

State Department of Finance
Budget Testimony for Little Hoover Commission Hearing on Education Data
Matt Aguilera

Testifier Bio

Matt Aguilera is the Finance Principal Program Budget Analyst responsible for supervising work on the State Department of Education budget in various program areas including, but not limited to, education data. He has over 15 years of professional budget experience in the Executive and Legislative branches of government in the health and education sectors primarily.

Introduction

Mr. Aguilera's testimony will provide some historical background information on the state's education data policy, and specific budget information on the student and teacher data systems currently under development.

Education Data Policy

The public and private sectors all have well-established interests in making sure that our educational system is working properly. Data is a necessary part of the state's accountability system. In addition, many programs funded by the state have some sort of evaluation component that also helps provide policy makers with useful information.

An abundance of education data is available in many forms at all levels of government and in the private sector. Examples range from automated reporting systems, program evaluations, studies, articles and more.

The new information that will be available through the new student and teacher data systems under development will be longitudinal data, which can track and shed insights into student and school performance over time.

The State has historically used the following strategic guiding principles, among others, concerning its development of education data policy systems:

1. Sharing responsibility (federal/state/local/private contributions)
2. Maximizing efficiency (minimizing state and local administration to the extent possible, avoiding duplication of effort, designing systems that are complementary and compatible to the extent possible, and justifiable to taxpayers)
3. Appropriately addressing business needs while taking into consideration factors such as costs and benefits, and the risks and likelihood of project success
4. Ensuring reasonable accountability
5. Providing for voluntary participation as practicable on what systems to use (some districts prefer to use their own systems, rather than participate in state

State Department of Finance
Budget Testimony for Little Hoover Commission Hearing on Education Data
Matt Aguilera

sanctioned alternatives / very small school automated systems may not be feasible or practical in some cases).

6. Weighing data desires with other competing priorities such as funding for direct instruction to students, for example.

Education Data Funding History—Specifically for the Student and Teacher Data Systems Under Development

The State has appropriated over \$156.6 million for the development of the student and teacher data systems, as follows:

Calpads Funding Detail (see Attachment I for detail):

Since 2002, the year of the enabling legislation for the longitudinal student data system, the State has appropriated \$107.8 million specifically for activities directly and indirectly associated with implementing the new system. In addition, from 1997 through 2001, the State appropriated \$46.3 million as a precursor for similar data reporting activities (primarily through California School Information Services) that have been incorporated as a part of the new system.

Caltides Funding Detail (see Attachment II for detail):

The State has appropriated \$2.4 million of federal Title II (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund) to prepare a feasibility study report, and initiate development (project management and oversight, and initial development) of the longitudinal teacher data system.

Closing

In closing, and on behalf of the Department of Finance, I would like to thank the commission for the opportunity to participate in this hearing, and I'd be happy to field any questions that members may have.

Glossary of Frequently Used State Data Terms

California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (Calpads)—A system that allows for tracking individual student enrollment history and academic performance data over time. System goals pursuant to Chapter 1002, Statutes of 2002 (SB 1453), are to provide school districts and CDE access to data necessary to (1) comply with federal No Child Left Behind reporting requirements, (2) provide a better means of evaluating educational progress and investments over time, (3) provide LEAs information that can be used to improve pupil achievement, and (4) provide an efficient, flexible, and secure means of maintaining longitudinal statewide pupil-level data.

California Longitudinal Teacher Integrated Data Education System (Caltides)—Chapter 840, Statutes of 2006 (SB 1614), authorizes the system. The State Department of Education, in consultation with the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, is responsible for developing the system, which will serve as the central state repository for information regarding the teacher workforce for the purpose of developing and reviewing state policy, identifying workforce trends, and providing high-quality program evaluations of the effectiveness of teacher preparation and induction programs.

California School Information Services (CSIS)—The Kern County Superintendent of Schools Office exists as the administrative and fiscal agent for the local California School Information Services program office. Its mission is to (1) build capacity of local education agencies to implement and maintain comparable, effective, and efficient student information systems that will support LEA daily program needs and promote the use of information for educational decision-making by school-site, district office and county staff; (2) enable the accurate and timely exchange of student transcripts between local education agencies and to post secondary institutions; and (3) assist local education agencies to transmit state reports electronically to the California Department of Education, thereby reducing reporting burden of LEA staff.

