



Getting Down to **FACTS**



EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION Section 6: Data & Data Systems

Beth Meloy
Child and Family Advisory
Collaborative

Deborah Stipek
Stanford University

May 2026



Stanford | SCALE Initiative
Accelerator for Learning

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

Section 6: Data & Data Systems

Beth Meloy, *Child and Family Advisory Collaborative*
Deborah Stipek, *Stanford University*

California has made a substantial investment in supporting young children’s learning and development. Critical questions now are: How well are elements of the early childhood education system working? Can they be improved? Can better coordination and alignment improve overall effectiveness and outcomes for children? What else needs to be done to ensure a strong educational foundation for all children?

None of these questions or others like them can be answered without systematic information – reliable data. Data collection and analysis can guide the efficient delivery and effectiveness of government programs by helping policymakers and practitioners identify needs, set goals, determine actions to achieve those goals, and assess the impact of various strategies. Data systems also help decision makers and practitioners understand how strategies, programs, and policies interact so that they can optimize their combined efforts.

Early childhood data can be used at the local level to support informed decision making by administrators and practitioners. For example, data on children’s skill levels, learning gains, and needs can help teachers plan classroom instruction, and it can help programs identify appropriate curricula and professional development. Data on families’ culture and needs can inform instructional programming and program schedules to better accommodate families.

At the state level, early childhood data can help inform the development of policies, such as whether there is a need to provide a full day of services or design programs to better serve children with disabilities. State-level data can be used to assess the effects of investments and particular policies and inform strategies to improve quality and efficiency. Data can also facilitate targeted investments to better reach children and families most in need, as well as inform the investment strategy for targeted and intensive technical assistance to support equitable program improvement. In other states, linked

data across programs and sectors has also allowed policymakers to better understand the integration of services and their related impact.

There are significant gaps in data related to the education of young children in California. Moreover, the data that exists is not used effectively. Due in part to the fragmented governance structure of ECE program administration (see Section 1), California's ECE data--whether on children and families, specific programs and services, the workforce, or initiatives to support quality improvement--exist in separate, disconnected local- and state-level data systems across childcare, preschool, TK-12, and higher education. Consequently, in addition to being inadequate, the information that is collected is not integrated for comprehensive use at the state level.

The disconnected data systems are rooted in data collection, storage, and analysis tied to particular programs or pieces of legislation. When a single provider draws on funding from multiple programs to deliver services to a single child, the data on that child and the services received often are not connected. This makes it difficult for state administrators to understand the reach and impact of the programs they administer, as well as to meet any unmet needs for the services they provide. For many ECE programs, no single state agency or team of analysts within an agency has direct access to all data collection and storage systems pertaining to that particular program. The siloing of data and the lack of intentional alignment in data collection, storage and access makes answering many key statewide questions about ECE in California difficult, if not impossible.

Even at the local level the use of multiple data collection and storage tools makes integration of data to inform programmatic decisions and practice difficult. Data collection and entry requires time for ECE programs and providers to complete. This is valuable time that could be spent on direct service delivery or quality improvement. When data is integrated, useful, and used, then the time spent is worthwhile. When data collection and storage is fragmented, however, providers may spend their valuable time entering the same or very similar data into multiple systems, without the ability to use it coherently to inform programmatic decisions and practice.

Understanding the current status of California's early childhood data collection, storage, and analysis is critical to taking steps to improve it. This section answers the following questions and makes recommendations to support California's progress towards data-driven ECE policies and practices that meet the needs of diverse children and families across the state:

1. What data on ECE does the state collect? What gaps exist in the state's data collection?
2. How is California's current ECE data infrastructure structured?
 - a. At the state level?
 - b. At the local level?
3. What role does external data collection and analysis play in California's decision making?
4. What strategies exist to support integrated data systems for better data-driven decision making, and how can California support better data-driven decision-making in the future?

Types of Early Childhood Data

Data related to ECE programs can be categorized into four key topics: 1) data on supply and enrollment, 2) data on the early childhood workforce, 3) child-level data, and 4) data on program quality. An important question for each of these kinds of data, described below, is whether the data should be collected and reside at the state or the local level, and whether data should be aggregated across systems and levels of data collection. In addition to describing the data that is currently collected, we discuss in this section data currently not collected that are needed to inform important state-level decision making. A summary of this information, though potentially non-exhaustive, can be found in Table X.

