

**Online Appendix for “Long-run Effects from Comprehensive Student Support: Evidence from Pathways to Education” (by Adam Lavecchia, Philip Oreopoulos and Robert Brown)**

**Appendix A: Data**

- A1: Toronto District School Board Data
- A2: Toronto Community Housing (TCH)
- A3: Administrative Data from Statistics Canada

**Appendix B: Additional Robustness Checks**

- B1: Decomposition of the Effect of Eligibility for Pathways on Unconditional Earnings
- B2: Sensitivity of the Main Results
- B3: Additional Results
- B4: Preliminary Estimates of the Effect of Eligibility for Pathways the Rexdale and Lawrence Heights Locations

**Online Appendix C: Benefit-Cost Analysis**

## **Online Appendix A (Data)**

This appendix provides additional details about the administrative datasets described in Section 3 and the construction of key variables. Appendix Table A1 summarizes the key variables used in our analysis.

### ***A1. Toronto District School Board Data***

The TDSB data contain information on the demographic characteristics and academic performance of students that entered Grade 9 in a TDSB school between September 2000 and September 2008. Importantly, the TDSB data also include information on students' first and last names, date of birth and address, including postal codes. This information allows us match the TDSB data to a list of public housing projects provided by Toronto Community Housing (TCH).

### ***A2. Toronto Community Housing (TCH)***

The Toronto Community Housing Corporation (TCH) is the public housing agency for the City of Toronto. The TCH is the second-largest public housing provider in North America (behind the New York City Housing Authority). As of 2017, TCH owns 2,100 buildings, including more than 350 high- and low-rise apartment buildings that house more than 110,000 residents in 60,000 low-income households.<sup>1</sup> TCH residents pay rent geared to income, with approximately 25 to 30 percent of a household's gross income being charged as rent. All

---

<sup>1</sup> For more details about TCH, refer to <https://www.torontohousing.ca/About>.

households wishing to obtain a unit in a TCH property must fill out a standardized application form. Since the demand for units is greater than the supply available in any given year, the TCH must ration spots in its properties. Since 1995 TCH has allocated units in chronological order, with special consideration given to newly arrived immigrants, the homeless and those facing domestic violence. Even those that qualify for special consideration, wait times were often substantial. For example, average wait times in 1998 were 5 to 7 years (Toronto Social Housing Connections, 1998). Applicants therefore faced strong incentive to indicate interest at all projects and accept the first unit offered. Since most families apply with young children and do not move once offered a unit, most would not have known about Pathways at the time of applying for housing.

Our data focuses on the 113 housing projects built before 1976. To create a publicly available dataset, some nearby and small projects are grouped together. This leaves us with 70 housing projects ranging in size across various neighborhoods in Toronto. The TCH data is matched with the TDSB data using the postal codes on school registration forms.

### ***A3. Administrative Data from Statistics Canada***

The long-term outcomes used in this study are derived from six administrative datasets provided by Statistics Canada. These datasets are: the T1 Family File (T1FF), the T1, T2, T3 and Payroll Deduction (PD7) tax files, and the Longitudinal Immigration Database (IMDB). In this section, we briefly describe each of these datasets, how the data are matched to the TDSB-TCH data and the construction of key variables.

*T1 Family File (TIFF)*: The TIFF is an administrative file that combines information from three tax files provided by the Canada Revenue Agency (CRA). The three files that comprise the TIFF are: the individual T1 file, the T4 file and the Canada Child Tax Benefit (CCTB) file.<sup>2</sup> The individual T1 file is based on the information provided by tax filers on their individual returns. Variables of interest include earnings, deductions, taxable income, as well as limited demographic characteristics and family identifiers. The T4 file supplements the information provided in individual tax returns with information submitted by third parties (employers and financial institutions). These third-party reports include information on earnings from employment, public and private pension contributions, payroll tax deductions and interest income. The CCTB file includes information on non-filing children, including year of year of birth. We use this information to construct an indicator variable for whether a tax filer has any children, as well as the filer's number of dependents in each year.

*T2, T3 and Payroll Deduction (PD7) files*: The T2 administrative file contains information from corporate income tax returns beginning with the 2000 tax year. In particular, variables in the T2 file include firm sales, gross profits, taxes, business equity and assets. The T3 Trust Income Tax and Information Return file contains information on the sales and income of communal farming organizations. The PD7 administrative file is derived from payroll deduction forms remitted by employers to the Canada Revenue Agency. For each year, the file contains information on total gross payrolls, the total number of employees, as well as summary statistics about the earnings of employees of the firm. In particular, the PD7 file contains information on the mean and median wage paid to employees of the firm.

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://www23.statcan.gc.ca/imdb/p2SV.pl?Function=getSurvey&SDDS=4105>

*Longitudinal Immigration Database (IMDB)*: The IMDB file combines administrative immigration and tax files to provide data on the socio-economic outcomes of Canadian immigrants. The file contains information on labour market outcomes, country of origin, education, as well as knowledge of English or French.<sup>3</sup> We use the IMDB file to confirm the immigrant status of individuals in our sample.

Online Appendix Table A2 reports summary statistics for select variables for 2015. The sample is all individuals that enrolled in a TDSB school between 2000 and 2008 and lived in a TCH public housing project. Column 1 reports means for Regent Park students. Columns 2 and 3 report means for students from the Rexdale and Lawrence Heights projects (where Pathways was introduced in 2007) and other public housing students (OPH), respectively. Across all sites, the fraction of individuals working ranges between 52 and 62 percent and (unconditional) average annual earnings range between \$10,700 and \$15,800. The low level of mean earnings partially reflects the age range of our sample in 2015 and partially reflects the fact that the employment rate is low. In particular, while students in the 2000 Grade 9 cohort are 29 years old in 2015, students in the 2008 cohort are only 21. Table A2 also shows that Regent Park students claim more tuition spending and are more likely to be immigrants than students from other public housing sites.

Online Appendix Table A3 reports the means of select outcome variables for 19 year-olds and 28 year-olds in the 2000 OPH cohort. The age patterns for earnings, the likelihood of being married and having a child and postsecondary tuition expenditures in the comparison group follow the expected pattern. For example, the average young adult in the 2000 OPH cohort earned \$4,043 at age 19 and \$16,402 at age 28.

---

<sup>3</sup> <http://www23.statcan.gc.ca/imdb/p2SV.pl?Function=getSurvey&SDDS=5057>

## Online Appendix B (Additional Results and Robustness Checks)

### *B1. Decomposition of the Effect of Eligibility for Pathways on Unconditional Earnings*

In Section 4.1 of the main text, we discuss how much of the effect of eligibility for Pathways on unconditional earnings is due to an increase in the likelihood of working (extensive margin). This section provides additional details regarding this decomposition using a simplified version of our estimating equation (1). For expositional reasons, we ignore covariates other than a young adult's age in calendar year  $t$  and collapse the housing project fixed effects and Grade 9 cohort fixed effects into two binary variables that indicate whether an individual lived in Regent Park and entered high school after September 2001. Let  $RP_i = 1$  if a young adult lived in Regent Park during high school and  $RP_i = 0$  otherwise. Similarly, let  $Post_t = 1$  for those that enrolled in Grade 9 in September 2001 or later and  $Post_t = 0$  otherwise. Furthermore, let  $Age_{it}$  denote the age of individual  $i$  in year  $t$  and let  $\gamma_a$  denote age fixed effects. Using the above notation, our main estimating equation can be written as follows.

$$y_{it} = \gamma_a + \beta_1 RP_{i(p)} + \beta_2 Post_t + \sum_{a=19}^{28} \beta_3^a (RP_i \times Post_t \times (Age_{it} = a)) + e_{it} \quad (B1)$$

All of the insights from the decomposition below follow through if equation (1) is used rather than equation (B1).

For each individual  $i$ , observed (unconditional) earnings in year  $t$ ,  $y_{it}$ , can be written as the product of a binary variable equal to 1 for those with positive earnings  $v_{it}$  and (the latent) conditional earnings variable  $z_{it}$ . Thus,  $y_{it} = v_{it} \times z_{it}$ . For individuals with positive earnings, observed earnings are equal to conditional earnings  $y_{it} = z_{it}$ . We can now write the estimating

equations for empirical models in which the dependent variable is the binary participation dummy and the conditional earnings variable, respectively

$$v_{it} = \alpha_a + \alpha_1 RP_i + \alpha_2 Post_t + \sum_{a=19}^{28} \alpha_3^a (RP_i \times Post_t \times (Age_{it} = a)) + u_{it} \quad (B2)$$

$$z_{it} = \pi_a + \pi_1 RP_i + \pi_2 Post_t + \sum_{a=19}^{28} \pi_3^a (RP_i \times Post_t \times (Age_{it} = a)) + \epsilon_{it} \quad (B3)$$

In the former equation,  $\alpha_3^a$  is the estimate of the average causal effect of eligibility for Pathways on the likelihood of working at age  $a$  (i.e. the estimates reported in Figure 3 and column 3 of Appendix Table A4). The parameter  $\pi_3^a$  is the estimate of the average causal effect of eligibility for Pathways on conditional earnings at age  $a$  (i.e. the intensive margin effect). Using equations (B1) to (B3), the mean unconditional observed earnings at age  $a$  for Regent Park and OPH youth that entered Grade 9 before September 2001 can be written as follows.

$$E[y_{it} | RP_i = 1, Post_t = 0, Age_{it} = a] = \gamma_a + \beta_1 = (\alpha_a + \alpha_1) \times (\pi_a + \pi_1) \quad (B4)$$

$$E[y_{it} | RP_i = 0, Post_t = 0, Age_{it} = a] = \gamma_a = \alpha_a \times \pi_a \quad (B5)$$

Similarly, the mean unconditional observed earnings at age  $a$  for Regent Park and OPH youth that entered Grade 9 after September 2001 can be written as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} E[y_{it} | RP_i = 1, Post_t = 1, Age_a = a] &= \gamma_a + \beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3^a \\ &= (\alpha_a + \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3^a) \times (\pi_a + \pi_1 + \pi_2 + \pi_3^a) \end{aligned} \quad (B6)$$

$$E[y_{it}|RP_i = 0, Post_t = 1, Age_a = a] = \gamma_a + \beta_2 = (\alpha_a + \alpha_2) \times (\pi_a + \pi_2) \quad (B7)$$

Subtracting (B5) from (B4) and (B7) from (B6) gives the Regent Park minus OPH difference in the mean observed earnings before and after the introduction of Pathways.

$$\begin{aligned} E[y_{it}|RP_i = 1, Post_t = 0, Age_a = a] - E[y_{it}|RP_i = 0, Post_t = 0, Age_a = a] &= \beta_1 \\ &= \alpha_1 \times (\pi_a + \pi_1) + \alpha_a \times \pi_1 \end{aligned} \quad (B8)$$

$$\begin{aligned} E[y_{it}|RP_i = 1, Post_t = 1, Age_a = a] - E[y_{it}|RP_i = 0, Post_t = 1, Age_a = a] &= \beta_1 + \beta_3^a \\ &= (\alpha_1 + \alpha_3^a) \times (\pi_a + \pi_1 + \pi_2 + \pi_3^a) + (\alpha_a + \alpha_2) \times (\pi_1 + \pi_3^a) \end{aligned} \quad (B9)$$

Finally, the difference-in-differences estimator of the average causal effect of eligibility for Pathways on earnings at age  $a$  is obtained by subtracting (B8) from (B9).

