Basic Skill Student Course Enrollment Patterns

Fall 2009 Cohort

March 2015

This report was prepared for the Developmental Education and Readiness Taskforce (DARE) at De Anza Community College at the request of the Director of Institutional Research and Planning.

For questions about the report, please contact:

Alyssa Nguyen, M.A.
anguyen@rpgroup.org

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the present report is to provide the Developmental and Readiness Taskforce (DARE) at De Anza College information about students enrolled in the lowest level basic skills courses offered in English Writing, Language Arts, math, and English as a Second Language. Of specific interest, were information about Black, Latino/a, and Filipino students and their rates of success in and through each of the content area pathways, identification of potential achievement gaps between the groups, and any corollaries of success that may be gauged from their enrollments in particular programs or courses.

Trends were analyzed for each of the content areas of interest and are organized by the content areas in this report. The following are the types of information provided for each of the content areas:
- Enrollments
  - Course type (i.e., Internet)
  - Special programs (i.e., Learning Communities)
- Success and retention rates by courses
- Transition to higher-level courses
- Average length of time to higher-level courses.

METHOD

Course-taking patterns were examined for student cohorts enrolled in the following basic skills courses below in the fall of 2009:

- MATH 210: College Math Preparation Level 1: Pre-Algebra
- EWRT 200: Fundamentals of Writing
- READ 200: Reading Fundamentals
- LART 200: Developing Reading and Writing Connections
- ESL 234: Low Intermediate English as a Second Language

Student enrollment files were obtained from the institutional research office at De Anza College and course attribute information were downloaded from the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office Data Mart, a public-facing data warehouse and merged with the local data files.

Enrollments were tracked from fall 2009 to summer 2015 and results are specifically focused on the following target populations: African American/Black, Latino/a, and Filipino.

GENERAL SUMMARY

The data reveal that on average, students from the target population have lower progression rates than the overall student population. An examination of the course-taking behaviors of students who progress through the math and English sequences and into college-level math and English courses reveal a few key differences from those who do not. Below are a few key findings from the trends examined:

- Students who progress to college-level math/English courses are more likely to be enrolled in general education courses
- Although the success rates for the target populations are low in remedial courses, the success rates of these students do increase in the higher level courses in the sequence
- Compared to non-target student populations, students from the target population have lower progression rates to subsequent courses and lower course success rates
- In review of the two English pathways, the outcomes for students enrolled in LART 200 are more favorable for students from the target populations, all students from the target population who progressed to college-level from LART 200 successfully completed their initial attempt at EWRT 1A
- Students from the target population groups have higher course success rates in First-Year Experience sections of READ 200 than target population students enrolled in the traditional courses and students from the non-target populations
- For special program enrollments, Black students appear to benefit from Learning Community sections

Data should be interpreted with a caution as sample sizes were extremely low in some cases (i.e., course success rates for Black students). Despite the low sample sizes, the data do suggest that when students from the target populations do make it to college-level courses, their success rates are comparable to the overall student population.

DETAILED RESULTS

Fall 2009 Math 210 Cohort Trends

Tables 1-7 provides trend information for students who were enrolled in Math 210 in the fall of 2009.

During the fall of 2009 there were 507 students enrolled in Math 210 (see Table1). A majority of the students were female (57.4%) and under the age of 24 (74.6%). The majority of the students were also part of the target ethnic student populations of interest (51.3% identified as Black, Latino/a, or Filipino).

Table 1. *General Demographics of Students Enrolled in Math 210 in Fall of 2009*

	Total Enrolled	Percentage of Total
Ethnic Group		
African American/Black	45	8.9%
Asian	71	14.0%
Decline to State/Unknown	31	6.1%
Filipino	42	8.3%
Latino/a	173	34.1%
Native American	7	1.4%
Pacific Islander	10	2.0%
White	128	25.2%
Age Range		
19 and younger	192	37.9%
20-24	186	36.7%
25-29	61	12.0%
30-34	22	4.3%
35-39	14	2.8%
40-49	29	5.7%
50 and older	3	0.6%
Gender		
Female	291	57.4%
Male	216	42.6%
Other	-	-
Overall Total	507	

Table 2 provides a comparison of the enrollments and course success rates by Math 210 section types by student populations. Of the 507 students enrolled in Math 210, 25 students were enrolled in a "Learning in Communities" (LinC) section of Math 210 with 74 percent of those enrollments by the target populations. A comparison of the success rates by students in the LinC section to those in the non-LinC sections revealed lower success rates in the LinC section by students in the target population than in the non-LinC sections overall, but high success rates for Black students in the LinC section than in non-LinC sections for Math 210.

Table 2. *Math 210 Enrollment and Course Success Rate Comparisons by Section Type and Student Population: Fall 2009*

	Section Type		
	LinC	Traditional	Difference
Enrollments			
Percentage of Black	20.0%	8.3%	11.7%
Percentage Filipino	8.0%	8.3%	-0.3%
Percentage Latino/a	48.0%	33.4%	14.6%
Percentage Target Populations	76.0%	50.0%	26.0%
Percentage Non-Target Populations	24.0%	50.0%	-26.0%
% Point Difference Target vs. Non-Target	52.0%	0.0%	52.0%
Total For All Students	25	482	-
Success Rates			
Black	60.0%	52.5%	7.5%
Filipino	50.0%	67.5%	-17.5%
Latino/a	50.0%	55.3%	-5.3%
Overall For Target Populations	52.6%	56.8%	-4.2%
Overall for Non-Target Populations	83.3%	69.7%	13.6%
% Point Difference Target vs. Non-Target	-30.7%	-12.9%	-17.8%
Overall For All Students	60.0%	63.6%	-3.6%

Table 3 provides subsequent Math course enrollment rates for students who enrolled in Math 210 in the fall of 2009. The table reveals that 29.6% of all students who began in Math 210 subsequently enrolled in a college-level Math course by the summer of 2015. The progression rate for students from the target populations were slightly lower compared to the overall progression rate and the progression rate for the non-Target students; only 26.2% of the target student populations were enrolled in a college-level Math course by summer of 2015. Of the target student population groups, Black students had slightly lower progression rates; 24.4% of the Black students who enrolled in Math 210 progressed to college-level Math by summer of 2015.

Table 3. *Progression to College-Level Math: Percentage of Fall 2009 Math 210 Target Student Populations Progressing to Each Math Level by Summer 2015*

	Entering Cohort Math 210: Pre-Algebra	Math 212: Algebra	Math 114: Intermediate Algebra	College-Level Math
Black	45	57.8% (26)	40.0% (18)	24.4% (11)
Filipino	42	64.3% (27)	38.1% (16)	26.2% (11)
Latino/a	173	59.0% (102)	38.7% (67)	26.6% (46)
All Target Population	260	59.6% (155)	38.8% (101)	26.2% (68)
All Non-Target Population	247	73.7% (182)	52.6% (130)	33.2% (82)
% Point Difference for Target vs. Non-Target	-	-14.1%	-13.8%	-7.0%
All Students	507	66.5% (337)	45.6% (231)	29.6% (150)

Notes. Unduplicated student headcounts in parentheses.