Data on Supply and Enrollment

Critical data points related to programs, services and enrollment include availability of childcare slots and information about how many and which children attend specific programs (e.g. California State Preschool Program) and receive specific services (e.g. Special Education). Data on available slots in programs are critical for families to be aware of their options so they can find a program that meets their needs. And information about who attends California's ECE programs, including children's demographic information, location, and dual enrollment in multiple programs, can be used to assess geographical and program needs.

Supply

California requires counties and programs to collect data about the supply of licensed care slots and enrollment in state-administered ECE programs, including state preschool, state-funded migrant programs, general childcare and development contracts, and vouchers administered through the Alternative Payment program. The federal government collects Head Start and special education enrollment data for oversight purposes. However, there are gaps.

For family-facing information, the state Department of Social Services funds California Resource and Referral Networks (R&Rs) to maintain large databases related to ECE, including data on childcare facilities, schedules, language options, cost, and capacity. From 2007 until 2011, local R&Rs maintained centralized eligibility lists for their counties, which helped them link eligible families to providers with available space. Funding for these lists was eliminated in the recession.¹ As a consequence, now only a few counties (e.g., Sacramento) maintain centralized lists. In most counties, therefore, each program runs its own waitlist, which may or may not be shared with local R&Rs, and families often have to contact many programs to find one with space.

Enrollment

Data on how many children are served and the demographics of these children are difficult to interpret, as will be discussed in greater detail below. Although data on enrollment, including demographic information, are collected for each program, these data typically are not integrated for any given child, making macro, state-level questions difficult, if not impossible to answer. Given the fragmentation, it is impossible to know how many services any given child receives in California or for how long. In addition, because there is no unique identifier shared across disparate datasets, children who participate in multiple programs, or who enter, leave, and reenter programs, are counted separately each time. Consequently, there is no way to know how many children are being served across, or sometimes even within, programs.

Workforce Data

Currently there is little systematic information about the population of ECE teachers or leaders—their compensation, benefits, educational attainment, and relevant professional

¹ California Department of Finance. (2011). *2011-12 Governor's budget summary*.

qualifications. What little information exists is largely collected by external researchers who survey individuals or link multiple data systems to map the landscape of the California ECE workforce. For example, the Center for the Study of Child Care Employment launched its Early Childhood Workforce Index in 2016, which was the first comprehensive state-by-state analysis of early childhood employment conditions and policies in all 50 states and Washington, D.C. The Index is updated biennially and subsequent editions were released in 2018, 2020, and 2024. CSCCE also provides individual state profiles that share key data the Center collects and analyzes from multiple sources.

Despite these external efforts, there are questions that cannot be answered without systematic state-level collection of key workforce data. A 2019 study from the Learning Policy Institute claim still rings true: "... it is nearly impossible to know which children have highly qualified educators, how educator quality is related to compensation, or the impact of investments in educator development and training."² A 2011 report by the Center for the Study of Child Care Employment proposes that the following information should be collected at the state level for every program type:

- Characteristics of the people caring for the young children in the state: age, gender, ethnicity, language capacity; level of education and training; length of time working in the field and at current workplace, wages and benefits; and place of work and children served
- Variations in access to education and professional development opportunities by: geographic region or characteristics; program setting or funding source; ages or other characteristics (language, special needs) of children served; and,
- Practitioner characteristics, such as education/training background, language skills of the workforce, and tenure.

The California Early Care and Education Workforce Registry, discussed in greater detail below, was a voluntary web-based system designed to track the qualifications, demographics, education, and professional development of early childhood professionals.³ The use of the Registry was not, however, required, and therefore never included a robust proportion of early childhood professionals in the

² Gardner, M., Melnick, H., Meloy, B., & Barajas, J. (2019, December). *Promising models for preparing a diverse, high-quality early childhood workforce in California* [Research brief]. Learning Policy Institute.

³ Child Care Alliance Los Angeles. (2021). *Improving early care and education workforce data: Opportunities for California* (CA-ECE-Workforce-Registry-2020-Report).

state.⁴ In 2018, for example, the registry was capable of collecting and maintaining data for nearly 75% of the estimated ECE workforce in the state, but only about 25% of the workforce were active members of the registry.⁵ Moreover, funding for the registry sunsets at the end of 2025.

The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) collects data on attainment of credentials and permits, as well as initial assignments of educators within the public school system, in its California Statewide Assignment Accountability System (CalSAAS). However, not all initial assignments within the ECE system are tracked and information about changes to educator employment, especially in non-LEA programs, is not collected.

