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# PALO ALTO COLLEGE <br> DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE \& ACADEMIC CHARACTERISTICS 

## Student Characteristics at First Entry

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

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

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

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

Of the five cohorts represented in this report, the largest cohort has been the Fall 2014 cohort with a headcount of 1,378 . Overall, the cohorts averaged 1,357 students per year.

|  | Fall 2011* | Fall 2012 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2013 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2014 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2015 <br> FTIC Cohort |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 539 | 588 | 546 | 558 | 572 |
| Female | 804 | 755 | 804 | 820 | 801 |
| Total FTIC | 1,343 | 1,343 | 1,350 | 1,378 | 1,373 |

*See notes, next page

## Gender

Female students constituted a higher proportion of the FTIC population than did male students in each cohort. The percentage of female students in each cohort ranged from $56 \%-60 \%$. The percentage of male students ranged from $40 \%$ 44\%.


## Ethnicity

The majority (74\%-86\%) of students in each cohort identified themselves as being Hispanic. The second most represented ethnic group was White (11\%-16\%). Students who identified themselves as Other increased significantly in both the Fall 2013 FTIC cohort and the Fall 2014 FTIC cohort, but decreased by 5.22 percentage points from Fall 2014 to Fall 2015.

|  | Fall 2011* <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2012 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2013 <br> FIIC Cohort | Fall 2014 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2015 <br> FTIC Cohort |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| African American | 29 | 31 | 29 | 34 | 25 |
| Asian | 3 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 5 |
| Hispanic | 1,098 | 1,097 | 1,063 | 1,029 | 1,177 |
| Other | 24 | 15 | 68 | 83 | 11 |
| White | 189 | 196 | 186 | 225 | 155 |
| Total FTIC | 1,343 | 1,343 | 1,350 | 1,378 | 1,373 |



[^0]
## Age

The large majority ( $79 \%-86 \%$ ) of students in each cohort were between 18 and 21 years old when they first enrolled. The second most represented age group included 25 to 35 year olds ( $5 \%-9 \%$ ). Students over the age of 51 had the lowest representation among the cohorts comprising less than $1 \%$ of FTIC students annually.

|  | Fall 2011* <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2012 | Fall 2013 <br> FTIC Cohort | FIIC Cohort <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2015 <br> FTIC Cohort |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 17 or less | 64 | 57 | 50 | 41 | 48 |
| $18-21$ | 1,059 | 1,065 | 1,114 | 1,177 | 1,175 |
| $22-24$ | 41 | 68 | 57 | 60 | 51 |
| $25-35$ | 118 | 103 | 93 | 71 | 73 |
| $36-50$ | 50 | 37 | 31 | 23 | 24 |
| $51+$ | 11 | 13 | 5 | 6 | 2 |
| Total FTIC | 1,343 | 1,343 | 1,350 | 1,378 | 1,373 |


|  |  | Fall FTIC Cohorts by Age at Entry |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fall 2015 <br> Fall 2014 |  |  |  |  | E |
|  |  |  |  |  | - |
| Fall 2013 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fall 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fall 2011* |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0\% | 20\% | 40\% |  | 60\% 8 | 100\% |
|  | Fall 2011* | Fall 2012 | Fall 2013 | Fall 2014 | Fall 2015 |
| - 17 or less | 4.77\% | 4.24\% | 3.70\% | 2.98\% | 3.50\% |
| -18-21 | 78.85\% | 79.30\% | 82.52\% | 85.41\% | 85.58\% |
| - 22-24 | 3.05\% | 5.06\% | 4.22\% | 4.35\% | 3.71\% |
| - 25-35 | 8.79\% | 7.67\% | 6.89\% | 5.15\% | 5.32\% |
| - 36-50 | 3.72\% | 2.76\% | 2.30\% | 1.67\% | 1.75\% |
| - 51+ | 0.82\% | 0.97\% | 0.37\% | 0.44\% | 0.15\% |

[^1]
## Enrollment Status

Across all cohorts, part-time students attended at higher rates than did full-time students. Full-time students were defined as those enrolled in 12 or more hours at census date. Part-time students represented the majority ( $64 \%-75 \%$ ) of the Fall FTIC cohort population at Palo Alto College.

|  | Fall 2011* <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2012 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2013 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2014 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2015 <br> FTIC Cohort |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Full-Time | 447 | 339 | 419 | 497 | 479 |
| Part-Time | 896 | 1,004 | 931 | 881 | 894 |
| Total FTIC | 1,343 | 1,343 | 1,350 | 1,378 | 1,373 |



[^2]
## Pell Status

The proportion of FTIC cohort students receiving the Pell grant in Fall 2015 (65.77\%) is 5.94 percentage points lower than in Fall 2011 ( $71.71 \%$ ). Overall, the percentage of students in each cohort who received the Pell grant ranged from 66\%72\%.

|  | Fall 2011* <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2012 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2013 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2014 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2015 <br> FTIC Cohort |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pell Grant | 963 | 924 | 948 | 946 | 903 |
| No Pell Grant | 380 | 419 | 402 | 432 | 470 |
| Total FTIC | 1,343 | 1,343 | 1,350 | 1,378 | 1,373 |



[^3]
## Veteran Status

A small percentage of all FTIC students in each cohort (4\%-6\%) were designated as veterans upon initial enrollment. This percentage has remained relatively consistent over the past five years, with a fluctuation of only 0.54 percentage points between the Fall 2011 and Fall 2015 cohorts.

|  | Fall 2011* <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2012 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2013 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2014 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2015 <br> FTIC Cohort |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vet | 71 | 59 | 73 | 88 | 80 |
| Non-Vet | 1,272 | 1,284 | 1,277 | 1,290 | 1,293 |
| Total FTIC | 1,343 | 1,343 | 1,350 | 1,378 | 1,373 |

## Fall FTIC Cohorts by Veteran Status at Entry



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

Source: FTIC Demographics-ACCDODS1.XCT_IRES_SC

## Developmental Education Referral Status

The 2011, 2012 and 2015 FTIC cohorts had the large majority ( $75 \%-82 \%$ ) of students in each cohort were referred to developmental education (DE) courses. However, a significant shift in referral levels is reflected in the 2013 FTIC student cohort. This shift is reflected in a $22 \%$ decline in students referred to developmental education from 2012 to 2013, and a further decline of $3 \%$ from 2013 to 2014. There was a small percentage of students $(1 \%-3 \%)$ in each cohort whose referral status could not be determined due to lack of assessment scores or DE course enrollment.

|  | Fall 2011* <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2012 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2013 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2014 <br> FTIC Cohort | Fall 2015 <br> FTIC Cohort |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Referred | 1,086 | 1,095 | 817 | 793 | 1,036 |
| Not Referred | 214 | 217 | 520 | 563 | 323 |
| Unknown | 43 | 31 | 13 | 22 | 14 |
| Total FTIC | 1,343 | 1,343 | 1,350 | 1,378 | 1,373 |

## Fall FTIC Cohorts by Referral to DE Courses



[^4]
# PALO ALTO COLLEGE PROGRESSION THROUGH DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION AND "GATEKEEPER" COURSES 

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

This report compares the 1- to 5-year developmental education (DE) and "gatekeeper" progression rates for English and Math for the Fall 2011 through Fall 2015 FTIC cohorts at Palo Alto College. Students in each cohort were referred to English and Math DE courses based on assessment scores for that subject. Students at each level then were tracked as they progressed through the DE and "gatekeeper" sequences within each subject. These rates were examined by various student and academic characteristics.
$\diamond$ Across English and Math subjects, female students compared to male students generally had greater success in DE and "gatekeeper" courses.
$\diamond$ Of those students referred to Level 2, African-American students, compared to students of other racial/ ethnic groups, successfully passed the highest DE English course at the highest rates in 2011.
$\diamond$ Across English and Math, no age group exhibited a trend.
$\diamond$ Across English and Math, full-time students compared to part-time students generally had greater success in DE and "gatekeeper" courses.
$\diamond$ For English and Math, Pell recipients compared to non-Pell recipients generally had greater success in DE and "gatekeeper" courses.
$\diamond$ For English and Math, veterans compared to non-veterans generally had greater success in highest DE and "gatekeeper" courses.

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

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

Notes:

1) Attempted = student received a grade for course (includes variations of W); Completed = student received a grade of A, B, C, D, F, I, IP, or P for course; Success = student received a grade of A, B, or C for course.
2) High $D E=$ last course in $D E$ sequence (Level 2).
3) English "gatekeeper" course is ENGL 1301.
4) Fall 2012-Fall 2015 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is first-time in college and credential seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the 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 $28 \%-47 \%$ of referred students in each cohort attempted the highest course in the English DE sequence, with $20 \%-34 \%$ of the cohort successfully passing the course. Approximately $26 \%-53 \%$ of referred students in each cohort attempted the English "gatekeeper" course, with 19\%-42\% students successfully passing the "gatekeeper" course. In comparing the 2011 and 2013 cohorts, success in year three "gatekeeper" increased by almost 11 percentage points.


## English "Gatekeeper" Progression of Non-Referred

After 3 years, $72 \%-82 \%$ of non-referred students in each cohort attempted the English "gatekeeper" course, with 52\%$67 \%$ of the cohort successfully passing the course. From Fall 2011 to Fall 2013 attempted and success in English "gatekeeper" rates, at corresponding intervals, have increased.


## Total English Progression

Overall, $40 \%-48 \%$ of all referred students in each cohort successfully passed any English DE course within the first year, $20 \%-34 \%$ successfully passed the highest DE course in the English sequence within 3 years, and approximately 31\%$39 \%$ successfully passed the English "gatekeeper" course within 3 years. Of the non-referred students, 52\%-67\% successfully passed the English "gatekeeper" course within 3 years. Of the total cohort, $44 \%-55 \%$ successfully passed the English "gatekeeper" course within 3 years. Those who were referred to Level 2 had higher success rates in the highest 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, both Level-2 referred and non-referred students 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) | Success in High DE (3rd Year) | Success in RSG (3rd Year) | Success in GK (3rd Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DE Level } 1 \\ & 192 \text { (14.3\%) } \end{aligned}$ | 132 (68.8\%) | 87 (45.3\%) | Not Applicable |  | 35 (18.2\%) | Not Applicable | 34 (17.7\%) |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 2 \\ 384(28.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 251 (65.4\%) | 176 (45.8\%) |  |  | 158 (41.1\%) |  | 143 (37.2\%) |
|  | Total Referred 576 (42.9\%) | 383 (66.5\%) | 263 (45.7\%) |  |  | 193 (33.5\%) |  | 177 (30.7\%) |
|  | College Level 746 (55.5\%) |  |  | Not | able |  |  | 414 (55.5\%) |
|  | Unknown $21 \text { (1.6\%) }$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ | Not Applicable |  | $0(0.0 \%)$ | Not Applicable | $0(0.0 \%)$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cohort Total } \\ & 1,343(100.0 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 456 (34.0\%) | 328 (24.4\%) |  |  | 255 (19.0\%) |  | 591 (44.0\%) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DE Level } 1 \\ & 178(13.8 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 136 (76.4\%) | 99 (55.6\%) | Not Applicable |  | 55 (30.9\%) | 1 (0.6\%) | 49 (27.5\%) |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 2 \\ 354(27.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 176 (49.7\%) | 124 (35.0\%) |  |  | 112 (31.6\%) | 1 (0.3\%) | 130 (36.7\%) |
|  | Total Referred $532 \text { (41.2\%) }$ | 312 (58.6\%) | 223 (41.9\%) |  |  | 167 (31.4\%) | 2 (0.4\%) | 179 (33.6\%) |
|  | College Level 751 (58.2\%) |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  | 388 (51.7\%) |
|  | Unknown $8(0.6 \%)$ | 1 (12.5\%) | 1 (12.5\%) |  |  | 1 (12.5\%) | $0(0.0 \%)$ | 2 (25.0\%) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cohort Total } \\ & 1,291(100.0 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 341 (26.4\%) | 246 (19.1\%) |  |  | 186 (14.4\%) | 2 (0.2\%) | 569 (44.1\%) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 등 } \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \text { m } \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{O} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DELevel } 1 \\ & 276(20.4 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 174 (63.0\%) | 130 (47.1\%) | Not Applicable |  | 37 (13.4\%) | 16 (5.8\%) | 72 (26.1\%) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DE Level } 2 \\ & 290(21.5 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 145 (50.0\%) | 120 (41.4\%) |  |  | 76 (26.2\%) | $0(0.0 \%)$ | 147 (50.7\%) |
|  | Total Referred 566 (41.9\%) | 319 (56.4\%) | 250 (44.2\%) |  |  | 113 (20.0\%) | 16 (2.8\%) | 219 (38.7\%) |
|  | College Level 771 (57.1\%) |  |  | Not | able |  |  | 513 (66.5\%) |
|  | Unknown $13(1.0 \%)$ | $0(0.0 \% 6)$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ | Not Applicable |  | $0(0.0 \%)$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ | 5 (38.5\%) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cohort Total } \\ & 1,350(100.0 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 343 (25.4\%) | 268 (19.9\%) |  |  | 125 (9.3\%) | 16 (1.2\%) | 737 (54.6\%) |

## Notes:

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

## Total English Progression (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) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DELevel 1 $136(9.9 \%)$ | 92 (67.6\%) | 58 (42.6\%) | 6 (4.4\%) | 3 (2.2\%) |  | 3rdYear Data Not Yet Available |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DELevel 2 } \\ 221(16.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 138 (62.4\%) | 98 (44.3\%) | 17 (7.7\%) | 8 (3.6\%) |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DELevel } 3 \\ & 188(13.6 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 143 (76.1\%) | 101 (53.7\%) | 137 (72.9\%) | 95 (50.5\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DELevel 4 4 (0.3\%) | 3 (75.0\%) | 3 (75.0\%) | 3 (75.0\%) | 3 (75.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Total Referred 549 (39.8\%) | 376 (68.5\%) | 260 (47.4\%) | 163 (29.7\%) | 109 (19.9\%) |  |  |  |
|  | College Level $749 \text { (54.4\%) }$ | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Unknown $80(5.8 \%)$ | 0 O.0\%) | $0(0.0 \%)$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cohort Total } \\ & 1,378(100.0 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 389 (28.2\%) | 270 (19.6\%) | 174 (12.6\%) | 117 (8.5\%) |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{t} \\ & 0 \\ & \frac{1}{0} \\ & \stackrel{n}{0} \\ & \stackrel{1}{N} \\ & \overline{\bar{n}} \end{aligned}$ | DELevel 1 $160(11.7 \%)$ | 95 (59.4\%) | 56 (35.0\%) | 6 (3.8\%) | 3 (1.9\%) |  | 3rd Year Data Not Yet Available |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DELevel } 2 \\ 312(22.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 173 (55.4\%) | 125 (40.1\%) | 23 (7.4\%) | 16 (5.1\%) |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DELevel 3 } \\ 302(22.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 170 (56.3\%) | 128 (42.4\%) | 159 (52.6\%) | 118 (39.1\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Total Referred 774 (56.4\%) | 438 (56.6\%) | 309 (39.9\%) | 188 (24.3\%) | 137 (17.7\%) |  |  |  |
|  | College Level $574 \text { (41.8\%) }$ | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Unknown 25 (1.8\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | $0(0.0 \%)$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cohort Total } \\ & 1,373(100.0 \%) \text { ) } \end{aligned}$ | 447 (32.6\%) | 316 (23.0\%) | 194 (14.1\%) | 143 (10.4\%) |  |  |  |

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

Overall, females compared to males successfully passed the English highest DE and "gatekeeper" courses at higher rates. When comparing the 2011 cohort to the 2013 cohort, 2013 cohort non-referred males experienced an increase in "gatekeeper" success.

