Impact of the National Education Opportunity Network's College-in-High School Model on Students' High School and Postsecondary Outcomes:

Early Evidence from the Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Vaughan Byrnes
Robert Balfanz
June 2026

EVERYONE GRADUATES CENTER

Table of Contents

Bridging the gap between higher-achieving students in marginalized communities and institutions of higher education

The National Education Opportunity Network (NEON) is a national education justice nonprofit committed to propelling access and opportunity for higher-achieving high school students in historically marginalized communities. It works with a consortium of selective colleges to deliver, and support, college credit-bearing courses into teacher-led Title 1 high school classrooms, at scale - and at no cost to students. As of spring 2026, NEON has offered courses in nearly 600 schools nationwide across 32 states and over 200 cities, reaching approximately 60,000 students.

The National Education Opportunity Network program is founded on the idea that while talent is evenly distributed, opportunity is not. Many higher-achieving students from economically disadvantaged or minority backgrounds are unable to pursue the postsecondary opportunities that are open to similarly skilled students from more advantaged backgrounds and are thus blocked from career paths and lifelong opportunities that would be available to them under more equal or merit-based conditions.

The program seeks to balance these inequalities by providing access to the most selective universities in the country to high schools serving historically underserved communities. It is hoped that by offering these courses to such high school students, they will not only earn postsecondary credits towards a degree, but that they will also be exposed to opportunities that they would otherwise be unfamiliar with. It is hoped that such exposure will positively affect their mindsets, giving them the knowledge that they can succeed at the highest levels and the confidence to broaden their education and career goals to paths they would have otherwise not considered. By offering the courses to schools and districts at only a fraction of the cost that universities typically charge, the program also seeks to overcome the financial roadblock that often prevents such students from pursuing postsecondary schooling or from choosing more selective institutions (4-year, higher status, out-of-state, private, etc.).

In the 2025-26 school year, NEON charged schools and districts $250 per enrollment per college course (which includes access to all course-related materials, co-teacher support, college credits upon passing, and an official transcript). This price point is a reflection of NEON's values and mission. It is made possible by the generosity of the participating colleges and universities offering their courses at cost and NEON's ability to secure additional philanthropic support to pass those savings on to communities across the country. NEON requires that the enrollment fee is not paid by students and families.

Purpose of This Study

As a relatively new program, evidence of the program's effectiveness is needed to better understand what type of students are being served by the program, and if the program is elevating their postsecondary outcomes. Evidence of the program's impact would support its scaling to more states, districts, schools, and students as a cost-effective model for improving the postsecondary outcomes, and therefore the career and lifelong opportunities, of historically marginalized communities.

The purpose of the study reported below was to gather exploratory evidence regarding the program's participating student population and their backgrounds, as well as their postsecondary outcomes using

data from the Miami-Dade County Public Schools (M-DCPS). Given that the NEON program has a concentration of participating schools (24) in M-DCPS, analysis of their student longitudinal data will provide an exploratory estimate of the program's impact as well as information regarding the student population served by the program.

Study Design and Method of Analysis

The explicit hypotheses, or research questions, tested as part of this study are as follows:

1. Do students who participate in National Education Opportunity Network courses experience significantly different postsecondary outcomes compared to other students in their schools? Specifically, Do they enroll in postsecondary schooling at higher rates? Do they enroll in different types of postsecondary schools and programs (2-year vs. 4-year, in or out-of-state, public vs. private, or in institutions that are higher status or offer mor opportunities for advancement)? Do they persist past the first year of postsecondary schooling at higher rates?
2. Are students who participate in National Education Opportunity Network courses significantly different from the other students in their schools in terms of their demographic backgrounds, prior attendance rates, and prior course marks/GPA? Are there significant differences in the types of students served between the NEON program and other similar college-level or college courses (i.e., AP, IB, Dual-Enrollment, AICE)?

To empirically test these questions, the study employs a quasi-experimental design comparing 12th grade students who participated in the National Education Opportunity Network program to other 12th grade students in their schools who did not take a NEON course. As we know that the NEON program generally attracts academically strong students who are interested in in pursuing postsecondary studies, it is reasonable to think that NEON participants will differ substantially from other students in their schools in terms of their prior academics, family backgrounds and resources, and their motivations and attitudes. These pre-existing differences between participants and our comparison group represent a selection bias that threatens the validity of any estimates of the program's impact. If participants achieved significantly different postsecondary outcomes than comparison students, how can we be sure that any differences are due to their having taken a NEON course, and not because of pre-existing differences? To address this inherent bias, we employed three different statistical methods, all similar weighting/matching techniques, to create baseline equality between NEON students and those students to whom we can compare them given the available data. All three techniques attempt to create equality between NEON students and comparison students in terms of their prior academic measures and demographic characteristics.

