Advancing the Maturity of Data Systems and the Quality of Data for State-Funded California Early Education and Childcare Programs

Building a knowledge base and analyzing opportunities to improve data collection, data quality, data completeness, and data exchange in publicly-funded childcare and early childhood education programs for children from birth to age five in California

Stewards of Change
INSTITUTE

LITERATURE REVIEW FINAL REPORT • MARCH 18, 2019

Table of Contents

Introduction

The long-term objective of the Heising-Simons Foundation's *Data for Action* initiative is to enable public agencies in California to meet the needs of young children and their families by using high-quality, integrated data to guide continuous improvement and inform policies and practices.

Three goals set for the *Data for Action* initiative are:

- To improve the quality of early childhood data;
- To establish appropriate measures and indicators of family and child well-being to track child outcomes throughout the 0-8 continuum; and
- To maximize child- and population-level data by advancing the linkages and the integration of child-level data across early childhood systems in order to 1) better identify needs, 2) improve coordination of services, 3) inform systems and policies, and 4) guide the investment of public resources for children and families.

With the recent election of Governor Gavin Newsome, significant shifts in priorities are taking place in California, with increased interest in early childhood education and data-driven policymaking. The Governor's commitments to strengthening the state's education system with a "cradle-to-career" approach include the intent to establish a Statewide Longitudinal Student Database (SLSD) to track and measure individual students in California as they matriculate through an educational system defined as pre-school through grade 20. Two state senators (Senator Steve Glazer and Senator Ben Allen) have introduced Senate Bill 2 (SB2) in the California State Assembly to establish the SLSD and Governor Newsome has earmarked $10M in his proposed budget to fund the system. If passed, SB2 would instruct the California Education Commission to appoint a committee tasked with developing recommendations for the establishment, implementation, funding, and administration of the database. The Commission would review its committee's recommendations and develop a database plan on or before July 1, 2021.

The Heising-Simons Foundation sees a critical gap in data collection and a historic lack of investment in data systems across the early childhood education sector and is organizing efforts to inform state policymakers and planners about the need to simultaneously invest in systems and training for data collection from state-funded programs where California's children are being cared for and educated, beginning at birth. A critical first step to advance these efforts will be to build understanding and awareness of the "current state" of data systems in use by programs receiving public funds to provide childcare and early educational experiences for children from birth to age five, with a focus on identifying the gaps in data collection for

children served by these programs, including but not limited to data quality, data completeness, data accessibility, and data system interoperability.

Stewards of Change Institute and partner consulting firm CedarBridge Group (SOCI team) was intending to conduct an environmental scan to document "current state" findings and provide Heising-Simons with a written report that will include a literature review, "current state" findings, and a set of recommended "desired future state" actions to improve data quality, data completeness, data availability, and data interoperability between and among programs providing early childhood education services to California's vulnerable young children.

> NOTE: due to recent positive developments the need for the proposed scan has been deemed to be no longer relevant. California was recently notified by US Dept of Education that they were awarded a $10 million ECE grant, which essentially makes the scan redundant. A new SOW for the remainder of the grant is being forwarded along with this final deliverable as identified in the original award.

This Literature Review is the first step in understanding the early childhood education and care landscape nationally and specifically in California, with a focus on data being collected, housed, managed, analyzed, and shared. The initial literature review formed the basis for the development of environmental scan questions and selection of key informants.

Methodology and Sources

Sixteen articles and the State Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) Grant Program's Early Childhood Integrated Data Systems (ECIDS) Toolkit were reviewed to gain an understanding of the current state of early childhood education and care data from both a national and California perspective. Many of the articles included case studies from states further along in the process of creating ECIDS. Articles were found via online research using various search terms (early childhood learning, early childhood education, early childhood care, with data, integrated data, data systems, and integrated data systems) and through searches on the Child Care and Early Education Research Connections website.

Article Summary

The literature shows a strong consensus on the necessity of a visioning process to ensure expectations are correctly set with respect to what questions the data will help to answer.

Answering Key Questions with an Early Childhood Data System, one resource from the ECIDS Toolkit, recommends first identifying a vision for how the system will be used and a list of essential question the data will answer.