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_3^a &= \alpha_3^a \times (\pi_a + \pi_1 + \pi_2 + \pi_3^a) + \pi_3^a(\alpha_a + \alpha_1 + \alpha_2) + \alpha_1 \times \pi_2 + \alpha_2 \times \pi_1 \\ &= \underbrace{\alpha_3^a \times (E[y_{it}|y_{it} > 0, RP_i = 1, Post_t = 1, Age_a = a] - \pi_3^a)}_{\text{Extensive Margin Effect}} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\pi_3^a \times P[y_{it} > 0 | RP_i = 1, Post_t = 1, Age_a = a]}_{\text{Conditional Earnings Effect}} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{(\alpha_1 \times \pi_2 + \alpha_2 \times \pi_1)}_{\text{Compositional Effect}} \end{aligned} \quad (B10)$$

Equation (B10) shows that average causal effect of eligibility for Pathways on earnings at age  $a$  can be decomposed into three terms. Each term in equation (B10) represents is the contribution to the relative differences in the earnings growth between Regent Park and OPH young adults, before and after the introduction of Pathways from one of three economic forces. The first term, which we refer to as the Extensive Margin Effect, is the product of (i) the average causal effect of eligibility for Pathways on employment and (ii) the counterfactual average earnings of employed young adults from Regent Park that entered Grade 9 after 2001. Intuitively, part of the difference in earnings growth between Regent Park and OPH young adults is due to the change

in the likelihood of working caused by the Pathways program multiplied by the earnings that those from Regent Park could expect to get in the absence of an intensive margin earnings effect. The second term in equation (B10), which we refer to as the Conditional Earnings Effect, is the product of (i) the average causal effect of eligibility for Pathways on conditional earnings and (ii) the fraction of young adults from the post-2001 Regent Park cohorts that are working. The third part of equation (B10) shows that to obtain the estimator for the average causal effect of eligibility for Pathways on earnings, we must add to the Extensive Margin and Conditional Earnings Effects a term that captures the difference in the composition of the sub-sample of employed workers caused by the effect of Pathways on the fraction of young adults that are working.

Using the fact that average earnings conditional on working at age 28 for young adults from Regent Park is \$32,030 ( $\$22,005/0.687$ ) in 2015, the estimates from columns 2 and 3 of Table A4 suggest that the extensive margin response explains approximately three quarters of the unconditional earnings response ( $\$32,030 * 0.088 / \$3,282 = 0.859$ ).

## ***B2. Sensitivity of the Main Results***

This section summarizes the results from additional analyses. We first explore the sensitivity of the main results reported in the main text. Online Appendix Table A7 reports the coefficients and standard errors from the estimation of equation (1) on the subsample of young adults that entered Grade 9 between September 2000 and September 2003. The results using the baseline sample in the main text uses an unbalanced panel with 46,798 individual-year observations. By restricting the sample to the 2000-2003 TDSB cohorts, we focus on a group of

young adults that we are able to follow from age 19 until their late 20s. The coefficient estimates in Appendix Table A7 are qualitatively and quantitatively similar to those reported in Figures 1-3 and Appendix Table A4. In particular, the effect of eligibility for Pathways on postsecondary tuition expenditures (column 1) is generally decreasing in age from age 19 to age 27 (the age 28 coefficient is suppressed because of residual disclosure and privacy concerns). Furthermore, in column 2, the effects of eligibility for Pathways on earnings are generally increasing in age. By ages 25-28, eligibility for Pathways is estimated to increase annual earnings by between \$2,500 and \$5,400, nearly identical to the estimates in Figure 2 and Table A4. The coefficient estimates in column 3 when employment status is the dependent variable are also very similar to those reported in Table A4.

Appendix Table A8 reports estimates of the causal effect of eligibility for Pathways on the employment status dummy using the alternative comparison groups considered in Table A5 of the main text. Although the estimates are generally less precisely estimated (several  $\beta^a$  estimates are not statistically significant at conventional levels), the results suggest that the baseline estimates in Table A4 (and repeated in column 1 of Table A8) are reasonably robust to alternative comparison groups. Online Appendix Figure A2b plots employment rates by Grade 9 cohort separately for young adults from Regent Park and other public housing sites in the legacy Metro Toronto school board for 2015. Reassuringly, there is no discernable difference in the employment trends of the Regent Park and OPH pre-2001 cohorts.

Young adults in the tax data are matched with the TDSB administrative records by matching on the first name, last name and date of birth of the former public housing students. Approximately 90 percent of public housing students in the TDSB data are matched with income tax records by Statistics Canada. Students that are not matched to the tax data likely either left

Canada before age 19 or have never filed a tax return. We investigated whether eligibility for Pathways affects the likelihood of being matched and found (in unreported results) that the program increases the likelihood of being matched by 2-4 percent. In our baseline sample, we assigned the small fraction of unmatched students zero values for all of the dependent variables (including earnings).

Online Appendix Table A9 explores how dropping unmatched students from the sample affects the results reported in the main text. The dependent variable in column 1 is tuition expenditures. The estimates of the effect of eligibility for Pathways on tuition expenditures on the sub-sample of matched tax filers is nearly identical to the estimates using the baseline sample. For example, the estimates  $\beta^{20} - \beta^{24}$  indicate that program eligibility increases tuition expenditures by \$390 and \$850 per year between the ages of 20 and 24 and near zero after 25.

The effects of eligibility for Pathways on earnings in column 2 have a similar age pattern as the estimates reported in Table A4 but are generally smaller in magnitude. Eligibility is estimated to have a negative effect on earnings for the youngest adults in our sample (ages 19-25); the  $\beta^{19} - \beta^{24}$  estimates range between -\$2,100 and -\$1,500. However, by age 25, eligibility for Pathways is estimated to increase annual earnings by between \$1,200 and \$4,500 per year. These estimates are smaller than the \$2,300 to \$5,300 range for the baseline sample and indicates that the sub-sample of TDSB students that are ultimately matched with the tax return data as adults is positively selected. In other words, eligibility for the Pathways program appears to induce marginal young adults to file a tax return or obtain formal employment.

The results in columns 3-6 of Appendix Table A9 also reinforce the findings from Figures 1-3 in the main text (and Appendix Table A4). Eligibility for Pathways is estimated to increase the fraction of young adults working, especially after age 23 (column 3), reduce social

assistance/welfare benefit receipts (column 4), increase UI benefits (column 5) and reduce the likelihood of having a child by age 28 (column 6). As with the results for postsecondary tuition payments and earnings, the estimated standard errors for the estimates in columns 3-6 are generally larger than those reported in the main text, likely due to the smaller sample size (42,191 versus 46,798).

The main results in the main carry out statistical inference using standard errors based on the clustered robust variance estimator (CVRE). Our tests for statistical significance compare the  $t$  statistic computed using the CVRE to the critical value of the  $t$  distribution with  $70-1 = 69$  degrees of freedom (since there are 70 TCH public housing projects in our data). Recent evidence from Monte Carlo simulations by MacKinnon and Webb (2017) suggests that the CVRE can be biased downwards in applications where the number of treated clusters is small, as in our application. In this situation, tests of statistical significance will tend to over-reject true null hypothesis. MacKinnon and Webb (2017) show that the main alternative to the CVRE, the wild cluster bootstrap, also performs poorly when the number of treated clusters is very small. They show that the wild cluster bootstrap has the opposite problem – tests of a true null hypothesis are never rejected.

To the best of our knowledge, there is no consensus about the best alternative to the CVRE for applications with very few treated clusters such as ours. Given that hypothesis tests based on the CVRE and  $t$  distribution with  $P - 1$  ( $70 - 1 = 69$ ) degrees of freedom tend to over-reject the null, one way to test the robustness of our main results is to reduce the degrees of freedom. Online Appendix Table A10 presents results using the degrees of freedom correction proposed by Young (2016). Column 1 reports the coefficient estimate for  $\beta^a$  based on the estimation of equation (1) in the main text. Column 2 reports the standard error for the estimate

of  $\beta^a$  that uses the bias correction proposed by Young (2016). Column 3 reports Young's effective degrees of freedom and column 4 the associated p-value for the hypothesis test that  $\beta^a = 0$ . Panels A-C of Table A10 report results for the case where the dependent variable of interest is postsecondary tuition expenditures, earnings and employment, respectively.

