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PREFACE

The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors adopted the Long-Term Family Self-Sufficiency (LTFSS) Plan on November 16, 1999. LTFSS Plan consists of 46 projects whose goal is to promote self-sufficiency among California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) families, former CalWORKs families, and other low-income families. Following an open and competitive bidding, Los Angeles County awarded RAND a contract to conduct a Countywide evaluation of the LTFSS Plan. A subcontract was awarded to Walter R. McDonald and Associates to work jointly with RAND on the evaluation. Robert F. Schoeni is the Project Director, and John Hedderson is Walter R. McDonald and Associate's project leader.

One goal of the evaluation is to measure 26 indicators that will help the County determine whether it is meeting its fundamental goal of self-sufficiency among low-income families. This document precisely defines each of the 26 indicators and assesses the availability of data to measure each indicator. The next report, which will be completed in September 2001, will provide estimates of the indicators leading up to the implementation of the LTFSS Plan, describe the causes for any changes that occurred leading up to implementation, and project the path that the indicators may have taken in the absence of the LTFSS Plan.

In addition to this quantitative study, a process analysis is being conducted. The process analysis, which will be completed in November 2001, describes the LTFSS Plan planning process and assesses the usefulness of the LTFSS Plan framework for achieving its goals.

For more information about RAND's evaluation of LTFSS Plan, contact:

Robert F. Schoeni
Project Director
Senior Economist
Associate Director, Labor and Population Program
RAND
1700 Main Street
Santa Monica, CA 90407
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SUMMARY

To promote sustained self-sufficiency among CalWORKs families, former CalWORKs families and other low-income families, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors adopted a Long-Term Family Self-Sufficiency (LTFSS) Plan on November 16, 1999. Implementation of the Plan is proceeding under a results-based accountability framework. Crucial to that framework is the selection of indicators of progress toward the desired results. The County has chosen 26 indicators, and this document develops these indicators along several dimensions: It explicitly defines each indicator, it assesses the availability of data to measure the indicators, it recommends headline indicators, and it proposes levels of geographic aggregation for evaluating the LTFSS Plan.

The report reaches the following conclusions:

• The quality of the data varies widely across indicators;
• The data are particularly weak for estimating indicators separately for people who speak different languages;
• For evaluating the LTFSS Plan, the indicator trendlines should be reported at the following geographic levels: Countywide; rest of California; rest of nation; Service Planning Area (SPA); and Supervisorial District (SD);
• The following indicators should be considered as headline indicators for the five outcome areas: (1) Good Health—low birth weight; (2) Safety and Survival—domestic violence arrests; (3) Economic Well-Being—annual income under poverty; (4) Social and Emotional Well-Being—personal behaviors harmful to self and others; and (5) Education and Workforce Readiness—teenage high school graduation.
• The following indicators should be placed on the data development agenda: access to health care, successful minor/family reunification after out-of-home care placement, access to transportation, adults earning a living wage, homeless within the past 24 months; index for personal behaviors harmful to self or others, access to quality child
care, parent-child time together, and high school graduation among mothers who gave birth before graduating from high school.
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ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFDC</td>
<td>Aid to Families with Dependent Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHS</td>
<td>American Housing Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalWORKs</td>
<td>California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids Act of 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDE</td>
<td>California Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDJ</td>
<td>California Department of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDSS</td>
<td>California Department of Social Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPS</td>
<td>Current Population Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTNA</td>
<td>CalWORKs Transportation Needs Assessment Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDD</td>
<td>Employment Development Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EITC</td>
<td>Earned Income Tax Credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSAA</td>
<td>High School Attendance Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACHS</td>
<td>Los Angeles County Health Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC DAO</td>
<td>Los Angeles County District Attorney’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC DCFS</td>
<td>Los Angeles County Department of Children and Family Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC PROB</td>
<td>Los Angeles County Probation Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTFSS</td>
<td>Long-Term Family Self-Sufficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDS</td>
<td>MediCal Eligibility Data System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORG</td>
<td>Outgoing Rotation Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Supervisory District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPA</td>
<td>Service Planning Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TANF</td>
<td>Temporary Assistance for Needy Families</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. INTRODUCTION

To promote sustained self-sufficiency among CalWORKs families, former CalWORKs families, and other low-income families, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors adopted a Long-Term Family Self-Sufficiency (LTFSS) Plan on November 16, 1999. Implementation of the Plan is proceeding under a results-based accountability framework. Crucial to that framework is the selection of indicators of progress toward the goals. As part of an ongoing contract with the Los Angeles County Chief Administrative Office, RAND is evaluating the LTFSS Plan. This document outlines the issues in selecting indicators.

THE LTFSS PLAN

As part of welfare reform and the availability of additional funds, Los Angeles County conducted a broad-based effort to review the delivery of services to low-income populations by County health and human service agencies and the need for additional services. This effort of the County’s New Directions Task Force resulted in a report that serves as the basis for the LTFSS Plan initiative (New Directions Task Force, 1999).

Following the County’s Strategic Plan for Children, Youth, and Families as proposed by the Los Angeles County Children’s Planning Council (Children’s Planning Council, 1998) and as adopted by the Board of Supervisors on January 26, 1993, the LTFSS Plan specifies five desired outcomes:

1. Good health;
2. Safety and survival;
3. Economic well-being;
4. Social and emotional well-being; and
5. Education and workforce readiness.

In addition, the LTFSS Plan identified 26 indicators to use in evaluating progress toward attaining the goals at the Countywide level. Previous work done for the LTFSS Plan and other County planning and evaluation projects laid a foundation for using these indicators (Moreno, 1999; New Directions Task Force,

To organize the proposals, the LTFSS Plan recommended eight strategies:

1. Promoting self-sustaining employment;
2. Ensuring access to healthcare;
3. Supporting stable housing;
4. Helping teens become self-sufficient adults;
5. Promoting youth literacy;
6. Curbing violence;
7. Building strong families;
8. Integrating the human services delivery system to be implemented through 46 projects.

CHOOSING INDICATORS

The LTFSS Plan is to be implemented using the results-based decision-making framework (Friedman, 2000). That model requires that indicators of program success be identified and measured, and that indicators be compared against trendlines to determine net impacts. The first step in this process is selecting indicators.

Starting with the list of 26 indicators, the selection process requires several steps:

1. Precisely define each indicator;
2. Determine the data sets that will be used to estimate each indicator;
3. Determine the availability of the estimates by time period, CalWORKs status, income, race/ethnicity, primary language, and geography; and
4. Assess the quality of the estimate that will be obtained.

Then, from among this list of indicators, a smaller number will be chosen to serve as “headline indicators” that will track each of the five outcome areas. Trends on the five headline indicators will provide a quick summary of the plan’s general success at achieving self-sufficiency for families. Data for the indicators not selected as headline indicators would continue to be collected for two
reasons: (1) they will help in developing an understanding of "stories behind the baselines"; and (2) they will play a role in validating the changes measured by the headline indicators. Indicators for which data are currently sparse or do not exist will be placed on the Data Development Agenda. Measurement of these indicators requires further exploration and consideration.

ORGANIZATION OF THIS DOCUMENT AND NEXT STEPS

The organization of this document corresponds to its two purposes. First, the report provides input for the choice of headline indicators and makes specific proposals. This information is provided in the next section (Section 2).

Second, the report provides a detailed catalog of the data sources available for each of the 26 indicators. Specifically, Section 3 describes the primary data sets, and Section 4 discusses the data available from each of the primary data sets for each of the 26 indicators.
2. THE POWER AND AVAILABILITY OF LTFSS PLAN INDICATORS

In this section, we present a summary assessment of the power and availability of the LTFSS Plan indicators as measures for the baseline evaluation. First, we discuss the criteria used in assessing the indicators; then, we discuss the assessment results within each of the five outcome areas and conclude with recommendations.

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING INDICATORS

In the end, decisions about the power of indicators are not often clear-cut and there may be differences in judgment. However, a useful first step is to establish criteria for each of the dimensions. The LTFSS Plan Evaluation Design, i.e., “Evaluation Design,” has defined three qualities of a good indicator: communication power, proxy power, and data power (Friedman, 2000). The focus of this document is to assess the data power of each indicator, but we also use the other two criteria as part of the evaluation. We discuss each criterion in turn.

Communication Power

Indicators should clearly communicate to County employees and County residents how the County is doing. The measures should be powerful, common sense, and compelling, not arcane and bureaucratic. An example of an indicator with strong communication power for the outcome Education/Workforce Readiness is teenage high school graduation. The general public can understand this indicator and most have personally experienced it.

Given this definition, indicators will be judged excellent in communication power if they are easily and correctly understood by the general public, very clearly linked to their outcome area, and available from data sources easily understood by the general public. Indicators will be judged good in communication power if they are easily and correctly understood by the general public, very clearly linked to their outcome area, but there are minor, easily explained technical issues concerning the measurement or its data sources that might mislead the general public.
Indicators will be judged *fair* in communication power if they are not easily and correctly understood by the general public, not very clearly linked to their outcome area, or there are technical issues concerning the measurement or its data sources that would be somewhat difficult to explain to the general public. Indicators will be judged *poor* in communication power if they are difficult for the general public to understand, not clearly linked to their outcome area, or there are technical issues concerning the measurement or its data sources that would be very difficult to explain to the general public.

**Proxy Power**

Proxy power concerns the degree to which the indicator measures something of central importance about self-sufficiency or one of the five outcome areas. An example of proxy power is teenage high school graduation rates as an indicator of education and workforce readiness outcome. This indicator is expected to correlate with the other indicators within this outcome area such as adult attainment of high school diploma, elementary and secondary school students reading at grade level, mother’s educational attainment at child’s birth, and high school graduation among mothers who gave birth before graduating from high school.

Given this definition, indicators will be judged *excellent* in proxy power if it is expected that they would change over time in a similar way as all the other indicators in their outcome area. Indicators will be judged *good* in proxy power if it is expected that they would follow trends similar to half or more of the other indicators in their outcome area.

Indicators will be judged *fair* in proxy power if it is expected that they would follow trends similar to one-third but less than half of the other indicators in their outcome area. Indicators will be judged *poor* in proxy power if it is expected that they would follow trends similar to less than one-third of the other indicators in their outcome area.

**Data Power**

Data power represents the validity and availability of the information necessary to calculate the indicator. An example of an indicator with high data power is the percentage of low birth weight births. This indicator is accepted as a valid indicator of the health of mothers and infants at the time of delivery. Data
are available annually since 1960 and for many levels of geography from subcounty areas to the nation. This indicator can also be broken down by race/ethnicity and the education of the parents, and the necessary data to calculate the indicator can be acquired quickly.

Because data power is the focus of this report, we divide data power into five subcategories: (1) validity; (2) timeline; (3) geography; (4) socioeconomic strata; and (5) speed of availability. We discuss each in turn, along with their four-part rating.

**Validity.** The degree to which an indicator accurately measures what it is supposed to measure is its validity. For example, child abuse and neglect is a conceptually clear LTFSS Plan indicator; however, accurately measuring trends in child abuse and neglect is complicated by any changes over time in standards of reporting, screening, investigation, and disposition. Given this discussion, indicators will be judged *excellent* in validity if there are only minor issues about the accuracy of their measurement. Indicators will be judged *good* in validity if there are moderate, but resolvable, issues about the accuracy of their measurement. Indicators will be judged *fair* in validity if there are serious issues about the accuracy of their measurement. Indicators will be judged *poor* in validity if there are very serious issues about the accuracy of their measurement.