The states studied recommend beginning with a process to identify the key questions that stakeholders, such as practitioners, policymakers, and parents, need answers to in order to

support evidence-based decision making and quality improvement. Essential questions identified by the end users of the data inform system development. The questions – and the data required to answer them – will also provide a guide for developing data and information sharing agreements across agencies.

There is also consensus on the need for a robust stakeholder engagement process which should include all individuals and groups who will be directly or indirectly affected by the data and the answers to the key questions.

The 2018 State of Early Childhood Data Systems report lists the Fundamentals of a Coordinated Early Childhood Data System:

1. Unique statewide child identifier;
2. Child-level demographics and program participation;
3. Child-level data on development;
4. Ability to link child-level data with K-12 and other key data systems;
5. Unique program site identifier with the ability to link with children and early childhood education workforce;
6. Program site structural and quality information ;
7. Unique early childhood education workforce identifier with ability to link program sites and children;
8. Individual-level data on early childhood education workforce demographics, education, and professional development information;
9. State governance body to manage data collection and use; and
10. Transparent privacy protection and security policies and practices.

Questions and Models to Consider for Key Informant Exploration

The Early Childhood Data Collaborative has developed Key Question Focus Areas which could provide a starting place for the key informant interviews as part of the environmental scan.

Family and Health – family knowledge of child development, socio-economic status, immunization rates, etc.

Participation – Access to programs and services, transition between programs, duplication, responsiveness of programs, program combinations, and earlier identification practices that contribute to children's greater involvement in quality programs.

Program Quality – Measurement of the effectiveness of early childhood programs.

Child Outcomes – Definition of success for early childhood programs, how outcomes in the early years impact later performance in school and the workforce.

Workforce – Early childhood professional preparation, professional development, and workforce characteristics.

Recommendations also focus on questioning stakeholders about thoughts and preferences for a governance body, technology model (federated versus warehouse), model of governance, and whether to create a system that is statewide or region by region.

Key Challenges/ Areas of Opportunity

Early childhood education and care data is collected, housed, managed, and governed by multiple agencies at the federal, state, and local level. The lack of coordination about the sources of data represents one of the greatest challenges in creating an ECIDS. Fears regarding the inappropriate or incorrect use of data is also an obstacle to creating these integrated systems.

In California, a number of communities have made progress on improving data collection and interoperability on a localized level. This represents both an opportunity and a challenge: work to build a statewide ECIDS can leverage and build upon the work done in these communities; however proponents of an ECIDS statewide will need to be thoughtful about not asking these communities to shift too far from what they have build while also allowing the stakeholder process to be authentic and not too pre-determined by the work already done in these communities.

The Governor's commitment to education and data systems, coupled with federal funding and support for integration and interoperability of data presents opportunities to build coalitions to support developing an ECIDS.

Conclusion

California will benefit greatly from investing in an early childhood integrated data system. There is federal and philanthropic money that has been made available for states to begin this work in earnest. The experience of early adopter states provides a good roadmap for California to customize and use as a springboard in this work. Over time early childhood data can be exchanged with other HHS information to positively impact multi-system involved clients and families. With the Governor's focus on education and data, California is poised to make strides in this area.

Appendix A: Literature Index

National		
Article Summary	**Authors**	**Source**
Article 1: The Integration of Early Childhood Data: State Profiles and a Report from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and the U.S. Department of Education		
SUMMARY: Prepared at the request of the Early Learning Interagency Board, a partnership between the US Dept. of Education and the US Dept. of Health and Human Services, this article seeks to address improving program coordination and quality across federally funded early learning and development programs for children aged 0 – 8. The authors looked at models implemented in GA, MD, MN, NC, OR PA, RI, UT and codified commonalities and lessons learned to help states refine capacity to use existing administrative data from early childhood programs to improve services for young children and their families. The authors sought to identify tools to help answer questions related to access, participation, and quality, and how these measures affect outcomes with a desire to inform how federal and state funds support young children's early learning, health and development across a wide rang of programs and services. They found that integrated data assisted policy makers by allowing for honest conversation and accurate evaluation regarding: availability and quality of services; how to improve quality and access to programs and services; and how to track and measure progress. The article covers the intended uses and benefits of an Early Childhood Integrated Data System (ECIDS) that connects, integrates, secures, maintains, stores, and reports information from early childhood programs and services. The article discusses integrating and/or linking data from Head Start, Child Care, EI/IDEA Part C and Part B 619, Public Health Screenings, Homelessness, and Early Childhood Education Workforce Data.	US Department of Health and Human Services and US Department of Education	https://www2.ed.gov/about/inits/ed/earlylearning/files/integration-of-early-childhood-data.pdf November 2016

