41.1\%) |  |  | N | 208 (16.9\%) | 43 (3.5\%) | N | 359 (29.1\%) |
|  | DELevel2 | $Y$ | 105 (6.9\%) | $\gamma$ | 67 (63.8\%) | Y | 60(57.1\%) |  |  | $Y$ | 47 (44.8\%) | 4 (3.8\%) | r | 63 (60.0\%) |
|  | 1,532 (19.6\%) | N | 1,427 (93.1\%) | N | 780 (54.7\%) | N | 615 (43.1\%) |  |  | N | 551 (38.6\%) | $\mathrm{N} \quad 37(2.6 \%)$ | N | 681 (47.7\%) |
|  | Total Referred | Y | 41 (38.0\%) | Y | 1(2.4\%) | $Y$ | 1(2.4\%) |  |  | $Y$ | $1(2.4 \%)$ | 1(2.4\%) | $\gamma$ | 29 (70.7\%) |
|  | 108 (1.4\%) | N | 67 (62.0\%) | N | 5 (7.5\%) | N | 2 (3.0\%) |  |  | N | 0 (0.0\%) | $N \quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | N | 22 (32.8\%) |
|  | College Level | Y | 281(5.7\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | Y | 209 (74.4\%) |
|  | 4,889 (62.5\%) | N | 4,608 (94.3\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | N | 3,269 (70.9\%) |
|  | Unknown | $Y$ | 171 (6.0\%) | $\gamma$ | 119 (69.6\%) | $Y$ | 99(57.9\%) | Not Applicable |  | $Y$ | 62 (36.3\%) | 5 (2.9\%) | r | 86 (50.3\%) |
|  | 2,831 (36.2\%) | N | 2,660 (94.0\%) | N | 1,480 (55.6\%) | N | 1,122 (42.2\%) |  |  | N | 759 (28.5\%) | $\mathrm{N} \quad 80$ (3.0\%) | N | 1,040 (39.1\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | $Y$ | 493 (6.3\%) | $Y$ | 126 (25.6\%) | Y | 106 (21.5\%) |  |  | Y | 67 (13.6\%) | 10 (2.0\%) | $\gamma$ | 324 (65.7\%) |
|  | 7.828(100.0\%) | N | 1,335 (93.7\%) |  | 1,579 (21.5\%) |  | 1,189 (16.2\%) |  |  | N | 810(11.0\%) | $\mathrm{N}=-{ }^{114(1.6 \%)}$ | N | 4,331 (59.0\%) |

Yes $=$ Veteran $\quad$ No $=$ Non-Veteran

## 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 <br> (3rd Year) | Success in GK (3rd Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{t}{0} \\ & \frac{\pi}{0} \\ & \stackrel{U}{4} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{N} \\ & \stackrel{N}{w} \end{aligned}$ | DELevel 1 | Y | 21 (2.9\%) | $Y$ | 15 (71.4\%) | $Y$ | 12 (57.1\%) | $Y$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ | Y | $0(0.0 \%)$ | 3 d Year Data Not Yet Available |  |  |
|  | 724 (9.2\%) | N | 703 (97.1\%) | N | 486 (69.1\%) | N | 322 (45.8\%) | N | 35 (5.0\%) | N | 19 (2.7\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DELevel 2 | Y | 31 (3.2\%) | $Y$ | 23 (74.2\%) | $Y$ | 21 (67.7\%) | $\gamma$ | 4 (12.9\%) | $Y$ | 2 (6.5\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 975 (12.4\%) | N | 944 (96.8\%) | N | 574 (60.8\%) | N | 416 (44.1\%) | N | 62 (6.6\%) | N | 41 (4.3\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DELevel 3 | Y | 45 (4.7\%) | $Y$ | 33 (73.3\%) | $Y$ | 22 (48.9\%) | $\gamma$ | 31 (68.9\%) | Y | 21 (46.7\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 959 (12.2\%) | N | 914 (95.3\%) | N | 579 (63.3\%) | N | 453 (49.6\%) | N | 511 (55.9\%) | N | 401 (43.9\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DELevel 4 | Y | 1 (7.7\%) | $Y$ | 1 (100.0\%) | $Y$ | 1 (100.0\%) | $\gamma$ | 1 (100.0\%) | $Y$ | 1 (100.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 13 (0.2\%) | N | 12 (92.3\%) | N | 10 (83.3\%) | N | 9 (75.0\%) | N | 10 (83.3\%) | N | 9 (75.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Total Referred | Y | 98 (3.7\%) | $Y$ | 72 (73.5\%) | $Y$ | 56 (57.1\%) | $Y$ | 36 (36.7\%) | $Y$ | 24 (24.5\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 2,671 (33.9\%) | N | 2,573 (96.3\%) | N | 1,649 (64.1\%) | N | 1,200 (46.6\%) | N | 618 (24.0\%) | N | 470 (18.3\%) |  |  |  |
|  |  | Y |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $4,810(61.1 \%)$ | N | $4,468(92.9 \%)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Unknown | Y | 24 (6.0\%) | $Y$ | 7 (29.2\%) | $Y$ | 4 (16.7\%) | $\gamma$ | 7 (29.2\%) | $Y$ | 4 (16.7\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 397 (5.0\%) | N | 373 (94.0\%) | N | 41 (11.0\%) | N | 26 (7.0\%) | N | 40 (10.7\%) | N | 26 (7.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Cohort Total | Y | 464 (5.9\%) | $Y$ | 123 (26.5\%) | $Y$ | 99 (21.3\%) | Y | 87 (18.8\%) | $Y$ | 67 (14.4\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 7,878(100.0\%) | N | 7,414 (94.1\%) | N | 2,191(29.6\%) , | N | 1,624 (21.9\%) | $\stackrel{N}{1}$ | 1,135 (15.3\%) | N | 871(11.7\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DELevel 1 | Y | 24 (3.1\%) | Y | 21 (87.5\%) | $Y$ | 17 (70.8\%) | $Y$ | 1(4.2\%) | $Y$ | $\overline{0}(0.0 \%)$ | 3rd Year Data Not Yet Available |  |  |
|  | 780 (9.7\%) | N | 756 (96.9\%) | N | 500 (66.1\%) | N | 349 (46.2\%) | N | 41 (5.4\%) | N | 28 (3.7\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DELevel 2 | Y | 46 (3.4\%) | $Y$ | 35 (76.1\%) | $Y$ | 25 (54.3\%) | $Y$ | 3 (6.5\%) | $Y$ | 2 (4.3\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 1,356 (16.9\%) | N | 1,310(96.6\%) | N | 801 (61.1\%) | N | 611 (46.6\%) | N | 104 (7.9\%) | N | 76 (5.8\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DELevel 3 | Y | 90 (5.1\%) | $Y$ | 73 (81.1\%) | $Y$ | 63 (70.0\%) | Y | 69 (76.7\%) | Y | 59 (65.6\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 1,761 (22.0\%) | N | 1,671 (94.9\%) | N | 1,170(70.0\%) | N | 936 (56.0\%) | N | 1,069 (64.0\%) | N | 846 (50.6\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DELevel 4 | Y | $0(0.0 \%)$ | $Y$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ | $Y$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ | $Y$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ | Y | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  |  |
|  | 3 (0.0\%) | N | 3 (100.0\%) | N | 2 (66.7\%) | N | 2 (66.7\%) | N | 2 (66.7\%) | N | 2 (66.7\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Total Referred | Y | 160 (4.1\%) | $Y$ | 129 (80.6\%) | Y | 105 (65.6\%) | $Y$ | 73 (45.6\%) | Y | 61 (38.1\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 3,900 (48.7\%) | N | 3,740 (95.9\%) | N | 2,473 (66.1\%) | N | 1,898 (50.7\%) | N | 1,216(32.5\%) | N | 952 (25.5\%) |  |  |  |
|  | College Level | Y | 336(8.5\%) | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3,960 (49.5\%) | N | 3,624 (91.5\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Unknown | Y | 10 (6.9\%) | $Y$ | 0 (0.0\%) | $Y$ | 0 (0.0\%) | $Y$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ | $Y$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  |  |
|  | 144 (1.8\%) | N | 134 (93.1\%) | N | $9(6.7 \%)$ | N | 8 (6.0\%) | N | 7 (5.2\%) | N | 6 (4.5\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Cohort Total | $Y$ | 506 (6.3\%) | $Y$ | 173 (34.2\%) | $Y$ | 141 (27.9\%) | $Y$ | 115 (22.7\%) | $Y$ | 96 (19.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 8,004 (100.0\%) | N | 7,498(93.7\%) | N | 2,971 (39.6\%) | N | 2,291 (30.6\%) | N | 1,697 (22.6\%) |  | 334 (17.8\%) |  |  |  |

