

---

## ASSESSING THE NUMBER OF ELIGIBLE TEEN PARENTS FOR SCHOOL-BASED PROGRAMS

---

WENDY C. WOLF, PH.D.

*Center for Assessment and Policy Development*

---

### INTRODUCTION

While issues related to adolescent parents are often discussed as part of welfare and political debates, teen parents and their children remain highly invisible in the school setting and the broader community. Because of their invisibility in the school setting, the problems and issues of teen parents are not often seen as mainstream issues that need to be addressed through schools. This is particularly troubling since the only piece of encouraging quantitative research showing positive effects on outcomes for teen parents suggests that providing on-site child care and case management at schools is more likely to improve outcomes for teen parents than other configurations that do not provide these services at the school setting; this work also shows that waiting to serve teen parents until they have dropped out has less effect than intervening through schools (see LEAP: Interim Findings on a Welfare Initiative to Improve School Attendance Among Teenage Parents, New York, NY: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation 1993).

### **Why are teen parents and their children so invisible at schools?**

First, many may have dropped out prior to the birth of the child: national data suggest that the number could be as large as 25%. Second, most schools have difficulty getting a handle on the number of adolescent parents that they serve, predominantly because of confidentiality issues surrounding collection of these data. Third, communities perceive the number of adolescent parents to be served in their own jurisdiction

as small. Often what's considered is the annual number of births to teens 18 and under as an estimate of the number of teen parents eligible to attend supportive programs through schools. However, the actual number of female adolescent parents who could potentially participate in school-based efforts is approximately two to three times that annual number of births given that many girls have had births in prior years and have not yet reached the age of 19.

For this reason, it is worthwhile to assist school districts and the broader service provider community to get a better understanding of the number of adolescent parents who could be and who are served through school. For if they had this type of information: they would have a better understanding of the scope and scale of the problem; they would be in a position to address these needs by first heightening the awareness of others; and they would need to alter the type of options available for this population. (For example, many districts have expanded support services and on-site child care to comprehensive high schools in order to accommodate the large number of teen parents.)

Over the last several years during our work with individual districts, we have become aware of three strategies to highlight the existence and the needs of teen parents:

- First, we have worked with districts to use a very simple algorithm to estimate the number of female adolescent parents who could be served through schools. The rest of this document piece addresses this methodology.

### Assessing the Number of Eligible Teen Parents for School-Based Programs (cont.)

---

- Another type of strategy is being developed by Minneapolis. The school district and other service providers are attempting to link the recent birth records of adolescents with other service data including data from schools to get a sense of the patterns of service receipt of adolescent parents and the critical gaps identified.
  - Finally, the Health Department of the State of California has produced geomapping of all births to adolescent parents, which can be useful to those in the communities and districts as they plan services for these populations.
- The rest of this piece includes:
- The description of one strategy to assess the number of female teen parents in a school district (See Attachment A);
  - The data resulting from this exercise from one city and its surrounding counties (See Attachment B);
  - An example of completing this exercise in the community of Utopia (See Attachment C); and
  - The kinds of birth data that are needed to do these estimates (See Attachment D).

## ATTACHMENT A

### *One Strategy for Assessing the Number of Eligible Female Teen Parents for School-Based Programs*

#### **ESTIMATING THE NUMBER OF THE COMMUNITY'S PREGNANT AND PARENTING TEENAGERS**

There is a simple way to estimate the number of the community's pregnant and parenting teenagers. Using the annual number of births to teens as a rough estimate of the numbers of pregnant and parenting teens in your community grossly understates the number of girls eligible for such services for it ignores girls who have had births in prior years and not yet reached the age of 19. There are a few simple steps that you need to take to get a better estimate of the number of pregnant and parenting teens eligible for such services:

- ***Get vital statistics data on births in the last four years to teens, by age. Put into the chart below.***

Number of teenagers giving birth during each year by age:

Year	<15 years	15 years	16 years	17 years	18 years
1997	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)
1996	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)
1995	(k)	(l)	(m)	(n)	(o)
1994	(p)	(q)	(r)	(s)	(t)

- ***Combine data from this year with prior years to develop an estimate of the number of pregnant and parenting teens in 1997 potentially eligible for these services***

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\text{<15 years: (a)} \\
 &\text{15 years: (b) + (f)} \\
 &\text{16 years: (c) + (g) + (k)} \\
 &\text{17 years: (d) + (h) + (l) + (p)} \\
 &\text{18 years: (e) + (i) + (m) + (q)} \\
 &\text{TOTAL = (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e) + (f) + (g) + (h) + (i)} \\
 &\quad \text{+ (k) + (l) + (m) + (p) + (q)}
 \end{aligned}$$

Recognize that this total number may be an over estimate because it does not take into account in and out migration of teen parents nor the fact that some teens gave birth in more than one year and are thus double counted. In addition, if you are dealing solely with the public schools this number could be deflated to account for the fact that some portion of teens are in the parochial and private schools. Finally, some school districts deal with municipalities while the birth data are often on a county basis. Please make sure that the numbers you are creating are from the same geographic entity as the birth data. If you can correct for any of these factors, do so. If not, always explain how and in what ways they may be over estimates.

