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Potential Outcomes of Promise Programs

- Non-college bound
- Post-Secondary: degree or credential
- Community Development: remain in/return to community
- Pre-K–12

Enter district → Post-Secondary → Community Development → Pre-K–12

Exit district

Leave area → In-migration

New businesses
K-12 Outcomes

• School district enrollment
• Behavior
• Grades / Test scores
• Graduation rates
Enrollment Trends in Kalamazoo Public Schools Before and After the Kalamazoo Promise
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KPS Enrollment, 1987 through 2014

Promise Announced
New entrants to KPS Before and After Promise

NOTE: A new entrant is a student enrolled in KPS as of fall count day in the given school year who was not enrolled as of the fall count day in the preceding year. Average new entrants per year shown.
Exit Rate From KPS Before and After Promise

NOTE: The exit rate is the fraction of students enrolled in a given grade in KPS as of fall count day in the given school year who are not enrolled as of fall count day the following school year. Rates for intervals are (unweighted) averages across years.
TAKEAWAYS

• KPS enrollment has risen 23% since Promise was announced

• Enrollment is stabilizing at mid 1990s levels

• Large jump first year from new entrants

• But most enrollment growth is due to greater retention

Thank you
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Main Findings

- The Kalamazoo Promise college scholarship program significantly improves high school students’ behavior.

- Among African-American high school students, the Promise also significantly improves GPA.
Our research approach

• Exploited aspect of KP that is natural experiment.

• In Nov. 2005, some KPS high school students discovered they were eligible for KP, others ineligible.

• Used data on eligible/ineligible students, from 2 yrs. before (2003-04) to 2 yrs. after (2007-08) KP announcement.

• Do behavior/academics show post-announcement trends for eligible vs. ineligible students that differ from pre-announcement trends?
KP effects on annual days in suspension, all students

Estimated effect of KP on days in suspension

Note: dots indicate statistical significance at 10 percent level, p<0.10
KP effects on annual days in suspension, African-American students

Estimated effect of KP on days in suspension

Note: dots indicate statistical significance at 10 percent level, p<0.10
KP effects on GPA, African-American students

Estimated effect of KP on GPA

Note: dots indicate statistical significance at 10 percent level, p<0.10
Summary

• Strong evidence that generous & broad eligibility Promise programs can improve the behavior of high school students and GPA for at least some groups.

• These estimated effects understate benefits: eligible vs. ineligible effects do not reflect effects on school climate.
El Dorado Promise

**History**
- Announced in January 2007
- Funded by Murphy Oil
- $50 million commitment for 20 years

**Eligibility**
- Universal scholarship
- Continuously enrolled in district since 9th grade
- Graduate from El Dorado High School
- *Once in college: 12 credit hours, 2.0 GPA*

**Scholarship Features**
- Max. amount= max. amount in-state tuition in AR (~$7,888 for 14-15)
- “First dollar”
- Can be used at any 2-yr or 4-yr private or public college/university in country
El Dorado: Enrollment Stabilizes
Post 2007, ELD Enrollment Shifts Upward relative to Trend

Figure 1: Enrollment of El Dorado, Union County, and comparison districts, 1990-91 to 2011-12

Promise begins
K-12 Achievement Results

Positive results

• Compared to similar students across Arkansas, El Dorado students in grades 3-8 grew more on state standardized exams in math and literacy from 2007 through 2012

• Differences are statistically significant and meaningful

• Benefits persist over multiple years

• Benefits driven by high ability students from traditionally under-served (economically-disadvantaged or African-American) student groups
El Dorado: Differential Benefits
Greater Gains by African American Students in Upper Half of Academic Distribution

Figure 3: Percentile rankings on AR Benchmark Literacy Exam for El Dorado students and matched comparison students, 2005-06 to 2010-11

High-Scoring African-American Subgroup:
Gains 12 %ile points on comparison students

Full sample of El Dorado students:
Gains 7 %ile points on comparison students
Summary of Results

**Achievement**

**Positive results**
- Positive overall and yearly effects
- Large subgroup effects for FRL and African-American High-Achieving Students
- Placebo test indicates only math results can be attributed with certainty to Promise

**Graduation**

**Null results**
- Roughly 80% of El Dorado students graduate
- The types of students who benefited most in the upper half of the class
- The types of students at risk of not graduating in bottom 20% of class
What Has Changed in El Dorado Since the Promise?