A minor validity issue is one that can be easily resolved. For example, if poverty data were missing for 1-5 percent of the respondents to a survey, but the families who did not respond were similar to the families that did respond, then the bias induced by nonresponse is small. An indicator might be rated as moderate on validity, if, for example, the data were missing for 1-5 percent of the respondents in a survey, and the families not responding to the questions were systematically different from the families who did respond to the survey. A serious validity issue might arise in the case where the response rate to a phone survey of families was 65%, and the leading cause of non-responses was that interviews were only offered in English. A nonresponse rate of roughly 45% or higher would be unacceptable, leading to a very serious validity problem.

**Timeline.** To assess the impact of the LTFSS Plan, it is important to have data before and after its adoption and implementation. Although some of the 46 projects are just now being implemented, the plan was adopted in 1999. Therefore, we require that estimates of the indicators be available prior to 1999. Moreover, the Evaluation Design requires a prediction of what the indicator will
be in the future. The minimum requirement to construct a trendline prediction is data for two time periods prior to the LTFSS Plan. But the greater the number of time periods, the more accurate the trendline prediction is likely to be. Therefore, when possible, we will rely on data sources that allow us to frequently estimate each indicator.

More generally, the more years of data that are available prior to the implementation of the LTFSS Plan the better. This is not to say that data from all years prior to the LTFSS Plan should be considered with equal value in the evaluation. In most cases, the time period just prior to the implementation of LTFSS Plan will be the most important for determining its effects. However, confounding factors may have caused an indicator to be particularly high or low just prior to the implementation of the LTFSS Plan, which could cause biased estimates of the impact of the LTFSS Plan. For example, the economy has been robust in Los Angeles County for several years, causing poverty to decline. But what if the economy slows in the next 1–2 years, causing poverty to rise? The rise in poverty would occur simultaneously with the implementation of the LTFSS Plan, even though the LTFSS Plan did not cause an increase in poverty. To account for these various confounding factors, it is important to have a long history of the indicator, so one can examine the movement of the indicator as the economy fluctuated in the past.

At the same time, obtaining, linking, and analyzing data can be costly. Therefore, we will trade off the cost of collection with the value of having the additional data. The indicators that we have proposed to analyze back into the 1980s, 1970s, and even 1960s (i.e., annual income relative to poverty, adults employed by quarter, infant mortality, low birthweight births, mother’s educational attainment at child’s birth) are not costly to obtain.

It is an advantage for the indicator to be estimated frequently. In general, quarterly data are better than annual data, annual data are better than biannual data, and so forth. In assessing the indicators, we recommend making the judgment primarily on the basis of earliest year of availability. However, if an indicator is not available at least biannually, then it lacks utility. If two indicators are available for the same period of time, the one that is available most frequently is preferable. This is in fact why we are not recommending the use of indicators based on the decennial census.
Given this discussion, indicators that are available at regular intervals since 1980 are rated \textit{excellent} on timeline availability. Indicators that are only available at regular intervals since 1990 are rated \textit{good} on timeline availability. Indicators that are only available since 1997 are rated \textit{fair} on timeline availability. Indicators that are only available for one time point are rated \textit{poor} on timeline availability.

\textbf{Geography.} The Evaluation Design calls for an investigation of the ability to report estimates of indicators at various geographic levels, including Countywide, Service Planning Area (SPA), Supervisorial District (SD), and "community." In previous evaluation efforts, communities have variously been defined by city boundaries, school boundaries, zip codes, census tracts, and/or groups of these elements.

The presumption of the Evaluation Design is that if data are available, then the narrower the geographic unit the better. Therefore, indicators rated \textit{excellent} on geographic availability can be used to calculate reliable statistics for high school attendance areas and larger levels of geography. Indicators rated \textit{good} on geographic availability can be used to calculate reliable statistics at the SPA, SD, and larger levels of geography. Indicators rated \textit{fair} on geographic availability are available at the County level and for the rest of California, but not any smaller levels of geography. Indicators rated \textit{poor} on geographic availability are available at the County level, but not for smaller levels of geography or for the rest of California.

\textbf{Socioeconomic Strata.} The Evaluation Design specifies that analysis of data should take place for various socioeconomic strata, including race/ethnicity, family income and CalWORKs status. It is the goal of the evaluation to use consistent definitions of these categories across each of the 26 indicators.

\textit{Race/Ethnicity.} Race/ethnicity is measured consistently across several different data sources. However, there are still substantial differences among indicators, and, most important, race and ethnicity is not available in some of the data sources that will be needed. Furthermore, when race/ethnicity are reported, in many cases there are too few members of some groups—e.g., Cambodian, Guamanian, Laotian, Pacific Islander, Samoan—to construct a reliable estimate. Therefore, we weighed the need for as much detail as possible against the need for comparability across indicators and adequate sample sizes to obtain accurate estimates. Based on these principals, when race/ethnicity is available in the
data, we recommend reporting estimates for the following racial and ethnic groups:

- Hispanic;
- White, non-Hispanic;
- Black, non-Hispanic;
- Asian and Pacific Islanders, non-Hispanic;
- American Indian/Alaskan Native, non-Hispanic.

Exploration of the feasibility of adding “Other” or “Multi-racial” categories will be placed on the Data Development Agenda.

Income. The data files that include income usually measure income by a continuous amount, allowing the analyst to choose any income group they want for reporting purposes. To assess the impact of the LTFSS Plan, one would want to differentiate between families likely to use LTFSS Plan services and those who are not. Grouping families by income level, using the poverty threshold, allows for such distinctions. One would expect the Plan to effect low-income families, for example families whose income is below the poverty threshold more so than those above 200 percent of poverty. It should also be noted that poverty status is determined by both income and family size; two families with the same income but with different family sizes may have different poverty status. The objective of the poverty status measure is to adjust for the fact that families with more members require greater income to achieve the same standard of living. Therefore, the evaluation will report indicators by several poverty thresholds, to examine differences between such groups.

As the evaluation proceeds and the LTFSS Plan becomes fully implemented, it will be important to assess the extent to which families at, for example, 100 percent, 150 percent, and 200 percent of poverty are likely to be affected by the LTFSS Plan. In the meantime, when income is available, we propose to estimate each indicator for three groups:

- Families below 100 percent of poverty;
- Families at 100 to 200 percent of poverty;
- Families above 200 percent of poverty.
The last group should not be affected by the LTFSS Plan and, therefore, for some indicators, it might serve as a useful comparison group.

**CalWORKs Status.** There are two basic methods to obtain data on current CalWORKs status. One method is when the instrument collecting the indicator data, such as a survey, also includes questions on CalWORKs status. This method will underestimate CalWORKs participation to the degree that participants in the program do not want to state that they are in the program.

A second method is through matching administrative files. When the indicator data are for individuals, their identifiers such as name and birth date can be matched against a list of CalWORKs participants to determine if they are in the program. The lists of participants can be obtained from State or County administrative files, neither of which are 100% accurate because of lag times in recording data on persons entering and leaving the program, but both of which have been found to be accurate enough to use in past evaluations. A second source of error is from the identifier information. For example, sometimes the same person might have slightly different names listed in two files and they would not be identified as the same person. In other cases, different people with the same name and birth date might be identified as the same person.

**Former CalWORKs Participants.** For most indicators, data do not exist to be able to estimate the indicator separately for former CalWORKs participants. Discussions with the principal investigators of the Statewide CalWORKs evaluation and the Los Angeles County CalWORKs evaluation have lead to the consensus that there is not one widely agreed upon definition of former CalWORKs participants that can be used. The definition will be affected by the source of the data and the precise nature of the analysis. We will coordinate our work with these other evaluation efforts to be as consistent as possible.

When data are available, we suggest experimentation with various definitions for this group. However, it is expected that the analysis will focus on recent former participants so that the estimates could quickly identify changes in former participants over time. Therefore, we propose the following definition: people who have been on aid in the past 12 months but who have not been on aid in the past 2-3 months. We require that the person not have been on aid for the past 2-3 months to eliminate families who left aid temporarily because of administrative reasons.
Language. The Evaluation Design requested that indicators be estimated separately for groups who speak different languages. Our assessment of the available data has concluded that language is infrequently available. In addition, when language is available, measurement of language varies across sources. For example, some data sources use “primary language spoken at home” while others use “speak English.” Although we will collect information by language when it is available, it will not likely be the focus of the evaluation. This item could be placed on the data development agenda.

It is also important to be clear that the analysis will not include estimation of the interaction of any of the socioeconomic or geographic groups. That is, although the evaluation will attempt to estimate indicators for African Americans and for people living in each SPA, estimates will not be generated for African Americans living in each SPA. For almost every indicator, the samples are too small to calculate reliable estimates of these quantities.

Given this discussion, indicators rated excellent on socioeconomic strata will have race/ethnicity, income, and CalWORKs status data available. Indicators rated good on socioeconomic strata will have two of the three socioeconomic stratification criteria available. Indicators rated fair on socioeconomic strata will have one of the three socioeconomic stratification criteria available. Indicators rated poor on socioeconomic strata will have none of the three socioeconomic stratification criteria available.

Speed of Availability. Another dimension of data power is the ease with which data can be obtained and used given the time constraints of the evaluation project’s work plan. The baseline document is to be completed by September 2001, and indicator data that would take several months to obtain and prepare for analysis could not be included in that report.

Given this time constraint, indicators will be judged to be excellent in terms of availability if the data needed for estimation can be compiled quickly, particularly within the next 2 months. Indicators will be judged to be good in terms of availability if the data needed for estimation can be compiled somewhat quickly, within the next 2–6 months, in time to be included in the first Countywide evaluation report in February 2002. Indicators will be judged to be fair in terms of availability if they will require 6–12 months to compile the data needed for estimation. Indicators will be judged to be poor in terms of availability if it will require more than 12 months to compile the data needed for estimation.
Other Indicator Power Issues

The objective of the analysis is to determine whether there have been substantive and statistically significant changes in the indicators over time. Indicators that are not measured accurately and therefore fluctuate widely from year to year are not useful. Therefore, it is also important to consider the expected precision of the estimates of each indicator. Precision is in part determined by the size of the sample that is used to estimate the indicator. Sample sizes may become particularly small when estimating indicators for groups whose prevalence in the County population is low, such as CalWORKs participants or people who live in a certain zip code or census tract. Section 4 discusses the expected sample sizes for each data source.

Estimates based on statistical modeling will not be used because of potential errors in model assumptions and controversy in methods. For example, 1997 poverty at the SPA level will be estimated from the LACHS rather than from an existing Los Angeles County tract-level estimation model because the survey data are more direct, more precise, and involve fewer assumptions. An exception to this guideline is that for intercensal years, population estimates will need to be used as denominators for some indicators, and these estimates will be based on modeling approaches.

Estimates of indicators can be sensitive to the way in which the data are collected. For example, in survey data slight changes in the wording of questions or the ordering of questions within the survey instrument can cause significant changes in findings. Therefore, a strong preference was placed on using the same data source to generate estimates of a given indicator over time and across groups.

Finally, although the LTFSS Plan indicators are good measures and the best available, like indicators in other program evaluations, the LTFSS Plan indicators have limitations. When rigorously scrutinized, any indicator that is proposed will have some shortcomings. In terms of proxy power, any one indicator provides only a suggestion of what is happening in a broad outcome area such as good health. In terms of validity, the statistics available for the indicators are subject to the errors that occur in collecting administrative information or conducting surveys. In terms of availability by time period, geographic breakdowns, CalWORKs and poverty status, and other socioeconomic characteristics, most of the indicators are uneven. The challenge
is to devise analytical strategies that bridge the gaps in the data so that the evaluation does not become an incompressible, unconnected mixture of separate indicators, different time periods, and different groups of people.