Article 2: 2018 State of Early Childhood Data Systems		
SUMMARY: Annual [Early Childhood Data Collaborative](#) Survey of 50 states' capacity to link child/family/program/workforce data across early childhood education programs. The 2018 survey focused on states' ability to follow individual children, programs, and staff across programs, over time. Key Findings: 1. Policy makers lack comprehensive data needed to assess early childhood policies and outcomes; 2. Home visiting and federally funding Head Start programs least likely to be linked relative to other programs; 3. From 2013 – 2018, there has been an increase in the number of states linking child level data from subsidized child care programs; 4. Data about site quality most frequently linked by states relative to workforce conditions (turnover) and structural standards (class size); 5. States least likely to link workforce level data relative to child level and program level data; 6. From 2013 – 2018, fewer states have defined a data governance body to support coordination and use of early childhood education data; and 7. State lack processes to engage the public about data privacy policies. The article provides recommended action steps for policy makers and allows for a state by state review of survey responses.	The Early Childhood Data Collaborative	https://www.ecedata.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/ECDC-50-state-survey-9.25.pdf 2018
Article 3: Rising to the Challenge: Building Effective Systems for Young Children and Families, a BUILD E-book		
SUMMARY: This article reviews the progress of seven Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge (ELC) grantees (MD, MN, NC, RI, IL, OR, WI). Race to the Top ELC seeks to: 1. Increase the number and percentage of low-income and disadvantaged children in each	Elizabeth Jordan Carlise King	http://buildinitiative.org/Portals/0/Uploads/Documents/E-BookChapter7StackingtheBlocksALookatIntegratedDataStrategies.pdf

age group of infants, toddlers, and preschoolers who are enrolled in high-quality early learning programs; 2. Design and implement an integrated system of high-quality early learning programs and services; and 3. Ensure any use of assessments conforms to the National Research Council's report on early childhood. Achieving these goals requires a clear picture of the needs of children in communities, available services, accessibility of services, quality of services, and the capacity of the workforce. Accurate, timely, and comprehensive data on children, early learning and development programs, and early learning and development workforce are required to increase quality and target limited resources appropriately. The article discusses Five Building Blocks to creating an integrated data system: 1. Assessment of early learning landscape and creation of a vision for early learning and development data use; 2. Development of interagency governmental structures; 3. Filling early learning data gaps; 4. Building and strengthening linkages between early learning and development data and data from other systems; and 5. Planning for sustainability of early learning and development data efforts. The article shares examples of how the seven states studied approached the five building blocks, the obstacles they faced (staffing the system build effort, program and data coordination, and negotiating data use agreements between agencies) and makes recommendations for states beginning this work (utilize technical assistance and support, ensure effective communications both within the project and across agencies, and articulate clear, concrete, achievable goals).		Build Initiative and Early Childhood Data Collaborative 2015
Article 4: IDS Governance: Setting Up for Ethical and Effective Use		
SUMMARY: This article approaches Integrated Data Governance (IDS) from a generic perspective, highlighting that regardless of the purpose,	Linda Gibbs Amy Hawn Nelson	https://www.aisp.upenn.edu/wp-

integrating data is not an easy task. The authors share key lessons from the field compiled by practitioners who have spent years pioneering efforts to establish ethical and effective integrated data systems. The authors state that an ethical imperative exists to respectfully share and use data to the best of our ability. Data should be gathered and used as a public asset to advance public good, making best use of public resources. Ethical IDS should ensure data are made available in a useable format and that incentives are created to ensure they are used for the public good. This requires high-standards of integrity around data quality and usage, including de-identification to protect personal privacy and ensuring cultural competency and protecting against unintentional perpetuation of discriminatory patterns of behavior. Recommendations: 1. Articulate a purpose in the form of collaboratively constructed vision and mission statements and guiding principles; 2. Engage stakeholders in designing, launching, and governing the IDS, ensuring to include those whose lives will be affected by use of the IDS data; 3. Establish IDS Governance body; 4. Establish IDS Governance policies and procedures; and 5. Establish IDS Governance approach.	Erin Dalton Joel Cantor Stephanie Shipp Della Jenkins	content/uploads/2016/07/Governance.pdf Actionable Intelligence for Social Policy March 2017