Child-level Data

The value of collecting and examining achievement data for children before they enter school and through the early elementary grades was supported by the GDTFII report by Sean Reardon and colleagues.⁶ Their analyses revealed that California's comparatively wide achievement gap is substantially explained by the size of the gap before third grade and to some degree before kindergarten. Despite this revelation, the state continues to wait until the third grade, when standardized testing begins, to collect systematic data on children's academic achievement.

Among ECE programs, teachers in programs licensed under Title 5 complete the Desired Results Developmental Profile (DRDP) on all children. However, these data are not easily linked to specific programs or program characteristics at the state level. Although assessment is not required for children in TK through second grade, some districts implement commercially available assessments or create their own (see Section 5). These assessments vary widely and are not available to be aggregated beyond the school or district-level. Furthermore, because no preschool assessment data are linked to school achievement data in the later grades and no systematic assessments exist for TK through second grade, it is not possible to track children's progress through those critical early years or analyze factors

⁴ Child Care Alliance Los Angeles. (2021). *Improving early care and education workforce data: Opportunities for California* (CA-ECE-Workforce-Registry-2020-Report).

⁵ California Early Care and Education Workforce Registry. (2018). *Progress and potential: A snapshot of Los Angeles County in California's Early Care and Education Workforce Registry 2018 report*.

⁶ Sean F. Reardon, Christopher Doss, Josh Gagné, Rebecca Gleit, Angela Johnson, Victoria Sosina (2018). *A Portrait of Educational Outcomes in California*. Getting Down to Facts II. https://gettingdowntofacts.com/sites/default/files/2018-09/GDTFII_Report_Reardon-Doss.pdf

that may contribute to the early emergence and trajectory of the achievement gap.

Data on Program Quality

Data on program quality is also limited for ECE programs in California. Licensing status and minimal monitoring assures that licensing standards are being met—primarily basic health and safety measures and minimum adult:child ratios. Otherwise, the primary source of data on the quality of ECE programs is their QRIS rating. This rating, however, is only available for a small proportion of participating programs, and the state is no longer supporting the cost of rating (see Section 4).

In addition to the dearth of information on the quality of programs, little is known about the availability and use of quality improvement resources. At present, it is not possible to determine who takes advantage of quality improvement and professional learning opportunities, what kind of opportunities are used, and where there is an oversupply versus an unmet need. It is also not possible to assess the effects of different forms of quality improvement support on the quality of teaching or children’s outcomes. Data on availability, participation, and effects of quality improvement activities would help policy makers identify which kinds of program support are in most demand, where there is duplication, where there are unmet needs, and what kinds of support are effective.

Analysis

California has substantially increased its investments in early childhood education programs, but does not collect the data needed to assess the use and effects of these investments. As a result, it is likely that some of the investment is wasted on programs and resources that are not used, duplicative, or ineffective. Dedicated staff and an infrastructure for data analysis are needed to justify the cost and burden of collecting data. However, despite the additional resources required; integrated, useful data would likely result in more efficient and effective use of existing resources.

California’s Data Infrastructure

In California’s current ECE data infrastructure, multiple data systems collect information on the same children and families, either at the same time, or at different points in time. Although these systems collect identifying information (e.g., names), connecting them using this information is difficult and imprecise. One solution to these challenges would be for the state to issue unique identifiers to

children who enroll in any type of early care and education programs, which they would carry over into elementary school and beyond. Unique identifiers would allow the state, districts, schools, and programs to assess both the short- and the long-term impacts of interventions and policy changes. In combination with other data, many policy-relevant questions could be answered.

The primary data systems that collect and house ECE data, without unique identifiers for children or their educators to connect them at the state and program level, are described below.

State Level Data Systems

ECE Data systems in California are generally siloed according to the agency that requires programs to collect and report specific data, usually according to legislatively-defined parameters for specific programs or funding sources. The California Department of Education (CDE) collects, stores, and analyzes data, as described below, related to Transitional Kindergarten and the California State Preschool Program, which are the two largest ECE programs in the state. Likewise, the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) collects, stores, and analyzes data regarding programs that it administers, including programs governed by both Title 5 and Title 22 regulations. First 5 California has historically supported data collections related to quality improvement and the ECE workforce, and other, quasi-government agencies and private entities support the collection of other data related to ECE programs, quality, and child outcomes.