SUMMARY EVALUATION OF INDICATORS BY OUTCOME AREAS

Given the three indicator power criteria and the subcategories within the data power criterion, we summarize here the results of our evaluation for each indicator. The discussion in this section is intentionally brief, with the detailed descriptions of each indicator that are the basis of our recommendation presented in Section 4. However, given the large number of indicators and factors on which they are judged, there will necessarily be assessments that will not receive universal acceptance. However, we make specific recommendations to facilitate a speedy resolution to these important choices.

Good Health

Table 2.1 presents a summary version of our evaluation results in the Good Health outcomes area. We propose “low birth weight” as the headline indicator. The indicator has excellent communication power and good proxy power. Its data power is excellent on validity, timeline, geography, and speed of availability. The socioeconomic strata availability is good if a match can be conducted to determine CalWORKs status of the mother.
Table 2.1 Summary of Results for Good Health Outcome Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Comm. Power</th>
<th>Proxy Power</th>
<th>Data Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Health Care</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Mortality</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Birth Weight</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth to Teens</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals Without Health Insurance</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This indicator needs to be defined

E = excellent; G = good; F = fair; P = poor.

Safety and Survival

Table 2.2 presents a summary version of our evaluation results in the Safety and Survival outcomes area. We propose "domestic violence arrests" as the headline indicator. This indicator has excellent communication power and good proxy power. It has a good timeline and is good in terms of speed of availability. Its validity is subject to fluctuations in the reporting and disposition of incidents; however, this is also true of the other Safety and Survival indicators except minor/family reunification, which is not a good proxy for the other indicators. Domestic violence arrests are readily available only for the County and rest of the State. Race/ethnicity is available but not income or CalWORKs status. Although the expectation is to use domestic violence arrests as the headline indicator, we will continue to explore the availability of data on youth arrests for violent crime from the Department of Justice, and if these data become available at the sub-county level we will consider this indicator for "headline" status.

For Safety and Survival, no current LTFSS Plan indicator can be measured at the SPA, SD, or community levels. An additional indicator that might be considered is the age-adjusted homicide rate, which can be calculated reliably for SPAs and SDs. The homicide rate is also not as susceptible to reporting and
disposition biases and could possibly be matched using name, birth date, and mother's maiden name against other files to determine CalWORKs status. RAND will attempt to collect these data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Comm. Power</th>
<th>Proxy Power</th>
<th>Data Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence Arrests</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Placement in Out-of-Home Care</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Probation Violations</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful / Minor Family Reunification After Out-of-Home Placement</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Arrests for Violent Crimes</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E = excellent; G = good; F = fair; P = poor.

**Economic Well-Being**

Table 2.3 presents a summary version of our evaluation results in the Economic Well-Being outcomes area. We propose as headline indicator "annual income under poverty level," using the CPS as a source. It has excellent communication and proxy power. Its data power ranks excellent on validity, timeline, socioeconomic strata, and speed of availability.

At the recommendation of the County, access to transportation and adults earning a living wage will be placed on the Data Development Agenda.
Table 2.3 Summary of Results for Economic Well-Being Outcome Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Comm. Power</th>
<th>Proxy Power</th>
<th>Validity</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Socio. Strata</th>
<th>Availability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adults Employed by Quarter</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Income Under Poverty Level</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Transportation</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Family Income Used for Housing</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults Earning a Living Wage</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless Within Prior 24 Months</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E = excellent; G = good; F = fair; P = poor.

Social and Emotional Well-Being

Table 2.4 presents a summary version of our evaluation results in the Social and Emotional Well-Being outcomes area. We propose as headline indicator “Personal Behaviors Harmful to Self or Others.” It has excellent communication and proxy power. Its data power ranks excellent on availability and good on validity and timeline. It has race/ethnicity data, but not income or CalWORKs status. Data files without individual identifiers are readily available for the County and the rest of California. As identifiers for matching with other files, name, birth date and mother’s maiden name are available in case management files. Delays could be encountered developing and receiving approval of data confidentiality protocols for extracts from the case management files; therefore, they are not listed as our primary data source at this time.
Table 2.4 Summary of Results for Social and Emotional Well-Being Outcome Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Comm. Power</th>
<th>Proxy Power</th>
<th>Data Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Behavior</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmful to Self/Others</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Quality of Child Care</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Community Activities</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent-Child Time Together</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E = excellent; G = good; F = fair; P = poor.

Education & Workforce Readiness

Table 2.5 presents a summary version of our evaluation results in the Education and Workforce Readiness outcomes area. We propose as headline indicator “teenage high school graduation.” It has excellent communication power and good proxy power. Its data power is good for validity and timeline. Its socioeconomic strata availability is fair, lacking income and CalWORKs status. Data are available for the County and the rest of California.
Table 2.5 Summary of Results for Education/Workforce Readiness Outcome Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Comm. Power</th>
<th>Proxy Power</th>
<th>Validity</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Socio. Strata</th>
<th>Availability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Attainment of HS Diploma, GED, or 8th grade reading level</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary and Secondary School Reading at Grade Level</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teenage HS Graduation</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's Educational Attainment at Child's Birth</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Graduation Among Mothers Who Gave Birth Before Graduating from HS</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Participation in Educational or Vocational Training</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E = excellent; G = good; F = fair; P = poor.

Summary: Choice of Headline and Secondary Indicators

According to the LTFSS Plan Evaluation Design, the selection of headline and secondary indicators should be based on three factors: communication power, proxy power, and data power. Although the preceding section described the communication and proxy power of each indicator, the focus of this report is evaluating the data power. The Workgroup initially recommended headline and secondary indicators to us based on the proxy and communication power of
each indicator. Therefore, based on our corresponding assessment of data power, we recommend the following headline indicators for each of the five outcome areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Area</th>
<th>Proposed Headline Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good Health</td>
<td>Low birth weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and Survival</td>
<td>Domestic violence arrests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Well-Being</td>
<td>Annual income under poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Emotional Well-Being</td>
<td>Personal behavior harmful to self and others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Workforce Readiness</td>
<td>Teenage high school graduation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Choice of Indicators for Data Development Agenda

Almost all indicators could be measured at some point in time for the County. However, the quality of the data varies substantially across indicators. There were some indicators for which the quality is quite low. Based on the detailed description of each indicator contained in Section 4, we propose to place the following indicators on the Data Development Agenda: (1) access to health care, (2) successful minor/family reunification after out-of-home care placement, (3) access to transportation, (4) adults earnings a living wage, (5) homeless within the past 24 months; (6) index of personal behaviors harmful to self or others, (7) access to quality child care, (8) parent-child time together, and (9) high school graduation among mothers who gave birth before graduating from high school. There is a need to prioritize the Data Development Agenda with input from CAO, the Department of Public Social Services, and the Evaluation Design Work Group.

OPTIONS FOR GEOGRAPHIC UNITS OF ANALYSIS

In assessing the utility of various geographic units of analysis, there are both research design and data availability concerns that must be weighed. The key to assessing the impact of the LTFSS Plan is to be able to obtain estimates for the indicators before and after the Plan was implemented. Furthermore,
geographic areas outside the County should be included in the analysis to detect the effects of outside forces such as swings in the California or national economy. A decades long timeline of data at the County, state, and national levels is the best input to the analysis for controlling for outside effects. However, as described in the Evaluation Design, analyses of trends at the subcounty level may also be useful and these trends will be presented when available.

Given the availability of data and the goals of the Countywide evaluation, we propose that the County be the primary geographic unit of analysis. The LTFSS Plan is a County initiative and the target population lives throughout the county. A long timeline of County data for the indicators, usually broken down by socioeconomic strata, are available within the timeframe of the current evaluation. At the state and national levels there are also long timelines of data available for many of the indicators.

There is also an interest in tracking the indicators at subcounty levels. Our investigation suggests that SPAs are the best subcounty units for use in evaluating the LTFSS Plan. SPAs have stable boundaries, and many of the indicators can be estimated for each of the eight SPAs. The timeline, however, for the economic well-being indicators, such as employment and poverty, is very limited at the SPA level. The only intercensal data available are gathered by the LACHS, which began in 1997 and is conducted biennially. The SPA-level analyses will assist planning by highlighting the relative ranking of regions of the County on the indicators, but the SPA-level analyses will probably not add as much to understanding the dynamics of how the LTFSS Plan is impacting the County.

The SDs are geographic units of great political interest, however, they present problems for program planning and evaluation because their boundaries are redrawn after each census. The current boundaries will change during the course of the LTFSS Plan evaluation. Vital records from LAC DHS that have census tract geocodes can be aggregated to SPA level statistics, because SPAs boundaries coincide with census tract boundaries. SD boundaries, however, follow city boundaries that split census tracts, and the vital records cannot be aggregated with high accuracy into SD geography. It is possible to geocode LAC DHS vital record data to include legal city, but this is not in the current files which only have the “postal” cities people use in their addresses. Despite these
difficulties, we propose using SDs as a subcounty unit of analysis because of their importance to decision makers.

Cities are geographic units that are of political interest and important for service planning and evaluation of municipal programs. However, the 88 cities in Los Angeles County present serious obstacles as geographic units of analysis for an evaluation that will rely heavily on trend analysis. To begin with, cities’ boundaries change routinely because of annexation. And it is even possible that boundaries may change because of areas splitting off from an existing city to form a new city. Occasionally, new cities are incorporated from unincorporated areas. Equally problematic is that the cities in Los Angeles County range in size from less than 100 residents to over 3 million residents. Very little data are available for the smaller cities. The larger cities, particularly Los Angeles, are too heterogeneous and sprawling to provide an improved focus over the SPA level analysis. For these reasons, we propose not using cities as a subcounty unit of analysis in the evaluation.

High school attendance areas (HSAA) have appeal as a geographic unit of analysis because they are at a community scale and they have the high school as a core institution. However, none of the economic well-being indicators and only a few of the other indicators are available at the HSAA level. Changes in boundaries would also present problems for trend analysis. If HSAA are to become a good geographic unit of analysis, more data need to be gathered at this level. Surveys would not be able to provide a reasonable sample size for each HSAA, so the best future prospects would be to develop databases from administrative records such as tax returns. The County has tackled such projects in the past, and there are great difficulties presented by changes in the proportion of people filing returns, returns not reflecting true family or true household units, and differences across the County in the ability to geocode addresses correctly. For these reasons, we propose not using HSAAAs as a subcounty unit of analysis in the evaluation.

Zip code data and census track data are similar in having too few incidents occurring to calculate reliable statistics for most of the indicators. There are, however, two very significant differences. First, census tract boundaries are stable over time except for changes done at the time of the decennial census. These decennial changes are usually only splits of existing tracts so that longitudinal work across decades is possible. Second, SPA boundaries coincide
closely with census tract boundaries so that aggregations to SPAs can be conducted with census tract data. SD boundaries also follow census tract boundaries, with some additional splitting along city boundaries, so that SD data can be aggregated from census tract data with city breakdowns. Census tracts split along city boundaries can serve as important building blocks to create other areas that are large enough for analysis and of great interest. In order to have a more compact and homogeneous unit, planners or evaluators often want to divide the City of Los Angeles or the unincorporated areas of the County into smaller geographic units. Tract-city splits provide a tool for doing this. At the same time, the task of gathering a useful amount of indicator data at these lower levels of geography remains daunting. We do not propose to use census tracts as a subcounty geographic unit of analysis in the evaluation, but we will aggregate vital records tract level data into SPA level data. We think that building the data available at the tract-city split level should be a high priority data development item. Geocoding can be done even more precisely, for example, to XY map coordinates, but data cannot be reported at that level and fewer people can be given access to it because of data confidentiality protocols. The more precise geocoding, however, can be viewed as an intermediate step that would create a file that could be aggregated to any geographic level.