|  |  | Referral Level |  | Attempted Any DE (1st Year) |  | Success in Any DE (1st Year) |  | Attempted RSG <br> (1st Year) | Success in RSG <br> (1st Year) |  | in High DE <br> Year) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Success in RSG } \\ \text { (3rd Year) } \end{gathered}$ |  | cess in GK <br> 3rd Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DE Level 1 | M | 92 (47.9\%) | M | 65 (70.7\%) | M | 42 (45.7\%) | Not Applicable |  | M | 15 (16.3\%) |  | M | 15 (16.3\%) |
|  | 192 (14.3\%) | F | 100 (52.1\%) | $F$ | 67 (67.0\%) | F | 45 (45.0\%) |  |  | F | 20 (20.0\%) |  | F | 19 (19.0\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | M | 172 (44.8\%) | M | 109 (63.4\%) | M | 67 (39.0\%) |  |  | M | 66 (38.4\%) |  | M | 59 (34.3\%) |
|  | 384 (28.6\%) | F | 212 (55.2\%) | $F$ | 142 (67.0\%) | F | 109 (51.4\%) |  |  | F | 92 (43.4\%) |  | F | 84 (39.6\%) |
|  | Total Referred | M | 264 (45.8\%) | M | 174 (65.9\%) | M | 109 (41.3\%) |  |  | M | 81 (30.7\%) |  | M | 74 (28.0\%) |
|  | 576 (42.9\%) | F | 312 (54.2\%) | F | 209 (67.0\%) | F | 154 (49.4\%) |  |  | F | 112 (35.9\%) |  | F | 103 (33.0\%) |
|  | College Level | M | 267 (35.8\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | M | 145 (54.3\%) |
|  | 746 (55.5\%) | F | 479 (64.2\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F | 269 (56.2\%) |
|  | Unknown | M | 8 (38.1\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | M | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable | M | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  | 21 (1.6\%) | F | 13 (61.9\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) | $F$ | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | F | 0 (0.0\%) |  | F | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | M | 539 (40.1\%) | M | 196 (36.4\%) | M | 129 (23.9\%) |  |  | M | 99 (18.4\%) |  | M | 219 (40.6\%) |
|  | 1,343 (100.0\%) | F | 804 (59.9\%) | F | 260 (32.3\%) | F | 199(24.8\%), |  |  | F | 156(19.4\%) |  | F | 372 (46.3\%) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & 0 \\ & \tilde{8} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \bar{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | DE Level 1 | M | 95 (53.4\%) | M | 72 (75.8\%) | M | 52 (54.7\%) | Not Applicable |  | M | 26 (27.4\%) | M 1 (1.1\%) | M | 24 (25.3\%) |
|  | 178 (13.8\%) | F | 83 (46.6\%) | F | 64 (77.1\%) | F | 47 (56.6\%) |  |  | F | 29 (34.9\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | F | 25 (30.1\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | M | 158 (44.6\%) | M | 90 (57.0\%) | M | 66 (41.8\%) |  |  | M | 57 (36.1\%) | M 0 (0.0\%) | M | 51 (32.3\%) |
|  | 354 (27.4\%) | F | 196 (55.4\%) | F | 86 (43.9\%) | F | 58 (29.6\%) |  |  | F | 55 (28.1\%) | 1 (0.5\%) | $F$ | 79 (40.3\%) |
|  | Total Referred | M | 253 (47.6\%) | M | 162 (64.0\%) | M | 118 (46.6\%) |  |  | M | 83 (32.8\%) | M $\quad 1$ (0.4\%) | M | 75 (29.6\%) |
|  | 532 (41.2\%) | F | 279 (52.4\%) | F | 150 (53.8\%) | F | 105 (37.6\%) |  |  | F | 84 (30.1\%) | 1 (0.4\%) | F | 104 (37.3\%) |
|  | College Level | M | 307 (40.9\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | M | 161 (52.4\%) |
|  | 751 (58.2\%) | F | 444 (59.1\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F | 227 (51.1\%) |
|  | Unknown | M | 6 (75.0\%) | M | 1 (16.7\%) | M | 1 (16.7\%) | Not Applicable |  | M | 1 (16.7\%) | M 0 (0.0\%) | M | 1 (16.7\%) |
|  | 8 (0.6\%) | F | 2 (25.0\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | F | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | F | 1 (50.0\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | M | 566 (43.8\%) | M | 180 (31.8\%) | M | 133 (23.5\%) |  |  | M | 97 (17.1\%) | M $\quad 1$ (0.2\%) | M | 237 (41.9\%) |
|  | 1,291 (100.0\%) | F | 725 (56.2\%) | F | 161 (22.2\%) | F | 113(15.6\%) |  |  | F | 89, $12.3 \%$ ) | 1 $0.1 \%$ | F | 332 $445.8 \%$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{1}{0} \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & 0 \\ & \text { m } \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2} \\ & \bar{\omega} \end{aligned}$ | DE Level 1 | M | 124 (44.9\%) | M | 76 (61.3\%) | M | 50 (40.3\%) | Not Applicable |  | M | 12 (9.7\%) | M 3 (2.4\%) | M | 24 (19.4\%) |
|  | 276 (20.4\%) | F | 152 (55.1\%) | $F$ | 98 (64.5\%) | $F$ | 80 (52.6\%) |  |  | F | 25 (16.4\%) | 13 (8.6\%) | F | 48 (31.6\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | M | 107 (36.9\%) | M | 57 (53.3\%) | M | 44 (41.1\%) |  |  | M | 30 (28.0\%) | M 0 (0.0\%) | M | 42 (39.3\%) |
|  | 290 (21.5\%) | F | 183 (63.1\%) | F | 88 (48.1\%) | $F$ | 76 (41.5\%) |  |  | F | 46 (25.1\%) | F 0 (0.0\%) | F | 105 (57.4\%) |
|  | Total Referred | M | 231 (40.8\%) | M | 133 (57.6\%) | M | 94 (40.7\%) |  |  | M | 42 (18.2\%) | M 3 (1.3\%) | M | 66 (28.6\%) |
|  | 566 (41.9\%) | F | 335 (59.2\%) | F | 186 (55.5\%) | F | 156 (46.6\%) |  |  | F | 71 (21.2\%) | 13 (3.9\%) | F | 153 (45.7\%) |
|  | College Level | M | 304 (39.4\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | M | 189 (62.2\%) |
|  | $771 \text { (57.1\%) }$ | F | 467 (60.6\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F | 324 (69.4\%) |
|  | Unknown | M | 11 (84.6\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | M | 0 (0.0\%) | M 0 (0.0\%) | M | 5 (45.5\%) |
|  | 13 (1.0\%) | F | 2 (15.4\%) | $F$ | 0 (0.0\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | F | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | M | 546 (40.4\%) | M | 142 (26.0\%) | M | 99 (18.1\%) |  |  | M | 44 (8.1\%) | M 3 (0.5\%) | M | 260 (47.6\%) |
|  | 1,350 (100.0\%) | F | 804 (59.6\%), | F | 201 (25.0\%) |  | 169 (21.0\%), |  |  | F | 81 $10.1 \%$ | 13(1.6\%) | F | 477(59.3\%) |

## English Progression by Gender

|  |  | Referral Level |  | Attempted Any DE (1st Year) |  | Success in Any DE (1st Year) |  | Attempted RSG (1st Year) |  | Success in RSG (1st Year) |  | Success in High DE (3rd Year) | Success in RSG (3rd Year) | Success in GK (3rd Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \frac{4}{0} \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & 0 \\ & \frac{\pi}{8} \\ & \frac{1}{1} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | DE Level 1 | M | 62 (45.6\%) | M | 39 (62.9\%) | M | 22 (35.5\%) | M | 2 (3.2\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) | 3rd Year Data Not Yet Available |  |  |
|  | 136 (9.9\%) | F | 74 (54.4\%) | F | 53 (71.6\%) | F | 36 (48.6\%) | F | 4 (5.4\%) | F | 3 (4.1\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 2 | M | 91 (41.2\%) | M | 63 (69.2\%) | M | 40 (44.0\%) | M | 8 (8.8\%) | M | 3 (3.3\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 221 (16.0\%) | F | 130 (58.8\%) | $F$ | 75 (57.7\%) | F | 58 (44.6\%) | $F$ | 9 (6.9\%) | $F$ | 5 (3.8\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 3 | M | 68 (36.2\%) | M | 54 (79.4\%) | M | 28 (41.2\%) | M | 52 (76.5\%) | M | 27 (39.7\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 188 (13.6\%) | F | 120 (63.8\%) | F | 89 (74.2\%) | F | 73 (60.8\%) | $F$ | 85 (70.8\%) | F | 68 (56.7\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 4 | M | 3 (75.0\%) | M | 2 (66.7\%) | M | 2 (66.7\%) | M | 2 (66.7\%) | M | 2 (66.7\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 4 (0.3\%) | F | 1 (25.0\%) | $F$ | 1 (100.0\%) | F | 1 (100.0\%) | F | 1 (100.0\%) | F | 1 (100.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Total Referred | M | 224 (40.8\%) | M | 158 (70.5\%) | M | 92 (41.1\%) | M | 64 (28.6\%) | M | 32 (14.3\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 549 (39.8\%) | F | 325 (59.2\%) | $F$ | 218 (67.1\%) | F | 168 (51.7\%) | F | 99 (30.5\%) | F | 77 (23.7\%) |  |  |  |
|  | College Level | M | $308 \text { (41.1\%) }$ | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $749 \text { (54.4\%) }$ | F | $441 \text { (58.9\%) }$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Unknown | M | 26 (32.5\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) | M | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  |  |
|  | 80 (5.8\%) | F | 54 (67.5\%) | $F$ | 0 (0.0\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) | F | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  |  |
|  | Cohort Total | M | 558 (40.5\%) | M | 165 (29.6\%) | M | 97 (17.4\%) | M | 70 (12.5\%) | M | 36 (6.5\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 1,378 (100.0\%) | F- | 820 (59.5\%) | F | 224 (27.3\%) | F | 173 (21.1\%) | F | 104 (12.7\%). | F | 81 (9.9\%) |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \overleftarrow{L}_{0} \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & \frac{1}{8} \\ & \stackrel{1}{4} \\ & \overline{4} \end{aligned}$ | DE Level 1 | M | 66 (41.3\%) | M | 40 (60.6\%) | M | 26 (39.4\%) | M | 2 (3.0\%) | M | 2 (3.0\%) | 3rd Year Data Not Yet Available |  |  |
|  | 160 (11.7\%) | F | 94 (58.8\%) | $F$ | 55 (58.5\%) | F | 30 (31.9\%) | $F$ | 4 (4.3\%) | F | 1 (1.1\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 2 | M | 132 (42.3\%) | M | 73 (55.3\%) | M | 45 (34.1\%) | M | 8 (6.1\%) | M | 6 (4.5\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 312 (22.7\%) | F | 180 (57.7\%) | F | 100 (55.6\%) | F | 80 (44.4\%) | $F$ | 15 (8.3\%) | $F$ | 10 (5.6\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 3 | M | $121 \text { (40.1\%) }$ | M | $63 \text { (52.1\%) }$ | M | $45(37.2 \%)$ | M | $58 \text { (47.9\%) }$ | M | $40(33.1 \%)$ |  |  |  |
|  | $302 \text { (22.0\%) }$ | F | $181 \text { (59.9\%) }$ | F | 107 (59.1\%) | F | 83 (45.9\%) | F | 101 (55.8\%) | $F$ | 78 (43.1\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Total Referred | M | $319 \text { (41.2\%) }$ | M | $176(55.2 \%)$ | M | $116 \text { (36.4\%) }$ | M | $68 \text { (21.3\%) }$ | M | $48(15.0 \%)$ |  |  |  |
|  | $774 \text { (56.4\%) }$ | F | 455 (58.8\%) | F | 262 (57.6\%) | F | 193 (42.4\%) | F | $120(26.4 \%)$ | F | $89 \text { (19.6\%) }$ |  |  |  |
|  | College Level | M | 245 (42.7\%) | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 574 (41.8\%) | F | 329 (57.3\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Unknown | M | 8 (32.0\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) | $\mathrm{M}$ | 0 (0.0\%) | M | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 25 (1.8\%) | F | 17 (68.0\%) | $F$ | 0 (0.0\%) | F | 0 (0.0\%) | F | $0(0.0 \%)$ | F | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Cohort Total | M | 572 (41.7\%) | M | 181 (31.6\%) | M | 120 (21.0\%) | M | 72 (12.6\%) | M | 52 (9.1\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 1,373 (100.0\%) | F | 801 (58.3\%) | F | 266 (33.2\%) | F | 196(24.5\%) | F | 122 (15.2\%). | F | 91(11.4\%) |  |  |  |

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

Sources:
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

Of those students referred to Level 2, African-American students, compared to students of other racial/ethnic groups, successfully passed the highest DE English course at the highest rates in 2011. When comparing the 2011 cohort to the 2013 cohort, both referred and non-referred Hispanic students experienced increases in "gatekeeper" success.

|  |  |  | al Level |  | d Any DE <br> ear) |  | in Any DE <br> Year) | Attempted RSG <br> (1st Year) | Success in RSG (1st Year) |  | High DE Year) | Success in RSG <br> (3rd Year) |  | $\begin{aligned} & s \text { in GK } \\ & \text { Year) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 4 \\ & 0 \\ & \frac{1}{0} \\ & \frac{7}{8} \\ & \overline{8} \\ & \bar{N} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 1 \\ 192 \text { (14.3\%) } \end{gathered}$ | AA | 4 (2.1\%) | AA | 2 (50.0\%) | AA | 1 (25.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable | AA | 1 (25.0\%) |
|  |  | A | 1 (0.5\%) | A | 1 (100.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | A | 0 (0.0\%) |  | A | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | H | 173 (90.1\%) | H | 119 (68.8\%) | H | 77 (44.5\%) |  |  | H | 31 (17.9\%) |  | H | 30 (17.3\%) |
|  |  | 0 | 1 (0.5\%) | 0 | 1 (100.0\%) | 0 | 1 (100.0\%) |  |  | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) |  | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | W | 13 (6.8\%) | W | 9 (69.2\%) | W | 8 (61.5\%) |  |  | W | 4 (30.8\%) |  | W | 3 (23.1\%) |
|  | DE Level 2$384 \text { (28.6\%) }$ | AA | 10 (2.6\%) | AA | 8 (80.0\%) | AA | 7 (70.0\%) |  |  | AA | 5 (50.0\%) |  | AA | 4 (40.0\%) |
|  |  | A | 1 (0.3\%) | A | $0(0.0 \%)$ | A | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | A | 0 (0.0\%) |  | A | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | H | 328 (85.4\%) | H | 221 (67.4\%) | H | 152 (46.3\%) |  |  | H | 139 (42.4\%) |  | H | 124 (37.8\%) |
|  |  | 0 | 4 (1.0\%) | 0 | 1 (25.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) |  | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | W | 41 (10.7\%) | W | 21 (51.2\%) | W | 17 (41.5\%) |  |  | W | 14 (34.1\%) |  | W | 15 (36.6\%) |
|  | Total Referred$576 \text { (42.9\%) }$ | AA | 14 (2.4\%) | AA | 10 (71.4\%) | AA | 8 (57.1\%) |  |  | AA | 5 (35.7\%) |  | AA | 5 (35.7\%) |
|  |  | A | 2 (0.3\%) | A | 1 (50.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | A | 0 (0.0\%) |  | A | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | H | 501 (87.0\%) | H | 340 (67.9\%) | H | 229 (45.7\%) |  |  | H | 170 (33.9\%) |  | H | 154 (30.7\%) |
|  |  | 0 | 5 (0.9\%) | 0 | 2 (40.0\%) | 0 | 1 (20.0\%) |  |  | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) |  | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | W | 54 (9.4\%) | W | 30 (55.6\%) | W | 25 (46.3\%) |  |  | W | 18 (33.3\%) |  | W | 18 (33.3\%) |
|  | College Level$746 \text { (55.5\%) }$ | AA | 12 (1.6\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | AA | 5 (41.7\%) |
|  |  | A | 1 (0.1\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | A | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | H | 581 (77.9\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | H | 325 (55.9\%) |
|  |  | 0 | 18 (2.4\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 12 (66.7\%) |
|  |  | W | 134 (18.0\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | W | 72 (53.7\%) |
|  | Unknown$21 \text { (1.6\%) }$ | AA | 3 (14.3\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable | AA | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | A | 0 (0.0\%) |  | A | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | H | 16 (76.2\%) | H | 0 (0.0\%) | H | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | H | 0 (0.0\%) |  | H | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | 0 | 1 (4.8\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) |  | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | W | 1 (4.8\%) | W | 0 (0.0\%) | W | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | W | 0 (0.0\%) |  | W | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  | Cohort Total$1,343(100.0 \%)$ | AA | 29 (2.2\%) | AA | 11 (37.9\%) | AA | 9 (31.0\%) |  |  | AA | 6 (20.7\%) |  | AA | 10 (34.5\%) |
|  |  | A | 3 (0.2\%) | A | 1 (33.3\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | A | 0 (0.0\%) |  | A | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | H | 1,098 (81.8\%) | H | 403 (36.7\%) | H | 285 (26.0\%) |  |  | H | 224 (20.4\%) |  | H | 479 (43.6\%) |
|  |  | 0 | 24 (1.8\%) | 0 | 3 (12.5\%) | 0 | 2 (8.3\%) |  |  | 0 | 1 (4.2\%) |  | 0 | 12 (50.0\%) |
|  |  | W | 189(14.1\%) | W | 38(20.1\%) | W | 32.16.9\% |  |  | W | 24, $12.7 \%$ |  | W | 90, (47.6\%) |

[^5]
## Notes:

1) Attempted = student received a grade for course (includes variations of $W$ ); Completed = student received a grade of $A, B, C, D, F, I, I P$, or $P$ for course; Success = student received a grade of A, B, or C for course.
2) High $D E=$ last course in $D E$ sequence (Level 2 ).
3) English "gatekeeper" course is ENGL 1301.
4) Fall 2012-Fall 2015 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is first-time in college and credential seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the 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 (denominato = 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:

Ethnicity: DE Referrals:

Course Enrollment::

