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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?

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

- Choose range of metrics at each level of the education pipeline
- Determine disproportional difference for all metrics
- ID 2 focus metrics based on disproportional difference & other factors

Support **Action**: Provide comparative data sets to help institutions and our community *move the needle* on these metrics

- What factor(s) most influence metric? (Gender/ethnicity/income)
- Which schools are bright spots across the region?
- Provide districts data to compare schools and focus actions
Data Analysis Goal 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 metric is calculated by income (low income or not), Gender (male or female), and Ethnicity (Black, Hispanic, White, Asian) – 16 total categories
- “Target Population” is a weighted average of Black and Hispanic low income males
- “Comparison Population” is White, non-low income females
- Disproportional difference is the percentage point difference between the target and comparison groups
Higher Education Metrics Reviewed

- Higher education enrollment
- % Enrolled full time versus part time
- % Transferred from 2-year to 4-year schools (From ACC)
- % 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)
- Failed a course (during the first year of enrollment)
- % Enrolled in credit bearing course after completing a remedial course (Math and English)
- % Employed one year after degree completion
- % Employed in the tech industry one year after degree completion
## Disproportional Differences in Metrics: Higher Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Disproportionality Difference</th>
<th># Impacted</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Completed a degree or certificate within 6 years of enrollment</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>Important indicator but lags 6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Enrolled full time versus part time</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>Very strong indicator of persistence and success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher education enrollment</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>Enrollment gap is much larger than graduation gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Transferred from 2 to 4 year institution</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>171</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Continuously enrolled (for 6 years following enrollment)</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Very low for all students!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Completed a STEM degree or certificate within 6 years of enrollment</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Employed in the tech industry one year after degree completion</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>Target group outperforms comparison group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Employed one year after degree completion</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>Target group outperforms comparison group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Higher Education Enrollment Rates 2014-2015

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

Disproportionality Difference = 29.5%
% Enrolled Full-Time
2014-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Non-Low Income</th>
<th>Low Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Female</td>
<td>74% (n=120)</td>
<td>58% (n=160)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Female</td>
<td>67% (n=432)</td>
<td>49% (n=474)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Female</td>
<td>67% (n=387)</td>
<td>60% (n=223)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Female</td>
<td>87% (n=179)</td>
<td>69% (n=85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Male</td>
<td>76% (n=1492)</td>
<td>53% (n=115)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Male</td>
<td>63% (n=387)</td>
<td>43% (n=335)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Male</td>
<td>73% (n=1450)</td>
<td>61% (n=175)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Male</td>
<td>87% (n=195)</td>
<td>70% (n=66)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disproportionality Difference = 31.6%

Source: E³ Alliance analysis of PEIMS data at the UT Austin Education Research Center
% Transferred from ACC to a 4 year Institution
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 w/in 6 years
Higher Ed Enrollees in 2009

Source: E³ Alliance analysis of PEIMS data at the UT Austin Education Research Center
% Completed a STEM degree w/in 6 years
Higher Ed Enrollees in 2009

Non-Low Income

- Black Female: 9% (n=23)
- Hispanic Female: 10% (n=84)
- White Female: 13% (n=490)
- Asian Female: 26% (n=122)

Low Income

- Black Female: 4% (n=7)
- Hispanic Female: 12% (n=77)
- White Male: 17% (n=509)
- Asian Male: 43% (n=174)

Black Female: 4% (n=12)
Hispanic Female: 6% (n=60)
White Female: 7% (n=25)
Asian Female: 26% (n=39)
Black Male: 4% (n=8)
Hispanic Male: 10% (n=62)
White Male: 13% (n=34)
Asian Male: 31% (n=38)

Disproportionality Difference = 4.9%

Source: E³ Alliance analysis of PEIMS data at the UT Austin Education Research Center
% Continuously Enrolled
Higher Ed Enrollees 2009

Non-Low Income

- Black Female: 67% (n=179)
- Hispanic Female: 61% (n=490)
- White Female: 68% (n=2488)
- Asian Female: 66% (n=305)

