Identifying a Clearer Pathway

How to Move from Data Collection to Policy and Improved Practice
Statewide Longitudinal Education Data System (SLEDS)

- MN Department of Education
- MN Office of Higher Education
- MN Department of Employment & Economic Development

sleds.mn.gov
Early Childhood Longitudinal Data System (ECLDS)

- MN Department of Education
- MN Department of Health
- MN Department of Human Services

eclds.mn.gov
Panelists

- Susan Brower, Minnesota State Demographic Center
- Jennifer Trost, University of St. Thomas
- Cael Warren, Wilder Research
- Stephanie Hogenson, Children’s Defense Fund of Minnesota
Questions

• Were there surprises in your analysis of SLEDS/ECLDS data? Did the data tell a story you didn’t expect? And impact a policy in a way you didn’t expect?

• What additional data collection or data sources would move your understanding to the next level?
Thank you!
Identifying a Clearer Pathway: How to Move from Data Collection to Policy and Improved Practice

Susan Brower, Minnesota State Demographer

October 18, 2017
Minnesota’s Attainment Goal

Minnesota Laws 2015, Chapter 69, Article 3, Section 25

• The number of Minnesota residents ages 25 to 44 years, who hold postsecondary degrees or certificates, should be increased to at least 70 percent by 2025.

Meeting and maintaining the goal of 70 percent of Minnesota residents ages 25 to 44 years, holding a postsecondary degree or certificate will likely be difficult without achieving attainment rates that are comparable across all race and ethnicity groups.
The Census Bureau collects data on post-secondary degrees, but not certificates.

Educational Attainment of MN 25-44 year olds, 2015

- Doctoral degree
- Professional degree beyond a bachelor's degree
- Master's degree
- Bachelor's degree
- Associate's degree, type not specified
- 1 or more years of college credit, no degree
- Some college, but less than 1 year
- GED or alternative credential
- Regular high school diploma
- 12th grade, no diploma

Source: ipums.org
“Certificates” for the purpose of the educational attainment goal refers to a postsecondary award, certificate, or diploma at a level less than a baccalaureate degree, which is not an associate degree. This group may include “awards”, “certificates” or “diplomas” depending on the naming convention used by a specific institution.
• Solving the “some college, no degree” problem
  • Isolating certificate completers from currently enrolled & non-completers

• Cohort analysis/Lifetable approach
  • In the absence of survey data, utilize historical data to model the cohort and behavior of interest
  • Determine the number of certificates awarded annually and age them forward
• Minnesota State Colleges and Universities (MnSCU)/SLEDS
  • Sub-Associate certificates awarded 1990 and later
  • Shortest program 5 credit CNA

• Minnesota Office of Higher Education
  • Certificates awarded 2006 and later
Assumptions

• **Mortality (death)**
  
  • The probability of survival to 2010 is based on an annual series of age-specific mortality rates from Minnesota Department of Health death records and U.S. Census Bureau population data for the period 1989 to 2009.

• **Migration**
  
  • Age-specific domestic net migration rates from the U.S. Census Bureau to account for the in- and out-migration of certificate holders across state lines. Age-specific rates of net migration are available for 1990, 2000, and 2010 for those with some college education.

• **Further educational attainment**
  
  • A series of probabilities of educational advancement to an associate’s degree (or higher) for each year after the certificate is obtained.

• **Age**
Percent of Certificate Completers Earning an Associate Degree or Higher by Year between Certificate and Subsequent Degree, Minnesota 1990-2015 MnSCU only

Lines represent calendar year initial certificate completed
Percent of MN 25-44 year-olds holding a certificate, 2010

- American Indian: 8%
- Asian: 4%
- Black: 6%
- Multiracial: 7%
- White: 7%
- Hispanic: 4%
- Unknown: -
- All: 7%
Minnesotans Age 25-44
Percentage with a Certificate or Higher Degree
2011-2015 (Centered on 2013), Basic Race Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>22%-26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>26%-29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>32%-35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>55%-60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>60%-61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>63%-66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>65%-66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Minnesota State Demographer, Minnesota Office of Higher Education
Evaluating Early Childhood Program Access
An Analysis of Participation Data for Lower Income Children, Children of Color and American Indian Children from the ECLDS.

Stephanie Hogenson, Outreach Director
shogenson@childrensdefense.org
Wednesday, October 17, 2017
Children’s Defense Fund-MN
a strong, effective, independent voice for all children

Legislative Advocacy:
• Early Childhood
• Health Care
• Child Care
• Child Well-Being
• Economic Security

Youth Leadership:
• Freedom Schools®
• Young Advocate Leadership Training® (YALT)
• Beat the Odds®

Research & Education:
• Issue Research
• KIDS COUNT®

Outreach & Organizing:
• Bridge to Benefits®
• Voices & Choices for Children
Annie E. Casey Foundation (AECF) granted funds and technical assistance through Child Trends to four KIDS COUNT organizations to partner with their state’s integrated early childhood data system in order to produce a research product that informs and influences early care and education policy in their states. CDF-MN collaborated with MDE to gain comprehensive understanding of the ECLDS system, data and the system’s governance and structure.
Why focus on early childhood program access?

• Pivotal point in statewide policy discussion: No longer should we invest in early childhood programs, but how and in which programs should we invest?

• Access to quality early childhood programs shows long-term improvements to child development and returns on investment and when targeted to children with increased developmental risks is more beneficial individually and systemically.

