

Cradle-to-Career Data and Tools Advisory Board Staff Report

Date Report Issued: March 16, 2026
Attention: Members of Data and Tools Advisory Board
Subject: **Presentation on and Discussion of the Draft Data and Tools Advisory Board Proposals Report and Feasibility Studies (Agenda Item Six)**
Staff Contact: Ryan Estrellado, Director of Data Programs and Marykate Cruz Jones, Chief of Strategic Initiatives and Partnerships

At this meeting, the Data and Tools Advisory Board (DTAB) will have the opportunity to revisit the 2025 proposals with the feasibility study findings and amendments and provide concluding thoughts on the draft proposal report for the Governing Board (Board). This staff report is broken down into four main parts: section one, background, section two, member preparation for the Spring meeting, and section three, next steps in the process.

Requested Action:

There is no requested action for this item. This is an informational item only.

Section One: Background

DTAB members last [met on October 3, 2025](#). At that meeting, members received reminders about the 2025 proposal process, learned about and discussed the four proposals submitted by members, and deliberated on which proposals would have the highest likelihood of success and impact.

Section Two: Member Preparation for the Spring Meeting

This section catalogs resources members are to review for member deliberations.

Section Two, Part A: DTAB Light-Touch Feasibility Studies

Following the October meeting, the Office of Cradle-to-Career Data System (Office) completed light-touch feasibility studies on all proposals, which can be

found in Attachment A, Attachment C, Attachment E, and Attachment G. Members will read the findings as the studies will inform member discussion.

Section Two, Part B: Office Reflections on Study Findings

The Office's assessment is while all four proposals have merit and value, with varying degrees of complexity, collaboration, and labor, the proposal, Post High School Student Pathway, Higher Ed, and Workforce Outcomes Data Extract for California K12 Counties and Districts, is feasible for the Office to execute, would yield a very high impact, and has natural alignment with existing projected work.

Section Two, Part C: DTAB Proposal Update Forms

Proposal authors had the opportunity to update or clarify their ideas in response to the Office's feasibility process. Proposal update forms can be found in Attachment B, Attachment D, Attachment F, Attachment, H. Members will read the updated forms to aid in their preparations for member deliberations.

Section Two, Part D: DTAB Proposal Report

DTAB members Tina Cheuk and Daniel Millán worked with Board Liaison, Ana Luz González-Vásquez, to draft a report that summarizes the discussion from the Fall DTAB meeting. The draft DTAB Proposal Report can be found in Attachment I. During member discussion, DTAB members will consider the draft report and share any comments or reflections on the overall report.

Section Two, Part E: Member Workbook

To help members organize their thoughts and reflect on key questions, the Office created a Member Proposal Workbook (Workbook), found in Attachment J.

Section Three: Next Steps in the Process

Page 34 of the [Governance Manual](#), states "the [Board's] liaison may update the [DTAB proposal] report based on the [Spring] discussion". The Board will have an opportunity to review and discuss the report at the May 20, 2026 Board meeting and the report "can inform the Board's work and deliberations. For any

additional points for the P20W data set where the Board would like to take action, the Board could ask the Office to resolve any open feasibility questions with the data provider and work on file upload specifications in preparation for formal Board action".



Feasibility Study: Teacher Data

Recommendation from the Office of California Cradle-to-Career Data System

This proposal seeks to have the California Department of Education (CDE) and the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) provide information on teacher assignments, teacher misassignments, teacher vacancies, additional demographic information, and whether teacher candidates received state grants. This request has a reasonable cost and a moderate level of value regarding access to actionable information. The new data points would be available in the analytical data set and integrated into the planned Teacher Pipeline data story.

The Office of California Cradle-to-Career Data System (Office) recommends that if the Governing Board (Board) wishes to include the additional data points, additional feasibility analysis and the file specification process would need to be implemented in the fall prior to the desired March import window.

Background

In 2025, Data and Tools Advisory Board (DTAB) member Lisa Catanzarite submitted a proposal to expand the number of data points regarding teachers in the California Cradle-to-Career Data System (C2C) analytical data set. The full text of the proposal can be found at [this link](#).

When conducting feasibility studies, the Office considers four factors: data availability, data reliability and data validity, cost, and compliance. Information on each aspect is included below.

Potential Approaches to Data Access

There are two ways that this proposal could be addressed:

Option 1: Include additional data points and visualizations in the Teacher Training and Retention dashboard

This option focuses on providing a more complete understanding of how teacher training relates to filling in-demand positions. By making information accessible through the dashboard, the public could examine topics including whether teacher candidates secure positions that align with their training, whether additional efforts are needed to ensure highly-qualified teachers are working in low-income communities, and the impact of grant programs that help cover the cost of teaching credentials.

Option 2: Through the research request process, allow researchers to conduct analyses that examine the relationship between teacher preparation and student outcomes

This option focuses on providing the information necessary for authorized researchers to conduct more nuanced analyses. For example, researchers could examine whether California K-12 local education agencies (LEA) have stronger educational outcomes when students are taught by educators with appropriate training. With access to assignment data, vacancy rates, and teacher demographics, researchers could also propose studies that look at the implications of current placement practices. Data on whether teacher candidates utilized state grant programs could be combined with other types of aid data to gain a better understanding of how teachers finance their training.

Data Availability

Data Sources and Historical Range: *Where the data originates from and the span of years for which data are available.*

The requested information is currently collected by CDE and CTC. However, the C2C analytical data set does not include information on teacher candidates who are attending independent colleges, where half of California's teachers are trained.

Demographic information from CDE may not be necessary to identify teacher characteristics, as this information may be available from other matched records, such as when the teacher was enrolled in college for a teacher preparation program. However, given that many teacher candidates may not attend a California public college, this information would address gaps in CTC's data set.

Future Relevance and Data Availability: *Evaluate whether the new data will remain useful as the analytical dataset evolves and if the information is likely to be collected in the future.*

The need to fill teacher vacancies and address the high cost of training are priorities for California, so information that could help better target teacher training efforts and identify strategies to make teacher training more affordable will have ongoing value.

Because the requested data points are regularly provided to CDE and CTC by LEAs, the information is likely to remain available.

Data Reliability and Data Validity

Institutional Variability: *Whether there are variations in administrative practices and data recording across institutions at the local level.*

Because these data points are reported to CDE and CTC, LEAs have already standardized data collection processes to state standards.

Agency Variability: *Data and metric definitions across various agencies follow a uniform format and standard.*

There may be some inconsistency in definitions used by CDE and CTC. For example, both agencies capture data points related to vacancy rates and misassignment.

For option 1, the Office would need to work with the two agencies to determine which data source to use in the dashboard.

For option 2, both versions of the data points could be included in the C2C analytical data set to ensure researchers have access to the most appropriate definition related to their research question.

Data Integration Across Agencies: *The Office's ability to consolidate data from multiple agencies.*

The Office already has the capacity to match teacher data from CDE and CTC.

Cost

Startup Costs: *Costs to provide access including both direct costs and associated staff time for the Office and its data providers.*

Office staff would need to engage with CDE and CTC to establish the file specifications for the new data points, which would require staff time from all parties.

When the teacher dashboard is developed, the proposal could help to inform ways to visualize information using the new data points.

Ongoing Costs: *Costs necessary to maintain collection of the stated data elements for the Office and data providers.*

Once the data definition is established and data are uploaded, there will be minimal costs for the Office and data providers.

Compliance

Legal Requirements: *Compliance with privacy laws, intellectual property rights, and any other relevant regulations.*

There are no legal concerns regarding expanding the teacher data.

Scope: *Whether the proposal is consistent with the scope of work that is described in the Cradle-to-Career Act.*

The [initial legislation](#) did not include teacher data. However, during the planning process, the December 2020 [report to the legislature](#) recommended that the Office create a dashboard that could help improve teacher preparation programs.