The three methods for creating equality between treatment and comparison groups are as follows:

A. **Inverse Probability of Treatment Weighted (IPTW) –** in this method, we first use regression modeling to calculate the probability that each and every student would have participated in a NEON course based on their prior characteristics, and based on the characteristics of those students who did enroll in a NEON course (as well as based on which school they attended and which cohort they were in). Comparison students are then assigned weights based upon how likely they were to participate in a NEON course. These weights are inverse ratios of their likelihood of participating (probability of

participation divided by probability of not participating), such that students who were more likely to take a NEON course received larger weights (above 1.0), while students who were less likely to participate received smaller weights (below 1.0). Comparison students whose probability of taking a NEON course was below the lowest estimate calculated for students who took a NEON course, were assigned weights of 0 (and considered fundamentally incomparable).

B. **Propensity Score Matching –** this method attempts to match each of the treatment students to a comparison student who most closely resembles them in terms of prior characteristics. The process begins by using regression modeling to calculate the probability that each student would have participated in a NEON course based on their prior characteristics, as well as which school they attended and which cohort they were in. Each NEON student is then matched to the comparison student whose probability of participation was closest to their own. As perfect matching of students (1 to 1) is not possible, the closest matches are chosen from amongst comparison students and then assigned weights to create a more perfectly matched group as a whole. Comparison students whose probability of participation was higher than the maximum or less than the minimum probability of NEON students themselves, are not considered for matching.

C. **Entropy Balancing –** similarly, this method seeks to balance prior characteristics between the treatment and comparison groups. Entropy balancing however, makes use of all available comparison cases, assigning a weight to all comparison students. It has also been shown to achieve more precise matching between groups, including for multiple prior characteristics considered simultaneously.

Even after creating baseline equality between NEON students and our comparison group through the statistical techniques noted above, this equality only pertains to the qualities and characteristics for which data is available (though they include some of the strongest predictors of postsecondary success, such as prior GPA). As long as participation in a NEON course is not determined in a random manner, it is always possible that there remain other differences between NEON students and comparison students that influence their outcomes, but which we can not measure due to lack of data. As such, our evidence can not say with certainty that any differences in outcomes were caused by participation in the program, but the results come from a strong quasi-experimental design and can be considered as inferential evidence of the effectiveness of the National Education Opportunity Network program as a low cost and scalable method for increasing postsecondary enrollment rates amongst historically marginalized communities.

Data Sample

Data for the study comes primarily from the M-DCPS and its longitudinal data base of student records. Data provided by M-DCPS includes information on student demographics such as race/ethnicity, sex, Free/Reduced Lunch program eligibility (FRL), Limited-English-Proficiency (LEP) status, special education status, and student age. Student demographics are used as control variables in analyses pertaining to our primary research question on students' postsecondary outcomes, allowing us to control for differences between NEON and comparison students as we compare their academic outcomes. Student background characteristics are also an outcome measure for our secondary research question, examining the types of students served by the NEON program and if they differ from the regular student population and those served by other advanced course programs.

M-DCPS also provided us with data on students' academic records such as their grade-point average (GPA), attendance rates, and graduation status. Students' GPA and attendance rates from the prior year will be used similarly to student demographic measures, as control variables in our first set of analyses comparing student academic performance, and as outcomes for our second set of analyses comparing student backgrounds. For comparison students, prior GPA and attendance rates come from their 11th grade year. For NEON participants, measure of prior academics come from the year prior to program participation, which could be 10th grade for those students who took a NEON course as 11th graders. Students' GPA and attendance rates from their 12th grade year are considered high school outcomes for our primary research question, along with high school graduation status.

To measure students' postsecondary outcomes, M-DCPS was able to provide us with students' data from the National Student Clearinghouse (NSC) which captures students' postsecondary records. NSC data includes student enrollment records in postsecondary institutions, including information on the type of institution (2-year/4-year, Public/Private), the dates of enrollment, the location of each institution, and the number of semesters enrolled. Postsecondary outcome variables include enrollment in a postsecondary institution, the type of institution enrolled in (2 vs. 4 years; public vs. private), if they enrolled in or out-of-state (Florida), and if the student enrolled in postsecondary schooling immediately following high school graduation. For students who did enroll in a postsecondary institution, we then have several measures of postsecondary persistence, including: enrollment in fall of the 2nd year; enrollment at any time of 2nd year (fall or spring); number of semester completed (raw count); and number of semesters weighted by enrollment status (full-time, three-quarter time, half-time, or less than half-time).

