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• National initiative launched in 2014 by President Obama to address persistent opportunity gaps faced by boys and young men of color and ensure that all young people can reach their full potential.

• ~200 Communities around the country have accepted the Challenge
• Vision:

Become a national model for boosting academic achievement, enhancing health and well-being and elevating the lifetime prosperity for young boys and men of color.

• Committee Structure:

1. Ensure all children enter school ready & read at grade level by 3rd grade
2. Ensure middle school students have advanced opportunities by 8th grade
3. Ensure all youth graduate high school college & career ready
4. Ensure all youth complete post-secondary and are employed
5. Ensure males of color have equitable access to healthcare
6. Ensure violence to and by males of color is prevented and increase second chances
Disproportional Difference Data Analysis: WHY?

1. Provide **Focus**: use objective data analysis to identify those metrics that will make the biggest difference in closing gaps for young men of color
   A. Choose range of metrics at each level of the education pipeline
   B. Determine disproportional difference for all metrics
   C. ID 2 focus metrics based on disproportional difference & other factors

2. Support **Action**: Provide comparative data sets to help institutions and our community *move the needle* on these metrics
   A. What factor(s) most influence metric? (Gender/ethnicity/income)
   B. Which schools are bright spots across the region?
   C. Provide districts data to compare schools and focus actions
Data Analysis Goal 1

1. **Provide Focus**: use objective data analysis to identify those metrics that will make the biggest difference in closing gaps for young men of color
Disproportional Difference Comparisons

• Each Committee chose a range of 6-10 metrics at that level of the education pipeline of interest for our MBK populations
• Every metric calculated by income (low income or not), Gender (male or female), and Ethnicity (Black, Hispanic, White, Asian) – 16 total categories
• “Target Population”: weighted average of Black and Hispanic low income males
• “Comparison Population”: White, non-low income females
• Disproportional difference is the percentage point difference between the target and comparison groups
Disproportional Difference Data Analysis:

1. **Provide **Focus**: use objective data analysis to identify those metrics that will make the biggest difference in closing gaps for young men of color

   A. Choose range of metrics at each level of the education pipeline
Early Education Metrics Reviewed

- % of eligible students enrolled in Pre-K
- % Chronically absent in Pre-K
- School readiness at beginning of K – Social emotional skills
- School readiness at beginning of K – Academic skills
- % Retained in Grade 1
- % Passed 3rd grade reading test
Middle School Metrics Reviewed

- Average daily attendance
- % Chronically Absent
- Disciplinary referrals
- Academic growth at 6th grade transition year
- Passing rate in 8th grade reading
- Placement in Algebra I in 8th grade
- Student mobility (possibly as a separate focus group in bright spot analysis)
- % Retained in 9th grade
High School Metrics Reviewed

- % Chronically Absent
- Disciplinary Referrals
- % Retained in 9th grade
- Passing rate in English II End of Course Exam
- Highest level math course completed
- Completion of CTE coursework
- % of students taking at least 1 AP/IB/Dual Credit Course
- Graduation rate (measured at 4, 5, and 6 years)
- Higher education enrollment
Higher Education Metrics Reviewed

- Higher education enrollment
- % Enrolled full time versus part time
- % Transferred from 2-year to 4-year schools (From Richard)
- % Completed a degree or certificate within 6 years of enrollment
- % Completed a STEM degree or certificate within 6 years of enrollment
- % Continuously enrolled (for 6 years following enrollment)
- % Employed one year after degree completion
- % Employed in the tech industry one year after degree completion

- Failed a course (during the first year of enrollment)
- % Enrolled in credit bearing course after completing a remedial course (Math and English)
Disproportional Difference Data Analysis: WHY?

1. Provide **Focus**: use objective data analysis to identify those metrics that will make the biggest difference in closing gaps for young men of color
   A. Choose range of metrics at each level of the education pipeline
   B. Determine disproportional difference for all metrics
Early Education Disproportional Differences
% of Eligible Students Enrolled in Pre-K
2013-2014

Non-Low Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian Female</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Male</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Male</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Male</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Low Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian Female</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Male</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Male</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Male</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disproportionality Difference = -11.6%

Source: E³ Alliance analysis of PEIMS data at the UT Austin Education Research Center
Chronic Absence Rates
Pre-K, 2013-2014

Source: E³ Alliance analysis of PEIMS data at the UT Austin Education Research Center

