Cradle-to-Career Governing Board Chair Report

Date Report Issued: December 7, 2023

Attention: Members of the Ad Hoc Committee for the Governance Manual Review

Subject: **Proposed Changes to the Advisory Boards Recommendation Process**

Contact: Robert Tagorda, Governing Board Chair

Background:

Cradle-to-Career's (C2C) two Advisory Boards have a charge "to provide input and feedback to the Governing Board" ([Ed Code 10865(b)(1)](#)).

The Community Engagement and the Data and Tools Advisory Boards met in the fall. This was the first time that either Advisory Board had the opportunity to discuss or vote on recommendations submitted by fellow Advisory Board members. After having lived the experience set forth by the [Governance Manual](#), members of the Advisory Boards as well as the public requested changes to the recommendation process. Attached to my Chair Report are some of those artifacts, including a transcript of the [Data and Tools meeting](#), which can be found on Attachment A, and a letter received from the public, which can be found on Attachment B.

Given the appetite for change expressed and wanting a deeper understanding of the experiences had by the Advisory Board members, I met with two individuals from the Data and Tools Advisory Board and two individuals from the Community Engagement Advisory Board. On Attached C, I have synthesized key findings or themes that I heard during these two meetings.

All three artifacts (Attachments A through C) informed my proposed changes to the Advisory Boards recommendation process.

Universe of Suggestions from the Advisory Board members:

- Amend the Advisory Board recommendation form to clarify that members may recommend adding to the data system either <u>one</u> data point or <u>several clearly related</u> data points
- Amend the Governance Manual to clearly define if there is a limit to the amount of recommendations each Advisory Board member can submit annually
- Clearly outline a mechanism for public involvement in the process
- Create a repository of all recommendations submitted
- Delineate two separate tracks for proposed Advisory Board recommendations: one for data points that are already collected by state-wide C2C data providers, and the other for data points that are not currently collected at the state level
- Expand the number of the proposals that Advisory Boards can advance to the feasibility study stage per year

Analysis, Rationale, and Chair Recommendation **One**:
Suggested Changes voiced by Advisory Board members

- Clearly outline a mechanism for public involvement in the process
- Ability for Advisory Board members to submit a recommendation outside of their board's authority

My Analysis and Rationale
Per [Education Code section 10863](#), a primary role of Advisory Board members is to listen to and work with the public; understand their needs and be able to communicate these effectively to fellow Advisory Board members, the Office of Cradle-to-Career Data (Office), and Governing Board members.

My Recommendation One
As noted, Education Code section 10863 specifies that members shall "prioritize the needs of students and families; consider and respond to stakeholder input; promote and foster an environment and culture of collaboration and cooperation; and promote a culture of data-informed decisionmaking by

consulting with data experts and intended data users, including members of the public, when developing data use priorities".

Statute highlights the critical function that Advisory Board members play, which is to hear the voice of the public and prioritize their needs. Given this expectation, I recommend that the public be brought into the recommendation process via the Advisory Board recommendation process, which will reinforce the role of and the responsibility on the Advisory Board members to listen to, collaborate with, understand and implement the thoughts, needs, and concerns of the public.

New process: Optional Sponsorship of Ideas from the Public or Other Advisory Board Members

One mechanism I recommend to employ these changes is to allow the public the ability to submit a recommendation form a few months prior to Advisory Board members submitting their own forms. The forms from the public would be due prior to the summer Advisory Board meeting and would be publicly posted. Over the summer, when Advisory Board members submit their own proposals, they can choose to sponsor any recommendations that were submitted by the public, including working with that member of the public to further refine the proposed idea. Once sponsored and submitted by an Advisory Board member, it will be treated as a submission by an Advisory Board member and undergo the pre-meeting survey process. See the section below, "Recommended Updated Process" for a layout of the proposed changes to the existing process.