## ATTACHMENT B

### *The experience in a City and its Surrounding Counties*

*\*This attachment was prepared by  
Barbara Kyle, Minneapolis Public Schools*

### *Number of Births to Mothers 19 Years Old or Younger Between 1991 and 1996 City of Minneapolis*

Year of Birth	Mother's Age						Totals
	<15	15	16	17	18	19	
1996	22	73	112	184	197	237	825
1995	24	70	128	180	192	225	594
1994	34	72	112	163	232	244	381
1993	32	68	123	178	219	236	223
1992	45	78	126	173	223	240	123
1991	35	64	138	176	234	288	35
<b>TOTALS*</b>	192	361	475	527	389	237	1,944

\*still <19 in 1995 by age when gave birth

### *Number of Births to Mothers 19 Years Old or Younger Between 1991 and 1996 Suburban Hennepin County*

Year of Birth	Mother's Age						Totals
	<15	15	16	17	18	19	
1996	5	18	40	82	129	188	462
1995	4	22	53	87	109	149	275
1994	7	21	466	99	107	156	173
1993	11	16	46	84	115	137	73
1992	8	11	51	85	114	145	19
1991	6	8	50	80	114	169	6
<b>TOTALS*</b>	41	88	185	268	238	188	1,008

\*still <19 in 1995 by age when gave birth

## ATTACHMENT C

### *The Community of Utopia: Working Through an Example*

*\*This case was prepared by  
Ronda Simpson-Brown, Department of State of California*

#### CASE STUDY: STATE OF UTOPIA

The school superintendent has just informed you that non-competitive funding is available to establish a school program for pregnant and parenting teens beginning January 1999. Unfortunately, the deadline for requesting funds is in two hours. The only information you have is shown below.

The announcement encourages the district to request sufficient funding to meet the need, but is very clear that the need is not to be overestimated. Your task is to determine how many pregnant/parenting students are in your county as of 1/99 taking into consideration that students can only be served through 18 years.

#### *Estimating the Number of Pregnant and Parenting Mothers*

Year	Mother's Age				
	<15	15	16	17	18
1997	9	13	16	23	24
1996	10	14	19	26	29
1995	12	17	22	27	32
1994	15	20	25	30	35

<15 years \_\_\_\_\_ 15 years \_\_\_\_\_ 16 years \_\_\_\_\_ 17 years \_\_\_\_\_ 18 years \_\_\_\_\_ TOTAL \_\_\_\_\_

#### *Births to Teen Mothers by Year and by Age (1997)*

##### *State of Utopia Case Study*

Year	Mother's Age						TOTAL	% Decrease
	<15	15	16	17	18	19		
1994	15	20	25	30	35	40	165	
1995	12	17	22	27	32	37	147	11%
1996	10	14	19	26	29	34	132	10%
1997	9	13	16	23	24	31	116	11%
<b>TOTAL</b>	46	64	82	106	120	142	560	

ATTACHMENT C (continued)

*Births to Teen Mothers by Year and by Age Projection for 1999*  
*State of Utopia Case Study*

Year	Mother's Age						TOTAL	TOTAL
	<15	15	16	17	18	19	10-19 Years	10-18 Years
1994					15	20	35	15
1995				12	17	22	51	29
1996			10	14	19	26	69	43
1997		9	13	16	23	24	85	61
SUB-TOTAL		9	23	42	74	92	240	148
1998 (est.)	8	11	14	20	22	89	164	75
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>404</b>	<b>223</b>

## ATTACHMENT D

### *The Kinds of Birth Data that are Needed to do These Estimates*

*These data are excerpted from CHILD TRENDS, INC., 4302 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20008. They are revised, updated and put on the web each year.*