Conducted focus groups and interviews with El Dorado school district personnel in January 2014

*What policies and efforts are under way in the El Dorado School District to support the Promise?*

*How has the Promise affected the culture of the El Dorado School District?*

**High expectations for all students**
- Internalized
- Felt responsibility to students

**Increased overall and disadvantaged student enrollment in college preparatory coursework**
- Pre-AP training for all secondary teachers
- “*Our AP classes went from country club to parks and rec.*”

**Efforts to increase college awareness**
- Promise backpacks
- College visits
Revisiting the Effect of the Kalamazoo Promise on Student Achievement

By Spencer Kennedy
RESEARCH QUESTIONS

 How did the Kalamazoo Promise affect state exam scores for KPS students relative to comparison districts?

 How were these effects different across student demographics and academic subjects?
**MY DATA**

- Mean Scaled Score CEPI data from MI Department of Education website
- Kalamazoo as well as 5 comparison districts
- 2005-2013
- How did Kalamazoo’s mean score across grades change over time relative to the comparison districts’ score across grades, irrespective of demographic changes?
## Effect of the Promise as a Proportion of a Standard Deviation in Mean Scaled Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Social Studies</th>
<th>Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>0.254***</td>
<td>0.274***</td>
<td>0.333**</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>0.374***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.246***</td>
<td>0.264***</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>0.382***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.266***</td>
<td>0.28***</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.342***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0.158**</td>
<td>0.145**</td>
<td>0.234**</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.263**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0.184*</td>
<td>0.282***</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>0.332**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0.211**</td>
<td>0.264***</td>
<td>0.27*</td>
<td>0.138*</td>
<td>0.376***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>0.163**</td>
<td>0.207***</td>
<td>0.42***</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.348***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-ED</td>
<td>0.345***</td>
<td>0.461***</td>
<td>0.657***</td>
<td>0.47**</td>
<td>0.265***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = significant at 10%  ** = significant at 5%  *** = significant at 1%
GAINS COME FROM A SLOW PROGRESSION

All Students: Math

All Students: Reading

Performance Relative to Comparison Districts

Year

2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013

Performance Relative to Comparison Districts

Year

2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013
GAINS ARE BROADLY DISTRIBUTED
RESULTS

- Broad test score increases across almost all subjects and all demographics relative to comparison districts
- Developed slowly across several years
- Greater increases for non-economically disadvantaged students
What we know: K-12 Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>El Dorado</th>
<th>Kalamazoo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School district enrollment</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades/test scores</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation rate</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Post-secondary Outcomes

- Enrollment
- Persistence
- Completion
Evaluating the Impact of the New Haven Promise

These findings are preliminary and have not been peer reviewed. Please do not cite.

Lindsay Daugherty
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Eligibility Criteria

- NHPS or approved charter school student throughout high school
- New Haven resident
- No expulsions
- 40 hours of community service
- 90% + attendance
- 3.0 GPA in high school
- Complete a Promise scholarship application form
- 2.0 GPA in college

Enrollment length determines award amount:
Students continuously enrolled since K receive 100% of funds
Challenges with the Evaluation

- Difficulty identifying eligible students
- Changing eligibility factors over time requires some analysis to be cohort-specific
- Staged roll-out may mean smaller short-term impacts, making statistically significant effects more challenging to identify
More students met eligibility requirements after the Promise was in place.

Class of 2010: Prior to the Promise, only 28% would have met the eligibility criteria.