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

English Progression by Ethnicity (continued)

|  |  | Referral Level |  | Attempted Any DE -- (1st Year) |  | Success in Any DE (1st Year) |  | Attempted RSG $\qquad$ (1st Year) | Success in RSG (1st Year) | Success in High DE (3rd Year) |  | Success in RSG <br> (3rd Year) |  | Success in GK (3rd Year) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 8 \\ & 8 \\ & 8 \\ & \frac{6}{8} \\ & \frac{1}{7} \end{aligned}$ | DE Level 1 <br> 178 (13.8\%) | AA | 3(1.7\%) | AA | 2 (66.7\%) | AA | 1 (33.3\%) | Not Applicable |  | AA | 1(33.3\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | 1(33.3\%) |
|  |  | A | $1(0.6 \%)$ | A | 1 (100.0\%) | A | 1 (100.0\%) |  |  | A | 1 (100.0\%) | A | $0(0.0 \%)$ | A | 1 (100.0\%) |
|  |  | H | 152 (85.4\%) | H | 119 (78.3\%) | H | 88 (57.9\%) |  |  | H | 48 (31.6\%) | H | 1 (0.7\%) | H | 40 (26.3\%) |
|  |  | 0 | 3 (1.7\%) | 0 | $1(33.3 \%)$ | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 0 | $0(0.0 \%)$ | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | $0(0.0 \%)$ |
|  |  | W | 19 (10.7\%) | W | 13 (68.4\%) | W | 9 (47.43\%) |  |  | W | $5(26.3 \%)$ | W | 0 (0.0\%) | W | 7 (36.8\%) |
|  | DE Level 2$354(27.4 \%)$ | AA | 11 (3.1\%) | AA | 6 (54.5\%) | AA | 2 (18.2\%) |  |  | AA | 2 (18.2\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | $0(0.05)$ |
|  |  | A | $1(0.3 \%)$ | A | 1 (100.0\%) | A | 1 (100.0\%) |  |  | A | 0 0,0\%\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | $0(0.0 \%)$ |
|  |  | H | 301 (85.0\%) | H | 150 (49.8\%) | H | 103 (34.2\%) |  |  | H | 96(31.9\%) | H | 1 (0.3\%) | H | 116 (38.5\%) |
|  |  | 0 | 1 (0.3\%) | 0 | $0(0.0 \%)$ | 0 | $0(0.08)$ |  |  | 0 | $0(00 \%)$ | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | $0(0.0 \%)$ |
|  |  | W | 40 (11.3\%) | W | 19 (47.5\%) | W | 18 (45.0\%) |  |  | W | 14 (35.0\%) | W | 0 (0.0\%) | W | 14 (35.0\%) |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total Referred } \\ 532(41.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | AA | 14 (2.6\%) | $A A$ | 8 (57.1\%) | AA | 3 (21.4\%) |  |  | AA | 3 (21.4\%) | AA | $0(0.0 \%)$ | AA | $1(7.1 \%)$ |
|  |  | A | $2(0.4 \%)$ | A | 2 (100.0\%) | A | 2 (100.0\%) |  |  | A | 1 (50.0\%) | A | $0(0.0 \%)$ | A | 1(50.0\%) |
|  |  | H | 453 (85.2\%) | H | 269 (59.4\%) | H | 191 (42.2\%) |  |  | H | 144 (31.8\%) | H | $2(0.4 \%)$ | H | 156 (34.4\%) |
|  |  | 0 | 4 (0.8\%) | 0 | 1 (25.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 0 | $0(0.0 \%)$ | 0 | $0(0.0 \%)$ | 0 | $0(0.0 \%)$ |
|  |  | W | 59 (11.1\%) | W | 32 (54.2\%) | W | 27 (45.8\%) |  |  | W | 19 (32.2\%) | W | 0 (0.0\%) | W | 21 (35.6\%) |
|  | College Level 751 (58.2\%) | AA | 16(2.1\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  | AA | 5(31.3\%) |
|  |  | A | 2(0.3\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | A | 1 (50.0\%) |
|  |  | H | 595 (79.2\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | H | 317 (53.3\%) |
|  |  | 0 | 11 (1.5\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 5 (45.5\%) |
|  |  | W | 127 (16.9\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | W | 60 (47.2\%) |
|  | Unknown 8 (0.6\%) | AA | 1 (12.5\%) | $A A$ | 0 0.0\%) | AA | $0(0.0 \%)$ | Not Applicable |  | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | $0(0.0 \%)$ |
|  |  | A | $0(0.0 \%)$ | A | 0,0.0\%) | A | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  | A | 0,0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | H | 7 (87.5\%) | H | 1 (14.3\%) | H | 1 (14.3\%) |  |  | H | 1 (14.3\%) | H | 0 (0.0\%) | H | 2 (28.6\%) |
|  |  | 0 | $0(0.0 \%)$ | 0 | $0(0.0 \%)$ | 0 | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | $0(0.0 \%)$ |
|  |  | W | $0(0.0 \%)$ | W | 010.0\%) | W | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  | W | 0(0.0\%) | W | $0(0.0 \%)$ | W | $0(00 \%)$ |
|  | Cohort Total 1,291 (1000\%) | AA | 31 (24\%) | $A A$ | $8(25.8 \%)$ | AA | 3 (9.7\%) |  |  | AA | 3(9.7\%) | AA | $0(0.0 \%)$ | AA | 6 (19.4\%) |
|  |  | A | 4 (0.3\%) | A | $2(50.0 \%)$ | A | 2 (50.0\%) |  |  | A | 1 (25.0\%) | A | $0(0.0 \%)$ | A | 2 (50.0\%) |
|  |  | H | 1,055 (81.7\%) | H | 293 (27.8\%) | H | 209 (19.8\%) |  |  | H | 159 (15.1\%) | H | $2(0.2 \%)$ | H | 475 (45.0\%) |
|  |  | 0 | 15 (1.2\%) | 0 | 1(6.7\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | $0(0.0 \%)$ | 0 | 5(33.3\%) |
|  |  | W | 186(14.4\%). | W | 37(19.9\%) | W. | 32.17 .284. |  |  | W | 23(12.4\%) | W | $0(0.0 \%)$ | W | 81 43.5\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & \frac{5}{8} \\ & \frac{1}{8} \\ & \text { m } \\ & 8 \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | DE Level 1 <br> 276 (20.4\%) | AA | 9 (3.3\%) | AA | 6 (66.7\%) | AA | 3 (33.3\%) | Not Applicable |  | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | $0(0.0 \%)$ | AA | 1 (11.15) |
|  |  | A | $2(0.7 \%)$ | A | 1 (50.0\%) | A | $1(50.0 \%)$ |  |  | A | $0(0.0 \%)$ | A | $0(0.0 \%)$ | A | 1 (50.0\%) |
|  |  | H | 216 (78.3\%) | H | 142 (65.7\%) | H | 107 (49.5\%) |  |  | H | 31 (14.4\%) | H | 10 (4.6\%) | H | 59 (27.33) |
|  |  | 0 | 17 (6.2\%) | 0 | 10 (58.8\%) | 0 | $8(47.15)$ |  |  | 0 | 1 (5.9\%) | 0 | 2 (11.8\%) | 0 | $5(29.4 \%)$ |
|  |  | W | 32 (11.6\%) | W | 15 (46.9\%) | W | 11 (34.4\%) |  |  | W | 5 (15.6\%) | W | 4 (12.5\%) | W | 6 (18.83) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & D E \text { Level } 2 \\ & 290(21.5 \%) \end{aligned}$ | AA | $6(2.15)$ | M | 2 (33.3\%) | A | 1 (16.7\%) |  |  | A | 1 (16.7\%) | $A A$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ | A | 2 (33.3\%) |
|  |  | A | $0(0.06)$ | A | $0(0.0 \%)$ | A | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | $0(0.0 \%)$ | A | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | H | 235 (81.08) | H | 119 (50.6\%) | H | 97 (41.3\%) |  |  | H | 60 (25.5\%) | H | $0(0.05)$ | H | 120 (51.15) |
|  |  | 0 | 18 (6.2\%) | 0 | 9 (50.0\%) | 0 | 8 (44.4\%) |  |  | 0 | 6 (33.3\%) | 0 | $0(0.05 \%)$ | 0 | $8(44.43)$ |
|  |  | W | 31 (10.78) | W | 15 (48.43) | W | 14 (45.2\%) |  |  | W | 9 (29.0\%) | W | $0(0.05 \%)$ | W | 17 (54.85) |
|  | Total Referred 566 (41.9\%) | M | 15 (2.73) | M | 8 (53.3\%) | M | 4 (26.7\%) |  |  | AA | 1 (6.7\%) | AA | $0(0.05)$ | AI | 3 (20.08) |
|  |  | A | $2(0.48)$ | A | 1 (50.0\%) | A | 1 (50.0\%) |  |  | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.05) | A | 1 (50.08) |
|  |  | H | 451 (79.78) | H | 261 (57.9\%) | H | 204 (45.2\%) |  |  | H | $91(20.2 \%)$ | H | 10 (2.25) | H | 179 (39.75) |
|  |  | 0 | 35 (6.2\%) | $0$ | $19 \text { (54.38) }$ | $0$ | $26 \text { (45.7\%) }$ |  |  | $0$ | 7(20.0\%) | 0 | 2 (5.7\%) | 0 | 13 (37.15) |
|  |  | W | 63 (11.15) | W | $30(47.6 \%)$ | W | 25 (39.7\%) |  |  | W | 24 (22.2\%) | W | 4 (6.35) | W | 23 (36.58) |
|  | College Level$771 \text { (57.1\%) }$ | AA | 14 (1.85) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  | AA | 7 (50.05) |
|  |  | A | 2 (0.38) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | A | 2 (100.05) |
|  |  | H | $603(78.25)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | H | 420 (69.75) |
|  |  | 0 | 33 (4.35) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 23 (69.7\%) |
|  |  | W | 119 (15.45) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | W | 61 (51.3\%) |
|  | Unknown 13 (1.05) | AA | $0(0.06)$ | AA | $0(0.06)$ | AA | $0(0.0 \%)$ | Not Applicable |  | AA | $0(0.05)$ | AA | $0(0058)$ | AA | $0(0.05)$ |
|  |  | A | $0(0.057)$ | A | $0(0.05)$ | A | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  | A | $0(00 \%)$ | A | $0(0.05)$ | A | $0(0.0 \%)$ |
|  |  | H | 9 (69.28) | H | $0(0.06)$ | H | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  | H | 0 (0.05) | H | $0(0.05)$ | H | 3 (38.3\%) |
|  |  | 0 | $0(0.06)$ | 0 | $0(0.06)$ | 0 | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  | 0 | $0(0.0 \%)$ | 0 | $0(0.05)$ | 0 | $0(0.05)$ |
|  |  | W | 4 (30.8\%) | W | $0(0.06)$ | W | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  | W | $0(0.0 \%)$ | W | $0(0.0 \%)$ | WI | 2 (50.0\%) |
|  | Cohort Total 1,350 (100.0\%) | AA | 29 (2.15) | AA | 8 (27.6\%) | AA | 4 (13.8\%) |  |  | AA | 1 (3.4\%) | $A A$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ | AA | 10 (34.5\%) |
|  |  | A | $4(0.36)$ | A | 1 (25.0\%) | A | 1 (25.0\%) |  |  | A | $0(0.0 \%)$ | A | $0(0.05)$ | A | 3 (75.0N) |
|  |  | H | 1,063 (78.7\%) | H | 283 (26.6\%) | H | 221 (20.8\%) |  |  | H | 102 (9.6\%) | H | 10 (0.9\%) | H | 602 (56.6\%) |
|  |  | 0 | 68 (5.04) | 0 | 20 (29.43) | 0 | 16 (23.5\%) |  |  | 0 | 7 (10.3\%) | 0 | 2 (2.9\%) | 0 | 36 (52.9\%) |
|  |  | W | $\underline{185}(13.89)$. | W | 31. 16.724 | W | 26(14.0\%) |  |  | W. | 2518.29 | - W | $4.2 .2{ }^{2}$ ) | W. | 85 46.2 yd |

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

## English Progression by Ethnicity (continued)


$A A=$ African-American $\quad A=A \operatorname{sian} \quad H=$ Hispanic $\quad O=$ Other $\quad W=$ White

## English Progression by Age

Across cohorts, levels, and age groups, after 3 years no trend was evident. When comparing the 2011 cohort to the 2013 cohort, both referred non-referred students ages 18-21 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) |  | High DE Year) | Success in RSG (3rd Year) |  | $\begin{aligned} & s \text { in GK } \\ & \text { Year) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{4} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \\ & \frac{7}{8} \\ & 8 \\ & \overline{7} \end{aligned}$ |  | $<17$ | 7 (3.6\%) | $<17$ | 5 (71.4\%) | $<17$ | 4 (57.1\%) | Not Applicable |  | $<17$ | 1 (14.3\%) |  | $<17$ | 2 (28.6\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 157 (81.8\%) | 18-21 | 109 (69.4\%) | $18-21$ | 72 (45.9\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 28 (17.8\%) |  | 18-21 | 26 (16.6\%) |
|  | DE Level 1 | 22-24 | 4 (2.1\%) | 22.24 | 2 (50.0\%) | 22-24 | 1 (25.0\%) |  |  | 22-24 | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  | 22-24 | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  | 192 (14.3\%) | 25-35 | 18 (9.4\%) | $25 \cdot 35$ | 11 (61.1\%) | 25-35 | 5 (27.8\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 3 (16.7\%) |  | 25-35 | 5 (27.8\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 5 (2.6\%) | $36 \cdot 50$ | 4 (80.0\%) | $36-50$ | $4(80.0 \%)$ |  |  | $36-50$ | 2 (40.0\%) |  | $36 \cdot 50$ | 1 (20.0\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | 1 (0.5\%) | 51+ | 1 (100.0\%) | 51+ | 1 (100.0\%) |  |  | 51+ | 1 (100.0\%) |  | 51+ | $0(0.0 \%)$ |
|  |  | $<17$ | 14 (3.6\%) | $<17$ | 9 (64.3\%) | $<17$ | 8 (57.1\%) |  |  | $<17$ | 7 (50.0\%) |  | <17 | 5 (35.7\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 293 (76.3\%) | 18-21 | 201 (68.6\%) | $18-21$ | 137 (46.8\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 126 (43.0\%) |  | 18-21 | 103 (35.2\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | 22-24 | 14 (3.6\%) | 22-24 | 6 (42.9\%) | 22-24 | 5 (35.7\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 4 (28.6\%) | Not Applicable | 22-24 | 2 (14.3\%) |
|  | 384 (28.6\%) | 25-35 | 43 (11.2\%) | 25-35 | 28 (65.1\%) | 25-35 | 20 (46.5\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 17 (39.5\%) | NotApplicable | 25-35 | 24 (55.8\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 16 (4.2\%) | $36 \cdot 50$ | 5 (31.3\%) | $36-50$ | $4(25.0 \%)$ |  |  | $36-50$ | $2(12.5 \%)$ |  | $36 \cdot 50$ | 5 (31.3\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | 4 (1.0\%) | 51+ | $2(50.0 \%)$ | 51+ | 2 (50.0\%) |  |  | $51+$ | 2 (50.0\%) |  | 51+ | 4 (100.0\%) |
|  |  | <17 | 21 (3.6\%) | $<17$ | 14 (66.7\%) | $<17$ | 12 (57.1\%) |  |  | $<17$ | 8 (38.1\%) |  | <17 | 7 (33.3\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 450 (78.1\%) | 18-21 | 310 (68.9\%) | 18-21 | 209 (46.4\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 154 (34.2\%) |  | 18-21 | 129 (28.7\%) |
|  | Total Referred | 22-24 | 18 (3.1\%) | 22-24 | 8 (44.4\%) | 22-24 | 6 (33.3\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 4 (22.2\%) |  | 22-24 | 2 (11.1\%) |
|  | 576 (42.9\%) | 25-35 | 61 (10.6\%) | $25 \cdot 35$ | 39 (63.9\%) | 25-35 | 25 (41.0\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 20 (32.8\%) |  | 25-35 | 29 (47.5\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 21 (3.6\%) | $36-50$ | 9 (42.9\%) | $36-50$ | 8 (38.1\%) |  |  | 36-50 | 4 (19.0\%) |  | $36-50$ | 6 (28.6\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | 5 (0.9\%) | 51+ | 3 (60.0\%) | 51+ | 3 (60.0\%) |  |  | 51+ | 3 (60.0\%) |  | 51+ | 4 (80.0\%) |
|  | College Level 746 (55.5\%) | $<17$ | 41 (5.5\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | $<17$ | 21 (51.2\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 603 (80.8\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18-21 | 331 (54.9\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | 22 (2.9\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 22-24 | 11 (50.0\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 53 (7.1\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $25 \cdot 35$ | 30 (56.6\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 23 (3.1\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 36.50 | 17 (73.9\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | 4 (0.5\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 51+ | 4 (100.0\%) |
|  | Unknown$21 \text { (1.6\%) }$ | $<17$ | 2 (9.5\%) | $<17$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ | $<17$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ | Not Applicable |  | $<17$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ | Not Applicable | <17 | $0(0.0 \%)$ |
|  |  | 18-21 | 6 (28.6\%) | 18-21 | 0 (0.0\%) | 18-21 | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  | 18-21 | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  | 18-21 | $0(0.0 \%)$ |
|  |  | 22-24 | 1 (4.8\%) | 22-24 | 0 (0.0\%) | 22-24 | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  | 22-24 | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  | 22-24 | $0(0.0 \%)$ |
|  |  | 25-35 | 4 (19.0\%) | $25 \cdot 35$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ | 25-35 | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  | 25-35 | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  | $25 \cdot 35$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ |
|  |  | 36-50 | 6 (28.6\%) | $36-50$ | 0 (0.0\%) | $36-50$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  | 36-50 | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  | $36-50$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ |
|  |  | 51+ | 2 (9.5\%) | 51+ | $0(0.0 \%)$ | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 51+ | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  | Cohort Total 1,343 (100.0\%) | $<17$ | 64 (4.8\%) | $<17$ | 16 (25.0\%) | $<17$ | 14 (21.9\%) |  |  | $<17$ | 9 (14.1\%) |  | $<17$ | 28 (43.8\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 1,059 (78.9\%) | 18-21 | 366 (34.6\%) | $18-21$ | 258 (24.4\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 203 (19.2\%) |  | 18-21 | 460 (43.4\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | 41 (3.1\%) | $22-24$ | 12 (29.3\%) | 22-24 | $9(22.0 \%)$ |  |  | 22.24 | 6 (14.6\%) |  | 22-24 | 13 (31.7\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 118 (8.8\%) | $25 \cdot 35$ | 46 (39.0\%) | 25-35 | 32 (27.1\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 27 (22.9\%) |  | 25-35 | 59 (50.0\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 50 (3.7\%) | $36-50$ | 13 (26.0\%) | $36-50$ | 12 (24.0\%) |  |  | 36-50 | 7 (14.0\%) |  | 36.50 | 23 (46.0\%) |
|  |  | _ 51+ | 11(0.8\%) | $51+$ | 3 $27.3 \%$ ) | 51+ | 3(27.3\%) |  |  | -51+ | $3(27.3 \%)$ |  | $51+$ | 8 $772.7 \%$ ) |

Notes:

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

Sources:
FTIC Age:
DE Referrals:
ACCDODS1.XST_ATD_ACCD
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 Age (continued)

|  |  | Referral Level |  | Attempted Any DE _ - (1st Year) |  | Success in Any DE - - (1st Year) |  | Attempted RSG - (1st Year) | Success in RSG $\qquad$ - (1st Year) _ | Success in High DE (3rd Year) |  | Success in RSG <br> (3rd Year) |  | Success in GK (3rd Year) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \frac{4}{0} \\ & \frac{0}{8} \\ & \text { y } \\ & \text { B } \\ & \frac{1}{7} \end{aligned}$ |  | <17 | 6 (3.4\%) | $<17$ | 3 (50.0\%) | <17 | 3 (50.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | <17 | 1(16.7\%) | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) | <17 | $0(0.05)$ |
|  |  | 18-21 | 140 (78.7\%) | 18-21 | 113 (80.7\%) | 18-21 | 82 (58.6\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 44 (31.4\%) | 18-21 | 1 (0.7\%) | 18-21 | 39 (27.9\%) |
|  | DE Level 1 | 22-24 | 5 (2.8\%) | 22-24 | $2(40.0 \%)$ | 22-24 | 1 (20.0\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 1 (20.0\%) | 22-24 | 0 (0.0\%) | 22-24 | 2 (40.0\%) |
|  | 178 (13.8\%) | 25-35 | 15 (8.4\%) | 25-35 | $9(60.0 \%)$ | 25-35 | 6 (40.0\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 4 (26.7\%) | 25-35 | 0 (0.0\%) | 25-35 | 4 (26.7\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 7 (3.9\%) | 36-50 | 6 (85.7\%) | 36-50 | 6 (85.7\%) |  |  | 36-50 | 4 (57.1\%) | 36-50 | 0 (0.0\%) | 36.50 | 3 (42.9\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | 5 (2.8\%) | 51+ | 3 (60.0\%) | 51+ | 1 (20.0\%) |  |  | 51+ | 1 (20.0\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) | 51+ | 1 (20.0\%) |
|  | DE Level 2$354 \text { (27.4\%) }$ | <17 | 13 (3.7\%) | <17 | 6 (46.2\%) | <17 | 1(7.7\%) |  |  | <17 | 1 (7.7\%) | <17 | 0 (0.0\%) | <17 | 4 (30.8\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 257 (72.6\%) | 18-21 | 139 (54.1\%) | 18-21 | 98 (38.1\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 86 (33.5\%) | 18-21 | 0 (0.0\%) | 18-21 | 96 (37.4\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | 26 (7.3\%) | 22-24 | 13 (50.0\%) | 22-24 | 11 (42.3\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 10 (38.5\%) | 22-24 | 0 (0.0\%) | 22-24 | 11 (42.3\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 37 (10.5\%) | 25-35 | 12 (32.4\%) | 25-35 | $10 \text { (27.0\%) }$ |  |  | 25-35 | 11 (29.7\%) | 25-35 | 1 (2.7\%) | 25-35 | 13 (35.1\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 17 (4.8\%) | 36-50 | 6 (35.3\%) | 36-50 | $4(23.5 \%)$ |  |  | 36-50 | 4 (23.5\%) | 36-50 | 0 (0.0\%) | 36.50 | 5 (29.4\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | 4 (1.1\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) | 51* | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) | 51+ | 1 (25.0\%) |
|  | Total Referred$532 \text { (41.2\%) }$ | <17 | 19 (3.6\%) | $<17$ | 9 (47.4\%) | <17 | 4 (21.1\%) |  |  | <17 | 2 (10.5\%) | <17 | 0 (0.0\%) | $<17$ | 4 (21.1\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 397 (74.6\%) | 18-21 | 252 (63.5\%) | 18-21 | 180 (45.3\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 130 (32.7\%) | 18-21 | 1 (0.3\%) | 18-21 | 135 (34.0\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | 31 (5.8\%) | 22-24 | 15 (48.4\%) | 22-24 | 12 (38.7\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 11 (35.5\%) | 22-24 | 0 (0.0\%) | 22-24 | 13 (41.9\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 52 (9.8\%) | 25-35 | 21 (40.4\%) | 25-35 | 16 (30.8\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 15 (28.8\%) | 25-35 | 1 (1.9\%) | 25-35 | 17 (32.7\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 24 (4.5\%) | 36-50 | 12 (50.0\%) | 36-50 | 10 (41.7\%) |  |  | 36-50 | 8 (33.3\%) | 36-50 | 0 (0.0\%) | $36-50$ | 8 (33.3\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | $9(1.7 \%)$ | 51+ | 3 (33.3\%) | $51+$ | 1 (11.1\%) |  |  | 51+ | 1 (11.1\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) | 51+ | 2 (22.2\%) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { College Level } \\ & 751 \text { (58.2\%) } \end{aligned}$ | $<17$ | 36 (4.8\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  | $<17$ | 15 (41.7\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 649 (86.4\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18-21 | 331 (51.0\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | 24 (3.2\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 22-24 | 14 (58.3\%) |
|  |  | $25-35$ | $29(3.9 \%)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 25-35 | $20(69.0 \%)$ |
|  |  | 36-50 | 10 (1.3\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 36-50 | 6 (60.0\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | 3 (0.4\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 51+ | 2 (66.7\%) |
|  | Unknown$8 \text { (0.6\%) }$ | <17 | 0 (0.0\%) | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) | <17 | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) | <17 | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 3 (37.5\%) | 18-21 | 1 (33.3\%) | 18-21 | 1 (33.3\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 1 (33.3\%) | 18-21 | 0 (0.0\%) | 18-21 | 2 (66.7\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | 3 (37.5\%) | 22-24 | 0 (0.0\%) | 22-24 | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  | 22-24 | 0 (0.0\%) | 22-24 | 0 (0.0\%) | 22-24 | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 1 (12.5\%) | 25-35 | 0 (0.0\%) | 25-35 | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 0 (0.0\%) | 25-35 | 0 (0.0\%) | 25-35 | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 1 (12.5\%) | 36-50 | 0 (0.0\%) | 36-50 | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 36-50 | 0 (0.0\%) | 36-50 | 0 (0.0\%) | $36-50$ | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | $51+$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ | $51+$ | 0 (0.0\%) | 51 | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  | $51+$ | $0(0.05 \%)$ | 51* | $0(0.0 \%)$ | $51+$ | $0(0.05)$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cohort Total } \\ & 1,291(100.0 \%) \end{aligned}$ | <17 | 55 (4.3\%) | <17 | 9 (16.4\%) | <17 | 4 (7.3\%) |  |  | $<17$ | 2 (3.6\%) | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) | <17 | 19 (34.5\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 1,049 (81.3\%) | 18-21 | 280 (26.7\%) | 18-21 | 202 (19.3\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 148 (14.1\%) | 18-21 | 1 (0.1\%) | 18-21 | 468 (44.6\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | $58(4.5 \%)$ | 22-24 | 16 (27.6\%) | 22-24 | 13 (22.4\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 12 (20.7\%) | 22-24 | 0 (0.0\%) | 22-24 | 27 (46.6\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 82 (6.4\%) | 25-35 | 21 (25.6\%) | 25-35 | 16 (19.5\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 15 (18.3\%) | 25-35 | 1 (1.2\%) | 25-35 | 37 (45.1\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 35 (2.7\%) | 36-50 | 12 (34.3\%) | 36-50 | 10 (28.6\%) |  |  | 36-50 | 8 (22.9\%) | 36-50 | 0 (0.0\%) | $36-50$ | 14 (40.0\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | 12-0.9\%) | 51+- | 3-25.0\% 1 | 51+ | - 1 (813\% |  |  | $-51$ | - 1 ( $8.38 \%$ ] | 51+ | 0 (0.05) | - $51+$ | 4 (33.356) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \frac{5}{6} \\ & \frac{8}{3} \\ & m \\ & \frac{m}{8} \\ & \frac{1}{4} \end{aligned}$ | DE Level 1$276 \text { (20.4\%) }$ | <17 | 7(2.5\%) | <17 | 6 (85.7\%) | <17 | 5 (71.4\%) | Not Applicable |  | <17 | 2(28.6\%) | <17 | $0(0.0 \%)$ | <17 | $\frac{1}{2}(28.6 \%)$ |
|  |  | 18-21 | 209 (75.7\%) | 18-21 | 135 (64.6\%) | 18-21 | 105 (50.2\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 30 (14.4\%) | 18-21 | 13 (6.2\%) | 18-21 | 52 (24.9\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | 19 (6.9\%) | 22.24 | 14 (73.7\%) | 22-24 | 6 (31.6\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 1 (5.3\%) | 22-24 | 1 (5.3\%) | 22-24 | 4 (21.1\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 23 (8.3\%) | 25.35 | 11 (47.8\%) | 25-35 | 8 (34.85) |  |  | 25.35 | 3 (13.0\%) | 25-35 | 2 (8.7\%) | 25-35 | 8 (34.8\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 16 (5.8\%) | 36.50 | 7 (43.8\%) | 36-50 | 5 (31.3\%) |  |  | 36-50 | 1 (6.9\%) | $36-50$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ | $36 \cdot 50$ | 5 (31.35) |
|  |  | $51+$ | $2(0.7 \%)$ | 51+ | 1 (50.0\%) | $51+$ | 1 (50.0\%) |  |  | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) | 51* | 1 (50.0\%) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DE Level } 2 \\ & 290 \text { (21.5\%) } \end{aligned}$ | $<17$ | 13 (4.5\%) | $<17$ | 10 (76.9\%) | $<17$ | 7 (53.8\%) |  |  | $<17$ | 6 (46.2\%) | <17 | 0 (0.0\%) | <17 | 7 (53.8\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 202 (69.7\%) | 18-21 | 96 (47.5\%) | 18-21 | 78 (38.6\%) |  |  | 18-21 | $51(25.2 \%)$ | 18-21 | 0 (0.0\%) | 18-21 | 103 (510\%) |
|  |  | 22-24 | 23 (7.9\%) | 22-24 | 11 (47.8\%) | 22-24 | 10 (43.5\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 4 (17.4\%) | 22-24 | $0(0.0 \%)$ | $22-24$ | 8 (34.8\%) |
|  |  | 25-35 | 39 (13.4\%) | 25-35 | 20 (51.3\%) | 25-35 | 17 (43.68) |  |  | 25-35 | $8(20.5 \%)$ | 25-35 | 0 (0.0\%) | 25-35 | 19 (48.7\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 11 (3.8\%) | $36-50$ | 8 (72.7\%) | 36-50 | 8 (72.75) |  |  | 36-50 | $7(63.6 \%)$ | 36-50 | $0(0.0 \%)$ | $36 \cdot 50$ | 9 (81.85) |
|  |  | 51+ | 2 (0.7\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) | $51+$ | $0(0.05)$ |  |  | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) | 51+ | $0(0.0 \%)$ | 51* | 1 (50.0\%) |
|  |  | <17 | 20 (3.5\%) | <17 | 16 (80.0\%) | <17 | 12 (60.0\%) |  |  | $<17$ | 8 (40.0\%) | <17 | $0(0.0 \%)$ | <17 | 9 (45.0\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 411 (72.6\%) | 18.21 | 231 (56.2\%) | 18-21 | 183 (44.5\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 81 (19.7\%) | 18-21 | 13 (3.2\%) | 18-21 | 155 (37.7\%) |
|  | Total Referred | 22-24 | 42 (7.4\%) | 22-24 | 25 (59.5\%) | 22-24 | 16 (38.1\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 5 (11.9\%) | 22-24 | 1 (2.4\%) | 22-24 | 12 (28.6\%) |
|  | 566 (41.9\%) | 25.35 | 62 (11.0\%) | 25.35 | 31 (50.0\%) | 25-35 | 25 (40.3\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 11 (17.7\%) | 25-35 | 2 (3.2\%) | 25-35 | 27 (43.5\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 27 (4.8\%) | $36 \cdot 50$ | 15 (55.6\%) | 36-50 | 13 (48.15) |  |  | 36.50 | 8 (29.6\%) | $36-50$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ | $36-50$ | 14 (51.9\%) |
|  |  | $51+$ | 4 (0.7\%) | $51+$ | 1 (25.0\%) | $51+$ | 1 (25.0\%) |  |  | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) | 51+ | 0 (0.0\%) | $51+$ | 2 (50.05) |
|  |  | <17 | 30 (3.9\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $<17$ | 20 (66.7\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 699 (90.7\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18-21 | 471 (67.4\%) |
|  | College Level | 22-24 | $12(1.6 \%)$ |  |  |  |  | Not Ap | able |  |  |  |  | 22-24 | 5 (41.7\%) |
|  | 771 (57.1\%) | 25-35 | 25 (3.2\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Ap |  |  |  |  |  | 25-35 | 15 (60.0\%) |
|  |  | 36.50 | $4(0.5 \%)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 36-50 | 1 (25.05) |
|  |  | 51+ | 1 (0.1\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 51* | 1 (100.05) |
|  |  | <17 | $0(0.0 \%)$ | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 4 (30.8\%) | 18-21 | 0 (0.0\%) | 18-21 | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  | 18-21 | $0(0.0 \%)$ | 18-21 | $0(0.0 \%)$ | 18-21 | 1 (25.0\%) |
|  | Unknown | 22-24 | 3 (23.1\%) | 22-24 | 0 (0.0\%) | 22-24 | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  | 22-24 | 0 (0.0\%) | 22-24 | $0(0.0 \%)$ | 22-24 | 2 (66.7\%) |
|  | 13 (1.0\%) | 25-35 | 6 (46.2\%) | 25-35 | 0 (0.0\%) | 25-35 | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 25.35 | 0 (0.0\%) | 25-35 | 0 (0.0\%) | 25-35 | 2 (33.3\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 0 (0.0\%) | 36-50 | 0 (0.0\%) | 36-50 | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 36-50 | 0 (0.0\%) | 36-50 | $0(0.0 \%)$ | $36 \cdot 50$ | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | 51+ | $0(0.0 \%)$ | $51+$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ | $51+$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  | $51+$ | 0 O $0.0 \%$ ) | $51+$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ | $51+$ | 0 (0.05) |
|  |  | <17 | $50(3.7 \%)$ | <17 | 17 (34.0\%) | <17 | 12 (24.0\%) |  |  | $<17$ | 8 (16.0\%) | $<17$ | 0 (0.0\%) | <17 | 29 (58.0\%) |
|  |  | 18-21 | 1,114 (82.5\%) | 18-21 | 253 (22.7\%) | 18-21 | 200 (18.0\%) |  |  | 18-21 | 92 (8.3\%) | 18-21 | 13 (1.2\%) | 18-21 | 627 (56.3\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | 22-24 | 57 (4.2\%) | 22-24 | 25 (43.9\%) | 22-24 | 16 (28.1\%) |  |  | 22-24 | 5 (8.8\%) | 22-24 | 1 (1.8\%) | 22-24 | 19 (33.3\%) |
|  | 1,350 (100.0\%) | 25-35 | 93 (6.9\%) | 25-35 | 32 (34.4\%) | 25-35 | 26 (28.0\%) |  |  | 25-35 | 12 (12.9\%) | 25-35 | 2 (2.2\%) | 25-35 | 44 (47.3\%) |
|  |  | 36-50 | 31 (2.3\%) | $36-50$ | 15 (48.4\%) | 36-50 | 13 (41.9\%) |  |  | 36-50 | 8 (25.8\%) | 36-50 | 0 (0.0\%) | $36-50$ | 15 (48.4\%) |
|  |  | _ 51+ | - 5 (0.4\%). | -51* | 1120.0\%1 | 51* | 1120.092. |  |  | 51+ | -10.0\%) | 51*- | $010.0 \%)$ | S1*- | 3 (60.0) |

English Progression by Age (continued)


## English Progression by Enrollment Status

Across all cohorts, of those who were referred or non-referred, full-time students compared to part-time students successfully passed both English highest DE and "gatekeeper" courses at higher rates. Fall 2011 full-time college level students experienced an increase in "gatekeeper" success with each subsequent cohort.