Table 4 provides the course success rates for students' initial enrollment in the subsequent Math courses by summer of 2015. Of the students who progressed to college-level Math, 69.3% successfully completed the initial college-level Math course they enrolled in. The overall trend reveals that students on average, succeed at higher rates in each subsequent Math course. However, the this trend is not present in the Black student population. Course success rates in college-level Math courses for Black student populations were the lowest; 45.5% of Black students who progressed to college-level successfully completed their initial college-level course compared to 65.2% for Hispanic students and 81.8% for Filipino students.

Table 4. *Fall 2009 Math 210 Students' Initial Course Success Rates in Subsequent Math Courses by Target Populations*

	Math 212: Algebra	Math 114: Intermediate Algebra	College-Level Math
Black	50.0% (26)	66.7% (18)	45.5% (11)
Filipino	48.1% (27)	50.0% (16)	81.8% (11)
Latino/a	44.1% (102)	52.2% (67)	65.2% (46)
All Target Population	45.8% (155)	54.5% (101)	64.7% (68)
All Non-Target Population	46.2% (182)	63.8% (130)	73.2% (82)
% Point Difference for Target vs. Non-Target	-0.4%	-9.3%	-8.5%
All Students	46.0% (337)	59.7% (231)	69.3% (150)

Table 5 provides the average number of quarters it took students who began in Math 210 in the fall of 2009 to progress to the next course in the Math sequence. Data are based on students' initial enrollment in each subsequent course and reveal that on average, students enrolled in about three quarters before enrolling in their first Math 212 course, about five quarters before enrolling in their first Math 114 course, and about 10 quarters before enrolling in their first college-level Math course. There do not appear to differences between student populations in terms of when students are enrolling in their subsequent math courses. Review of course success rates in the initial subsequent Math course reveal increasing gaps in course success rates for students in the target population compared to students in the non-target population in each subsequent Math course.

Table 5. *Fall 2009 Math 210 Students: Average Number of Quarters to Subsequent Math Course*

	Math 212: Algebra	Math 114: Intermediate Algebra	College-Level Math
Black	2.5	4.5	10.1
Filipino	2.7	5.8	9.5
Latino/a	2.7	5.2	10.0
All Target Population	2.7	5.2	10.0
All Non-Target Population	2.3	5.6	9.9
Difference Target vs. Non-Target	0.4	-0.4	0.1
All Students	2.5	5.4	10.0

Table 6 provides enrollment comparisons by the two-digit Taxonomy of Programs (TOP) code used to identify programs of study for each course. Review of Table 6 reveals that students who progressed to college-level Math course(s) within five years were more likely to enroll in general education courses in discipline areas such as Humanities, Mathematics, and Social Sciences than students who did not progress to college-level within five years. These students were also less likely to be enrolled in vocational courses in discipline areas such as Health, Engineering and Industrial Technologies, and Public Protective Services.

Table 6. *Proportion of Course Enrollments for Fall 2009 MATH 210 Cohort: Comparison of Course Enrollment Types by Two Digit Taxonomy of Program Family*

	Enrolled in College-Level Math by Summer 2015?		
Courses Categorized By Two-Digit TOP Code	No	Yes	Difference
01 Agriculture and Natural Resources	0.0%	0.6%	0.6%
03 Environmental Sciences and Technology	1.2%	2.7%	1.5%
04 Biological Sciences	1.7%	2.1%	0.4%
05 Business and Management	4.8%	4.8%	0.0%
06 Media and Communications	2.3%	1.8%	-0.4%
07 Information Technology	1.4%	1.1%	-0.3%
08 Education	10.5%	9.8%	-0.8%
09 Engineering and Industrial Technologies	1.6%	0.3%	-1.3%
10 Fine Arts and Applied Arts	5.1%	5.1%	0.0%
11 Foreign Language	2.2%	1.8%	-0.3%
12 Health	3.9%	1.0%	-2.9%
13 Family and Consumer Sciences	2.9%	3.5%	0.6%
14 Law	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%
15 Humanities	18.1%	19.3%	1.2%
16 Library Science	0.1%	0.0%	-0.1%
17 Mathematics	14.5%	16.3%	1.9%
19 Physical Sciences	2.9%	3.5%	0.6%
20 Psychology	6.0%	4.9%	-1.1%
21 Public and Protective Services	1.7%	0.8%	-0.9%
22 Social Sciences	14.9%	16.2%	1.2%
49 Interdisciplinary Studies	4.3%	4.5%	0.2%
Total Enrollments	4469	4435	8904

Note. TOP code information retrieved from CCCCO Data Mart – Course Information merged with local data files. 417 enrollments (4.7%) did not have a match.

Table 7 compares enrollments in special program sections by students who enrolled in college-level Math by summer 2015 and students who did not to determine if there were differences in progression rates depending on whether students enrolled in special program sections. Table 7 reveals that students who progressed to college-level Math by summer 2015 were less likely to enroll in Distance Education (DE) courses than students who did not progress to college-level Math. This trend was evident for the overall student population, as well as the target student population. Another trend worth noting is that

although the overall student population who progressed had higher enrollments in civic engagement courses than students who did not progress to college-level Math, the target population groups who progressed to college-level Math (with the exception of Filipino students) showed slightly fewer enrollments in civic engagement courses. Of all special program types, a slightly larger percentage (3.1% higher) of the target student groups who progressed to college-level Math were enrolled in Learning Community sections, with all groups except Latino/a's showing higher enrollment rates than students who did not progress to college-level Math.