Low Income

- Black Female: 66% (n=192)
- Hispanic Female: 60% (n=562)
- White Female: 57% (n=199)
- Asian Female: 60% (n=90)

Disproportionality Difference = 6.7%
% Employed 1 year after graduation
Higher Ed Enrollees in 2008

Non-Low Income

Black Female: 89% (n=295)
Hispanic Female: 83% (n=1467)
White Female: 82% (n=3410)
Asian Female: 69% (n=388)

Black Male: 79% (n=242)
Hispanic Male: 80% (n=1299)
White Male: 78% (n=3329)
Asian Male: 66% (n=373)

Low Income

Black Female: 86% (n=335)
Hispanic Female: 88% (n=2043)
White Female: 79% (n=456)
Asian Female: 82% (n=88)

Black Male: 88% (n=313)
Hispanic Male: 84% (n=1715)
White Male: 82% (n=443)
Asian Male: 75% (n=77)

Disproportionality Difference = -2.5%

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

© 2016 E³ Alliance
% Employed in STEM industry 1 year after graduation
Higher Ed Enrollees in 2008

Non-Low Income

- Black Female: 5% (n=295)
- Hispanic Female: 4% (n=1467)
- White Female: 7% (n=388)
- Asian Female: 6% (n=3410)

Low Income

- Black Female: 3% (n=335)
- Hispanic Female: 5% (n=2043)
- White Female: 4% (n=456)
- Asian Female: 7% (n=88)
- Black Male: 5% (n=242)
- Hispanic Male: 8% (n=1299)
- White Male: 10% (n=3329)
- Asian Male: 9% (n=373)

Disproportionality Difference = -2.1%

8.3%

Source: E³ Alliance analysis of PEIMS data at the UT Austin Education Research Center
© 2016 E³ Alliance
Choosing “Top 2” Focus Metrics

Decision Criteria:

- Greatest disproportionality for our target students
- Number of students potentially impacted
- Potential to change outcomes
- “Leading” versus “lagging” indicator
- Ability to amplify and build upon existing work
Disproportional Differences in Metrics: Higher Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Disproportionality Difference</th>
<th># Impacted</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Completed a degree or certificate within 6 years of enrollment</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Enrolled full time versus part time</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>Very strong indicator of persistence and success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher education enrollment</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>Enrollment gap is much larger than graduation gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Transferred from 2 to 4 year institution</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>171</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Continuously enrolled (for 6 years following enrollment)</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Very low for all students!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Completed a STEM degree or certificate within 6 years of enrollment</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Employed in the tech industry one year after degree completion</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Employed one year after degree completion</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second chosen metric: persistence to second year
Data Analysis Goal 2

➢ Support **Action**: Provide comparative data sets to help institutions and our community *move the needle* on these metrics
Focus Metric: Higher Education Enrollment

- In line with primary committee goal
- Important leading indicator – Students can’t complete a degree if they never enroll
- Can build on current initiatives that help students with the application and admission processes, accessing of financial aid, etc.
- Consistent with Chamber regional DTC70 goal and Blueprint Objectives
Higher Education Enrollment Rates 2014-2015

Disproportionality Difference = 29.5%

Source: E3 Alliance analysis of PEIMS data at the UT Austin Education Research Center
What Influences Higher Education Enrollment Rates?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td>$R^2 = 0.0088$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Status</strong></td>
<td>$R^2 = 0.0904$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Low Income</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td>$R^2 = 0.0456$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MBK Pops of Interest</strong></td>
<td>$R^2 = 0.0502$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison Group</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Group</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All values significant at $p < .001$
No Improvement in Proportion of High School Graduates Enrolling in Texas Higher Ed Institutions

Percent Enrolled in Higher Ed in Texas Within One Year of Graduating High School, Class of 2013

Source: E³ Alliance analysis of high school graduation and higher education enrollment data at the UT Austin ERC
No Improvement in Proportion of High School Graduates Enrolling in Higher Ed Institutions

Percent Enrolled in Higher Ed Within One Year of Graduating HS

Source: E3 Alliance analysis of high school graduation and higher education enrollment data at the UT Austin ERC
Enrollment Rates for Low Income High School Grads Increased Through 2011, Then Declined