One important caveat to keep in mind when interpreting the results in Table A10 is that the bias correction and effective degrees of freedom procedure proposed by Young (2016) also has undesirable properties when the number of treated groups is very small, as in our application. Monte Carlo simulations by MacKinnon and Webb (2018) show that procedure proposed in Young (2016) either severely under-rejects or severely over-rejects true null hypothesis when the number of treated clusters is small and there is heteroskedasticity in the error terms of the treated and untreated clusters. In our application, the standard deviation of earnings and employment rates is lower in Regent Park than for the OPH. On the other hand, the standard deviation of postsecondary tuition expenditures is larger for Regent Park than for the untreated OPH sites. MacKinnon and Webb (2018) show that the procedure suggested by Young (2016) almost never rejects a true null hypothesis in situations where there is only one treated group and where the variance of outcomes in the treated cluster is smaller than the variance of outcomes in the untreated clusters. The procedure has the opposite problem of over-rejecting when outcomes of the treated cluster are more variable than the outcomes of the untreated clusters (see Figure 14 in MacKinnon and Webb (2018)). Thus, the p-values calculated using the procedure suggested by Young (2016) are likely to be conservative for the earnings and employment outcomes and too small when postsecondary tuition expenditures is the dependent variable of interest.

Panel A, column 2 of Table A10 shows that the standard errors calculated using the bias correction procedure proposed by Young (2016) are much larger than the standard errors from

the CVRE for postsecondary tuition expenditures. For example, the standard error on the  $\beta^{20}$  coefficient is 2.5 times larger than the CVRE standard error estimate in Table 1 (\$190 versus \$66). However, the coefficient estimates for  $\beta^{20} - \beta^{24}$  remain statistically significant at the one percent level.

Since the earnings of the young adults in our sample are more volatile than tuition expenditures, it is not surprising that the degrees of freedom correction leads to different significance levels compared with the estimates based on the CVRE reported in Figure 2 in the main text and Appendix Table A4. As one example, the p-value on the test for statistical significance of Pathways on earnings at age 26 jumps from  $p = 0.0001$  to  $p = 0.102$ . Indeed, none of the  $\beta^{19} - \beta^{26}$  estimates are statistically significant at conventional levels. Furthermore, only the  $\beta^{27}$  estimate is statistically significant at the 1 percent level; the  $\beta^{26}$  and  $\beta^{28}$  estimates are almost statistically significant at the 10 percent levels with p-values of 0.102 and 0.164, respectively.

Taken at face value, the standard errors calculated using the Young (2016) correction suggest that we cannot reject the null hypothesis that eligibility for Pathways has no statistically significant impact on earnings at most ages. As mentioned earlier, however, Monte Carlo simulations show that the Young degrees of freedom correction almost never reject a true null hypothesis in a setting such as hours, leading us to be cautious about relying on the standard errors in Table A10 for inference about the effects of Pathways.

### ***B3. Additional Results***

In this section, we describe the results presented in Tables A11-A16 and discuss effects of eligibility for Pathways: (a) at different levels of the earnings distribution (Table A11), (b) on

various measure of job quality (Table A12), (c) on male and female students (Tables A13 and A14), and (d) natives and immigrants (Tables A15 and A16).

Table A11 reports results from the estimation of quantile difference-in-differences (QDID) regressions at different quantiles of the 2015 earnings distribution.<sup>4</sup> The estimates in column 1 show eligibility for Pathways has no effect on earnings at the 25<sup>th</sup> percentile for all ages. This is not surprising because in any given year, approximately 35 percent of the young adults in our sample have no earnings. Despite the fact that eligibility for Pathways increases the likelihood of working (see Table A4), the effects are not big enough to generate impacts at the 25<sup>th</sup> percentile of the earnings distribution. The remaining columns of Table A11 show that the positive effects of Pathways on the earnings of young adults age 25-28 are the biggest at the middle of the earnings distribution. In particular, eligibility for Pathways is estimated to raise annual earnings at age 28 by \$6,500 and \$6,300 at the 50<sup>th</sup> and 75<sup>th</sup> percentiles, but by a statistically insignificant \$1,700 at the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile.

We explored whether eligibility for Pathways causes youth to work in better jobs, conditional on working. Online Appendix Table A12 reports estimates of the effect of eligibility for Pathways on three measures of job quality available in the administrative data. Both measures use information from firm administrative tax files that we link to personal income tax records. The first two measures use information about the earnings of other employees that the firm, namely the median and average wage of workers at the firm (the first column repeats column 5 in Table A6). Intuitively, more productive firms pay higher wages (Card et al., 2018). Both measures yield similar results. The estimates in column 1 suggest that Pathways leads to

---

<sup>4</sup> The youngest Grade 9 cohort in our sample entered Grade 9 in 2006. Young adults in this cohort were age 23 in 2015, on average. Consequently, by restricting the sample to the 2015 tax year, we are unable to estimate the effects of eligibility for Pathways at lower ages.

higher job quality, as measured by the median earnings at one's primary employer. For example, eligibility for Pathways increases the median earnings at one's employer by \$2,800 to \$4,200 between ages 19 and 22. The effects are smaller at older ages (around \$1,700 per year), but the estimates become somewhat more imprecise.

The third measure (column 3) is the total payroll at the firm (in thousands of dollars). This captures the fact that firms that have a bigger payroll tend to be larger and more productive, on average.<sup>5</sup> The estimates suggest that at younger ages (19-23), eligibility for Pathways leads individuals to work at larger firms but this effect disappears by the time young adults reach their late 20s.

Appendix Tables A13 and A14 report the coefficient estimates and standard errors from the estimation of equation (1) on men and women separately. In columns 1 and 2 of both tables, the dependent variable is postsecondary tuition expenditures and earnings, respectively. At all ages, the estimated effects of eligibility for Pathways on both tuition payments and earnings are similar. Eligibility for the program initially increases postsecondary attendance (proxied by tuition payments), eventually leading to higher earnings. Eligibility for Pathways significantly increases the likelihood of working, especially for young adults over 25 (see Table A4). The estimates reported in column 3 of Tables A13 and A14 show that the labor supply response induced by the program is concentrated among women. In particular, while the  $\beta^{25} - \beta^{28}$  estimates for men range between 2.3 and 6.6 percentage points, among women eligibility for Pathways increases the likelihood of working by 8.6 to 11.9 percentage points, relative to young women from OPH.

---

<sup>5</sup> Unfortunately, neither the individual nor the corporate tax return data have information on non-wage benefits or measures of job satisfaction.

The estimates in column 4 of Tables A13 and A14 show that the positive effects of Pathways on social assistance (welfare) receipt are also larger for women than for men. For example, between the ages of 25 and 28, eligibility for Pathways is estimated to reduce reliance on social assistance by \$280-\$390 per year for men and \$440-\$660 per year for women. Eligibility for the program also reduces the likelihood of having a child by more for women than man at all ages (column 6).

Appendix Tables A15 and A16 report the coefficient estimates and standard errors from the estimation of equation (1) on natives and immigrants separately. With the exception of the employment status, eligibility for Pathways is estimated to increase postsecondary tuition expenditures and earnings and decrease social assistance receipts by more for immigrants than native born adults.

#### ***B4. Preliminary Estimates of the Effect of Eligibility for Pathways the Rexdale and Lawrence Heights Locations***

Up to now, we have considered estimates of the impact of Pathways at its first location in Regent Park, Toronto. In 2007, the program expanded to two sites in Toronto, Rexdale and Lawrence Heights (LH). In this section, we discuss the estimated impacts of eligibility for Pathways at these expansion sites. Like Regent Park, the communities of Rexdale and LH each house several hundred tenants paying below market rents and suffer from high levels of poverty. There are, however, some important difference between Regent Park and the Rexdale/LH sites. Whereas the Regent Park community is located in downtown Toronto, the Rexdale and LH communities are located in the suburbs (though still part of the City of Toronto). The racial and

ethnic compositions of the Regent Park and Rexdale/LH communities also differ somewhat. As show in Online Appendix Table A2, the share of immigrants in Regent Park is much higher than in Rexdale/LH.

Eligibility for Pathways at the Rexdale and LH locations is based on residence. All students beginning Grade 9 and living within the catchment areas of the two communities are eligible for the program. In Oreopoulos, Brown and Lavecchia (2017), we showed that in a typical year, approximately 80 percent of the 60 students from each community enroll in the Pathways program. Because the average Grade 9 cohort at Rexdale and LH is about half the size of a Grade 9 cohort at Regent Park, the results we discuss below are from regressions that pool the two locations.

Online Appendix Table A17 reports the coefficient estimates and standard errors from the estimation of equation (1) on a sample of students that entered Grade 9 between September 2001 and September 2008 and are at least age 19 in 2005-2015.<sup>6</sup> It is worth noting that we are not able to estimate the long run effects of Pathways at the Rexdale and LH sites because the first cohort of eligible students, having entered Grade 9 in September 2007, are no older than 22 in 2015 (the last year of our tax data). Consequently, we interpret the estimates from Table A17 with caution, recognizing that it would be better to follow the progress of young adults that are eligible for Pathways at its Rexdale and LH sites into their late 20s and beyond.

The dependent variable in column 1 of Table A17 is postsecondary tuition expenditures. Unlike the results from Regent Park (see column 1, Table A4), eligibility for Pathways at its Rexdale and LH sites has no statistically significant effect on tuition expenditures. Furthermore,

---

<sup>6</sup> We restrict the sample to young adults that entered Grade 9 after 2000 to avoid having Regent Park (in the comparison group for Rexdale and LH), change treatment status.

each of the  $\beta^{19} - \beta^{22}$  estimates are all small in magnitude and negative in sign. In our previous work, we found that the effect of eligibility for Pathways on postsecondary enrollment at its Rexdale and LH sites is about a third as large as the impact at the Regent Park location (see Table 5 in Oreopoulos, Brown and Lavecchia (2017)). That eligibility for Pathways has essentially no impact on postsecondary tuition expenditures is consistent with our earlier results. Unfortunately, the Pathways participation data we collected for Oreopoulos, Brown and Lavecchia (2017) do not have sufficient information on the attendance on tutoring, mentoring and SPSW-student meetings to determine whether the smaller educational attainment results at the Rexdale and LH locations is due to differences in program delivery, heterogeneous treatment effects (due to there being some differences between the populations at the three locations) or both.