Table 7. *Comparison of Special Program Enrollments: Fall 2009 Math 210 Students Who Enrolled in College-Level Math by Summer 2015 vs. Those Who Did Not*

	Civic Engagement	Distance Education	First Year Experience	Honors	Learning in Communities
Did not Enroll in College-Level by Summer 2015					
Black	21.7%	14.0%	50.0%	0.0%	7.4%
Filipino	0.0%	11.2%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%
Latino/a	37.0%	33.3%	50.0%	68.8%	50.0%
Target	58.7%	58.5%	100.0%	68.8%	58.8%
Non-Target	41.3%	41.5%	0.0%	31.3%	41.2%
Target Total	27	209	4	11	40
Non-Target Total	19	148	0	5	28
Total Enrollments	46	357	4	16	68
Enrolled in College-Level by Summer 2015					
Black	6.7%	15.3%	50.0%	0.0%	25.4%
Filipino	10.0%	6.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%
Latino/a	23.3%	23.0%	0.0%	16.7%	22.2%
Target	40.0%	44.3%	50.0%	16.7%	61.9%
Non-Target	60.0%	55.7%	50.0%	83.3%	38.1%
Target Total	24	133	1	2	39
Non-Target Total	36	167	1	10	24
Total Enrollments	60	300	2	12	63
Difference					
Black	-15.1%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	18.0%
Filipino	10.0%	-5.2%	0.0%	0.0%	12.8%
Latino/a	-13.6%	-10.3%	-50.0%	-52.1%	-27.8%
Target	-18.7%	-14.2%	-50.0%	-52.1%	3.1%
Non-Target	18.7%	14.2%	50.0%	52.1%	-3.1%

Note. Counts represent enrollments/duplicated headcount

Fall 2009 EWRT 200 Cohort Trends

EWRT 200 is a writing course that is a stand-alone course. Tables 8 to 14 provides trend information for students who were enrolled in EWRT 200 in the fall of 2009.

There were 166 students enrolled in EWRT 200 in the fall of 2009 (see Table 8). Of the 166 students, the majority of the students were under the age of 19 (54.8%), male (59.6%), and Asian or Latino/a ethnic background.

Table 8. *Demographics for Students Enrolled in EWRT 200 in Fall of 2009*

Demographics	Total Enrolled	Percentage of Total
Ethnic Group		
African American/Black	10	6.0%
Asian	65	39.2%
Decline to State/Unknown	*	*
Filipino	11	6.6%
Latino/a	60	36.1%
Native American	N/A	N/A
Pacific Islander	*	*
White	12	7.2%
Age Range		
19 and younger	91	54.8%
20-24	55	33.1%
25-29	10	6.0%
30-34	2	1.2%
35-39	3	1.8%
40-49	3	1.8%
50 and older	2	1.2%
Gender		
Female	66	39.8%
Male	99	59.6%
Other	*	*
Overall Total	166	

Table 9 provides the enrollment and course success rate comparisons in EWRT 200 for sections offered in fall of 2009. During the fall of 2009 there were two sections of the First-Year Experience (FYE) in EWRT 200 and there were 49 students enrolled. Compared to the traditional sections of EWRT 200, there was a 5.4% higher point percentage difference in enrollments from students from the target population and on average, FYE students from the target population succeeded at a higher rate than non-FYE students enrolled in EWRT 200; their success rate was 16.0% higher than it was for students from the target population who enrolled in the traditional sections of EWRT 200.

Table 9. *EWRT 200 Comparisons by Section Type and Student Population: Fall 2009*

	Section Type		
	First-Year Experience	Traditional	Difference
Enrollments			
Percentage of Black	10.2%	4.3%	5.9%
Percentage Filipino	2.0%	8.5%	6.5%
Percentage Latino/a	23.5%	12.7%	10.8%
Percentage All Target Population	91.8%	30.8%	60.0%
Percentage All Non-Target Population	8.2%	69.2%	-61.0%
% Point Difference for Target vs. Non-Target	83.6%	-38.4%	121.0%
Total For All Students	49	117	-
Success Rates			
Black	100.0%	60.0%	40.0%
Filipino	100.0%	90.0%	10.0%
Latino/a	92.3%	85.7%	6.6%
Overall For All Target Population	99.3%	83.3%	16.0%
Overall for All Non-Target Population	75.0%	88.9%	-13.9%
% Point Difference for Target vs. Non-Target	24.3%	5.6%	29.9%
Overall For All Students	91.8%	87.2%	-4.7%

Table 10 provides the percentage of fall 2009 EWRT 200 students who enrolled in the subsequent English course. The table reveals that 70.5% of all EWRT 200 students who enrolled in the fall of 2009 subsequently enrolled in EWRT 001A by summer 2015. Of all the target student populations, Filipino students had the lowest progression rates to college-level English (54.5%) and Latino/a students had the highest progression rates (63.3%).

Table 10. *Percentage of Fall 2009 EWRT 200 Target Student Populations Progressing to Each English Level by Summer 2015*

	Entering Cohort EWRT 200	EWRT 211	EWRT 001A
Black	10	60.0% (6)	60.0% (6)
Filipino	11	63.6% (7)	54.5% (6)
Latino/a	60	53.3% (32)	63.3% (38)
All Target Population	81	55.6% (45)	61.7% (50)
All Non-Target Population	85	77.6% (66)	78.8% (67)
% Point Difference for Target vs. Non-Target	-	-22.0%	-17.1%
All Students	166	66.9% (111)	70.5% (117)*

Note. Unduplicated student headcounts in parentheses. *EWRT 001A counts are higher than EWRT 211 because 25 EWRT 200 students did not enroll in EWRT 211/LART 211 prior to enrolling in EWRT 001A.

Table 10 provides the course success rates for fall 2009 EWRT 200 students' initial enrollment in the subsequent English courses by summer of 2015. Of the 166 students, 117 (83.8%) successfully passed their first college-level English course by summer of 2015. Overall, students' course success rates in each subsequent course increased; with the greatest gains seen for Black students. The course success rates for Black students in their initial EWRT 211 was only 33.3% but for the Black students who progressed to EWRT 001A, their overall success rate was 83.3% in their first college-level EWRT 001A course. Despite, the high success rates, the rates for the target student populations were still lower than the non-target student populations for each subsequent Engish course.

Table 11. *Fall 2009 EWRT 200 Students' Initial Course Success Rates in Subsequent English Courses by Target Populations*

	EWRT 211	EWRT 001A
Black	33.3% (6)	83.3% (6)
Filipino	71.4% (7)	66.7% (6)
Latino/a	62.5% (32)	76.3% (38)
All Target Population	60.0% (45)	76.0% (50)
All Non-Target Population	75.8% (66)	89.6% (67)
% Point Difference for Target vs. Non-Target	-15.8%	-13.6%
All Students	69.4% (111)	83.8% (117)

Table 12 provides the cumulative average number of quarters fall 2009 EWRT 200 took to enroll in the subsequent English course by summer 2015. On average, the fall 2009 EWRT 200 students took two quarters to enroll in their first EWRT 211 course and took three quarters to enroll in their first EWRT 001A course. Black and Filipino students took the longest time to enroll in the subsequent English courses in the sequence compared to their Latino/a counterparts.

Table 12. *Fall 2009 EWRT 200 Students: Average Number of Quarters to Subsequent English Course*

	EWRT 211	EWRT 001A
Black	2.7	4.3
Filipino	1.3	4.8
Latino/a	2.0	2.6
All Target Population	2.0	3.1
All Non-Target Population	1.3	3.9
Difference for Target vs. Non-Target	0.7	-0.8
All Students	1.6	3.5

Table 13 reveals differences in enrollments in certain programs between EWRT 200 students who progressed to college-level English and those that did not. Students who progressed to EWRT 001A by Summer 2015 were enrolled in more courses in Public and Protective Services and Business and Management and were less likely to enroll in courses in Education, Family and Consumer Sciences, and Social Sciences.