Office of Technology Review, Oversight and Security (OTROS)—The Department of Finance office responsible for (1) reviewing information technology (IT) proposals and ensuring expenditures represent a prudent investment while meeting state business needs; (2) recommending expenditure authority for IT projects, commensurate with the substantiated needs, and any necessary fiscal controls to the budget unit responsible for a department's budget, (3) assisting Finance to ensure approved IT expenditures are in alignment with statewide policies and strategies; (4) implementing an effective system of graduated oversight for all IT projects; (5) establishing statewide standards for project management and oversight; (6) assessing department IT project management and oversight practices; (7) establishing IT security and risk management policy and oversight; and (8) establishing operational recovery policy and oversight.

Statewide Student Identifiers—Chapter 1002, Statutes of 2002 (SB 1453), requires local education agencies and charter schools to assign and maintain Statewide Student Identifiers. This identifier is required on all individual student data submissions to the state beginning in 2005-06. The identifier assignment and maintenance processes are the responsibility of the California School Information Services program office.

Statewide Educator Identifiers—Pursuant to Chapter 840, Statutes of 2006 (SB 1614), the Commission on Teacher Credentialing began work in 2006-07 on developing and

Glossary of Frequently Used State Data Terms

disseminating statewide teacher identifiers for populating its systems and subsequent future use in the statewide teacher data system (Caltides).

Best Practices Cohort (“CSIS-Lite”)—The Budget Act of 2006 (6110-101-0349) and Chapter 79, Statutes of 2006 (Section 43), provided \$29.5 million (\$20 million Educational Telecommunications Fund and \$9.5 million in one-time Proposition 98) for allocation through a voluntary program to non-California School Information Services local education agencies to build their capacity to collect, maintain, and submit student level data to the statewide student data system (Calpads). Chapter 79, Statutes of 2006 (Section 43), also provided (1) \$1.5 million for the State Department of Education to transfer \$500,000 each year for three years to California School Information Services for increased workload associated with the implementation plan to prepare local educational agencies for the statewide student data system, and (2) \$533,000 for the State Department of Education to transfer to California School Information Services for one-time equipment, hardware and software purchases consistent with the approved implementation plan.

California Schools Information Services
(Dollars in Thousands)

	BUDGET ACT OF											Totals by Function
	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	
Local Project Funding	5,664	2,500	5,000	8,600	11,566	7,000	-	1,000	3,900	1,360	2,010	48,600
Central Operations Funding		1,000	2,400	4,200	4,500	4,290	3,899	4,198	3,899	3,899	3,899	36,184
Student Identifier Central Operations (Maintenance)						320	522	522	397	397	397	2,555
Student Identifier Issuance							1,300	1,300	-	-	-	2,600
Student Identifier Maintenance (Local Support)								450	907	828	828	3,013
Student Friendly Services (Transcripts)							500	500	500	500	500	2,500
Oversight Funding					150	150	150	150	150	150	150	1,050
FCMAT Project Management	-	-	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	2,250
CALPADS Local Transition (Best Practices Grants)										29,500	-	29,500
CALPADS Transition (Best Practices Admin.)										1,578	1,045	2,623
CALPADS Development										952	2,863	3,815
Longitudinal Database Administration						6,000	6,000	2,960	844	881	881	17,566
EDEN/CALPADS Data Collection						880	880				121	1,881
TOTAL	\$5,664	\$3,500	\$7,650	\$13,050	\$16,466	\$18,890	\$13,501	\$11,330	\$10,847	\$40,295	\$12,944	\$154,137

Authorized Appropriations for CALTIDES

	<u>2005/06</u>	<u>2006/07</u>	<u>2007/08</u>
6110-001-0890 Feasibility Study Federal Title II Funds	\$ 350,000		
6110-001-0890 Phase One ^{1/} Costs Including 1 LT position for CDE and \$252,00 and 2.5 LT positions for CTC Federal Title II Funds		\$ 938,000	
6110-001-0890 Phase Two ^{2/} Costs Including 1 LT position for CDE and \$248,000 and 2.5 LT positions for CTC Federal Title II Funds			<u>\$ 1,142,000</u>
	<u>\$ 350,000</u>	<u>\$ 938,000</u>	<u>\$ 1,142,000</u>
Total Appropriation Authority Since Project Commencement			\$ 2,430,000

^{1/} Phase One: Procure contracts for Project Management, Independent Oversight, Independent Verification and Validation, and Vendor Proposal Evaluation.

^{2/} Phase Two: Finalize Procurement activities of Phase One and begin development activities including business requirement definitions, business rule updates, data transformation, and identification of technical requirements.