


# Postsecondary Enrollment for 2010 Graduates: District Report

## How many AISD graduates enrolled in postsecondary education?

**Historical Perspective.** Overall postsecondary enrollment increased slowly over time until 2010. The drop in enrollment this year follows a national trend (see sidebar for more information). Enrollment at 4-year colleges fell more than did enrollment at 2-year colleges.



**About This Report.** This is the district report on postsecondary enrollment for 2010 graduates. [The Department of Research and Evaluation](#) (DRE), a department within Austin Independent School District's (AISD) Office of Accountability, creates district-wide and campus-specific reports on postsecondary enrollment annually and publishes them on line. This report speaks to goal 3, measurable outcome 8 of the district's [Strategic Plan](#) (see page 6).

**Understanding the Data.** This report presents outcomes based on [National Student Clearinghouse](#) (NSC) data, which covers 93% of nationwide enrollment. Data from NSC were linked to the 2010 graduate records submitted to the Texas Education Agency's (TEA) Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) (N = 4,073).


**2010 Graduates.** The majority of 2010 graduates were enrolled in a postsecondary institution by spring 2011. Of those enrolled, most were at in-state institutions; more than half were at 4-year institutions; and over 61% of all enrollees attended a local university.

**Historical Perspective.** This graph includes enrollment records for the fall and spring following graduation. Enrollment for fall was 56%. The enrollment rate increased by 6 percentage points from fall to spring.

Two reasons might explain the drop in enrollment from 2009. The [Pew Research Center](#) found families were reluctant to borrow money for college because of low confidence in postsecondary education. In addition, [USA Today](#) reported colleges and universities have imposed enrollment caps in response to state budget cuts, despite an increase in applicants.

**2010 Graduates.** Students who were not confirmed as enrolled either were not enrolled at all or were enrolled in a postsecondary institution that does not provide data to NSC.

An institution was considered "local" if it was within 60 miles of the center of the City of Austin.



### Where did graduates enroll?


Campus Name	Number	All	In-state
Austin Community College	1,046	26%	48%
Texas State University - San Marcos	219	5%	10%
University of Texas at Austin	194	5%	9%
University of Texas - San Antonio	129	3%	6%
Texas A&M University	97	2%	4%
St. Edwards University	64	2%	2%
University of North Texas	43	1%	2%
University of Houston	25	1%	1%
Blinn College	22	1%	1%
Texas Christian University	22	1%	1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,861</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>85%</b>

**Ten Most Common Colleges for Enrollment.** Nearly half of all graduates who enrolled in postsecondary education were found at 10 colleges. Nearly half the students who enrolled in a Texas college were found at Austin Community College.

Other colleges that enrolled at least 15 AISD graduates, but are not shown here, were Texas A&M University at Corpus Christi, Huston-Tillotson University and Southwestern University.

### How did postsecondary enrollment compare for 2010 and 2009 graduates?

**Comparison by High School.** Postsecondary enrollment decreased for 10 out of 13 high schools. Garza, Travis, and Eastside experienced a slight increase in overall enrollment. An increase in 4-year enrollment led to the slight increase in overall enrollment for Eastside graduates. (Note: Eastside students graduated from Green Tech High School on the Eastside Memorial campus). For most campuses, the decrease in overall enrollment was due to lower enrollment at 4-year colleges. Five campuses experienced an increase in 2-year enrollment: Austin, Bowie, Garza, Reagan and Travis.




## How did postsecondary enrollment vary by student demographic groups?

**Enrollment by Demographics.** Postsecondary enrollment in 2010 decreased for most demographic groups compared to 2009. Enrollment for most groups fell between 1 and 4 percentage points. Limited English proficient (LEP) graduates experienced the greatest decrease in enrollment rates with a drop of 13 percentage points in overall enrollment. This decrease was largely a result of lower enrollment at 2-year institutions.

Enrollment rates did not fall for all groups. Special education graduates experienced an increase in 2-year and 4-year enrollment. The other exception was American Indian / Alaska Native (AI/AN) graduates, whose increase in overall enrollment was driven by 4-year enrollment.

