Young Parents Demonstration: Public Use File

Introduction

The Young Parents Demonstration (YPD) was a federal grant initiative, sponsored by the U.S. Department of Labor's Employment and Training Administration (USDOL/ETA), to enhance USDOL/ETA's existing programs to better serve at-risk and disadvantaged young parents and expectant parents. Grant funds were to be used to serve young parents (both in-school and out-of-school mothers and fathers) and expectant parents ages 16 to 24, including those in high-risk categories such as: victims of child abuse, children of incarcerated parents, court-involved youth, youth at risk of court involvement, homeless and runaway youth, Indian and Native American youth, migrant youth, youth in or aging out of foster care, low-income youth, and youth with disabilities.

In Fiscal Year (FY) 2008, Congress designated Pilot, Demonstration, and Research funds under the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to award competitive grants under YPD to organizations providing educational and occupational skills training to young parents who may be at risk of low educational attainment and poor employment opportunities. The purpose of these grants was to test the effectiveness of enhanced services in improving educational and employment outcomes for at-risk young parents and expectant parents.

The YPD initiative was broken into three rounds. The grant period of performance for Rounds I and II awards were for three years; the Round III awards were for four years. Participants were randomly assigned into treatment and control groups, with a 50 percent chance of being in the treatment group. YPD grantees were required to implement a differential experimental research design, whereby the treatment group received an enhanced service intervention, providing treatment group members with an additional level of services above and beyond the base level of services provided to both the treatment and control groups. The treatment intervention, which was mentoring activities for all Round III grantees, was aimed at improving employment and earnings of participants, as well as improving chances that participants secured additional educational degrees and certifications.

Round I and II were awarded to 13 grantees in June 2009, and shared the same data collection instruments and grantees. Round III of YPD was awarded to an additional four grantees (and one subcontractor) in June of 2011, and it included an expanded set of data collection instruments, with a focus on mentoring services.

YPD Public Use Data Contents

Data in these public use files are obtained from several sources:

Participant Tracking System (PTS)

All three rounds of YPD data were collected at the participant-level though the Participant Tracking System (PTS), a web-based management information system (MIS). All data was entered into the PTS by grantee staff during their respective performance periods.

The web-based PTS was developed for and implemented by each YPD grantee to: (1) execute the random assignment procedures; (2) enable sites to collect basic demographic data on participants, as well as to compile systematic data on service receipt and employment outcomes over time; and (3) provide participant-level demographic, service receipt, and employment outcomes data for monitoring and evaluating grantee sites. All grantees implemented the web-based PTS prior to the start of random assignment in each site.

Participant 18-month Follow-up Survey

A participant follow-up telephone survey was conducted with Round III treatment and control group members at 18 months after random assignment. Surveying of Round III participants began in August 2013 and concluded in May 2015. The general topics covered in the survey included the following: (1) service receipt and satisfaction with services received; (2) educational attainment; (3) employment and earnings; (4) receipt of cash assistance; (5) receipt of food stamps and other assistance; (6) family composition/change; (7) relationship/engagement with children; (8) food security; (9) housing and housing security; and (10) family income/contact information.

Data collection efforts included telephone and in-person locating for survey non-responders. If the sample information provided by the grantee programs was inaccurate or incomplete, telephone locators were trained to attempt to locate participants by contacting up to three secondary contacts. If telephone locating efforts did not yield a completed interview, cases were turned over to in-person locators for additional locating. In the original locating protocol, after 12 attempts to reach the respondent, cases were transferred from telephone locators to specially trained in-person locators. Once the interview was completed, a $25 incentive payment (using a credit card) was made to the respondent. Overall, the YPD 18-month follow-up survey achieved a 58.5% response rate.

Public Use Data File Structure

YPD data is available for download in CSV format. The two data sources mentioned above have been merged, by participant primary key. All Personally Identifiable Information (PII) has been removed. Data is separated into the following two CSV files, by round:

File Name	Number of Records	Number of Variables	Data Sources
YPD PTS Data – All Rounds	3,516	283	PTS,18-month follow-up survey
YPD PTS Data – Rounds I and II	1,926	73	PTS
YPD PTS Data – Round III	1,590	265	PTS,18-month follow-up survey

Additional documents are available to help with the use of the YPD data. They are this user guide, as well as the following Excel data dictionaries:

- **YPD PTS Data – All Rounds – Data Dictionary**
- **YPD PTS Data – Rounds I and II – Data Dictionary**
- **YPD PTS Data – Round III – Data Dictionary**

Each data dictionary contains the record layout of the accompanying data file. This includes the variable name (32-characters or less), the variable description (the question as worded to participants), the response categories, the max length, and the round (the YPD round that the variable is associated with).