Neutrality of the Office: *Whether the proposal might jeopardize the Office's neutral stance.*

If research regarding the impact of teacher training on student performance were used to evaluate teachers, it could politicize the Office's work. In some states, this type of analysis has been tied to teacher [performance evaluation](#) and termination decisions, which has been condemned by educators and unions.

However, because research requests would be cleared by data providers, agencies like CDE and CTC could ensure that analyses examine trends and weigh other variables that can shape student outcomes.

Suppression and Regulatory Feasibility: *The impact of compliance policies on access to data based on the Office's data suppression policy and other regulatory concerns such as reidentification risks.*

This proposal can be implemented using the current data suppression policies and does not pose a risk to regulatory issues such as reidentification.



Connecting
Data and Insights
to Advance
Equitable Futures

Cradle-to-Career Data and Tools Advisory Board Proposal Update Form

Instructions:

Per the [Governance Manual](#), Advisory Board proposal authors may update or clarify their ideas in response to the Office of California Cradle-to-Career Data System's (Office) feasibility process. This form provides structure to the proposal updates, ensuring they effectively address the flagged issue and meaningfully advance the Office's work. Please note there should only be one update per form. An update should **clarify** the original proposal.

Name:

Lisa Catanzarite, Ph.D.

Which proposal are you submitting an update for?:

Adding Pathways and Placement Data to Strengthen Teacher Workforce Insights

Identify which section should be updated (Check only one):

Section 1. Changes to the Data Request Process

- 1.1 What is the nature of the issue with the data request process?
- 1.2 What action should be taken to address the issue?
- 1.3 Who could benefit from this action?
- 1.4 Who would implement this action?
- 1.5 How does the action relate to the mission and vision of C2C?

Section 2. Changes to Tools Such as Dashboards or Practical (Operational) Tools

- 2.1 What is the nature of the gap regarding access to actionable information?
- 2.2 What type of tool should be developed?
- 2.3 How would a tool address the gap?
- 2.4 Who would be the likely user(s) of the tool?
- 2.5 How does the tool relate to the mission and vision of C2C?

Section 3. Adding Data Points Not Available Through the P20W Data Set or Adjusting the Existing P20W Data Points

- 3.1 What data point should be added or changed?
- 3.2 Who would use the data point?
- 3.3 How would the data point be used?
- 3.4 Who would provide the data point?
- 3.5 Does the data point already exist in a state-level data set or would it need to be collected by local institutions and reported to state agencies?
- 3.6 Which population(s) should be included in the data point? (such as K-12 students or workforce development participants)
- 3.7 How does the data point relate to the mission and vision of C2C?

What language do you want to change in the proposal?

Items 3 & 12—additional specificity.

What action do you want to take towards this language? (Check only one)

- Add language
- Clarify language/definitions
- Change the scope

What is your update for the proposal?

Additional language:

Item 3:

Where the CTC and CDE data sets contain different metrics that measure slightly different underlying issues, C2C should assess differences and the purposes for which alternative metrics may be used. Based on C2C assessments, C2C should use its discretion to decide which metrics and which levels of aggregation are appropriate for the public-facing dashboards. For the data request process, C2C should attempt to include all available metrics (including those that may be too sensitive for public-facing dashboards) so that authorized researchers may choose the metrics that best suit their research questions and purposes.

Item 12:

The proposal is requesting *both* options, as laid out in the Feasibility Study:

Option 1: Include additional data points and visualizations in the Teacher Training and Retention dashboard.

and

Option 2: Through the research request process, allow researchers to conduct analyses that examine the relationship between teacher preparation and student outcomes.

[What issue does your update address?](#)

Additional language provides greater specificity for Item 3 regarding data and Item 12 regarding use cases.

[How would your update resolve this issue?](#)

Item 3: Explicitly acknowledge differences in CDE and CTC datasets and acknowledge role of C2C staff in assessing nuances and divergent possible

uses of different data elements, and making determinations regarding dashboard elements.

Item 12: Explicit request for both Options, acknowledging the importance of providing key teacher training and placement metrics on the public-facing dashboard and the value of providing all metrics to authorized researchers.

[Provide specific actions the Office could take to implement this update:](#)

Clarifications noted above.



Feasibility Study: College Promise Programs

Recommendation from the Office of California Cradle-to-Career Data System

This proposal seeks to have the Office of California Cradle-to-Career Data System (Office) establish a consistent definition and collect information on the individuals who benefit from College Promise programs. This request has a significant cost and an unclear value regarding access to actionable information.

The Office recommends that it support efforts led by interested data providers to identify the rationale and requirements for evaluating College Promise programs. Some of the data in this proposal is not currently collected by data providers. Should the Governing Board (Board) want to consider allocating more resources to implementing these ideas, they may request the Office to develop more specific estimates of financial and administrative cost for collecting the new variables.

Background

In 2025, Data and Tools Advisory Board (DTAB) members Myrtha Ortiz Villar and Diana Phoung submitted a proposal to update the definition for College Promise programs in the California Cradle-to-Career Data System (C2C) analytical data set. The full text of the proposal can be found at [this link](#).

When conducting feasibility studies, the Office considers four factors: data availability, data reliability and data validity, cost, and compliance. Information on each aspect is included below.

Potential Approaches to Data Access

There are three ways that this proposal could be addressed:

Option 1: Conduct an analysis through the research request process

California K-12 local education agencies (LEA) that want information about the outcomes of students who participated in College Promise programs while in high school could conduct a research study using the C2C data request process. If approved by the postsecondary agencies, the LEA would provide identifiers for their students and the Office would match these records to the C2C analytical data set. Then, researchers at the LEAs could determine students' longer-term outcomes or compare them to students who did not receive this type of support. This analysis could also be requested by a research organization that is working in partnership with LEAs.

Option 2: Establish a common definition for College Promise programs

This option focuses on creating a consistent definition for the types of programs that count as College Promise. The current definition for the C2C analytical data set refers to tuition waivers, even though College Promise programs may include other components like guaranteed admissions, tutoring services, or career advising. The Office could use its role as a convenor to partner with other agencies to create a common definition or create a list of options that a data provider could choose from as part of the file specification process. Once a common definition or list of options is established, the Office could help socialize the consistent definition. For example, staff could post a plain language definition on the C2C website and work with community partners to disseminate this information.

Option 3: Create a new data point that documents whether individuals are participating in a College Promise program

The current College Promise data point is defined at the institutional level, indicating whether a community college or four-year institution offers a College Promise option. However, because information is not tracked at the individual level, it is not possible to know which students benefited from the support.

In addition, both K-12 and postsecondary institutions need to provide student-level information to evaluate the impact of College Promise programs. This option would require that each local education agency and college begin

tracking which students are participating in College Promise programs and report this information to the relevant state agency. It would also require the California Department of Education (CDE), California Community College Chancellor's Office (CCCCO), California State University (CSU), and University of California (UC) to collect this information each year.

Data Availability

Data Sources and Historical Range: *Where the data originates from and the span of years for which data are available.*

CCCCO, CSU, and the independent colleges indicated in the Participation Agreement that they will provide data to the Office on whether colleges associated with their systems offer a College Promise program. However, the Office has not yet worked with the data providers to create file specifications for College Promise programs and no information has been submitted. This work has not yet been scheduled.

Currently, none of the data providers ask educational institutions to report on College Promise programs at either the institutional or individual level, so new state-level data collection would be needed.

Future Relevance and Data Availability: *Evaluate whether the new data will remain useful as the analytical dataset evolves and if the information is likely to be collected in the future.*

Local programs that address both the cost of college and provide wrap around supports are important tools for college access. Therefore, it may be valuable to document the impact of College Promise programs and whether their scope and impact changes over time.

However, data providers do not currently collect information on College Promise programs.