• Understand how children are accessing and layering our array of early childhood programs
Why focus on lower income children?

High-quality early education generates returns on investment up to $16 for every $1 spent. Recent targeted investments have made progress, but there is still work to do.

**LOW INCOME CHILDREN AGE 3 AND 4 NOT IN SCHOOL**

- **64%** (2005-09)
- **61%** (2010-14)
- **60%** (2011-15)
Why focus on children of color and American Indian children?

CHILD POPULATION GROWTH FROM 2005–2015

- +43% Two or More Races
- +38% Hispanic/Latino
- +30% Black
- +26% Asian
- -9% White
Disparities in opportunity access and outcomes start early.
Purpose of Analysis

• Spread awareness of the ECLDS

• Share research on importance of early childhood program access

• Provide data and context around how young children of color, American Indian children and children accessing MFIP and Food Programs access early childhood programs included on the ECLDS

• Provide recommendations to increase access, target outreach, and support early childhood development through policy initiatives, program improvements and best practices. Recommendations were informed by the Voices & Choices Coalition, advocates and early childhood program administrators and staff.
Key Take Away: Only 40% of 2015 Kindergartners Accessed an EC Program on the ECLDS Prior to Kindergarten

Figure 1: Total Kindergartners Accessing Early Childhood Programs Included in the ECLDS

- Total Kindergartners: 68,797
- Known*: 41,478 (60.3%)
- Unknown**: 27,319 (39.7%)

Participation by Program as a Percent of All 2015 Kindergartners:
- CCAP: 10,547 (15.3%)
- ECFE: 1,947 (2.8%)
- ECSE: 8,812 (12.8%)
- District Preschool: 12,147 (17.7%)
Why are so few young children accessing early childhood programs?

PERCENT OF INCOME ELIGIBLE CHILDREN NOT SERVED BY SUBSIDIZED EARLY EDUCATION PROGRAMS

- 83% Are not receiving Early Learning Scholarships
- 52% Are not enrolled in Head Start
- 94% Are not enrolled in Early Head Start

CHILDREN NOT ENROLLED IN CCAP DUE TO LACK OF FUNDING

- Ages 0-12
  - Income eligible: 88%
  - Income and work eligible: 78%

- Ages 0-5
  - Income eligible: 84%
  - Income and work eligible: 70%
Key Take Away: Children Who Accessed MFIP & Food Programs were more likely to access EC Program on the ECLDS

68%

50%

29%
Key Take Away: CCAP is highest used EC Program for lower income children

Children accessing MFIP and another EC Program

Children accessing Food Programs and EC Program
Key Take Away: EC Participation Varies Significantly by Race/Ethnicity and by Program

Asian and Hispanic/Latino children are least likely to participate in one of the EC programs included on ECLDS. Nationally, Asian children typically participate at higher rates, while Hispanic/Latino at lower rates.

Black children are the most likely and their participation is driven by high rates of CCAP participation.
How are we using the analysis?

• Presenting at local events across the state on the analysis and local-level data.

• Sharing with legislators, advocates and others in early childhood field to develop understanding of the data and influence implementation of recommendations.

• Sharing with national interests through Annie E. Casey Foundation and Child Trends (they just made a video for social media and other uses on our analysis)

• Continuing to use ECLDS data to inform trends in early childhood and social program participation.
Thank you!

Stephanie Hogenson
Outreach Director
shogenson@childrensdefense.org
651-855-1175
Dual Enrollment and Students of Color

Jennifer Trost, PhD
• High School graduates for the class of 2012
  - Student Demographics
  - High School characteristics
  - Whether or not student enrolled in PSEO or Concurrent Enrollment
Found that students of color did not access dual enrollment at same level as White students.
Added a qualitative portion
Served as K12 Partnerships at Century College
What I did differently because of my research?

- Scrutinized the law
- Brought race/ethnicity to the forefront
- Advocated for high schools
The Effects
Increased number of class options and diversity of high schools
Increased number of students of color and women participating
SLEDS = Hypothesis confirmed = Institutional policy changed...
Using SLEDS Data for a Cradle-to-College Intervention: The Northside Achievement Zone

Cael Warren

Wilder Research
Northside Achievement Zone (NAZ)

- Aims to end inter-generational poverty and close the achievement gap in North Minneapolis
- A whole-family initiative
- A collaboration of 25+ partners including schools, career support orgs, out-of-school and early childhood programs, prenatal services, etc.
- A federal Promise Neighborhood (2011-16)
- Relies on data-based solutions and ongoing learning
NAZ Academic Data Needs

- NAZ gathers academic data from Pre-K through post-secondary

- We’ve used two kinds of SLEDS data:
  - Aggregate (school-level) data
  - De-identified individual-level data
Promise Neighborhood Reporting: School-Level SLEDS Data

- Met federal reporting requirements
  - Post-secondary enrollment
  - Post-secondary enrollment without need for developmental (remedial) education
  - Post-secondary completion time
- Set a baseline for post-secondary outcomes out of NAZ partner high schools
- (Eventually) see where NAZ is having a population-level impact and where changes are needed
Targeting NAZ Efforts: Individual-Level SLEDS Data

- Identify the groups of students who need help
  - Which groups of students don’t enroll in post-secondary education?
  - Which groups of students don’t complete post-secondary education?
  - Which groups of students require developmental education after enrolling in post-secondary education?
Thank you!

Cael Warren
Wilder Research
cael.warren@wilder.org