Article 5: Guidelines for Developing Data Sharing Agreements to Use State Administrative Data for Early Care and Education Research

SUMMARY: This article is focused on assisting researchers to develop data sharing agreements with states for early childhood care and education data. The issues are analogous to those states will face in developing data sharing agreements across agencies and organizations housing and managing state administrative data. Most notable is the recommendation to allow up to a year or longer to develop and finalize these data use agreements. Further recommendations are:	Sara Shaw Van-Kim Lin, MSPH Kelly Maxwell, PhD	https://www.childtrends.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/data-sharing-agreements_Child-Trends_June-2018.pdf OPRE Research Brief #2018-67 June 2018

1. Identify data needed to answer research question and clarify research goals, including specifying the benefit to the state agency; 2. Identify organization that won, oversee, or manage the data, recognizing that the data may be housed or managed across several organizations or agencies; 3. Identify individuals who will be responsible for developing, reviewing, and approving data sharing agreements, ensuring clear expectations about the dissemination of the analysis are set; 4. Develop draft agreement using templates if possible; 5. Share draft agreement and work collaboratively to address issues, recognizing that numerous iterations may be necessary; and 6. Finalize and sign agreement. Article details common elements of a data sharing agreement, agreement examples, and a resource guide.		From Child Trends for ACF/US Dept. HHS

Article 6: Answering Key Questions with an Early Childhood Data System

SUMMARY: This report is premised on the belief that in order to build a useful early childhood data system, states must start with a vision for how the system will be used and a list of essential questions the data will answer. In a series of calls sponsored by the Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDS) Grant Program, state representatives shared experiences and offered tips for sharing early childhood data. This report is a product of these conversation and is designed to support states working to create or evaluate their current policy questions. This document examines examples of policy questions from states and outlines why those questions are needed, how to create them, and who should be involved in the process.	Missy Cochenour SLDS Grant Program, State Support Team Stephanie Porowski SLDS Grant Program, State Support Team Writer Early Childhood Data Sharing Working Group Expert Contributor: Elliot Regenstein Ounce of Prevention Fund	https://nces.ed.gov/programs/slds/pdf/IssueBrief_Answering_key_questions_with_an_early_childhood_data_system.pdf SLDS Issue Brief, October 2013

Article 7: Leveraging Early Childhood Data for Better Decision Making

SUMMARY: This article looks at state agencies that have been building early childhood data systems and	Philip Sirinides Missy Coffey	http://www.nasbe.org/wp-

discusses the authors beliefs about why these systems have not yet provided actionable data for evidence-based decision making.

The authors note that the studied data systems include a set of technical features, believing that technical specifications will position them to answer an endless list of questions—answers that have no actionable use and lead only to more questions.

Technical and nontechnical factors prevent states from using their data effectively and sustainably. Specifically, there are three types of gaps:

1. Technical capacity for organizing data;
2. Analytic capacity for understanding data; and
3. Organizational capacity for learning from data.

If innovative uses of data are to bolster public institutions, then each of these gaps must be closed. The article discusses the Consortium for Policy Research in Education at the University of Pennsylvania approach to closing these gaps. | | content/uploads/2018/01/Sirinides-Coffey_Jan-2018-Standard.pdf

National Association of State Boards of Education

January 2018 |

Article 8: Creating an Integrated Efficient Early Care and Education System to Support Children and Families: A State-by-State Analysis

SUMMARY: The Bipartisan Policy Center (BPC) compiled information about each state's specific approaches to organizing, administering, and coordinating early childhood education programs. Specifically, BPC looked at:

1. The total amount of federal and state funds spent on early childhood development programs;
2. How states are responding to federal requirements, including the coordination requirements set forth in various authorizing statutes;
3. The number of state agencies and divisions within state agencies involved in administering these programs;
4. The institutional housing of related programs and the level of coordination and collaboration that takes place across programs;
5. Whether the state has a functioning early learning state advisory council (SAC) and where that council is housed, if it exists, and, | Bipartisan Policy Center (BPC) for the Early Childhood Initiative | https://bipartisanpolicy.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/Creating-an-Integrated-Efficient-Early-Care-and-Education-System-to-Support-Children-and-Families-A-State-by-State-Analysis.pdf

December 2018 |

Article Summary	Authors	Source

similarly, where the Head Start Collaboration Office is housed; and

6. The integration of early childhood data across programs and implementation of quality rating and improvement systems (QRIS) at the state level.

The article defines and explains federal funding sources and programs supporting early childhood learning and development and makes specific policy recommendations for Governors, Federal Agencies, and Congress.

California

Article Summary	Authors	Source
Article 9: Interagency, Cross-Sector Collaboration to Improve Care for Vulnerable Children: Lessons for California from Six State Initiatives		
SUMMARY: This report describes six programs in five states that implemented collaboration mechanisms to address the needs of children and youth with special health care needs (CYSHCN) and other vulnerable populations. The report then offers specific recommendations for the state of California to expand the concept of "health and well-being" to promote greater collaboration across sectors, including: 1. Enhance engagement with California stakeholders and seek executive and legislative support for interagency collaboration through public hearings and identifying potential champions within: Medi-Cal/Department of Health Care Services; Department of Developmental Services, Departments of Public Health, Education, Social Services; and at the at the county level within California Children's Services (CCS) programs, public health and welfare departments, various early care and education (ECE) programs, and others; 2. Use the shift of CCS services to managed care to monitor, test, identify, and disseminate effective strategies for the transition and for improving rather than	Sharon Silow-Carroll Diana Rodin Anh Pham	https://www.healthmanagement.com/wp-content/uploads/HMA-Interagency-Collaboration-CA-report-02.15.2018.pdf Health Management Associates for the Lucile Packard Foundation for Children's Health February 2018

reducing coordination and continuity of care for CYSCHN; 3. Explore opportunities to better leverage the existing Medi-Cal Management Information System/Decision Support System (MIS/DSS) data warehouse to improve communication and coordination across programs and service providers; 4. Explore further potential collaboration between Health and Education agencies, and opportunities for collaboration that involve counties and managed care organizations; 5. Support and train family members to participate in health plan and statewide advisory committees including those planned as part of the CCS transition to managed care; and 6. Connect with agency staff in other states to share information and best practices about interagency collaboration.		

Article 10: Early Identification and Intervention Systems in California		
SUMMARY: This report, funded by the David and Lucile Packard Foundation, presents case studies of the successes and lessons learned in three California counties—Alameda, San Diego, and Santa Clara – in developing and strengthening early identification and intervention systems. The purpose of this study is to support the greater conversation around early identification and intervention in California. While counties throughout California are doing this important work, these three counties were identified as bright spots in early identification and intervention, with other counties across the state interested in learning about their efforts and experiences to date. This report prioritizes ideas that would (1) feel relevant or applicable to other counties and municipalities, and (2) speak to the role of an entity that supports coordination and collaboration across the system. The case studies are illustrative, not evaluative, and they appear in alphabetical order: • **Alameda County: Families Front and Center** highlights the paramount role of meaningful family	Harder and Co. Community Research for the David and Lucille Packard Foundation, in partnership with the First 5 agencies in Alameda, San Diego, and Santa Clara.	https://www.packard.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/Early-Identification-and-Intervention-Systems-in-CA-Full-Report.pdf September 2018

engagement in building a culture of early identification and intervention.

• **San Diego: Coordination from the Ground Up** describes a longstanding cross-sector collaborative system that was built through a decade of relationship-building and partnership.