[^1]
## Notes:

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

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

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

Math developmental education referral levels were based on formal student assessment outcomes for Math or on Math DE course enrollment. From Fall 2011through Fall 2013, Alamo Colleges offered four levels of Math developmental educa-tion-MATH 0300 (Basic Mathematics), MATH 0301 (Introduction to Algebra), MATH 0302 (Elementary Algebra), and MATH 0303 (Intermediate Algebra). From Fall 2014 onward, Alamo Colleges offered four levels of Math developmental education - MATH 0305 (Pre-Algebra), MATH 0310/0442 (Elementary Algebra/Pre-Statistics), MATH 0320 (Intermediate Algebra), and Ready, Set, Go MATH 1314 (MATH 1314 with a 1-hour support course). Students placed in a DE course had to earn a grade of " $C$ " or better to be successful and move up to the next DE course in the Math sequence until they reached MATH 0303/0320, which served as the highest developmental education course in the sequence. Students designated as "Unknown" did not have an assessment on file or could not be placed within referral range and could not be categorized based on DE course enrollment. Students placed at college level or who successfully passed MATH 0303/0320 could then take one of the "gatekeeper" Math courses, which were MATH 1314 (College Algebra), MATH 1324 (Mathematics for Business and Social Sciences I), MATH 1332 (Contemporary Math I-Math for Liberal Arts Majors I), MATH 1333 (Contemporary Math II—Math for Liberal Arts Majors II), MATH 1414 (College Algebra Pre-Cal track), and MATH 1442 (Elementary Statistical Methods).

## Math Developmental Education Progression of Referred

After 3 years, approximately $28 \%-39 \%$ of referred students in each cohort attempted the highest DE course in the Math sequence, with $20 \%-29 \%$ of referred students successfully passing the course. Approximately $29 \%-40 \%$ of referred students in each cohort attempted a Math "gatekeeper" course, with $22 \%-30 \%$ of referred students successfully passing a "gatekeeper" course. When comparing the 2013 cohort to the 2011 cohort, success in any DE course and success in "gatekeeper" increased by 7.1 and 4.9 percentage points, respectively.


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

## Math "Gatekeeper" Progression of Non-Referred

After 3 years, $75 \%-82 \%$ of non-referred students in each cohort attempted one of the Math "gatekeeper" courses, with $57 \%-59 \%$ of non-referred successfully passing that course, which is 2 to 3 times the rate of referred students.