Using the YPD Public Use Files

Data in both files is at the participant level. A randomly generated ID number between 1 and 10000 is available for analysis of public use data. The variable GRANTEE indicates which YPD grantee a participant was associated with. There were 17 YPD grantees, but 18 possible grantee values. There are 13 grantees in the Round I and II file, and an additional 5 entries in the Round III file. The grantee "Asheville-Buncombe Community Christian Ministry (ABCCM)" had a subcontractor in the YPD program known as Family Services of Davidson County (FSDC). ABCCM (GRANTEE=16) and FSDC (GRANTEE=17) are both under the same YPD grant award.

The full text of the questions corresponding to each variable is available in the data dictionary documents, along with allowable values. Numeric missing values are represented with a '.' character. Variables with 100% non-response or missing values are identified as "suppressed" in the data dictionary. Variables that were specific to a given Round are omitted from the file in which they were not fielded. Variables that include the text response when the respondent was prompted "Other (Specify)" have been dropped.

For paper versions of all instruments and a discussion of how data was used in analysis, please refer to the publicly available YPD Rounds I and II report and Round III report.

Survey Weights

The Round III file of the YPD public use file contains the variable WEIGHT, which is a person-level survey weight created for data analysis. The survey weight reduces potential bias due to both survey non-response and for those respondents that never received the survey because of the expiration of the OMB approval date.

Higher weights were given to interviews conducted with those participants who we found to be less likely to respond or more likely to not have received the survey (and commensurately reducing the weight of the interviews from parents who were more likely to respond or have received the survey). Hence, using the survey weight reduces bias in mean sample characteristics.

All survey weight adjustments were done separately for those that were randomly assigned to be in the treatment group versus those assigned to the control group. Some adjustments were also done separately by the four grantee sites (AltaMed Health Services Corporation, Asheville Buncombe Community Christian Ministry Incorporated, The Dannon Project, and the Training Resources of America Incorporated). The final survey weight variable included adjustments for the following factors:

- Lower than expected number of completed interviews with white respondents in the control group at the AltaMed Health Services Corporation site.
- Higher than expected number of completed interviews with non-white respondents in the control group at the AltaMed Health Services Corporation site.
- Lower than expected number of completed interviews with Hispanic respondents in the treatment group at the AltaMed Health Services Corporation site.
- Higher than expected number of completed interviews with black respondents in the treatment group at the AltaMed Health Services Corporation site.

- Lower than expected number of completed interviews with respondents that had limited English ability in the control group at all four sites.
- Lower than expected number of completed interviews with respondents that had limited English ability in the treatment at all four sites.
- Higher than expected number of completed interviews with respondents that were employed at the beginning of the project in the control group across all four sites.
- Lower than expected number of completed interviews with respondents that were employed at the beginning of the project in the treatment group across all four sites.
- Lower than expected number of completed interviews with respondents that were receiving SNAP at the beginning of the project in the treatment group across all four sites.
- Higher than expected number of completed interviews with respondents that were receiving Medicaid at the beginning of the project in the control group across all four sites.
- Higher than expected number of completed interviews with respondents that were receiving Medicaid at the beginning of the project in the treatment group across all four sites.
- Lower than expected number of completed interviews with respondents that were homeless at the beginning of the project in the control group across all four sites.
- Lower than expected number of completed interviews with respondents that were homeless at the beginning of the project in the treatment group across all four sites.

The final survey weight is normalized so that the sum of the weights equaled the sample size of completed control and treatment interviews across all four sites (n=809; 421 control interviews and 388 treatment interviews).

Post-data collection statistical adjustments were required due to survey non-response and because some respondents never received the survey. The post-data collection adjustments require analysis procedures that adjust the standard errors that you would obtain had you done a simple random sample that involved no adjustments. Therefore, when using the survey weight, variance estimation requires estimating the survey design effect associated with the weighted estimate. The term design effect is used to describe the variance of the weighted sample estimate relative to the variance of an estimate that assumes a simple random sample.

In a wide range of situations, the adjusted standard error of a statistic should be calculated by multiplying the usual formula by the design effect (deft). Thus, the formula for computing the 95% confidence interval around a percentage is:

$$\hat{p} \pm \left(deft \times 1.96 \sqrt{\frac{\hat{p}(1-\hat{p})}{n}} \right)$$

Where $\hat{p}$ is the sample estimate and n is the unweighted number of sample cases in the group being considered.

The average design effects for the survey weight 1.118. The deft is the square root of the design effect which is 1.057. Thus, to get a more accurate estimate of the standard errors associated with the weighted estimate one would multiply the unweighted standard error by the "Deft" value or 1.057. For

example, suppose one was using the survey weight on a measure from the survey and the estimate had an unweighted standard error of .0213. The weighted estimate would not change however the standard error of the estimate would be greater, or .0225 (.0213 x 1.057).