This will allow for the public to have a defined mechanism to be a part of the process and will provide for natural collaboration between the public and the Advisory Board, which will compliment their role as Advisory Board members. The implementation of this formal mechanism will provide a designated space and time for the exchange of ideas. This optional sponsorship process would complement (and not displace) the other mechanisms the public already has to provide continuous input on C2C's work, via contacting the Office or

providing written or oral comment at any public meeting of the Advisory Boards or Governing Board.

Different Scopes for the Two Advisory Boards

Per Education Code section 108635 Sections (b)(A) and (B) the scope and authority of the Advisory Boards differ. With the establishment of the Governance Manual, the C2C Governing Board decided to define the authority of the two Advisory Boards, the selection criteria for appointing members to the two Advisory Boards, and the scope of the recommendations the two Advisory Boards may make. The two Advisory Boards are distinct in their membership, expertise provided, and authority; they are not identical. That said, cross pollination has its benefits. Not only should Advisory Board members listen to the public, they should also be able to gather ideas and collaborate with their colleagues on a different Advisory Board. For this reason, I would extend the sponsorship idea I describe above to be inclusive of Advisory Board members' recommendations. This would mean that a Data and Tools member could submit a Community Engagement recommendation form and vice versa at the same time that a member of the public can submit their ideas. The cross-board sponsorship process will abide by the timing and requirements of the public sponsorship process.

Recommended Updated Process (additions made in red)
- Spring Meeting: Public meeting to review the feasibility studies and determine which recommendations will be referred to the Governing Board for approval. Review recommendation form and rubric.
  - Post Spring Meeting Activities: Prior to the Summer meeting, the recommendation form will be made available to the public. The public (including members of the other Advisory Board) can submit the form to the Office. The form submissions will be made public.
- Summer Meeting: Public meeting to review data points and ask questions of Data Providers. ~~Review recommendation form and rubric.~~
  - Post Summer Meeting Activities: Advisory Board members submit the recommendations. Members can also choose to sponsor or further

refine recommendation(s) received by a member of the public or the other Advisory Board. One month prior to the Fall meeting, members prioritize top recommendations in a pre-meeting survey.

- <u>Fall Meeting</u>: Public meeting to review the top three ranked recommendations and decide which recommendations will be submitted for a feasibility study.
- <u>Spring Meeting</u>: Public meeting to review the feasibility studies and determine which recommendations will be referred to the Governing Board for approval.

Analysis, Rationale, and Chair Recommendation **Two**:
Suggested Changes voiced by Advisory Board members

- Delineate two separate tracks for proposed Advisory Board recommendations: one for data points that are already collected by state-wide C2C data providers, and the other for data points that are not currently collected at the state level
- Expand the number of the proposals that Advisory Boards can advance to the feasibility study stage per year

My Analysis and Rationale

We are only in our second year and C2C has just completed its first data ingestion. We need to continue to prioritize the build of the system and the continued ingestion of data without overwhelming the newly built processes and structures. Additionally, I believe there was wisdom in defining a process that aided the Advisory Boards in prioritizing what its members feel are the most crucial proposals each year, instead of having up to 32 members each submit recommendations without a mechanism for prioritization. Advancing such a large number of proposed ideas each year could result in a diluted feasibility study process and the potential for a recommendation to advance to the Governing Board without the context and specific feasibility assessments needed for the Governing Board to potentially act on the recommendations.

In reading the discussions by the Advisory Board members, I heard a concern that the current process would result in the data system expanding by a maximum of three data points per year. However, there are a number of planned expansions to the data system that will include involvement and input from the Advisory Boards. For example, the Office plans to host task forces related to at least three planned sets of additional data points defined in the 5-year timeline: early learning and care, health and human services data, and workforce information. For each of these, the Office would follow a process similar to the planning process that preceded the launch of the Office: first defining a learning agenda of the highest priority questions to answer and then exploring the most useful and feasible data points available to address those questions, together with C2C's data partners, the C2C boards, subject matter experts, and the public.

