

Cradle-to-Career Ad Hoc Committee Scope: Advisory Board Review Packet

Purpose

The Advisory Board Nomination Ad Hoc Committee shall assist the Cradle-to-Career (C2C) Governing Board by working with the Office of Cradle-to-Career Office staff to develop a slate of candidates for each of the two advisory committees. The ad hoc committee shall assist in filling vacancies as needed.

Membership

The Advisory Board Ad Hoc Committee shall consist of C2C Governing Board members. The C2C Governing Board Chair will serve as liaison to the C2C Staff.

Background

The Governing Board established the Advisory Board Ad Hoc Committee unanimously at its February 22, 2022 Governing Board Meeting. In creating the ad hoc committee, the Governing Board recognized the importance of recruiting diverse Advisory Board members with an expertise in equity, and a structured application process will be helpful in surfacing the strengths of individuals who would like to serve on the advisory boards.

The Governing Board provides oversight of the data system and high-level operational direction to the Office of Cradle-to-Career and considers recommendations from two advisory boards:

- Data and Tools Advisory Board: ensures that the data tools provide actionable information and identifies ways to improve access to that information.
- Community Engagement Advisory Board: ensures there are strong feedback loops with data users to support evidence-based decision-making, analytical capacity, and equitable access to actionable information.

Each Advisory Board will have 16 members. Members of the advisory boards serve three-year terms, with the initial appointment term staggered such that one-third of the positions expire each year.

Refer to pages 25-28 of the Cradle-to-Career System Governance Manual for additional information about the authority, membership and terms, member expectations, meetings, decision-making, and responsibilities for each advisory committee.

Advisory Board members are subject to the Cradle-to-Career Conflict of Interest Policy and must report their financial interests through the Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC) Form 700, which is considered a public document.

Scope of Work

The ad hoc committee is entrusted with reviewing the initial selection process to ensure that the advisory committees are seated with collaborative individuals having diverse perspectives and relevant expertise to make timely and high-quality recommendations to the Governing Board. The ad hoc committee is responsible for managing the schedule of its committee work to support full membership of the advisory boards.

C2C staff managed the application process. C2C staff created an application form and scoring rubric based on the proposed activities of the advisory boards, and managed the application process, including posting the application on the C2C website, Screendoor, and other relevant sites.

Ad hoc committee members will score applications based on the rubric and rank candidates based on scoring criteria in each of their assigned categories. Committee members will submit the results of their individual rubrics via Google Forms prior to the committee meeting. The C2C staff will share the average results from those individual rubrics as a starting point for discussion and decision making at the ad hoc committee meeting. During the meeting, the ad hoc committee will develop a recommended slate of candidates to present to the Board Chair and the Governing Board.

Instructions for ad hoc committee members

Please submit the results of your review of your set of applications in the Google Form you received via email no later than Thursday, April 21, 2022.

Overall, we received far more applications than we have slots. Scoring and selecting from among the applicants will take time and involve challenging trade-offs. We recommend keeping the following in mind: First, the terms will be staggered, and each year the Governing Board will have the opportunity to select new members for one-third of the seats. Second, individuals who are not selected for these advisory boards could still contribute their expertise via other forms of engagement with our work.

To support you in your review of the candidates, C2C Staff prepared the following:

- 1) **A scoring rubric** which defines the criteria described in the applications. This is intended to help you structure your evaluation of the statements in the applications.
- 2) **A pdf and Excel application packet** with the submitted applications. For each board, these are organized by category (advocacy, community organization, etc.) and alphabetized by last name within each category. For the Excel sheet, you must enable macros to select applicants by name in a dropdown list.
- 3) **A summary spreadsheet** of the applicants assigned to you for review, organized by applicant category, where you can note the results of your individual review of the applications. Please complete this first, and then use your individual rubric results to complete the google form.
- 4) **A Google Form** for you to submit the results of your individual rubric. C2C staff have organized the form to let you rank your preferred candidates based on their category (eg, community organization, research organization, etc.) Based on the results of your rubric, select your preferred candidates in rank order in each category on the google form. The C2C

staff members will collate results and share the averages as a decision support tool during the April 26th meeting.