One additional data point used, and taken from outside the M-DCPS sources, is the Carnegie IHE 2025 Student Access and Earnings Classification rating for each postsecondary institution[1]. A recently developed resource from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, the Student Access and Earnings Classification identifies the extent to which postsecondary institutions A) provide access to students from lower socioeconomic and historically underrepresented racial/ethnic backgrounds, along with B) the degree to which the institution's students go on to earn competitive wages in the context of their geographic location. Based on these two factors, institutions fall into one of the following six ordinal categories: Lower Access/Lower Earnings; Higher Access/Lower Earnings; Lower Access/Medium Earnings; Higher Access/Medium Earnings; Lower Access/Higher Earnings; or Higher Access/Higher Earnings (termed Opportunity Colleges and Universities). This classification system, which has also been referred to as the Social and Economic Mobility Classification, allows us to examine if NEON participants sought out and attended institutions of higher quality than did comparison students.

Our final analytic sample includes 22,482 students who were 12th graders in the 2021-22, 2022-23, and 2023-24 school years, from the 24 schools in the Miami-Dade School District that offered a NEON course during this time. The analytic sample includes only students who had complete data in terms of the prior academic and background characteristics and includes 521 students who took a NEON course during those first three years of the program's implementation. Measures of postsecondary persistence are only observed for students from the 21-22 and 22-23 cohorts, as 2nd year postsecondary data for students from

[1] https://carnegieclassifications.acenet.edu/carnegie-classification/classification-methodology/2025-student-access-and-earnings-classification/

the 23-24 cohort is not yet available. Similarly, measures of postsecondary outcomes do no include degree attainment as not enough time has passed for students from the first cohort to have completed a 4-year program and earn an award.

Results & Analysis

Table 1, below, shows the background characteristics of NEON participants in comparison to all other 12th grade students at their schools. As expected, NEON participants had significantly higher GPAs and attendance rates compared to other students in their schools, prior to taking a NEON course. In the context of its implementation in the Miami-Dade school district, participation was skewed towards the highest achieving students in those schools. Only 18% of NEON participants had a prior GPA below 3.0, 35% were between 3.0 to 3.4, and roughly half of participants (47%) had prior GPAs of 3.5 or higher. They were also significantly less likely to be overage for their grade, LEP, or special education. However, while the NEON program did attract the academically strongest students in its schools, there were no significant differences in ethnicities or Free/Reduced Lunch eligibility between NEON participants and other 12th grade students.

The right columns of the table also show the statistical significance of any differences between NEON participants and comparison students, after applying the various methods for weighting and balancing to create baseline equivalence. We see that all three statistical techniques resulted in balanced and statistically equivalent groups, with both the IPTW and Entropy balancing methods creating greater equivalence than Propensity Score matching.

Table 1 - Student Demographics & Prior Academic Measures (Analytic Sample)

	NEON participants	Other 12th grade students	Difference	P-Value	P-Value (after IPT weighting)	P-Value (after PS matching)	P-Value (after Entropy balancing)
N =	**521**	**21,961**					
Prior GPA	3.4	2.6	0.8	.000	*.695*	*.778*	*1.000*
Prior Attendance Rate	92.9%	88.8%	4.1%	.000	*.936*	*.341*	*1.000*
Female	61.6%	50.0%	11.6%	.000	*.933*	*.949*	*1.000*
Asian	1.0%	0.6%	0.4%	.238	*.978*	*.738*	*1.000*
Black	35.1%	34.4%	0.7%	.722	*.993*	*.606*	*1.000*
White	3.3%	3.6%	-0.3%	.643	*.975*	*.415*	*1.000*
Hispanic	59.1%	60.3%	-1.2%	.589	*.934*	*.415*	*1.000*
Other	1.5%	1.1%	0.4%	.382	*.733*	*.807*	*1.000*
Overage	9.4%	20.8%	-11.4%	.000	*.973*	*.916*	*1.000*
FRL	73.1%	76.3%	-3.2%	.089	*.944*	*.408*	*1.000*
LEP	0.8%	7.5%	-6.7%	.000	*.900*	*.738*	*1.000*
Exited LEP	42.6%	43.7%	-1.1%	.616	*.815*	*.900*	*1.000*
Special Ed.	4.2%	13.6%	-9.4%	.000	*.951*	*.205*	*1.000*

