Identifying State-level Data for Short- and Long-Term Planning
What comes to mind when you think about “equity” in early childhood education?
data:

information:

knowledge:
What do your data suggest?
How dashboards can help cities improve early childhood development
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EARLY CHILDHOOD SUCCESS REPORT CARD

- Related Dashboard on Early Childhood
  - Childcare Center Capacity & Map
  - Map & Trend by Indicators

https://www.santafedatahub.org/early-childhood.html
Early Childhood Outcomes & Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Trends</th>
<th>Change from Previous Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 1</strong> Babies Are Born Healthy</td>
<td>% of Low Birth Weight Babies (&lt;5.5 lbs or 2,500 grams)</td>
<td>2007: 9.9% in 2007, 2014: 9.4% in 2014</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Women Receiving Prenatal Care in First Trimester</td>
<td>2007: 73.7% in 2014</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 2</strong> Children are Healthy, Safe &amp; Nurtured</td>
<td>Substantiated Child Abuse and Neglect Cases Per 1,000 Children Under 5</td>
<td>2007: 16.8 in 2013, 2014: 20.0 in 2015</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 3</strong> Children Are Ready for School</td>
<td># and % of 4-year-olds Attending PreK or Head Start</td>
<td>2014: 733 or 49%</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Children Who Are Ready for Kindergarten (Proxy Indicator: % Meeting DIBELS Benchmarks for First Consonant Sound)</td>
<td>2007: 54.4% in 2014, 2015: 54.2% in 2014</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Arrows indicate change from the previous year. Colors indicate whether the change is desirable (green) or not desirable (red).
Early Childhood Data Dashboard for Austin / Travis County

Low-income children are your fastest-growing demographic:
Population growth from 2000 to 2010:
- Total Population: 26%
- Children Under 6: 31%
- Low-income Children: 71%

They are not set up for success:
- Percent of school-ready children: 13%
- Lack of access tonections: 50%

Care & education in Austin are expensive:
- $9,987: Care for one child
- $19,312: Child care for two children

Families cannot afford care:
- 26,000: Families with incomes below the poverty line
- 4,740: Children left unserved

Other communities are outpacing us:
- City of Austin Investments
- Public spending per low-income child

The School Readiness Action Plan is a community-wide initiative led by United Way for Greater Austin to change these statistics. Learn more at: uwaga.org/sb6

2019 ROUNDTABLE | WWW.CEEO.ORG/2019-ROUNDTABLE
Early Childhood

Featured Report Topics

How many children are participating in Early Childhood programs before Kindergarten?

- 29% Percent of 2016-17 Kindergartners in Great Start Readiness Program before Kindergarten
- 6.2% Absenteeism rate of 2015-17 Economically Disadvantaged Kindergartners who had an Early Childhood program before Kindergarten

Early Childhood Inquiries

Child Count
Shows the number of Michigan children enrolled in Early Childhood Programs by programs or demographic report category.
Generate a Report

Participation by Kindergarten
Shows how many kindergarteners attended early childhood programs by location, school year, program type and demographic information.
Generate a Report

Early Childhood Impact on K-3 Absenteeism
Shows absence rates for students in kindergarten through third grade, and allows rate comparison of students who have participated in select publicly-funded early childhood programs before kindergarten, with that of all students.

Kindergarten Pathways
Shows the order in which children were enrolled in publicly-funded early childhood programs prior to entering kindergarten, and the number of children that followed each pathway.
Generate a Report
Rennie Center for Education Research and Policy (MA)
What is the story behind your equity data?

If you don’t have the message and data, someone else will tell the story.
Nebraska Early Childhood Data
Melody Hobson
Administrator, Office of Early Childhood
Nebraska Department of Education
AQuESTT

- 6 Tenets of AQuESTT
- School and District Ratings
  - Assessment Scores
  - High School Graduation Rates (Districts and High Schools)
  - Evidence Based Analysis
    - Attendance Data for Pre-K 12
Infants and Toddlers

• Birth mandate state
  – IDEA Part –C services co lead by NDHHS and NDE
  – Services provided through Public Schools

• Sixpence / Birth to Three Endowment
  – Public Private Partnership
  – Interest from Endowment
  – State General Funds
  – CCDF Infant/Toddler funds (CC partnership)
Infant /Toddler Data

• **Part –C** data on all children birth to 3 receiving services
• **Sixpence** – Birth to 3 Endowment
• **Early Head Start** Grantees that are School District/ESU
• School Districts that provide **child care**
Transition information

• 2015-16 - **58%**
  – 1846 2-yr-olds in I/T programs
  – 1065 in PreK the next year

• 2016-17 – **55%**
  – 2076 2-yr olds in I/T programs
  – 1133 in PreK the next year

• 2017-18 – **52%**
  – 2252 2-yr-olds in I/T programs
  – 1176 in PreK the next year
Assessing Impact for All Alabama Students

Using advanced statistical methods to “control” for all other characteristics* that might influence school performance,

Children who received First Class Pre-K were:
• More likely to be proficient in reading
• More likely to be proficient in math
• Less likely to be retained in grade
• Less likely to be chronically absent

Compared to children who did not receive First Class Pre-K.

We see no evidence of fade out of benefits over time.

Based on analyses of ACT Aspire results from Spring 2015, 2016, and 2017 for children in 3rd through 7th grades.

*Multivariable linear probability fixed effects models control for receipt of First Class Pre-K, year received/could have received First Class Pre-K, race/ethnicity, gender, poverty, and school attended.
Statewide analysis among Alabama’s most vulnerable 3rd and 6th grade children shows that children who received First Class Pre-K were **more likely to be proficient in reading and math** compared with children who did not receive First Class Pre-K.