Selection of Seats by Category

To facilitate the ad hoc committee's decision making, C2C staff organized the applications for each advisory board by category relative to the sector or population represented. Based on the applications received and the Governing Board's guidance to aim for diverse perspectives and backgrounds, the staff recommends the following number of seats per category.

Data & Tools Advisory Board: Recommended numbers for each category

Practitioners	8 - Representatives (at least 1 each from Community Colleges, K-12, CSU, and UC)
Students/Families	1 representative
Community Organizations	2 representatives
Research Organizations	3 representatives
Advocacy Organizations	2 representatives

Community Engagement: Recommended numbers for each category

Community Organizations	5 representatives
Advocacy Organizations	5 representatives
Practitioners	6 representatives

C2C staff divided the nine board members who volunteered for this ad hoc committee into three groups, and each group will review a set of applications. This means that each application will be read and scored by at least three ad hoc committee members.

Rubric: Data and Tools Advisory Committee

	1 point	3 points	5 points
Experience conducting analyses using the data that will be included in the analytical tools	Does not describe conducting analyses using relevant data	Experience with data analysis and some visualization	Data analyses experience with C2C-relevant data; experience with data visualization and analysis
Will help to ensure that accurate and aligned data can be integrated into the analytical tools	No experience with data cleaning, data quality, or data alignment described	Has experience with data alignment and data quality efforts	Has led or directed data alignment and data quality efforts in related datasets and analyses
Familiarity with C2C-relevant data sets and the way information is gathered and processed	Little familiarity with C2C-relevant data sets and data collection processes described	Familiarity with some C2C-relevant data elements and collection processes	Experience with data collection efforts or detailed analysis of C2C-relevant data

Rubric: Community Engagement Advisory Committee

	1 point	3 points	5 points
Has strong experience serving as an ambassador for a specific community or user group	No experience serving as an ambassador for a specific community or user group described	Some ability to reach communities and user groups	Demonstrated ability to reach and learn from communities and user groups; adept at informing decision making with lived experiences
Can access forums to work closely with community members to better understand their needs and concerns that are relevant to C2C	No access to relevant forums or community groups described	Some experience working with community members or groups	Demonstrated experience working closely with community members to understand needs and priorities that can inform the shape of C2C's work
Experience supporting awareness of and access to student and educator tools, particularly regarding college, career, and financial aid planning	No experience with relevant student or educator-facing operational tools described	Some experience supporting awareness of student or educator-facing operational tools	Demonstrated experience supporting access to student and educator-facing operational tools; experience relevant to college, career, and financial aid planning

Ad Hoc Committee Meeting on April 26, 2022

During the committee meeting, C2C staff will share background information on the application process. Next, C2C staff will share the collated scores with the committee and open the meeting for discussion around selecting final candidates.

To ensure a robust and efficient discussion, ad hoc committee members are requested to review the applications and submit the results of their scoring rubrics via Google Form by April 21, 2022. This will enable C2C staff to begin the discussion with a summary overview which displays the average results of the ad hoc committee members' individual rubrics and can provide a starting point finalizing a slate of candidates.

Questions the ad hoc committee will address during the meeting:

- 1) Should applications from individuals who work directly for an office currently represented on the Governing Board be deprioritized? The C2C staff recommends that applications from individuals who are employed by offices or entities currently on the Governing Board be deprioritized, given that Governing Board members' staff can already participate in homework groups or ad hoc committees. This would allow for a broader range of perspectives across the Governing Board and Advisory Boards.
- 2) How should we handle applications from out-of-state candidates, given complexities and some restrictions for @reimbursement for out-of-state travel?
- 3) Discussion of the slate of candidates, which will initially be composed based on the results of the ad hoc committee members' individual rubrics that were submitted in advance of the meeting.
- 4) After a slate of recommended candidates is finalized, assign 1, 2, or 3 year terms, if the preferences of the candidates do not match available slots. The staff recommendation is to decide term years by randomization (eg, drawing names from a hat) for the candidates where we cannot accommodate their preferred term length.

5) What lessons have we learned from this process that can inform outreach and recruitment of applications for the $\frac{1}{3}$ of the slots we will fill a year from now? For example, can we leverage the seated advisory board members to encourage future applications to ensure a wide range of perspectives across groups of individuals, including encouraging more applications from students and families?