My Recommendation Two

Given that each recommendation has implications on the time, resources, and bandwidth of the Office and data providers, a maximum of six recommendations (three recommendations provided by each Advisory Board) a year across the two Advisory Boards is reasonable and viable. Each data point added, even if it comes from a preexisting data set, requires an analysis of technical specifications, data availability and quality, and legal and cybersecurity frameworks.

Analysis, Rationale, and Chair Recommendation **Three**:
Suggested Changes voiced by Advisory Board members

- Dedicate brainstorming time at an Advisory Board meeting related to ideation of recommendations
- Formation of a work group to discuss the prioritization of recommendations

My Analysis and Rationale

The current process as defined by the Governance Manual does not stipulate that the recommendations be discussed until after the top three have been

prioritized by the Advisory Board. I see value in the collaboration and the representation of diverse perspectives, from discussing these topics in an open forum. It is within the power of the Advisory Boards to request future agenda items and convene an ad hoc committee.

My Recommendation Three

The Governance Manual can be updated to include language related to having two standing agenda items at the summer Advisory Board meeting. One agenda item would be an open forum to provide space for the ideation of recommendations. If the Governance Manual Review Committee chooses to adopt the sponsorship process described above (Recommendation One), members could also discuss any public recommendations received.

The second agenda item would be for each Advisory Board to vote to implement an ad hoc committee to help with the prioritization of the recommendations. The ad hoc committee would be limited to five members and would hold a public meeting prior to the fall Advisory Board meetings. The focus of the ad hoc committee would be to analyze the recommendations and provide a recommended top three to the Advisory Board in a report. The five members of the committee would need to take on the responsibility of creating the written, publicly posted report that emerges from that committee meeting (e.g., via two of them volunteering to take the meeting notes and create a report that summarizes it). Additionally, when creating the report and providing recommendations, the committee could weigh how to balance recommendations that rely on data already collected by state-level C2C data providers vs. those that would require new data collection efforts. Advisory Board members would still undergo the individual pre-meeting survey as the prioritization by members is an integral part of their role, however, the member could consult the report from the ad hoc committee when completing their pre-meeting prioritization survey. See the section below, "Recommended Updated Process" for a layout of the proposed changes to the existing process.

Recommended Updated Process (additions made in blue)

- <u>Spring Meeting</u>: Public meeting to review the feasibility studies and determine which recommendations will be referred to the Governing Board for approval. Review recommendation form and rubric.
    - <u>Post Spring Meeting Activities</u>: Prior to the Summer meeting, the recommendation form will be made available to the public. The public (including members of the other Advisory Board) can submit the form to the Office. The form submissions will be made public.
- <u>Summer Meeting</u>: Public meeting to review data points and ask questions of Data Providers. Add an agenda item for the ideation of recommendations as well as a vote for the formation of an ad hoc committee to review the recommendations and provide a committee report for Advisory Board members. ~~Review recommendation form and rubric.~~
    - <u>Post Summer Meeting Activities</u>: Advisory Board members submit the recommendations. Members can also choose to sponsor or further refine recommendation(s) received by a member of the public or the other Advisory Board. Ad Hoc Committees will convene and publish a public-facing report with a justification and prioritization of recommendations. One month prior to the Fall meeting, members prioritize top recommendations in a pre-meeting survey.
- <u>Fall Meeting</u>: Public meeting to review the top three ranked recommendations and decide which recommendations will be submitted for a feasibility study.
- <u>Spring Meeting</u>: Public meeting to review the feasibility studies and determine which recommendations will be referred to the Governing Board for approval.

Analysis, Rationale, and Chair Recommendation Four:
Suggested Changes voiced by Advisory Board members

- Amend the Advisory Board recommendation form to clarify that members may recommend adding to the data system either <u>one</u> data point or <u>several clearly related</u> data points

My Analysis and Rationale

After the first iteration of the recommendation process, I believe a few amendments will need to be made to the recommendation form as noted by the public and Advisory Board members. I concur that the clarification of <u>one</u> data point or <u>several clearly related</u> data points should be added to the list of changes. Additionally, as noted in recommendation two, it is fundamental to provide space on the form for the submitter to communicate what research questions they cannot answer now and what they would answer with the additional data being requested. Advisory Board members as well as the public, should the sponsorship process be adopted, are well positioned to point out gaps in the data system. Identifying what cannot be answered would enable the Office to understand the objective which can inform the feasibility study.

