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• The Steve Fund has created a **special keyword**, STEVE, that young people of color can text to 741741 to connect with a trained crisis counselor, 24/7, confidentially, for free.

• We have reached over half a million students and our usage has increased 300% in 2017.

• Join us by emailing programs@stevefund.org with the subject line “STEVE Keyword Partnership”
Steve Fund Supports for Colleges
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The American Dream of Upward Mobility?
Probability that a Child Born to Parents in the Bottom Fifth Reaches the Top Fifth

USA
- Chetty, Hendren, Kline, Saez 2014
- 7.5%

UK
- Blanden and Machin 2008
- 9.0%

Denmark
- Boserup, Kopczuk, and Kreiner 2013
- 11.7%

Canada
- Corak and Heisz 1999
- 13.5%

→ Chances of achieving the “American Dream” are almost two times higher in Canada than in the U.S.
Measuring College Attendance

- Data source: de-identified data from 1996-2014 income tax returns

- Primary sample: all children in 1980-82 birth cohorts claimed as dependents by tax filers in the U.S. (11 million children)

- All Title IV institutions report student attendance to IRS on Form 1098-T
  - 1098-T data covers 95% of enrolled students; students who pay no tuition sometimes not covered
  - Use Dept. of Ed data (NSLDS) on students receiving Pell grants to identify these students

- Baseline: define college attendance as most-attended college between ages 19-22
Parent Household Income Distribution (AGI during kid ages 15-19)
For Parents with Children in 1980 Birth Cohort

20th Percentile = $25k
Median = $60k
60th Percentile = $74k
80th Percentile = $111k
99th Percentile = $512k
Distribution of Children’s Individual Labor Earnings at Age 34
1980 Birth Cohort

- 20th Percentile = $1k
- Median = $28k
- 80th Percentile = $58k
- 99th Percentile = $197k
Define a college’s mobility rate (MR) as the fraction of its students who come from bottom quintile and end up in top quintile.

\[
\text{Mobility Rate} = \frac{\text{Success Rate}}{\text{Access}}
\]

\[
\frac{P(\text{Child in Q5} \& \text{Parent in Q1})}{P(\text{Child in Q5| Parent in Q1}) \cdot P(\text{Parent in Q1})}
\]

E.g., SUNY-Stony Brook: 8.4% = 51.2% \times 16.4%

The mobility rate should be interpreted as an accounting measure rather than a causal effect.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mobility Rate</th>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Success Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cal State University – LA</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pace University – New York</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SUNY – Stony Brook</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Technical Career Institutes</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>University of Texas – Pan American</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CUNY System</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Glendale Community College</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>South Texas College</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cal State Polytechnic – Pomona</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>University of Texas – El Paso</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Correlates of Top 20% Mobility Rate

- College Type
  - Public
  - For-Profit
  - 4-Year College

- Selectivity
  - Rejection Rate
  - Rejection Rate, Public
  - Rejection Rate, Private

- Institutional Characteristics
  - Enrollment
  - Completion Rate
  - Avg. Faculty Salary
  - STEM Major Share
  - Instr. Expenditures per Student
  - Net Cost for Poor
  - Sticker Price

- Expend. & Cost
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## Top 10 Community Colleges by Mobility Rate
Share of Students Coming from Bottom 20% and Reaching Top 20%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mobility Rate</th>
<th>Access   x</th>
<th>Success Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Glendale Community College</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Laredo Community College</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Texas State Tech. - Harlingen</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CUNY Junior System</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Southwest Texas Junior College</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Imperial Valley College</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pasadena City College</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>El Paso Community College</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Reid State Technical College</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lamar Institute Of Technology</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Mobility Rate</td>
<td>Access x Success Rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mitchell Technical Institute</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>North Dakota State Col. Of Science</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ohlone College</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Northern Virginia Community Col.</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Warren County Community College</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Montgomery College</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Odessa College</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bergen Community College</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Wharton County Junior College</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Northwest Iowa Community College</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Top 10 Community Colleges by Top-60% Success Rate

Probability of Reaching Top 60% if Coming from Bottom 20%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mobility Rate</th>
<th>Access x</th>
<th>Success Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>North Dakota State Col. Of Science</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ohlone College</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mitchell Technical Institute</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Northern Virginia Community Col.</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Southeast Technical Institute</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Montgomery College</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bergen Community College</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Colorado Northwestern Comm. Col.</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Central Texas College</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Georgia Highlands College</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STEM Share and Top 60% Success Rates among Community Colleges

- **STEM = 9.9%**
- **STEM = 9.6%**

Pct. of Degree Awards by Major in 2000 (%)

- All Other Community Colleges
- High Success Rate Community Colleges

Major Categories:
- STEM
- Trades and Personal Services
- Public and Social Services
- Health and Medicine
- Business
- Social Sciences
- Multi/Interdisciplinary Studies
- Arts and Humanities
Fraction of Success Stories by School Type
Share Among Children in Top 20% with Parents in Bottom 20%
Mobility Rates and Expenditures per Student