Table 13. *Comparison of Course Enrollment Types by Two Digit Taxonomy of Program Family: Enrollment Proportions of Fall 2009 EWRT 200 Cohort*

	Enrolled in College-Level English by Summer 2015?		
Courses Categorized By Two-Digit TOP Code	No	Yes	Difference
01 Agriculture and Natural Resources	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%
03 Environmental Sciences and Technology	0.2%	1.3%	1.1%
04 Biological Sciences	0.4%	2.5%	2.1%
05 Business and Management	2.1%	5.5%	3.3%
06 Media and Communications	1.0%	1.5%	0.5%
07 Information Technology	1.2%	1.4%	0.2%
08 Education	8.9%	8.5%	-0.5%
09 Engineering and Industrial Technologies	0.4%	0.4%	0.0%
10 Fine Arts and Applied Arts	7.4%	6.2%	-1.2%
11 Foreign Language	2.9%	2.5%	-0.5%
12 Health	0.4%	0.8%	0.4%
13 Family and Consumer Sciences	4.7%	1.4%	-3.2%
14 Law	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
15 Humanities	26.3%	27.5%	1.3%
16 Library Science	10.7%	12.3%	1.6%
17 Mathematics	2.1%	4.9%	2.8%
19 Physical Sciences	5.4%	4.0%	-1.4%
20 Psychology	1.6%	1.0%	-0.6%
21 Public and Protective Services	8.8%	17.6%	8.8%
22 Social Sciences	4.1%	2.4%	-1.7%
49 Interdisciplinary Studies	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%
Total Enrollments	455	3,399	3,854

Note. TOP code information retrieved from CCCCO Data Mart – Course Information merged with local data files. 54 enrollments (1.4%) had unknown TOP codes. did not have a match.

Given that a high percentage of fall 2009 EWRT 200 students progressed to EWRT 1A by summer 2015, the enrollment trend comparisons by special program types were not very meaningful for this population (see Table 14). There is not enough data to be able to make a meaningful comparison.

Table 14. *Proportion of Course Enrollments in Special Programs for the Fall 2009 EWRT 200 Cohort: Comparison of Special Program Enrollments*

	Civic Engagement	Distance Education	First Year Experience	Honors	Learning in Communities
Did not Enroll in College-Level by Summer 2015					
Black	0.0%	0.0%	17.8%	-	0.0%
Filipino	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	-	0.0%
Latino/a	33.3%	0.0%	77.8%	-	50.0%
Target	33.3%	0.0%	95.6%	-	50.0%
Non-Target	66.7%	100.0%	4.4%	-	50.0%
Target Total	1	0	43	-	1
Non-Target Total	2	7	2	-	1
Total Enrollments	3	7	45	-	2
Enrolled in College-Level by Summer 2015					
Black	11.8%	5.3%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%
Filipino	14.7%	4.7%	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Latino/a	38.2%	34.7%	77.7%	11.8%	50.0%
Target	64.7%	44.7%	82.0%	11.8%	50.0%
Non-Target	35.3%	55.6%	8.5%	88.2%	50.0%
Target Total	22	67	173	2	5
Non-Target Total	12	84	18	15	5
Total Enrollments	34	151	211	17	10
Difference					
Black	11.8%	5.3%	-7.4%	-	0.0%
Filipino	14.7%	4.7%	3.3%	-	0.0%
Latino/a	4.9%	34.7%	-0.1%	-	0.0%
Target	31.4%	44.7%	-13.6%	-	0.0%
Non-Target	-31.4%	-44.4%	4.1%	-	0.0%

Fall 2009 READ 200 Cohort Trends

READ 200 is a stand-alone reading course. Tables 15 to 21 provides trend information for students who were enrolled in EWRT 200 in the fall of 2009.

During fall 2009 there were 106 students enrolled in READ 200. The majority of the students were from the targeted student populations (59.4%) and were under the age of 19 (See Table 15). There were slightly more male students enrolled in READ 200 than female students (55.7% vs. 44.3% respectively).

Table 15. *Demographics for Students Enrolled in READ 200 in Fall of 2009*

Demographics	Total Enrolled	Percentage of Total
Ethnic Group		
African American/Black	8	7.5%
Asian	34	32.1%
Decline to State/Unknown	4	3.8%
Filipino	10	9.4%
Latino/a	45	42.5%
Native American	-	-
Pacific Islander	-	-
White	5	4.7%
Age Range		
19 and younger	65	61.3%
20-24	30	28.3%
25-29	4	3.8%
30-34	3	2.8%
35-39	3	2.8%
40-49	1	0.9%
50 and older	65	61.3%
Gender		
Female	47	44.3%
Male	59	55.7%
Other	-	-
Overall Total	106	

Table 15 provides a breakdown of the enrollments by ethnic group and the success rates for the target and non-target student populations based on the READ 200 section type. A comparison of READ 200 section types by student population reveal that a larger proportion of the target student populations enroll in First-Year Experience sections and attain higher success rates in this course than students from the non-target population.

Table 16. *READ 200 Comparisons by Section Type and Student Population: Fall 2009*

	Section Type		Difference
	First-Year Experience	Traditional	Difference
Enrollments			
Percentage of Black	10.4%	5.2%	5.2%
Percentage Filipino	2.1%	15.5%	-13.4%
Percentage Latino/a	79.2%	12.1%	67.1%
Percentage All Target Population	91.7%	32.8%	58.9%
Percentage All Non-Target Population	8.3%	67.2%	-58.9%
% Point Difference for Target vs. Non-Target	83.4%	34.4%	49.0%
Total For All Students	48	58	
Success Rates			
Black	100.0%	66.7%	33.3%
Filipino	100.0%	77.8%	22.2%
Latino/a	94.7%	85.7%	9.0%
Overall For All Target Population	95.5%	78.9%	16.5%
Overall for All Non-Target Population	75.0%	87.2%	-12.2%
% Point Difference for Target vs. Non-Target	20.5%	-8.2%	-
Overall For All Students	93.8%	84.5%	9.3%

Table 17 provides the subsequent course enrollment rates for students by ethnic group. A greater percentage of students from the non-target population progressed to EWRT 001A by summer 2015 compared to the students from the target population (83.7% vs. 65.1% respectively).Of the students from the target population, African American students have the lowest progression to EWRT 001A rates.