The CDE collects data about children enrolled in California State Preschool programs via four primary data systems:

- *The Child Development Management and Information System (CDMIS)*: This system collects monthly snapshots of child and family demographic data that are used to summarize enrollment trends for children enrolled in non-LEA-administered CSPP-funded preschools⁷, but does not store longitudinal records. The data are collected at a contractor- rather than preschool site or classroom-level. Many contractors serve children at multiple program sites across large geographic areas. (Note that CDE and CDSS run independent CDMIS systems and the data are not integrated in any way.)

⁷ Community colleges, which are considered LEAs, also submit their data via CDE's CDMIS.

- *The California Preschool Data Collection (CAPSDAC)*: A new longitudinal data system that collects enrollment and dual language learner data on children, their educators and other program staff, and the sites where they attend, for CSPP-funded preschools administered by LEAs.
- *The Preschool Language Information System (PLIS)*: Collects language status, child and family demographic information, and data about language support models for all children at the contractor level for non-LEA-administered CSPP-funded preschools.
- *The Child Development Provider Accounting Information System (CPARIS)*: CPARIS is used to submit enrollment and fiscal reports for contract reimbursement.

The CDE also collects data related to the administration and use of funds through individual grants, although what data is collected and at what level varies by grant. For example, the CDE collects information about expense categories for grantees receiving funds through the CSPP Quality Rating Improvement System Grant and the Inclusive Early Education Expansion Program.

The CDE collects data about children enrolled in Transitional Kindergarten via two primary data systems:

- *The California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS)*: Many, but not all, state and federal ECE programs that fund services administered by or in concert with LEAs, such as Transitional Kindergarten and special education programs (including those administered by CSPPs), submit data. CALPADS does not collect achievement data for children before third grade, which means no achievement or outcome data is available for children enrolled in TK.
- *Afterschool/Expanded Learning Program Data*: After School Education and Safety (ASES) and 21st Century programs are required to submit data to the CDE on program and school-day attendance, as well as evidence of a data-driven program quality improvement process. In 2025-2026, LEAs will be required to submit program data related to the Expanded Learning Opportunities Program (ELOP). Specifically, the CDE has launched a new LEA-level data collection in CALPADS that will collect enrollment and attendance information for ASES, 21st Century, and ELOP.

Data within the CDE, but across LEA and non-LEA administered programs cannot be linked. Unique child identification numbers are not issued until children enter the public school system.

The California Department of Social Services (CDSS) also collects information about children enrolled in Title 5 and Title 22 programs they administer through three primary data systems, one of which essentially replicates a system administered by the CDE:

- *Child Development Management and Information System (CDMIS)*: This system collects monthly snapshots of enrollment data and other data points for children enrolled in CDSS operated contracts, including CCTR. (Note that CDE and CDSS run independent CDMIS systems and the data are not integrated in any way).
- *Child Development Program Enrollment Attendance and Fiscal Reporting (CDPR)*: The CDPR replaces the reporting previously done through the Child Development Provider Accounting Information System (CPARIS), which is owned by CDE. The CDPR is used to submit enrollment and fiscal reports for contract reimbursement.
- *CalWORKs and Alternative Payment Online Portal (CalWORKs AP Portal)*: Alternative Payment and CalWORKs contractors use the CalWORKs AP Portal to payment data (accrued revenue and expenditures) and caseload data.

Similar to LEA and non-LEA data systems, the data collected by the CDSS are not linked, at the child or family level, to data systems administered by the CDE. The data systems administered by the CDE and the CDSS, described above, are summarized in the table below.

State Administered Data Collection Systems

CDE		
System	Data Source	Primary Data Collection
Child Development Management System	Non-LEA - administered CSPP	Monthly snapshots of enrollment with child and family demographics
California Preschool Data Collection	LEA-administered CSPP	Child enrollment and child and staff demographics
Child Development Provider Accounting Information System	All CSPPs	Enrollment and fiscal information
Preschool Language Information System	Non-LEA - administered CSPP	Child language status, child and family demographics, language support programs

California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System	Transitional Kindergarten	Enrollment, attendance, child and family demographics, and service delivery (e.g. special education); teacher information
Afterschool/Expanded Learning Program Data System	After School Programs	Enrollment and attendance
CDSS		
Child Development Management System ⁸	General Child Care Contracted Programs	Monthly snapshots of enrollment with child and family demographics
Child Development Program Enrollment Attendance and Fiscal Reporting	General Child Care Contracted Programs	Enrollment and fiscal information
CalWORKs and Alternative Payment Online Portal	Alternative Placement and CalWorks Contractors	Payments and caseloads