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

## Total Math Progression

Overall, $48 \%-56 \%$ of all referred students in each cohort successfully passed any Math DE course within the first year, $20 \%$ $-29 \%$ successfully passed the highest DE course in the Math sequence within 3 years, and approximately $22 \%-30 \%$ successfully passed the Math "gatekeeper" course within 3 years. Of the non-referred students, $57 \%-59 \%$ successfully passed the Math "gatekeeper" course within 3 years. Of the total cohort, $30 \%-44 \%$ successfully passed the Math "gatekeeper" course within 3 years. Those who were referred to Level 4 had higher success rates in the Math highest DE and "gatekeeper" courses than 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, upper-levelreferred students experienced a large 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) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 1 \\ 1,618(17.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 1,183 (73.1\%) | 703 (43.4\%) | Not Applicable |  | 153 (9.5\%) | Not Applicable | 159 (9.8\%) |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 2 \\ 1,742(19.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 1,443 (82.8\%) | 972 (55.8\%) |  |  | 316 (18.1\%) |  | 291 (16.7\%) |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 3 \\ \text { 2,154 (23.5\%) } \end{gathered}$ | 1,787 (83.0\%) | 1,110 (51.5\%) |  |  | 633 (29.4\%) |  | 492 (22.8\%) |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 4 \\ 1,442 \text { (15.7\%) } \end{gathered}$ | 1,110 (77.0\%) | 759 (52.6\%) |  |  | 771 (53.5\%) |  | 592 (41.1\%) |
|  | Total Referred 6,956 (75.8\%) | 5,523 (79.4\%) | 3,544 (50.9\%) |  |  | 1,873 (26.9\%) |  | 1,534 (22.1\%) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { College Level } \\ & \text { 2,025 (22.1\%) } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  | 1,182 (58.4\%) |
|  | Unknown $190 \text { (2.1\%) }$ | 20 (10.5\%) | 16 (8.4\%) | Not Applicable |  | 14 (7.4\%) | Not Applicable | 22 (11.6\%) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cohort Total } \\ & \underline{9,171(100.0 \%)} \end{aligned}$ | 5,783 (63.1\%) | 3,760 (41.0\%) |  |  | 2,062 (22.5\%) |  | 2,738 (29.9\%) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DE Level } 1 \\ & 1,311 \text { (16.4\%) } \end{aligned}$ | 1,051 (80.2\%) | 704 (53.7\%) |  |  | 191 (14.6\%) | 4 (0.3\%) | 232 (17.7\%) |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 2 \\ 1,203(15.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 994 (82.6\%) | 628 (52.2\%) |  |  | 296 (24.6\%) | 3 (0.2\%) | 312 (25.9\%) |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 3 \\ 1,920(24.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 1,527 (79.5\%) | 912 (47.5\%) | Not App | cable | 637 (33.2\%) | 1 (0.1\%) | 573 (29.8\%) |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 4 \\ 1,222 \text { (15.3\%) } \end{gathered}$ | 691 (56.5\%) | 451 (36.9\%) |  |  | 492 (40.3\%) | 1 (0.1\%) | 567 (46.4\%) |
|  | Total Referred 5,656 (70.6\%) | 4,263 (75.4\%) | 2,695 (47.6\%) |  |  | 1,616 (28.6\%) | 9 (0.2\%) | 1,684 (29.8\%) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { College Level } \\ & \text { 2,104 (26.3\%) } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | Not Ap | cable |  |  | 1,189 (56.5\%) |
|  | Unknown $251 \text { (3.1\%) }$ | 140 (55.8\%) | 99 (39.4\%) | Not Applicable |  | 46 (18.3\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | 69 (27.5\%) |
|  | Cohort Total 8,011 (100.0\%) | 4,544 (56.7\%) | 2,895 (36.1\%) |  |  | 1,753 (21.9\%) | 9 (0.1\%) | 2,942 (36.7\%) |
|  | Students Unaccounted For 274 (Cohort Total: 8,285) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

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.

## 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:
DE Referrals:

Course Enrollment::

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

## Math Progression by Gender

Across the Fall 2011 through Fall 2013 cohorts, both referred and non-referred women successfully passed Math highest DE and "gatekeeper" courses at higher rates than did men. Overall, an increase in "gatekeeper" success from the 2011 to 2013 cohort was evident for referred men and women, particularly for Levels 3 and 4.