### *Births to Teenage Mothers in Large U.S. Cities in 1995*

City	NUMBER OF BIRTHS TO TEENS			OF ALL BIRTHS FOR CITY	NUMBER OF BIRTHS TO TEENS UNDER AGE 20		BIRTHS TO UNMARRIED TEEN MOTHERS			OF ALL BIRTHS TO MOTHERS UNDER 20
	Total under 20	17 and younger	Ages 18-19	% to mothers under 20	White	Black	Total under 20	17 and younger	Ages 18-19	% non marital
Akron, OH	644	263	381	18	304	327	586	252	334	91
Albuquerque, NM	1177	476	701	15	1056	43	970	428	542	82
Amarillo, TX	605	247	358	20	521	67	386	188	198	64
Anaheim, CA	823	330	493	12	777	23	504	225	279	61
Anchorage, AK	462	177	285	10	262	64	348	160	188	75
Arlington, TX	559	224	335	11	446	96	391	180	211	70
Atlanta, GA	1617	795	822	20	185	1427	1480	756	724	92
Aurora, CO	471	174	297	11	331	121	353	148	205	75
Austin, TX	1433	628	805	14	1111	302	995	500	495	69
Bakersfield, CA	1333	584	749	19	1144	161	987	474	513	74
Baltimore, MD	2357	1193	1164	22	343	2004	2274	1178	1096	96
Baton Rouge, LA	802	341	461	17	156	641	729	329	400	91
Birmingham, AL	934	444	490	23	85	846	858	430	428	92
Boise City, ID	302	92	210	11	295	1	175	73	102	58
Boston, MA	909	397	512	11	344	534	844	377	467	93
Buffalo, NY	905	401	504	18	390	500	845	387	458	93
Charlotte, NC	946	440	506	12	285	640	840	419	421	89
Chattanooga, TN	474	214	260	21	167	306	395	195	200	83
Chesapeake, VA	325	136	189	12	152	168	264	127	137	81
Chicago, IL	10217	4605	5612	19	3856	6303	9056	4319	4737	89
Chula Vista, CA	375	132	243	12	323	28	234	95	139	62

ATTACHMENT D (continued)

*Births to Teenage Mothers in Large U.S. Cities in 1995*

City	NUMBER OF BIRTHS TO TEENS			OF ALL BIRTHS FOR CITY	NUMBER OF BIRTHS TO TEENS UNDER AGE 20		BIRTHS TO UNMARRIED TEEN MOTHERS			OF ALL BIRTHS TO MOTHERS UNDER 20
	Total under 20	17 and younger	Ages 18-19	% to mothers under 20	White	Black	Total under 20	17 and younger	Ages 18-19	% non marital
Cincinnati, OH	1145	538	607	20	348	792	1083	521	562	95
Cleveland, OH	1972	888	1084	21	660	1308	1839	858	981	93
Colorado Springs, CO	809	301	508	13	667	111	533	269	264	66
Columbus, GA	581	244	337	22	170	406	495	227	268	85
Columbus, OH	1640	675	965	16	837	783	1456	641	815	89
Corpus Christi, TX	1003	457	546	21	932	62	770	379	391	77
Dallas, TX	3876	1653	2223	18	2286	1536	2988	1401	1587	77
Dayton, OH	558	248	310	19	243	314	506	236	270	91
Denver, CO	1367	618	749	16	1096	225	1069	536	533	78
Des Moines, IA	469	201	268	13	366	80	402	188	214	86
Detroit, MI	3794	1687	2107	22	445	3315	3623	1646	1977	95
Durham, NC	276	120	156	11	52	224	250	115	135	91
El Paso, TX	2341	941	1400	17	2270	60	1418	621	797	61
Flint, MI	688	312	376	23	237	447	651	305	346	95
Ft. Lauderdale, FL	553	271	282	14	156	395	512	257	255	93
Ft Wayne, IN	559	211	348	16	338	215	496	205	291	89
Ft. Worth, TX	1654	699	955	18	1122	511	1158	560	598	70
Freemont, CA	178	67	111	6	148	12	87	35	52	49
Fresno, CA	1778	836	942	18	1278	205	1154	559	595	65
Garden Grove, CA	280	107	173	9	224	7	159	76	83	57
Garland, TX	450	179	271	13	365	74	312	145	167	69
Glendale, AZ	514	199	315	14	470	36	409	187	222	80
Glendale, CA	139	43	96	6	127	1	92	36	56	66
Grand Rapids, MI	637	282	355	16	334	292	573	268	305	90
Greensboro, NC	350	139	211	12	107	233	299	130	169	85
Hampton, VA	310	116	194	14	119	184	257	112	145	83

ATTACHMENT D (continued)