It is difficult to conduct trend analyses with zip code data or aggregations of zip code data because frequently the boundaries are changed or new zip code areas are created. For the purposes of the LTFSS Plan countywide baseline evaluation, it is not feasible to establish indicator trendlines for zip code areas from which to make forecasts. Aggregating zip code level data to SPA or SD geography is theoretically possible to a degree; however, some zip code areas are split by SPA and SD boundaries. Aggregating information available at the zip code level to SPA or SD is difficult because the correspondence between zip code boundaries and the SPA and SD boundaries are continually changing. Separate correspondence tables would have to be developed for each year in the analysis, and new tables would be required for future years. Even these annual tables would have errors because of changes that occur midyear. We propose not using zip code as a geographic unit of analysis in the evaluation.

In sum, when data are available, we recommend that indicators be reported for the following geographic units:
Countywide
Service Planning Areas
Supervisiorial Districts
Rest of California
Rest of Nation
3. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED DATA SOURCES

A careful selection of data sources is essential to implement a successful evaluation of the LTFSS Plan. The data sources are of two types: surveys and administrative files. Scores of surveys have been conducted of Los Angeles County that contain some information pertinent to the proposed indicators. Similarly, scores of administrative files contain information pertinent to the proposed indicators. Nevertheless, there are relatively few data sources that have covered the County using a consistent measure for a long period of time at a low level of geography.

Some LTFSS Plan indictors can be measured from more than one source. When that is the case, each source has its own characteristics, such as available timelines, geography, and socioeconomic strata. Even the way in which an indicator is measured may differ significantly between two sources. As a general rule, we choose to use only the most powerful data source. This section describes our proposed data sources.

SURVEY DATA

Current Population Survey (CPS)

The CPS is a national household survey that includes roughly 130,000 individuals each month, and data for Los Angeles are available beginning in at least 1977. The survey collects a variety of information pertaining to labor force outcomes for all people 15 and older living in the household.

In each month, roughly 5,000 people in Los Angeles County are interviewed. Although the CPS samples are substantial, it may be necessary to merge two or more years of data to increase the precision of the estimates. In addition, the CPS is based on a clustered sample design. Therefore, the standard errors of the estimates must take this design effect into consideration.

Eight panels are used to rotate the sample each month. A sample unit is interviewed for four consecutive months and, then, after an eight-month rest period, for the same four months a year later. Each month a new panel of addresses, or one-eighth of the total sample, is introduced. Thus, in a particular
month, one panel is being interviewed for the first time and one panel is being interviewed for the second through the eighth and final time.

Interviewers use laptop computers to administer the interview, asking questions as they appear on the screen and directly entering the responses obtained. The first and the fifth month-in-sample interviews are almost always conducted by an interviewer who visits the sample unit. Over 90 percent of month-in-sample 2 through 4 and 6 through 8 interviews are conducted by telephone, either by the same interviewer or by an interviewer working at one of three centralized telephone interviewing centers.

The CPS data are widely used, their quality is very high, and they are the official source for income, poverty, and labor force statistics for the federal government. Moreover, the data can be used to make consistent comparison between Los Angeles and several other geographic areas, including the rest of California and the rest of the nation.

A disadvantage is that it is not currently possible to examine geographic areas within Los Angeles County; only Countywide analyses are possible. We recommend that obtaining subcounty identifiers be placed on the Data Development Agenda. If the Bureau of the Census grants RAND permission, we could use the UCLA Census Research Data Center to analyze confidential data containing more detailed geographic identifiers. At the same time, given the size of the CPS samples and the clustered sampling design, the standard errors of estimates at the SPA or SD level may be too high even if one could obtain the geographic indicators needed to calculate such estimates. As suggested above, one way to offset these limitations, but perhaps not solve them, is to merge two or more years of data.

In most months, the CPS supplements its core set of questions. We propose to use a variety of these supplements. Each supplement is discussed in turn.

**March Supplement to the CPS**

The March Supplement to the CPS, which is sometimes referred to as the Annual Demographic Survey, is used to generate the annual population profile of the United States, reports on geographical mobility and educational attainment, and detailed analysis of money income and poverty status. The labor force and
work experience data from this survey are used to profile the U.S. labor market and to make employment projections.

Most important for this project, the March Supplement contains information on income from all components, including welfare. Therefore, this data source will be used widely to examine indicators separately by CalWORKs status and by income. Individuals living in Los Angeles County can be identified in the March CPS beginning in at least 1977. In March 1998, information on 5,815 Angelenos was collected. Historically, roughly 5 percent of the population have participated in Aid to Families with Dependent Children/Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (AFDC/TANF), implying a sample size of 250 to 300 CalWORKs participants in each year. Merging two or more years of data will likely be necessary to increase the precision of estimates for CalWORKs participants.

**Outgoing Rotation Groups (ORG) of the CPS**

The ORG files include the answers to the basic questions asked for each of the twelve months, as well as a special set of questions about weekly versus hourly pay that is asked in the fourth and eighth month of survey participation. The questions are asked of the portion of the population that roughly corresponds to wage and salary workers. (Self-employed persons in incorporated businesses are excluded.) The annual sample size is about three times greater than that for any individual month. Therefore, in any given year the number of Angelenos included in the survey is roughly 15,000. Individuals living in Los Angeles County can be identified in the ORGs beginning in 1989, and the latest data available are from 2000.

**School Enrollment Supplement to the CPS**

Since at least 1994, supplementary questions on School Enrollment have been collected in the October round of the CPS. The information includes a detailed set of questions pertaining to school enrollment, including type of school, and school fees. We estimate that roughly 5,000 Angelenos were interviewed in this supplement in each year.

**Voting and Registration Supplement to the CPS**

Every other year since at least 1994, supplementary questions on voting and voter registration have been collected in the November round of the CPS.
This information includes whether each person in the household is registered to vote, whether they voted, and why they did not vote in the recent election. We estimate that roughly 5,000 Angelenos were interviewed in this supplement in each year.

**American Housing Survey (AHS)**

The AHS is conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau to obtain up-to-date housing statistics. The AHS obtains a wide array of information from occupants of homes, including income, detailed housing expenses, household composition, welfare participation, and race. Roughly 3,000 homes in Los Angeles County were interviewed in each year 1980, 1985, 1989, 1995, 1999. Smaller samples, roughly 1,000 homes, were interviewed in 1983, 1987, 1991, 1993, and 1997.

The AHS is described in more detail at http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/ahs.html.

**Decennial Census**

The decennial census in 1970, 1980, and 1990 can currently be used. The 2000 public use microdata are scheduled for release next summer. These data are the best for obtaining estimates of a variety of indicators for narrow geographic areas. However, their usefulness is limited because they are only available every ten years. Estimates from the censuses will in many cases supplement and validate estimates generated from the CPS, which are available on an annual or monthly basis.

**Los Angeles County Health Survey (LACHS)**

LACHS was conducted in 1997 and 1999 by the County’s Department of Health Services. Plans are under way for a third survey to be conducted within the next year. The LACHS is the broadest single source of LTFSS Plan evaluation data because it has questions concerning all five outcome areas, and it is likely to have sample sizes sufficient to calculate reasonably precise estimates for each SPA and SD. The main questionnaire was completed by 8,003 adults in 1997, with 2,363 completing the parent supplement, which is the source of information on parent-child interaction.

A Hispanic origin question by area is asked, followed by a race question with the following major categories (multiple answers are allowed): White, Black,
Asian/Pacific Islander, American Indian/Alaskan Native, and Other. There is a follow up question to specify the origins of Asian/Pacific Islander respondents.

**CalWORKs Transportation Needs Assessment Survey (CTNA)**

CTNA was part of a multifaceted assessment of the transportation needs of Welfare-to-Work participants conducted in 2000 (Urban Research Division, 2000). The study included focus groups on transportation. There were also neighborhood transportation deficiency analyses based on access to transit to available jobs for which participants might qualify. This is a very thorough and informative report on access to transportation in Los Angeles County. The major disadvantage of the CTNA is that the first survey was not done until 2000, and it is uncertain how often the survey will be repeated.

**ADMINISTRATIVE FILES**

The administrative files contain data of two types: (1) events that must be reported by law, such as births, deaths or incidents of child abuse; and; (2) records from program participation, such as persons enrolled in programs to treat mental illness or substance abuse. There are serious problems in determining the prevalence of a behavior in the general population, e.g., domestic violence or substance abuse, from program participation administrative files. Most importantly, not everyone who suffers from, for example, domestic violence or substance abuse, participates in assistance programs. Therefore, changes over time in the indicator can be attributable to changes in underlying prevalence in the general population or changes in program resources, participant recruitment, participant screening, or the composition of program participants. For this reason, we will minimize the use of program participation administrative records as a data source for the indicators. Even some of the administrative files based on mandatory reported events, such as child abuse and domestic violence, are sensitive to social and agency changes in detection, reporting, screening, and disposition standards.

**California Birth Cohort Files**

These files include all live births in California for a calendar year that have been “followed” for one year to determine how many of the infants survived and how many died within their first year of life. These files include infant death data
from death certificates and fetal deaths of 20 weeks or more gestation for that year. The data files are available from the California Center for Health Statistics. RAND expects to receive confidential identifying information—name of child and mother—that will facilitate linking with the MEDS file.

**California Birth Statistical Master File**

These files include all live births in California for a calendar year. Information includes, among other things, the weight of the baby at birth, county of birth, zip code of mother’s residence, and mother’s education, age, and race and ethnicity. The data files are available from the California Center for Health Statistics. RAND expects to receive confidential identifying information—name of child and mother—that will facilitate linking with the MEDS file.

**Medi-Cal Eligibility Data System (MEDS)**

The MEDS is an individual level database that contains information on all Medi-Cal-eligible persons in California. The MEDS contains indicators of the type of assistance, allowing identification of current and former CalWORKs participants. The confidential data, which RAND will attempt to use for the evaluation, includes names of the case (e.g., mother) and the children. Name and age will be crucial for linking these data with administrative files from other sources.

The MEDS file has a lag of a few months before new program participant data and changes in participant status are entered into the file. However, when the database is updated for this lag, it has been found to be good for matching purposes.¹ An alternative to MEDS is the County’s own administrative files on CalWORKs participants. However, with the change to the new LEADER system, it is unclear whether the County data system can be used consistently over time. Furthermore, RAND has extensive expertise with the MEDS files that will be beneficial for the evaluation.

---

¹This statement is based on a phone conversation with Paul Smilanich, Research Program Specialist California Department of Social Services, June 4, 2001. An evaluation of the MEDS data has been conducted by Paul Ong, and this report will be sent to us shortly.
Los Angeles County Department of Children and Family Services (LAC DCFS)

The case management information systems of LAC DCFS provide data on child abuse and neglect, out-of-home placement, and family reunification. These data are indicators for safety and survival and social and emotional well-being outcome areas. Data since 1987 are available; however, there was a conversion to new system in 1997, and data for 1987 through 1995 may require more time to obtain than other years. The department is developing census tract geocoding capabilities. At this time, however, aside from DCFS areas, only city and zip code geocodes are available. Individual identifiers in the DCFS case management system include name, birth date, and mother’s maiden name.