Data Reliability and Data Validity

Institutional Variability: *Whether there are variations in administrative practices and data recording across institutions at the local level.*

Because College Promise programs are local in nature, their definitions vary across institutions. In addition, the specific components of College Promise programs may evolve over time, so if the data included in the C2C analytical data set becomes more granular, agencies will need to track which components are being implemented on an annual basis.

Agency Variability: *Data and metric definitions across various agencies follow a uniform format and standard.*

Definitions vary across agencies. For example, K-12 programs focus more on admissions and college selection while college programs focus more on services that encourage persistence and completion.

Data Integration Across Agencies: *The Office's ability to consolidate data from multiple agencies.*

At the institutional level, once a definition is established and data providers begin to share information using those specifications, the Office will be able to provide information about which institutions offer College Promise programs.

Similarly, if data providers share individual-level data, the current matching process would allow for information on College Promise program participation to become a characteristic for each student. Therefore, it would be possible to conduct analyses on the milestones and outcomes that students achieve.

Cost

Startup Costs: *Costs to provide access including both direct costs and associated staff time for the Office and its data providers.*

To create consistent definitions, Office staff could use the file specifications process to engage with data providers to create a list of characteristics

associated with College Promise programs. This could be done through direct conversations with providers, or the Office could convene a task force to recommend definitions. This activity would need to be integrated into a future work plan and weighed against other priorities, such as establishing definitions for health and human services or early childhood data points.

To begin collecting information on individuals in College Promise programs, the costs would be significant. LEAs and postsecondary institutions would have to devote time and resources to identifying which students are participating. They would also need to amend their local data systems to allow them to track this information. Finally, they would need to devote time to uploading the information to the state level data systems maintained by CDE, CCCCCO, and CSU.

Startup processes for the data providers would also be significant. They would need to amend the data structure of their information systems, develop guidance documents regarding how to report this information, host training for LEAs and postsecondary institutions regarding new requirements, and validate the new information. Generally, focused attention is required for three years to develop, explain, collect, and ensure the quality of new data points.

Ongoing Costs: *Costs necessary to maintain collection of the stated data elements for the Office and data providers.*

Once the data definition is established and data are uploaded, there will be minimal costs for the Office.

There will be ongoing costs for data providers to capture information on the characteristics of College Promise programs offered by LEAs and colleges each year.

There will be an ongoing cost for LEAs and colleges to track who is participating in College Promise programs and to report this information each year to the relevant agency.

Compliance

Legal Requirements: *Compliance with privacy laws, intellectual property rights, and any other relevant regulations.*

There are no legal concerns regarding creating a consistent definition or sharing information on an individual's participation in a College Promise program.

Scope: *Whether the proposal is consistent with the scope of work that is described in the Cradle-to-Career Act.*

The [initial legislation](#) included a requirement that the planning process create recommendations for “a means of developing common data definitions and additional data elements necessary for partner entities to collect for future linkage to the data system.” During the planning process, this was addressed by convening a subcommittee that examined how each data provider currently collects information on a given data point and then assessing that data point for quality before determining whether to include it in the initial C2C analytical data set (see the [December 2020 report to the legislature](#)).

Office staff follow a similar process to develop file specifications with each data provider. However, there is not currently a process for convening partners to align definitions. For example, after the planning process was complete, questions arose about the Office establishing a consistent definition for teacher residency programs. The decision on how to make the definition more precise has been made by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC), not by the Office. Similarly, a task force that the Office convened to create a consistent definition for earnings was inconclusive and therefore the Office staff developed a formula that is not aligned with any specific agency calculation.

Neutrality of the Office: *Whether the proposal might jeopardize the Office's neutral stance.*

As a neutral body, the Office's role is to provide documentation on the information included in the C2C analytical data set, as specified by data providers. In instances where definitions vary across agencies, the Office

generally creates unique data points that focus on the differing approaches. For example, when determining whether an individual is low income, CDE provides a student's socioeconomic status, which includes factors like parental education and access to free and reduced price meals. Colleges, on the other hand, report whether students received financial aid. Having the Office establish a consistent definition would not be in keeping with its current role.

Suppression and Regulatory Feasibility: *The impact of compliance policies on access to data based on the Office's data suppression policy and other regulatory concerns such as reidentification risks.*

This proposal can be implemented using the current data suppression policies and does not pose a risk to regulatory issues such as reidentification.



Cradle-to-Career Data and Tools Advisory Board Proposal Update Form

Instructions:

Per the [Governance Manual](#), Advisory Board proposal authors may update or clarify their ideas in response to the Office of California Cradle-to-Career Data System's (Office) feasibility process. This form provides structure to the proposal updates, ensuring they effectively address the flagged issue and meaningfully advance the Office's work. Please note there should only be one update per form. An update should **clarify** the original proposal.

Name:

Diana Phuong and Myrtha Ortiz Villar

Which proposal are you submitting an update for?:

Enhance College Promise Definition Proposal

Identify which section should be updated (Check only one):

Section 1. Changes to the Data Request Process

- 1.1 What is the nature of the issue with the data request process?
- 1.2 What action should be taken to address the issue?
- 1.3 Who could benefit from this action?
- 1.4 Who would implement this action?
- 1.5 How does the action relate to the mission and vision of C2C?

Section 2. Changes to Tools Such as Dashboards or Practical (Operational) Tools

- 2.1 What is the nature of the gap regarding access to actionable information?
- 2.2 What type of tool should be developed?
- 2.3 How would a tool address the gap?
- 2.4 Who would be the likely user(s) of the tool?
- 2.5 How does the tool relate to the mission and vision of C2C?

Section 3. Adding Data Points Not Available Through the P20W Data Set or Adjusting the Existing P20W Data Points

- 3.1 What data point should be added or changed?
- 3.2 Who would use the data point?
- 3.3 How would the data point be used?
- 3.4 Who would provide the data point?
- 3.5 Does the data point already exist in a state-level data set or would it need to be collected by local institutions and reported to state agencies?
- 3.6 Which population(s) should be included in the data point? (such as K-12 students or workforce development participants)
- 3.7 How does the data point relate to the mission and vision of C2C?

What language do you want to change in the proposal?

This amendment clarifies that the proposal does not immediately mandate new student-level data collection. The update clarifies that C2C should support efforts led by interested data providers to identify the rationale and requirements for evaluating College Promise programs.

What action do you want to take towards this language? (Check only one)

- Add language
- Clarify language/definitions
- Change the scope

[What is your update for the proposal?](#)

This amendment updates our proposal to go beyond a one time definition update to the existing College Promise data point. The proposal update acts as a further call to action to the Governing Board to use the feasibility study as catalyst in bringing data providers together to address a larger issue of misalignment and the lack of consistent Promise data across data providers and the systems they represent. **College Promise programs operate under multiple legislative actions, including AB 19 in the community colleges and SB 412 in the CSU system, in addition to local and community-based Promise programs. California has invested tens of millions of dollars annually into Promise programs through legislation but without clearer working definitions and identifiable student-level data, the state cannot meaningfully assess participation, impact, effectiveness, or return on investment of this investment.**

By tying these goals explicitly to a need for more research, the amendment strengthens the proposal and makes clear that **this is an ongoing conversation, not a one-time technical change.**

Citations:

AB 19 (2017) California College Promise Program

SB 412 (2019) California Promise Program at CSU

[What issue does your update address?](#)

This amendment addresses the concern that the proposal could be interpreted as a narrow definition adjustment at the institutional level. The larger issue is cross-institution misalignment and the lack of consistent data across CC, CSU, UC and K-12 systems.

[How would your update resolve this issue?](#)

This amendment would strengthen the proposal by clarifying that the feasibility study is a starting point for continued alignment. **It reinforces that definition clarity, participation data, and long-term student-level visibility should be explored collaboratively with data-providers.**

Rather than suggesting that a single definition update resolves the issue, this approach calls for further studies as an opportunity to map current capacity to report on existing data points, identify gaps in College Promise data, and outline next steps for data providers to come together and begin a definition process. It keeps equity, transparency, and public accountability at the center of the C2C work. Elevating this work within Governing Board discussions ensures that this remains a strategic priority and encourages data providers to engage in coordinated research and alignment across institutions.