|  |  | 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) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Success in RSG } \\ \text { (3rd Year) } \end{gathered}$ |  | cess in GK <br> 3rd Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\frac{4}{4}$ <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 7 <br> 7 | DE Level 1 | FT | 23 (12.0\%) | FT | 16 (69.6\%) | FT | 12 (52.2\%) | Not Applicable |  | FT | 1 (4.3\%) | Not Applicable | FT | 4 (17.4\%) |
|  | 192 (14.3\%) | PT | 169 (88.0\%) | PT | 116 (68.6\%) | PT | 75 (44.4\%) |  |  | PT | 34 (20.1\%) |  | PT | 30 (17.8\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | FT | $70 \text { (18.2\%) }$ | FT | 54 (77.1\%) | FT | $43 \text { (61.4\%) }$ |  |  | FT | $40 \text { (57.1\%) }$ |  | FT | 36 (51.4\%) |
|  | $384(28.6 \%)$ | PT | $314 \text { (81.8\%) }$ | PT | $197(62.7 \%)$ | PT | $133 \text { (42.4\%) }$ |  |  | PT | $118 \text { (37.6\%) }$ |  | PT | 107 (34.1\%) |
|  | Total Referred | FT | 93 (16.1\%) | FT | 70 (75.3\%) | FT | 55 (59.1\%) |  |  | FT | 41 (44.1\%) |  | FT | 40 (43.0\%) |
|  | 576 (42.9\%) | PT | 483 (83.9\%) | PT | 313 (64.8\%) | PT | 208 (43.1\%) |  |  | PT | 152 (31.5\%) |  | PT | 137 (28.4\%) |
|  | College Level | FT | 350 (46.9\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | FT | 212 (60.6\%) |
|  | $746(55.5 \%)$ | PT | 396 (53.1\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PT | 202 (51.0\%) |
|  | Unknown | FT | 4 (19.0\%) | FT | $0(0.0 \%)$ | FT | $0(0.0 \%)$ | Not Applicable |  | FT | $0(0.0 \%)$ | Not Applicable | FT | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  | 21 (1.6\%) | PT | 17 (81.0\%) | PT | 0 (0.0\%) | PT | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  | PT | 0 (0.0\%) |  | PT | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | FT | 447 (33.3\%) | FT | 83 (18.6\%) | FT | 65 (14.5\%) |  |  | FT | 50 (11.2\%) |  | FT | 252 (56.4\%) |
|  | 1,343 (100.0\%) | PT | 896 (66.7\%) | PT | 373 (41.6\%) | PT | 263 (29.4\%) |  |  | PT | 205 (22.9\%) |  | PT | 339 (37.8\%) |
|  | DE Level 1 | FT | 22 (12.4\%) | FT | 19 (86.4\%) | FT | 13 (59.1\%) | Not Applicable |  | FT | 10 (45.5\%) | FT 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 10 (45.5\%) |
|  | 178 (13.8\%) | PT | 156 (87.6\%) | PT | 117 (75.0\%) | PT | 86 (55.1\%) |  |  | PT | 45 (28.8\%) | PT $\quad 1(0.6 \%)$ | PT | 39 (25.0\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | FT | 47 (13.3\%) | FT | 23 (48.9\%) | FT | 18 (38.3\%) |  |  | FT | 16 (34.0\%) | FT $0(0.0 \%)$ | FT | 18 (38.3\%) |
|  | 354 (27.4\%) | PT | 307 (86.7\%) | PT | 153 (49.8\%) | PT | 106 (34.5\%) |  |  | PT | 96 (31.3\%) | PT $\quad 1(0.3 \%)$ | PT | 112 (36.5\%) |
|  | Total Referred | FT | $69 \text { (13.0\%) }$ | FT | $42 \text { (60.9\%) }$ | FT | $31 \text { (44.9\%) }$ |  |  | FT | 26 (37.7\%) | FT $0(0.0 \%)$ | FT | 28 (40.6\%) |
|  | 532 (41.2\%) | PT | $463 \text { (87.0\%) }$ | PT | $270 \text { (58.3\%) }$ | PT | 192 (41.5\%) |  |  | PT | 141 (30.5\%) | PT $\quad 2(0.4 \%)$ | PT | 151 (32.6\%) |
|  | College Level | FT | 261 (34.8\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | FT | 168 (64.4\%) |
|  | 751 (58.2\%) | PT | 490 (65.2\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PT | 220 (44.9\%) |
|  |  | FT | 2 (25.0\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT | $0(0.0 \%)$ | Not Applicable |  | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT $0(0.0 \%)$ | FT | 1 (50.0\%) |
|  | $8 \text { (0.6\%) }$ | PT | 6 (75.0\%) | PT | 1 (16.7\%) | PT | 1 (16.7\%) |  |  | PT | 1 (16.7\%) | PT $0(0.0 \%)$ | PT | 1 (16.7\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | FT | 332 (25.7\%) | FT | 44 (13.3\%) | FT | 33 (9.9\%) |  |  | FT | 28 (8.4\%) | FT $0(0.0 \%)$ | FT | 197 (59.3\%) |
|  | 1,291 $1000 \%$ ) | PT | 959 (74.3\%) | PT | 297 (31.0\%) | PT | 213 (22.2\%) |  |  | PT | 158 (16.5\%) | PT-ーー $2(0.2 \%)$ | PT | 372 (38.8\%) |
|  | DE Level 1 | FT | 27 (9.8\%) | FT | 25 (92.6\%) | FT | 18 (66.7\%) | Not Applicable |  | FT | 3 (11.1\%) | FT $1(3.7 \%)$ | FT | 7 (25.9\%) |
|  | 276 (20.4\%) | PT | 249 (90.2\%) | PT | 149 (59.8\%) | PT | 112 (45.0\%) |  |  | PT | 34 (13.7\%) | PT $\quad 15(6.0 \%)$ | PT | 65 (26.1\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | FT | 47 (16.2\%) | FT | 23 (48.9\%) | FT | 20 (42.6\%) |  |  | FT | 18 (38.3\%) | FT $0(0.0 \%)$ | FT | 31 (66.0\%) |
|  | 290 (21.5\%) | PT | 243 (83.8\%) | PT | 122 (50.2\%) | PT | 100 (41.2\%) |  |  | PT | 58 (23.9\%) | PT $0(0.0 \%)$ | PT | 116 (47.7\%) |
|  | Total Referred | FT | 74 (13.1\%) | FT | 48 (64.9\%) | FT | 38 (51.4\%) |  |  | FT | 21 (28.4\%) | FT $\quad 1(1.4 \%)$ | FT | 38 (51.4\%) |
|  | 566 (41.9\%) | PT | 492 (86.9\%) | PT | 271 (55.1\%) | PT | 212 (43.1\%) |  |  | PT | 92 (18.7\%) | PT $\quad 15(3.0 \%)$ | PT | 181 (36.8\%) |
|  | College Level | FT | 339 (44.0\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | FT | 270 (79.6\%) |
|  | $771 \text { (57.1\%) }$ | PT | 432 (56.0\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PT | 243 (56.3\%) |
|  | Unknown | FT | 6 (46.2\%) | FT | $0(0.0 \%)$ | FT | $0(0.0 \%)$ | Not Applicable |  | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT $0(0.0 \%)$ | FT | 5 (83.3\%) |
|  | 13 (1.0\%) | PT | 7 (53.8\%) | PT | 0 (0.0\%) | PT | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | PT | 0 (0.0\%) | PT $0(0.0 \%)$ | PT | $0(0.0 \%)$ |
|  | Cohort Total | FT | 419 (31.0\%) | FT | 53 (12.6\%) | FT | 43 (10.3\%) |  |  | FT | 24 (5.7\%) | FT $\quad 1(0.2 \%)$ | FT | 313 (74.7\%) |
|  | 1,350 (100.0\%) | PT | 931 (69.0\%) | PT | 290 (31.1\%) | PT | 225 $24.2 \%$ ) |  |  | PT | 101 (10.8\%) | PT - - ${ }^{15}(1.6 \%)$ | PT | 424 4 45.5\%) |
| FT = Full-time |  | PT = Part-time |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:

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

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

## English Progression by Enrollment Status (Continued)

|  |  | Referral Level |  | Attempted Any DE (1st Year) |  | Success in Any DE <br> (1st Year) |  | 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) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{4}{0} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \stackrel{J}{8} \\ & \stackrel{1}{7} \end{aligned}$ | DE Level 1 | FT | 17 (12.5\%) | FT | 14 (82.4\%) | FT | 11 (64.7\%) | FT | 1 (5.9\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | 3rd Year Data Not Yet Available |  |  |
|  | 136 (9.9\%) | PT | 119 (87.5\%) | PT | 78 (65.5\%) | PT | 47 (39.5\%) | PT | 5 (4.2\%) | PT | 3 (2.5\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 2 | FT | 62 (28.1\%) | FT | 40 (64.5\%) | FT | 29 (46.8\%) | FT | 2 (3.2\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 221 (16.0\%) | PT | 159 (71.9\%) | PT | 98 (61.6\%) | PT | 69 (43.4\%) | PT | 15 (9.4\%) | PT | 8 (5.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 3 | FT | 64 (34.0\%) | FT | 50 (78.1\%) | FT | 34 (53.1\%) | FT | 50 (78.1\%) | FT | 34 (53.1\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 188 (13.6\%) | PT | 124 (66.0\%) | PT | 93 (75.0\%) | PT | 67 (54.0\%) | PT | 87 (70.2\%) | PT | 61 (49.2\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 4 | FT | 1 (25.0\%) | FT | 1 (100.0\%) | FT | 1 (100.0\%) | FT | 1 (100.0\%) | FT | 1 (100.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 4 (0.3\%) | PT | 3 (75.0\%) | PT | 2 (66.7\%) | PT | 2 (66.7\%) | PT | 2 (66.7\%) | PT | 2 (66.7\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Total Referred | FT | 144 (26.2\%) | FT | 105 (72.9\%) | FT | 75 (52.1\%) | FT | 54 (37.5\%) | FT | 35 (24.3\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 549 (39.8\%) | PT | 405 (73.8\%) | PT | 271 (66.9\%) | PT | 185 (45.7\%) | PT | 109 (26.9\%) | PT | 74 (18.3\%) |  |  |  |
|  | College Level | FT | 334 (44.6\%) | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 749 (54.4\%) | PT | 415 (55.4\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Unknown | FT | 19 (23.8\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 80 (5.8\%) | PT | 61 (76.3\%) | PT | 0 (0.0\%) | PT | 0 (0.0\%) | PT | 0 (0.0\%) | PT | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Cohort Total | FT | 497 (36.1\%) | FT | 108 (21.7\%) | FT | 77 (15.5\%) | FT | 56 (11.3\%) | FT | 36 (7.2\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 1,378(100.0\%) | PT | 881 (63.9\%) | PT | 281 (31.9\%) | PT | 193(21.9\%) | PT | 118(13.4\%). | PT | 81 (9.2\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 1 | FT | 18 (11.3\%) | FT | 8 (44.4\%) | FT | 6 (33.3\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 160 (11.7\%) | PT | 142 (88.8\%) | PT | 87 (61.3\%) | PT | 50 (35.2\%) | PT | 6 (4.2\%) | PT | 3 (2.1\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 2 | FT | 65 (20.8\%) | FT | 33 (50.8\%) | FT | 27 (41.5\%) | FT | 3 (4.6\%) | FT | 2 (3.1\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 312 (22.7\%) | PT | 247 (79.2\%) | PT | 140 (56.7\%) | PT | 98 (39.7\%) | PT | 20 (8.1\%) | PT | 14 (5.7\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 3 | FT | 127 (42.1\%) | FT | 77 (60.6\%) | FT | 63 (49.6\%) | FT | 74 (58.3\%) | FT | 61 (48.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 302 (22.0\%) | PT | 175 (57.9\%) | PT | 93 (53.1\%) | PT | 65 (37.1\%) | PT | 85 (48.6\%) | PT | 57 (32.6\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Total Referred | FT | 210 (27.1\%) | FT | 118 (56.2\%) | FT | 96 (45.7\%) | FT | 77 (36.7\%) | FT | 63 (30.0\%) | 3rd Year Data Not Yet Available |  |  |
|  | 774 (56.4\%) | PT | 564 (72.9\%) | PT | 320 (56.7\%) | PT | 213 (37.8\%) | PT | 111 (19.7\%) | PT | 74 (13.1\%) |  |  |  |
|  | College Level | FT | 264 (46.0\%) | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 574 (41.8\%) | PT | 310 (54.0\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Unknown | FT | 5 (20.0\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) | FT | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 25 (1.8\%) | PT | 20 (80.0\%) | PT | 0 (0.0\%) | PT | 0 (0.0\%) | PT | 0 (0.0\%) | PT | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Cohort Total | FT | 479 (34.9\%) | FT | 120 (25.1\%) | FT | 98 (20.5\%) | FT | 79 (16.5\%) | FT | 65 (13.6\%) |  |  |  |
|  | . 1,373 (10000\%) | PT | 894 (65.1\%). | PT | 327 (36.6\%) | PT | 218 (24.4\%) | PT | 115 (12.9\%). |  | 78(8.7\% |  |  |  |

## English Progression by Pell Status

Of non-referred students, Pell recipients successfully passed English "gatekeeper" courses at higher rates than did nonPell recipients. Of students referred to Level 2, 2011 and 2012 cohort non-Pell recipients successfully passed the high level English course at lower rates than did Pell recipients. DE Level 12011 non-Pell recipients had year-to-year increases in "gatekeeper" success rates.

|  |  | Referral Level |  | Attempted Any DE <br> (1st Year) |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Success in Any DE } \\ & \text { (1st Year) } \end{aligned}$ |  | Attempted RSG <br> (1st Year) | Success in RSG <br> (1st Year) |  | $s \text { in High DE }$ <br> Year) | Success in RSG <br> (3rd Year) |  | ccess in GK <br> (3rd Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 4 \\ & \frac{4}{0} \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & \frac{7}{8} \\ & \stackrel{1}{0} \\ & \overline{4} \end{aligned}$ | DE Level 1 | Y | 124 (64.6\%) | $Y$ | 100 (80.6\%) | Y | 65 (52.4\%) | Not Applicable |  | $Y$ | 26 (21.0\%) |  | $\gamma$ | 24 (19.4\%) |
|  | 192 (14.3\%) | N | 68 (35.4\%) | N | $32(47.1 \%)$ | N | 22 (32.4\%) |  |  | N | $9(13.2 \%)$ |  |  | 10 (14.7\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | Y | 237 (61.7\%) | $Y$ | 179 (75.5\%) | Y | 127 (53.6\%) |  |  | Y | 115 (48.5\%) | Not Applicable | Y | 103 (43.5\%) |
|  | 384 (28.6\%) | N | 147 (38.3\%) | N | 72 (49.0\%) | N | 49 (33.3\%) |  |  | N | 43 (29.3\%) | Notappicable |  | 40(27.2\%) |
|  | Total Referred | $Y$ | 361 (62.7\%) | $Y$ | 279 (77.3\%) | $Y$ | 192 (53.2\%) |  |  | Y | 141 (39.1\%) |  |  | 127 (35.2\%) |
|  | 576 (42.9\%) | N | 215 (37.3\%) | N | 104 (48.4\%) | N | $71(33.0 \%)$ |  |  | N | 52 (24.2\%) |  |  | 50 (23.3\%) |
|  | College Level | Y | 428 (57.4\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  | 257(60.0\%) |
|  | 746 (55.5\%) | N | 318(42.6\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 157 (49.4\%) |
|  | Unknown | Y | 10 (47.6\%) | $Y$ | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | Y | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  | 21 (1.6\%) | N | 11 (52.4\%) | N | 0 (0.0\%) | N | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | N | 0 (0.0\%) |  | N | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | Y | 799 (59.5\%) | $Y$ | 324 (40.6\%) | Y | 233 (29.2\%) |  |  | Y | 178 (22.3\%) |  |  | 384 (48.1\%) |
|  | 1.3,333 $1000.0 \%$ ) | N | 54440.4\%), | N | 132 (24.3\%) | N | .95.17.5\%) |  |  | N | 77 [14.2\%) |  |  | -207.38.1\%1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { H} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \text { Nै } \\ & \text { in } \\ & \overline{0} \end{aligned}$ | DE Level 1 | Y | 115 (64.6\%) | Y | 96(83.5\%) | Y | 69 (60.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | Y | 40 (34.8\%) | 1 (0.9\%) |  | 36(31.3\%) |
|  | 178 (13.8\%) | N | 63 (35.4\%) | N | 40 (63.5\%) | N | 30 (47.6\%) |  |  | N | 15 (23.8\%) | 0 (0.0\%) |  | 13(20.6\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | Y | 208 (58.8\%) | Y | 111 (5.4\%) | Y | 76 (36.5\%) |  |  | Y | 74 (35.6\%) | 1 (0.5\%) |  | 83 (39.9\%) |
|  | 354 (27.4\%) | N | 146 (41.2\%) | N | 65 (44.5\%) | N | 48 (32.9\%) |  |  | N | 38 (26.0\%) | 0 (0.0\%) |  | 47 (32.2\%) |
|  | Total Referred | Y | 323 (60.7\%) | $Y$ | 207 (64.1\%) | $Y$ | 145 (44.9\%) |  |  | Y | 114 (35.3\%) | $2(0.6 \%)$ |  | 119 (36.8\%) |
|  | 532 (41.2\%) | N | 209 (39.3\%) | N | 105 (50.2\%) | N | $78(37.3 \%)$ |  |  | N | 53 (25.4\%) | 0 (0.0\%) |  | 60(28.7\%) |
|  | College Level | Y | 402 (53.5\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  | 236 (58.7\%) |
|  | 751 (58.2\%) | N | 349 (46.5\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 152 (43.6\%) |
|  | Unknown | Y | 4(50.0\%) | $Y$ | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | $r$ | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 (0.0\%) |  | 1 (25.0\%) |
|  | $8(0.6 \%)$ | N | 4(50.0\%) | N | 1(25.0\%) | N | 1(25.0\%) |  |  | N | 1(25.0\%) | 0 (0.0\%) |  | 1 (25.0\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | Y | 729 (56.5\%) | $Y$ | 227 (31.1\%) | $Y$ | 161 (22.1\%) |  |  | Y | 127 (17.4\%) | $2(0.3 \%)$ |  | 356 (48.8\%) |
|  | 1,29111000\% | N | 562 (43.5\%) | N | 114(20.3\%) | N | 855 $115.1 \%$ ) |  |  | N | 59, $10.5 \%$ ) | N |  | -213]37.9\%1 |
|  | DE Level 1 | Y | 215 (77.9\%) | Y | 143 (66.5\%) | Y | 105 (48.8\%) | Not Applicable |  | Y | 31 (14.4\%) | 13 (6.0\%) |  | 51 (23.7\%) |
|  | 276 (20.4\%) | N | 61 (22.1\%) | N | 31 (50.8\%) | N | 25 (41.0\%) |  |  | N | 6 (9.8\%) | 3(4.9\%) |  | 21 (34.4\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | Y | 215 (74.1\%) | $Y$ | 111 (51.6\%) | Y | 91 (42.3\%) |  |  | $r$ | 54 (25.1\%) | 0 (0.0\%) |  | 105 (48.8\%) |
|  | 290 (21.5\%) | N | 75 (25.9\%) | N | 34 (45.3\%) | N | 29 (38.7\%) |  |  | N | 22 (29.3\%) | 0 (0.0\%) |  | 42 (56.0\%) |
|  | Total Referred | Y | 430 (76.0\%) | Y | 254 (59.1\%) | Y | 196 (45.6\%) |  |  | Y | 85 (19.8\%) | 13 (3.0\%) |  | 156 (36.3\%) |
|  | 566 (41.9\%) | N | 136 (24.0\%) | N | 65 (47.8\%) | N | 54 (39.7\%) |  |  | N | 28 (20.6\%) | 3(2.2\%) |  | 63 (46.3\%) |
|  | College Level | Y | 512 (66.4\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  | 341 (66.6\%) |
|  | 771 (57.1\%) | N | 259 (33.6\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 172 (66.4\%) |
|  | Unknown | Y | 6 (46.2\%) | $Y$ | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | Y | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 (0.0\%) |  | 2(33.3\%) |
|  | 13(1.0\%) | N | 7 (53.8\%) | N | 0 (0.0\%) | N | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | N | 0 (0.0\%) | $N \quad 0$ (0.0\%) |  | $3(42.9 \%)$ |
|  | Cohort Total | Y | 948 (70.2\%) | Y | 271 (28.6\%) | $Y$ | 208 (21.9\%) |  |  | $r$ | 95 (10.0\%) | Y 13 (1.4\%) |  | 499 (52.6\%) |
|  | . 13.350 (1000\% 0 ) | N- | 4022.29.8\%) | - | 72(17.9\%) |  | 60(14.9\%) |  |  |  | 30 $71.5 \%$ ) | N |  | _ 338 (5992\% |