### 3rd Grade
- **Reading:**
  - FCPK: 26.5%
  - No-FCPK: 23.5%

- **Math:**
  - FCPK: 49.7%
  - No-FCPK: 43.5%

### 6th Grade
- **Reading:**
  - FCPK: 29.1%
  - No-FCPK: 26.6%

- **Math:**
  - FCPK: 40.6%
  - No-FCPK: 37.2%
3rd Grade Achievement Gap Based on Income

In both Reading and Math, we observe a **29.6 percentage point gap** in proficiency between poverty and non-poverty students. First Class Pre-K closes that gap for children in poverty.
Impact: Narrowing the 3rd Grade Achievement Gap in Reading for Low Income Students

- Statewide: 34.1
- No-FCPK Poverty: 23.5
- FCPK Poverty: 26.5

28% gap closure
10.6 point gap
3 point increase

Reading Proficiency

The 3% difference means 1,068 more children could have been proficient if all in poverty had FCPK

- All Poverty: 23.7
- FCPK Poverty: 26.5

12% gain
2.8 point increase

2016-2017 ACT-Aspire
Impact: Narrowing the 3rd Grade Achievement Gap in Math for Low Income Students

- Statewide Math Proficiency: 54.3
- No-FCPK Poverty: 43.5
- FCPK Poverty: 49.7
- All Poverty: 43.9
- FCPK Poverty: 49.7

57% gap closure (10.8 point gap)
6.2 point increase

The 6.2% difference means 2,207 more children could have been proficient if all in poverty had FCPK.

13% gain
5.8 point increase

2016-2017 ACT-Aspire
Impact: Grade Retention for All Alabama Students

Children who received First Class Pre-K are **less likely to be retained in grade** than children who did not attend.

### Percent of All Students Retained as of Fall 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade (Year of Kindergarten Entry)</th>
<th>No-First Class Pre-K</th>
<th>First Class Pre-K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st (2016)</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd (2015)</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd (2014)</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th (2013)</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th (2012)</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th (2011)</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th (2010)</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impact: Grade Retention for Low Income Students

Children who received First Class Pre-K are **less likely to be retained in grade** than children who did not attend.

These differences mean that 6,503 fewer students could have been retained if all low income children in these grades had received FCPK.

Reducing retention = Fewer “extra years” → cost savings

Estimated potential cost savings of $59,165,276 for these 4 groups.
Impact: Attendance for Low Income Students

Alabama First Class Pre-K children consistently over time and across grades miss fewer days of school. Low income children who received First Class Pre-K are less likely to be chronically absent.

Percentage of Low Income Children who were Chronically Absent by Grade, 2015-2016 school year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>FCPK</th>
<th>No-FCPK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These differences result in an estimated $5,403,655 in cumulative “lost cost” avoided.

Chronically absent students missed 18 or more days per year.
USING DATA TO INFORM EQUITY FOCUSED POLICIES
OREGON EARLY LEARNING DIVISION

LILLIAN GREEN, EQUITY DIRECTOR
GWYN BACHTLE, DIRECTOR OF EARLY LEARNING PROGRAMS

May 2019
2015 Legislative Session

- New Mixed-delivery preschool program
  - Requires lead teachers to have a bachelor’s degree
  - Requires pay parity with kindergarten teachers

- Priority populations for eligibility
  - Income: 0-200% FPL
  - Race and ethnicity: Communities that have experienced persistent educational disparities
First Year:
Student Demographics

1,259 students

Primary Language:
65% English
35% Spanish

Income at or below 100% of the Federal Poverty Levels: 33%

Income between 101-200% of the Federal Poverty Levels: 67%

[Pie chart showing the following demographics:
- Hispanic 46%
- White 35%
- Black 6%
- Multiracial 5%
- Asian 4%
- American Indian/American Native 3%]
First Year:
Lead Teacher Education Level

77% of the lead teachers have a Bachelor Degree or higher
First Year:
Teaching Staff Demographics

This is inclusive of both lead teachers, assistants and support staff that interact with the students.
2017 Legislative Session

- Amended enacting legislation and removed the bachelor’s degree requirement

- Determining new entry level educational level
  - Stakeholder input
  - Use of workforce data
  - Use of Equity Lens
### Data Appendix: Race and Ethnicity of Steps 3-12, Active Designated Positions, by Registry Step

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino or Hispanic</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (not Latino or Hispanic)</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1,112</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>8.5</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>9.5</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino or Hispanic</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (not Latino or Hispanic)</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
<td>1,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Data Appendix: Race and Ethnicity of Steps 3-12, Active Designated Positions, by Registry Step

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>7.5</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino or Hispanic</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (not Latino or Hispanic)</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>59.9%</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>387</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1,145</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>8.5</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>9.5</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino or Hispanic</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (not Latino or Hispanic)</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>197</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1,161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Steps

- Equitable access and opportunity to pursue higher degrees
- Other methods to acknowledge (and accept) quality teaching practices
- Setting metrics and benchmarks
  - Program policy aligned with workforce data
  - Shared ‘ownership’ of achievement
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Data Use & Table Discussions

Internal Data Use
Match your question... With your data... In your context...

External Data Use
Connect the right people... To the right content... With the right data...
which way to the next mountain?
First Year:
Mixed Delivery Actualized

- Childcare Provider: 24%
- Public School: 24%
- Education Service Districts: 2%
- Head Start/OPK: 16%
- Certified Center: 20%
- Community Based Org.: 11%
- Charter School: 1%
- Relief Nurseries: 2%

n=92
## Child Demographic Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>100 - 200% FPL</th>
<th>&lt;100% FPL Rate</th>
<th>100 - 200% FPL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino or Hispanic</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (not Latino or Hispanic)</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>