

# Cradle-to-Career Definitions Subcommittee Meeting Summary

March 18, 2021

This document provides a summary of the key points that emerged from the March 2021 meeting of the Definitions Subcommittee. The suggestions from this group will be used to craft specific definitions for data points in the P20W data set. More information about the meeting, including support materials, a recording of the meeting, and the PowerPoint, are available at <https://cadatasystem.wested.org/meeting-information/definitions-subcommittee> (click on “Meeting Materials”).

The goals of this meeting were to establish public display options for the following data points:

- Homeless
- Early learning and care provider type
- Early learning and care program type/ licensure status
- Early learning and care quality rating
- Early learning and care duration of participation
- Early learning and care age
- Early learning and care half-day/full-day provider status
- Student/counselor ratios
- K-12 class size
- K-12 suspension rate
- K-12 four-Year Adjusted Cohort graduation rate
- K-12 College/Career Indicator
- K-12 type of secondary school
- Postsecondary institution type
- Institutional proportions for a variety of measures

In addition, the subcommittee reviewed updates to definitions on type of four-year degree, duration of financial aid, AP exams, IB exams, ELPAC tests, leadership/military science courses, and the state seal of biliteracy. Finally, the group received updates on the work of the earnings homework team and input from the Practice & Operations and Policy & Analytics Advisory Groups.

The following Definitions Subcommittee representatives attended the meeting:

Randy Tarnowski, Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities; Adrian Felix, California Student Aid Commission; Todd Hoig, California Community College Chancellor’s Office; Erin Skubal, Marjorie Suckow, and Phi Phi Lau, California Commission on Teacher Credentialing; Channa Hewawickrama, Randy Bonnell & Paula Mishima, California Department of Education; Glen Forman, California Department of Industrial Relations; Janet Buehler, California Department of Technology; David Sanabria, California Health and Human Services Agency; Matthew Case & Monica Malhotra, California State University; Valerie Mendelsohn, West Coast University; Rima Mendez, California School Information Services; Chris Furgiele, University of California Office of the President

## Public Comment

Debbie Raucher of John Burton Advocates for Youth expressed appreciation that the data system will include a data point on homelessness and recommended including students who were noted as homeless across data sources, even though the definitions vary somewhat and are captured in different ways. She also encouraged providing the option to determine if a student had ever been homeless or was homeless in a specific time period.

## Updates and Future Assignments

Kathy Booth of WestEd noted that the earnings homework team will continue to meet in April to refine the formula by which earnings and living wage should be calculated. In addition, this group will consider the suggestion from the advisory groups to include a data point collected by the Employment Development Department about the location of the employer's corporate headquarters. Chris Furguele of UC asked whether the location of record is where payroll is processed, as opposed to being the corporate headquarters for the employer. This question will be brought to EDD for clarification in the homework team discussion. Meetings of this homework team will be open to the public and publicized on the Cradle-to-Career Data System website.

The advisory groups also urged the partner entities to provide information on grades and GPAs. This issue will be discussed at the March workgroup meeting. Members of the Data Definitions Subcommittee should confer with workgroup representatives on how to address this request. WestEd is currently working to create two reference documents based on the work of this subcommittee:

- A single document that lists all public display options
- A dictionary that captures documentation on each source data point

If any documentation on individual data points are missing, WestEd staff will circle back directly with the appropriate data providers to fill in the gaps.

By March 22, WestEd will circulate three documents:

- an updated version of the matrix of the data points and their allowable use, based on feedback provided over the last month and at this meeting
- an updated summary of changes to the P20W data set from the list approved in summer 2020
- an updated description of information that will be available in the dashboards and query builder

Subcommittee members should share the three documents broadly with stakeholder groups to ensure that the scope of data system information is well understood. WestEd is available to provide additional background information as needed during this review process. Final decisions regarding which data points will be provided by each data provider will be recorded in the June 2021 report to the legislature. Additional work on definitions will take place in 2021-22, after the user-centered design process to ensure that each data point is constructed in the manner that best addresses how information will be displayed.