Percent of Central Texas High School Graduates Enrolled in Texas Higher Education Institutions Within One Year, by Income Status

Source: E³ Alliance analysis of high school graduation and higher education enrollment data at the UT Austin ERC

© 2016 E³ Alliance
Higher Education Enrollment for Central Texas
Low Income Students Lags Behind Texas

Percent of High School Graduates Enrolled in Higher Ed
In Texas Within One Year, by Income Status

- CTX - Non-Low Income
- Texas - Non-Low Income
- CTX - Low Income
- Texas - Low Income

Source: E3 Alliance analysis of high school graduation and higher education enrollment data at the UT Austin ERC
College Enrollment Strongly Related to District’s Proportion of Low-Income Students

Direct-to-College Enrollment Rate, Central Texas, Class of 2013*

Percent of Graduates Enrolled in Postsecondary Institutions

Percent of Low Income Students

Eanes 89%
Lake Travis 80%
Round Rock 68%
Hutto 59%
Pflugerville 59%
Austin 62%
Manor 46%
San Marcos 41%
Del Valle 40%
Leander 68%
Hays 53%
Taylor 48%
Bastrop 40%
R² = 0.8712

Source: E³ Alliance analysis of THECB and NSC data
*Out-of-state enrollment estimated from 2007-2010 rates

© 2016 E³ Alliance
Higher Education Enrollment Among Hispanic Graduates Increased Dramatically Until 2013

Percent Enrolled in Higher Ed in Texas Within One Year of Graduating HS, by Ethnicity, Central Texas

Source: E³ Alliance analysis of high school graduation and higher education enrollment data at the UT Austin ERC
Female HS Graduates are Enrolling at Higher Rates than Males

College Enrollment, Central Texas, Class of 2013

Note: Full-time enrollment defined as either enrolled FT in both semesters or not enrolled in Fall and enrolled FT in Spring. Part-time enrollment includes all other enrollment patterns.
Source: E3 Alliance analysis of PEIMS and higher education data at the UT Austin Education Research Center
More Than Half of CTX students Enrolling in Postsecondary in CTX Enter 4-Year Institutions

Top Ten Higher Education Institutions Serving Central Texas, Central Texas HS Class of 2013 Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College or University</th>
<th>2-Year Institution</th>
<th>4-Year Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austin Community College</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas State University</td>
<td></td>
<td>995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas - Austin</td>
<td></td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M College Station</td>
<td></td>
<td>683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Tech University</td>
<td></td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blinn College</td>
<td></td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas - San Antonio</td>
<td></td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M Corpus Christi</td>
<td></td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Edwards University</td>
<td></td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL=** 3,481 3,702

Note: An additional 1,783 enrolled in other Texas 4-year Institutions, and 505 enrolled in other 2-year institutions.

Source: E³ Alliance analysis of THECB data at the UT Education Research Center
About 7% of Central Texas High School Graduates Enroll in Colleges Outside of Texas Annually

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Graduates</th>
<th>Graduates Enrolled in Higher Ed Outside of Texas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>13,797</td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>13,753</td>
<td>962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>15,151</td>
<td>1,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>15,791</td>
<td>1,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>16,807</td>
<td>1,228</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: E3 Analysis of NSC data obtained from the TEA PEIMS Standard Reports
Higher Education Enrollment Rate
Bright Spots Analysis, Graduating Class of 2014

*Excluding all Juvenile Justice-focused schools and schools with <10% target population*
## Bright Spot Schools – Numbers of Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>District</th>
<th># of Graduate(s)</th>
<th># Target (M&amp;F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LASA</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista Ridge HS</td>
<td>Leander</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCallum HS</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stony Point HS</td>
<td>Round Rock</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manor New Technology High</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmony Science Academy North Austin</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John B Connally HS</td>
<td>Pflugerville</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akins HS</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manor HS</td>
<td>Manor</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis HS</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIPP Austin Collegiate</td>
<td>Charter School</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Focus Metric: Second Year Persistence