Note: Residency and community service hours not examined.
Difference-in-difference estimates relative to pre-Promise cohorts are small and non-significant.
Regression discontinuity estimates are larger and significant.
Summary of findings

- Graduates were more likely to meet eligibility requirements after the Promise was implemented.
- Estimates of the Promise impact on college enrollment are mixed.
- There are a number of limitations to the analysis.
The *Promise* of Place-Based Investment in College Access and Success: Investigating the Pittsburgh Promise

Lindsay Page, Jennifer Iriti, Danielle Lowry & Aaron Anthony
University of Pittsburgh- Learning Research and Development Center
Established 2008
Last dollar
Eligibility criteria rolled in to:
  • 2.5 GPA
  • 90% attendance
  • Reside in city and attend PPS since at least 9th grade
Award rolled in to current:
  • Up to $10,000 per year toward tuition, fees, room & board
  • Attend any PA institution accredited to grant license, diploma, certificate, or degree
Research Question

To what extent and in what ways has the Promise impacted students’ postsecondary enrollment, post-secondary sector attendance patterns, and persistence?
## Summary of Quantitative Impact Analyses: Pittsburgh Promise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Differences-in-Differences Analysis</th>
<th>Discontinuity Analysis (@ full Promise margin)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enroll in college</td>
<td>+5 pp</td>
<td>+5 pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enroll in a four-year college</td>
<td>+5 pp</td>
<td>+8 pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enroll in a PA institution</td>
<td>+11 pp</td>
<td>+5 pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enroll &amp; persist in college for two years</td>
<td>+4 pp</td>
<td>+6 pp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Take-aways

► Both DID and RD analyses reveal positive and significant impacts of the Promise on:
  • Initial college enrollment,
  • Enrollment in PA,
  • Enrollment in a four-year institution, and
  • Enrollment and persistence in the second year of college.

► Preliminary, conservative estimate suggests positive ROI
Effects of the Kalamazoo Promise on Postsecondary Outcomes
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College enrollment by time since high school graduation

Source: Bartik, Hershbein, and Lachowska (2015). Note: Estimates correspond to the second column of table 3 in the paper. Whiskers show 95 percent confidence intervals around estimate in Promise period.
College completion within six years of high school graduation

![Bar chart showing college completion rates before and after the Promise program.](image)

Source: Bartik, Hershbein, and Lachowska (2015). Note: Estimates correspond to the second column of table 6 in the paper. Whiskers show 95 percent confidence intervals around estimate in Promise period.
Any college credential within six years, by subgroup

Source: Bartik, Hershbein, and Lachowska (2015). Note: Estimates correspond to the fifth and sixth columns of table 7 in the paper. Whiskers show 95 percent confidence intervals around estimate in Promise period.
TAKEAWAYS

• Promise boosted immediate college-going at 4-year colleges by 25+%

• Upgrading effect in where students attended

• Degree completion within 6 years jumped by one-third and was mostly due to greater bachelor’s completion

• Degree completion improved the most for students of color and women, and gains were similar across student incomes

Thank you
What we know: Post-secondary Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kalamazoo</th>
<th>New Haven</th>
<th>Pittsburgh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>![Up Arrow]</td>
<td>![Up Arrow]</td>
<td>![Up Arrow]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistence</td>
<td>![Up Arrow]</td>
<td></td>
<td>![Up Arrow]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion</td>
<td>![Up Arrow]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community development impact

- Migration
- Housing
- Job Creation
Student Migration Responses to the Kalamazoo Promise
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RESEARCH QUESTIONS

• Where do new students come from? Where would leavers have gone?

• What are the characteristics of new students? Leavers?

• How does school-sorting behavior change?

• Strength of Promise-type program as economic development tool rests on understanding these relationships
# KPS Enrollment: Inflows and Outflows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other MI district</td>
<td>Other MI district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>-111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside of MI</td>
<td>Outside of MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>Charter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First school entry</td>
<td>Dropout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Graduated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>End-of-year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>482</strong></td>
<td>-265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>% share of difference</strong></th>
<th><strong>% -point change in exit rate</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other MI district</td>
<td>Other MI district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside of MI</td>
<td>Outside of MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>Charter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First school entry</td>
<td>Dropout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Graduated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>End-of-year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td>-3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) More than 1/2 of the 2006 influx came from other MI districts, 1/4 came from outside the state, and the rest were split between charters and privates.

2) Of those from other MI districts, 90 percent came from elsewhere within Kalamazoo County.