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

## English Progression by Pell Status (Continued)

|  |  | Referral Level |  | Attempted Any DE (1st Year) |  | Success in Any DE (1st Year) |  | Attempted RSG (1st Year) |  | Success in RSG <br> (1st Year) |  | Success in High DE (3rd Year) | Success in RSG (3rd Year) | Success in GK (3rd Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{H}{0} \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & 0 \\ & \frac{7}{4} \\ & \frac{1}{4} \\ & \overline{4} \end{aligned}$ | DE Level 1 | Y | 93 (68.4\%) | $Y$ | 70 (75.3\%) | Y | 47 (50.5\%) | $Y$ | 2 (2.2\%) | Y | 1 (1.1\%) | 3rd Year Data Not Yet Available |  |  |
|  | 136 (9.9\%) | $N$ | 43 (31.6\%) | N | 22 (51.2\%) | N | 11 (25.6\%) | N | 4 (9.3\%) | N | 2 (4.7\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 2 | Y | 160 (72.4\%) | $Y$ | 103 (64.4\%) | Y | 71 (44.4\%) | $Y$ | 10 (6.3\%) | Y | 3 (1.9\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 221 (16.0\%) | N | 61 (27.6\%) | N | 35 (57.4\%) | N | 27 (44.3\%) | N | 7 (11.5\%) | N | 5 (8.2\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 3 | Y | 136 (72.3\%) | $Y$ | 101 (74.3\%) | Y | 67 (49.3\%) | $Y$ | 97 (71.3\%) | $Y$ | 62 (45.6\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 188 (13.6\%) | N | 52 (27.7\%) | N | 42 (80.8\%) | N | 34 (65.4\%) | N | 40 (76.9\%) | N | 33 (63.5\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 4 | Y | 3 (75.0\%) | $Y$ | 3 (100.0\%) | Y | 3 (100.0\%) | $Y$ | 3 (100.0\%) | Y | 3 (100.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 4 (0.3\%) | $N$ | 1 (25.0\%) | N | $0(0.0 \%)$ | N | 0 (0.0\%) | N | $0(0.0 \%)$ | N | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Total Referred | Y | 392 (71.4\%) | $Y$ | 277 (70.7\%) | Y | 188 (48.0\%) | $Y$ | 112 (28.6\%) | Y | 69 (17.6\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 549 (39.8\%) | N | 157 (28.6\%) | N | 99 (63.1\%) | N | 72 (45.9\%) | N | 51 (32.5\%) | N | 40 (25.5\%) |  |  |  |
|  | College Level | Y | 500 (66.8\%) | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $749 \text { (54.4\%) }$ | N | $249 \text { (33.2\%) }$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Unknown | Y | 54 (67.5\%) | $Y$ | $0(0.0 \%)$ | Y | $0(0.0 \%)$ | Y | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  |  |
|  | 80 (5.8\%) | N | 26 (32.5\%) | N | $0(0.0 \%)$ | N | 0 (0.0\%) | N | 0 (0.0\%) | N | $0(0.0 \%)$ |  |  |  |
|  | Cohort Total | Y | 946 (68.7\%) | $Y$ | 283 (29.9\%) | Y | 191 (20.2\%) | $Y$ | 117 (12.4\%) | Y | 71 (7.5\%) |  |  |  |
|  | $1,378(100.0 \%)$ | N | 432 (31.3\%) | N | 106 (24.5\%) | N | 79 (18.3\%) | N | 57 (13.2\%) . | N | 46(10.6\%) |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{4}{0} \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & \frac{0}{2} \\ & \frac{1}{8} \\ & \bar{\pi} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | DE Level 1 | Y | 112 (70.0\%) | Y | 67 (59.8\%) | Y | 36 (32.1\%) | Y | 5 (4.5\%) | $Y$ | 2 (1.8\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 160 (11.7\%) | N | 48 (30.0\%) | N | 28 (58.3\%) | N | 20 (41.7\%) | N | 1 (2.1\%) | N | 1 (2.1\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 2 | Y | 226 (72.4\%) | $Y$ | 129 (57.1\%) | Y | 93 (41.2\%) | $Y$ | 15 (6.6\%) | Y | 11 (4.9\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 312 (22.7\%) | $N$ | 86 (27.6\%) | N | 44 (51.2\%) | N | 32 (37.2\%) | N | 8 (9.3\%) | N | 5 (5.8\%) |  |  |  |
|  | DE Level 3 | Y | 204 (67.5\%) | $Y$ | 128 (62.7\%) | Y | 96 (47.1\%) | $Y$ | 121 (59.3\%) | Y | 90 (44.1\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 302 (22.0\%) | N | 98 (32.5\%) | N | 42 (42.9\%) | N | 32 (32.7\%) | N | 38 (38.8\%) | N | 28 (28.6\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Total Referred | Y | $542 \text { (70.0\%) }$ | Y | $324 \text { (59.8\%) }$ | $Y$ | $225 \text { (41.5\%) }$ | Y | $141 \text { (26.0\%) }$ | Y | $103 \text { (19.0\%) }$ | 3rd Year Data Not Yet Available |  |  |
|  | $774 \text { (56.4\%) }$ | N | $232 \text { (30.0\%) }$ | N | 114 (49.1\%) | N | $84 \text { (36.2\%) }$ | N | $47 \text { (20.3\%) }$ | N | $34 \text { (14.7\%) }$ |  |  |  |
|  | College Level | Y | 349 (60.8\%) | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 574 (41.8\%) | N | 225 (39.2\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Unknown | Y | 12 (48.0\%) | $Y$ | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 0 (0.0\%) | $Y$ | 0 (0.0\%) | $Y$ | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 25 (1.8\%) | N | 13 (52.0\%) | N | 0 (0.0\%) | N | 0 (0.0\%) | N | 0 (0.0\%) | N | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  |  |
|  | Cohort Total | $Y$ | 903 (65.8\%) | Y | 329 (36.4\%) | Y | 229 (25.4\%) | Y | 144 (15.9\%) | Y | 106 (11.7\%) |  |  |  |
|  | 1,373 (100.0\%) | N | 470 (34.2\%) | N | 118 (25.1\%) | N | 87 (18.5\%) | N | 50 (10.6\%). | N | 37 (7.9\%) |  |  |  |

## Notes:

1) Attempted = student received a grade for course (includes variations of W); Completed = student received a grade of A, B, C, D, F, I, IP, or P for course; Success = student received a grade of A, B, or C for course.
2) High DE = last course in DE sequence (Level 2).
3) English "gatekeeper" course is ENGL 1301.
4) Fall 2012-Fall 2015 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is first-time in college and credential seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the 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 referred students, Pell recipients successfully passed English DE courses at higher rates than did non-Pell recipients. Of students referred to Level 2, Pell recipients successfully passed the English "gatekeeper" course at higher rates than did non-Pell recipients. Of those who were non-referred, Pell recipients performed better in the English "gatekeeper" course than did non-Pell recipients. When comparing the 2011 cohort to the 2013 cohort, both referred and non-referred Pell recipients experienced increases in "gatekeeper" success.


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

Notes:

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

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

## English Progression by Veteran Status (Continued)
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## Progression Through Math Developmental Education \& "Gatekeeper" Courses

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

## Math Developmental Education Progression of Referred

After 3 years, approximately $27 \%-41 \%$ of referred students in each cohort attempted the highest DE course in the Math sequence, with $19 \%-29 \%$ of the cohort successfully passing the course. Approximately $27 \%-41 \%$ of referred students in each cohort attempted a Math "gatekeeper" course, with $19 \%-27 \%$ of the cohort successfully passing a "gatekeeper" course. When comparing the 2013 cohort to the 2011 cohort, success in "gatekeeper" increased by 6.7 percentage points.



## Math "Gatekeeper" Progression of Non-Referred

After 3 years, approximately $71 \%-83 \%$ of non-referred students in each cohort attempted one of the Math "gatekeeper" courses, with $45 \%-57 \%$ of that cohort successfully passing that course, which is more than double the rate of referred students.


## Total Math Progression

Overall, $52 \%-58 \%$ of all referred students in each cohort successfully passed any Math DE course within the first year, $19 \%-29 \%$ successfully passed the highest DE course in the Math sequence within 3 years, and approximately $19 \%-27 \%$ successfully passed the Math "gatekeeper" course within 3 years. Of the non-referred students, $45 \%-57 \%$ successfully passed the Math "gatekeeper" course within 3 years. Of the total cohort, $26 \%-38 \%$ successfully passed the Math "gatekeeper" course within 3 years. Those who were referred to Level 4 had higher success rates in the highest Math DE course than those who were referred to lower levels. Non-referred students had higher success rates in Math "gatekeeper" courses than did referred students. When comparing the 2013 cohort to the 2011 cohort, referred students experienced an 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) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{*}{ \pm} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & -\underset{1}{\sim} \\ & \bar{N} \\ & \bar{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 1 \\ 162 \text { (12.1\%) } \end{gathered}$ | 90 (55.6\%) | 36 (22.2\%) | Not Applicable |  | 8 (4.9\%) | Not Applicable | 8 (4.9\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 $332 \text { (24.7\%) }$ | 286 (86.1\%) | 227 (68.4\%) |  |  | 75 (22.6\%) |  | 44 (13.3\%) |
|  | DE Level 3 $323 \text { (24.1\%) }$ | 273 (84.5\%) | 169 (52.3\%) |  |  | 81 (25.1\%) |  | 69 (21.4\%) |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 4 \\ 211(15.7 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 174 (82.5\%) | 119 (56.4\%) |  |  | 110 (52.1\%) |  | 71 (33.6\%) |
|  | Total Referred 1,028 (76.5\%) | 823 (80.1\%) | 551 (53.6\%) |  |  | 274 (26.7\%) |  | 192 (18.7\%) |
|  | College Level $276 \text { (20.6\%) }$ |  |  | Not Ap | licable |  |  | 156 (56.5\%) |
|  | Unknown $39 \text { (2.9\%) }$ | 4 (10.3\%) | 4 (10.3\%) | Not Applicable |  | 5 (12.8\%) | Not Applicable | 5 (12.8\%) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cohort Total } \\ & 1,343(100.0 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 856 (63.7\%) | 577 (43.0\%) |  |  | 301 (22.4\%) |  | 353 (26.3\%) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DE Level } 1 \\ & 246(19.1 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 208 (84.6\%) | 159 (64.6\%) |  |  | 44 (17.9\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | 42 (17.1\%) |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 2 \\ 235 \text { (18.2\%) } \end{gathered}$ | 202 (86.0\%) | 131 (55.7\%) |  |  | 51 (21.7\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | 52 (22.1\%) |
|  | DE Level 3 $335 \text { (25.9\%) }$ | 262 (78.2\%) | 170 (50.7\%) | Not Ap | icable | 120 (35.8\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | 103 (30.7\%) |
|  | DE Level 4 $152 \text { (11.8\%) }$ | 92 (60.5\%) | 57 (37.5\%) |  |  | 61 (40.1\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | 61 (40.1\%) |
|  | Total Referred 968 (75.0\%) | 764 (78.9\%) | 517 (53.4\%) |  |  | 276 (28.5\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | 258 (26.7\%) |
|  | College Level $286 \text { (22.2\%) }$ |  |  | Not Appres | licable |  |  | 128 (44.8\%) |
|  | Unknown $37 \text { (2.9\%) }$ | 24 (64.9\%) | 18 (48.6\%) | Not Applicable |  | 8 (21.6\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | 10 (27.0\%) |
|  | Cohort Total <br> 1,291 (100.0\%) | 822 (63.7\%) | 561 (43.5\%) |  |  | 308 (23.9\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | 396 (30.7\%) |

## Notes:

1) Attempted = student received a grade for course (includes variations of W); Completed = student received a grade of $A, B, C, D, F, I, I P$, or $P$ for course; Success = student received a grade of A, B, or C for course.
2) High DE = last course in DE sequence (Level 4 for Fall 2011-Fall 2013; Level 3 for Fall 2014 onward).
3) Math "gatekeeper" courses are MATH 1314, MATH 1324, MATH 1332, MATH 1333, MATH 1414, and MATH 1442.
4) Fall 2012 through Fall 2015 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is firsttime in college and credential seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBM001). Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using THECB methodology.
5) Developmental education (DE) referral levels are based on formal student assessment outcomes for the subject area of DE course enrollment. Students designated as "Unknown" did not have an assessment on file or could not be placed within referral range and could not be categorized based on DE course enrollment.

## Total Math Progression (Continued)


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

## Sources:

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

## Math Progression by Gender

Generally, women compared to men successfully passed Math "gatekeeper" courses at higher rates. When comparing the 2013 cohort to the 2011 cohort, referred women experienced an increase in "gatekeeper" success.


## Notes:

1) Attempted = student received a grade for course (includes variations of W); Completed = student received a grade of A, B, C, D, F, I, IP, or P for course; Success = student received a grade of A, B, or C for course.
2) High DE = last course in DE sequence (Level 4 for Fall 2011-Fall 2013; Level 3 for Fall 2014 onward).
3) Math "gatekeeper" courses are MATH 1314, MATH 1324, MATH 1332, MATH 1333, MATH 1414, and MATH 1442.
4) Fall 2012 through Fall 2015 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is firsttime in college and credential seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBM001). Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using THECB methodology.
5) Developmental education (DE) referral levels are based on formal student assessment outcomes for the subject area of DE course enrollment. Students designated as "Unknown" did not have an assessment on file or could not be placed within referral range and could not be categorized based on DE course enrollment.

## Math Progression by Gender (Continued)



[^7]
## Math Progression by Ethnicity

In general, of referred and non-referred students, White students, compared to students from other racial/ethnic groups, successfully passed the highest DE and "gatekeeper" courses at the highest rates. When comparing the 2013 cohort to the 2011 cohort, referred White and Hispanic students experienced increases in "gatekeeper" success.


Notes:

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

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

## Math Progression by Ethnicity (Continued)

|  |  |  |  |  | d Any DE Year) |  | in Any DE Year) | Attempted RSG (1st Year) | Success in RSG (1st Year) |  | in High DE Year) |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { in RSG } \\ & \text { ear) } \end{aligned}$ |  | ess in GK d Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DE Level 1 <br> 246 (19.1\%) | AA | 8 (3.3\%) | $A A$ | 6 (75.0\%) | AA | 2 (25.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | AA | 1 (12.5\%) | $A A$ | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | A | 0(0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | H | 217 (88.2\%) | H | 184 (84.8\%) | H | 144 (66.4\%) |  |  | H | 37 (17.1\%) | H | 0 (0.0\%) | H | 37 (17.1\%) |
|  |  | o | 4(1.6\%) | 0 | 3 (75.0\%) | 0 | 1 (25.0\%) |  |  | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | O | 1 (25.0\%) |
|  |  | w | 17 (6.9\%) | w | 15 (88.2\%) | w | 12 (70.6\%) |  |  | w | 6 (35.3\%) | w | 0 (0.0\%) | w | 4 (23.5\%) |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DE Level } 2 \\ 235 \text { (18.2\%) } \end{gathered}$ | AA | 4 (1.7\%) | $A A$ | 3 (75.0\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | AA | 0(0.0\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | A | 1 (0.4\%) | A | 1 (100.0\%) | A | 1 (100.0\%) |  |  | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | $A$ | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | H | 194 (82.6\%) | H | 164 (84.5\%) | H | 106 (54.6\%) |  |  | H | 43 (22.2\%) | H | 0 (0.0\%) | H | 42 (21.6\%) |
|  |  | 0 | 4 (1.7\%) | 0 | 4 (100.0\%) | 0 | 2 (50.0\%) |  |  | 0 | 1 (25.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | O | 1(25.0\%) |
|  |  | w | 32 (13.6\%) | w | 30 (93.8\%) | w | 22 (68.8\%) |  |  | w | 7 (21.9\%) | w | 0 (0.0\%) | W | 9 (28.1\%) |
|  | DE Level 3 <br> 335 (25.9\%) | AA | 11 (3.3\%) | AA | 4 (36.4\%) | AA | 2 (18.2\%) |  |  | AA | 0(0.0\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | 0(0.0\%) |
|  |  | A | 0(0.0\%) | A | 0(0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | A | 0(0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0(0.0\%) |
|  |  | H | 274 (81.8\%) | H | 225 (82.1\%) | H | 143 (52.2\%) |  |  | H | 103 (37.6\%) | H | 0 (0.0\%) | H | 88 (32.1\%) |
|  |  | 0 | 4(1.2\%) | 0 | 3 (75.0\%) | 0 | 2 (50.0\%) |  |  | 0 | 2 (50.0\%) | O | 0 (0.0\%) | O | 1(25.0\%) |
|  |  | w | 46 (13.7\%) | w | 30 (65.2\%) | W | 23 (50.0\%) |  |  | w | 15 (32.6\%) | w | 0 (0.0\%) | W | 14 (30.4\%) |
|  | DE Level 4 <br> 152 (11.8\%) <br> Total Referred | AA | 4 (2.6\%) | $A A$ | 1 (25.0\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | A | 1 (0.7\%) | A | 1 (100.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | $A$ | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | H | 113 (74.3\%) | H | 75 (66.4\%) | H | 45 (39.8\%) |  |  | H | 48 (42.5\%) | H | 0 (0.0\%) | H | 50 (44.2\%) |
|  |  | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | o | 0 (0.0\%) | O | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | w | 34 (22.4\%) | w | 15 (44.1\%) | w | 12 (35.3\%) |  |  | w | 13 (38.2\%) | w | 0 (0.0\%) | W | 11 (32.4\%) |
|  |  | AA | 27 (2.8\%) | $A A$ | 14 (51.9\%) | AA | 4 (14.8\%) |  |  | AA | 1(3.7\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | A | 2 (0.2\%) | A | 2 (100.0\%) | A | 1 (50.0\%) |  |  | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | H | 798 (82.4\%) | H | 648 (81.2\%) | H | 438 (54.9\%) |  |  | H | 231 (28.9\%) | H | 0 (0.0\%) | H | 217 (27.2\%) |
|  |  | o | 12 (1.2\%) | 0 | 10 (83.3\%) | O | $5(41.7 \%)$ |  |  | o | 3 (25.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | O | 3 (25.0\%) |
|  |  | w | 129 (13.3\%) | W | 90 (69.8\%) | w | 69 (53.5\%) |  |  | w | 41 (31.8\%) | w | 0 (0.0\%) | W | 38 (29.5\%) |
|  | College Level 286 (22.2\%) | AA | 3 (1.0\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  | AA | 1 (33.3\%) |
|  |  | A | 1 (0.3\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | A | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | H | 225 (78.7\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | H | 100 (44.4\%) |
|  |  | 0 | 3 (1.0\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | O | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | w | 54 (18.9\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | w | 27 (50.0\%) |
|  | Unknown$37 \text { (2.9\%) }$ | AA | 1 (2.7\%) | $A A$ | 0(0.0\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | A | 1 (2.7\%) | A | 1 (100.0\%) | A | 1 (100.0\%) |  |  | A | 0(0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | H | 32 (86.5\%) | H | 22 (68.8\%) | H | 16 (50.0\%) |  |  | H | 8 (25.0\%) | H | 0 (0.0\%) | H | 10 (31.3\%) |
|  |  | - | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | O | 0 (0.0\%) | O | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | w | 3 (8.1\%) | w | 1 (33.3\%) | w | 1 (33.3\%) |  |  | w | 0 (0.0\%) | w | 0 (0.0\%) | w | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cohort Total } \\ & \text { 1,291(100.0\%) } \end{aligned}$ | AA | 31 (2.4\%) | AA | 14 (45.2\%) | AA | 4 (12.9\%) |  |  | AA | 1 (3.2\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | 1 (3.2\%) |
|  |  | A | 4 (0.3\%) | A | 3 (75.0\%) | A | 2 (50.0\%) |  |  | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | H | 1,055 (81.7\%) | H | 700 (66.4\%) | H | 476 (45.1\%) |  |  | H | 259 (24.5\%) | H | 0 (0.0\%) | H | 327 (31.0\%) |
|  |  | - | 15 (1.2\%) | $\bigcirc$ | 11 (73.3\%) | $\bigcirc$ | 6 (40.0\%) |  |  | 0 | 4 (26.7\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | $\bigcirc$ | 3 (20.0\%) |
|  |  | w | 186(14.4\%) | w | 94(50.5\%) | w | 73 (39.2\%) |  |  | w | 44 (23.7\%) | w | O (0.0\%) | w | 65 (34.9\%). |
|  | DE Level 1 <br> 330 (24.4\%) | AA | 10 (3.0\%) | AA | 6 (60.0\%) | AA | 2 (20.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | AA | 0(0.0\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | A | 1 (0.3\%) | A | 1 (100.0\%) | A | 1 (100.0\%) |  |  | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | $A$ | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | H | 261 (79.1\%) | H | 212 (81.2\%) | H | 156 (59.8\%) |  |  | H | 29 (11.1\%) | H | 1 (0.4\%) | H | $38(14.6 \%)$ |
|  |  | 0 | 21 (6.4\%) | 0 | 18 (85.7\%) | 0 | 13 (61.9\%) |  |  | 0 | 4 (19.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | O | 3 (14.3\%) |
|  |  | w | 37 (11.2\%) | w | 30 (81.1\%) | w | 20 (54.1\%) |  |  | w | 6 (16.2\%) | w | 0 (0.0\%) | w | 8 (21.6\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 <br> 152 (11.3\%) | AA | 4 (2.6\%) | $A A$ | 2 (50.0\%) | AA | 2 (50.0\%) |  |  | AA | 2 (50.0\%) | $A A$ | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | 1 (25.0\%) |
|  |  | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | H | 115 (75.7\%) | H | 99 (86.1\%) | H | 60 (52.2\%) |  |  | H | 13 (11.3\%) | H | 0 (0.0\%) | H | 28 (24.3\%) |
|  |  | o | 9 (5.9\%) | 0 | 9 (100.0\%) | 0 | 7 (77.8\%) |  |  | o | 1(11.1\%) | - | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 4 (44.4\%) |
|  |  | w | 24 (15.8\%) | w | 20 (83.3\%) | w | 17 (70.8\%) |  |  | w | 4 (16.7\%) | w | 0 (0.0\%) | w | 8 (33.3\%) |
|  | DE Level 3 120 (8.9\%) | AA | 2 (1.7\%) | $A A$ | 1 (50.0\%) | AA | 1 (50.0\%) |  |  | AA | 1 (50.0\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | 1 (50.0\%) |
|  |  | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0(0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | A | 0(0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | H | 98 (81.7\%) | H | 86 (87.8\%) | H | 56 (57.1\%) |  |  | H | 31 (31.6\%) | H | 0 (0.0\%) | H | 44 (44.9\%) |
|  |  | o | 5(4.2\%) | 0 | 5 (100.0\%) | 0 | 3 (60.0\%) |  |  | o | 4 (80.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 1 (20.0\%) |
|  |  | w | 15 (12.5\%) | w | 10 (66.7\%) | w | 8 (53.3\%) |  |  | w | 5 (33.3\%) | w | 0 (0.0\%) | W | 5 (33.3\%) |
|  | DE Level 4 <br> 51 (3.8\%) | AA | 1 (2.0\%) | $A A$ | 1 (100.0\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | AA | 0(0.0\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0(0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | A | 0(0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | H | 39 (76.5\%) | H | 29 (74.4\%) | H | 17 (43.6\%) |  |  | H | 19 (48.7\%) | H | 0 (0.0\%) | H | 18 (46.2\%) |
|  |  | 0 | 1 (2.0\%) | - | 0 (0.0\%) | O | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | o | 0 (0.0\%) | O | 0 (0.0\%) | O | 1 (100.0\%) |
|  |  | w | 10 (19.6\%) | w | 4 (40.0\%) | w | 4 (40.0\%) |  |  | w | 5 (50.0\%) | w | 0 (0.0\%) | w | 5 (50.0\%) |
|  | Total Referred 653 (48.4\%) | AA | 17 (2.6\%) | AA | 10 (58.8\%) | AA | 5 (29.4\%) |  |  | AA | 3 (17.6\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | 2 (11.8\%) |
|  |  | A | 1 (0.2\%) | A | 1 (100.0\%) | A | 1 (100.0\%) |  |  | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | $A$ | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | H | 513 (78.6\%) | H | 426 (83.0\%) | H | 289 (56.3\%) |  |  | H | 92 (17.9\%) | H | 1 (0.2\%) | H | 128 (25.0\%) |
|  |  | O | 36 (5.5\%) | 0 | 32 (88.9\%) | $\bigcirc$ | 23 (63.9\%) |  |  | o | 9 (25.0\%) | O | 0 (0.0\%) | O | 9 (25.0\%) |
|  |  | w | 86 (13.2\%) | w | 64 (74.4\%) | w | 49 (57.0\%) |  |  | w | 20 (23.3\%) | w | 0 (0.0\%) | W | 26 (30.2\%) |
|  | College Level 689 (51.0\%) | AA | 12 (1.7\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  |  | AA | 5 (41.7\%) |
|  |  | A | 3 (0.4\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | A | 1(33.3\%) |
|  |  | H | 545 (79.1\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | H | 286 (52.5\%) |
|  |  | o | 32 (4.6\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | 14 (43.8\%) |
|  |  | w | 97 (14.1\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | W | 45 (46.4\%) |
|  | Unknown$8 \text { (0.6\%) }$ | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | 0(0.0\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | AA | 0(0.0\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | H | 5 (62.5\%) | H | 2 (40.0\%) | H | 1 (20.0\%) |  |  | H | 1 (20.0\%) | H | 0 (0.0\%) | H | 2 (40.0\%) |
|  |  | 0 | 0(0.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) |
|  |  | w | 3 (37.5\%) | w | 0 (0.0\%) | W | 0 (0.0\%) |  |  | w | 0 (0.0\%) | w | 0 (0.0\%) | w | 1 (33.3\%) |
|  |  | AA | 29 (2.1\%) | AA | 10 (34.5\%) | AA | 5(17.2\%) |  |  | AA | 4 (13.8\%) | AA | 0 (0.0\%) | AA | 7 (24.1\%) |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cohort Total } \\ & \text { 1,350(100.0\%) } \end{aligned}$ | A | 4 (0.3\%) | A | 2 (50.0\%) | A | 2 (50.0\%) |  |  | A | 0 (0.0\%) | A | 0 (0.0\%) | $A$ | 1 (25.0\%) |
|  |  | H | 1,063 (78.7\%) | H | 473 (44.5\%) | H | 321 (30.2\%) |  |  | H | 108 (10.2\%) | H | 1 (0.1\%) | H | 416 (39.1\%) |
|  |  | 0 | 68 (5.0\%) | 0 | 33 (48.5\%) | 0 | 23 (33.8\%) |  |  | 0 | 10 (14.7\%) | 0 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0 | 23 (33.8\%) |
|  |  | w | 186(13.8\%) | w | $71(38.2 \%)$. | w | 55 (29.6\%) |  |  | w | 23(12.4\%) | w | O(0.0\%) | w | 72 (38.7\%). |

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

## Math Progression by Ethnicity (Continued)


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

## Math Progression by Age

Across cohorts, levels, and age groups, after 3 years, no trend was evident. When comparing the 2013 cohort to the 2011 cohort, referred students younger than 35 experienced increases in "gatekeeper" success.


Notes:

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

Sources:
FTIC Age: ACCDODS1.XST_ATD_ACCD
DE Referrals:

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

Math Progression by Age
(Continued)


Math Progression by Age

## (Continued)



## Math Progression by Enrollment Status

Generally, full-time students successfully passed both Math highest DE and "gatekeeper" courses at higher rates than did part-time students. When comparing the 2013 cohort to the 2011 cohort, referred full-time students experienced the largest increase in "gatekeeper" success.

FT = Full-time $\quad$ PT $=$ Part-time

Notes:

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

Sources:

FTIC FT/PT Status:
DE Referrals:

Course Enrollment::

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

## Math Progression by Enrollment Status (Continued)



FT = Full-time
PT = Part-time

## Math Progression by Pell Status

In the Fall 2011 and Fall 2012 cohorts, of both referred and non-referred students, Pell recipients compared to Pell nonrecipients successfully passed highest DE and "gatekeeper" Math courses at slightly higher rates. When comparing the 2013 cohort to the 2011 cohort, non-referred Pell non-recipients experienced an increase in "gatekeeper" success.

|  |  |  |  |  | ed Any DE Year) |  | in Any DE Year) | Attempted RSG (1st Year) | Success in RSG (1st Year) |  | in High DE Year) | Success in RSG (3rd Year) |  | sess in GK <br> rd Year) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DE Level 1 | Y | 91 (56.2\%) | Y | 65 (71.4\%) | Y | 29 (31.9\%) | Not Applicable |  | Y | 6 (6.6\%) | Not Applicable | Y | 5 (5.5\%) |
|  | 162 (12.1\%) | N | 71 (43.8\%) | N | 25 (35.2\%) | N | 7 (9.9\%) |  |  | N | 2 (2.8\%) |  | N | 3 (4.2\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | Y | 225 (67.8\%) | Y | 207 (92.0\%) | Y | 160 (71.1\%) |  |  | Y | 51 (22.7\%) |  | Y | 30 (13.3\%) |
|  | 332 (24.7\%) | N | 107 (32.2\%) | N | 79 (73.8\%) | N | 67 (62.6\%) |  |  | N | 24 (22.4\%) |  | N | 14 (13.1\%) |
|  | DE Level 3 | Y | 196 (60.7\%) | Y | 180 (91.8\%) | Y | 109 (55.6\%) |  |  | Y | 51 (26.0\%) |  | Y | 47 (24.0\%) |
|  | 323 (24.1\%) | N | 127 (39.3\%) | N | 93 (73.2\%) | N | 60 (47.2\%) |  |  | N | 30 (23.6\%) |  | N | 22 (17.3\%) |
|  | DE Level 4 | Y | 111 (52.6\%) | Y | 104 (93.7\%) | Y | 75 (67.6\%) |  |  | Y | 66 (59.5\%) |  | Y | 43 (38.7\%) |
|  | 211 (15.7\%) | N | 100 (47.4\%) | N | 70 (70.0\%) | N | 44 (44.0\%) |  |  | N | 44 (44.0\%) |  | N | 28 (28.0\%) |
|  | Total Referred | Y | 623 (60.6\%) | Y | 556 (89.2\%) | Y | 373 (59.9\%) |  |  | Y | 174 (27.9\%) |  | Y | 125 (20.1\%) |
|  | 1,028 (76.5\%) | N | 405 (39.4\%) | N | 267 (65.9\%) | N | 178 (44.0\%) |  |  | N | 100 (24.7\%) |  | N | 67 (16.5\%) |
|  | College Level | Y | 153 (55.4\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | Y | 89 (58.2\%) |
|  | 276 (20.6\%) | N | 123 (44.6\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | N | 67 (54.5\%) |
|  | Unknown | Y | 23 (59.0\%) | $Y$ | 3 (13.0\%) | Y | 3 (13.0\%) | Not Applicable |  | Y | 4 (17.4\%) | Not Applicable | Y | 3 (13.0\%) |
|  | 39 (2.9\%) | N | 16 (41.0\%) | N | 1 (6.3\%) | N | 1 (6.3\%) |  |  | N | 1 (6.3\%) |  | N | 2 (12.5\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | Y | 799 (59.5\%) | Y | 578 (72.3\%) | Y | 392 (49.1\%) |  |  | Y | 195 (24.4\%) |  | Y | 217 (27.2\%) |
|  | 1,343 (100.0\%) | N | 544(40.5\%) | N | 278(51.1\%). | N | 185 (34.0\%) |  |  | N | 106(19.5\%) |  | N | 136(25.0\%). |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { to } \\ & \text { 응 } \\ & \text { I } \\ & 0 \\ & \bar{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | DELevel 1 | Y | 143 (58.1\%) | Y | 135 (94.4\%) | Y | 101 (70.6\%) | Not Applicable |  | Y | 30 (21.0\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 29 (20.3\%) |
|  | 246 (19.1\%) | N | 103 (41.9\%) | N | 73 (70.9\%) | N | 58 (56.3\%) |  |  | N | 14 (13.6\%) | $\mathrm{N} \quad \mathrm{O}(0.0 \%)$ | N | 13 (12.6\%) |
|  | DE Level 2 | Y | 140 (59.6\%) | Y | 129 (92.1\%) | Y | 85 (60.7\%) |  |  | Y | 31 (22.1\%) | $Y \quad 0$ (0.0\%) | Y | 29 (20.7\%) |
|  | $235 \text { (18.2\%) }$ | N | 95 (40.4\%) | N | 73 (76.8\%) | N | 46 (48.4\%) |  |  | N | 20 (21.1\%) | $\mathrm{N} \quad \mathrm{O}(0.0 \%)$ | N | 23 (24.2\%) |
|  | DE Level 3 | Y | 201 (60.0\%) | Y | 173 (86.1\%) | Y | 113 (56.2\%) |  |  | Y | 73 (36.3\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 66 (32.8\%) |
|  | 335 (25.9\%) | N | 134 (40.0\%) | N | 89 (66.4\%) | N | 57 (42.5\%) |  |  | N | 47 (35.1\%) | $\mathrm{N} \quad \mathrm{O}(0.0 \%)$ | N | 37 (27.6\%) |
|  | DE Level 4 | Y | 67 (44.1\%) | Y | 51 (76.1\%) | Y | 33 (49.3\%) |  |  | Y | 33 (49.3\%) | $Y$ Y 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 27 (40.3\%) |
|  | 152 (11.8\%) | N | 85 (55.9\%) | N | 41 (48.2\%) | N | 24 (28.2\%) |  |  | N | 28 (32.9\%) | $\mathrm{N} \quad \mathrm{O}(0.0 \%)$ | N | 34 (40.0\%) |
|  | Total Referred | Y | 551 (56.9\%) | Y | 488 (88.6\%) | Y | 332 (60.3\%) |  |  | Y | 167 (30.3\%) | 0 (0.0\%) | Y | 151 (27.4\%) |
|  | 968 (75.0\%) | N | 417 (43.1\%) | N | 276 (66.2\%) | N | 185 (44.4\%) |  |  | N | 109 (26.1\%) | $\mathrm{N} \quad 0$ (0.0\%) | N | 107 (25.7\%) |
|  | College Level | Y | 155 (54.2\%) |  |  |  |  | Not Applicable |  |  |  |  | Y | 80 (51.6\%) |
|  | $286 \text { (22.2\%) }$ | N | $131(45.8 \%)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | N | 48 (36.6\%) |
|  | Unknown | Y | 23 (62.2\%) | $Y$ | 14 (60.9\%) | Y | 10 (43.5\%) | Not Applicable |  | Y | 3 (13.0\%) | $Y \quad 0$ (0.0\%) | Y | 5 (21.7\%) |
|  | $37 \text { (2.9\%) }$ | N | 14 (37.8\%) | N | 10 (71.4\%) | N | 8 (57.1\%) |  |  | N | 5 (35.7\%) | $\mathrm{N} \quad 0(0.0 \%)$ | N | 5 (35.7\%) |
|  | Cohort Total | Y | 729 (56.5\%) | Y | 524 (71.9\%) | Y | 358 (49.1\%) |  |  | Y | 184 (25.2\%) | $Y \quad 0$ (0.0\%) | Y | 236 (32.4\%) |
|  | 1,291(100.0\%) | N | 562(43.5\%) | N | 298(53.0\%) | N | 203 (36.1\%) |  |  | N | 124(22.1\%) | N | N | 160 (28.5\%). |

## 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 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 and 2013 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is first-time in college and credential seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBM001). 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:
Course Enrollment::
ACCDODS1.XST_ATD_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:

## Math Progression by Pell Status (Continued)



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

## Math Progression by Veteran Status

In the Fall 2011 and Fall 2012 cohorts, of both referred and non-referred students, veterans compared to non-veterans successfully passed highest DE and "gatekeeper" Math courses at slightly higher rates. When comparing the 2013 cohort to the 2011 cohort, referred non-veterans experienced an increase in "gatekeeper" success.


Yes = Veteran No $=$ Non-Veteran

## Notes:

1) Attempted = student received a grade for course (includes variations of W); Completed = student received a grade of A, B, C, D, F, I, IP, or P for course; Success = student received a grade of A, B, or C for course.
2) High DE = last course in DE sequence (Level 4 for Fall 2011-Fall 2013; Level 3 for Fall 2014 onward).
3) Math "gatekeeper" courses are MATH 1314, MATH 1324, MATH 1332, MATH 1333, MATH 1414, and MATH 1442.
4) Fall 2012 and 2013 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is first-time in college and credential seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBM001). 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:

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

## Math Progression by Veteran Status (Continued)



# PALO ALTO COLLEGE PRODUCTIVE GRADE RATES (PGR) 

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

This report compares the 1- to 5-year productive grade rates (PGR) of the Fall 2010 through Fall 2014 FTIC cohorts for Palo Alto College. 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 years by course section location. These rates were examined by various student and academic characteristics.
$\diamond$ Productive grade rates at Palo Alto College fluctuated between $68 \%-74 \%$ across all cohorts and all years.
$\diamond$ Female students demonstrated higher productive grade rates than did male students.
$\diamond$ African American and Hispanic students achieved their highest productive grade rates in the first year Fall 2015 cohort
$\diamond$ After the first year students less than and including the 22-24 age group exhibited lower productive grade rates than did students in older age groups.
$\diamond$ Full-time students consistently produced higher productive grade rates than part-time students in each cohort and each year.
$\diamond$ Across each cohort and year, productive grade rates were higher among non-Pell grant recipients than Pell grant recipients.
$\diamond$ Overall, across each cohort and each year, productive grade rates were higher among veteran students than non-veteran students.
$\diamond$ Students not referred to developmental education had higher productive grade rates than did students who were referred to developmental education.