|  |  |  |  |  | pted Any DE st Year) |  | s in Any DE st Year) | Attempted RSG <br> (1st Year) | Success in RSG (1st Year) |  | s in High DE d Year) | Success in RSG <br> (3rd Year) |  | cess in GK <br> (3rd Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DE Level 1 | M | 635 (39.2\%) | M | 442 (69.6\%) | M | 229 (36.1\%) | Not Applicable |  | M | 39 (6.1\%) | Not Applicable | M | 42 (6.6\%) |
|  | 1,618(17.6\%) | F | 983 (60.8\%) | F | 741 (75.4\%) | F | 474 (48.2\%) |  |  | F | 114 (11.6\%) |  | F | 117 (11.9\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | M | 745 (42.8\%) | M | 593 (79.6\%) | M | 383 (51.4\%) |  |  | M | 112 (15.0\%) |  | M | 112 (15.0\%) |
|  | 1,742 (19.0\%) | F | 997 (57.2\%) | F | 850 (85.3\%) | F | 589 (59.1\%) |  |  | F | 204 (20.5\%) |  | F | 179 (18.0\%) |
|  | DE Level 3 | M | 871 (40.4\%) | M | 680 (78.1\%) | M | 381 (43.7\%) |  |  | M | 206 (23.7\%) |  | M | 171 (19.6\%) |
|  | 2,154 (23.5\%) | F | 1,283 (59.6\%) | F | 1,107 (86.3\%) | F | 729 (56.8\%) |  |  | F | 427 (33.3\%) |  | F | 321 (25.0\%) |
|  | DE Level 4 | M | 690 (47.9\%) | M | 520 (75.4\%) | M | 327 (47.4\%) |  |  | M | 344 (49.9\%) |  | M | 256 (37.1\%) |
|  | 1,442 (15.7\%) | F | 752 (52.1\%) | F | 590 (78.5\%) | F | 432 (57.4\%) |  |  | F | 427 (56.8\%) |  | F | 336 (44.7\%) |
|  | Total Referred | M | 2,941 (42.3\%) | M | 2,235 (76.0\%) | M | 1,320 (44.9\%) |  |  | M | 701 (23.8\%) |  | M | 581 (19.8\%) |
|  | 6,956 (75.8\%) | F | 4,015 (57.7\%) | F | 3,288 (81.9\%) | F | 2,224 (55.4\%) |  |  | F | 1,172 (29.2\%) |  | F | 953 (23.7\%) |
|  | College Level | M | 1,073 (53.0\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | M | 584 (54.4\%) |
|  | 2,025 (22.1\%) | F | 952 (47.0\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F | 598 (62.8\%) |
|  | Unknown | M | 92 (48.4\%) | M | 9 (9.8\%) | M | 5 (5.4\%) | Not Applicable |  | M | 2 (2.2\%) | Not Applicable | M | 7 (7.6\%) |
|  | 190 (2.1\%) | F | 98 (51.6\%) | F | 11 (11.2\%) | F | 11 (11.2\%) |  |  | F | 12 (12.2\%) |  | F | 15 (15.3\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | M | 4,106 (44.8\%) | M | 2,366 (57.6\%) | M | 1,427 (34.8\%) |  |  | M | 788 (19.2\%) |  | M | 1,172 (28.5\%) |
|  | 9,171 (100.0\%) | F | 5,065 (55.2\%) | F | 3,417 (67.5\%). | F | 2,333 (46.1\%) |  |  | F | 1,274 (25.2\%) |  | F | 1,566 (30.9\%) |
|  | DE Level 1 | M | 505 (38.5\%) | M | 390 (77.2\%) | M | 233 (46.1\%) | Not Applicable |  | M | 51 (10.1\%) | M 0 (0.0\%) | M | 67 (13.3\%) |
|  | 1,311 (16.4\%) | F | 806 (61.5\%) | F | 661 (82.0\%) | F | 471 (58.4\%) |  |  | F | 140 (17.4\%) | 4 (0.5\%) | F | 165 (20.5\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | M | 504 (41.9\%) | M | 400 (79.4\%) | M | 222 (44.0\%) |  |  | M | 95 (18.8\%) | $\mathrm{M} \quad \mathrm{O}(0.0 \%)$ | M | 101 (20.0\%) |
|  | 1,203 (15.0\%) | F | 699 (58.1\%) | F | 594 (85.0\%) | F | 406 (58.1\%) |  |  | F | 201 (28.8\%) | 3 (0.4\%) | F | 211 (30.2\%) |
|  | DE Level 3 | M | 797 (41.5\%) | M | 605 (75.9\%) | M | 317 (39.8\%) |  |  | M | 220 (27.6\%) | $\mathrm{M} \quad \mathrm{O}(0.0 \%)$ | M | 198 (24.8\%) |
|  | 1,920 (24.0\%) | F | 1,123 (58.5\%) | F | 922 (82.1\%) | F | 595 (53.0\%) |  |  | F | 417 (37.1\%) | 1 (0.1\%) | F | 375 (33.4\%) |
|  | DE Level 4 | M | 622 (50.9\%) | M | 353 (56.8\%) | M | 208 (33.4\%) |  |  | M | 232 (37.3\%) | $\mathrm{M} \quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | M | 255 (41.0\%) |
|  | 1,222 (15.3\%) | F | 600 (49.1\%) | F | 338 (56.3\%) | F | 243 (40.5\%) |  |  | F | 260 (43.3\%) | 1 (0.2\%) | F | 312 (52.0\%) |
|  | Total Referred | M | 2,428 (42.9\%) | M | 1,748(72.0\%) | M | 980 (40.4\%) |  |  | M | 598 (24.6\%) | $\mathrm{M} \quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | M | 621 (25.6\%) |
|  | 5,656 (70.6\%) | F | 3,228 (57.1\%) | F | 2,515 (77.9\%) | F | 1,715 (53.1\%) |  |  | F | 1,018 (31.5\%) | 9 (0.3\%) | F | 1,063 (32.9\%) |
|  | College Level | M | 1,126 (53.5\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | M | 594 (52.8\%) |
|  | 2,104 (26.3\%) | F | 978 (46.5\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F | 595 (60.8\%) |
|  | Unknown | M | 135 (53.8\%) | M | 84 (62.2\%) | M | 62 (45.9\%) | Not Applicable |  | M | 27 (20.0\%) | $\mathrm{M} \quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | M | 35 (25.9\%) |
|  | 251 (3.1\%) | F | 116 (46.2\%) | F | 56 (48.3\%) | F | 37 (31.9\%) |  |  | F | 19 (16.4\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | F | 34 (29.3\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | M | 3,689 (46.0\%) | M | 1,904 (51.6\%) | M | 1,091 (29.6\%) |  |  | M | 668 (18.1\%) | $\mathrm{M} \quad \mathrm{O}(0.0 \%)$ | M | 1,250 (33.9\%) |
|  | 8,011 (100.0\%) | F | 4,322 (54.0\%) | F | 2,640 (61.1\%) | F | 1,804 (41.7\%) |  |  | F | 1,085 (25.1\%) | 9 (0.2\%) | F | 1,692 (39.1\%) |
|  | Students Unaccounted For 274 (Cohort Total: 8,285) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \stackrel{0}{N} \\ & \overline{\bar{N}} \end{aligned}$ | DELevel 1 | M | 599 (38.8\%) | M | 482 (80.5\%) | M | 280 (46.7\%) | Not Applicable |  | M | 52 (8.7\%) | M ${ }^{\text {( }}$ (0.5\%) | M | 71 (11.9\%) |
|  | 1,544 (19.7\%) | F | 945 (61.2\%) | F | 756 (80.0\%) | F | 533 (56.4\%) |  |  | F | 139 (14.7\%) | 12 (1.3\%) | F | 151 (16.0\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | M | 388 (45.1\%) | M | 321 (82.7\%) | M | 207 (53.4\%) |  |  | M | 50 (12.9\%) | $\mathrm{M} \quad 2(0.5 \%)$ | M | 80 (20.6\%) |
|  | 860 (11.0\%) | F | 472 (54.9\%) | F | 402 (85.2\%) | F | 318 (67.4\%) |  |  | F | 102 (21.6\%) | 5 (1.1\%) | F | 142 (30.1\%) |
|  | DE Level 3 | M | 346 (44.6\%) | M | 293 (84.7\%) | M | 191 (55.2\%) |  |  | M | 74 (21.4\%) | $\mathrm{M} \quad 1(0.3 \%)$ | M | 122 (35.3\%) |
|  | 776 (9.9\%) | F | 430 (55.4\%) | F | 380 (88.4\%) | F | 279 (64.9\%) |  |  | F | 129 (30.0\%) | 6 (1.4\%) | F | 187 (43.5\%) |
|  | DE Level 4 | M | 153 (46.5\%) | M | 93 (60.8\%) | M | 65 (42.5\%) |  |  | M | 66 (43.1\%) | $\mathrm{M} \quad \mathrm{O}(0.0 \%)$ | M | 70 (45.8\%) |
|  | 329 (4.2\%) | F | 176 (53.5\%) | F | 120 (68.2\%) | F | 84 (47.7\%) |  |  | F | 92 (52.3\%) | 2 (1.1\%) | F | 94 (53.4\%) |
|  | Total Referred | M | 1,486 (42.3\%) | M | 1,189 (80.0\%) | M | 743 (50.0\%) |  |  | M | 242 (16.3\%) | M $\quad 6$ (0.4\%) | M | 343 (23.1\%) |
|  | 3,509 (44.8\%) | F | 2,023 (57.7\%) | F | 1,658 (82.0\%) | F | 1,214 (60.0\%) |  |  | F | 462 (22.8\%) | 25 (1.2\%) | F | 574 (28.4\%) |
|  | College Level | M | 2,039 (48.3\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | M | 1,112 (54.5\%) |
|  | 4,225 (54.0\%) | F | 2,186 (51.7\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F | 1,380 (63.1\%) |
|  | Unknown | M | 68 (72.3\%) | M | 13 (19.1\%) | M | 7 (10.3\%) | Not Applicable |  | M | 6 (8.8\%) | M $\quad 0$ (0.0\%) | M | 23 (33.8\%) |
|  | 94 (1.2\%) | F | 26 (27.7\%) | F | 10 (38.5\%) | F | 3 (11.5\%) |  |  | F | 3 (11.5\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | F | $9(34.6 \%)$ |
|  | Cohort Total | M | 3,593 (45.9\%) | M | 1,297(36.1\%) | M | 807 (22.5\%) |  |  | M | 292 (8.1\%) | M $\quad 6$ (0.2\%) | M | 1,478 (41.1\%) |
|  | 7,828(100.0\%) | F | 4,235 (54.1\%) | F | 1,783(42.1\%). | F | 1,295 (30.6\%) |  |  | F | 501 (11.8\%) | F--25(0.6\%) | F | 1,963 (46.4\%) |