3) 80 percent of the *immediate* drop in exits is from K County, but this share falls to 50 percent over time.

4) New students in 2006 were less poor and had higher test scores than previously; this continues in 2007 but not afterward.

5) No evidence that new students in 2006 chose “good” schools.
Say Yes to Education in Buffalo

Bob Bifulco
Ross Rubenstein
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Jud Murchie

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY
Say Yes to Education in Buffalo

- Initiated in 2012-13
- Higher Education Compact - “placed-based” college scholarships
- Supplemented by student supports during elementary and secondary school
  - Summer and after school programs
  - School social workers
  - Assistance with financial aid applications
  - School improvement assistance
Scholarship Eligibility

- Scholarships can be used at:
  - any community college
  - any 4-year college or university in the SUNY system
  - List of 63 private universities and colleges
- “Last dollar” scholarship – makes up gap between need and other financial aid
- Private college income cap of $75,000, flat grant ($5,000) for families above cap
Evaluation of Impacts on:

• Enrollment
• Property Values
• College Matriculation
Enrollment in Buffalo vs. Other Districts in Erie County

One Year Prior to the Syracuse Say Yes

One Year Prior to the Buffalo Say Yes

Normalized Enrollment (K-12)

Buffalo City School District
Other Districts in Erie

School Year


Normalized Enrollment (K-12)
Comparison of Enrollments in Erie and Monroe Counties

Graphs showing the enrollment trends from 2000 to 2014 for Buffalo City School District, Rochester City School District, and Other Districts in Erie and Other Districts in Monroe. The graphs indicate a decline in enrollment over time, with a notable dip in 2008, and a subsequent recovery before declining again.
Estimated Impact of Say Yes on Enrollments in Buffalo

• Increase in enrollment relative to projected trends and relative to nearby suburbs in first three years of Say Yes.
  – 10% (nearly 3000 students) above projected trend in third year

• Enrollment gains relative to suburbs larger in Buffalo than in Rochester

• Increases in enrollments were accompanied by unusually large decreases in private school enrollments in the area.
Median Housing Value Trends in Buffalo and its Suburbs
Estimate Changes in Property Values Relative to Projections in Buffalo

- Housing prices decreased in Buffalo and increased in suburbs following the announcement of Say Yes.
- However, the price decreases start prior to Say Yes.
- After controlling for neighborhood-specific trends, housing price change in Buffalo are not statistically significant.
Reasons why Say Yes might influence matriculation rates

• Compositional Effects

• Behavioral Effects
  – Finance effect
  – Information effect
  – Academic effect
High School Graduates (Among 12th Graders)

College Matriculation (Among 12th Graders)

College Matriculation (Among Graduates)
The graph shows the increasing percentage of high school graduates entering 2-year and 4-year colleges from 2008-09 to 2012-13 cohorts. The percentage for 2-year college (blue line) starts at 26.9 in 2008-09, increases to 27.2 in 2009-10, peaks at 32.5 in 2010-11, drops to 30.0 in 2011-12, and reaches 31.2 in 2012-13. For 4-year college (red line), the percentage remains relatively stable, starting at 30.6 in 2008-09, with slight fluctuations, reaching 32.4 in 2012-13.
Summary of Results on College Matriculation

• Increases in matriculation among 12\textsuperscript{th} graders in first Say Yes year.
  – Increase of about 5-6\% relative to previous cohorts
• Increases were larger for those eligible for Say Yes than those ineligible
• Gains concentrated in 2-year colleges
• Increase likely due to finance and information effects
A Preliminary Look at Enrollment Effects

Ashley Miller
College of the Holy Cross
Presentation to PromiseNet 2015
Research Questions

Question 1
Do Promise programs increase student enrollment?