Ivy-Plus Colleges
Median Instr. Exp = $42,688/student

Top 10% MR colleges
Median Instr. Exp = $4,980/student

Success Rate: $P(\text{Child in Q5 | Par in Q1})$

Access: Percent of Parents in Bottom Quintile
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Trends in Low-Income Access from 2000-2011 at Selected Colleges

Percent of Parents in the Bottom Quintile

Year When Child was 20


Glendale CC
SUNY Stony Brook
UC Berkeley
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Downloading the data


- College specific reports (three-page PDFs): https://sites.google.com/site/dannyyagan/college
Richard Kahlenberg
Senior Fellow
The Century Foundation
Giving Community Colleges the Resources They Need

Association of Community College Trustees Invitational Symposium on Student Success: Economic Inequality
Las Vegas, NV
September 24, 2017

Richard D. Kahlenberg
Senior Fellow, The Century Foundation
Century Foundation’s Two-Part Initiative


Economic Stratification in Higher Education

Socioeconomic Distribution at Colleges by Selectivity, 2006

Note: Some columns do not total 100 due to rounding.
Source: Anthony P. Carnevale and Jeff Strohl, “How Increasing College Access Is Increasing Inequality, and What to Do about It,” in Rewarding Strivers: Helping Low-Income Students Succeed in College, ed. Richard D. Kahlenberg (New York: Century. Foundation Press, 2010), 137, Figure 3.7 (using National Educational Longitudinal Study data).
Degree Goals vs. Completion

Degree Goals vs. Completion for First-time Beginning Community College Students, 2004-2009

Aspire to a bachelor's degree: 81.4%
Bachelor's degree: 11.6%
Associate's degree: 14.5%
Certificate: 8.5%
Fail to earn degree or certificate: 65.5%

Inequality in Higher Education Spending

Per-Pupil Total Operating Expenditures, FY 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Spending per FTE student (in 2013 dollars)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private research sector</td>
<td>$71,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public research sector</td>
<td>$39,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private bachelor's sector</td>
<td>$29,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private master's sector</td>
<td>$22,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public master's sector</td>
<td>$19,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public community college sector</td>
<td>$14,090</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Education and Related Spending (Excluding Research)

**Per-Pupil Education and Related Spending, FY 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Spending per FTE student (in 2013 dollars)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private research sector</td>
<td>$37,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private bachelor's sector</td>
<td>$23,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private master's sector</td>
<td>$18,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public research sector</td>
<td>$17,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public master's sector</td>
<td>$13,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public community college sector</td>
<td>$10,804</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Education and related expenses (E&R) is a measure of institutional spending that excludes spending on auxiliary enterprises (such as hospitals) and sponsored research.

Large Subsidies for Private Four-Year Colleges

*Does not include subsidies based on property tax exemptions

**Based on 2013 endowments: high endowments (HE) average, $1,500,000,000; medium endowments (ME), $15,000,000; low endowments (LE), $2,000,000

Source: Jorge Klor de Alva and Mark Schneider, Rich Schools, Poor Students: Tapping Large University Endowments to Improve Student Outcome (Nexus Research and Policy Center, April 2015), 1,7.
Increases in Spending In Last Decade

Inequality in Faculty

Full-time vs. Part-time Faculty, AY 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Full-time faculty</th>
<th>Part-time faculty/graduate assistants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Bachelor's Sector</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Master's Sector</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Research Sector</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Research Sector</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Master's Sector</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Community College Sector</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diminished Outcomes

Estimated Effects on Bachelor's Degree Attainment of Attending a Two-year College Instead of a Four-year College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Percentage Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds, 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>-24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>-31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long &amp; Kurlaender, 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>-14.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New Working Group: Are There Lessons from K-12 Schooling?

- Federal and state programs to provide greater funding for students with greatest needs.
- Studies of what it requires to provide an “adequate” education, and how much of a premium in spending is required for disadvantaged students.
Progressive K-12 State Funding Based on Student Needs

K-12 State Funding for Low-Income Students or Compensatory Education

Note: Figure reflects state laws as of 2007, with the exception of Rhode Island, which was not listed in the original source but was added for this chart because the state approved a new funding formula in 2008.

Working Group on Community College Financial Resources

- 21 member group of academics, researchers and practitioners.
- Background papers by (1) Bruce Baker and Jesse Levin, (2) Anthony Carnevale, Jeff Strohl and Tanya Garcia; (3) Robert Shireman, Richard Kahlenberg, Halley Potter and Kimberly Quick
- Grappling with a number of key questions:
  - What is the cost of providing a strong community college education?
  - What is the additional cost associated with educating disadvantaged students?
Questions to consider in study

- Defining Outcomes: Unlike K-12, a wide variety of outcome goals. What is the best way to define outcomes? Labor market outcomes? Learning outcomes? Persistence and completion?
- What are the necessary ingredients for success?
- Different costs associated with:
  - Different programs/disciplines
  - Geographic locations
  - College sizes/scale
  - Concentrated need
Questions to consider (cont.)