My Recommendation Four

I recommend these additions be made to both the Data and Tools recommendation form as well as the Community Engagement recommendation form.

Analysis, Rationale, and Chair Recommendation **Five**:
Suggested Changes voiced by Advisory Board members
- Amend the Governance Manual to clearly define if there is a limit to the amount of recommendations each Advisory Board member can submit annually
- Create a repository of all recommendations submitted

My Analysis and Rationale

Given that there is a prioritization system in place that Advisory Board members undergo, I do not see a need to create a cap on the number of recommendations a member can submit a year.

The Governance Manual states that all proposal forms received must be "posted on the C2C website". In response to this requirement, the Office created a <u>static landing page</u> which houses instructions for the process, all

necessary forms associated with the process, and most importantly, all recommendations submitted by both Advisory Boards. Given the importance of historical knowledge, I would recommend that the Office maintain this page and categorize it by year, so members or the public can be refreshed on any recommendations that have been submitted in the past. It would be helpful to know as well which proposals advanced to the feasibility study stage and which proposals were formally shared with the Governing Board. Therefore if any member would like to sponsor a recommendation from a previous year they could and they would also be up-to-date on the life cycle of a previously proposed recommendation.

These two suggestions compliment one another; it is important for members to share their ideas in a formalized fashion which will be captured via the repository. In turn, this will allow future members the ability to lean on past wisdom of other members should they choose to do so. Additionally, it will bolster our historical knowledge that we are strengthening every year, as well as our governance culture that we continue to nurture and foster.

My Recommendation Five

My recommendation is to add a sentence to the Governance Manual noting that there is not a limit on the number of recommendations that an individual member can propose. Also, I suggest that the Office continue to upkeep the Advisory Board proposal page on the C2C website, noting a few modifications that would strengthen the information provided.

Transcript of the Data and Tools October 12, 2023 Meeting During Agenda Item Three, Overview of the Recommendation Process

The discussion of this item begins at 30:25 on the [meeting recording](#).

Member Borgen: Is there a number of studies that can be handled a year in your mind a year or what is the quantifiable amount of feasibility studies including in any year?

Marykate Cruz Jones: Today we will determine if the proposals will go to the feasibility study and since the Governance Manual caps three proposals to be heard at this meeting, it would be a max of three per Advisory Board.

Member Chavez: Thank you so much for this agenda item and the opportunity to have a discussion. I just want to confirm at a 10,000 foot level my understanding of how data points are available to be proposed. This is based on my reading of the governance manual and other materials you have provided over a time together. First a data provider can make a suggestion for a data point. Second, this Board can provide data points through the process that you just outlined. Also the public by my understanding can propose data points by emailing the C2C office. Am I correct of my understanding of those three streams to purpose data points?

Mary Ann Bates: Yes, I think the members of the public, I would have to go back to the Governance Manual to make sure that I do not misspeak, but part of what we were intending that mechanism to serve is if a member of the public is curious about whether something is available or not, we could answer their questions if they reach out to us. This Board is the most formal mechanism for entities other than the data providers to purpose the specific data points and to have that go through the feasibility study and then come before the Governing Board. Members of the public can reach out and provide public comment at any of our meetings, can reach as you mentioned via email or otherwise to learn more about what is available and that can inform our Office's understanding of what kinds of data points and what kinds of information are

most in demand and that people would most like to see. That is different from the formal process that you have which enables you to formally recommend something to the Governing Board.

Member Chavez: As a follow up to that, during the earlier meeting of this year and then this meeting, the Board has received a formal communication from an external stakeholder or two suggesting or recommending data points. Is the intention that we as a Board take this and then as individuals we would propose it going through the official process, if we agree with that?