Question 2
Does the answer depend on program characteristics?
- Eligibility Criteria for Students
  Universal vs. Targeted
- Eligible Post-Secondary Institutions
  Expansive vs. Restrictive
Example: The Kalamazoo Promise (Universal, Expansive)
**Example: The Kalamazoo Promise (Universal, Expansive)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Actual Enrollment</th>
<th>Counterfactual &quot;No Promise&quot; Enrollment</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Time After Promise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>11,483</td>
<td>11,238</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>three years before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>11,062</td>
<td>11,254</td>
<td>-192</td>
<td>two years before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>10,558</td>
<td>11,119</td>
<td>-561</td>
<td>one year before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>10,313</td>
<td>10,592</td>
<td>-279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>11,597</td>
<td>10,735</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>one year after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>11,549</td>
<td>10,082</td>
<td>1,467</td>
<td>two years after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>11,834</td>
<td>9,867</td>
<td>1,967</td>
<td>three years after</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What Promise programs are (currently) included in this study?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Universal (all students eligible)</th>
<th>Targeted (e.g., income or merit requirements)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005 - Kalamazoo Promise in Kalamazoo, MI</td>
<td>2006 - College Bound in Hammond, IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 - El Dorado Promise in El Dorado, AR</td>
<td>2006 - Denver Scholarship Foundation in Denver, CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 - Pontiac Promise Zone in Pontiac, MI</td>
<td>2006 - Pittsburgh Promise in Pittsburgh, PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 - Baldwin Promise in Baldwin, MI</td>
<td>2007- Leopard Challenge in Norphlet, AR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 - Syracuse Say Yes to Education in Syracuse, NY</td>
<td>2007- Northport Promise in Northport, MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011- Benton Harbor Promise in Benton Harbor, MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 - Hazel Park Promise in Hazel Park, MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 - Saginaw Promise in Saginaw, MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expansive Post-Secondary Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005 - Legacy Scholars in Battle Creek, MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 - Garrett County Scholarship Program in Garrett, MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 - Dyer County Promise in Dyer County, TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006- Ventura College Promise in Ventura, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 - Lansing Promise in Lansing, MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 - Tulsa Achieves in Tulsa, OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 - Detroit College Promise in Detroit, MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 - Great River Promise in Mississippi, AR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006- Jackson Legacy in Jackson, MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 - Hopkinsville Rotary Scholars in Hopkinsville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 - Bay Commitment in Bay City, MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 - Peoria Promise in Peoria, IL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restrictive Post-Secondary Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005 - Legacy Scholars in Battle Creek, MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 - Garrett County Scholarship Program in Garrett, MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 - Dyer County Promise in Dyer County, TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006- Ventura College Promise in Ventura, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 - Lansing Promise in Lansing, MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 - Tulsa Achieves in Tulsa, OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 - Detroit College Promise in Detroit, MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 - Great River Promise in Mississippi, AR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results

- Positive Enrollment Effects, On Average
- True for all four “Promise Types”
- Quite a bit of variation
We welcome...

- Questions
- Suggestions
- Comments
- Collaborations

Contact: ashley.ruth.miller@gmail.com
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What migration effects would we expect from Promise programs?

- Directly attracts households with children to Promise area.

- Short-term increase in in-migration, sustained reduction in out-migration. Increased population demand increases housing prices.

- Both positive and negative spillovers on migration of households without children, and on migration in overall local labor market. Positive due to migration boost to area economy, negative due to housing price increases.
This study compares migration in 8 local labor markets that include Promise programs to 120 matched areas.

- 8 Promise areas: Kalamazoo, Pittsburgh, Hammond, El Dorado, Syracuse, Arkadelphia, New Haven, Buffalo.

- Using individual migration data from American Community Survey (1% sample of U.S. population) from 2005-2013, examine Promise effects on in-migration rates and out-migration rates of all households, and households with children, before and after Promise announcement, for local labor market areas and for smaller PUMA areas of about 100,000 people.

- Summary: Sizable persistent effects of Promise programs in reducing out-migration.
Out-migration dynamics before and after Promise

Out-migration as % of relevant population

Out-migration of all households, local labor market
Out-migration of households with children, local labor market
Out-migration of households with children, area around Promise

Years relative to Promise announcement
Population and housing price effects of Promise programs

- Pop effect on area surrounding Promise for households with children: 6.0%
- Pop effect on local labor market for households with children: 2.5%
- Pop effect for all local households in Promise area: 1.7%
- Inferred pop effect for households with kids in Promise area: 15.9%
- Predicted housing price effects on local labor market: 1.0%
- Predicted housing price effect on Promise area: 7.3%
- LeGower-Walsh housing price effect in Promise area: 9%
Summary

• Large effects of Promise programs on local labor and housing markets.