Additionally, First 5 California, has historically provided funding to support Early Care and Education systems across the state. A portion of this funding has been used to support two primary data systems, although this funding is coming to an end in 2027 and the future of these data systems is unknown. Specifically, the *Common Data File System* is used by Quality Counts California (QCC) to collect quality improvement data from administering agencies across the state. The Common Data File includes quality assessment information only for participating counties and participating sites within the Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS), Quality Improvement System (QIS), and Quality Improvement (QI) activities. These data are not, however, available for all classrooms that a program runs, because these data are often not collected comprehensively. Currently, Hubbe, a for-profit organization that provides fee-based services, provides data support for the QRIS in 52 of the 58 California counties. Similar quality data on ECE programs that do not participate in this system are not collected.

First 5 California has also historically supported the *Early Care and Education Workforce Registry*, which collects data about ECE professionals on a voluntary basis. The workforce registry has encountered many challenges that remain unaddressed, such as multiple entries in the registry as professionals move in and out of the field. Funding for the Registry, like funding for the Common Data file, will no longer be provided by First 5 California after January of 2026.

⁸ Although these data systems share the same name at both CDE and CDSS, the systems are not connected.

Finally, California also relies on quasi-governmental agencies, like WestEd, and external entities, such as TeachStone, to support collection of critical data about state-funded ECE programs and the children they serve. For example, *DRDP Online*, which WestEd is contracted to support, is California's data system for the Desired Results Developmental Profile (DRDP). It is designed for teachers, program administrators, and other designated staff to access DRDP instruments and complete assessments online. *DRDP Online* stores child data in a secure database and produces a variety of assessment reports to support quality improvement for individual children and groups of children across California. DRDP data is available to the CDE at an aggregate level. DRDP Online is also used at the local level. However, this platform, and the data it collects are owned by WestEd, and can be difficult for external researchers to access.

Similarly, CDE is using MyTeachstone, a product of TeachStone, the developer of the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS), as a centralized location for all CSPP CLASS and CLASS Environment data collection and reporting to the CDE. Through MyTeachstone, users are able to track their progress toward completing observations and obtain reports at the classroom, site, and agency level. To further enhance user knowledge of CLASS and effective interactions, professional learning support (such as strategy tips and example activities), can be accessed within the platform. It is important to note, however, that these data systems (e.g. *DRDP Online* and MyTeachstone) are not connected, making it difficult--if not impossible--to answer key questions about how elements of classroom quality influence child outcomes (e.g. DRDP scores).

Program Level Data Systems

Subsidized ECE programs may also turn to external vendors to support the collection of data they are required to report to state agencies as well as to inform their own decision making. Common external ECE vendors include the *Student Information System (SIS)*, provided by Hubbe, a for-profit organization that provides fee-based services to preschool programs. This data system helps agencies collect and integrate data such as enrollment, attendance, assessment, and family engagement activity participation. Other vendors, such as Pinwheel, provide similar program-level data collection and storage support.

Other data collection systems are utilized at the program level to meet state requirements. For example, DRDP Online and MyTeachStone are available for programs to utilize at the local level.

Strategies to Support Data-Driven Decision Making for ECE

An Early Childhood Integrated Data System (ECIDS) is a type of data system that should provide practitioners and policymakers the capacity to track ECE program capacity (how many children can be served) and access to services (how many children are served), and to better understand the impact of programs and program design on child outcomes over time.⁹ Many states have invested in developing an ECIDS. According to a 2020 report from the Education Commission of the States, at least six states have succeeded in implementing an ECIDS, while many other states are in the process of planning for and developing ECIDS.¹⁰ These systems allow states to ask and answer key policy questions related to the integration of early childhood services for young children and their families as well as the impact of those services on child and family outcomes.¹¹ It is unclear what other states have made progress in recent years.

Concurrent with a statewide focus on developing greater data and analytic capacities, California is taking steps to address its data limitations by developing an ECIDS and connecting ECE data to the state's Cradle to Career Data System. California's first iteration of its ECIDS was established in May 2024 in collaboration with California Health and Human Services Agency and Third Sector Intelligence (3Si). This initial system does not yet achieve every goal of a fully functioning ECIDS.¹² Quality assurance, testing, and continuous data integration for the first use case was ongoing from the fall of 2024 to early 2025. Initial analytics and outputs were developed for the first use case around access to facilities. ECIDS in California contains some basic data at the child- and family-level for CDSS administered

⁹ Coffey, M., Chatis, C., Irvine, S., Sellers, J., & Duarte, S. (2014). An early childhood integrated data system: What is an ECIDS? U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

¹⁰ Education Commission of the States (2020). Response to Information Request. Retrieved from: <https://www.ecs.org/wp-content/uploads/State-Info-Request-Early-Education-Integrated-Data-Systems.pdf>

¹¹ Coffey, Missy and Nguyen, Jenna, "Lessons Learned about ECIDS Teams: Infrastructure and Composition" (2020). ECDataWorks. 5.