Table 2, below, shows the raw differences in outcomes between NEON and comparison students, without any statistical modeling, controls, or weighting techniques. Looking at these unadjusted averages, NEON students finished High School with significantly stronger outcomes than did comparison students, with GPAs one half point higher, attendance rates 4% higher, 14% fewer chronically absent students, and with roughly 10% more of students graduating. They also exhibited significantly higher postsecondary outcomes. Neon students enrolled in postsecondary schools at a 15% higher rate, though this overall rate hides that they enrolled in 4-year IHEs at a 28% higher rate but in 2-year programs at a 12% lower rate. NEON participants were more likely to enroll immediately following high school graduation, and more likely to enroll in schools that were private or out-of-state. NEON students also persisted into the 2nd year of postsecondary schooling at significantly higher rates, had completed more semesters on average, and were enrolling in postsecondary institutions with higher ratings on the Carnegie Classification system, in particular to the highest Opportunity Colleges and Universities. However, while NEON students realised much stronger high school and postsecondary outcomes than did other 12th grade students in their schools, we also know that they were much stronger students to begin with. Looking at the raw averages alone, can not tell us if the differences in outcomes were due to their participation in the NEON program.

Table 2 - HS & PS Outcomes (Unweighted T-tests)

	NEON	Comparison	Difference	P-Value
N =	**521**	**21,961**		
GPA	3.4	2.9	0.5	.000***
Attendance Rate	91.1%	87.1%	4.0%	.000***
Attendance <90%[1] (Chronically Absent)	33.0%	47.1%	-14.1%	.000***
HS Graduation[1]	99.0%	89.5%	9.5%	.000***
PS Enrollment[1]	68.5%	53.9%	14.6%	.000***
2-Year Enrollment[1]	27.6%	39.7%	-12.1%	.000***
4-Year Enrollment[1]	47.6%	19.2%	28.4%	.000***
Public Enrollment[1]	58.0%	49.3%	8.7%	.000***
Private Enrollment[1]	12.1%	6.6%	5.5%	.000***
Out-of-State Enrollment[1]	9.6%	5.2%	4.4%	.000***
Immediate Enrollment[1]	64.3%	45.5%	18.8%	.000***
Persisted 2nd year (fall) [1,2]	88.1%	71.6%	16.5%	.000***
Persisted 2nd year (fall or spring) [1,2]	91.0%	78.9%	12.1%	.000***
Semesters (raw) [2]	3.0	2.1	0.9	.000***
Semesters (weighted) [2]	2.5	1.6	0.9	.000***
Carnegie Classification[2]	5.0	4.4	0.6	.000***
Higher Earnings College or University[1,2]	58.7%	24.1%	34.6%	.000***
Opportunity College or University[1,2]	47.2%	19.8%	27.4%	.000***

* indicates statistically significant difference (* - p<.05; ** - p<.01; *** - p <.001)

[1] – binary outcome; [2] – only for those students who enrolled in postsecondary

Table 3 shows the estimated impacts of NEON participation on student outcomes, after weighting, matching, and balancing the samples to ensure that NEON participants are being compared to a group of students who are equivalent in terms of prior academic and demographic characteristics. Three sets of results are presented, one for each method. Estimates are derived from statistical regression models that controlled for students' prior characteristics (gender, race/ethnicity, FRL status, ELL status, special education status, overage for grade status, and their prior attendance and GPA), even after the reweighting of samples for baseline equality. Models also include dummy variables to control for which school a student attended, and their year/cohort. Statistical significance was determined based upon cluster-robust standard errors to account for the fact that students are clustered in schools, and the outcomes and experiences of students in the same school are correlated and not independent of each other.

Coefficients for high school GPA and attendance rates, as well as for the number of postsecondary semesters completed, and the average Carnegie Classification rating of their postsecondary institution, represent estimates of the direct impact of NEON participation. For all other outcomes, which are binary, the coefficients are odds-ratios that represent the likelihood of achieving those outcomes for NEON students as compared to other students in their schools. Odds-ratios above 1 show that NEON students were more likely to achieve those outcomes, while odds-ratios below 1 show that they were less likely to achieve those outcomes.