Interestingly, the estimates reported in column 2 of Table A17 show that eligibility for Pathways at the Rexdale and LH locations has a positive, albeit modest, impact on earnings. With one exception, the  $\beta^{22}$  coefficient that is imprecisely estimated, the estimates in column 2 suggest that program eligibility increases annual earnings by \$800-\$1,900 between the age of 19 and 21. Taken at face value, these estimates suggest that Pathways may increase earnings for participants at the Rexdale and LH locations despite having little impact on postsecondary education attendance. A fruitful area of future research may be to investigate whether the modest earnings gains persist as young adults age into their late 20s and beyond. Additionally, studying whether subsequent Rexdale and LH cohorts also experience small postsecondary impacts together with positive earnings gains.

The remaining columns of Table A17 show that eligibility for Pathways at its Rexdale and LH locations has no effect on the likelihood of working (column 4), increases UI benefit receipt (column 4) and decreases the fraction of young adults that have a child (column 5).<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Due to residual disclosure concerns caused by the relatively small size of the Rexdale and LH housing projects, estimates of the impact of Pathways on social assistance receipt is unavailable.

## Online Appendix C (Benefit-Cost Analysis)

Although Pathways appears to have led to significant benefits for youth at the Regent Park site, the comprehensive nature of the program means that its delivery entails significant costs. The direct (operating) cost per student-year is \$3,500 in 2010 dollars and head-office administrative costs are \$1,200 per student-year.<sup>8</sup> The present value direct operating costs over a participant's high school tenure is \$13,400, plus indirect administrative costs and costs to provincial governments due to staying in high school longer and attending college or university.<sup>9</sup>

Estimating the long-term benefits of the program requires making assumptions about how the earnings gain from Pathways evolves beyond early adulthood. Our calculations assume that the earnings gain from Pathways at age 28 (\$3,282) persists until retirement at age 65 and that future earnings are discounted at an annual rate of 3 percent (Krueger, 1999; Chetty et al., 2011). We also deflate the costs of Pathways by 0.83 because the direct operating and administrative costs are per Pathways participant, while our estimate for the earnings gain is an average across all individuals eligible for the program. This implies that the expected direct costs of the program per eligible student is  $0.83 * \$13,400 = \$11,122$ . The expected direct plus administrative cost per eligible student is \$14,935.

Using estimates of the impact of the program on postsecondary education attainment, employment earnings and social assistance payments we calculate the estimated financial benefits

---

<sup>8</sup> Direct operating costs comprise 20 percent for public transportation tickets, 15 percent for the postsecondary bursary and 65 percent towards SPSWs, tutoring and group activity operations.

<sup>9</sup> Whereas the average cost per college or university student can be calculated by dividing college or university operating costs by the number of students, only the marginal cost per student is required for the benefit-cost analysis. Our calculations below abstract from marginal costs given that they are expected to be much smaller than average costs.

from Pathways. We estimate that the discounted lifetime earnings gains from Pathways is \$58,070 per student, on average. If only the direct costs of the program are considered, the long-run benefit-to-cost ratio from Pathways eligibility at the Regent Park site is 5.22 ( $\$58,070/\$11,122$ ). If the indirect administrative (head office) costs are considered, the benefit-to-cost ratio is 3.89 ( $\$58,070/\$14,935$ ). This benefit/cost calculation assumes that the sole financial benefit arises from increased lifetime earnings for individuals. Including other possible pecuniary and nonpecuniary benefits, such as reduced crime and improvements to health would lead to even larger returns to the program (Oreopoulos and Salvanes, 2011; Lochner, 2011; Heckman, Humphries and Veramendi, 2018).

Instead of focusing on the private benefits, one can also estimate the benefit-to-cost ratio of Pathways using the expected fiscal benefits of the program. These benefits include higher labor income tax revenues and reduced spending on social assistance. Assuming a 20 percent average tax rate, our estimates imply that the discounted lifetime fiscal benefit from Pathways is \$21,939. Expected tax revenue gains exceed the direct and indirect administrative costs, leading to a benefit-to-cost ratio of 1.47 ( $\$21,939/\$14,935$ ). This suggests that public investments in the Pathways program are likely fiscally neutral or positive.

While our estimates indicate that eligibility for Pathways leads to large increases in adult earnings, employment and postsecondary education attainment at the Regent Park site, some caution with this interpretation may be prudent. With data that only goes up to 2015, we are only able to observe long run outcomes to age 28 (for the oldest Pathways-eligible cohort). Since earnings and other outcomes for young adults are notoriously volatile, some of our estimates are imprecise. Another caveat is that we are only able to estimate the effect of Pathways on long-run outcomes for the Regent Park site. Estimating the long run education and earnings gains of

Pathways at its expansion sites will help to better understand whether the program can be ‘scaled-up’ to alternative locations.

The methodology employed in this paper is not able to determine whether the impacts of Pathways are due to one feature of the program or whether the integration of the various features drives the results. This is important not only for understanding how Pathways works, but for containing costs. Experimenting with variations of the program at some of Pathways’ expansion sites or further qualitative research through surveys and ethnographic work may help shed light on this question. Future research that exploits additional administrative data linkages, especially linkages to crime and health data, is also important to determine the extent to which Pathways improves non-pecuniary outcomes.

## References

Card, David, Ana Rute Cardoso, Joerg Heining and Patrick Kline (2018), “Firms and Labor Market Inequality: Evidence and Some Theory,” *Journal of Labor Economics*, 36(S1): S13-S70.

Chetty, Raj, John N. Friedman, Nathaniel Hilger, Emmanuel Saez, Diane Schanzenbach, and Danny Yagan (2011), “How Does Your Kindergarten Classroom Affect Your Earnings? Evidence from Project STAR,” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 16(4): 1593-1660.

Heckman, James J., John Eric Humphries and Gregory Veramendi (2018), “Returns to Education: The Causal Effects of Education on Earnings, Health, and Smoking,” *Journal of Political Economy*, forthcoming.

Krueger, Alan B. (1999), “Experimental Estimates of Education Production Functions,” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 114(2): 497-532.

Lochner, Lance (2011), “Nonproduction Benefits of Education: Crime, Health and Good Citizenship,” In *Handbook of Economics of Education*, vol. 4, edited by Eric Hanushek, Steve Machin and Ludger Woessmann, Elsevier, Amsterdam.

MacKinnon, James G., and Matthew D. Webb (2017), “Wild Bootstrap Inference for Wildly Different Cluster Size,” *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 32(2): 233-254.


MacKinnon, James G., and Matthew D. Webb (2018), “Randomization Inference for Difference-in-Differences with Few Treated Clusters,” Working Paper No. 1355, Economics Department, Queen’s University.

Oreopoulos, Philip, Robert S. Brown and Adam M. Lavecchia (2017), “Pathways to Education: An Integrated Approach to Helping At-Risk High School Students,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 125(4): 947-984.

Oreopoulos, Philip, and Kjell G. Salvanes (2011), “Priceless: The Non-Pecuniary Benefits of Schooling,” *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 25(1): 159-184.


Young, Alwyn (2016), “Improved, Nearly Exact, Statistical Inference with Robust and Clustered Covariance Matrices using Effective Degrees of Freedom Corrections,” Unpublished manuscript, London School of Economics.

**Figure A1**  
**Sensitivity Analysis: Employment**




Notes: Figure A1 presents estimates of the causal effect of eligibility for Pathways on employment rates by age. The black markers represent the coefficient estimates for  $\beta^a$  from equation (1) using the baseline sample and the dashed lines the corresponding 95 percent confidence intervals. Standard error estimates are calculated using the clustered robust variance estimator (CRVE) with  $70 - 1 = 69$  degrees of freedom. The light grey square markers represent the coefficient estimates for  $\beta^a$  from equation (1) when the comparison group is restricted to the 11 largest public housing projects in Toronto. The dark grey triangle markers represent the coefficient estimates for  $\beta^a$  from equation (1) when the comparison group is restricted to the 13 “priority neighborhoods” in Toronto that feature high concentrations of poverty. The black diamond markers represent the coefficient estimates for  $\beta^a$  from equation (1) when the comparison group is restricted to public housing projects in the legacy Metro Toronto school board.

**Figure A2**  
**2015 Outcomes by Grade 9 Cohort: Legacy Metro Toronto Comparison Group**  
**(a) Earnings**



**(b) Employment**



Notes: Figure A2 plots 2015 tax year earnings (Figure A2a) and employment rates (Figure A2b) by year entered Grade 9 for the 1999-2008 TDSB cohorts. The means for young adults that lived in Regent Park are represented by the solid circle markers and the means for the legacy Metro Toronto public housing sites are represented by the open diamond markers.

**Appendix Table A1: Descriptions of Key Variables**

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Description</b>
Earnings	Total earnings from employment at all jobs in a given year (earnings set equal to zero for those without any earnings)
Fraction working	Dummy variable equal to 1 for individuals with positive earnings and zero otherwise
Tuition deduction	Total tuition payments to eligible colleges and universities in a given year
Female	Dummy variable equal to 1 for women and zero otherwise
Immigrant	Dummy variable equal to 1 for individuals who are not born in Canada and zero otherwise
English second language	Dummy variable equal to 1 for individuals who do not speak English as their first language upon enrolling in Grade 9
Cohort	Year entered Grade 9
Age in Grade 9	Age of individual upon enrolling in Grade 9 in a TDSB school
Age (current year)	$age = t - YOB = t - cohort - age\ in\ Grade\ 9$
Number of years claimed tuition deduction	Count of the number of years the variable "Tuition deduction" is positive
Social assistance payments	Social assistance payments received in a given year
EI benefit payments	EI benefits received in a current year
Married or common law	Dummy variable equal to 1 for individuals that are married or are living with a common law partner and zero otherwise
Has child	Dummy variable equal to 1 for individuals who claim a dependant in the CCTB file and zero otherwise

**Table A2**  
**Summary Statistics**

	(1)	(2)	(3)
	Regent Park	Rexdale/LH	Other Public Housing
Earnings	15,770	10,659	13,080
Working	0.618	0.519	0.566
Tuition Deduction	908	616	773
Age	25.7	24.8	25.0
Female	0.5	0.5	0.5
Immigrant	0.5	0.3	0.3
Observations	1,460	864	5,705

Notes: This table reports means of select variables. The sample is individuals (students) who entered a TDSB high school between 1999 and 2008 and lived in a public housing project during high school. The time-varying variables (earnings, working, tuition tax credits and tuition deduction) are for the 2015 calendar year. All dollar amounts are inflated to 2015 dollars using the Bank of Canada's Consumer Price Index.