Two new indicators were added this year. Data suggest a bias against students' self-report as being economically disadvantaged between junior and senior years, so an indicator that captures economically disadvantaged status at anytime between 8th and 12th grades was added. The number of 2010 graduates who were ever economically disadvantaged (2,227) was 23% larger than the number of 2010 graduates who were economically disadvantaged in their senior year (1,816). Even with the larger numerator, the percentage of "ever economically disadvantaged" 2010 graduates enrolled in college was only 1 percentage point greater than the percentage who were "economically disadvantaged in senior year."

Also added was an indicator that captures whether a student was ever classified as an immigrant in district or state data systems. To say a student was an immigrant at some point during his or her tenure in AISD does not mean the student was undocumented. However, an immigrant indicator is the best proxy for documentation status in available data sources. It is included here because campus staff have expressed a need to learn about the postsecondary circumstances of undocumented students.



\*AI/AN data are not reported by 2- or 4-year colleges because enrollment was <5 students in 2009 and 2010.

## How do campuses use postsecondary enrollment data?



**Data-use Seminars.** In the fall and spring of 2010-2011, DRE staff provided interactive seminars for campus leadership teams, which included administrators, school improvement facilitators, counselors, Project ADVANCE staff, advisory co-chairs, and teacher leaders. These seminars were delivered to all comprehensive high school campuses in support of Goal 3 in the district [Strategic Plan](#) (see page 6).

The purpose of the seminars was to provide data to improve college and career preparation for all AISD students. The seminars were designed to follow best practices for using data and were expected to be the first of ongoing, data-driven conversations about college and career preparation. Key data sources included the High School Exit Survey, NSC data and Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) data.

During these conversations, campus staff provided feedback to DRE about reports related to postsecondary enrollment. They shared thoughts on the utility of historically reported data and provided suggestions on new data that might inform their practices.

Thus, this report includes data points not previously included in analyses of postsecondary enrollment in an attempt to meet campus needs and to inform best practices. For example, this report includes enrollment by predictors of postsecondary enrollment, the aspiration gap by grade point average and the aspiration gap by race / ethnicity.

**Report on Data-use Seminars.** For a full report on the data-use seminar, see the [district summary](#) (report #10.28). This report includes a review of postsecondary preparation activities on campuses, including successes, promising practices, challenges and action items.




**Other Data-use Seminar Materials.** You can view the data-use (Power Point) presentation on the [DRE reports website](#) (#10.35).


Other documents used in the seminars included reports [#07.85](#), [#09.41RB](#) and [#09.42](#).

## Did enrollment vary by “predictors of postsecondary enrollment”?

**Previous Predictors of Enrollment.** DRE modeled a study from the [Chicago Consortium of School Research](#) using data from the AISD Class of 2007 to learn what student characteristics predicted enrollment in a postsecondary institution ([#07.85](#)). This figure lists the top predictors from that study, applied to the Class of 2010. These characteristics appeared to remain strong influences on enrollment. Clear differences were found between students who met these criteria (shown as yes) and those who did not (shown as no). A greater proportion of yes than no graduates enrolled in postsecondary institutions. See Technical Documentation (report 10.xx) for a complete description of these indicators.



### What was the “Aspiration Gap” for the Class of 2010?





**Aspiration Gap.** As found in previous years, survey data suggest there was an aspiration gap for this graduating class. The aspiration gap is the gap between students’ intentions regarding college enrollment and their actual college enrollment. Although there is a gap between intention and submitting an application, the gap between acceptance and enrollment may be of greater concern.

\*Data are from the 2010 High School Exit Survey, a self-report survey for seniors. These data represent graduates who completed the survey (n = 3,370). The 4-year and 2-year bars for *intended*, *applied* and *accepted* were not mutually exclusive.

**Aspiration Gap by Grade Point Average (GPA).** Most students intended to enroll in college, but many did not progress towards enrolment. Stark differences were found by quartile rank based on graduates’ 4-point scale GPA.