Results are consistent across all three methods of establishing baseline equivalence. After controlling for prior characteristics, NEON students had significantly stronger high school outcomes, including GPA (effect size=0.05) and being roughly four times as likely to graduate high school. NEON participants also had significantly higher outcomes across all aspects of postsecondary schooling, in terms of enrollment, persistence, and institutional quality. While there was no significant different between NEON participants and other students in terms of overall postsecondary enrollment rates, this masks two diverging trends. NEON participants were roughly twice as likely to enroll in 4-year IHEs, while only half as likely to enroll in 2-year programs, with the two trends cancelling each other out in the overall enrollment rate. There was borderline evidence that NEON participants persisted at higher rates (more semesters competed). Lastly, students who participated in a NEON course and enrolled in postsecondary schooling were enrolling in IHEs with higher social mobility ratings (ES=0.38) and were twice as likely to specifically enroll in IHEs considered Opportunity Colleges and Universities according to the Carnegie Classification system. These are institutions that provide greater access to students from lower socioeconomic and historically underrepresented racial/ethnic backgrounds and whose students go on to earn competitive wages, thus providing students with greater opportunities for social and economic mobility.

Table 3 - HS & PS Outcomes (Weighted Regression Results)

	IPTW		PS Matching		Entropy Balancing	
	Coefficient/ Odds-Ratio[1]	P-Value	Coefficient/ Odds-Ratio[1]	P-Value	Coefficient/ Odds-Ratio[1]	P-Value
GPA	0.02	.012*	0.03	.007*	.02	.012*
Attendance Rate	0.73	.228	0.54	.375	0.83	.184
Attendance <90%[1] (Chronically Absent)	0.92	.633	0.80	.237	0.90	.531
HS Graduation[1]	4.18	.003**	3.71	.016*	4.13	.003**
PS Enrollment[1]	0.85	.310	0.91	.601	0.85	.286
2-Year Enrollment[1]	0.52	.000***	0.56	.000***	0.52	.000***
4-Year Enrollment[1]	1.69	.000***	1.57	.001***	1.69	.000***
Public Enrollment[1]	0.78	.080	0.86	.295	0.79	.104
Private Enrollment[1]	1.25	.326	1.17	.482	1.20	.435
Out-of-State Enrollment[1]	1.23	.293	1.18	.571	1.17	.450
Immediate Enrollment[1]	0.97	.804	1.06	.726	0.96	.761
Persisted 2nd year (fall) [1,2]	1.39	.156	1.40	.274	1.38	.168
Persisted 2nd year (fall or spring) [1,2]	1.13	.668	1.41	.236	1.12	.688
Semesters (raw) [2]	0.28	.012*	0.33	.095	0.10	.391
Semesters (weighted) [2]	0.22	.064	0.30	.229	0.05	.752
Carnegie Classification[2]	0.33	.000***	0.31	.003***	0.32	.000***
Higher Earnings College or University[1,2]	2.55	.000***	2.54	.000***	2.50	.000***
Opportunity College or University[1,2]	2.27	.000***	2.01	.000***	2.20	.000***

* indicates statistically significant difference (* - p<.05; ** - p<.01; *** - p <.001)

[1] – binary outcome / logistic regression model; [2] – only for those students who enrolled in postsecondary

Table 4 compares the background characteristics of NEON students to all other 12th grade students across the entire Miami-Dade County public school district, not just those schools that offered a NEON course. It also compares NEON students to students who took other advanced course programs across the district, including the Cambridge AICE, Advanced Placement, Dual Enrollment, and International Baccalaureate programs. For this table, the sample includes all students and is not limited to only those students with data on all prior characteristics, as was the case for the analytic sample and our primary analyses. This allows us to see, overall, what kind of students are served by the NEON program, how they compare to the district's student population, and specifically to the types of students served by other advanced course programs.

Table 4 - Student Demographics & Prior Academic Measures (Entire District)

	NEON	MIAMI-DADE DISTRICT	AICE	AP	DE	IB
N =	**742**	**74,088**	**6,765**	**29,119**	**15,784**	**1,713**
Prior GPA	3.4	2.8***	3.2***	3.3***	3.3***	3.6***
Prior Attendance Rate	92.9%	90.0***	92.3%	93.6%	93.2%	95.6%***
Female	62.5%	50.1%***	54.8%***	57.1%**	58.9%	63.3%
Asian	1.6%	1.1%	1.2%	1.8%	1.4%	3.6%**
Black	36.6%	18.1%***	8.6%***	9.4%***	15.1%***	6.4%***
White	4.0%	6.7%**	8.9%***	8.9%***	6.5%**	18.7%***
Hispanic	55.8%	73.2%***	80.5%***	79.1%***	75.9%***	70.2%***
Other	1.6%	0.8%	0.8%*	0.8%**	0.9%	1.0%
Overage	8.8%	17.8%***	8.9%	8.0%	9.8%	4.6%***
FRL	73.9%	62.2%***	57.5%***	57.7%***	65.5%***	41.4%***
LEP	0.5%	5.9%***	1.7%*	3.7%***	1.8%**	0.1%*
Exited LEP	44.2%	45.5%	50.0%**	47.3%	48.7%*	41.5%
Special Ed.	3.9%	10.7%***	4.2%	3.0%	5.8%*	1.2%***