California Department of Social Services (CDSS)

CDSS provides reports since 1990, which can be used for comparisons with LAC, on child abuse and neglect, out-of-home placement, and family reunification. Data are presented by race/ethnicity. County data are the lowest level of geography presented in reports. Individual identifiers in the CDSS case management system include name, birth date, and mother’s maiden name; however, permission is needed to access this data.

However, while the birth and death files have almost 100 percent coverage, the incidence of child abuse and neglect is not as easily determined from administrative files. Trends in these numbers can be affected by shifts in public awareness and by social service activities that affect rates of detection, reporting, screening, investigation, and disposition.

Los Angeles County Probation Department (LAC PROB)

Case management files at LAC PROB contain data on status violations of juvenile probation, not, however, by specific violation in electronic files. Specific violations could not be tabulated without going through hard-copy folders. Electronic case data are archived after two years, and hard-copy folders are purged after five years. Race/ethnicity information is available. Individual identifiers in the PROB case management system include and name, birth date, and mother’s maiden name.
California Department of Justice (CDJ)

Administrative files from the CDJ contain data on arrests for youth violent crimes and domestic violence. State and county data are available, as are data for cities above 100,000 population and law enforcement jurisdictions. Data are available for race/ethnicity. Youth violent crime arrest data are available since 1990, and domestic violence arrest data are available since 1988. Individual identifiers are not available from CDJ, which only receives summary-level data from law enforcement jurisdictions.

California Department of Education (CDE)

Administrative files from the CDE provide information on elementary and secondary school students reading at grade level and on high school graduation. Data on students reading at grade level are available since 1998 and data on students graduating from high school are available since 1992. The educational data are available by race/ethnicity. The data are available at the County and by school attended. However, the school attended may not be the school closest to the student’s home. There are not statewide files with individual identifiers for students graduating from high school. Individual identifiers in reading test files would include individual name and birth date; individual-level files are not readily available.
4. DETAILED ASSESSMENT OF EACH INDICATOR

This section provides an in-depth discussion of each of the 26 indicators. The work reported in this section builds directly on a report by Moreno (1999). The indicator is first defined both conceptually and operationally. That is, what is the general concept that is being captured by the indicator and how, exactly, is the indicator defined? A variety of technical issues influence the usefulness and interpretation of the indicator, and these issues are described. In some cases, the indicator can be measured from more than one source, and when this is the case, it is noted. However, the report also recommends the specific data source that should be targeted for use. Moreover, in most cases, we are proposing to obtain the micro-level data and calculate the estimate of the indicator ourselves. We will not plan to rely on individual agencies to analyze the data for us. When published tabulations are available, we will compare our estimate with these published reports.

Next, the report states the time period over which the indicators can be collected. As described in Section 2, unless costs are prohibitive, we recommend analyzing long time trends. However, the time period listed in this section is the period for which the data are available, which is not necessarily the time period that will be reported in the “baseline report” or the Countywide evaluation report. That decision will not be made until the databases have been obtained and analyzed.

We expect that the focus of the analysis will be Countywide estimates. However, to allow the County to identify problem areas and to better assess the impact of the LTFSS Plan, it is useful to compare the indicators in Los Angeles County with other counties in California and, perhaps, the rest of the United States. Furthermore, it is useful to estimate the indicators for subareas within Los Angeles County, such as SPAs, or SDs. Therefore, the document describes the options for measuring the indicators at various geographic levels.

Finally, certain groups of residents are more likely to be affected by the LTFSS Plan than others. Comparing trends in each indicator for the groups who are likely to be affected with those who are not likely to be affected may be helpful in determining the impact of the LTFSS Plan. Moreover, the analysis may help target services to groups found to have particularly bad outcomes.
Therefore, this section also describes the options for estimating each indicator by the following socioeconomic characteristics: CalWORKs participants, former CalWORKs participants, income, race/ethnicity, and language. Estimates will not be made for interactions of the various groups because of limitations on sample size. For example, although estimates will be calculated for African Americans and for CalWORKs participants, estimates will not be made for African American CalWORKs participants.

The indicators are described in the order they appear in the LTFSS Plan (New Directions Task Force, 1999). We have placed numbers on each indicator to facilitate use of the document. We will explore measuring the indicator “personal behaviors harmful to self or others (domestic violence, child abuse and neglect, substance abuse)” using an index. In the interim, we report the rate of child abuse and neglect alone.

Finally, this section of the report does not indicate the speed at which the indicators can be measured. For example, some indicators must be measured using large, complex data systems and linking information across files. In many cases, this linkage (based on name, age, and other information) has never been conducted. Therefore, the quality of the data that will be generated from this process and the time it will take to conduct the links is difficult to assess at this stage. Therefore, when an indicator is denoted as being “available,” this does not imply that it is available immediately; the measure of “availability” reported in Tables 2.1–2.5 incorporates an estimated amount of time until the indicator can be estimated.

The full analysis in this section is reported in indicator-by-indicator descriptions. For detailed questions about an indicator, these descriptions should be referenced. However, a summary table, Table 4.1, is also provided as a quick-reference tool.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome area/indicator</th>
<th>Years of data currently available</th>
<th>CalWORKs Participants</th>
<th>Former CalWORKs Participants</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Census tract</th>
<th>Zip code</th>
<th>SPA</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Rest of State</th>
<th>Nation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to health care</td>
<td>65-97</td>
<td>M (90-97)</td>
<td>M (80-97)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant mortality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low birth weight births</td>
<td>60-99</td>
<td>M (90-99)</td>
<td>M (80-99)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Births to teens</td>
<td>60-99</td>
<td>M (90-99)</td>
<td>M (80-99)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals without health insurance</td>
<td>80-00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y (97&amp;99)</td>
<td>Y (97&amp;99)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and Survival</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence arrests</td>
<td>88-98</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child placement in out-of-home care</td>
<td>87-99</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile probation violations</td>
<td>90-99</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful reunification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth arrests for violent crimes</td>
<td>90-99</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Well-Being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults employed by quarter</td>
<td>77-00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y (97&amp;99)</td>
<td>Y (97&amp;99)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual income under poverty level</td>
<td>77-99</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y (97&amp;99)</td>
<td>Y (97&amp;99)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of family income used for housing</td>
<td>80,85,89,95,99</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults earning a living wage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelness within prior 24 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Emotional Well-Being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal behaviors harmful to self/others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child abuse and neglect</td>
<td>87-99</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to quality child care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in community activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting and registering to vote</td>
<td>94, 96, 98, &amp; 00</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent-child time together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Workforce Readiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult educational attainment</td>
<td>77-00</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elem/Sec. students reading at grade level</td>
<td>98-99</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teenage high school graduation</td>
<td>90-00</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's educ. attainment at child's birth</td>
<td>60-99</td>
<td>M (90-99)</td>
<td>M (80-99)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS graduation for moms giving birth before HS graduation</td>
<td>94-98</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Y=Yes; N=No; M=Maybe; NA=Not applicable.

Available for recipients of SSI, AFDC/TANF, or other welfare.

Report of availability of data by CalWORKs status, income, race/ethnicity, and language apply to countywide estimates.
1. ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE

We recommend that access to health care be placed on the Data Development Agenda. Therefore, the discussion of this indicator does not follow the format described in the introduction to this section. Information describing potential options for this indicator is provided below.

Several indicators could be used to represent access to health care. One of the most common indicators is health insurance coverage, which is explicitly listed as one of the 26 indicators. Two additional commonly used indicators are having a regular source of care, and receipt of appropriate preventive services. All three of these measures have been used by the Los Angeles County Department of Health Services as indicators of access to health care (L.A. Health Profiles, Los Angeles County Department of Health Services, 1999). Another option, which has been measured by LAC DHS, is parent's ability to obtain needed health care for their children. Yet another option is use of prenatal care, which is reported in the birth master statistical files.

Recommended Data Source(s):

All of the above indicators are available in the LACHS. The preventive services estimated by LAC DHS include receipt of age- and risk-appropriate screening for cervical, breast, and prostate cancer in the past two years. In addition, health insurance coverage is available from the March CPS, as described below.
2. INFANT MORTALITY

Conceptual Definition:
Deaths among infants.

Operational Definition:
Number of babies born alive each year who die within 12 months of birth per 1,000 live births in that year.

Technical Issues:
This indicator is well-measured. However, there is a 3–4 year delay in availability of the data. Currently, the latest available data are for 1997.

Recommended Data Source(s):
Birth cohort file, which is available from California Department of Health Services, Office of Health Information and Research, Vital Statistics Section.

LAC DHS data on births and deaths. The data from the County are similar to the birth cohort data provided by the California Department of Health Services, except that the County data include an indicator for the census tract in which the person lives.


Time Period Available:
Annually from 1965 to 1997.

Geography:
Countywide:
Available.

Sub-county:
Available for SPA, SDs, zip code, and census tract. LAC DHS data on births and deaths allow estimates by census tract, although these data may not be available as far back as 1960.

Rest of State/Rest of Nation:
Available for rest of State and nation as a whole.

CalWORKs Status:
Not readily available. In principle, available by linking the birth cohort file to the MEDS, which contains information on each family receiving CalWORKs. However, these estimates can only be made from 1990 onward because the MEDS is not available before 1990.

**Former CalWORKs:**
Not readily available. In principle, available by linking the birth cohort file to the MEDS, which contains information on each family receiving CalWORKs. However, these estimates can only be made from 1990 onward because the MEDS is not available before 1990.

**Income:**
Not available. However, the mother’s highest grade completed is contained in the birth cohort file, and we can explore the possibility of calculating estimates by education level. Women with relatively few years of education are much more likely to use LTFSS Plan services.

**Race/Ethnicity:**
Available. Hispanic, White, Black, Asian/Pacific Islanders. (Additional detail is available, but samples may be too small.)

**Language:**
Not available.

**Alternative Data Source(s):**
None.

**Data Source Contact(s):**
California Department of Health Services, Office of Health Information and Research, Vital Statistics Section, 916-445-6355.

Los Angeles County Department of Health Services, Larry Portigal, http://lapublichealth.org

3. LOW BIRTHWEIGHT BIRTHS

Conceptual Definition:
Infants born weighing less than 2500 grams.

Operational Definition:
Number of babies born alive each year who weigh less than 2,500 grams per 1,000 live births per year.

Technical Issues:
This indicator is well-measured.

Recommended Data Source(s):
Birth statistical master file, which is available from California Department of Health Services, Office of Health Information and Research, Vital Statistics Section.

LAC DHS data on births. The data from the County are similar to the birth statistical master file provided by the California Department of Health Services, except that the County data includes an indicator for the census tract in which the person lives.

U.S. Department of Health, National Center for Health Statistics. Source of data for national data.

Time Period Available:
Annually from 1960 to 1999.

Geography:
Countywide:
Available.

Sub-county:
Available for SPA, SDs, zip code, and census tract. LAC DHS data on births and deaths allow estimates by census tract, although these data may not be available as far back as 1960.

Rest of State/Rest of Nation:
Available for rest of State and nation as a whole.

CalWORKs Status:
Not readily available. In principle, available by linking the birth statistical master file to the MEDS, which contains information on each family receiving CalWORKs. However, these estimates can only be made from 1990 onward because the MEDS is not available before 1990.