Disproportionality Difference = -12.6%

18.5%
School Readiness – Social Emotional Skills
Beginning of Pre-K, 2010-2014

Non-Low Income
- Black Female: 68% (n=137)
- Hispanic Female: 76% (n=1059)
- White Female: 80% (n=2958)
- Asian Female: 84% (n=437)
- Black Male: 51% (n=105)
- Hispanic Male: 63% (n=946)
- White Male: 65% (n=2542)
- Asian Male: 65% (n=376)

Low Income
- Black Female: 56% (n=403)
- Hispanic Female: 60% (n=2956)
- White Female: 63% (n=602)
- Asian Female: 63% (n=519)
- Black Male: 41% (n=308)
- Hispanic Male: 54% (n=2740)
- White Male: 51% (n=105)
- Asian Male: 81% (n=100)

Disproportionality
Difference = 26.9%

Source: E³ Alliance analysis of PEIMS data at the UT Austin Education Research Center
School Readiness – Academic Skills
Beginning of Pre-K, 2010-2014

Non-Low Income
- Black Female: 74% (n=150)
- Hispanic Female: 74% (n=1032)
- White Female: 66% (n=995)
- Asian Female: 73% (n=2855)
- Black Male: 69% (n=142)
- Hispanic Male: 66% (n=2855)
- White Male: 73% (n=2855)
- Asian Male: 78% (n=456)

Low Income
- Black Female: 56% (n=403)
- Hispanic Female: 54% (n=2692)
- White Female: 65% (n=615)
- Asian Female: 69% (n=92)
- Black Male: 51% (n=386)
- Hispanic Male: 49% (n=2453)
- White Male: 51% (n=519)
- Asian Male: 68% (n=83)

Disproportionality Difference = 32.6%

Source: E³ Alliance analysis of PEIMS data at the UT Austin Education Research Center
Grade Retention Rates
Kindergarten-Grade 2, 2012-2014

Non-Low Income

Low Income

0% 5%

Percent of Students

Disproportionality Difference = 2.5%

Source: E³ Alliance analysis of PEIMS data at the UT Austin Education Research Center
Reading STAAR Exam Passing Rate
Grade 3, Spring 2015

Source: E³ Alliance analysis of PEIMS data at the UT Austin Education Research Center
Middle School Disproportional Differences
Average Daily Attendance Rates
Grades 6-8, 2013-2014

Non-Low Income

Black Female: 3.92 (n=792)
Hispanic Female: 5.53 (n=4551)
White Female: 5.74 (n=11194)
Asian Female: 2.97 (n=1417)

Low Income

Black Female: 7.5 (n=2124)
Hispanic Female: 7.61 (n=12170)
White Female: 8.32 (n=2516)
Asian Female: 3.39 (n=385)

Disproportionality Difference = 2.1 days per student

Days Absent

Source: E3 Alliance analysis of PEIMS data at the UT Austin Education Research Center
Chronic Absence Rates
Grades 6-8, 2013-2014

Source: E³ Alliance analysis of PEIMS data at the UT Austin Education Research Center
### Disciplinary Referral Rates
**Grades 6-8, 2013-2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Non-Low Income</th>
<th>Low Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian Male</td>
<td>4% (n=56)</td>
<td>10% (n=39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Female</td>
<td>1% (n=305)</td>
<td>3% (n=13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Male</td>
<td>21% (n=184)</td>
<td>47% (n=1097)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Female</td>
<td>13% (n=99)</td>
<td>28% (n=599)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Male</td>
<td>14% (n=647)</td>
<td>30% (n=3911)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Female</td>
<td>7% (n=327)</td>
<td>19% (n=2312)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Male</td>
<td>11% (n=1250)</td>
<td>29% (n=809)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Female</td>
<td>3% (n=356)</td>
<td>14% (n=647)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Disproportionality Difference = 30.1%**

Source: E³ Alliance analysis of PEIMS data at the UT Austin Education Research Center
Days Missed due to Disciplinary Referrals
Grades 6-8, 2013-2014

Source: E³ Alliance analysis of PEIMS data at the UT Austin Education Research Center