## Homeless

The group discussed whether the homeless measure should be described as students who are homeless or at risk of becoming homeless, based on the nature of data collected on the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA). Chris Furguele asked if it would be appropriate to describe the data point as students who are homeless or experiencing housing insecurity. Randy Tarnowski of AICCU noted that housing insecurity is a much broader designation than what is flagged by most data providers. Paula Mishima of CDE concurred, noting that CDE does not track housing insecurity on K-12 students. Channa Hewawickrama of CDE stated that, for early learning and care, the data point specifies that the child is homeless and seeking permanent housing. Debbie Raucher of John Burton Advocates for Youth clarified that, on the FAFSA, being designated as at risk of homelessness requires third party verification that the student will become homeless within a matter of weeks. Adrian Felix of CSAC noted that two of the three homelessness flags on the FAFSA are for unaccompanied youth as defined by the Housing and Urban Development Department. Therefore, the group recommended simply defining the measure as

whether the student is or is not homeless, with appropriate documentation about the sources and quality of the data point from each provider.

**DECISION:** The subcommittee categorized Homeless as “ok to include.”

### Student to Counselor Ratios

The group discussed the difficulty in providing this data point, given the lack of specificity about counseling and advising roles in staff-level data. For example, it is not currently possible to distinguish between a school psychologist and a college counselor. Paula Mishima of CDE indicated that her agency would like to examine the underlying data to determine ways to improve it. For example, by implementing greater specificity, CDE could provide data points like whether local education agencies have school nurses. Chris Furgiuele of UC noted that it will be important to work with data users to better understand the categories that would be most useful. Therefore, this area should be addressed during the user center designed process.

**DECISION:** The subcommittee categorized Student to Counselor Ratios as “do not include.”

### Early Learning and Care Data Points

#### Agency Type

Channa Hewawickrama of CDE noted that this data point should refer to “providers” rather than “agencies.” The data point on licensure status can then be merged with this data point.

**DECISION:** The subcommittee categorized Early Learning and Care Provider Type as “ok to include.”

#### Program Type

There were no concerns about this data point.

**DECISION:** The subcommittee categorized Early Learning and Care Program Type as “ok to include.”

### Quality Counts Tier

Channa Hewawickrama of CDE noted that while quality count designations may be useful at the state level, his agency has concerns about attempting to apply this designation at the regional or provider level, particularly given challenges with linking the survey data set with specific providers and children. Susan Savage of Child Care Resource Center stated that there are also concerns about how home-based childcare is evaluated in the survey.

Channa Hewawickrama of CDE clarified that CDE and CDSS are currently working to address issues with the underlying data structure that make matching difficult and are also examining ways to best assess home-based care. Therefore, this data point should be reconsidered at a future date for inclusion.

**DECISION:** The subcommittee categorized Quality Counts Tier as “do not include.”

### Duration of Participation

Channa Hewawickrama of CDE noted that this data point should refer to “enrollment” rather than “participation” because CDE does not capture daily attendance data for early learning and care.

**DECISION:** The subcommittee categorized Early Learning and Care Duration of Participation as “ok to include.”

### Age Grouping

Channa Hewawickrama of CDE recommended that this data point focus on the age of the child when they entered state-subsidized early learning and care. In the future, if there is a need to disaggregate results by the specific age of the child, this could easily be done using the date of birth data point that will be part of the Cradle-to-Career data set. At that point, the managing entity could work with CDE and CDSS to determine whether to use October 2 or December 2 as the benchmark date for establishing age within a calendar year. The state has designated different benchmark dates at different points in time and usage contexts.

**DECISION:** The subcommittee categorized Age Entering Early Learning and Care as “ok to include.”

### Half Day or Full Day Enrollment

Channa Hewawickrama of CDE clarified that his agency can provide child-level data on whether they were enrolled half day or full day, but due to issues with linking records between children and providers, this data point should be associated with individuals rather than institutions.