## Total Productive Grade Rates

Productive grade rates at Palo Alto College fluctuated between $68 \%-74 \%$ across all cohorts and all years. First year productive grade rates climbed to $72 \%$ in the Fall 2013 cohort, then climbed again to $74 \%$ in the Fall 2015 cohort. In the Fall 2011 to 2014 cohorts, productive grade rates remained relatively unchanged from the first year to the second year, and relatively consistent in subsequent years. Productive grade rates in the Fall 2011 cohort remained relatively unchanged from the first year (70.2\%) to the fifth year (70.8\%).
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## Productive Grade Rates by Gender

Across each cohort and each year, female students consistently demonstrated higher productive grade rates than did male students. In most years both male and female productive grade rates declined from the first year to the second year but climbed in subsequent years. First year male productive grade rates of the Fall 2015 cohort ( $72.4 \%$ ) grew 5.7 percentage points higher than the first year Fall 2011 cohort ( $66.7 \%$ ). Overall, productive grade rates ranged from a low of $65.5 \%$ (male, 2012, year 2nd year) to a high of $75.7 \%$ (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 White students were often higher than other student groups across the cohorts and years. However, Asian students had higher productive grade rates than White students in the first year 2012, 2013, and 2015 cohorts. African American and Hispanic students achieved their highest productive grade rates in the first year Fall 2015 cohort than in any other previous year and any other cohort. After five year of tracking, African American and Hispanic students in the Fall 2011 cohort demonstrated increases from the first year to the fifth year, while rates for Asian, Other, and White students declined.


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) 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 less than and including the 22-24 age group exhibited lower productive grade rates than did students in older age groups. However this group of students demonstrated improved rates in the first year Fall 2015 cohort when compared to the first year Fall 2011 cohort. The first year pattern established in most cohorts remained unchanged in each 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 CBMOO1).
(5) Age as reported at the Fall semester of the cohort year.
(6) Sources: FTIC Demographics ACCDODS.XST_CBM001_ACCD; Course Enrollment ACCDODS1.XST_IRES_SC

## Productive Grade Rates by Enrollment Status

Full-time students consistently produced higher productive grade rates than part-time students in each cohort and each year. Productive grade rates of full-time students ranged from $73 \%$ to $81 \%$, while part-time student rates ranged from $65 \%$ to $70 \%$. First year full-time productive grade rates of the Fall 2015 cohort ( $81.1 \%$ ) were 8.3 percentage points higher than the first year Fall 2011 cohort ( $72.8 \%$ ). In the Fall 2011 cohort, productive grade rates of both full and part-time students grew 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) 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

Across each cohort and 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 to 2013 cohort followed by the highest rate in the Fall 2015 cohort. Non-Pell students demonstrated little fluctuation in rates from year-to-year.


## Notes:

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

## Productive Grade Rates by Veteran Status

Overall, across most cohorts and years, productive grade rates were higher among veteran students than non-veteran students. First year productive grade rates among veteran students exhibited an increase of 4.3 percentage points from the Fall 2011 cohort ( $72.9 \%$ ) to the Fall 2015 cohort ( $77.2 \%$ ). During the same period, non-veteran students' productive grade rates also climbed 4.1 percentage points. In the Fall 2011 cohort, productive grade rates of veteran and nonveteran students remained relatively unchanged 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) 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 DE. First year referred student productive grade rate of the Fall 2015 cohort ( $69.5 \%$ ) increased 3.5 percentage points from the first year Fall 2011 cohort (66\%). Also, first year non-referred student productive grade rates of the Fall 2015 ( $79.7 \%$ ) grew 7.1 percentage points from the Fall 2011 cohort ( $72.6 \%$ ). In the Fall 2011 cohort, productive grade rates of referred students remained relatively unchanged, while rates for students not-referred increased by less than one percentage point. 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 ( $70.8 \%$ ) increased 2.7 percentage points from the first year Fall 2011 cohort ( $68.1 \%$ ). Also, first year non-referred student productive grade rates of the Fall 2015 cohort ( $80.5 \%$ ) increased 3.6 percentage point from the first year Fall 2011 cohort ( $76.9 \%$ ). In the Fall 2011 cohort, productive grade rates of referred students remained relatively unchanged from the first year to the fifth year, while rates for non-referred students increased by less than one percentage point during the same period.


Notes:
(1) Productive grade rates represent grades of $C$ or higher based on all courses (cumulative) through the Fall semester of the first, second, third, fourth, and fifth year.
(2) Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC cohort methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using the THECB methodology.
(3) Fall 2012 FTIC student cohort is defined by a combination of THECB (demographic profile, persistence rates, and graduation rates) and True FTIC (productive grade rates, progression through developmental and gatekeeper courses) methodologies.
(4) Fall 2013, 2014, and 2015 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is firsttime in college and credential-seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBM001).
(5) Beginning in Fall 2014, Math 0300, 0301, 0302, and 0303 were replaced with Math 0305, 0310, 0320, and 0442.
(6) Sources: DE Referral ACCDODS1.XST_ATD_ACCD; Course Enrollment ACCDODS1.XST_IRES_SC

# PALO ALTO COLLEGE SEMESTER-TO-SEMESTER PERSISTENCE RATES 

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

This report compares the 1- to 5-year persistence rates of the Fall 2011 through Fall 2015 FTIC cohorts at Palo Alto College. Persistence rate is the measure of FTIC students, excluding graduates, who continue from their initial Fall semester (cohort year) to a subsequent time of measure. The FTIC cohort is the unduplicated first-time-in-college student as defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (excluding graduates). Data were reported by course section owner. These rates were examined by various student and academic characteristics.
$\diamond$ First-year persistence rates at Palo Alto College had alternately climbed and declined year-to-year.
$\diamond$ Overall, female students persisted at higher rates than did male students.
$\diamond$ When compared to other ethnic groups, Hispanic student persistence rates were the most consistent across all terms.
$\diamond$ First year students 18-21 years old had the least variance in persistence rates year-after-year.
$\diamond$ Overall, full-time students persisted at higher rates than did part-time students.
$\diamond$ Across the cohorts, Fall-to-Spring (1st year) persistence rates were higher among Pell grant recipients than among non-Pell grant recipients.
$\diamond$ Overall, first- through third-year persistence rates for students not referred to developmental education were higher than those for students referred to developmental education.

## Total Persistence Rates

First-year persistence rates at Palo Alto College remained consistent from Fall 2011 to Fall 2015. However, a slight increase in first-year persistence rates is observed in Fall 2013 and Fall 2015. At year two, slightly less than half of Fall FTIC students who started at Palo Alto College were still enrolled through Fall 2014 and just over half in Fall 2015 (45\%-52\%). Gaps in persistence rates were greater from year-to-year in the first three years.


## Persistence Rates by Gender

In each cohort and each year, female students consistently persisted at higher rates than did male students. The gaps in persistence rates between male and female students were greater in years one through three. By the fourth year, the difference in persistence rates between male and female students began to lessen. One year persistence rates peaked in Fall 2013 for males (71\%) and in Fall 2015 for females (75.4\%).


[^9]
## Persistence Rates by Ethnicity

African American students had the lowest rates of first-year persistence than other student groups in each cohort. This trend generally continued in each subsequent persistence year. The widest gap in persistence was between Asian and African American students in the first year - Asian student persistence was higher. By the following year, the trend flipped and Asian and African American students alternately climbed and fell year-to-year.


5th Year: Fall to Any Term 5th Year

| 100\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 80\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 40\% |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0\% | 17 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Fall 2011* | Fall 2012 | Fall 2013 | Fall 2014 | Fall 2015 |
| - African American | 0.0\% |  |  |  |  |
| - Asian | 0.0\% |  |  |  |  |
| - Hispanic | 11.8\% |  |  |  |  |
| - Other | 10.0\% |  |  |  |  |
| - White | 8.1\% |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

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

FTIC Demographics: 2011-2015: ACCDODS1.XST_CBM001_ACCD

## Persistence Rates By Age

Students 17 or less and 18-21 persisted at higher rates than most students in year one. Students in the Fall 2013 51+ age group had $100 \%$ first-year persistence rates. Gaps in persistence rates were greater the first, second and third year than the fourth and fifth year.

1st Year: Fall to Spring


3rd Year: Fall to Third Fall

| 100\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 80\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 40\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| $0 \%$ | Fall 2011** | Fall 2012 | Fall 2013 | Fall 2014 | Fall 2015 |
| - 17 or less | 27.4\% | 25.0\% | 32.6\% | 24.4\% |  |
| -18-21 | 27.4\% | 29.8\% | 34.0\% | 30.3\% |  |
| - $22-24$ | 15.8\% | 25.4\% | 19.6\% | 20.8\% |  |
| - 25-35 | 27.3\% | 25.3\% | 23.6\% | 23.9\% |  |
| - 36-50 | 27.1\% | 22.9\% | 36.7\% | 28.6\% |  |
| - 51+ | 25.0\% | 15.4\% | 40.0\% | 16.7\% |  |

2nd Year: Fall to Second 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 first-time in college and credential-seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBM001). Persistence rates exclude graduates.
(3) Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC cohort methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using the THECB methodology. Persistence rates excludes graduates.
(4) Age as reported at the Fall semester of the cohort year.
(4) Graduate Status: 2011-2015: ACCDODS1.XST_CBM009_ACCD FTIC Demographics: 2011-2015: ACCDODS1.XST_CBM001_ACCD

## Persistence Rates by Enrollment Status

Overall, full-time students persisted at higher rates than did part-time students. The greatest variation in persistence rates occurred within the first, second, and third years. After five years, the gap between full-and part-time student persistence rates closed and rates ended up relatively close.
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## Persistence Rates by Pell Status

Fall-to-Spring (1st year) persistence rates were higher among Pell grant recipients than among non-Pell grant recipients. Similarly, the second and third year persistence rates were generally higher for Pell grant recipients than for non-Pell grant recipients from Fall 2013 forward. However, by the fourth year the gap between Pell and non-Pell student persistence rates closed and rates ended up relatively close.
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## Persistence Rates by Veteran Status

Between veteran and non-veteran students, the widest gap in persistence rates (by almost 16 percentage points) was in Fall 2015. The greatest variation in persistence rates occurred within the first, second and third years. After five years, the gap between veteran and non-veteran student persistence rates closed and rates ended up relatively close.
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## Persistence Rates by Developmental Education Referral

Overall, first- through third-year persistence rates for students not referred to developmental education (DE) were higher than those for students referred to DE. First year persistence peaked in the Fall 2011 for students not-referred to DE (77\%) and in Fall 2015 (72\%) for those referred to DE.

## Persistence Rate by DE Referral
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## PALO ALTO COLLEGE GRADUATION RATES

## AtD Indicator \#5: Complete Credentials

This report compares the 1- to 5-year graduation rates of the Fall 2011 through Fall 2015 FTIC cohorts at Palo Alto College. To calculate graduation rates, cumulative associate and certificate graduates were divided by the total starting cohort. These rates were examined by various student and academic characteristics.
$\diamond$ The percentage of FTIC students graduating after two, three, four and five years steadily increased each year across all cohorts.
$\diamond$ Of the FTIC students who started at Palo Alto College in 2011, 17.1\% of male and 22.0\% of female students received a degree or certificate after five years.
$\diamond$ Female students generally demonstrated higher graduation rates than did male students across the cohorts and years.
$\diamond$ White students continued to have higher graduation rates than did Hispanic students over most cohorts and years.
$\diamond$ Students in Fall 2011 FTIC cohort and in the 51+ age group displayed higher graduation rates in years two through five than other age groups.
$\diamond$ Overall, the graduation rates of full-time students were higher than those of part-time students.
$\diamond$ FTIC Pell recipients exhibited similar graduation rates to non-Pell recipients across most cohorts and years.
$\diamond$ Overall, FTIC students who identified as veterans had higher graduation rates than did students who did not identify as veterans.
$\diamond$ Overall, FTIC students not referred to developmental education courses had higher graduation rates than did students requiring developmental education.

## Total Graduation Rates

The percentage of FTIC students graduating after one year decreased in each cohort from Fall 2011 to Fall 2014. The percentage of FTIC students graduating after two, three, four and five years steadily increased each year across all cohorts. Of the FTIC students who started at Palo Alto College in 2011, 20.0\% received a degree or certificate after five years.


## Graduation Rates by Gender

Female students generally demonstrated higher graduation rates than did male students across the cohorts and years. Of the FTIC students who started at Palo Alto College in 2011, $17.1 \%$ of male and $22.0 \%$ of female students received a degree or certificate after five years.


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

## Graduation Rates by Ethnicity

Asian students exhibited higher graduation rates than other student groups in all available years for the Fall 2011 cohort. White students continued to have higher graduation rates than did Hispanic students over most cohorts and years. Both Asian and African American students exhibited higher long-term graduation rates (in years three, four and five) than shortterm graduation rates (in years one and two).


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

## Graduation Rates by Age

Students in Fall 2011 FTIC cohort and in the 51+ age group displayed higher graduation rates in years two through five than other age groups. Students in the 17 or less and 18-21 age groups had higher long term (3-5 year) than short term (1 -2 year) graduation 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, 2014, and 2015 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is firsttime in college and credential-seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBM001).
(4) Graduation rate based on Associates or Certificates received at any Alamo College. Data are cumulative over time. Students who transfer or leave Alamo Colleges are not removed from denominators.
(5) Age as reported at the Fall semester of the cohort year.
(6) Source FTIC Demographics: ACIRES.CBM001, Graduates: ACCDIR.CBM009

## Graduation Rates by Enrollment Status

Overall, the graduation rates of full-time students were higher than those of part-time students. There was little variance between full- and part-time student first year graduation rates across most cohorts. However, this variance grew in years two through five. Of the FTIC students who started at Palo Alto College in 2011, 27.3\% of full-time and 16.4\% of part-time students received a degree or certificate after five years.

Graduation Rate by Enrollment Status


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

## Graduation Rates by Pell Status

FTIC Pell recipients exhibited similar graduation rates to non-Pell recipients across most cohorts and years. However, there was a gap between the two in years three and four, for the Fall 2012 and Fall 2013 cohorts. By year five of the 2011 cohort the gap between graduation rates of Pell and non-Pell students had completely diminished.


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

## Graduation Rates by Veteran Status

Overall, FTIC students who identified as veterans had higher graduation rates than did students who did not identify as veterans. Of the FTIC students who started at Palo Alto College in 2011, 25.4\% of students who identified as veterans and $19.7 \%$ of students who did not identify as veterans received a degree or certificate after five years.

Graduation Rate by Veteran 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) 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 had higher graduation rates than did students requiring developmental education (DE). DE referred students' third- and fourth-year graduation rates have increased with each subsequent cohort.

Graduation Rate by DE Referral


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


[^0]:    Notes:
    (1) 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) Source FTIC Demographics: ACIRES.CBM001

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

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

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

[^4]:    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.
    (5) Source FTIC Demographics: ACIRES.CBM001, Course Enrollment: ACCDIR.EXTENDEDENROLLMENT, DE Referrals: Students.V_StuTaspAlIDIS

[^5]:    $A A=$ African-American $\quad A=$ Asian $\quad H=$ Hispanic $\quad \mathrm{O}=$ Other $\quad \mathrm{W}=$ White

[^6]:    Yes $=$ Veteran

[^7]:    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

[^8]:    *See notes, next page

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

    FTIC Demographics: 2011-2015: ACCDODS1.XST_CBM001_ACCD

[^10]:    Notes:
    (1) Persistence rate is the measure of FTIC students, excluding graduates, who continue from their initial Fall semester (cohort year) to a subsequent time of measurement.
    (2) Fall 2012 and 2013 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is first-time in college and credential-seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBM001). Persistence rates exclude graduates.
    (3) Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC cohort methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using the THECB methodology. Persistence rates excludes graduates.
    (4) Full-Time/Part-Time status as reported at the Fall semester of the cohort year.
    (5) Graduate Status: 2011-2015: ACCDODS1.XST_CBM009_ACCD FTIC Demographics: 2011-2015: ACCDODS1.XST_CBM001_ACCD
    (6) Preliminary numbers were used Fall 2014, third year and Fall 2015, second year.

[^11]:    Notes:
    (1) Persistence rate is the measure of FTIC students, excluding graduates, who continue from their initial Fall semester (cohort year) to a subsequent time of measurement.
    (2) Fall 2012 and 2013 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is first-time in college and credential-seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBM001). Persistence rates exclude graduates.
    (3) Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC cohort methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using the THECB methodology. Persistence rates excludes graduates.
    (4) Pell status as reported at the Fall semester of the cohort year.
    (4) Graduate Status: 2011-2015: ACCDODS1.XST_CBM009_ACCD FTIC Demographics: 2011-2015: ACCDODS1.XST_CBM001_ACCD

[^12]:    Notes:
    (1) Persistence rate is the measure of FTIC students, excluding graduates, who continue from their initial Fall semester (cohort year) to a subsequent time of measurement.
    (2) Fall 2012 and 2013 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is first-time in college and credential-seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBM001). Persistence rates exclude graduates.
    (3) Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC cohort methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using the THECB methodology. Persistence rates excludes graduates.
    (4) Graduate Status: 2011-2015: ACCDODS1.XST_CBM009_ACCD FTIC Demographics: 2011-2015: ACCDODS1.XST_CBM001_ACCD
    (5) Veteran status as reported at the Fall semester of the cohort year.

[^13]:    Notes:
    (1) Persistence rate is the measure of FTIC students, excluding graduates, who continue from their initial Fall semester (cohort year) to a subsequent time of measurement.
    (2) Fall 2012 and 2013 FTIC student cohorts are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as any student who is first-time in college and credential-seeking (declared intent to earn an associate degree, earn a certificate, earn credits for transfer, or did not respond to declared intent as reported in the CBMO01). Persistence rates exclude graduates.
    (3) Fall 2011* Preliminary True FTIC cohort methodology used to create cohort of students without academic history as opposed to using the THECB methodology. Persistence rates excludes graduates.
    (4) Graduate Status: 2011-2015: ACCDODS1.XST_CBM009_ACCD

    FTIC Demographics: 2011-2015: ACCDODS1.XST_CBM001_ACCD