© 2016 E³ Alliance
Grade 9 Retention Rates 2014-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Non-Low Income</th>
<th>Low Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Female</td>
<td>4% (n=14)</td>
<td>8% (n=72)</td>
<td>11% (n=41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Female</td>
<td>4% (n=67)</td>
<td>7% (n=41)</td>
<td>3% (n=14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Female</td>
<td>3% (n=99)</td>
<td>6% (n=41)</td>
<td>4% (n=14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Male</td>
<td>6% (n=112)</td>
<td>11% (n=41)</td>
<td>4% (n=14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Male</td>
<td>1% (n=50)</td>
<td>1% (n=50)</td>
<td>1% (n=50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Female</td>
<td>&lt;1% (n&lt;5)</td>
<td>4% (n=14)</td>
<td>4% (n=14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Male</td>
<td>&lt;1% (n&lt;5)</td>
<td>4% (n=5)</td>
<td>4% (n=5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: E³ Alliance analysis of PEIMS data at the UT Austin Education Research Center

Disproportionality Difference = 11.7%
English STAAR Exam Passing Rate
Grade 8, Spring 2015

Non-Low Income
- Black Female: 80% (n=235)
- Hispanic Female: 87% (n=1426)
- White Female: 75% (n=1410)
- Asian Female: 93% (n=424)

Low Income
- Black Female: 65% (n=366)
- Hispanic Female: 68% (n=2552)
- White Female: 79% (n=91)
- Asian Female: 72% (n=538)

Disproportionality Difference = 37%

Source: E3 Alliance analysis of PEIMS data at the UT Austin Education Research Center

© 2016 E3 Alliance
Gap in Reading Pass Rate Remains Stable between 3rd and 8th grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Grade 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Low Income</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Texas Education Agency: STAAR Results
Gap in Reading Pass Rate Remains Stable between 3rd and 8th grade

Source: Texas Education Agency: STAAR Results
Algebra 1 Placement in 8th Grade
Spring 2015

Source: E³ Alliance analysis of PEIMS data at the UT Austin Education Research Center

Percent of Students

Non-Low Income
- Black Female: 26% (n=79)
- Hispanic Female: 31% (n=522)
- White Female: 23% (n=76)
- Hispanic Male: 30% (n=531)
- White Male: 40% (n=1621)
- Asian Male: 42% (n=193)
- Asian Female: 47% (n=231)

Low Income
- Black Female: 17% (n=100)
- Hispanic Female: 20% (n=774)
- White Female: 20% (n=138)
- Hispanic Male: 18% (n=723)
- White Male: 21% (n=162)
- Asian Male: 42% (n=57)
- Asian Female: 36% (n=44)

Disproportionality Difference = 25.2%
Student Growth Percentile (Reading & Math)  
Grade 6, 2014-2015

- **Asian Female**: Non-Low Income - 63.2 (n=533)  
- **White Female**: Non-Low Income - 50.7 (n=1631)  
- **Hispanic Female**: Non-Low Income - 54.3 (n=3668)  
- **Black Female**: Non-Low Income - 48.3 (n=281)  
- **Asian Male**: Non-Low Income - 65.7 (n=522)  
- **White Male**: Non-Low Income - 56.5 (n=4070)  
- **Hispanic Male**: Non-Low Income - 52.8 (n=1656)  
- **Black Male**: Non-Low Income - 51.9 (n=294)  
- **Asian Female**: Low Income - 59.8 (n=110)  
- **White Female**: Low Income - 47.7 (n=684)  
- **Hispanic Female**: Low Income - 44.7 (n=3971)  
- **Black Female**: Low Income - 42.9 (n=638)  
- **Asian Male**: Low Income - 59.9 (n=125)  
- **White Male**: Low Income - 50.7 (n=772)  
- **Hispanic Male**: Low Income - 45.7 (n=4104)  
- **Black Male**: Low Income - 45.0 (n=606)  

Disproportionality Difference = 8.7 pts

Source: E³ Alliance analysis of PEIMS data at the UT Austin Education Research Center

© 2016 E³ Alliance
Student Mobility
Grades 6-8, 2013-2014

Disproportionality Difference = 6.2%

Source: E³ Alliance analysis of PEIMS data at the UT Austin Education Research Center
High School Disproportional Differences
Chronic Absence Rates
Grades 9-12, 2013-2014

Non-Low Income

- Black Female: 11% (n=148)
- Hispanic Female: 15% (n=960)
- White Female: 10% (n=1552)
- Asian Female: 3% (n=62)

Low Income

- Black Male: 12% (n=176)
- Hispanic Male: 15% (n=1026)
- White Male: 10% (n=1561)
- Asian Male: 4% (n=62)