Table 17. *Percentage of Fall 2009 READ 200 Target Student Populations Progressing to Each English Level by Summer 2015*

	Entering Cohort READ 200	READ 211	EWRT 001A
Black	8	50.0% (4)	50.0% (4)
Filipino	10	80.0% (8)	70.0% (7)
Latino/a	45	48.9% (22)	66.7% (30)
All Target Population	63	54.0% (34)	65.1% (41)
All Non-Target Population	43	81.4% (35)	83.7% (36)
% Point Difference for Target vs. Non-Target	-	-27.4%	-18.6%
All Students	106	65.1% (69)	72.6% (77)*

Note. Unduplicated student headcounts in parentheses. * EWRT 001A is higher than the READ 211 counts because 22 students directly bypassed READ 211/LART 211 classes and enrolled directly into EWRT 001A from READ 200.

Even though the EWRT 001A progression rates for African American students are the lowest of the three target student populations, their course success rate in their initial college-level English class is the highest (See Table 18). All African American students who subsequently enroll in EWRT 001A by summer 2015 successfully pass the course in their initial attempt.

Table 18. *Fall 2009 READ 200 Students' Initial Course Success Rates in Subsequent English Courses by Target Populations*

	READ 211	EWRT 001A
Black	50.0%% (4)	100.0% (4)
Filipino	75.0%% (8)	57.1% (4)
Latino/a	72.7%% (22)	80.0% (30)
All Target Population	70.6%% (34)	78.0% (41)
All Non-Target Population	97.1%% (35)	86.1% (36)
% Point Difference for Target vs. Non-Target	-26.5%	-8.1%
All Students	84.1% (69)	81.8% (77)

On average, READ 200 students take about two quarters to enroll in READ 211 and about four quarters to enroll in EWRT 001A (See Table 19). Students from the target population are progressing to EWRT 001A on average, three quarters faster than students from the non-target student population.

Table 19. *Fall 2009 READ 200 Students: Average Number of Quarters to Subsequent English Course*

	READ 211	EWRT 001A
Black	1.3	1.8
Filipino	1.6	5.0
Latino/a	1.8	1.8
All Target Population	1.7	2.3
All Non-Target Population	1.5	5.3
Difference for Target vs. Non-Target	0.2	-3.0
All Students	1.6	3.7

A comparison of the type of programs students who progress to college-level English versus students who do not progress to college-level English by summer 2015 reveal higher enrollments in Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary courses and lower enrollments in Education and Health (See Table 20).

Table 20. *Comparison of Course Enrollment Types by Two Digit Taxonomy of Program Family: Enrollment Proportions of Fall 2009 READ 200 Cohort*

Courses Categorized By Two-Digit TOP Code	Enrolled in College-Level English by Summer 2015?		
	No	Yes	Difference
01 Agriculture and Natural Resources	0.3%	0.1%	-0.2%
03 Environmental Sciences and Technology	1.1%	1.3%	0.3%
04 Biological Sciences	2.2%	2.3%	0.1%
05 Business and Management	2.4%	3.7%	1.3%
06 Media and Communications	6.2%	4.6%	-1.6%
07 Information Technology	1.1%	2.0%	0.9%
08 Education	13.0%	9.2%	-3.8%
09 Engineering and Industrial Technologies	2.4%	1.6%	-0.9%
10 Fine Arts and Applied Arts	4.9%	6.3%	1.4%
11 Foreign Language	3.0%	4.8%	1.8%
12 Health	6.8%	4.6%	-2.1%
13 Family and Consumer Sciences	1.9%	1.8%	-0.1%
14 Law	0.8%	0.3%	-0.5%
15 Humanities	16.5%	14.7%	-1.8%
16 Library Science	-	-	-
17 Mathematics	10.3%	10.9%	0.7%
19 Physical Sciences	3.2%	4.9%	1.7%
20 Psychology	5.4%	3.6%	-1.8%
21 Public and Protective Services	4.6%	3.3%	-1.3%
22 Social Sciences	8.6%	12.5%	3.8%
49 Interdisciplinary Studies	5.4%	7.5%	2.1%
Total Enrollments	370	2,305	2,315

Note. TOP code information retrieved from CCCCO Data Mart – Course Information merged with local data files. 55 enrollments (2.3%) had unknown TOP codes. did not have a match.

Table 21 compares enrollments in special program sections by students who enrolled in college-level English by summer 2015 and students who did not to determine if there were differences in progression rates depending on whether students enrolled in special program sections. A review of the data reveal that READ 200 who progress to EWRT 001A by summer 2015 have enrolled in Honors courses. A comparison of the enrollment types for target student populations reveal that students from the target population who progress to college-level have slightly more enrollments in Distance Education courses and slightly less enrollments in First Year Experience courses.

Table 21. *Proportion of Course Enrollments in Special Programs for the Fall 2009*
READ 200 Cohort: Comparison of Special Program Enrollments

	Civic Engagement	Distance Education	First Year Experience	Honors	Learning in Communities
Did not Enroll in College-Level by Summer 2015					
Black	66.7%	26.3%	17.8%	-	0.0%
Filipino	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	-	0.0%
Latino/a	16.7%	10.5%	77.8%	-	0.0%
Target	83.3%	36.8%	95.6%	-	100.0%
Non-Target	16.7%	63.2%	4.4%	-	0.0%
Target Total	5	7	43	-	1
Non-Target Total	1	12	2	-	0
Total Enrollments	6	19	45	-	1
Enrolled in College-Level by Summer 2015					
Black	12.5%	4.3%	10.5%	0.0%	0.0%
Filipino	6.3%	5.2%	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Latino/a	43.8%	33.9%	78.1%	22.2%	50.0%
Target	62.5%	43.5%	91.9%	22.2%	50.0%
Non-Target	37.5%	56.5%	8.1%	77.8%	50.0%
Target Total	20	50	193	2	2
Non-Target Total	12	65	17	7	2
Total Enrollments	32	115	210	9	4
Difference					
Black	-54.2%	-22.0%	-7.3%	-	0.0%
Filipino	6.3%	5.2%	3.3%	-	0.0%
Latino/a	27.1%	23.4%	0.3%	-	-50.0%
Target	-20.8%	6.6%	-3.7%	-	-50.0%
Non-Target	20.8%	-6.6%	3.7%	-	50.0%

Fall 2009 LART 200 Cohort Trends

LART 200 is a combined reading and writing course in the English sequence. Tables 22 to 28 provides trend information for students enrolled in LART 200 in the fall of 2009.

In the fall of 2009, 75 students were enrolled in LART 200 (see Table 22). The majority of the students were of Asian ethnic backgrounds, 24 years of age or younger, and female.