A difference of 14 percentage points was found between intention and enrollment for 1st-quartile graduates, graduates with the highest GPA in the district. This gap increased with quartile rank to a gap of 38 percentage points for 4th-quartile students.



**Aspiration Gap by Race / Ethnicity.** Little difference was found between race / ethnic groups regarding intention to enroll in college and in application rates. Gaps emerged between groups with respect to preparation activities, acceptance rates and enrollment rates. In particular, non-Hispanic Blacks and Hispanics took college entrance exams at much lower rates than did other groups.

A 17 percentage point difference was found between intention and enrollment for non-Hispanic White students. This gap was 23 and 31 percentage points, respectively, for Black and Hispanic graduates.

## Additional Information About this Report

**About the Department of Research and Evaluation.** The Department of Research and Evaluation (DRE) was established in 1972 to support program decision and strategic planning in the district. The department is housed in the Office of Accountability and is charged with evaluating federal, state, and locally funded programs in AISD. DRE staff integrate best and innovative evaluation practices with educational and institutional knowledge. DRE staff work with program staff throughout the district to design and conduct formative and summative program evaluations. DRE’s methods for evaluating programs vary depending on the research question, program design, and reporting requirements. The evaluations report objectively about program implementation and outcomes, and serve to inform program staff, decision makers, and planners in the district. [DRE reports can be accessed online.](#)

**About the Author.** Ginger Gossman completed a Ph.D. in demography at the University of Texas at Austin in 2006. Her academic interests include maternal and child health, secondary education, infectious disease, and obesity research. She has presented her research findings at regional and national conferences and has been a member of the American Evaluation Association since 2007. Ginger joined the Research and Evaluation team in September 2008.

**Funding Sources.** Funding for this report was provided by district local and Smaller Learning Community grant funds. NSC data were obtained at no cost to AISD through a grant from the TEA.

**District Strategic Plan.** This report speaks to goal 3, measurable outcome 8. **Goal 3:** All students will graduate college and career ready. **Measurable Outcome 8:** Postsecondary enrollment.

**Technical Notes.** This report used data provided by the NSC on June 14, 2011. NSC data covers 93% of nationwide enrollment. A list of participating colleges is on the [NSC website](#), under “Resource Center.” The U.S. Department of Education’s Family Policy Compliance Office (FPCO) has certified that NSC practices are [compliant with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act \(FERPA\)](#). These data included a unique record for every occurrence of enrollment per semester, quarter or year. The unit of enrollment time varied by institution and depended on program/degree offerings.

Data were parsed down to a single record per student using the following sequenced selections: (1) fall over spring semester, (2) 4-year over 2-year institution, (3) full-time over part-time, (4) latest enrollment begin date, and (5) latest enrollment end date. Records for enrollment in Summer 2009 only were considered *unmatched* to align reporting with best practices. Enrollment records for students identified by NSC as withdrawn, deceased or on leave of absence were also considered *unmatched* in these analyses. All methods followed NSC practices where known.

Data from NSC were then matched to AISD student files from the 2010 AISD student graduate records submitted to TEA’s for PEIMS. This file includes students who graduated at any point during the 2009-2010 academic year. Records were matched using a unique numeric identifier. Note that NSC does not use these unique identifiers for its purposes. NSC matches students to enrollment records using name, dates of birth and graduation date. The identifier is retained in the data to allow matching to district records. Student demographic and academic data were taken from district student information systems. Other data sources included the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS), High School Exit Survey, SAT, ACT, and FAFSA records. Results were not reported when there were fewer than five students in a cell in accordance with FERPA guidelines.

**SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS**  
Meria J. Carstarphen Ed.D.

**OFFICE OF ACCOUNTABILITY**  
William H. Caritj, M.Ed.

**DEPARTMENT OF PROGRAM EVALUATION**  
Holly Williams, Ph.D.  
Karen Looby, Ph.D.

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

Mark Williams, President • Vincent Torres, M.S., Vice President  
Lori Moya, Secretary • Cheryl Bradley • Annette LoVoi • Christine Brister •  
Robert Schneider • Tamala Barksdale • Sam Guzman