- Black Female (Low Income): 25% (n=614)
- Hispanic Female (Low Income): 25% (n=3180)
- White Female (Low Income): 26% (n=777)
- Asian Female (Low Income): 8% (n=41)

- Black Male (Low Income): 25% (n=703)
- Hispanic Male (Low Income): 24% (n=3305)
- White Male (Low Income): 25% (n=862)
- Asian Male (Low Income): 8% (n=48)

Disproportionality Difference = 14%

Source: E³ Alliance analysis of PEIMS data at the UT Austin Education Research Center
Disciplinary Referral Rates
Grades 9-12, 2013-2014

Source: E³ Alliance analysis of PEIMS data at the UT Austin Education Research Center
Days Missed due to Disciplinary Referrals
Grades 9-12, 2013-2014

Source: E³ Alliance analysis of PEIMS data at the UT Austin Education Research Center

Disproportionality Difference = 10.9 days, Or 6% of school days
Grade 9 Retention Rates 2014-2015

Source: E³ Alliance analysis of PEIMS data at the UT Austin Education Research Center
English II EOC Pass Rate
Grades 9-12, Spring 2015

- **Black Female**: 78% (n=295)
- **Hispanic Female**: 81% (n=1467)
- **White Female**: 93% (n=3410)
- **Asian Female**: 94% (n=388)
- **Black Male**: 58% (n=242)
- **Hispanic Male**: 69% (n=1299)
- **White Male**: 85% (n=3329)
- **Asian Male**: 91% (n=373)
- **Black Female**: 52% (n=335)
- **Hispanic Female**: 58% (n=2043)
- **White Female**: 73% (n=456)
- **Asian Female**: 63% (n=88)
- **Black Male**: 38% (n=313)
- **Hispanic Male**: 45% (n=1715)
- **White Male**: 57% (n=443)
- **Asian Male**: 60% (n=77)

Disproportionality Difference = 49.7%

Source: E3 Alliance analysis of PEIMS data at the UT Austin Education Research Center
Highest Math Course Completed
Grades 9-12, Graduating Class of 2014

Source: E3 Alliance analysis of PEIMS data at the UT Austin Education Research Center
Percent of students Completing at least Pre-Calculus Grades 9-12, Graduating Class of 2014

Non-Low Income

Black Female: 60% (n=156)
Hispanic Female: 64% (n=665)
White Female: 72% (n=2265)
Asian Female: 89% (n=276)

Low Income

Black Female: 35% (n=230)
Hispanic Female: 42% (n=1211)
White Female: 45% (n=401)
Asian Female: 75% (n=117)

Black Male: 54% (n=135)
Hispanic Male: 57% (n=649)
White Male: 67% (n=2273)
Asian Male: 90% (n=323)

Disproportionality Difference = 37.3%

Source: E3 Alliance analysis of PEIMS data at the UT Austin Education Research Center
CTE Course Passing Rates
Grades 9-12, 2013-2014

Non-Low Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Passing Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian Female</td>
<td>67% (n=1032)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Female</td>
<td>65% (n=899)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Female</td>
<td>63% (n=4172)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Female</td>
<td>62% (n=9065)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Male</td>
<td>69% (n=1060)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Male</td>
<td>64% (n=990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Male</td>
<td>63% (n=4430)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Male</td>
<td>66% (n=10085)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Male</td>
<td>69% (n=1060)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Low Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Passing Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian Female</td>
<td>68% (n=312)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Female</td>
<td>65% (n=1466)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Female</td>
<td>62% (n=7065)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Female</td>
<td>64% (n=1597)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Male</td>
<td>68% (n=318)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Male</td>
<td>60% (n=1540)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Male</td>
<td>61% (n=7471)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Male</td>
<td>65% (n=1828)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Male</td>
<td>66% (n=336)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disproportionality Difference = 1.7%

Source: E³ Alliance analysis of PEIMS data at the UT Austin Education Research Center
AP/IB Course Passing Rates
Grades 9-12, 2013-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Non-Low Income</th>
<th>Low Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Female</td>
<td>30% (n=420)</td>
<td>16% (n=367)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Female</td>
<td>28% (n=1858)</td>
<td>18% (n=2087)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Female</td>
<td>40% (n=5757)</td>
<td>24% (n=439)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Female</td>
<td>61% (n=946)</td>
<td>42% (n=194)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Male</td>
<td>21% (n=319)</td>
<td>10% (n=249)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Male</td>
<td>24% (n=1667)</td>
<td>13% (n=1643)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Male</td>
<td>33% (n=5020)</td>
<td>14% (n=388)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Male</td>
<td>58% (n=903)</td>
<td>40% (n=205)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: E³ Alliance analysis of PEIMS data at the UT Austin Education Research Center