* indicates statistically significant difference from NEON sample – (* - p<.05; ** - p<.01; *** - p <.001)

We see that compared to district students as a whole, NEON participants have significantly higher GPA and attendance rates, are more likely to be female, and conversely less likely to be overage, LEP, or special education status. These differences are true for other advanced course programs as well. Where the student population served by NEON differs from those served by other advanced course programs is in student demographics. While other advanced course programs serve fewer black and FRL-eligible students than the district as a whole, the NEON program actually serves these student groups at a higher rate. Similarly, the NEON program serves fewer white and Hispanic students than the district as a whole, while other advanced course programs serve these groups at higher rates. This is a direct result of the NEON program targeting Title 1 schools that serve predominantly disadvantaged student populations, and their participants reflecting the demographics of the schools that they serve. Recent research, based on both state level and nationally representative data, has found that while advanced course programs improve students' postsecondary outcomes (particularly enrollment in 4-year programs), access to such programs is typically not equal as white and affluent students enroll in such courses at higher rates[2].

Overall, there is strong evidence that students who participated in the NEON program experienced high school and postsecondary outcomes that were significantly higher than those of other students in their schools, even after accounting for the strong academic backgrounds of students who tend to participate. In terms of postsecondary outcomes, the greatest impacts of the NEON program were on students'

[2] Djita, R. R., Parra-Martinez, A., Wai, J. & McKenzie, S. C. (2023). The Role of AP & Concurrent Courses on Student Postsecondary Outcomes, Out-of-state Choice, and College Selectivity. Arkansas Education Report, Vol., Issue 7. Fayetteville, AR: Office for Education Policy, University of Arkansas.
Xu, D., Solanki, S., & Fink, J. (2021). College acceleration for all? Mapping racial gaps in Advanced Placement and dual enrollment participation. American Educational Research Journal, 58(5), 954-992. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831221991138

likelihood of enrolling in 4-year IHEs and ones that provide students with greater opportunity for social mobility. Further, by targeting Title 1 schools, the NEON program is ensuring that underserved populations are receiving access to advanced course program and to the benefits they bring in regard to postsecondary outcomes and lifelong career opportunities.

Appendix

All postsecondary records used in this study for identifying students' postsecondary outcomes come from the National Student Clearinghouse (NSC). In the NSC records, Miami-Dade College is identified as a 4-year college but offers both Bachelor and Associate degrees. Originally a 2-year college, it became a 4-year degree granting institution in 2003. However, Miami-Dade College (MDC) is recognized as one of the largest community colleges in the nation and grants significantly more Associate degrees than Bachelor degrees. Annually, MDC awards approximately 8,500 to 9,000 Associate degrees compared to roughly 1,500 to 2,000 Bachelor degrees. As over 80% of the degrees awarded by MDC are Associate degrees, we recoded the institution as a 2-year IHE to improve the accuracy of our data in terms of correctly categorizing students' postsecondary enrollments (by a ratio of 4:1), and to increase the validity of our analysis and results. The issue is a major one in terms of local Miami-Dade conditions and analyzing the postsecondary outcomes of its students, as many M-DCPS college-bound high-school graduates attend Miami-Dade College. Of all NSC enrollment records shared with us as part of this study, 39%, more than a third, were linked to MDC alone, and district report indicate that closer to 50% of graduates in recent years who transition to postsecondary schooling do so at MDC[3]. Without recoding MDC to be a 2-year IHE, fewer than 2% of all M-DCPS high school students are coded as having enrolled in a 2-year program, a percentage which seems unrealistically low. After recoding MDC to be a 2-year IHE, the percentage of all M-DCPS students coded as enrolling in a 2-year program rises to 38%. In the above report, the recoding of MDC from a 4-year to 2-year IHE only effects the outcomes for postsecondary enrollment in 2-year and 4-year IHEs, no other outcomes are effected by this change.

[3] https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED678715.pdf
https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED674838.pdf
https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED671688.pdf