## Notes:

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

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

## Math Progression by Ethnicity

Of all racial/ethnic groups, after 3 years, for the Fall 2011 and Fall 2013 cohorts, Asian students successfully passed the highest DE and "gatekeeper" Math courses at the highest rates. When comparing the 2013 cohort to the 2011 cohort, both referred and non-referred Asian and White students experienced slight 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 $D E=$ 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 Demographics:
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 Ethnicity (Continued)


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

## Math Progression by Ethnicity (Continued)



## Math Progression by Age

Generally, of referred students, those who were older than 51 successfully passed the Math "gatekeeper" course at the lowest rates. When comparing the 2013 cohort to the 2011 cohort, referred students younger than 51 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 $D E=$ 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 Demographics:
ACCDODS1.XST_ATD_ACCD
DE Referrals:

Course Enrollment::

Math Progression by Age
(Continued)


Math Progression by Age
(Continued)


## Math Progression by Enrollment Status

Across all cohorts, of those referred and of those who were non-referred, 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, part-time students referred to Level 3 experienced the largest increase in "gatekeeper" success.


Notes:

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

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

## Math Progression by Enrollment Status (Continued)



## Math Progression by Pell Status

In general, non-Pell recipients who were not referred successfully passed Math "gatekeeper" courses at higher rates than did Pell recipients. When comparing the 2013 cohort to the 2011 cohort, referred non-Pell recipients experienced the larg-


## Notes:

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

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

## Math Progression by Pell Status (Continued)



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

## Math Progression by Veteran Status

In general, veterans successfully passed Math highest DE and "gatekeeper" courses at higher rates than did non-veterans. When comparing the 2013 cohort to the 2011 cohort, referred veterans experienced the largest increase in "gatekeeper"

5) Developmental education (DE) referral levels are based on formal student assessment outcomes for the subject area of DE course enrollment. Students designated as "Unknown" did not have an assessment on file or could not be placed within referral range and could not be categorized based on DE course enrollment.
6) Years of progression refer to the period between initial Fall semester (cohort year) and time of measurement. Data are cumulative over time.
7) Referral level percentages are based on the total cohort (denominator = cohort size).
8) Progression percentages are based on the referral level (denominator = number referred to level).
9) Students who transfer or leave Alamo Colleges are not removed from denominators.
10) In some instances, data have been updated to reflect the most current data at time of publication. Slight variations in data as recorded in prior publications may appear. However, these updates do not impact overall trends or outcomes.

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

## Math Progression by Veteran Status (Continued)



Yes $=$ Veteran
No $=$ Non-Veteran

# ALAMO COLLEGES <br> PRODUCTIVE GRADE RATES (PGR) 

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

This report compares the 1- to 5-year productive grade rates (PGR) of the Fall 2010 through Fall 2014 FTIC cohorts at Alamo Colleges. 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 the Alamo Colleges fluctuated between $71 \%-76 \%$ across all cohorts and all years.
$\diamond \quad$ First year productive grade rates peaked in the Fall 2015 cohort at 76\%.
$\diamond$ Across each cohort and each year, females consistently had higher productive grade rates than did males.
$\diamond$ Overall, productive grade rates improved among most student groups from the 2011 cohort to the most current cohort each year.
$\diamond$ After the first year, students age 25 and older produced higher productive grade rates than those in younger age groups.
$\diamond$ Overall, full-time students in each cohort and each year produced higher productive grade rates than parttime students.
$\diamond$ Productive grade rates were predominantly higher among non-Pell recipients than among Pell recipients.
$\diamond$ Overall, across each cohort and each year, productive grade rates were higher among Veteran students than non-Veteran students.
$\diamond$ Overall, productive grade rates were higher among students not referred to developmental education than among those referred.