Table 22. *General Demographics for Students Enrolled in LART 200 in Fall of 2009*

Demographics	Total Enrolled	Percentage of Total
Ethnic Group		
African American/Black	10	13.3%
Asian	41	54.7%
Decline to State/Unknown	*	-
Filipino	*	-
Latino/a	12	16.0%
Native American	*	-
Pacific Islander	-	-
White	*	-
Age Range		
19 and younger	33	44.0%
20-24	34	45.3.%
25-29	*	-
30-34	*	-
35-39	*	-
40-49	*	-
50 and older	*	-
Gender		
Female	42	56.0%
Male	33	44.0%
Other	-	-
Overall Total	75	

Thirty-three percent of the students enrolled in LART 200 in the fall of 2009 were from one of the target student populations (see Table 23) and their overall course success rate in LART 200 was 14.7% lower than it was for the overall student population.

Table 23. *LART 200 Comparisons by Section Type and Student Population: Fall 2009*

| | Section Type | | |
	Learning Community	Traditional	Difference
Enrollments			
Percentage of Black	13.3%	-	-
Percentage Filipino	4.0%	-	-
Percentage Latino/a	16.0%	-	-
Percentage of All Target Population	33.3%	-	-
Percentage of All Non-Target Population	66.7%		
% Point Difference for Target vs. Non-Target	-33.4%		
Total Students Enrolled	75	-	-
Success Rates			
Black	80.0%	-	-
Filipino	66.7%	-	-
Latino/a	50.0%	-	-
Overall For All Target Population	64.0%	-	-
Overall for All Non-Target Population	86.0%		
% Point Difference for Target vs. Non-Target	-22.0%		
Overall For All Students	78.7%	-	-

Note. LART 200 sections in the fall of 2009 were all learning community sections.

Of the 75 students in LART 200, only about a third of the students subsequently enrolled in LART 211; the majority of the students subsequently enrolled in EWRT 211 (53.3%). Overall, 49 students (65.3%) subsequently enrolled in EWRT 001A by the summer of 2015 (see Table 24). Forty-percent of 25 students from the target population progressed to EWRT 001A by summer 2015. Progression to EWRT 001A courses were highest for Black students and lowest for Filipino and Latino/a students in the target population. LART 200 enrollments appeared to be benefit students from the non-Target student population the most, 78% of the non-target students who started in LART 200 subsequently enrolled in college-level English by summer 2015.

Table 24. *Percentage of Fall 2009 LART 200 Target Student Populations Progressing to Each English Level by Summer 2015*

	Entering Cohort LART 200	LART 211	EWRT 211	READ 211	EWRT 001A
Black	10	10.0% (1)	70.0% (7)	50.0% (5)	50.0% (5)
Filipino	3	33.3% (1)	33.3% (1)	33.3% (1)	33.3% (1)
Latino/a	12	25.0% (3)	33.3% (4)	16.7% (2)	33.3% (4)
All Target Population	25	20.0% (5)	48.0% (12)	32.0% (8)	40.0% (10)
All Non-Target Population	50	36.0% (18)	56.0% (28)	48.0% (24)	78.0% (39)
% Point Difference for Target vs. Non-Target	-	-16.0%	-8.0%	-16.0	-38.0%
All Students	75	29.3% (22)	53.3% (40)	42.7% (32)	65.3% (49)*

Notes. Unduplicated student headcounts in parentheses. * This number is higher than the LART 211 numbers because 24 students subsequently enrolled in EWRT 001A without enrolling in LART 211.

Although the majority of the LART 200 students subsequently enrolled in EWRT 211 rather than LART 211, the course success rates for students who initially enrolled in LART 211 were higher than the rates for students enrolled in EWRT 211 (81.8% vs. 50.0%) [see Table 25]. Course success rates for LART 200 students who eventually enrolled in EWRT 001A by summer 2015 were high overall (87.8%) but were highest for students in the target population. Students from the target population who initially enrolled in LART 200 in the fall 2009 who progressed to EWRT 001A by summer 2015, all successfully completed the EWRT 001A in their first attempt.

Table 25. *Fall 2009 LART 200 Students' Initial Course Success Rates in Subsequent English Courses by Target Populations*

	LART 211	EWRT 211	READ 211	EWRT 001A
Black	0.0% (1)	14.3% (7)	80.0% (5)	100.0% (5)
Filipino	100.0% (1)	100.0% (1)	100.0% (1)	100.0% (1)
Latino/a	66.7% (3)	50.0% (4)	100.0% (2)	100.0% (4)
All Target Population	60.0% (5)	25.0% (12)	87.5% (8)	100.0% (10)
All Non-Target Population	88.9% (18)	60.7% (28)	87.5% (24)	84.6% (39)
% Point Difference for Target vs. Non-Target	28.9%	-35.7%	0.0%	15.4%
All Students	81.8% (22)	50.0% (40)	87.5% (32)	87.8% (49)

On average, LART 200 students in the fall of 2009 took two quarters to enroll in LART 211, three quarters to enroll in EWRT 211, and five quarters to enroll in EWRT 001A (See Table 26). The progression to EWRT 001A was shortest for Filipino students in the target population, relative to their Latino/a and Black peers.

Table 26. *LART 200 Progression to College-Level English: Average Number of Quarters from Fall 2009*

	LART 211	EWRT 211	READ 211	EWRT 001A
Black	1.0	2.3	2.4	8.0
Filipino	2.0	5.0	5.0	4.0
Latino/a	5.0	11.0	10.0	7.0
All Target Population	3.6	5.4	4.6	7.2
All Non-Target Population	1.1	2.1	2.0	4.9
Difference Target vs. Non-Target	2.5	3.3	2.6	2.3
All Students	1.6	3.1	2.0	5.4

Table 27 reveals slight differences in enrollment of Creative Art type programs by LART 200 students who subsequently enroll in college-level English compared to LART 200 students who do not by summer of 2015. Enrollment proportions by program types reveal that LART 200 students who enrolled in college-level English were a slightly more likely to enroll in Media and Communication and slightly less likely to be enrolled in Fine and Applied Arts and Foreign Language courses.

Table 27. *Comparison of Course Enrollment Types by Two Digit Taxonomy of Program Family: Enrollment Proportions of Fall 2009 LART 200 Cohort*

Courses Categorized By Two-Digit TOP Code	Enrolled in College-Level English by Summer 2015?		
	No	Yes	Difference
01 Agriculture and Natural Resources	-	-	-
03 Environmental Sciences and Technology	0.2%	1.3%	1.1%
04 Biological Sciences	2.1%	2.4%	0.3%
05 Business and Management	1.3%	2.6%	1.4%
06 Media and Communications	1.3%	6.6%	5.3%
07 Information Technology	0.8%	0.6%	-0.2%
08 Education	0.0%	2.0%	2.0%
09 Engineering and Industrial Technologies	7.1%	8.1%	0.9%
10 Fine Arts and Applied Arts	5.0%	2.1%	-2.9%
11 Foreign Language	6.7%	2.8%	-3.9%
12 Health	3.3%	2.5%	-0.8%
13 Family and Consumer Sciences	0.4%	3.4%	3.0%
14 Law	0.4%	1.7%	1.3%
15 Humanities	25.9%	26.1%	0.2%
16 Library Science	12.1%	12.0%	-0.2%
17 Mathematics	2.9%	5.1%	2.2%
19 Physical Sciences	5.9%	4.3%	-1.6%
20 Psychology	2.1%	0.2%	-1.9%
21 Public and Protective Services	16.7%	15.2%	-1.6%
22 Social Sciences	5.9%	2.4%	-3.4%
49 Interdisciplinary Studies	2.1%	2.4%	0.3%
Total Enrollments	248	1509	1757

Note. TOP code information retrieved from CCCCO Data Mart – Course Information merged with local data files. 2.3% enrollments (41) had unknown TOP codes.