[Provide specific actions the Office could take to implement this update:](#)

The Office could use the feasibility study findings as a foundation for deeper cross-institution conversations. This clouds moving forward with all three **recommendations in the feasibility study but not limited to: 1) Conduct an analysis through the research request process, 2) Establish a common definition for College Promise programs, 3) Create a new data point that identifies individual participation in a College Promise program; all alongside interested data providers.**

Pilot analyses using existing data and possible rosters of students could further demonstrate how stronger College Promise student-level data tracking supports evaluation of persistence, completion, and long-term outcomes.

This approach ensures that the feasibility study becomes a catalyst for continued progress rather than a closing of this proposal.



Feasibility Study: Homeless Status

Recommendation from the Office of California Cradle-to-Career Data System

This proposal seeks to have the Office of California Cradle-to-Career Data System (Office) provide information on an individual's recent experiences with homelessness, as well as including data collected by the Business, Consumer Services, and Housing Agency (BCSH). This request has a reasonable cost and a high level of value regarding access to actionable information.

The Office recommends that it use existing data to create a new metric on whether an individual experienced homelessness in a specific year. In addition, the Governing Board could direct the Office to approach BCSH to determine its interest in becoming a data provider in summer 2026 so the P20W dataset could include information from the Homeless Data Integration System (HDIS) in the March 2027 cycle.

Background

In 2025, Data and Tools Advisory Board (DTAB) member J. Oliver Schack submitted a proposal to improve information on homelessness in the California Cradle-to-Career Data System (C2C) analytical data set. The full text of the proposal can be found at [this link](#).

When conducting feasibility studies, the Office considers four factors: data availability, data reliability and data validity, cost, and compliance. Information on each aspect is included below.

Potential Approaches to Data Access

There are three ways that this proposal could be addressed:

Option 1: Create an additional homelessness data point using existing data

This option focuses on adjusting how existing data on homelessness is processed. Currently, the Office flags individuals as homeless if any data provider indicated that they experienced homelessness in any year. The proposal would create an additional data point that indicates whether an individual has experienced homelessness in the last year. This additional data point would allow researchers to conduct analyses on topics such as chronic homelessness without requiring that any new data be collected.

Option 2: Secure confirmation of whether an individual experienced homelessness from HDIS

The current data on homeless status comes from the California Department of Education (CDE) for K-12 students, the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (CCCCO), and the California Student Aid Commission (CSAC). Therefore, information on homeless status is not currently available for preschool children and four-year college students who do not receive federal financial aid. More complete information would be available if the C2C analytical data set also included data points from BCSH's HDIS.

HDIS is a statewide data system on people receiving homeless services based on data from regional homelessness service coordination and planning bodies. This option would prioritize BCSH as a C2C data provider and would require a memo from BCSH similar to the one provided by the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (LWDA) when workforce data was added. For option two, only one data point would be requested: a simple yes/no regarding whether an individual was flagged as homeless in HDIS.

Option 3: Include a number of homelessness data points from HDIS

HDIS includes additional data points that would enrich analyses about the relationship between homelessness and educational attainment, such as the types of services individuals are receiving and whether services are provided to families with children. This option would follow the same process outlined in

option 2, but would request that the Office work with BCSH to identify a number of new data points to include (rather than a simple yes/no).

Data Availability

Data Sources and Historical Range: *Where the data originates from and the span of years for which data are available.*

Information for the first option is already available in the C2C analytical data set.

Information for the second two options would require that the Office establish a data sharing agreement, create file specifications, and ingest data from BCSH.

Future Relevance and Data Availability: *Evaluate whether the new data will remain useful as the analytical dataset evolves and if the information is likely to be collected in the future.*

Given that affordable housing is consistently one of the top concerns of Californians, better data on homelessness will be valued by the public, policy makers, educators, and service providers in the future.

Because HDIS assists the state to better coordinate services for unhoused people, it is likely this information will be collected in the future.

Data Reliability and Data Validity

Institutional Variability: *Whether there are variations in administrative practices and data recording across institutions at the local level.*

Current data collection by educational institutions is likely to be consistent, given that there are clear guidelines for reporting by CDE, CCCCO, and CSAC. Information from HDIS is also likely to be consistent because local collection must conform to federal definitions.

Agency Variability: *Data and metric definitions across various agencies follow a uniform format and standard.*

Definitions vary across agencies. For K-12 students, this information is gathered by California K-12 local education agencies (LEA). CCCCO and CSAC data are reported by students on application forms. In each case, different criteria are used. For example, CSAC captures data on students at risk of being homeless, while CCCCO uses a definition that is aligned with the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA).

HDIS is constructed using federal definitions that include data points including entry and exit dates, whether people are experiencing homelessness for the first time, the amount of time an individual has been homeless, the number of people who return to homelessness, whether they are placed into permanent housing, and how many had successful placements from street outreach projects.

Data Integration Across Agencies: *The Office's ability to consolidate data from multiple agencies.*

The Office would be able to ingest HDIS data, using the same matching process that is used with other agencies.

Cost

Startup Costs: *Costs to provide access including both direct costs and associated staff time for the Office and its data providers.*

The cost for option one would be small, given that it only requires a change in coding.

Costs for options two and three would be more significant, as it requires that the Office meet with BCSH to determine which data points to share. Then, the Office will need to work with BCSH to establish the file specifications. The cost differential between options two and three depends on how many data points would be shared. This activity would need to be integrated into a future work plan and weighed against other priorities, such as establishing definitions for health and human services or early childhood data points. These would be similar staff time costs to onboarding and importing data from LWDA agencies,

Department of Developmental Services (DDS), and the Scholarshare Investment Board (SIB).

Ongoing Costs: *Costs necessary to maintain collection of the stated data elements for the Office and data providers.*

There are no significant ongoing costs for option one.

For options two and three, once the data definitions are established, data specifications are completed, data are uploaded, and records are matched, there will be minimal costs for the Office and BCSH.

Compliance

Legal Requirements: *Compliance with privacy laws, intellectual property rights, and any other relevant regulations.*

There are no legal concerns regarding making a new metric using existing data.

If the Office works with BCSH, they should consider any legal factors relating to allowable use requirements for homeless data.

Scope: *Whether the proposal is consistent with the scope of work that is described in the Cradle-to-Career Act.*

The [initial legislation](#) did not include a specific reference to homelessness, but does indicate that the data system should include health and human services data.

Neutrality of the Office: *Whether the proposal might jeopardize the Office's neutral stance.*

Including additional information on homelessness would not jeopardize neutrality, particularly given that the data providers discussed the value of providing both “if ever” and “current year” versions of metrics associated with student characteristics during the [planning process](#). In addition, the issue of variable data definitions was discussed during the [planning process](#) as a limiting

factor. At the time, because HDIS had not yet been built, it was proposed as a potential future data source.

Suppression and Regulatory Feasibility: *The impact of compliance policies on access to data based on the Office's data suppression policy and other regulatory concerns such as reidentification risks.*

This proposal can be implemented using the current data suppression policies and does not pose a risk to regulatory issues such as reidentification.



Cradle-to-Career Data and Tools Advisory Board Proposal Update Form

Instructions:

Per the [Governance Manual](#), Advisory Board proposal authors may update or clarify their ideas in response to the Office of California Cradle-to-Career Data System's (Office) feasibility process. This form provides structure to the proposal updates, ensuring they effectively address the flagged issue and meaningfully advance the Office's work. Please note there should only be one update per form. An update should **clarify** the original proposal.