**Former CalWORKs:**
Not readily available. In principle, available by linking the birth statistical master file to the MEDS, which contains information on each family receiving CalWORKs. However, these estimates can only be made from 1990 onward because the MEDS is not available before 1990.

**Income:**
Not available. However, the mother’s highest grade completed is contained in the birth cohort file, and we can explore the possibility of calculating estimates by education level. Women with relatively few years of education are much more likely to use LTFSS Plan services.

**Race/Ethnicity:**
Available. Hispanic, White, Black, Asian/Pacific Islanders. (Additional detail is available, but samples may be too small.)

**Language:**
Not available.

**Alternative Data Source(s):**
None.

**Data Source Contact(s):**
California Department of Health Services, Office of Health Information and Research, Vital Statistics Section, 916-445-6355.


4. BIRTH TO TEENS

Conceptual Definition:
Births to women age 10–17 years old.

Operational Definition:
Number of live births to women 10–17 years old per 1,000 women 10–17 years old.

Technical Issues:
This indicator will require estimation of the numerator (live births to women 10–17 years old) and denominator (number of women 10–17 years old) from different data sources. Accurate estimates of the number of live births to women 10–17 years old can be obtained. Estimates of the number of women 10–17 can be obtained for the County as a whole, but estimates for subgroups—e.g., SPAs, CalWORKs participants—are not as precise.

Recommended Data Source(s):
For the numerator, live births to women 10-17 years old: Birth statistical master file, which is available from California Department of Health Services, Office of Health Information and Research, Vital Statistics Section.

The source of denominator population estimates at the County level is the LAC CAO Urban Research Section, which prepares its County-level estimates based on the decennial censuses, vital records, school enrollments, and the CPS.

U.S. Department of Health, National Center for Health Statistics.

Time Period Available:
Annually from 1960 to 1999.

Geography:
Countywide:
Available.

Sub-county:
The number of births to women 10–17 years old (i.e., the numerator) can be calculated for the County, SPAs, SDs, zip codes, and census tracts, although these data may not be available as far back as 1960.

The number of women 10–17 years old in each year by SPA, SD, and census tract (i.e., the denominator) are available for 1990 and 2000 from the censuses. But intercensal estimates would need to be based on interpolation methods, which would induce measurement error that would reduce the accuracy of the estimates.

**Rest of State/Rest of Nation:**
Available for rest of the State and for the nation as a whole.

**CalWORKs Status:**
Not readily available. In principle, available by linking the birth statistical master file to the MEDS, which contains information on each family receiving CalWORKs. Linking would be based on the name and birth date of the mother and child. The linked data would provide an estimate of the number of live births to CalWORKs participants 10–17 years old. An estimate of the number of CalWORKs participants who are 10–17 years old would be obtained from MEDS. However, these estimates can only be made from 1990 onward because the MEDS is not available before 1990.

We will also explore the possibility of using the MEDS to estimate teen births directly. That is, presumably virtually all women who are on CalWORKs before having another child remain enrolled after birth. We can use the MEDS to identify teenagers who are receiving aid in their own name and then have a newborn added to the assistance unit. RAND is currently using this approach in related work.

It is also important to distinguish between women who were enrolled in CalWORKs in the month they had the baby versus in the few months after birth. In principle, the information should be contained in the linked files to investigate this factor.
**Former CalWORKs:**

Not readily available. In principle, available by linking the birth statistical master file to the MEDS, which contains information on each family receiving CalWORKs. Linking would be based on the name and birth date of the mother and child. The linked data would provide an estimate of the number of live births to CalWORKs participants 10–17 years old. An estimate of the number of CalWORKs participants who are 10–17 years old would be obtained from MEDS. However, the MEDS are only available from roughly 1990 onward, which limits the time period for which this analysis can be conducted. For example, consider a 15-year-old female who had a baby in 2001 and who was on aid when she herself was 0–2 years old. To know that she was a former CalWORKs participant, we would need access to MEDS data back to at least 1988, when she was 2 years old. These data are not available. One option is to limit the analysis to women who were former CalWORKs participants at older ages, say 10 and older.

**Income:**

Not available. However, the mother’s highest grade completed is contained in the birth cohort file, and we can explore the possibility of calculating estimates by education level. Women with relatively few years of education are much more likely to use LTFSS Plan services.

**Race/Ethnicity:**

Race (e.g., White, Black, Asian/Pacific Islander) and ethnicity (Hispanic) is reported on the birth statistical master file, allowing estimation of the number of births to women 10–17 years old by racial group (i.e., the numerator). The number of women 10–17 years old in each racial group (i.e., the denominator) can be estimated using the CPS. However, the comparability of reports of racial and ethnic identity in the CPS and the birth statistical master file must be examined. Moreover, the estimates of the number of women 10–17 years old within racial/ethnic groups will be measured with greater error than the estimates of all women regardless of race/ethnicity.

**Language:**

Not available.

**Alternative Data Source(s):**
None.

Data Source Contact(s):
California Department of Health Services, Office of Health Information and Research, Vital Statistics Section, 916-445-6355.


5. INDIVIDUALS WITHOUT HEALTH INSURANCE

**Conceptual Definition:**
Individuals without insurance that provides medical care or reimbursement for medical care

**Operational Definition:**
Proportion of people without health insurance.

**Technical Issues:**
This indicator is relatively well-measured using survey data. It should be noted that even though health insurance may be an important factor influencing appropriate treatment and care, it is not a direct measure of well-being and health. Many people in good health do not have health insurance, and many people with health insurance are in bad health.

**Recommended Data Source(s):**


**Time Period Available:**
Annually from 1980 to 2000.

**Geography:**

**Countywide:**
Available.

**Sub-county:**
Estimates for SPAs and SDs can be obtained using the LACHS, although the sample sizes are not large.

**Rest of State/Rest of Nation:**
Available for rest of State and rest of nation using the March CPS.

**CalWORKs Status:**
Available. Both the March CPS and the LACHS ask respondents whether they participate in CalWORKs, which will allow estimation of health insurance status for individuals on CalWORKs. However, in almost all years of the analysis, CalWORKs participants are eligible for MediCal, which implies 100 percent coverage for this population.

**Former CalWORKs:**
Not available in the March CPS or the 1997 LACHS. The 1999 LACHS asks whether the person has participated in CalWORKs since 1998. Combined with the respondent's answer to the question pertaining to their current participation in CalWORKs, the survey allows identification of people who were on aid in the past year but who were not on aid at the time of the survey, i.e., welfare terminators. However, this sample is likely to be quite small.

**Income:**
Available. Both the March CPS and the LACHS ask respondents their income, which will allow estimation of health insurance status for people of different income levels.

**Race/Ethnicity:**
Available. Hispanic, White, Black, Asian/Pacific Islander.

**Language:**
Limited availability. The LACHS was offered in English, Spanish, Mandarin, Cantonese, Korean, and Vietnamese. Therefore, health insurance coverage can be estimated separately for groups who requested interviews in each of these languages in 1997 and 1999.

**Alternative Data Source(s):**
None.

**Data Source Contact(s):**

LACHS: Los Angeles County Department of Health Services, Paul Simon, Director, Office of Health Assessment and Epidemiology.
6. DOMESTIC VIOLENCE ARRESTS

Conceptual Definition:
Physical violence and intimidation between spouses and cohabitants.

Operational Definition:
Arrests for domestic violence per 100,000 population per year.

Technical Issues:
Domestic violence is underreported to law enforcement authorities. Differential rates of reporting, arrests, charges, convictions and sentencing over time and by socioeconomic group may bias law-enforcement-based measures of domestic violence. Although reported victimization from survey data would be preferable to law enforcement data, we do not have survey data with a sufficient timeline to use in the current evaluation. The data source provides aggregate level reports that do not permit matching with other files and other individual level analyses.

Recommended Data Source(s):
California Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics Center. The strength of this data source is that Countywide data from 1988 onward are available in an annual report. A disadvantage is that the County data in the annual reports are not broken down by age, race/ethnicity, and sex of perpetrators. Race/ethnicity data are available at the State level in the annual reports; County-level race/ethnicity data would require special tabulation request.

U.S. Department of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service.

The source of denominator population estimates at the County level is the LAC CAO Urban Research Section, which prepares its County-level estimates based on the decennial censuses, vital records, school enrollments and the CPS The source of denominator population estimates at the State and federal levels is the Bureau of the Census.

Time Period Available:

Geography:
Countywide:
Available.

Sub-county:
Not available.

Rest of State/Rest of Nation:
Available for rest of State, but not the rest of the nation.

CalWORKs Status:
Not available.

Former CalWORKs:
Not available.

Income:
Not available.

Race/Ethnicity:
Available. Hispanic, White, Black, Asian/Pacific Islander, and American Indian/Alaskan Native. (Additional detail is available, but statistically reliable rates cannot be calculated for smaller subcategories.)

Language:
Not available.

Alternative Data Source(s):
The LAC District Attorney’s Office (DAO) handles 100 percent of County’s domestic violence felony complaint charge filings. The disadvantage of this source is that it omits non-felony charges and arrests for which charges were not filed. The DAO data could be analyzed separately by age, race/ethnicity, and sex of victims and perpetrator. Zip code by location of incident is available. Matching CalWORKs participants to DAO filings to determine participants who are domestic violence victims is not practical because victims have the right to request anonymity, and it is necessary to go through the hard case files to determine if anonymity has been requested. The names of alleged perpetrators are public record, and it may be possible to identify CalWORKs families experiencing domestic violence by matching on the perpetrator information. The CalWORKs files would probably underreport coinhabitants, and, therefore, the match on perpetrators would underreport domestic violence.

Data Source Contact(s):
California Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics Center, http://caaq.state.ca.us/cjsc/.


Pam Booth, LAC District Attorney’s Office, 213.974.3785.
7. CHILD PLACEMENT IN OUT-OF-HOME CARE

Conceptual Definition:
Removal of children from their parents' or related caretaker's homes and temporary or permanent placement in another living situation.

Operational Definition:
Child placements in out-of-home care per 1000 persons under the age of 18. Out-of-home care refers to living outside of the home of the parent or related caretaker.

Technical Issues:
A decline in child placement in out-of-home care rates is not a desirable outcome if it results from a decline in the detection and substantiation of actual child abuse and neglect. Differential rates of reporting, screening, and disposition over time and by socioeconomic group may bias measures of child placement in out-of-home care. The state and federal data sources provide aggregate level reports that do not permit matching with other files and other individual level analyses.

Recommended Data Source(s):
LAC DCFS. Data since 1987 should be available in LAC DCFS management information system files. Because there was a conversion to a new system in 1997, data from 1987 through 1995 data may be more difficult to access.

California Department of Social Services. Source of California data for comparisons with LAC.


Time Period Available:
Annually since 1987.

Geography:
Countywide:
Available.

Sub-county:
SPA and SD boundaries may be approximated from LAC DCFS zip code data. DCFS is developing capacity to geocode cases to census tract.

**Rest of State/Rest of Nation:**
Available for rest of State.

**CalWORKs Status:**
Not readily available. In principle, available by linking DCFS files with MEDS files.

**Former CalWORKs:**
Not readily available. In principle, available by linking DCFS files with MEDS files.

**Income:**
Not available.

**Race/Ethnicity:**
Available. Hispanic, White, Black, Asian/Pacific Islander, and American Indian/Alaskan Native. (Additional detail is available, but statistically reliable rates cannot be calculated for smaller subcategories.)