Given that a high percentage of fall 2009 LART 200 students have progressed to EWRT 1A, the enrollment trend comparisons by special program types are not very meaningful for this population (see Table 28). The trend comparisons by program type for this population does not reveal much as the enrollment counts for students who did not progress are very low relative to the enrollment counts for students who did progress to college-level English. There is not enough data to be able to make a meaningful comparison.

Table 28. *Proportion of Course Enrollments in Special Programs for the Fall 2009 LART 200 Cohort: Comparison of Special Program Enrollments*

	Civic Engagement	Distance Education	First Year Experience	Honors	Learning in Communities
Did not Enroll in College-Level by Summer 2015					
Black	-	-	-	-	-
Filipino	-	-	-	-	10.0%
Latino/a	-	-	100.0%	-	50.0%
Target	-	-	100.0%	-	60.0%
Non-Target	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	-	40.0%
Target Total	0	0	1	-	6
Non-Target Total	1	7	0	-	4
Total Enrollments	1	7	1	-	10
Enrolled in College-Level by Summer 2015					
Black	8.3%	18.9%	100.0%	-	4.4%
Filipino	-	-	-	-	13.0%
Latino/a	16.7%	2.7%	-	-	8.7%
Target	25.0%	21.6%	100.0%	0.0%	26.1%
Non-Target	75.0%	78.4%	0.0%	100.0%	73.9%
Target Total	3	16	5	-	6
Non-Target Total	9	58	0	10	17
Total Enrollments	12	74	5	10	23
Difference					
Black	8.3%	18.9%	100.0%	-	4.4%
Filipino	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	-	3.0%
Latino/a	16.7%	2.7%	-100.0%	-	-41.3%
Target	25.0%	21.6%	0.0%	-	-33.9%
Non-Target	-25.0%	-21.6%	0.0%	-	33.9%

Fall 2009 ESL 234 Cohort Trends

Tables 29 – 35 provides trend information for students enrolled in ESL 234 in the fall of 2009.

In the fall of 2009, 103 students were enrolled in ESL234. Of the 103 students, the majority of students were of Asian ethnic backgrounds and female (see Table 29).

Table 29. *General Demographics for Students Enrolled in ESL 234 in Fall of 2009*

Demographics	Total Enrolled	Percentage of Total
Ethnic Group		
African American/Black	*	-
Asian	59	57.3%
Decline to State/Unknown	*	-
Filipino	*	-
Latino/a	22	21.4%
Native American	*	-
Pacific Islander	*	-
White	*	-
Age Range		
19 and younger	12	11.7%
20-24	36	35.0%
25-29	15	14.6%
30-34	*	-
35-39	*	-
40-49	15	14.6%
50 and older	*	-
Gender		
Female	72	69.9%
Male	31	30.1%
Other	-	-
Overall Total	103	

Table 30 reveals that about a third of the students enrolled in ESL 234 during the fall of 2009 were from one of the target student population groups. Compared to the overall course success rate, students from the target population had lower course success rates (59.4% vs. 44.8%).

Table 30. *ESL 234 Comparisons by Section Type and Student Population: Fall 2009*

	Section Type		
	Other	Traditional	Difference
Enrollments			
Percentage of Black	-	6.8%	-
Percentage Filipino	-	-	-
Percentage Latino/a	-	21.4%	-
Percentage of All Target Population	-	28.2%	-
Percentage of All Non-Target Population		71.8%	
% Point Difference for Target vs. Non-Target		-43.6%	
Total Students Enrolled	-	103	-
Success Rates			
Black	-	42.9%	-
Filipino	-	-	-
Latino/a	-	45.5%	-
Overall For All Target Population	-	44.8%	-
Overall For All Non-Target Population		64.9%	
% Point Difference for Target vs. Non-Target		-20.1%	
Overall for All Students		59.4%	

Rates of progression to college-level English (ESL 005 or EWRT 001A) for ESL 234 students in the fall of 2009 are very relatively low; only about a quarter of all ESL 234 students enrolled in college-level English course by summer of 2015 (See Table 31). These rates are even lower for students from the target population, only about a tenth of these students are progressing to college-level English.

Table 31. *Percentage of Fall 2009 ESL 234 Target Student Populations Progressing to Each English Level by Summer 2015*

	Black	Latino/a	All Target	All Non-Target	% Point Difference Target vs. Non-Target	All Students
Entering Cohort: ESL 234	6.8% (7)	21.4% (22)	28.2% (29)	71.8% (74)	-43.6%	103
ESL 244	85.7% (6)	54.5% (12)	62.1% (18)	68.9% (51)	-6.8%	67.0% (69)
ESL 253	57.1% (4)	54.5% (12)	55.2% (16)	64.9% (48)	-9.7%	62.1% (64)
ESL 252	28.6% (2)	60.0% (6)	27.6% (8)	51.4% (38)	-23.8%	32.0% (33)
ESL 251	28.6% (2)	36.4% (8)	34.5% (10)	55.4% (41)	-20.9%	49.5% (51)
ESL 263	14.3% (1)	27.3% (6)	24.1% (7)	31.1% (23)	-7.0%	29.1% (30)
ESL 262	14.3% (1)	27.3% (6)	24.1% (7)	37.8% (28)	-13.7%	34.0% (35)
ESL 261	-	-	-	-	-	-
ESL 273	-	18.2% (4)	13.8% (4)	21.6% (16)	-7.8%	19.4% (20)
ESL 272	14.3% (1)	22.7% (5)	20.7% (6)	24.3% (18)	-3.6%	23.3% (24)
ESL 005	-	9.1% (2)	6.9% (2)	16.2% (12)	-9.3%	13.6% (14)
EWRT 001A	-	4.5% (1)	3.4% (1)	16.2% (12)	-12.8%	12.6% (13)

Notes. Unduplicated student headcounts in parentheses.