## Total Productive Grade Rates

Productive grade rates at the Alamo Colleges fluctuated between $71 \%-76 \%$ across all cohorts and all years. First year productive grade rates climbed each year from Fall 2011 ( $71.2 \%$ ), 2012 ( $73 \%$ ), and 2013 ( $73.8 \%$ ). After a decline in Fall 2014 ( $71.8 \%$ ), rates peaked in the Fall 2015 cohort at $75.7 \%$. In each cohort, productive grade rates remained relatively unchanged from the first year to the second year, and again from the third year to subsequent years. Productive grade rates in the Fall 2011 cohort increased 1.4 percentage point from the first year (71.2\%) to the fifth year (72.6\%).


[^2]
## Productive Grade Rates by Gender

Across each cohort and each year, female students consistently demonstrated higher productive grade rates than did male students. Female productive grade rates fluctuated between $73 \%$ and $77 \%$ through the Fall 2014 cohort, then peaked at $78 \%$ in the Fall 2015 cohort. Male productive grade rates exhibited a steady pattern of improvement from the first year to the most current year in all cohorts except the second year. Overall, productive grade rates ranged from a low of $68.4 \%$ (male, 2011, 1st year) to a high of $77.6 \%$ (female, 2015, 1st year).


## Notes:

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

## Productive Grade Rates by Ethnicity

Productive grade rates of Asian students were predominantly higher than all other student groups across all cohorts and in each year. Other and White student groups displayed higher productive grade rates than did African American and Hispanic student groups. African American students exhibited the greatest first year increase among all student groups growing 7.2 percentage points from Fall 2011 cohort ( $63.6 \%$ ) to the Fall 2015 cohort ( $70.8 \%$ ). Additionally, both African American and Hispanic student groups in the Fall 2011 cohort exhibited an increase in productive grade rates from the first year to the fifth year.


Notes:
(1) Productive grade rates represent grades of $C$ or higher based on all courses (cumulative) through the Fall semester of the first, second, third, fourth, and fifth year.
(2) 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

After the first year students age 25 and older displayed higher productive grade rates than those younger than they were. With few exceptions, this was a recurrent pattern throughout each cohort and each year. After five years of longitudinal tracking, students in the Fall 2011 cohort 17 or less age group displayed a 4.3 percentage point increase in rates from the first year ( $71.6 \%$ ) to the fifth year ( $75.9 \%$ ). During the same period, the $25-35$ age group exhibited a 1.6 percentage point decrease from the first year (77.3\%) to the fifth year (75.7\%).


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) Age as reported at the Fall semester of the cohort year.
(6) Sources: FTIC Demographics ACCDODS.XST_CBM001_ACCD; Course Enrollment ACCDODS1.XST_IRES_SC

## Productive Grade Rates by Enrollment Status

Full-time students consistently produced higher productive grade rates than part-time students in each cohort and each year. Productive grade rates of full-time students ranged from $73 \%$ to $79 \%$, while part-time student rates ranged from $69 \%$ to $73 \%$. First year full-time productive grade rates of the Fall 2015 cohort ( $79.4 \%$ ) were 6.3 percentage points higher than the first year Fall 2011 cohort ( $73.1 \%$ ). Overall, in most cohorts, productive grade rates remained relatively unchanged from the first year to the second year, and again from the third year to subsequent years.


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

Overall, across each cohort and each year, productive grade rates were higher among non-Pell grant recipients than Pell grant recipients. Productive grade rates of Pell students exhibited consecutive first year increases from the Fall 2011 (70\%) to Fall 2013 ( $71.3 \%$ ), followed by a decline in the Fall 2014 cohort ( $68.4 \%$ ) . However, by Fall 2015 the first year rates of Pell students had surpassed the previous cohorts and reached $74.3 \%$. Non-Pell students indicated an overall improvement in rates from year-to-year and cohort-to-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 CBMOO1).
(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 (excluding Fall 2015). However, first year productive grade rates among veteran students exhibited a decline from previous years in the Fall 2014 and 2015 cohorts. During the same period, non-veteran students' productive grade rates increased 5 percentage points from the Fall 2011 cohort ( $70.8 \%$ ) to the Fall 2015 cohort ( $75.8 \%$ ). In the Fall 2011 cohort, productive grade rates of veteran students declined 1.8 percentage points from the first year to the fifth year while rates for non-veteran students increased by 1.7 percentage points over 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) 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 ( $72.8 \%$ ) grew 6.9 percentage points higher than the first year Fall 2011 cohort ( $65.9 \%$ ). Also, first year non-referred student productive grade rates of the Fall 2015 cohort ( $78 \%$ ) grew 3.4 percentage points higher than the first year Fall 2011 cohort ( $74.6 \%$ ). In the Fall 2011 cohort, productive grade rates of referred students grew 2.2 percentage points from the first year to the fifth year, while rates for students not-referred grew 0.9 percentage points. 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 CBM001).
(5) Beginning in Fall 2014, Integrated Reading and Writing (INRW) developmental education courses replaced English and Reading developmental courses. INRW 0305 combined READ 0301, READ 0302, and ENGL 0300. INRW 0420 combined READ 0303 and ENGL 0301. RSG (Ready, Set, Go; ENGL 1301+) is an accelerated English course that allows students to move right into ENGL 1301. It combines ENGL 1301 and INRW 0100. INRW courses are reported as English courses from Fall 2014 cohort onward. Reading courses are not reported from Fall 2014 onward.
(6) Sources: DE Referral ACCDODS1.XST_ATD_ACCD; Course Enrollment ACCDODS1.XST_IRES_SC

## 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 ( $72.1 \%$ ) grew 3.8 percentage points from the first year Fall 2011 cohort ( $68.3 \%$ ). Also, first year non-referred student productive grade rates of the Fall 2015 cohort ( $80 \%$ ) grew by less than one percentage points from the first year Fall 2011 cohort ( $79.2 \%$ ). In the Fall 2011 cohort, productive grade rates of referred students grew 2 percentage points from the first year to the fifth year, while rates for non-referred students changed by less than one percentage point.