• For example, Kalamazoo Promise costs around $11 million annually. Inferred property value increase for Kalamazoo County of 1% increases property values by about $163 million.

• As another example, the 1.7% boost to local labor market population would be expected to boost employment by similar %. For Kalamazoo County, this corresponds to job creation of about 1,900 jobs. Cost per job is around $6,000 (=$11M/1900).
What we know: Community Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Buffalo</th>
<th>Kalamazoo</th>
<th>Syracuse</th>
<th>Cross-site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migration</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Up Arrow" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Up Arrow" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Up Arrow" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Up Arrow" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Up Arrow" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Up Arrow" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Creation</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Question Mark" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Question Mark" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Question Mark" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Question Mark" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Promise Monitoring and Evaluation Framework

- Created by Jen Iriti and Michelle Miller-Adams with support from Lumina Foundation
- Housed on PromiseNet and Upjohn Institute websites
- Includes information on:
  - Theory of change
  - Implementation timeline
  - Documenting programmatic interventions
  - Identifying appropriate indicators
  - Data dashboard examples
  - Timing issues – what to measure when
  - Research briefs and links to full research papers
Identifying Appropriate Indicators

• Tool for Promise stakeholders trying to understand what indicators they should track

• Two types of indicators
  – Essential to success of a Promise
  – Likely to be affected by a Promise

• Includes 30 indicators grouped by outcome area
Identifying Appropriate Indicators

Click here to access indicators in each category, or download a PDF of the entire indicators table.

Promise Program Outcome Areas
Identifying Appropriate Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>SUGGESTED INDICATOR</th>
<th>RATIONALE</th>
<th>POSSIBLE DATA SOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School attendance rates</td>
<td>• Fraction of K-3rd grade students with &gt;90% attendance&lt;br&gt;• Fraction of 6-8th grade students with &lt;20% absenteeism&lt;br&gt;• Fraction of 9th-12th grade students missing fewer than 10% of school days per year</td>
<td>School attendance predicts academic success.&lt;br&gt; ✓ In grades K-3, students absent fewer than 10% of the time are more likely to be promoted on time and receive higher grades in core subject areas.&lt;br&gt; ✓ In middle grades, &lt;20% absenteeism is correlate with on time high school graduation.&lt;br&gt; ✓ In high school, missing no more than 10% of school days per year is associated with on-track graduation</td>
<td>Existing: School district administrative records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading proficiency by 3rd grade</td>
<td>• Fraction of 3rd grade students who meet a particular cut point for proficiency&lt;br&gt;• Fraction of schools in which 75%+ students met a particular cut point for proficiency</td>
<td>Reading by 3rd grade predicts academic success in middle and high school.&lt;br&gt; Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2010; Hernandez, 2012</td>
<td>Existing: Standardized reading proficiency assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passing Algebra I in 8th grade and Algebra II in 9th grade</td>
<td>• Fraction of 8th students taking and passing Algebra I&lt;br&gt;• Fraction of 9th grade students taking and passing Algebra II</td>
<td>Passing Algebra I in 8th grade and Algebra II in 9th grade is inversely correlated with remediation at the postsecondary level.&lt;br&gt; Kurlaender, Reardon, &amp; Jackson, 2008; CRIS Annenberg Institute for School Reform, 2010; Klepfer &amp; Hull, 2012; Lee, 2012 &amp; 2013</td>
<td>Existing: District administrative data for course taking and student grades</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you for listening!

- Join us tomorrow for Research Roundtable (Session I) and Program Evaluation: Build It From the Beginning (Session III)
- Questions / comments about specific presentations should be sent to individual researchers.
- Questions / comments about the Promise Research Consortium should be directed to Michelle Miller-Adams miller-adams@upjohn.org / 269-385-0436
- Thank you to the W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research and Lumina Foundation for their support of the Promise Research Consortium.