**Table A3**  
**Means of Various Outcomes For ‘Other Public Housing’ (comparison group)**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Tuition Expenditures	Earnings	Working	Social Assistance Payments	UI Benefit Payments	Has Child
Age 19	763 [69]***	4,043 [231]***	0.542 [0.019]***	568 [83]***	4,071 [231]***	0.366 [0.018]***
Age 28	369 [55]***	16,402 [843]***	0.549 [0.019]***	1,035 [115]***	16,182 [834]***	0.499 [0.019]***

Notes: The sample is individuals (students) who entered a TDSB high school in 2000 and lived in a non-Regent Park public housing project. In row 1 (2), the sample is further restricted to individuals that are 19 (28) years old. The number in each cell is the average of the outcome variable for individuals in the comparison group based on a regression of the outcome variable on a constant. Robust standard errors are in brackets. \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1.

**Table A4**  
**Intent to Treat (ITT) Estimated Effects of Pathways on Adult Outcomes by Age**

	(1) Tuition Expenditures	(2) Earnings	(3) Working
Pathways*Age 19	437 [59]***	-1,470 [532]***	0.029 [0.017]*
Pathways*Age 20	640 [66]***	-888 [544]	0.020 [0.017]
Pathways*Age 21	796 [65]***	-1,197 [499]**	0.046 [0.016]***
Pathways*Age 22	744 [58]***	-1,305 [487]***	0.053 [0.017]***
Pathways*Age 23	480 [51]***	-857 [445]*	0.061 [0.014]***
Pathways*Age 24	360 [46]***	158 [488]	0.055 [0.015]***
Pathways*Age 25	31 [54]	2,295 [512]***	0.077 [0.016]***
Pathways*Age 26	35 [49]	2,720 [598]***	0.081 [0.016]***
Pathways*Age 27	-37 [68]	5,317 [575]***	0.091 [0.017]***
Pathways*Age 28	- -	3,282 [726]***	0.088 [0.022]***
Age 20	285 [27]***	1,024 [85]***	0.028 [0.008]***
Age 21	292 [32]***	2,208 [137]***	0.030 [0.007]***
Age 22	187 [31]***	3,703 [172]***	0.033 [0.010]***
Age 23	-58 [36]	5,610 [216]***	0.030 [0.008]***
Age 24	-268 [44]***	7,673 [269]***	0.027 [0.010]***
Age 25	-340 [53]***	9,438 [301]***	0.025 [0.010]**
Age 26	-454	10,699	0.019

	[46]***	[388]***	[0.010]*
Age 27	-428	11,241	0.022
	[46]***	[480]***	[0.013]
Age 28	-508	13,383	0.031
	[56]***	[538]***	[0.015]**
Age 29	-556	14,480	0.027
	[61]***	[546]***	[0.013]**
Constant	6,071	28,576	1.125
	[589]***	[7,150]***	[0.265]***
Observations	46,798	46,798	46,798

Notes: Table A4 presents estimates of the causal effect of eligibility for Pathways on tuition expenditures, earnings and employment by age. The rows report the  $\beta^a$  and  $\gamma_a$  coefficient estimates from equation (1). The estimates in columns 1-3 are represented graphically in Figures 1-3 in the main text. The sample is individuals (students) who entered a TDSB high school between 2000 and 2006, lived in a public housing project and are at least 19 years old between 2005 and 2015. Pathways is a binary variable equal to one for students who entered Grade 9 after 2001 and resided in the Regent Park housing project, and zero otherwise. All regressions include cohort (year started Grade 9) and housing project fixed effects, as well as the following covariates: age started Grade 9 and dummies for gender, immigrant status and English as a second language (ESL) status. Student immigrant status and first language status is based on TDSB administrative records. Standard errors are clustered at the housing project level and inference is based on the critical values of the t distribution with  $70-1 = 69$  degrees of freedom. \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*  $p < 0.1$ .

**Table A5**  
**ITT Estimated Effects for Pathways to Education Using Alternative Comparison Groups**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Baseline	Large Density Projects	Priority Neighbourhoods	Legacy Toronto Projects
<i>A. Tuition Expenditures</i>				
Pathways*Age 19	437 [59]***	387 [88]***	531 [79]***	587 [220]**
Pathways*Age 19	640 [66]***	579 [114]***	767 [100]***	687 [241]**
Pathways*Age 21	796 [65]***	761 [110]***	911 [108]***	783 [228]**
Pathways*Age 22	744 [58]***	670 [96]***	831 [97]***	656 [230]**
Pathways*Age 23	480 [51]***	408 [67]***	527 [91]***	407 [169]**
Pathways*Age 24	360 [46]***	411 [52]***	517 [57]***	276 [147]
Pathways*Age 25	31 [54]	6 [46]	49 [51]	24 [157]
Pathways*Age 26	35 [49]	-81 [45]*	3 [60]	93 [187]
Pathways*Age 27	-37 [68]	-69 [91]	13 [70]	194 [155]
Pathways*Age 28	- -	- -	- -	- -

---

*B. Earnings*

Pathways*Age 19	-1,470 [532]***	-2,170 [1,058]*	-2,927 [594]***	-4,535 [1,566]**
Pathways*Age 20	-888 [544]	-1,622 [1,080]	-2,354 [528]***	-1,344 [1,618]
Pathways*Age 21	-1,197 [499]**	-2,080 [875]**	-2,743 [545]***	-1,774 [1,530]
Pathways*Age 22	-1,305 [487]***	-2,111 [848]**	-2,560 [543]***	-1,751 [1,629]
Pathways*Age 23	-857 [445]*	-1,615 [813]*	-2,061 [464]***	-1,163 [1,778]
Pathways**Age 24	158 [488]	-482 [791]	-535 [349]	475 [1,771]
Pathways*Age 25	2,295 [512]***	1,743 [919]*	1,662 [450]***	2,843 [1,751]
Pathways*Age 26	2,720 [598]***	2,190 [1,038]*	1,834 [583]***	2,772 [1,498]
Pathways*Age 27	5,317 [575]***	4,240 [1,073]***	4,364 [854]***	5,024 [1,875]**
Pathways*Age 28	3,282 [726]***	2,227 [1,399]	2,848 [781]***	1,743 [2,442]
Observations	46,798	23,676	19,835	16,581

---

Notes: Table A5 reports estimates of equation (1) when the comparison group is restricted to various public housing sites similar to Regent Park. The estimates for tuition expenditures (earnings) in Panel A (in Panel B) are depicted graphically in Figure 4a (4b) in the main text. For column 2, the large density projects include: Alexandra Park, Bleecker Street, East Mall, Edgeley Village, Jane Finch, Firgrove Crescent, Flemingdon Park, Lawrence Heights, Malbern, Moss Park, Pelham Park, Regent Park, Rexdale (Thistletown) and Warden Woods. For column 3, the priority neighbourhoods are comprised of the following 11 housing projects: Duncanwoods Drive, Edgeley Village, Firgrove Crescent, Flemingdon Park, Lawrence Heights, McCowan Road, Pelham Park, Rexdale (Thistletown), Scarlettwoods, Yorkwoods Village, and 'Other' projects (several small projects grouped together to create a publicly available dataset). For column 4, the legacy Metro Toronto projects include: Alexandra Park, Blake Street, Bleecker Street, Don Mount Court, Edgewood Avenue, Greenwood Park, Pelham Park and Regent Park. All regressions include cohort (year started Grade 9) and housing project fixed effects, as well as the following covariates: age started Grade 9 and dummies for gender, immigrant status and English as a second language (ESL) status. Student immigrant status and first language status is based on TDSB administrative records. Standard errors are clustered at the housing project level and inference is based on the critical values of the t distribution with G-1 degrees of freedom (G denotes number of housing projects). \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1.

**Table A6**  
**Intent to Treat (ITT) Estimated Effects of Pathways on Additional Outcomes**

	(1) Social Assistance Payments	(2) UI Benefit Payments	(3) Married or Common Law	(4) Has Child	(5) Employer Quality
Pathways*Age 19	-112 [101]	-1,308 [438]***	-0.031 [0.007]***	-0.066 [0.014]***	4,207 [872]***
Pathways*Age 20	-115 [96]	-882 [444]*	-0.025 [0.007]***	-0.063 [0.014]***	3,065 [795]***
Pathways*Age 21	-162 [91]*	-1,077 [438]**	-0.017 [0.007]**	-0.089 [0.014]***	2,960 [707]***
Pathways*Age 22	-139 [97]	-1,160 [437]***	-0.024 [0.007]***	-0.088 [0.014]***	2,769 [744]***
Pathways*Age 23	-232 [92]**	-688 [391]*	-0.016 [0.006]**	-0.088 [0.014]***	1,456 [683]**
Pathways*Age 24	-355 [96]***	323 [426]	-0.001 [0.007]	-0.080 [0.013]***	1,294 [712]*
Pathways*Age 25	-403 [112]***	2,551 [485]***	0.015 [0.008]**	-0.088 [0.014]***	2,726 [781]***
Pathways*Age 26	-362 [106]***	2,547 [489]***	0.048 [0.009]***	-0.106 [0.015]***	1,344 [940]
Pathways*Age 27	-385 [130]***	5,128 [507]***	0.089 [0.009]***	-0.121 [0.016]***	1,725 [1,062]
Pathways*Age 28	-478 [120]***	3,019 [653]***	0.089 [0.012]***	-0.168 [0.020]***	1,705 [1,133]
Constant	-4,474 [1,906]**	27,453 [6,915]***	-0.125 [0.098]	-0.429 [0.244]*	63,405 [10,993]***
Observations	46,798	46,798	46,798	45,863	25,830

Notes: Table A6 reports estimates from equation (1) for various economic and family outcomes. The estimates reported in this table are depicted graphically in Figure 5 in the main text. Employer quality is the median earnings of the largest firm an individual works for. Pathways is a binary variable equal to one for students who entered Grade 9 after 2001 and resided in the Regent Park housing project, and zero otherwise. All regressions include cohort (year started Grade 9) and housing project fixed effects, as well as the following covariates: age started Grade 9 and dummies for gender, immigrant status and English as a second language (ESL) status. Student immigrant status and first language status is based on TDSB administrative records. Standard errors are clustered at the housing project level and inference is based on the critical values of the t distribution with 70-1 = 69 degrees of freedom. \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1.