**DECISION:** The subcommittee categorized Early Learning and Care Half Day/Full Day Enrollment as “ok to include.”

### K-12 Data Points

#### College/Career Indicator Level

Paula Mishima and Randy Bonnell of CDE noted that this value should be provided directly by CDE rather than be calculated by the managing entity, to ensure it aligns with the School Dashboard.

**DECISION:** The subcommittee categorized College/Career Indicator Level as “ok to include.”

#### International Baccalaureate Exams

Jenny Singh of CDE provided minor edits on the documentation notes.

**DECISION:** The subcommittee categorized International Baccalaureate Exams as “ok to include.”

#### Advanced Placement Exams

Jenny Singh of CDE provided minor edits on the data point related to the first available year and the documentation notes.

**DECISION:** The subcommittee categorized Advanced Placement Exams as “ok to include.”

#### Leadership/Military Science Courses

Jenny Singh of CDE provided minor edits on the data point related to the display options to note they should include taking courses for less than a year, between one and two years, and two years or more.

**DECISION:** The subcommittee categorized Leadership/Military Science Courses as “ok to include.”

#### State Seal of Biliteracy

There were no concerns about this data point.

**DECISION:** The subcommittee categorized Earned the State Seal of Biliteracy as “ok to include.”

## English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC)

Paula Mishima of CDE clarified that this data point, earlier classified as by request only, would be made available on the query builder.

**DECISION:** The subcommittee categorized English Language Proficiency Assessments for California as “ok to include.”

## Type of Alternative School

Paula Mishima of CDE noted that her agency would like to include an additional data point that characterizes the types of alternative schools such as continuation, county/district community day, opportunity, county community, juvenile court, California Education Authority Division of Juvenile Justice, and country-run special education schools. CDE will provide documentation after the meeting.

**DECISION:** The subcommittee categorized Type of Secondary School as “ok to include.”

## Suspension Rate

Paula Mishima of CDE noted that her agency would provide this data point so that it aligns exactly with information displayed on the School Dashboard.

**DECISION:** The subcommittee categorized Suspension Rate as “ok to include.”

## Postsecondary Data Points

In the course of the conversation, three additional data points were identified for inclusion, which will be documented after this meeting:

- Type of Private College Award
- Term of Enrollment
- Undergraduate/Graduate Student Status

## Postsecondary Institution Type

Chris Furgieuele of UC clarified that this information would be compiled by the managing entity, rather than supplied by the data providers. Monica Malhotra of CSU asked for clarification about other types of institutions, such as adult schools, which are sometimes designated as postsecondary institutions. Paula Mishima of CDE noted that K-12 adult schools will not be included in the first phase of the data system. Todd Hoig of CCCC confirmed that community college-based adult education programs, such as noncredit colleges, would be grouped with the community colleges.

**DECISION:** The subcommittee categorized Postsecondary Institution Type as “ok to include.”

## Type of Four-Year Award

Chris Furgieuele of UC suggested providing greater specificity for one type of doctoral degrees.

**DECISION:** The subcommittee categorized Type of Four-Year Award as “ok to include.”

## Duration of Financial Aid

This data point had originally been flagged as by request only, but after feedback from the advisory groups, CSAC opted to have the managing entity calculate a measure on the proportion of terms in which a student received financial aid. The group discussed the proposed display options, which group the proportion of terms into quartiles. Matthew Case of CSU suggested that the precise formula be examined at the point that it will be calculated, to address issues such as whether quartiles are the

optimal grouping, how summer terms should be treated, and how to address cases where financial aid is provided on an annual rather than a term basis. He also noted that in cases where a cohort is used, additional scrutiny is needed to ensure that students' persistence over time does not distort the measure. Finally, the group opted to amend the title of the measure to make it more descriptive.

**DECISION:** The subcommittee categorized Proportion of Terms Receiving Financial Aid as "ok to include."

### Institutional Proportions

The group considered a number of equations that the managing entity will calculate to contextualize outcomes for specific groups of students. In each case, a data point that had already been vetted through the review process would be compared against an appropriate cohort of students at the selected institution or geographic location.