Name:

Jacob (Oliver) Schak

Which proposal are you submitting an update for?:

Expanding Student Homeless Status Data Element

Identify which section should be updated (Check only one):

Section 1. Changes to the Data Request Process

- 1.1 What is the nature of the issue with the data request process?
- 1.2 What action should be taken to address the issue?
- 1.3 Who could benefit from this action?
- 1.4 Who would implement this action?
- 1.5 How does the action relate to the mission and vision of C2C?

Section 2. Changes to Tools Such as Dashboards or Practical (Operational) Tools

- 2.1 What is the nature of the gap regarding access to actionable information?
- 2.2 What type of tool should be developed?
- 2.3 How would a tool address the gap?
- 2.4 Who would be the likely user(s) of the tool?
- 2.5 How does the tool relate to the mission and vision of C2C?

Section 3. Adding Data Points Not Available Through the P20W Data Set or Adjusting the Existing P20W Data Points

- 3.1 What data point should be added or changed?
- 3.2 Who would use the data point?
- 3.3 How would the data point be used?
- 3.4 Who would provide the data point?
- 3.5 Does the data point already exist in a state-level data set or would it need to be collected by local institutions and reported to state agencies?
- 3.6 Which population(s) should be included in the data point? (such as K-12 students or workforce development participants)
- 3.7 How does the data point relate to the mission and vision of C2C?

What language do you want to change in the proposal?

LANGUAGE FOR UPDATE 1

In the original proposal, Member Schak stated that, at minimum, the P20W Data System should include:

- Flags indicating whether each student experienced any homelessness prior to enrollment over the preceding 30 days, 12 months, 5 years, and ever since birth.
- Information on whether each student was homeless during the school year, and what kinds of services the student received, such as the service provider, nature of housing (e.g., rapid rehousing), and duration of services.
- Outcome measures on the number and duration of homeless spells at 1

year, 5 years, and 10 years after exiting high school and/or college. The October DTAB and feasibility study surfaced concerns about the availability and feasibility of collecting some of these data points. Moreover, the State of California, and particularly its health and human service departments, have come under considerable budgetary constraints that could limit their capacity in extracting and providing additional data for the Cradle-to-Career Data System.

With those considerations in mind, Member Schak would like to clarify that the highest priority should go to creating a student-level flag on homeless status that would indicate which students have ever been homeless, as well as those who have been homeless within the last 12 months. Cradle-to-Career would work with data partners to update this flag annually, so that the public could track how housing stability and homelessness changes over time.

LANGUAGE FOR UPDATE 2

The feasibility study examined three options on how to expand information on housing and homelessness:

- Option 1: Create an additional homelessness data point using existing data
- Option 2: Secure confirmation of whether an individual experienced homelessness from Homeless Data Integration System
- Option 3: Include a number of homelessness data points from HDIS

As a clarification on the sources that the expanded data element would come from, Member Schak favors either Option 2 or Option 3. The Homeless Data Integration System (HDIS) provides the most comprehensive, reliable, and robust view of student housing and homelessness experiences, since it compiles data from most major service providers within the state's homelessness response system.

The system would allow Cradle-to-Career to track student housing experiences across educational segments and measure homeless status based on a consistent definition. Moreover, a partnership with the data steward for HDIS (BCSHA) could open the door to a well of knowledge about student experiences moving forward. With access to information on homeless status and services, Cradle-to-Career and its partners could uncover novel insights about the interplay between human services, housing, and educational excellence.

Option 2 may strike a good balance between improving data on a pressing issue and conserving state resources. Although both Option 2 and Option 3 would require coordination and legal agreements between Cradle-to-Career and BCSHA, Option 2 would likely require fewer resources at the technical level, when staff reach the stage of specifying data standards and matching procedures. By focusing on extracting one commonly used data element from HDIS, this option may have the highest likelihood of success in providing an improved picture of which students experience homelessness.

To assist a partnership with BCSHA, Cradle-to-Career can also look to state SLSD's that have made inroads, in bridging human service and education data systems, and in developing a shared language and understanding between these two spaces:

- Connecticut: Collaborated with 15 participating agencies to ensure that individuals can successfully navigate supportive services and education pathways into the workforce.
- Iowa: Brought together the leadership from the Departments of Health & Human Services, Education, Workforce Development, and the Iowa Head Start Associations to host a wide range of data at Iowa State University. This system provides a success story in integrating early childhood data into a broader mosaic of sources from participating partners.
- North Carolina: NC Department of Health and Human Services is one of the

state's six current data contributors. Data on social services are accessed via the Department's Early Childhood Integrated Data System, which houses both education and non-education data elements.

The public may read more about these examples [here](#).

LANGUAGE FOR UPDATE 3

This proposal adds information on which student populations should be included in an expanded homeless status data point –

To the extent possible, Cradle-to-Career should work to include all students in such a data point, including early childhood, elementary, secondary, post-secondary, and workforce. Every student should be included regardless of whether they attend a public or private college, or whether they receive federal or state financial aid.

That said, data for some sectors may be more readily available than others. Currently, the best coverage exists for students at K-12 public schools, community colleges, and those who receive financial aid. The most difficult gap to close is in early childhood education, where Cradle-to-Career has limited access to student-level data that would facilitate a match with data sources on homelessness. Private colleges and students without financial aid represent additional gaps that are critical to address.

Matching educational data with HDIS may help close some of these gaps, especially when student data (e.g., enrollment) are reported from an available data source, but specific reporting on homeless status is either unavailable or inconsistent. When Cradle-to-Career expands its reach to early childhood education and private schools, HDIS data may prove valuable in supplementing future data sources that do not collect consistent, high-quality information on homelessness and housing supports.

What action do you want to take towards this language? (Check only one)

- Add language
- Clarify language/definitions
- Change the scope

What is your update for the proposal?

Member Schak proposes three updates for this proposal (see revisions/additions above).

Update 1 (3.1): Clarifies the minimal data elements needed to better understand patterns of housing and homelessness for California students.

Update 2 (3.4): Clarifies and expands on the reasons why HDIS is the most promising data source for homelessness data. Additionally, this update provides information on several states that already collect and integrate health and human service data into their SLDS.

Update 3 (3.6) Adds language on which populations should be included in the data point.

What issue does your update address?

The feasibility study surfaced several areas needing clarification and additional detail. Given increased scarcity of staffing and resources at California agencies, greater clarity is needed about which homelessness data elements warrant the highest priority. The feasibility study provided new information on the promising options for expanding the homelessness data point – an area Member Schak addresses directly in this updated proposal. Member Schak also would like to share an overview of state systems that could provide lessons on how to overcome organizational and technical silos between educational, health, and human service data systems. Finally, the feasibility study brought up some additional nuances about which populations would be included in this data point.

[How would your update resolve this issue?](#)

This update provides clarification on the minimal data elements needed to expand the homeless status data point, underscoring that the most pressing improvement would be adding a regularly collected flag that indicates homeless status during the previous year. It briefly discusses the merits of different data sources, and points to several states that may provide guideposts for how to successfully collaborate with social service partners, to integrate expanded data on homelessness and housing supports. Additionally, the update adds an overview of which student populations and educational sectors should be included in this data point.

[Provide specific actions the Office could take to implement this update:](#)

The Office could publish their feasibility study and this proposal update well in advance of the DTAB meeting on March 25, 2026. Member Schak also encourages the Office to provide ample space for two-way dialogue on these clarifications and additions at the DTAB meeting.



Feasibility Study: High School Outcomes Data Extract

Recommendation from the Office of California Cradle-to-Career Data System

This proposal seeks to create a high school student pathway, higher education, and workforce outcomes data extract for California K-12 local education agencies (LEAs). This request has a reasonable cost and a high level of value regarding access to actionable information.

The Office of California Cradle-to-Career Data System (Office) recommends that it make adjustments to the website to create clearer navigation to assist LEA staff to find the extract file from the Pathways Data Story. In addition, the Governing Board (Board) could direct the Office to create an additional public extract that provides more data points on postsecondary outcomes for high school graduates during fall 2026.