**Language:**
Available.

**Alternative Data Source(s):**
None.

**Data Source Contact(s):**
California Department of Social Services,
8. JUVENILE PROBATION VIOLATIONS

Conceptual Definition:
Violations of conditions of probation ordered by Juvenile Court, for example, school attendance or drug testing.

Operational Definition:
Violations per 1000 juvenile probationers per year.

Technical Issues:
Specific violations could not be tabulated without going through hard-copy folders. Electronic case data are archived after two years and hard-copy folders are purged after five years.

Recommended Data Source(s):
LAC Probation Department. Source of County-level data by race/ethnicity.

Time Period Available:
Annually from 1999 onward.

Geography:
Countywide:
Not currently reported, but might be able to be produced by LAC Probation Department.

Sub-county:
Not currently reported by SPA, SD, or zip code, but might be able to be produced by LAC Probation Department using zip code geocodes.

Rest of State/Rest of Nation:
Not available.

CalWORKs Status:
Not readily available.

Former CalWORKs:
Not readily available.

Income:
Not available.

Race/Ethnicity:
Available. Hispanic, White, Black, Asian/Pacific Islander, and American Indian/Alaskan Native. (Additional detail is available, but statistically reliable rates cannot be calculated for smaller subcategories.)

Language:
Not available.

Alternative Data Source(s):
None.

Data Source Contact(s):
Celso De La Paz, Chief of Research, Probation Department, 562.940.2616, cdelapaz@probation.co.la.ca.us.
9. SUCCESSFUL MINOR/FAMILY REUNIFICATION AFTER OUT-OF-HOME PLACEMENT

We recommend that access to health care be placed on the Data Development Agenda. The information we have gathered about this indicator is reported below.

Existing reports are very limited for Los Angeles County. Estimates for two cohorts -- 1993 and 1998 -- were conducted, but the estimates are not comparable. State and national data have gaps, and the national data prior to 1996 are estimates based on less than half of the children who are actually in care.

The measure assumes reliable monitoring over time of the success of minor/family reunifications. If monitoring became less stringent, unsuccessful reunifications would be less likely to be detected. The measure also will be sensitive to changes in the characteristics of cases involving out-of-home placements. If less serious cases began to be referred to out-of-home placements, reunification would be more likely. Similarly, if fewer cases with a higher threat threshold were referred to out-of-home care, reunification would be less likely.

The data that are available can be obtained from the Los Angeles County, Department of Child and Family Services. Contact person is Joy Russell, Chief, Management Information Systems, 562.497.3351 and Cecilia Custodio, Analyst, Management Information Systems, 562.497.3364.

Data for California can be obtained from the California Department of Social Services,

10. YOUTH ARRESTS FOR VIOLENT CRIMES

Conceptual Definition:
Violent crimes committed by persons under the age of 18.

Operational Definition:
Youth arrests per 100,000 youths per year for homicide, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, or kidnapping. Youths are persons under the age of 18. These arrests do not necessarily result in complaint filings and convictions; these events happen after the arrests and are not available.

Technical Issues:
Differential rates of reporting, arrests, charges, convictions and sentencing over time and by socioeconomic group may bias law enforcement-based measures of youth violence. The data source provides aggregate level reports that do not permit matching with other files and other individual level analyses.

Recommended Data Source(s):
California Department of Justice Criminal Justice Statistics Center. Countywide data by age and sex are available from 1990 onward in an annual report. Race/ethnicity data are available at the State level in the annual reports; county-level race/ethnicity data would require a special tabulation request.


The source of denominator population estimates at the County level is the LAC CAO Urban Research Section, which prepares its County-level estimates based on the decennial censuses, vital records, school enrollments and the CPS. The source of denominator population estimates at the State and federal levels is the Bureau of the Census.

Time Period Available:
Annually from 1990 to 1999.
Geography:

Countywide:
Available.

Sub-county:
Not available.

Rest of State/Rest of Nation:
Rest of State, but not available for rest of nation.

CalWORKs Status:
Not Available.

Former CalWORKs:
Not Available.

Income:
Not Available.

Race/Ethnicity:
Might be available: Hispanic, White, Black, Asian/Pacific Islander, and American Indian/Alaskan Native. (Additional detail is available, but statistically reliable rates cannot be calculated for smaller subcategories.)

Language:
Not Available.

Alternative Data Source(s):
LAC Sheriff's Department and city police departments.

Data Source Contact(s):
California Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics Center, http://justice.hdcdojnet.state.ca.us/cjsc_stats/prof99/19/3C.htm.

11. ADULTS EMPLOYED BY QUARTER

Conceptual Definition:
Adults working for wages, salary or profit.

Operational Definition:
Proportion of adults 18–61 not in school who are employed.

Technical Issues:
This indicator can be measured relatively well. However, some people choose not to work; even if they had a job opportunity, they would not accept it. An alternative measure that does not suffer from this problem is the unemployment rate. The unemployment rate is defined as the ratio of the number of people not employed and looking for work to the number of people employed or looking for work.

Recommended Data Source(s):
March and monthly CPS, from (at least) 1977 to 2000.

California MediCal Eligibility Data System (MEDS) linked to the California Employment Development Department (EDD) "base wage" file, from roughly 1990 to 2000.

Time Period Available:
Quarterly from at least 1977 to 2000.

Geography:

Countywide:
Available.

Sub-county:

Rest of State/Rest of Nation:
Available for rest of State and rest of nation.

CalWORKs Status:
Available. The March CPS can be used to estimate this indicator in each year separately for individuals receiving CalWORKs. Alternatively, one can use a data set that links the MEDS to the EDD “base wage” file, which indicates whether a person received earnings from a firm that is covered
by the Unemployment Insurance system. However, informal employment, which may be common among CalWORKs participants, is not included in the “base wage” file.

**Former CalWORKs:**

Potentially available. The MEDS-EDD linked data would allow one to estimate employment among former CalWORKs participants.

**Income:**

Available using the March CPS.

**Race/Ethnicity:**

Available in the March CPS. Hispanic, White, Black, Asian/Pacific Islander.

**Language:**

Not available.

**Alternative Data Source(s):**

None.

**Data Source Contact(s):**

**CPS:** Bureau of Labor Statistics,


**MEDS:** State of California, Department of Social Services.
12. ANNUAL INCOME UNDER POVERTY LEVEL

Conceptual Definition:
People living in poverty.

Operational Definition:
Proportion of people living in families with income under the federal poverty threshold.

Technical Issues:
This indicator is relatively well-measured. The current standard Census Bureau procedures for calculating poverty will be used, including the exclusion of taxes (e.g., the Earned Income Tax Credit, EITC) and in-kind benefits (e.g., Food Stamps).

Recommended Data Source(s):
Annual March CPS, from at least 1977 to 2000.


Time Period Available:
Annually from at least 1977 to 1999.

Geography:
Countywide:
Available.

Sub-county:

Rest of State/Rest of Nation:
Available for rest of State and rest of nation.

CalWORKs Status:
Available using the March CPS and censuses.

Former CalWORKs:
Not available.

Income:
Not relevant.

Race/Ethnicity:
Available. Hispanic, White, Black, Asian/Pacific Islander.
Language:
Available for 1980 and 1990. The 1980 and 1990 censuses ask the respondents the language they speak most often at home, which would allow estimation of poverty status for individuals whose most common language is not English.

Alternative Data Source(s):
None.

Data Source Contact(s):
Bureau of Labor Statistics,
13. ACCESS TO TRANSPORTATION

This indicator will be placed on the Data Development Agenda. We provide some information about potential data sources and measures for consideration.

Data on access to adequate transportation are scarce. The LAC CAO Urban Research Division issued in November 2000 an assessment of transportation needs of the County's welfare-to-work participants. The assessment was based on a survey, focus groups, and neighborhood deficiencies in transportation versus proximity to work. An update of that assessment is in the planning stages. The LACHS includes a question on transportation as a barrier to having a regular place to go when sick and a second question on transportation as a barrier to obtaining health services for children. We believe that the best data are from the LACHS because it has data from two years prior to the adoption of the LTFSS Plan and is being repeated biennially. The LACHS sample can also provide estimates at the SPA and SD level, although the estimates are less precise than the Countywide estimates.
14. PERCENT OF FAMILY INCOME USED FOR HOUSING

Conceptual Definition:
Amount of housing costs relative to income.

Operational Definition:
Among all people, the ratio of average family spending on housing to average family income.

Technical Issues:
This indicator is relatively well-measured. Housing costs will include electricity, gas, fuel oil, garbage and trash, water and sewage, real estate taxes, property insurance, condo fees, land or site rent, rent, mortgage payments, and other charges. Family income includes income from all sources, including cash transfers.

Recommended Data Source(s):

Time Period Available:

Geography:
Countywide:
Available.

Sub-county:
Not available.

Rest of State/Rest of Nation:
Available for rest of State and rest of nation.

CalWORKs Status:
Not available. However, this indicator can be reported for people receiving SSI, CalWORKs, or other welfare; CalWORKs cannot be broken out by itself.

Former CalWORKs:
Not available.

Income:
Available.
Race/Ethnicity:
    Available. Hispanic, White, Black, Asian/Pacific Islander.

Language:
    Not available.

Alternative Data Source(s):
    None.

Data Source Contact(s):
15. ADULTS EARNING A LIVING WAGE

This indicator will be placed on the Data Development Agenda. Data on hourly wages is available from the Current Population Survey. However, the definition of “living wage” must be established. We provide some information about potential data sources and measures for consideration.

**Conceptual Definition:**
Adults earning a living wage.

**Operational Definition:**
Percent of employed people 18–61 who earn an hourly wage of a specified level.

**Technical Issues:**
Note that we assume that the denominator is the number of adults who have a job, not all adults.

**Recommended Data Source(s):**
Outgoing Rotation Group (ORG) of the CPS, 1989 to 2000.


**Time Period Available:**
Annually from roughly 1989 to 2000.

**Geography:**

**Countywide:**
Available.

**Sub-county:**
Not available.

**Rest of State/Rest of Nation:**
Available for rest of State and rest of nation.

**CalWORKs Status:**
Not available.

**Former CalWORKs:**
Not available.

**Income:**
Available. The ORG does not ask respondents their total income. However, the March CPS does, and it also includes information to calculate hourly wages. However, the sample sizes in the March survey are roughly one-third the size of the sample sizes in the ORG; therefore, the estimates will be measured with greater error.

**Race/Ethnicity:**
Available. Hispanic, White, Black, Asian/Pacific Islander.

**Language:**
Not available.

**Alternative Data Source(s):**
None.

**Data Source Contact(s):**
March CPS: Bureau of Labor Statistics,

Outgoing Rotation Group CPS,
16. HOMELESS WITHIN PRIOR 24 MONTHS

This indicator has been placed on the Data Development Agenda. We provide some information about potential data sources and measures for consideration.

Homelessness is extremely difficult to measure. Perhaps the best option is to use a survey of people living in houses who are asked whether they have been homeless within the past several years. For example, the LACHS asks respondents if they have been homeless in the past 5 years. This approach has been used effectively in a number of studies. However, this method will lead to an underestimate of homelessness because the people who are homeless at the time of the survey will not be captured. In sum, we feel that the challenges of estimating this indicator accurately over time are insurmountable.
17. PERSONAL BEHAVIOR HARMFUL TO SELF OR OTHERS: INDEX

Conceptual Definition:
Prevalence of behaviors that are harmful to one’s self or others.