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

# ALAMO COLLEGES <br> 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 Alamo Colleges. 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.
$\diamond$ Of Fall FTIC students who started at Alamo Colleges, $76 \%-81 \%$ of students in each cohort persisted to the subsequent Spring term (1st year).
$\diamond$ Overall, females in each cohort and each year persisted at higher rates than did males.
$\diamond$ Overall, Asian students persisted at higher rates than other student groups in each cohort and each year.
$\diamond$ After five years, students in the 17 or less and 18-21 age groups persisted at slightly higher rates than students in older age groups.
$\diamond$ Overall, full-time students in each cohort and each year persisted at higher rates than did part-time students.
$\diamond$ After five years, non-Pell grant recipients persisted at slightly higher rates than Pell grant recipients.
$\diamond$ Generally, in each cohort and each year, persistence rates of students not referred to developmental education (DE) were slightly higher than those of students referred to DE.

## Total Persistence Rates

First year (Fall-to-Spring) persistence rates peaked with the Fall 2012 cohort (79\%), but remained relatively consistent across the other cohorts ( $77 \%-78 \%$ ). After two years (initial Fall term to subsequent Fall term), more than half of Fall FTIC students who started at Alamo Colleges were still enrolled. The Fall 2011 cohort gaps in persistence rates were greater from year-to-year in the first three years.
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## Persistence Rates by Gender

Overall and consistently, females persisted at higher rates than did males.


## 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 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). 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.
Graduate Status: 2011-2015: ACCDODS1.XST_CBM009_ACCD
FTIC Demographics: 2011-2015: ACCDODS1.XST_CBM001_ACCD

## Persistence Rates by Ethnicity

Overall, Asian students persisted at higher rates than other student groups in each cohort and each year. African American students persisted at lower rates for the first three years. First year persistence rates among Hispanic and White students were relatively close in each cohort. After five years, Asian students persisted at higher rates than other student groups.


5th Year: Fall to Any Term 5th Year

| 100\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 80\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 40\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20\% |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Fall 2011* | Fall 2012 | Fall 2013 | Fall 2014 | Fall 2015 |
| - African American | 11.6\% |  |  |  |  |
| - Asian | 21.6\% |  |  |  |  |
| - Hispanic | 15.2\% |  |  |  |  |
| - Other | 8.9\% |  |  |  |  |
| - White | 12.4\% |  |  |  |  |

Notes:
(1) Persistence rate is the measure of FTIC students, excluding graduates, who continue from their initial Fall semester (cohort year) to a subsequent time of measurement.
(2) Fall 2012 and 2013 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is 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). 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.
Graduate Status: 2011-2015: ACCDODS1.XST_CBM009_ACCD
FTIC Demographics: 2011-2015: ACCDODS1.XST_CBM001_ACCD

## Persistence Rates By Age

First year persistence rates increased and decreased across all cohorts, alternately, for students less than 17 years old . Overall, students 22-24 and 51+ years old have the lowest persistence rates. Second year persistence rates for student $51+$ years old jumped from the 2nd year low (35\%) in Fall 2014 to the highest (63\%) for that age group the following Fall.


5th Year: Fall to Any Term 5th 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 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). 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
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 in each cohort and each year persisted at higher rates than did part-time students through the first four years. The greatest gaps in persistence rates between full-time and part-time students was most evident within the first three years. After four and five years, this gap closes and persistence rates between full- and part-time students become relatively equal.

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 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). 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.
Graduate Status: 2011-2015: ACCDODS1.XST_CBM009_ACCD FTIC Demographics: 2011-2015: ACCDODS1.XST_CBM001_ACCD
(4) Preliminary numbers used for Fall 2014, third year and Fall 2015, second year.

## Persistence Rates by Pell Status

First-year persistence rates across all cohorts were higher among Pell grant recipients than non-Pell grant recipients. However, this ratio was inverted in subsequent years as persistence rates were higher among non-Pell grant recipients through 2014. After five years, non-Pell grant recipients persisted at slightly higher rates (15\%) than Pell grant recipients (14\%).

Persistence Rate by Pell Status


## Notes:

(1) Persistence rate is the measure of FTIC students, excluding graduates, who continue from their initial Fall semester (cohort year) to a subsequent time of measurement.
(2) Fall 2012 and 2013 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is 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). 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.
Graduate Status: 2011-2015: ACCDODS1.XST_CBM009_ACCD
FTIC Demographics: 2011-2015: ACCDODS1.XST_CBM001_ACCD

## Persistence Rates by Veteran Status

Overall, persistence rates for the first three years were higher for veteran students than non-veteran students. First-year persistence rates for veterans peaked in Fall 2013 ( $84 \%$ ). By the fourth year, the gap between veteran and non-veteran students narrows.

Persistence Rate by Veteran Status


[^4]
## Persistence Rates by Developmental Education Referral

Generally, persistence rates of students not referred to developmental education (DE) were slightly higher than those of students referred to DE. By the fourth year the persistence gap narrows between students referred to DE and those that were not. By the fifth year, both, college ready and those referred to $D E$, were relatively equal.