- Defining Disadvantage. What categories of students should receive extra funding? Poverty? English Language Learners? Special Education? Race?
- Policy discussion: connecting to outcomes-based funding, which has grappled with some of these questions.
Timeline and Goal

- 5 meetings and 3 background papers (February 2017-September 2018)
- Final report due in Spring 2019
- Will lay the groundwork for an ultimate study in this arena
- Goal: the best approximation of costs so that not determined merely by raw political power but is also informed by solid research
Contact Information

- Richard D. Kahlenberg, Senior Fellow

- The Century Foundation
  2040 S Street, NW
  Washington, D.C. 20009
  kahlenberg@tcf.org

Bridging the Higher Education Divide:
http://tcf.org/assets/downloads/20130523-Bridging_the_Higher_Education_Divide-REPORT-ONLY.pdf

tcf.org
Resources

Download the report from:

Download the report from:
## Round Table Discussions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tables 1-5</th>
<th>Defining Outcomes: What is the best way to define outcomes? Labor market outcomes? Learning outcomes? Persistence and completion?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tables 6-10</td>
<td>What are the necessary ingredients for success? Different costs associated with: Different programs/disciplines Geographic locations College sizes/scale Concentrated need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tables 11-15</td>
<td>Defining Disadvantage. What categories of students should receive extra funding? Poverty? English Language Learners? Special Education? Race?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reframing Wasted Talent: The Missing Male Dilemma/ Opportunity Deprived

Denise Nadasen
Director of Research and Board Services
ACCT

Marcia Calloway
Research and Curriculum Specialist
ACCT

Denise Pearson
Principal Policy Analyst
SHEEO
Urban and Rural Men

Barriers to and Opportunities for Higher Education
Urban Minority Males
Disconnected Youth

- Opportunity Nation
  - Ages 16 to 24, neither employed nor in school
  - Higher percentage of minorities
- $25 billion
  - Social service
  - Tax revenue
Socioeconomic Disparities

- **High Poverty**
  - 15% national rate
  - African-American: 22% Hispanic/Latino: 19%

- **High Unemployment (2017)**
  - White men 3%, Black men 7%, Hispanic men 4%

- **Incarceration**
  - African-American men: 6 times
  - Hispanic men: 2-3 times
Cycle of Poverty

Children stay in low Socio-Economic Status

Primary and Secondary School

Adulthood incarceration
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Educational Attainment

- Disparities in Enrollment, Persistence, and Achievement
  - Completion Rates for Community College
    - White men 50%
    - African-American men 28%
    - Hispanic/Latino men 23%
Rural Males
Figure 1: Unemployment Rates in Select Areas

Source: Opportunity Index, 2016.
Figure 2: 2016 Poverty Rates in Select Areas

Source: US Rate is from the Census Bureau; the rates for rural communities come from the US Department of Agriculture; rates for individual counties come from the Opportunity Index. All rates are for 2016.
Industries

- Farming, mining, agriculture
  - Male dominated industries
- Retail - Walmart
- Digital divide - Amazon
- Middle skills in the labor market
  - John Deere
  - Siemens
Higher education

- Barriers
  - Education - 23% enrollment rate for men
  - Digital divide
  - Transportation infrastructure
  - Community resources - drug rehab, healthcare

- Community Colleges
  - Workforce development
  - Community collaboration
  - Support services for students
  - Collaborate with other educational sectors
Similarities and Difference
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Similarities</th>
<th>Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Enrollment, Persistence, and Achievement are low</td>
<td>• Different Job Markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strengthen Caregiving and Family Support</td>
<td>• Digital divide is more prominent in rural communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conceptualization of Masculinity</td>
<td>• Different types of transportation issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Poverty</td>
<td>• Demographic differences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From your practitioner’s perspective:

What are we missing?
What needs more emphasis?
## Round Table Discussions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tables 1-4</th>
<th>What is the process of trustee engagement with workforce development initiatives to identify job/skill voids in the community?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tables 5-7</td>
<td>What is your relationship with rural-centered organizations, including the White House Rural Council and the Rural Community College Alliance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tables 8-11</td>
<td>Are “Ban the Box” laws and practices in place to advance employment opportunities in your states, once citizens obtain credentials?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tables 12-15</td>
<td>What specific state policies hinder or support rural and urban male participation in the community college experience?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DAY 2: WELCOME BACK

OVERVIEW

Caroline Altman Smith

Deputy Director, Education Program

The Kresge Foundation
Student Success Center Network
46% of the community colleges are in these states.

60% of the CC fall enrollments were in these states.

69% of all minority students at CCs were in these states.

56% of Pell grant recipients at CCs were in these states.

57% of the Associate’s degree recipients were in these states.

Source: 2015-16 IPEDS data
Degrees, Apprenticeships, New Credentials: Addressing Quality, Equity, and Opportunity in a New Credentialing Landscape
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Debra Humphreys</td>
<td>Vice President of Stakeholder Engagement</td>
<td>Lumina Foundation, Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Schneider</td>
<td>Vice President and Institute Fellow</td>
<td>American Institutes for Research, Presenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Bosak</td>
<td>Vice President for Workforce Strategies and Policy</td>
<td>Achieving the Dream, Reactor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Lynn</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor Workforce and Economic Development</td>
<td>Alabama Community College System, Reactor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING!
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