Background

In 2025, Data and Tools Advisory Board (DTAB) members Iulia Tarasova and John Watson proposed that the Office provide K-12 districts and county offices with easier access to information on the longer-term outcomes of their graduates. The full text of the proposal can be found at [this link](#).

When conducting feasibility studies, the Office considers four factors: data availability, data reliability and data validity, cost, and compliance. Information on each aspect is included below.

Potential Approaches to Data Access

There are two ways that this proposal could be addressed:

Option 1: Create clear navigation to available data

This option focuses on ease of access to the information that can already be downloaded from the Pathways Data Story. In the short term, to ensure that

people who work at LEAs can easily find information on their graduates' outcomes, the California Cradle-to-Career Data System (C2C) website could include a feature in its drop down menu or provide a link on the Student Pathways Data Story page that allows users to select a specific LEA and then download summary data with a single click. When the query builder is developed, it could have a specific feature for LEAs with a ready made report, similar to the federal Integrated Postsecondary Data System's [Data Feedback Report](#).

Option 2: Provide expanded public access to data already included in the C2C analytical data set

This option would be implemented as part of the query builder. A clearly marked option for LEAs and county offices would allow users to download information from the current Pathways Data Story, plus additional data points that are already included in the analytical data set. All downloads would follow the same suppression protocol as data points in the Pathways Data Story to ensure student privacy. The proposal included a list of potential additional data points. If the proposal is adopted, this list would be reviewed by the relevant data providers to determine which data points to include, based on considerations about data quality and availability at the LEA level (for example, if a data point is missing from many LEAs, or is a newer data point that may not have information for the timeframe used for the Pathways Data Story, it would not be included).

Data Availability

Data Sources and Historical Range: *Where the data originates from and the span of years for which data are available.*

All of the information requested is already included in the C2C analytical data set.

Future Relevance and Data Availability: *Evaluate whether the new data will remain useful as the analytical dataset evolves and if the information is likely to be collected in the future.*

LEAs are a key user for the C2C data system and would benefit from being able to see information about the longer-term outcomes of their students. Given that many LEAs must purchase this data from the National Student Clearinghouse (NSC) each year, being able to access data through C2C for free may be the only way for them to have this information, given budget reductions.

Because the data points being requested are already included in the Participation Agreement with the data providers, this information should remain available in the future.

Data Reliability and Data Validity

Institutional Variability: *Whether there are variations in administrative practices and data recording across institutions at the local level.*

Data included in the Pathways Data Story have already been evaluated to ensure they are reliable at the institutional level. Any additional elements would be vetted by the data providers.

Agency Variability: *Data and metric definitions across various agencies follow a uniform format and standard.*

Data included in the Pathways Data Story have already been evaluated to ensure they are reliable at the institutional level. Any additional elements would be vetted by the data providers.

Data Integration Across Agencies: *The Office's ability to consolidate data from multiple agencies.*

Data included in the Pathways Data Story and additional requested elements have already been linked within the C2C analytical data set.

Cost

Startup Costs: *Costs to provide access including both direct costs and associated staff time for the Office and its data providers.*

There would be no additional costs for the data providers.

Costs for the Office would include staff time to review availability of requested data points at the LEA level, coordination with data providers to review the list of data points that would be included, and implementation costs.

Ongoing Costs: *Costs necessary to maintain collection of the stated data elements for the Office and data providers.*

For options 1 and 2, some staff time will be needed for the production, housing, and maintenance of the extract files.

Compliance

Legal Requirements: *Compliance with privacy laws, intellectual property rights, and any other relevant regulations.*

There are no legal concerns, given that the requested information would be provided under the protocols already established to ensure individual privacy.

Scope: *Whether the proposal is consistent with the scope of work that is described in the Cradle-to-Career Act.*

The request aligns with the intentions of the [initial legislation](#), which prioritized “identifying and tracking predictive indicators to enable parents, teachers, health and human services providers, and policymakers to provide appropriate interventions and supports to address disparities in opportunities and improve outcomes for all students.” Making it easier for educators to get information on their students would be consistent with the discussions held during the [planning process](#), when agency representatives contemplated ways to provide privileged access for data providers and their associated local institutions.

Neutrality of the Office: *Whether the proposal might jeopardize the Office's neutral stance.*

Because the focus of the proposal is enhancing data access for educational institutions that submit the information that populates the C2C analytical data set, it does not impact the Office's neutrality.

Suppression and Regulatory Feasibility: *The impact of compliance policies on access to data based on the Office's data suppression policy and other regulatory concerns such as reidentification risks.*

This proposal can be implemented using the current data suppression policies and does not pose a risk to regulatory issues such as reidentification.



Cradle-to-Career Data and Tools Advisory Board Proposal Update Form

Instructions:

Per the [Governance Manual](#), Advisory Board proposal authors may update or clarify their ideas in response to the Office of California Cradle-to-Career Data System's (Office) feasibility process. This form provides structure to the proposal updates, ensuring they effectively address the flagged issue and meaningfully advance the Office's work. Please note there should only be one update per form. An update should **clarify** the original proposal.

Name:

John Watson and Iulia Tarasova

Which proposal are you submitting an update for?:

Career Technical Education Pathway Outcomes Data for Query Builder

Identify which section should be updated (Check only one):

Section 1. Changes to the Data Request Process

- 1.1 What is the nature of the issue with the data request process?
- 1.2 What action should be taken to address the issue?
- 1.3 Who could benefit from this action?
- 1.4 Who would implement this action?
- 1.5 How does the action relate to the mission and vision of C2C?

Section 2. Changes to Tools Such as Dashboards or Practical (Operational) Tools

- 2.1 What is the nature of the gap regarding access to actionable information?
- 2.2 What type of tool should be developed?
- 2.3 How would a tool address the gap?
- 2.4 Who would be the likely user(s) of the tool?
- 2.5 How does the tool relate to the mission and vision of C2C?

Section 3. Adding Data Points Not Available Through the P20W Data Set or Adjusting the Existing P20W Data Points

- 3.1 What data point should be added or changed?
- 3.2 Who would use the data point?
- 3.3 How would the data point be used?
- 3.4 Who would provide the data point?
- 3.5 Does the data point already exist in a state-level data set or would it need to be collected by local institutions and reported to state agencies?
- 3.6 Which population(s) should be included in the data point? (such as K-12 students or workforce development participants)
- 3.7 How does the data point relate to the mission and vision of C2C?

What language do you want to change in the proposal?

What action do you want to take towards this language? (Check only one)

- Add language
- Clarify language/definitions
- Change the scope

What is your update for the proposal?

A Query Builder-integrated LEA-level annual data extract will provide:

- Pre-selected, actionable datasets on postsecondary, workforce, financial aid, and CTE outcomes.
- A predefined dataset in extract form, an efficient format for LEAs and COEs to retrieve and connect to other datasets.
- Aggregated data reporting to protect student privacy while giving meaningful insights at the district and county level.
- Reduced dependence on costly third-party data or specialized analysis.

Feasibility Study outcome preference: The Feasibility Study for this proposal resulted in two options both of which advance C2C's mission by increasing access to actionable information. The authors of this proposal express a strong preference for Option 2 described in the Feasibility Study as a full Query Builder extract with pre-selected existing data points described in the Proposed Output Table, for automated, easy access datasets as the specified extract would otherwise require reliance and cost to obtain and combine datasets available from a variety of external sources. The authors recognize that the pragmatic near-term Option 1 described in the Feasibility Study, with enhanced navigation to existing Pathways Data Story downloads for immediate usability, is acceptable.

[What issue does your update address?](#)

Emphasize that the tool provides annual, LEA-specific extracts, including CTE participation and industry sector interest, postsecondary enrollment (UC, CSU, CCC), workforce outcomes, and financial aid use.