## Notes:

(1) Persistence rate is the measure of FTIC students, excluding graduates, who continue from their initial Fall semester (cohort year) to a subsequent time of measurement.
(2) Fall 2012 and 2013 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is 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). 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. Graduate Status: 2011-2015: ACCDODS1.XST_CBM009_ACCD FTIC Demographics: 2011-2015: ACCDODS1.XST_CBM001_ACCD

# ALAMO COLLEGES <br> GRADUATION RATES 

## AtD Indicator \#5: Complete Credentials

This report compares the 1- to 5-year graduation rates for the Fall 2011 through Fall 2015 FTIC unduplicated cohorts at Alamo Colleges. To calculate graduation rates, cumulative associate and certificate graduates were divided by the total starting cohort. These rates were examined by various student and academic characteristics.
$\diamond$ The proportion of students graduating after 3 years steadily increased across the 2011 (10.0\%), 2012 (12.6\%), and 2013 (14.3\%) cohorts.
$\diamond \quad$ Male students had a higher one-year graduation rate than female students, across all cohorts. Female students, however, had a higher percentage than male students in 2-year, 3-year, 4-year and 5-year graduation rates across most cohorts.
$\diamond$ Asian students exhibited higher graduation rates than other students in each cohort from year 3 to 5 .
$\diamond$ Students aged 22-24 had lower graduation rates than other age groups across all cohorts in years three, four and five
$\diamond$ Graduation rates of full-time students were generally higher than those of part-time students.
$\diamond$ Generally, FTIC Pell recipients and non-Pell recipients graduated at similar rates across all cohorts and years.
$\diamond$ Students who identified as veterans experienced higher graduation rates than non-veteran students over most cohorts and years.
$\diamond$ A significant growth in graduation rates among students not referred to DE is evident from year 2 to year 3 in the 2011, 2012 and 2013 cohorts.

## Total Graduation Rates

First year graduation rates were relatively similar across each cohort. The proportion of students graduating after 3 years steadily increased across the 2011 (10.0\%), 2012 (12.6\%), and 2013 (14.3\%) cohorts. The proportion of students graduating after 4 years increased from the 2011 (16.3\%) to the 2012 (19.6\%) cohort. Of the FTIC students who started at the Alamo Colleges in 2011, 20.2\% received a degree or certificate after 5 years.

*See notes, next page

## Graduation Rates by Gender

Male students had a higher one-year graduation rate than female students, across all cohorts. Female students, however, had a higher percentage than male students in 2-year, 3-year, 4-year and 5-year graduation rates across most cohorts. Of the FTIC students who started at the Alamo Colleges in 2011, $17.5 \%$ of male students and $22.4 \%$ of female students received a degree or certificate after 5 years.

## Graduation Rate by Gender
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## Graduation Rates by Ethnicity

Asian students exhibited higher graduation rates than other students over most cohorts from year 3 to 5 . White students exhibited the second highest graduation rates over most cohorts after the first year.


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.
(5) Data are cumulative over time.
(6) Students who transfer or leave Alamo Colleges are not removed from denominators.
(7) Sources: FTIC Demographics-ACIRES.CBM001, Graduates-ACCDIR.CBM009

## Graduation Rates by Age

Students under age 18 and over the age of 35 exhibited the highest graduation rates in years three, four and five. Students aged 22-24 had lower graduation rates than other age groups across all cohorts in years three, four and five.


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

## Graduation Rates by Enrollment Status

Graduation rates of full-time students were higher than those of part-time students across most cohorts. Of the FTIC students who started at the Alamo Colleges in 2011, $25.6 \%$ of full-time students and $15.9 \%$ of part-time students received a degree or certificate after 5 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.
(5) Data are cumulative over time.
(6) Students who transfer or leave Alamo Colleges are not removed from denominators.
(7) Sources: FTIC Demographics-ACIRES.CBM001, Graduates-ACCDIR.CBM009

## Graduation Rates by Pell Status

Generally, FTIC Pell recipients and non-Pell recipients graduated at similar rates across all cohorts and years. Of the FTIC students who started at the Alamo Colleges in 2011, 20.4\% of Pell recipients and $19.9 \%$ of non-Pell recipients received a degree or certificate after five years.

## Graduation Rate by Pell Status



## Notes:

(1) Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC cohort methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using the THECB methodology.
(2) Fall 2012 FTIC student cohort is defined by a combination of THECB (demographic profile, persistence rates, and graduation rates) and True FTIC (productive grade rates, progression through developmental and gatekeeper courses) methodologies.
(3) Fall 2013, 2014, and 2015 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is firsttime in college and credential-seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBMOO1).
(4) Graduation rate based on Associates or Certificates received at any Alamo College.
(5) Data are cumulative over time.
(6) Students who transfer or leave Alamo Colleges are not removed from denominators.
(7) Sources: FTIC Demographics-ACIRES.CBM001, Graduates-ACCDIR.CBM009, Pell Status-ACCDIR.FADS

## Graduation Rates by Veteran Status

Students who identified as veterans experienced higher graduation rates than non-veteran students over most cohorts and years. Of the FTIC students who started at the Alamo Colleges in 2011, 26.5\% of veteran students and $19.8 \%$ of nonveteran 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 CBMOO1).
(4) Veteran status as reported at the Fall semester of the cohort year.
(5) Source: FTIC Demographics-ACCDODS1.XCT_IRES_SC

## Graduation Rates by Developmental Education Referral

Overall, FTIC students not referred to developmental education (DE) had higher graduation rates than did students referred to developmental education. A significant growth in graduation rates among students not referred to DE is evident from year 2 to year 3 in the 2011, 2012 and 2013 cohorts. This pattern is also evident among students who were referred to $D E$ although their counterparts experienced greater growth in these rates.


## Notes:

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

## Sources: FTIC Demographics-ACIRES.CBM001, Graduates-ACCDIR.CBM009

DE Referrals-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


[^0]:    $A A=$ African-American $\quad A=$ Asian $\quad H=$ Hispanic $\quad O=$ Other $\quad W=$ White

[^1]:    Yes = Veteran
    No $=$ Non-Veteran

[^2]:    *See notes, next page

[^3]:    *See notes, next page

[^4]:    Notes:
    (1) Persistence rate is the measure of FTIC students, excluding graduates, who continue from their initial Fall semester (cohort year) to a subsequent time of measurement
    (2) Fall 2012 and 2013 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is 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). 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. Graduate Status: 2011-2015: ACCDODS1.XST_CBM009_ACCD FTIC Demographics: 2011-2015: ACCDODS1.XST_CBM001_ACCD
    (4) Veteran status as reported at the Fall semester of the cohort year.

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