*Births to Teenage Mothers in Large U.S. Cities in 1995*

City	NUMBER OF BIRTHS TO TEENS			OF ALL BIRTHS FOR CITY	NUMBER OF BIRTHS TO TEENS UNDER AGE 20		BIRTHS TO UNMARRIED TEEN MOTHERS			OF ALL BIRTHS TO MOTHERS UNDER 20
	Total under 20	17 and younger	Ages 18-19	% to mothers under 20	White	Black	Total under 20	17 and younger	Ages 18-19	% non marital
Hialeah, FL	286	107	179	11	275	11	175	81	94	61
Honolulu, HI	366	119	247	7	51	16	313	116	197	86
Houston, TX	6226	2705	3521	15	4146	2009	4502	2147	2355	72
Huntington Beach, CA	152	48	104	6	145	1	88	28	60	58
Huntsville, AL	321	138	183	14	130	187	256	125	131	80
Indianapolis, IN	2049	896	1153	15	1163	875	1832	852	980	89
Irving, TX	373	156	217	12	328	41	265	125	140	71
Jackson, MS	696	318	378	21	78	617	647	311	336	93
Jacksonville, FL	1630	699	931	15	751	850	1305	622	683	80
Jersey City, NJ	566	251	315	14	249	307	515	240	275	91
Kansas City, KS	571	251	320	24	284	277	500	235	265	88
Kansas City, MO	1132	495	637	17	445	670	1035	479	556	91
Knoxville, TN	428	168	260	16	293	132	307	141	166	72
Laredo, TX	788	328	460	17	788	0	433	211	222	55
Las Vegas, NV	1329	487	842	13	1030	235	1024	436	588	77
Lexington-Fayette, KY	424	174	250	13	243	180	345	157	188	81
Lincoln, NE	225	87	138	8	193	24	187	79	108	83
Little Rock, AR	461	189	272	15	104	352	400	173	227	87
Long Beach, CA	1312	507	805	14	894	309	742	300	442	57
Los Angeles, Ca	9618	3987	5631	14	8047	1423	6658	2928	3730	69
Louisville, KY	1245	67	678	19	647	588	1077	517	560	87
Lubbock, TX	578	250	328	19	478	96	350	174	176	61
Madison, WI	198	76	122	8	107	76	174	72	102	88
Memphis, TnN	2371	1066	1305	21	322	2040	2197	1040	1157	93
Mesa, AZ	835	303	532	13	770	27	658	280	378	79
Miami, FL	2197	986	1211	14	903	1283	1887	901	986	86

ATTACHMENT D (continued)

*Births to Teenage Mothers in Large U.S. Cities in 1995*

City	NUMBER OF BIRTHS TO TEENS			OF ALL BIRTHS FOR CITY	NUMBER OF BIRTHS TO TEENS UNDER AGE 20		BIRTHS TO UNMARRIED TEEN MOTHERS			OF ALL BIRTHS TO MOTHERS UNDER 20
	Total under 20	17 and younger	Ages 18-19	% to mothers under 20	White	Black	Total under 20	17 and younger	Ages 18-19	% non marital
Milwaukee, WI	2394	1119	1275	21	755	1537	2227	1085	1142	93
Minneapolis, MN	822	402	420	14	276	384	753	388	365	92
Mobile, AL	629	269	360	19	161	465	540	249	291	86
Modesto, CA	609	269	340	15	518	28	405	194	211	67
Montgomery, AL	572	268	304	18	112	457	526	259	267	92
Marino Valley, CA	414	162	252	18	281	112	287	130	157	69
Nashville/Davidson, TN	1182	504	678	15	554	615	995	469	526	84
Newark, NJ	1080	483	597	20	368	708	999	461	538	93
New Orleans, LA	1804	842	962	22	64	1727	1739	830	909	96
Newport News, VA	495	193	302	12	203	286	383	175	208	77
New York, NY	13689	5546	8143	11	7526	5944	12240	5237	7003	89
Norfolk, VA	782	311	471	18	235	535	610	285	325	78
Oakland, CA	954	401	553	15	300	581	619	271	348	65
Ocean Side, CA	484	153	331	13	397	58	216	90	126	45
Oklahoma City, OK	1215	503	712	17	758	373	929	430	499	76
Omaha, NE	680	277	403	13	402	256	598	270	328	88
Orlando, FL	956	384	572	16	486	457	805	356	449	84
Oxnard, CA	588	249	339	16	564	1	309	146	163	53
Patterson, NJ	554	249	305	18	317	234	483	230	253	87
Philadelphia, PA	4456	2077	2379	18	1388	2973	4271	2029	2242	96
Phoenix, AZ	3671	1538	2133	17	3261	258	3050	1379	1671	83
Pittsburgh, PA	656	301	355	14	201	448	633	295	338	96
Plano, TX	134	49	85	5	118	14	104	43	61	78
Pomona, CA	570	237	333	16	484	67	345	156	189	61
Portland, OR	904	387	517	13	644	185	774	363	411	86
Providence, RI	463	205	258	18	280	125	421	193	228	91