Despite the low progression rates, ESL 234 students who did progress to college-level English had high course success rates in their first attempt in ESL 005 and EWRT 001A courses (see Table 32) and all Latino/a students who progressed to college-level English courses successfully passed their first attempt of the course. Of the seven Black students enrolled in ESL 234 in the fall of 2009, none, to date, have enrolled in a college-level English course. In comparing the college-level course success rates for target and non-target students, target students who do make it to college-level ESL and English courses have higher course success rates than non-target students.

Table 32. *Fall 2009 ESL 234 Students' Initial Course Success Rates in Subsequent ESL Courses by Target Populations*

	Black	Latino/a	All Target	All Non-Target	% Point Difference for Target vs. Non-Target	All Students
ESL 244	33.3% (6)	75.0% (12)	61.1% (29)	84.3% (51)	-23.2%	78.3% (69)
ESL 253	25.0% (4)	58.3% (12)	50.0% (16)	58.3% (48)	-8.3%	56.3% (64)
ESL 252	50.0% (2)	87.5% (6)	80.0% (8)	84.2% (38)	-4.2%	83.3% (33)
ESL 251	50.0% (2)	100.0% (8)	90.0% (10)	85.4% (41)	15.4%	86.3% (51)
ESL 263	100.0% (1)	83.3% (6)	74.1% (7)	82.6% (23)	-8.5%	80.0% (30)
ESL 262	100.0% (1)	83.3% (6)	85.7% (7)	85.7% (28)	0.0%	85.7% (35)
ESL 261	-	-	-	-	-	-
ESL 273	-	75.0% (4)	75.0% (4)	93.8% (16)	-18.8%	90.0% (20)
ESL 272	100.0% (1)	100.0% (5)	100.0% (6)	83.3% (18)	16.7%	87.5% (24)
ESL 005	-	100.0% (2)	100.0% (2)	91.7% (12)	8.3%	92.9% (14)
EWRT 001A	-	100.0% (1)	100.0% (1)	83.3% (12)	16.7%	84.6% (13)

Review of their progression rate reveals that on average, it takes the target student population about 10 quarters to enroll in their first college-level ESL course and 16 quarters to enroll in their first college-level English course (see Table 33). Compared to their non-Target student peers, these students take substantially longer to enroll in a college-level English course (16 vs. 11 respectively).

Table 33. *ESL 234 Progression to College-Level English: Average Number of Quarters from Fall 2009*

	Black	Latino/a	All Target	All Non-Target	Difference for Target vs. Non-Target	All Students
ESL 244	5.7	5.3	5.4	2.7	2.7	3.4
ESL 253	6.8	7.6	7.4	5.6	1.8	6.1
ESL 252	4.5	6.5	6.1	4.4	1.7	4.8
ESL 251	4.0	5.0	4.8	4.1	0.7	4.3
ESL 262	5.0	7.5	7.1	5.6	1.5	5.9
ESL 263	19.0	8.2	9.7	5.9	3.8	6.8
ESL 261	-	-	-	-	-	-
ESL 272	12.0	9.2	9.7	6.3	3.4	7.2
ESL 273	-	7.0	7.0	7.1	-0.1	7.1
ESL 005	-	10.0	10.0	9.5	0.5	9.6
EWRT 001A	-	16.0	16.0	11.2	4.8	11.5

Table 34 reveals that a majority of the enrollments by ESL 234 are in Public and Protective Service courses (35% of enrollments of students who subsequently enroll in college-level English and 45% of enrollments of students who do not). A review of the data reveal that ESL 234 students who make it college-level, are more likely to enroll in general education courses in areas such as Law, Mathematics, Psychology, and Social Sciences.

Table 34. *Proportion of Course Enrollments for Fall 2009 ESL 234 Cohort: Comparison of Course Enrollment Types by Two Digit Taxonomy of Program Family*

Courses Categorized By Two-Digit TOP Code	Enrolled in College-Level Math by Summer 2015?		
	No	Yes	Difference
01 Agriculture and Natural Resources	-	-	-
03 Environmental Sciences and Technology	0.5%	2.8%	2.3%
04 Biological Sciences	0.7%	2.6%	2.0%
05 Business and Management	7.6%	5.6%	-2.0%
06 Media and Communications	0.3%	0.6%	0.2%
07 Information Technology	2.0%	3.2%	1.2%
08 Education	6.4%	5.4%	-1.0%
09 Engineering and Industrial Technologies	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%
10 Fine Arts and Applied Arts	4.4%	3.5%	-0.9%
11 Foreign Language	3.5%	2.8%	-0.7%
12 Health	2.4%	2.0%	-0.3%
13 Family and Consumer Sciences	3.2%	1.2%	-2.0%
14 Law	5.3%	9.2%	3.9%
15 Humanities	0.2%	0.1%	-0.1%
16 Library Science	6.5%	9.5%	3.0%
17 Mathematics	1.2%	4.8%	3.6%
19 Physical Sciences	1.2%	2.0%	0.8%
20 Psychology	2.1%	7.9%	5.8%
21 Public and Protective Services	45.0%	34.9%	-10.1%
22 Social Sciences	0.5%	2.8%	2.3%
49 Interdisciplinary Studies	0.7%	2.6%	2.0%
Total Enrollments	886	684	1570

Note. TOP code information retrieved from CCCCO Data Mart – Course Information merged with local data files. 75 enrollments (4.8%) did not have a match.

Table 35 reveals that ESL 234 students who enrolled in a college-level English course by summer 2015 were less likely to enroll in special program sections, these students were less likely to be enrolled in Distance Education courses and learning community sections than students who did not enroll in a college-level English course by summer 2015. However, there is not enough data to make a meaningful comparison.

Table 35. *Proportion of Course Enrollments in Special Programs for the Fall 2009 ESL 234 Cohort: Comparison of Special Program Enrollments*

	Civic Engagement	Distance Education	First Year Experience	Honors	Learning in Communities
Did not Enroll in College-Level by Summer 2015					
Black	-	3.8%	-	-	-
Latino/a	-	15.1%	-	-	66.7%
Target	-	18.9%	-	-	66.7%
Non-Target	100.0%				
Target Total	0	10	-	-	2
Non-Target Total	3	43	-	-	1
Total Students	3	53	-	-	3
Enrolled in College-Level by Summer 2015					
Black	-	-	-	-	-
Latino/a	-	2.0%	-	-	50.0%
Target	-	2.0%	-	-	50.0%
Non-Target	100.0%	98.0%	-	-	50.0%
Target Total	-	1	-	-	4
Non-Target Total	1	48	-	-	4
Total Students	1	49	-	-	8
Black	-	-3.8%	-	-	-
Latino/a	-	-13.1%	-	-	-16.7%
Target	-	-16.9%	-	-	-16.7%
Non-Target	0.0%	16.8%	-	-	16.7%