- Closely linked to, early indicator of higher education completion
- Biggest drop off in college years typically after first year
- Timing of this indicator allows for more immediate tracking of regional progress
One in Ten Low Income Graduates Complete College Within 6 Years of Finishing High School

High School Graduates at 2-or 4-Year Higher Education Institutions, Central Texas Class of 2008

Percent of High School Graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Income</th>
<th>Non-low Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed within 6 Years</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persisted into or completed by 3rd year</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persisted into or completed by 4th year</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled within 1 year</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Excludes HS grads that did not enroll within one year of graduating from high school.
Note: Completion defined as receiving a certificate, associate's degree, or bachelor's degree
Source: E³ Alliance analysis of data at the UT Austin Education Research Center
Second Year Higher Ed Persistence Rates

Not Improving

Percent of Central Texas HS Grads Enrolled in Texas Higher Ed that Persist Into Second Year, by HS Grad Class

Source: E³ Alliance analysis of data at the UT Austin Education Research Center
Second Year Persistence Consistently Higher At Public 4-year Institutions

Percent of Central Texas HS Grads Enrolled in Texas Higher Ed that Persist Into Second Year, by HS Grad Class

Source: E³ Alliance analysis of data at the UT Austin Education Research Center
Second Year Persistence for Low Income Grads Consistently Lower than for Non-low Income Grads

Percent of Central Texas HS Grads Enrolled in Texas Higher Ed that Persist Into Second Year, by Income Status, By HS Grad Class

Source: E3 Alliance analysis of data at the UT Austin Education Research Center
Regardless of Income Status, Fewer Part-time Enrollees Persist to Second Year

Second Year Persistence in Higher Ed, Central Texas, 2012 HS Graduates

Percent of Higher Ed Enrollees

- PT in Year 1
- FT in Year 1
- PT in Year 2
- FT in Year 2

Low Income

- Low Income
- Non-low Income

Source: E³ Alliance analysis of PEIMS and higher education data at the UT Austin Education Research Center
Black Students in Higher Ed Lowest Persistence Rate

Second Year Persistence in Higher Ed, Central Texas, 2012 HS Graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Persistence Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: E³ Alliance analysis of PEIMS and higher education data at the UT Austin Education Research Center
## Higher Education – 2nd Year Persistence

### Combined 3 years of Class Cohorts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Low-Income Black Male</th>
<th># of Students</th>
<th>% Persist</th>
<th>PP Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>Low-Income Black Male</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low-Income Hispanic Male</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non Low-Income White Female</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordia</td>
<td>Low-Income Black Male</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>&gt;99%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low-Income Hispanic Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>&gt;99%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non Low-Income White Female</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huston Tillotson</td>
<td>Low-Income Black Male</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low-Income Hispanic Male</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non Low-Income White Female</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern</td>
<td>Low-Income Black Male</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>&gt;99%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low-Income Hispanic Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>&gt;99%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non Low-Income White Female</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Edward's</td>
<td>Low-Income Black Male</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low-Income Hispanic Male</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non Low-Income White Female</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas State</td>
<td>Low-Income Black Male</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low-Income Hispanic Male</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non Low-Income White Female</td>
<td>3660</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>Low-Income Black Male</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low-Income Hispanic Male</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non Low-Income White Female</td>
<td>3998</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Possible Next Steps for Committee

1. Review landscape of efforts to build on:
   - Chamber FAFSA Saturdays & DTC70 work
   - ACAN College persistence plan

2. Overlay qualitative data (the *why?*) to understand bright spots, plan for regional change in target metrics

3. Meet with partner districts and IHE’s to share analysis and build action plans to address improvements in target metrics school by school

4. Build regional action plan to move the needle on target metrics
Disproportional Difference Data Analysis: WHY?

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

- Choose range of metrics at each level of the education pipeline
- Determine disproportional difference for all metrics
- ID 2 focus metrics based on disproportional difference & other factors

Support **Action**: Provide comparative data sets to help institutions and our community *move the needle* on these metrics

- What factor(s) most influence metric? (Gender/ethnicity/income)
- Which schools are bright spots across the region?
- Provide districts data to compare schools and focus actions
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