ATTACHMENT D (continued)

*Births to Teenage Mothers in Large U.S. Cities in 1995*

City	NUMBER OF BIRTHS TO TEENS			OF ALL BIRTHS FOR CITY	NUMBER OF BIRTHS TO TEENS UNDER AGE 20		BIRTHS TO UNMARRIED TEEN MOTHERS			OF ALL BIRTHS TO MOTHERS UNDER 20
	Total under 20	17 and younger	Ages 18-19	% to mothers under 20	White	Black	Total under 20	17 and younger	Ages 18-19	% non marital
Raleigh, NC	357	171	186	9	116	235	308	161	147	86
Reno, NV	345	132	213	12	313	15	275	111	164	80
Richmond, VA	505	265	240	18	49	455	487	261	226	96
Riverside, CA	893	361	532	15	764	95	615	271	344	69
Rochester, NY	804	359	445	18	321	473	758	349	409	94
Rockford, IL	402	174	228	16	244	155	354	168	186	88
Sacramento, CA	1704	698	1006	15	959	434	1129	479	650	66
St. Louis, MO	1351	614	737	22	237	1105	1298	606	692	96
St. Paul, MN	664	283	381	14	284	175	549	258	291	83
St. Petersburg, FL	522	236	286	16	243	267	460	222	238	88
Salt Lake City, UT	624	229	395	10	556	19	414	182	232	66
San Antonio, TX	3724	1683	2041	18	3419	286	2412	1263	1149	65
San Bernardino, CA	853	340	513	18	654	178	664	264	400	78
San Diego, CA	2095	810	1285	10	1471	396	1211	504	707	58
San Francisco, CA	655	270	385	8	330	220	405	169	236	62
San Jose, CA	1640	693	947	10	1377	97	984	446	538	60
Santa Ana, CA	1268	491	777	14	1225	11	746	339	407	59
Savannah, GA	567	246	321	21	125	440	494	230	264	87
Scottsdale, AZ	110	38	72	6	93	5	88	33	55	80
Seattle, WA	498	194	304	7	258	135	422	172	250	85
Shreveport, LA	649	275	375	21	141	504	563	259	304	87
Spokane, WA	428	143	285	13	387	12	333	126	207	78
Springfield, MA	462	217	245	20	331	122	429	212	217	93
Springfield, MO	324	103	221	15	304	17	227	90	137	70
Stockton, CA	986	427	559	18	600	180	684	312	272	69
Syracuse, NY	520	246	274	20	237	268	498	241	257	96

ATTACHMENT D (continued)

*Births to Teenage Mothers in Large U.S. Cities in 1995*

City	NUMBER OF BIRTHS TO TEENS			OF ALL BIRTHS FOR CITY	NUMBER OF BIRTHS TO TEENS UNDER AGE 20		BIRTHS TO UNMARRIED TEEN MOTHERS			OF ALL BIRTHS TO MOTHERS UNDER 20
	Total under 20	17 and younger	Ages 18-19	% to mothers under 20	White	Black	Total under 20	17 and younger	Ages 18-19	% non marital
Tacoma, WA	473	189	284	16	262	123	404	179	225	85
Tampa, FL	1280	545	735	18	667	603	1071	503	568	84
Tempe, AZ	196	67	129	10	181	11	154	60	94	79
Toledo, OH	933	372	561	17	535	394	830	356	474	89
Torrance, CA	184	64	120	8	155	21	119	42	77	65
Tucson, AZ	1343	556	787	16	1214	67	1090	503	587	81
Tulsa, OK	913	372	541	15	519	308	686	322	364	75
Virginia Beach, VA	632	246	386	9	398	201	475	217	258	75
Warren, MI	149	51	98	8	139	3	132	49	83	89
Washington, DC	1471	659	812	16	123	1340	1406	642	764	96
Wichita, Ks	851	320	531	15	603	222	667	278	389	78
Winston-Salem, NC	410	172	238	16	146	261	365	163	202	89
Worcester, MA	355	151	204	15	297	44	328	144	184	92
Yonkers, NY	262	92	170	10	178	80	151	61	90	58