Disproportionality Difference = 26.8%
Dual Credit Course Passing Rates
Grades 9-12, 2013-2014

Percent of Students

Source: E³ Alliance analysis of PEIMS data at the UT Austin Education Research Center

© 2016 E³ Alliance
Graduation Rates
4-year rates, Graduating Class of 2014

Source: E³ Alliance analysis of PEIMS data at the UT Austin Education Research Center
4, 5 and 6 year Graduation Rates
Ninth Graders in 2008-2009

Source: E³ Alliance analysis of PEIMS data at the UT Austin Education Research Center
Higher Education Enrollment Rates
2014-2015

Source: E³ Alliance analysis of PEIMS data at the UT Austin Education Research Center
Higher Education Disproportional Differences
Higher Education Enrollment Rates
2014-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Non-Low Income</th>
<th>Low Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asian Female</strong></td>
<td>70% (n=209)</td>
<td>85% (n=93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White Female</strong></td>
<td>74% (n=670)</td>
<td>85% (n=93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hispanic Female</strong></td>
<td>71% (n=170)</td>
<td>82% (n=239)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black Female</strong></td>
<td>66% (n=2024)</td>
<td>77% (n=92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asian Male</strong></td>
<td>80% (n=208)</td>
<td>74% (n=670)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White Male</strong></td>
<td>70% (n=209)</td>
<td>82% (n=239)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hispanic Male</strong></td>
<td>64% (n=637)</td>
<td>82% (n=239)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black Male</strong></td>
<td>63% (n=139)</td>
<td>77% (n=92)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disproportionality Difference = 29.5%

Source: E³ Alliance analysis of PEIMS data at the UT Austin Education Research Center
### % Enrolled Full-Time 2014-2015

#### Non-Low Income
- **Black Female**: 74% (n=120)
- **Hispanic Female**: 67% (n=432)
- **White Female**: 76% (n=1492)
- **Asian Female**: 87% (n=179)
- **Black Male**: 66% (n=90)
- **Hispanic Male**: 63% (n=387)
- **White Male**: 73% (n=1450)
- **Asian Male**: 83% (n=195)

#### Low Income
- **Black Female**: 58% (n=160)
- **Hispanic Female**: 49% (n=474)
- **White Female**: 60% (n=223)
- **Asian Female**: 69% (n=65)
- **Black Male**: 53% (n=115)
- **Hispanic Male**: 43% (n=335)
- **White Male**: 61% (n=175)
- **Asian Male**: 70% (n=66)

**Disproportionality Difference** = 31.6%

Source: E³ Alliance analysis of PEIMS data at the UT Austin Education Research Center
First two years of enrollment, 2011-2012

- **Black Female**: 15% (n=45)
- **Hispanic Female**: 11% (n=124)
- **White Female**: 26% (n=292)
- **Asian Female**: 35% (n=31)
- **Black Male**: 11% (n=25)
- **Hispanic Male**: 11% (n=102)
- **White Male**: 23% (n=267)
- **Asian Male**: 41% (n=)

Disproportionality Difference = 15.2%

Source: E³ Alliance analysis of PEIMS data at the UT Austin Education Research Center
% Completed a Degree Within 6 Years
Higher Ed Enrollees in 2009

Non-Low Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Percent of Students</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Female</td>
<td>59% (n=157)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Female</td>
<td>58% (n=466)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Female</td>
<td>70% (n=2561)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Female</td>
<td>84% (n=392)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Male</td>
<td>40% (n=76)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Male</td>
<td>48% (n=299)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Male</td>
<td>57% (n=1686)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Male</td>
<td>84% (n=336)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Low Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Percent of Students</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Female</td>
<td>44% (n=128)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Female</td>
<td>45% (n=422)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Female</td>
<td>43% (n=149)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Female</td>
<td>77% (n=115)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Male</td>
<td>35% (n=65)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Male</td>
<td>37% (n=240)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Male</td>
<td>39% (n=103)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Male</td>
<td>60% (n=73)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disproportionality Difference = 33%

Source: E³ Alliance analysis of PEIMS data at the UT Austin Education Research Center
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