Clarify that data is aggregated, pre-selected in the Query Builder, and drawn from existing administrative datasets.

Highlight that Option 2 is preferred, but Option 1 is acceptable as a near-term

solution to improve access while the Query Builder integration is finalized.

Reiterate alignment with feasibility study recommendations, workplan priorities, and Advisory Board feedback.

[How would your update resolve this issue?](#)

- Provides explicit language confirming annual data refreshes, LEA-level aggregation, and query builder integration.
- Highlights flexibility by including a near-term Option 1 implementation for immediate impact.
- Demonstrates feasibility, aligns with C2C workplan, and addresses Board feedback regarding usability, scope, equity, and cost.

[Provide specific actions the Office could take to implement this update:](#)

The additional text would be added to the proposal directly after the Proposed Output Table in the “What type of tool should be developed?” section, noting that this addition references the Feasibility Study.

Data and Tools Advisory Board Proposal Report

SECTION 1. PROPOSALS OVERVIEW

Several proposals were submitted for consideration, each seeking to expand the California Cradle-to-Career Data System (C2C):

1. [**Adding Pathways and Placement Data to Strengthen Teacher Workforce Insights**](#) - Submitted by Member Catanzarite

This proposal aims to enhance the P20W system by incorporating new metrics related to teacher vacancies, subject areas, assignments and misassignments, and teacher career pathways. The rationale is that California faces persistent teacher shortages and frequent misassignments, which can limit students' access to qualified teachers and negatively affect learning outcomes. Current data systems do not fully capture these dynamics, making it difficult for policymakers and educators to identify where shortages and misassignments occur, which student populations are most affected, and how teacher career pathways influence retention and workforce stability. By enhancing P20W with new metrics on teacher vacancies, subject areas, assignments/misassignments, and career pathways, this proposal would fill critical data gaps and provide actionable insights to improve both teacher workforce planning and student learning.

Existing agreements between C2C and relevant state agencies, including current data partners, provide a foundation for this proposal, allowing it to leverage existing datasets. While prior proposals related to teacher data have been submitted, they have not been prioritized. By adding these metrics, P20W could support analyses that reveal variation in students' access to qualified teachers across student subgroups, school districts, and subject areas.

Potential research questions that could be addressed with these data include:

- Which regions and communities are most affected by teacher shortages, and how have these trends changed over time?

- Which students are most likely to attend schools with the highest vacancies?
- How do teacher vacancy rates in schools and districts impact students' educational trajectories?

Additional insights would include patterns of teacher misassignments, participation in state grant programs, and career pathways, with the ability to disaggregate by race/ethnicity, gender, and other social locations.

If implemented, this proposal could generate both institutional- and individual-level data and support alignment with:

- A forthcoming "Teacher Training and Retention" dashboard
- The P20W query builder
- The research request tool/process

Overall, this proposal aligns with C2C's mission by providing actionable insights into the teacher pipeline, with implications for teachers, students, and communities, ultimately supporting a stronger education-to-employment pathway.

2. [**Enhance College Promise Definition**](#) - Submitted by Member Ortiz Villar and Member Phuong

The proposal seeks to explore the various definitions of "College Promise" programs and address the lack of a standardized statewide definition. Currently, P20W contains only one data point on College Promise programs, dating to 2007–2008. Since then, over 120 programs have been established, but they are only tracked by WestEd, a California nonprofit, and College Promise, a national nonprofit.

College Promise programs are recognized as a best practice for supporting students early in high school and are associated with increased college enrollment and persistence. This aligns with C2C's mission to provide actionable data on educational resources and outcomes.

With a clear definition and operationalization of College Promise programs, the following questions could be answered:

- How many students have access to College Promise programs?
- How is participation in these programs changing over time across schools and legislative districts?
- Which College Promise students are enrolled in which colleges?

Answering these questions requires student-level data to track participation and the role of College Promise programs along students' educational trajectories.

The current definition, "whether the institution waives some or all tuition and fees for some students," is broad and may miss programs that support college access through place-based services, income-based grants or scholarships, or admissions offers. Many College Promise programs provide more than tuition waivers, including neighborhood-based supports.

Data on these programs are already collected by K–12 districts, California Community Colleges, California State Universities, and independent institutions. However, no statewide entity consistently tracks College Promise programs.

3. [Expanding the Student Homeless Status Data Element](#) - Submitted by Member Schak

This proposal recommends a significant enhancement to the P20W "Homeless Status" data element to provide a more complete and accurate picture of student homelessness across K–12 education, postsecondary education, and the workforce. The current data point is narrowly aligned with K–12 McKinney-Vento data and FAFSA self-reports, leading to undercounting and inconsistent measurement.

The proposal introduces a broader and more nuanced set of indicators, including:

- Flags indicating whether a student experienced homelessness within the past 30 days, 12 months, 5 years, or at any point in their lifetime

- Distinctions among types of homelessness (sheltered, unsheltered, chronic, transitional)
- Data on services accessed (e.g., rapid rehousing, transitional housing), service providers, and duration of services
- Longitudinal measures capturing homelessness post–high school or college (1-, 5-, and 10-year intervals)

The proposal draws on multiple existing datasets, including HDIS, College-Focused Rapid Rehousing/HHIP, CSAC’s 2023 Basic Needs Survey, and CANS, to better capture the breadth of student experiences and reduce undercounting of students who do not interface with traditional K–12 or federal financial aid systems.

By integrating these data elements, P20W would enable educational institutions, policymakers, and service providers to identify unmet needs, design targeted interventions, and track outcomes over time.

4. [Post High School Student Pathway, Higher Education, and Workforce Outcomes Data Extract](#) - Submitted by Member Watson and Member Tarasova

This proposal addresses a major information gap for K–12 systems: the lack of actionable, longitudinal data about students’ post–high school transitions. Without this visibility, districts and county offices cannot evaluate the long-term impact of CTE pathways, graduation readiness strategies, counseling programs, or college and career initiatives.

The proposed solution is an annual, standardized, disaggregated data extract that would be available via the Query Builder interface or secure access that combines data across six domains:

- **K–12 experiences:** CTE participation and completion, eligibility metrics, and graduation status
- **Postsecondary experiences:** application, enrollment, remediation, ESL, awards, discipline

- **Financial aid:** state financial aid eligibility and receipt
- **Social services:** CalWORKs, CalFresh, Medi-Cal
- **Employment outcomes:** wages, industry, and quarterly earnings
- **Student characteristics:** demographic and equity groups, including foster, homeless, disability, LGBTQ+, migrant, and military

This level of data would enable local education agencies to conduct consistent, equity-focused analyses of student outcomes while streamlining work that many districts currently outsource to external vendors, reducing costs, increasing efficiency, and improving standardization across regions.

SECTION 2. DISCUSSIONS KEY TAKEAWAYS

During the October 3, 2025, Data and Tools Advisory Board meeting, members engaged in active debate on the merits and complexities of each proposal:

1. **Adding Pathways and Placement Data to Strengthen Teacher Workforce Insights**

- Members raised questions about the scope of available data and the specific demographic variables to be included in the proposed dataset. A clarification was requested regarding which student and teacher characteristics can be disaggregated and how consistently those data elements are collected across systems.
- There was also discussion about whether data from CSU and UC teacher preparation programs could be leveraged. While this is possible, there are important limitations, including a lack of standardization across institutions and incomplete coverage of teachers trained out of state or at other institutions.

2. **Enhance College Promise Definition**

- Members raised questions about the proposal's purpose and scope, specifically whether it seeks to create a new definition of College

Promise programs or simply incorporate additional data. The primary focus is to conceptualize and operationalize a consistent definition that can encompass multiple program types while acknowledging variation in structure and services.

- Given the diversity of College Promise models across the state, members noted that a feasibility study could help clarify what is possible for defining, standardizing, and integrating College Promise program data.