**Table A7**  
**Intent to Treat (ITT) Estimated Effects of Pathways on Adult Outcomes by Age for**  
**the 2000-2003 cohorts**

	(1) Tuition Expenditures	(2) Earnings	(3) Working
Pathways*Age 19	443 [62]***	-1,927 [546]***	0.009 [0.018]
Pathways*Age 20	592 [69]***	-653 [565]	0.049 [0.017]***
Pathways*Age 21	793 [65]***	-1,061 [513]**	0.058 [0.017]***
Pathways*Age 22	653 [58]***	-1,194 [496]**	0.068 [0.017]***
Pathways*Age 23	485 [53]***	-176 [457]	0.082 [0.015]***
Pathways*Age 24	353 [47]***	1,502 [475]***	0.092 [0.016]***
Pathways*Age 25	6 [52]	2,557 [487]***	0.083 [0.016]***
Pathways*Age 26	34 [49]	2,598 [594]***	0.082 [0.015]***
Pathways*Age 27	-50 [68]	5,384 [575]***	0.092 [0.017]***
Pathways*Age 28	- -	3,293 [724]***	0.088 [0.022]***
Age 20	312 [35]***	852 [123]***	0.015 [0.011]
Age 21	306 [33]***	2,046 [192]***	0.010 [0.010]
Age 22	225 [42]***	3,707 [320]***	0.018 [0.011]

Age 23	22	5,360	0.015
	[47]	[409]***	[0.010]
Age 24	-202	6,945	0.010
	[53]***	[351]***	[0.012]
Age 25	-287	8,710	0.004
	[55]***	[404]***	[0.012]
Age 26	-423	10,422	0.004
	[51]***	[443]***	[0.011]
Age 27	-390	10,987	0.009
	[50]***	[530]***	[0.013]
Age 28	-472	13,132	0.018
	[59]***	[588]***	[0.015]
Age 29	-520	14,206	0.013
	[62]***	[606]***	[0.014]
Constant	5,818	35,927	1.260
	[822]***	[9,286]***	[0.344]***
Observations	31,367	31,367	31,367

Notes: Table A7 reports the estimates from equation (1) on a sample of young adults who entered a TDSB high school between 2000 and 2003, lived in a public housing project and are at least 19 years old between 2005 and 2015. Pathways is a binary variable equal to one for students who entered Grade 9 after 2001 and resided in the Regent Park housing project, and zero otherwise. All regressions include cohort (year started Grade 9) and housing project fixed effects, as well as the following covariates: age started Grade 9 and dummies for gender, immigrant status and English as a second language (ESL) status. Student immigrant status and first language status is based on TDSB administrative records. Standard errors are clustered at the housing project level and inference is based on the critical values of the t distribution with  $70-1 = 69$  degrees of freedom. \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*  $p < 0.1$ .

**Table A8**  
**ITT Estimated Employment (Extensive Margin) Effects for Pathways Using Alternative Comparison Groups**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Baseline	Large Density Projects	Priority Neighbourhoods	Legacy Toronto Projects
Pathways*Age 19	0.029 [0.017]*	-0.014 [0.019]	0.003 [0.023]	0.021 [0.048]
Pathways*Age 20	0.020 [0.017]	-0.017 [0.025]	0.016 [0.026]	0.017 [0.049]
Pathways*Age 21	0.046 [0.016]***	0.014 [0.020]	0.031 [0.022]	0.030 [0.046]
Pathways*Age 22	0.053 [0.017]***	0.027 [0.026]	0.057 [0.026]**	0.023 [0.056]
Pathways*Age 23	0.061 [0.014]***	0.028 [0.020]	0.051 [0.021]	0.042 [0.058]
Pathways*Age 24	0.055 [0.015]***	0.021 [0.014]	0.042 [0.013]***	0.043 [0.050]
Pathways*Age 25	0.077 [0.016]***	0.029 [0.016]***	0.049 [0.019]**	0.062 [0.055]
Pathways*Age 26	0.081 [0.016]***	0.036 [0.010]***	0.059 [0.015]***	0.059 [0.043]
Pathways*Age 27	0.091 [0.017]***	0.053 [0.017]***	0.084 [0.015]***	0.077 [0.056]
Pathways*Age 28	0.088 [0.022]***	0.028 [0.021]	0.066 [0.012]***	0.029 [0.055]
Observations	46,798	23,676	19,835	16,581

Notes: Table A8 reports estimates of equation (1) when the comparison group is restricted to various public housing sites similar to Regent Park. The estimates in this table are depicted graphically in Online Appendix Figure A1. Pathways is a binary variable equal to one for students who entered Grade 9 after 2001 and resided in the Regent Park housing project, and zero otherwise. For column 2, the large density projects include: Alexandra Park, Bleecker Street, East Mall, Edgeley Village, Jane Finch, Firgrove Crescent, Flemingdon Park, Lawrence Heights, Malvern, Moss Park, Pelham Park, Regent Park, Rexdale (Thistletown) and Warden Woods. For column 3, the priority neighbourhoods are comprised of the following 11 housing projects: Duncanwoods Drive, Edgeley Village, Firgrove Crescent, Flemingdon Park, Lawrence Heights, McCowan Road, Pelham Park, Rexdale (Thistletown), Scarlettwoods, Yorkwoods Village, and 'Other' projects (several small projects grouped together to create a publicly available dataset). For column 4, the legacy Metro Toronto projects include: Alexandra Park, Blake Street, Bleecker Street, Don Mount Court, Edgewood Avenue, Greenwood Park, Pelham Park and Regent Park. All regressions include cohort (year started Grade 9) and housing project fixed effects, as well as the following covariates: age started Grade 9 and dummies for gender, immigrant status and English as a second language (ESL) status. Student immigrant status and first language status is based on TDSB administrative records. Standard errors are clustered at the housing project level and inference is based on the

critical values of the t distribution with  $G-1$  degrees of freedom ( $G$  denotes number of housing projects). \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*  $p < 0.1$ .

**Table A9**  
**Intent to Treat (ITT) Estimated Effects of Pathways on Various Outcomes:**  
**Matched Students with a SIN**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Tuition Expenditures	Earnings	Working	Social Assistance Payments	UI Benefit Payments	Has Child
Pathways*Age 19	469 [66]***	-2,088 [572]***	0.004 [0.017]	-193 [116]	-1,912 [447]***	-0.037 [0.014]***
Pathways*Age 20	682 [74]***	-1,488 [586]**	-0.007 [0.017]	-198 [110]*	-1,481 [455]***	-0.036 [0.014]**
Pathways*Age 21	850 [73]***	-1,859 [528]***	0.021 [0.015]	-253 [104]**	-1,728 [445]***	-0.065 [0.013]***
Pathways*Age 22	797 [66]***	-2,018 [505]***	0.028 [0.015]*	-232 [110]**	-1,856 [436]***	-0.065 [0.012]***
Pathways*Age 23	515 [57]***	-1,574 [478]***	0.037 [0.013]***	-335 [104]***	-1,386 [402]***	-0.065 [0.014]***
Pathways*Age 24	387 [55]***	-585 [492]	0.028 [0.014]**	-473 [106]***	-403 [412]	-0.052 [0.012]***
Pathways*Age 25	39 [62]	1,542 [545]***	0.048 [0.015]***	-520 [124]***	1,825 [482]***	-0.059 [0.013]***
Pathways*Age 26	49 [59]	1,763 [636]***	0.049 [0.014]***	-479 [118]***	1,584 [497]***	-0.074 [0.015]***
Pathways*Age 27	-21 [79]	4,460 [610]***	0.061 [0.017]***	-505 [142]***	4,273 [530]***	-0.092 [0.017]**
Pathways*Age 28	- -	1,215 [742]	0.030 [0.023]	-621 [135]***	983 [685]	-0.107 [0.021]***
Constant	7,221 [786]***	36,607 [7,762]***	1.439 [0.303]***	-5,442 [1,976]	35,175 [7,518]***	-0.678 [0.280]**
Observations	42,191	42,191	42,191	42,191	42,191	42,191

Notes: Table A9 reports estimates of equation (1) when the sample is restricted to students who are matched/have a Social Insurance Number (SIN). In the main text, TDSB students who are not matched to tax records based on first name, last name and date of birth are assigned zero values for all outcome variables. Pathways is a binary variable equal to one for students who entered Grade 9 after 2001 and resided in the Regent Park housing project, and zero otherwise. All regressions include cohort (year started Grade 9) and housing project fixed effects, as well as the following covariates: age started Grade 9 and dummies for immigrant status and English as a second language (ESL) status. Student immigrant status and first language status is based on TDSB administrative records. Standard errors are clustered at the housing project level and inference is based on the critical values of the t distribution with 70-1 = 69 degrees of freedom. \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1