The discussion yielded several important notes, including:

- For the K-12 data points, the first year of available data will be 2011-12, as this was the first year in which CDE started calculating measures based on an enrollment cohort.
- To address the gap between enrolling in ESL classes while in community college and students who are English language learners, it may be helpful to create a flag for students who exited from K-12 with the designation of being an English Language Learner.
- Students will be included in the measure if they held the status at any point within the designated year (so if a student was reassigned from English language learner to proficient halfway through a year, they would be counted as an English language learner).
- The measure on taking an ESL course should focus on students who attempted courses rather than students who completed courses.
- Rather than breaking out Free and Reduced Price Meal and Parental Education Levels as data points for K-12, the composite Socioeconomic Status measure should be used.
- An additional proportion should be provided on the number of postsecondary students who were eligible for state financial aid.
- The proportion of students in various race/ethnicity categories should be broken out by undergraduate and graduate students at four-year institutions.
- Documentation should be provided on the K-12 students with disabilities data point to note when the definition changed and how the measure was constructed prior to and after this change.
- UC will not provide data on students receiving disability services due to issues of data quality, and CSU is concerned about the quality of its information. However, they can work to improve data quality so it can be included at a future date.
- An additional proportion regarding parental education level should be created – one for students where neither parent had some college and one where neither parent had a bachelor's degree.
- "Not reported" should not be listed in the display options for the institutional proportion data points.
- The K-12 data point on completing four years of math will include college math courses that a student completes while in high school.
- In the future, when K-12 adult schools are added, they should be included in the apprenticeship proportions.

- In the future, once CALPADS has been updated to allow for the scaling of CaliforniaColleges.edu, the quality of the a-g completion data point will be much stronger and the proportion of students completing four years of math in high school can be expanded to include all students.
- The proportion on earning an associate degree for transfer should be evaluated during the user centered design process to determine if it would be preferable to include all completers in the denominator or just those who earned associate degrees.

The cohort of students for each proportion measure—or denominators—were noted as follows.

**DECISION:** The subcommittee noted that the following institutional proportions should be calculated using all students who enrolled in the institution:

- Proportion of K-12 students who were childhood English language learners
- Proportion of community college students who enrolled in an ESL course
- Proportion of K-12 socioeconomically disadvantaged students
- Proportion of K-12 students who were chronically absent
- Proportion of students with various race/ethnicities
- Proportion of K-12 students with a disability
- Proportion of postsecondary students receiving disability services
- Proportion of homeless students
- Proportion of postsecondary students with parents who do not have a bachelor’s degree
- Proportion of postsecondary students who were in the first generation to attend college
- Proportion of students who completed a distance learning/distance education course
- Proportion of students in apprenticeship programs
- Proportion of students eligible for state financial aid

The following institutional proportion should be provided by CDE to align with the School Dashboard:

- Proportion of students who are chronically absent

The following institutional proportions should be calculated using all students who enrolled in credit courses in postsecondary institutions:

- Proportion of students receiving financial aid

The following institutional proportions should be calculated using all students who graduated from K-12:

- Proportion of graduates who completed a-g requirements
- Proportion of graduates who attained the State Seal of Biliteracy

The following institutional proportions should be calculated using students in the specific eligible grades (which will be determined by CDE after the meeting):

- Proportion of students who completed an AVID course
- Proportion of students who completed a CTE course
- Proportion of students who completed an AP course
- Proportion of students who completed an IB course

- Proportion of students who completed college credit

The following institutional proportions should be calculated using only students who were enrolled in a public K-12 institution in California for four years:

- Completed four years of math

The following institutional proportions should be calculated using first year community college students as defined for the Student Centered Funding Formula:

- Completed transfer math/English

The following institutional proportions should be calculated using only students who earned associate degrees:

- Earned an Associate Degree for Transfer