¹² California Department of Social Services. Activity 5: Improving Quality and Service Integration. https://www.cdss.ca.gov/preschool-development-grant/the-pdg-activities/activity-5-improving-quality-and-service-integration#_Activity_5:_Support

programs, CDE administered programs, public data from Head Start, and census data related to pertinent child and family demographics.

What does an effective ECIDS look like: South Carolina's ECIDS

One state that has made major strides in building a strong ECIDS is South Carolina. The SC ECIDS was designed to create and maintain a comprehensive infrastructure for accurate and actionable data on young children and their families. The state invested in its ECIDS because it wanted to be able to answer critical questions about their young children and families, such as which programs are young children and their families accessing, and what program characteristics are associated with the best outcomes for children. The evolution of SC ECIDS was largely influenced by legislative actions and oversight bodies. The SC ECIDS was borne out of legislatively mandated reporting about the reach and impact of South Carolina's state-funded, full-day targeted pre-kindergarten program, provided both by LEAs and community-based organizations and administered by two distinct state agencies. In 2014, this reporting highlighted the disjointed nature of SC's data on early childhood, generally, and this program specifically, and led to requirements for the two state agencies to agree on how children's outcomes and program quality would be monitored overtime and for the programs to enter into a data-sharing MOU in order to participate and receive funds.

Once the impetus for an aligned data system was in place, the work of achieving such a system began. In 2019, a state established committee made recommendations for how to improve data sharing across agencies and programs in early childhood, which led to the establishment of a process for early childhood programs across South Carolina to be able to obtain a unique identifier (a number that can be used to follow children longitudinally as they matriculate through public school, supported by funding from a \$3.7 million dollar Preschool Development Grant. This unique identifier forms the backbone of South Carolina's ECIDS, and in conjunction with data sharing agreements and expectations of systemwide consensus on measures and data definitions, has allowed South Carolina's ECIDS to flourish as an example of a successful, actionable mechanism for answering critical questions about children and families to inform policies and investments.¹³

¹³ To learn more about South Carolina's ECIDS, See: <https://www.newamerica.org/education-policy/edcentral/south-carolina/>

To address the disjointed nature of California’s information infrastructure, legislation was passed in 2019 to establish a statewide, longitudinal data system for California. A workgroup was established to bring together all relevant state agencies and many educational institutions, research and policy organizations, and community groups to design a blueprint for what California is calling the Cradle-to-Career System (C2C). Governor Gavin Newsom and the Legislature approved funding to begin building the C2C in the state’s 2021-22 budget. The C2C is housed in the Government Operations Agency, and is informed by community engagement through its two advisory boards and voting public members on its governing board. Ultimately, it will integrate 11 data systems in California, including those for early childhood education, TK-12, higher education, employment, and health and human services data. Information from the C2C will be made available through state-level dashboards, query tools and standard data request protocols.

In the initial planning phases of the C2C data system, workgroup members identified a number of strategies focused on understanding access to ECE and impacts on child outcomes, and recommended the development of a dashboard that would allow users to sort information by child demographics and key program features. The C2C final legislative report indicated that expanding its analytical data set to include early learning and care would be a year 4 deliverable (FY 2025-26).¹⁴ This timeline is likely to be revisited, however, as there continues to be significant concerns about ECE data quality. At present, it is unclear when or if the C2C will expand to integrate ECE data. Theoretically, the C2C has the potential to serve as an ECIDS in addition to linking data longitudinally across TK-12, higher education and beyond. To do this, however, it will need to ensure that ECE systems are linked to each other, in addition to being linked to TK-12 systems.

¹⁴ California Cradle to Career Data System (2024). Roadmap & Progress. Sacramento, CA. Retrieved from <https://c2c.ca.gov/roadmap-progress/>; WestEd (2020). Cradle to Career Data System First Legislative Report 2020). Sacramento, CA. Retrieved from <https://cadatasystem.wested.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/Cradle-to-Career-Data-System-December-2020-Legislative-Report-FINAL.pdf>