**Table A10**  
**Intent to Treat (ITT) Estimated Effects of Pathways on Adult Outcomes by Age**  
**Young (2016) Degrees of Freedom Correction**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Coefficient	Standard Error	Effective Degrees of Freedom	p-value
<b>A. Tuition Expenditures</b>				
Pathways*Age 19	409	[177]	33.0	0.027
Pathways*Age 20	613	[190]	33.0	0.003
Pathways*Age 21	765	[190]	33.0	0.000
Pathways*Age 22	719	[174]	33.0	0.000
Pathways*Age 23	452	[151]	33.0	0.005
Pathways*Age 24	336	[138]	33.0	0.021
Pathways*Age 25	23	[151]	33.4	0.878
Pathways*Age 26	21	[136]	32.3	0.877
Pathways*Age 27	-50	[194]	31.5	0.799
Pathways*Age 28	-	-	-	-
<b>B. Earnings</b>				
Pathways*Age 19	-1728	[1262]	33.0	0.180
Pathways*Age 20	-1142	[1285]	33.0	0.384
Pathways*Age 21	-1460	[1201]	33.0	0.233
Pathways*Age 22	-1558	[1185]	33.0	0.198
Pathways*Age 23	-1117	[1079]	33.0	0.308
Pathways*Age 24	-44	[1215]	33.0	0.972
Pathways*Age 25	2158	[1290]	33.4	0.104
Pathways*Age 26	2577	[1530]	32.3	0.102
Pathways*Age 27	5154	[1501]	31.5	0.002
Pathways*Age 28	3219	[2256]	30.2	0.164

---

<b>C. Working</b>				
Pathways*Age 19	0.022	[0.044]	33.0	0.618
Pathways*Age 20	0.013	[0.045]	33.0	0.773
Pathways*Age 21	0.039	[0.042]	33.0	0.368
Pathways*Age 22	0.046	[0.044]	33.0	0.308
Pathways*Age 23	0.054	[0.038]	33.0	0.164
Pathways*Age 24	0.048	[0.040]	33.0	0.237
Pathways*Age 25	0.073	[0.044]	33.4	0.104
Pathways*Age 26	0.077	[0.043]	32.3	0.080
Pathways*Age 27	0.087	[0.046]	31.5	0.066
Pathways*Age 28	0.088	[0.070]	30.2	0.213

---

Notes: Table A10 reports estimates from equation (1) when the dependent variable is postsecondary tuition expenditures (Panel A), earnings (Panel B) and an employment status dummy (Panel C). The sample is individuals (students) who entered a TDSB high school between 2000 and 2006, lived in a public housing project and are at least 19 years old between 2005 and 2015. Pathways is a binary variable equal to one for students who entered Grade 9 after 2001 and resided in the Regent Park housing project, and zero otherwise. All regressions include cohort (year started Grade 9) and housing project fixed effects, as well as the following covariates: age started Grade 9 and dummies for gender, immigrant status and English as a second language (ESL) status. Student immigrant status and first language status is based on TDSB administrative records. Standard errors are clustered at the housing project level and are adjusted using the bias correction in Young (2016). Inference is based on the t distribution using the effective degrees of freedom (EDF) from Young (2016).

**Table A11**  
**Distribution Effects of Pathways on 2015 Adult Earnings**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	p25	p50	p75	p90
Pathways*Age 23	0 [140]	738 [4,194]	5,508 [5,348]	-2,275 [6,464]
Pathways*Age 24	0 [138]	-3,195 [4,137]	-2,581 [5,274]	-2,239 [6,376]
Pathways*Age 25	0 [136]	1,734 [4,090]	8,668 [5,215]*	-1,748 [6,304]
Pathways*Age 26	0 [141]	3,162 [4,217]	7,566 [5,377]	1,748 [6,500]
Pathways*Age 27	0 [135]	6,686 [4,041]*	14,998 [5,152]***	9,624 [6,228]
Pathways*Age 28	0 [134]	6,475 [4,025]	6,270 [5,132]	1,659 [6,204]
Constant	1,770 [1,314]	74,282 [39,407]*	310,995 [50,243]***	459,537 [60,736]***
Observations	5,840	5,840	5,840	5,840

Notes: Table A11 reports estimates from equation (1) when the baseline sample is restricted to the 2015 tax year only. In particular, the sample is individuals who entered a TDSB high school between 2000 and 2006, living in a public housing project and are at least 19 years old in the 2015 tax year. Pathways is a binary variable equal to one for students who entered Grade 9 after 2001 and resided in the Regent Park housing project, and zero otherwise. All regressions include cohort (year started Grade 9) and housing project fixed effects, as well as the following covariates: age started Grade 9 and dummies for gender, immigrant status and English as a second language (ESL) status. Student immigrant status and first language status is based on TDSB administrative records. Standard errors are clustered at the housing project level and inference is based on the critical values of the t distribution with  $70-1 = 69$  degrees of freedom. \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*  $p < 0.1$ .

**Table A12**  
**Intent to Treat (ITT) Estimated Effects of Pathways on Job Quality by Age**

	(1)	(2)	(3)
	Median Earnings at Primary Employer (dollars)	Average Earnings at Primary Employer (dollars)	Total Payroll at Primary Employer (thousands of dollars)
Pathways*Age 19	4,207 [872]***	3,937 [1,017]***	110,522, [30,471]***
Pathways*Age 20	3,065 [795]***	2,534 [945]***	57,725 [27,734]**
Pathways*Age 21	2,960 [707]***	1,866 [830]**	-10,394 [29,871]
Pathways*Age 22	2,769 [744]***	1,918 [900]**	58,257 [33,233]*
Pathways*Age 23	1,456 [683]**	1,250 [810]	43,458 [33,667]
Pathways*Age 24	1,294 [712]*	1,288 [785]	-3,263 [31,177]
Pathways*Age 25	2,726 [781]***	3,076 [1,227]**	58,870 [35,284]*
Pathways*Age 26	1,344 [940]	1,642 [1,034]	-16,380 [39,643]
Pathways*Age 27	1,725 [1,062]	1,558 [1,197]	-11,027 [44,374]
Pathways*Age 28	1,705 [1,133]	2,759 [1,214]**	-63,507 [51,225]
Age 20	1,697 [377]***	2,093 [387]***	25,322 [13,027]*
Age 21	3,298 [403]***	4,067 [443]***	54,300,242 [17,522]***
Age 22	5,053 [387]***	6,080 [418]***	61,458 [16,128]***
Age 23	7,585 [459]***	8,504 [476]***	79,193 [18,304]***
Age 24	9,988 [529]***	10,923 [520]***	81,719 [19,787]***
Age 25	11,795	13,633	88,932

	[513]***	[733]***	[21,763]***
Age 26	13,807	15,145	114,372
	[628]***	[659]***	[26,208]***
Age 27	15,171	16,566	150,889
	[584]***	[660]***	[27,128]***
Age 28	17,718	18,818	161,525
	[615]***	[690]***	[28,566]***
Age 29	18,638	20,244	222,988
	[874]***	[1,046]***	[40,301]***
Constant	63,405	79,373	328,616
	[10,993]***	[12,325]***	[342,404]***
Observations	25,830	25,830	28,113

Notes: Table A12 reports estimates of equation (1) when the dependent variable is various measures of job quality. The sample is individuals (students) who entered a TDSB high school between 2000 and 2006, lived in a public housing project and are at least 19 years old between 2005 and 2015 and who are employed. In column (column 2), the dependent variable is the median earnings (average earnings) at the firm a worker derives most of their earnings from. The dependent variable in column 3 is the total payroll (in thousands of dollars) at the firm a worker derives most of their earnings from. Pathways is a binary variable equal to one for students who entered Grade 9 after 2001 and resided in the Regent Park housing project, and zero otherwise. All regressions include cohort (year started Grade 9) and housing project fixed effects, as well as the following covariates: age started Grade 9 and dummies for gender, immigrant status and English as a second language (ESL) status. Student immigrant status and first language status is based on TDSB administrative records. Standard errors are clustered at the housing project level and inference is based on the critical values of the t distribution with  $70-1 = 69$  degrees of freedom. \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*  $p < 0.1$ .

**Table A13**  
**Intent to Treat (ITT) Estimated Effects of Pathways on Various Outcomes:**  
**Male Students**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Tuition Expenditures	Earnings	Working	Social Assistance Payments	UI Benefit Payments	Has Child
Pathways*Age 19	266 [99]***	-2,381 [1,007]**	-0.042 [0.026]	-130 [74]*	-2,523 [756]***	0.004 [0.021]
Pathways*Age 29	463 [100]***	-1,620 [1,012]	-0.028 [0.024]	-147 [78]*	-1,777 [758]**	-0.020 [0.019]
Pathways*Age 21	651 [103]***	-2,107 [898]**	-0.001 [0.022]	-219 [80]***	-2,187 [722]***	-0.029 [0.019]
Pathways*Age 22	653 [99]***	-2,063 [922]**	0.010 [0.022]	-197 [83]**	-2,099 [771]***	-0.041 [0.019]**
Pathways*Age 23	375 [92]***	-1,428 [887]	0.017 [0.021]	-195 [79]**	-1,488 [739]**	-0.027 [0.018]
Pathways*Age 24	270 [90]***	-893 [814]	0.015 [0.021]	-244 [81]***	-986 [664]	-0.001 [0.019]
Pathways*Age 25	28 [103]	1,465 [896]	0.023 [0.025]	-386 [95]***	1,636 [851]*	-0.023 [0.021]
Pathways*Age 26	-46 [108]	3,656 [891]***	0.069 [0.023]***	-288 [88]***	3,229 [703]***	-0.075 [0.022]***
Pathways*Age 27	-122 [121]	5,451 [916]***	0.059 [0.023]**	-280 [100]***	4,977 [767]***	-0.063 [0.021]***
Pathways*Age 28	- -	2,221 [1,275]*	0.066 [0.029]**	-307 [114]***	2,051 [947]**	-0.097 [0.025]***
Constant	5,698 [820]***	24,776 [11,352]**	1.150 [0.403]***	-789 [1,786]	20,098 [11,095]*	-0.305 [0.364]
Observations	23,586	23,586	23,586	23,586	23,586	23,586

Notes: Table A13 reports estimates of equation (1) when the baseline sample is restricted to male students. Pathways is a binary variable equal to one for students who entered Grade 9 after 2001 and resided in the Regent Park housing project, and zero otherwise. All regressions include cohort (year started Grade 9) and housing project fixed effects, as well as the following covariates: age started Grade 9 and dummies for immigrant status and English as a second language (ESL) status. Student immigrant status and first language status is based on TDSB administrative records. Standard errors are clustered at the housing project level and inference is based on the critical values of the t distribution with 70-1 = 69 degrees of freedom. \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1.

