



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.