• **Santa Clara: Starting with Services** reports on successful efforts to build the capacity and close service gaps within the network of early intervention service providers

Article 11: Getting Down to Facts II – Early Childhood Education in California		
SUMMARY: This report reviews and analyzes California policies that are designed to support early learning in children from birth through age five years. The analysis is limited to early childhood education related programs and supports that are likely to directly affect children's cognitive and social development. Although all aspects of children's experiences affect their development, social services (e.g., related to child abuse and neglect or housing), nutrition programs, and health care services are not included.	Deborah Stipek and Colleagues Madhuvanti Anantharajan co-authored the chapter on Early Childhood Data Systems Stanford University and PACE	https://www.gettingdowntofacts.com/sites/default/files/2018-09/GDTFII_Report_Stipek.pdf
The information in the report comes primarily from state and locally collected data from original sources, extant reports that summarize information related to the topic, and research on effective early childhood practices and policies. Added to this information are findings from interviews with people who have firsthand experience and knowledge of early childhood programs and resources in California.		
For each topic addressed in the report, the report examines: 1. The current situation in California—including current resources, governance and administration, access for different groups of children, and unmet needs; 2. Research, expert opinion, and other evidence on best practices related to the topic; 3. An analysis of how well California policies and practices meet the standards for what is known about best practices;		

4. Policy options, including examples of effective policies implemented in other states; 5. Data identified in the process of the review that need to be collected to inform future practice and policy decisions. The last chapter of the report, **Early Child Care Data Systems**, discusses data that needs to be collected in California to inform policy decisions, including data that: 1. Tracks children's skill development from preschool through K-12; 2. Provides information on extant programs and availability of spaces; and **3.** Provides information on the workforce.		

Article 12: Building an Early Learning System That Works: Next Steps for California

SUMMARY: Building on the Learning Policy Institute (LPI) report Understanding California's Early Care and Education System, this report analyzes how ECE programs operate at the county level and describes challenges and promising practices for administration of early childhood education, access to care, the early childhood workforce, program quality, and data systems. It concludes with actions policymakers can take to improve access to high-quality early childhood education for California children. This report examines 10 counties that vary by region, population density (i.e., rural, urban, suburban), child care affordability, and child care costs. The counties studied are: Trinity, Lake, Sacramento, San Mateo, Merced, Inyo, San Louis Obispo, San Bernardino, Los Angeles, and San Diego. Section 6 of the report highlights the data that are currently collected on early childhood education, the limitations of these data, and local efforts to collect comprehensive data.	Hanna Melnick, Beth Meloy, Madelyn Gardner, Marjorie Wechsler, and Anna Maier Learning Policy Institute	https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/Building_Early_Learning_System_Works_CA_REPORT.pdf January 2018

Article 13: First 5 California Strategic Plan

SUMMARY: This strategic plan builds upon First 5 California's vision, mission, and values. Four Strategic Priority Areas (SPAs) provide the primary focus areas for First 5 California's external and internal work. The	First 5 California	https://www.ccfc.ca.gov/pdf/about/budget_perf/F5CA_Strategic_Plan_2017.pdf

three externally-focused SPAs of Children and Families, System and Network, and Public Will and Investment are critically linked; the intended outcomes for children will not be achieved without a strong system of services, network of providers and partners, and the public and political support to invest in early childhood. Additionally, the internally-focused SPA of Institutional Development recognizes that strengthening First 5 California's organizational capacity will improve its ability to accomplish its external programmatic goals.

Each SPA has specific goals, and each goal has detailed objectives, activities, and indicators of success. | | Adopted January 2014

Revised April 2017 |

Article 14: Together, Preparing Every Child for Life and School – A strategy for Monterey County to better support all children and their families, from the prenatal stage through age 8 (2018 – 2025)

SUMMARY: This document lays out a shared vision of what is needed to transform systems and achieve tangible results for the 64,500 young children ages 0-8 in Monterey County and their families. The concepts and principles described in this strategic framework represent a shared understanding of how children develop in the context of their families and communities, and how collaboration can be better supported.

The strategy document details 10 strategies across 4 areas of focus:

1. Empowered and resilient parents;
2. Families surrounded by support;
3. Caregivers that help children grow and learn; and
4. An equitable system of support for all. | Early Childhood Development Advisory Group of Monterey County, with staff support from Bright Beginnings/Bright Futures, First 5 Monterey County, and the United Way of Monterey County | https://brightbeginnings mc.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/0 5/BB-StrategyContentBooklet-Web.pdf |

Article 15: 2017–18 | FIRST 5 CALIFORNIA ANNUAL REPORT

SUMMARY: The 2017–18 Annual Report summarizes First 5 California's past year's accomplishments at both the state and local levels, detailing review of activities in all counties.