**Table A14**  
**Intent to Treat (ITT) Estimated Effects of Pathways on Various Outcomes:**  
**Female Students**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Tuition Expenditures	Earnings	Working	Social Assistance Payments	UI Benefit Payments	Has Child
Pathways*Age 19	608 [77]***	-524 [636]	0.091 [0.021]***	-106 [185]	-130 [619]	-0.118 [0.020]***
Pathways*Age 20	812 [91]***	-135 [621]	0.058 [0.023]**	-100 [172]	-26 [602]	-0.096 [0.021]***
Pathways*Age 21	937 [91]***	-244 [643]	0.085 [0.022]***	-125 [159]	-1 [619]	-0.141 [0.020]***
Pathways*Age 22	838 [83]***	-503 [644]	0.087 [0.023]***	-108 [165]	-256 [623]	-0.129 [0.021]***
Pathways*Age 23	595 [67]***	-241 [619]	0.095 [0.020]***	-290 [152]*	70 [612]	-0.140 [0.021]***
Pathways*Age 24	449 [82]***	1,299 [668]*	0.086 [0.021]***	-496 [164]***	1,615 [658]**	-0.150 [0.020]***
Pathways*Age 25	31 [87]	3,205 [692]***	0.119 [0.023]***	-440 [183]**	3,427 [690]***	-0.143 [0.021]***
Pathways*Age 26	104 [56]*	1,863 [750]**	0.081 [0.021]***	-470 [178]**	1,842 [706]**	-0.128 [0.022]***
Pathways*Age 27	43 [70]	5,342 [796]***	0.112 [0.023]***	-496 [213]**	5,331 [687]***	-0.169 [0.024]***
Pathways*Age 28	- -	4,279 [848]***	0.100 [0.029]***	-659 [200]***	3,807 [845]***	-0.231 [0.031]***
Constant	7,197 [1,059]***	32,904 [9,173]***	1.154 [0.374]***	-9,145 [3,725]***	36,766 [9,443]***	-0.478 [0.389]
Observations	23,212	23,212	23,212	23,212	23,212	23,212

Notes: Table A14 reports estimates of equation (1) when the baseline sample is restricted to female students. Pathways is a binary variable equal to one for students who entered Grade 9 after 2001 and resided in the Regent Park housing project, and zero otherwise. All regressions include cohort (year started Grade 9) and housing project fixed effects, as well as the following covariates: age started Grade 9 and dummies for immigrant status and English as a second language (ESL) status. Student immigrant status and first language status is based on TDSB administrative records. Standard errors are clustered at the housing project level and inference is based on the critical values of the t distribution with 70-1 = 69 degrees of freedom. \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1.

**Table A15**  
**Intent to Treat (ITT) Estimated Effects of Pathways on Various Outcomes:**  
**Natives**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Tuition Expenditures	Earnings	Working	Social Assistance Payments	UI Benefit Payments	Has Child
Pathways*Age 19	298 [80]***	-2,347 [642]***	0.036 [0.021]*	-406 [153]***	-2,253 [636]***	-0.107 [0.020]***
Pathways*Age 20	461 [83]***	-2,310 [641]***	0.031 [0.022]	-283 [148]*	-2,403 [632]***	-0.102 [0.020]***
Pathways*Age 21	512 [87]***	-2,658 [650]***	0.053 [0.021]**	-353 [147]**	-2,814 [632]***	-0.106 [0.019]***
Pathways*Age 22	457 [81]***	-2,682 [641]***	0.033 [0.022]	-313 [149]**	-2,729 [634]***	-0.103 [0.018]***
Pathways*Age 23	166 [67]**	-1,705 [630]***	0.078 [0.019]***	-342 [147]**	-1,874 [632]***	-0.136 [0.021]***
Pathways*Age 24	-14 [79]	-1,523 [664]**	0.034 [0.020]*	-522 [150]***	-1,808 [649]***	-0.086 [0.019]***
Pathways*Age 25	-107 [93]	-363 [696]	0.041 [0.023]*	-507 [176]***	-551 [684]	-0.102 [0.019]***
Pathways*Age 26	48 [68]	1,239 [759]	0.093 [0.022]***	-377 [177]**	927 [732]	-0.155 [0.022]***
Pathways*Age 27	-23 [87]	1,804 [654]***	0.108 [0.024]***	-418 [213]*	1,327 [668]*	-0.176 [0.023]***
Pathways*Age 28	- -	-2,562 [986]**	0.121 [0.032]***	-554 [220]**	-3,139 [943]***	-0.210 [0.026]***
Constant	5,598 [903]***	35,264 [12,674]***	1.472 [0.463]***	-4,511 [2,659]*	33,296 [12,700]***	-0.523 [0.409]
Observations	26,826	26,826	26,826	26,826	26,826	26,826

Notes: Table A15 reports estimates of equation (1) when the baseline sample is restricted to students born in Canada (natives). Pathways is a binary variable equal to one for students who entered Grade 9 after 2001 and resided in the Regent Park housing project, and zero otherwise. All regressions include cohort (year started Grade 9) and housing project fixed effects, as well as the following covariates: age started Grade 9 and dummies for immigrant status and English as a second language (ESL) status. Student immigrant status and first language status is based on TDSB administrative records. Standard errors are clustered at the housing project level and inference is based on the critical values of the t distribution with 70-1 = 69 degrees of freedom. \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1.

**Table A16**  
**Intent to Treat (ITT) Estimated Effects of Pathways on Various Outcomes:**  
**Immigrants**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Tuition Expenditures	Earnings	Working	Social Assistance Payments	UI Benefit Payments	Has Child
Pathways*Age 19	498 [110]***	-1,426 [796]*	0.008 [0.026]	-85 [99]	-1,363 [625]**	-0.007 [0.025]
Pathways*Age 20	723 [112]***	-295 [813]	-0.005 [0.025]	-176 [93]*	-323 [609]	-0.017 [0.023]
Pathways*Age 21	933 [106]***	-689 [758]	0.019 [0.025]	-163 [86]*	-442 [627]	-0.057 [0.024]**
Pathways*Age 22	910 [108]***	-949 [704]	0.057 [0.026]**	-141 [91]	-723 [606]	-0.062 [0.026]**
Pathways*Age 23	689 [94]***	-940 [678]	0.029 [0.025]	-301 [92]***	-511 [600]	-0.025 [0.025]
Pathways*Age 24	620 [102]***	765 [731]	0.056 [0.025]**	-365 [109]***	1,212 [630]*	-0.056 [0.024]**
Pathways*Age 25	105 [98]	3,294 [839]***	0.085 [0.025]***	-459 [120]***	3,896 [835]***	-0.057 [0.025]**
Pathways*Age 26	-48 [102]	2,850 [914]***	0.052 [0.027]*	-473 [104]***	2,652 [828]***	-0.050 [0.025]*
Pathways*Age 27	-126 [135]	6,938 [1,044]***	0.055 [0.030]*	-457 [110]***	6,843 [909]***	-0.064 [0.031]**
Pathways*Age 28	- -	7,123 [1,081]***	0.053 [0.032]*	-502 [116]***	7,016 [1,030]***	-0.127 [0.032]***
Constant	6,571 [1,000]***	21,832 [8,428]***	0.637 [0.308]**	-4,786 [2,987]	21,440 [7,980]***	0.028 [0.268]
Observations	19,972	19,972	19,972	19,972	19,972	19,972

Notes: Table A16 reports estimates of equation (1) when the baseline sample is restricted to students born outside Canada (immigrants). Pathways is a binary variable equal to one for students who entered Grade 9 after 2001 and resided in the Regent Park housing project, and zero otherwise. All regressions include cohort (year started Grade 9) and housing project fixed effects, as well as the following covariates: age started Grade 9 and dummies for immigrant status and English as a second language (ESL) status. Student immigrant status and first language status is based on TDSB administrative records. Standard errors are clustered at the housing project level and inference is based on the critical values of the t distribution with 70-1 = 69 degrees of freedom. \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1.

**Table A17**  
**Intent to Treat (ITT) Estimated Effects of Pathways at the Rexdale/LH Sites**  
**on Various Outcomes**

	(1) Tuition Expenditures	(2) Earnings	(3) Working	(4) UI Benefit Payments	(5) Has Child
New-Pathways*Age 19	6 [195]	761 [440]*	0.044 [0.027]	850 [332]**	-0.020 [0.021]
New-Pathways*Age 20	-185 [295]	973 [347]***	0.009 [0.015]	1,087 [268]***	-0.016 [0.012]
New-Pathways*Age 21	-151 [180]	1,850 [402]***	0.009 [0.035]	1,917 [296]***	-0.050 [0.034]
New-Pathways*Age 22	-163 [125]	-493 [793]	-0.044 [0.059]	-390 [659]	-0.026 [0.041]
Constant	6,876 [687]***	22,029 [6,431]***	0.674 [0.265]***	21,437 [5,703]***	0.091 [0.241]
Observations	44,001	44,001	44,001	44,001	44,001

Notes: Table A17 presents estimates of the causal effect of eligibility for Pathways at its expansion sites in Toronto, Lawrence Heights and Rexdale. The rows of the table report the  $\beta^a$  coefficient estimates from equation (1) when the sample is individuals (students) who entered a TDSB high school between 2001 and 2008, lived in a public housing project and are at least 19 years old between 2005 and 2015. New-pathways is a binary variable equal to one for students who entered Grade 9 after 2007 and resided in the Rexdale or Lawrence Heights housing projects, and zero otherwise. All regressions include cohort (year started Grade 9) and housing project fixed effects, as well as the following covariates: age started Grade 9 and dummies for immigrant status and English as a second language (ESL) status. Student immigrant status and first language status is based on TDSB administrative records. Standard errors are clustered at the housing project level and inference is based on the critical values of the t distribution with 70-1 = 69 degrees of freedom. \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1.