3. Expanding the Student Homeless Status Data Element

- Members repeatedly emphasized the urgency of addressing homelessness in California and its profound implications for equity.
- The proposal responds to this pressing need by advancing more consistent, statewide definitions and measurements, creating the foundation for clearer identification of need, improved coordination across systems, and more equitable policy responses.
- Members also raised several key considerations. Aligning definitions and measurement approaches across K–12 systems, higher education, and service providers will require significant coordination to ensure consistency and comparability. They also expressed concerns about data reliability, particularly the variability and undercounting of higher education students. While the proposal is conceptually strong, members emphasized that a feasibility study will be necessary to determine the reliability with which the proposed indicators can be implemented across data partners.

4. Post High School Student Pathway, Higher Education, and Workforce Outcomes Data Extract

- Members recognized the proposal as strongly aligned with C2C's mission to provide actionable insights into student pathways and strengthen the education-to-employment pipeline. Several described it as vital, particularly for supporting regional career pathway planning and long-term outcome analysis.
- At the same time, members identified several questions and potential risks. Some asked whether the proposed data extract might duplicate functionality already planned within the Query Builder. Others raised concerns about resource prioritization and whether developing this extract could set a precedent for elevating certain outcome data over others. Members also noted the technical complexity of linking data across systems, as the extract may require more advanced integration than the Query Builder currently supports. Finally, questions were raised about local capacity, whether districts could already conduct some of these analyses, though others emphasized that a standardized statewide extract would be far more efficient, consistent, and equitable.

Section 3. KEY CONSIDERATIONS

During the October 3, 2025, discussion and feasibility reports, the Data and Tools Advisory Board recognized the value of each proposal while acknowledging the practical hurdles to expanding data submissions. Members emphasized:

Similarities Among Proposals

- All proposals address equity issues, especially among vulnerable populations, and aim to support and track students' success.

- All proposals focus on outcomes and on examining gaps and inequities, highlighting alignment between student and teacher career pathways data.
- They underscore the unique role of C2C in uniting disparate data sources and systems, while also emphasizing the need for common definitions across the state.
- Teacher workforce data and student homelessness data are particularly urgent issues following the COVID-19 pandemic, representing pressing social problems that require immediate attention.

Differences Between Proposals

- The C2C team and others emphasized the need to balance long-term and short-term priorities when adding new data points. This includes considering existing relationships with data partners, as well as relationships that may need to be established. Defining data elements and fully integrating them into P20W is generally a long-term goal, while some proposals focus on data already available in the system. Balancing what can be implemented in the one-year plan versus the five-year plan is critical.
- The teacher workforce and student homelessness proposals include detailed descriptions of how variables would be collected. This level of specificity is valuable for producing data that is both policy-relevant and timely.
- Proposals also differ in terms of implementation and required effort. The post-high school outcomes and workforce proposal relies on aggregate data, which may primarily involve C2C office work in designing how the data is displayed. The College Promise proposal focuses on defining the concept and establishing consistent measurement, which is more conceptual in nature. The teacher workforce proposal intersects with

multiple education domains, which could risk overly broadening the scope and complicating implementation.

Overall Impressions and Takeaways

Teacher workforce data and student homeless status data

- Teacher workforce data complements student data by highlighting the types of investments needed to support both students and the broader education workforce. There is a strong sense of urgency around teacher workforce and student homelessness data, given their immediate relevance in California, whereas the other two proposals may be more appropriate for a five-year planning horizon.
- Regarding the Teacher Workforce proposal, there is concern about leaving it to C2C to decide between Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) data and California Department of Education (CDE) data on teacher assignments. Regarding student homelessness data, questions were raised about the reliability of the data and the consistency of methods for capturing housing insecurity.

Enhance College Promise Definition

- The College Promise proposal raises questions about whether C2C's role should involve defining and comparing different types of programs, potentially setting a precedent of performing analytical work on behalf of users rather than enabling users to do it themselves.
- There is concern about whether C2C has the authority to create and implement definitions, such as for College Promise, instead of relying on experts in the field. Some members expressed skepticism that it is C2C's responsibility to identify critical metrics, which might be more appropriately determined through proposals or partnerships. At the same time, members emphasized the importance of C2C promoting trusted

data, including consistent definitions of College Promise programs to support transparency and accountability.

Post High School Student Pathway, Higher Education, and Workforce Outcomes Data Extract

- This proposal brings together data elements already available in C2C and aligns with the mission of providing actionable information. This could raise concerns over why this data extract is prioritized over others; one potential approach is to consider whether sufficient demand exists through expedited requests, which could justify turning it into an accessible dashboard or query builder.
- The proposal requires clear decisions regarding which metrics to include and the intended audience. While moving away from proprietary data was seen as a positive step, members noted that it could also elevate certain data points and user groups over others. This extract may be more complex than the current Query Builder is designed to support, particularly when connecting to K–12 data. A feasibility study could help clarify these challenges and determine what is possible with the Query Builder.
- If the goal is to integrate additional data partners and enhance understanding of student pathways, proposals like this—particularly those feasible within a 12-month timeframe—could be prioritized.



Member Proposal Workbook

Data and Tools Advisory Board (DTAB) Meeting

Wednesday, March 25, 2026

Overview

The Member Proposal Workbook (Workbook) is designed to help members organize their thoughts and reflect on key questions in order to actively engage in discussion during the meeting. The Workbook is structured into two sections:

1. **Individual Reflections:** a reflection space to answer guiding questions and record additional thoughts on the light-touch feasibility studies and proposal updates.
2. **Big Picture Reflection Chart:** a visual tool to capture responses to key theme questions.

Instructions

Before the DTAB meeting, members are expected to:

1. Review all four light-touch feasibility studies and all four proposal update forms and fill out the **Individual Reflections** documents; and
2. Fill out the **Big Picture Reflection Chart**.

During the DTAB meeting, members are expected to share their reflections from the Workbook during member deliberation. This Workbook is for members' notes only and will not be shared publicly.

[Adding Pathways and Placement Data to Strengthen Teacher Workforce Insights](#)
- submitted by Member Catanzarite

Questions	Reflections
What are your understandings of the light-touch feasibility study?	
What are your curiosities of the light-touch feasibility study?	
What are your understandings of the update to the proposal?	
What are your curiosities of the update to the proposal?	

Enhance College Promise Definition - submitted by Member Ortiz Villar and
Member Phuong

Questions	Reflections
What are your understandings of the light-touch feasibility study?	
What are your curiosities of the light-touch feasibility study?	
What are your understandings of the update to the proposal?	
What are your curiosities of the update to the proposal?	

Expanding Student Homeless Status Data Element - submitted by Member Schak

Questions	Reflections
What are your understandings of the light-touch feasibility study?	
What are your curiosities of the light-touch feasibility study?	
What are your understandings of the update to the proposal?	
What are your curiosities of the update to the proposal?	

Post High School Student Pathway, Higher Ed, and Workforce Outcomes Data
Extract for California K12 Counties and Districts - submitted by Member Watson
and Member Tarasova

Questions	Reflections
What are your understandings of the light-touch feasibility study?	
What are your curiosities of the light-touch feasibility study?	
What are your understandings of the update to the proposal?	
What are your curiosities of the update to the proposal?	

Fill out the Big Picture Reflection Chart, found below, addressing the questions in the left column.

	Adding Pathways and Placement Data to Strengthen Teacher Workforce Insights	Enhance College Promise Definition	Expanding Student Homeless Status Data Element	Post High School Student Pathway, Higher Ed, and Workforce Outcomes Data Extract for California K12 Counties and Districts
Given the results of the light-touch feasibility study findings, how does this change the feedback in the Proposal Report?				
In thinking about the light-touch feasibility study findings and the annual work plan, how does this change the recommendations in the Proposal Report?				