Operational Definition:
Currently the measure is being reported using the rate of child abuse and neglect, defined as children abused or neglected per 1000 children per year substantiated by the LAC DCFS. However, for future reports we are exploring the use of an index of three behaviors that are harmful to one’s self or others, domestic violence, substance abuse, and child abuse and neglect. The information below is for the measure, as it will be reported initially.

Technical Issues:
A decline in child abuse and neglect rates is not a desirable outcome if it results from a decline in the detection and substantiation of actual child abuse and neglect. Differential rates of reporting, screening, and disposition over time and by socioeconomic group may bias measures of child abuse and neglect. The data sources for state and national statistics provide aggregate level reports that do not permit matching with other files and other individual level analyses.

Recommended Data Source(s):
LAC DCFS. Data since 1987 should be available in LAC DCFS management information system files. Because there was a conversion to new system in 1997, data from 1987 through 1995 data may be more difficult to access.

California Department of Social Services. Source of California data for comparisons with LAC.
http://www.dss.cahwnet.gov/research/childrensprograms/Publications.htm

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families (DHHS-ACF) is the source of national data from 1990 through 1999.
The source of denominator population estimates at the County level is the LAC CAO Urban Research Section which prepares its County level estimates based on the decennial censuses, vital records, school enrollments and the CPS. The source of population estimates for the State and national levels is the Bureau of the Census.

**Time Period Available:**
Available since 1987.

**Geography:**

- **Countywide:**
  Available.

- **Sub-county:**
  SPA and SD boundaries may be approximated from LAC DCFS zip code data. DCFS is developing capacity to geocode cases to census tract.

- **Rest of State/Rest of Nation:**
  Available.

**CalWORKs Status:**
Not readily available. In principle, available from DCFS files matched to MEDS files.

**Former CalWORKs:**
Not readily available. In principle, available from DCFS files matched to MEDS files.

**Income:**
Not available.

**Race/Ethnicity:**
Available. Hispanic, White, Black, Asian/Pacific Islander, and American Indian/Alaskan Native. (Additional detail is available, but statistically reliable rates cannot be calculated for smaller subcategories.)

**Language:**
Not available.

**Alternative Data Source(s):**
None.

**Data Source Contact(s):**

18. ACCESS TO QUALITY CHILD CARE

This indicator has been placed on the Data Development Agenda. We provide some information about potential data sources and measures for consideration.

Determining whether child care or early childhood educational programs are of good quality is difficult. One criterion that can be used is whether the provider is licensed, but this is a simple dichotomy that assumes all licensed providers are good and all unlicensed providers are not. A second criterion that can be used is parental satisfaction. The satisfaction question is not specifically asked in terms of quality of care. Negative answers could reflect attitudes about lack of convenience or affordability. Moreover, even if “quality” child care could be defined, it is unclear how “access” should be defined.
19. PARTICIPATION IN COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES

Conceptual Definition
Extent to which the population is engaged in activities within their communities.

Operational Definition:
1. Percent of voting age population who voted in the November election.
2. Percent of voting age population who were registered to vote in the November election.
3. Percent of registered voters who voted in the November election.

Technical Issues:
This indicator has not been defined by the Evaluation Design Work Group. There are a large number of ways in which individuals can participate in community activities. One definition that the County has proposed and is measurable is voting and registration; we list three candidate definitions above. However, it should be noted that undocumented immigrants are not eligible to vote, yet they may participate in community activities.

Recommended Data Source(s):
Voting and Registration Supplements to the CPS.

Time Period Available:

Geography:
Countywide:
Available.

Sub-county:
Not available.

Rest of State/Rest of Nation:
Available for rest of State and rest of nation.

CalWORKs Status:
Not available.

Former CalWORKs:
Not available.
Not available. However, estimates can be calculated by education level, which is strongly related to income. People with relatively few years of education are much more likely to use LTFSS Plan services than are people with few years of education.

**Race/Ethnicity:**
Available. Hispanic, White, Black, Asian/Pacific Islander.

**Language:**
Not available.

**Alternative Data Source(s):**
None.

**Data Source Contact(s):**
Bureau of Labor Statistics,
20. PARENT-CHILD TIME TOGETHER

This indicator has been placed on the Data Development Agenda. The only data source currently known to estimate this indicator, the LACHS, does not measure the concept consistently over time.
21. ADULT ATTAINMENT OF A HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA, GED, OR 8TH GRADE READING LEVEL

Conceptual Definition:
Adults who attained basic education, knowledge/skills in adulthood.

Operational Definition:
Proportion of people 18 and older who have completed high school or a General Education Degree.

Technical Issues:
There is very little information on the reading ability of the adult population; therefore, we propose that the indicator measure completion of a high school degree or a GED.

Recommended Data Source(s):

March CPS for CalWORKs status and income.

Time Period Available:
Annually from at least 1977 to 2000.

Geography:
Countywide:
Available.

Sub-county:
Not available.

Rest of State/Rest of Nation:
Available for rest of State and rest of nation.

CalWORKs Status:
Available using the March CPS. We will also explore using administrative data on CalWORKS participants.

Former CalWORKs:
Not available.

Income:
Available using the March CPS.

Race/Ethnicity:
Available. Hispanic, White, Black, Asian/Pacific Islander.
Language:
   Not available.
Alternative Data Source(s):
   None.
Data Source Contact(s):
   Monthly CPS: Bureau of Labor Statistics,

   March CPS: Bureau of Labor Statistics,
22. ELEMENTARY/SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS READING AT GRADE LEVEL

Conceptual Definition:
Performance at 50 percent for grade on nationally standardized tests.

Operational Definition:
Percentage of elementary and secondary students (grades 2–11) performing at median for grade in the California Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) program.

Technical Issues:
Students with test-taking disabilities may not have their reading level accurately assessed. There may be cultural biases in the STAR tests that would affect the performance of students by socioeconomic status or English fluency. The data source provides aggregate level reports that do not permit matching with other files and other individual level analyses.

Recommended Data Source(s):
California Department of Education.

Time Period Available:
Annually beginning in 1998.

Geography:
Countywide:
Available.

Sub-county:
Available. SPAs and SDs could be approximated by zip code of school attended. However, errors would be introduced by students attending school outside of the normal school attendance boundary.

Rest of State/Rest of Nation:
Available for rest of State, but not for rest of nation.

CalWORKs Status:
Not available.

Former CalWORKs:
Not available.

Income:
Available only by “economically disadvantaged” versus “not economically disadvantaged” dichotomy based on participation in Title I and Title VII programs.

**Race/Ethnicity:**
Available: Hispanic, White, Black, Asian/Pacific Islander, and American Indian/Alaskan Native. (Additional detail is available, but statistically reliable rates cannot be calculated for smaller subcategories.)

**Language:**
Available. English-only, fluent English, limited English proficient.

**Alternative Data Source(s):**
None.

**Data Source Contact(s):**
23. TEENAGE HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION

Conceptual Definition:
Percentage of students entering high school who graduate within 4 years.

Operational Definition:
Ratio of the number of high school graduates to the number of ninth graders three years previous.

Technical Issues:
This measure is susceptible to errors caused by migration in and out of the County. The number of students enrolled in ninth grade is an overestimate of the number of students entering ninth grade because some ninth graders were held back and not allowed to progress to tenth grade. RAND would not receive the individual-level data; we would receive aggregate level reports.

Recommended Data Source(s):
California Department of Education, Educational Demographics Office

Time Period Available:

Geography:
Countywide:
Available.

Sub-county:
Not available.

Rest of State/Rest of Nation:
Available for rest of state and nation.

CalWORKs Status:
Not available.

Former CalWORKs:
Not available.

Income:
Not available.

Race/Ethnicity:
Available.

Language:
Not available.

**Alternative Data Source(s):**
 None.

**Data Source Contact(s):**
 California Department of Education, Educational Demographics Office,
 [http://www.cde.ca.gov/demographics](http://www.cde.ca.gov/demographics).
24. MOTHER’S EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT AT CHILD’S BIRTH

Conceptual Definition:
Educational attainment of new mothers.

Operational Definition:
Average years of education among women giving birth in each year.

Technical Issues:
The data that will be used is the birth statistical master file. Although education is reported by the mother on the birth certificate (which is the source of these data), the quality of the information on education has not been examined extensively.

Recommended Data Source(s):
Birth statistical master file, which is available from California Department of Health Services, Office of Health Information and Research, Vital Statistics Section.

LAC DHS data on births. The data from the County are similar to the birth statistical master file provided by the California Department of Health Services, except that the County data includes an indicator for the census tract in which the person lives.

U.S. Department of Health, National Center for Health Statistics, is the source of the national data.

Time Period Available:
Annually from 1960 to 1999.

Geography:
Countywide:
Available.

Sub-county:
Available for SPA, SDs, zip code, and census tract. LAC DHS data on births and deaths allow estimates by census tract, although these data may not be available as far back as 1960.

Rest of State/Rest of Nation:
Available for rest of State and nation as a whole.
CalWORKs Status:
Not readily available. In principle, available by linking the birth statistical master file to the MEDS, which contains information on each family receiving CalWORKs. Linking will be based on the birth date and name of the mother. However, these estimates can only be made from 1990 onward because the MEDS is not available before 1990.

Former CalWORKs:
Not readily available. In principle, available by linking the birth statistical master file to the MEDS, which contains information on each family receiving CalWORKs. Linking will be based on the birth date and name of the mother. However, these estimates can only be made from 1990 onward because the MEDS is not available before 1990.

Income:
Not available.

Race/Ethnicity:
Available. Hispanic, White, Black, Asian/Pacific Islanders. (Additional detail is available, but samples may be too small.)

Language:
Not available.

Alternative Data Source(s):
None.

Data Source Contact(s):
California Department of Health Services, Office of Health Information and Research, Vital Statistics Section. 916-445-6355.


25. HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION AMONG MOTHERS WHO GAVE BIRTH BEFORE GRADUATING FROM HIGH SCHOOL

This indicator has been placed on the Data Development Agenda. We are unaware of any data that will allow estimation of this indicator.
26. ADULT PARTICIPATION IN EDUCATION OR VOCATIONAL TRAINING

Conceptual Definition:
Adults enhancing their human capital by participating in education or vocational training.

Operational Definition:
Percent of people 18–45 years old who are enrolled in education or vocational training.

Technical Issues:
The County must decide what constitutes an "adult" for the purposes of measuring this indicator. Conceptually, one may be concerned about the ability of people to return to school if needed. Older adults are less likely to return to work in part because they are approaching retirement. Therefore, it may be best to limit the age range to people no older than, say, 45 years old.

Recommended Data Source(s):
Annual School Enrollment Supplement to the CPS.

Time Period Available:
Annually from at least 1994 through 1998.

Geography:
Countywide:
Available.

Sub-county:
Not available.

Rest of State/Rest of Nation:
Available for rest of State and rest of nation.

CalWORKs Status:
Not available.

Former CalWORKs:
Not available.

Income:
Not available. However, estimates can be calculated by education level, which is strongly related to income. People with relatively few years of
education are much more likely to use LTFSS Plan services than are people with more years of education.

**Race/Ethnicity:**
Available. Hispanic, White, Black, Asian/Pacific Islander.

**Language:**
Not available.

**Alternative Data Source(s):**
None.

**Data Source Contact(s):**
Bureau of Labor Statistics,
http://www.bls.census.gov/cps/school/scenmain.htm,
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