Highlights include:

1. The planning and development of First 5 California's 2018 Child Health, Education, | First 5 California | http://www.ccfc.ca.gov/ pdf/about/budget_perf/ annual_report_pdfs/Ann ual_Report_17-18.pdf |

and Care Summit last April. Over 700 early education and care professionals attended the three-day event;		
2. The essential, ongoing services provided at local levels across the state for children and families. First 5 county commissions provided nearly 185,000 services to improve family functioning for children ages 0 to 5;		
3. The successful continuation of First 5 California's Talk. Read. Sing.® public education and outreach campaign. This effort is designed to inform parents and the public about the importance of early brain development in young children in their earliest months and years through positive verbal engagement. It continues to reach millions of Californians through television, radio, social and digital media, the First 5 California Parent Website, and First 5 California's Kit for New Parents;		
4. The First 5 Express, a mobile outreach tour that traveled to all 58 counties reaching out and providing information to families and caregivers of children ages 0 to 5. More than 39,000 Express visitors walked away with helpful resources and other creative items developed for both children and their parents; and		
5. The continued commitment by First 5 county commissions in developmental screenings and services, leading the state in these important health investments		

Gray Literature		
Article Summary	**Author(s)**	**Publication**
Article 16: An Unofficial Guide to the Why and How of State Early Childhood Data Systems		
SUMMARY: This article provides a comprehensive and relevant view of Early Childhood Data Systems (ECDS). It discusses why these systems are important and spells out the behaviors and paradigms state should be seeking to change to allocate resources based on actual need, ensure children and families are getting the right mix of services, provide parents	Elliot Regenstein	https://www.theounce.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/PolicyPaper_UnofficialGuide.pdf

and the public information on the early childhood system and its providers, and improve teaching and learning from kindergarten through second grade (termed the "mystery years")		the Ounce Policy Conversations
		Conversation No. 7 Version 1.0
The author suggests the same formula: engage stakeholders to determine what they want and need in order to develop what questions the ECDS will answer; focus on governance and clear interagency agreements; assess the data landscape; and build linkages.		August 22, 2017
The section on assessing the data landscape is most relevant to this project. The author stresses the need to understand where data is being collected and maintained and what needs to be added.		
The stakeholder engagement process will develop the questions the system will answer. The questions will inform the gap analysis. However, the gap analysis will reveal more needs than can be addressed at one time and will need to be routed through a follow-up engagement process to set priorities and expectations.		
The author stresses looking for easy wins and quick accomplishments to build momentum for future work.		

The author suggests the goals should be to raise data quality and reduce administrative burden on service providers. To accomplish this, states should focus on:
 	
1. Data desired but not being collected
    a. Should it be collected?
2. Data collected that may not be reliable (self-reported; unaudited)
    b. Is there an authoritative source in case of conflicts?
3. Data is being collected by many but called by different names		

The author concludes the article by saying states underestimate the amount of time, resources, and capacity needed to build and maintain data systems. States require assistance to identify needs, define priorities, and build capacity. States need to plan for the work to be modular and sequenced.		
This will require leadership and money to grow the states capacity to generate and utilize data.		

Article 17: Early Childhood Integrated Data Systems Toolkit		
SUMMARY: The SLDS Early Childhood Integrated Data System (ECIDS) Toolkit was designed for use by any state regardless of where it is in the process of developing an ECIDS. The Toolkit has seven components: 1. Purpose and Vision; 2. Planning and Management; 3. Stakeholder Engagement; 4. Data Governance; 5. System Design; 6. Data Use; and 7. Sustainability. Each component has a set of key indicators that describe the ideal "what" for the specific component and each indicator has elements that discuss "how" to accomplish the "what" outlined in the indicator. The toolkit refers to early childhood broadly, as some ECIDSs extend beyond early learning and education to include health and social services.	Statewide Longitudinal Data System Grant Program	https://slds.grads360.org/#program/ecids-toolkit