Mary Ann Bates: For today, you all reviewed proposals that you submitted by the deadline this summer that then are here for discussion today. This is the first time we are running this process. We welcome your input on how to do this best. The way it is described in the Governance Manual is that today you are discussing the proposals that you all prioritized and there are three that you will be discussing. Public comment given today, the public comment that was received in writing in advance can inform your discussion. It can certainly inform what you may want to propose in the next cycle next year as well. You have an opportunity to discuss these proposals and perhaps make some amendments or tweaks if you would like to today. That might increase the complexity of the process a bit. The gist of it is that you each have the opportunity to share a proposal, you all collectively prioritized three to discuss today, and the idea is that then goes for a discussion and you decide whether to advance this to the feasibility study stage, and then we do the feasibility study. Is that answering your question?

Member Chavez: Yes, so what I am hearing from you is that say a stakeholder communicates with this Board, we have some ideas, then we would if we agree with it, as individuals we would submit a formal proposal in the next cycle.

Mary Ann Bates: Yes.

<u>Member Chavez</u>: That was my question, thank you for that. Here is my observation of the process now that we are in the middle of it. It is just an observation and I understand that we cannot act upon this, but let me just share that we first initiated this process, I was kind of under the impression that our proposals were going to be focused on data points that do not necessarily exist but we have ideas and they should exist. In point of fact, there are data points that already exist in the statewide database and then there are some that were unclear that they exist or they do not exist. The seven proposals that were put forth, three described data points that already exist in a statewide database. I personally consider data that already exists in a statewide database as low hanging fruit. I know those data points will still be subject to a feasibility study but it would be of a different kind and the ones that the proposals that they go through it is based on data that is not clear if it exists or it needs to be developed, that is going to require an extent to the feasibility study, everything that was just described. The only thing I just want to share is that it just seems to me that there should be two tracks in terms of evaluation proposals. There would be a set of proposals, statewide data points that already exist and those maybe should not have a limit of three, there should be an unlimited. Whereas, there should be a cap on those proposals that propose data points that do not already exist because that of course is going to require some staff's time, feasibility studies, etcetera. That would be a little bit more extensive. The last thing that I just want to comment again, my observation is that if we continue with the current process which is for this Board to review three data points send it to feasibility studies and then recommend again, that seems to me that the P20W dataset will only increase potentially three data points per year or a set of data points per year. That seems like a little inefficient to me, unless the Data Providers are also making recommendations for data points. Those are my observations and I am interested in what my colleagues have to say.

<u>Marykate Cruz Jones</u>: If it is a helpful frame and we can continue member deliberation, to root in the process for the Office, as you mentioned, the Governance Manual is what dictates the process. If amendments were to be considered, it seems like you had a few suggestions, what that would look like is that the Committee that works on the Governance Manual, would have to accept those and the Governing Board would

have to formally adopt all of those changes. Not to get too in the weeds, but if helpful to say out loud.

Member Hough: I appreciate your reflections, I appreciate that Member Chavez. I wonder if one thing that might help is if prior to putting in those recommendations for proposals, we had some brainstorming time at our meetings where we could all share ideas that we had and maybe individuals do that or put it forward but it could be a bit more of a collaborative process. I think that might be generative and might not require changes to the Governing Manual but help us to generate better ideas, more ideas, and think about ways to work together.

Member Harlick: I just have a general question about future proposals, if there is a question about the validity of an existing measure being proposed, is there an upper limit to what can be done as part of the feasibility study? Say the request is to uncover an issue, you would actually need to do an actual validity and reliability study with an outcome measure. Is that possible or are we kind of constrained by resources in terms of the feasibility study?

David Lang: This is something that is always kind of context dependent. I feel like you are using validity in more of the psychometric language than the Governance Manual is. If you have something that has a high Cronbach's alpha, that is not necessarily the construct that we are talking about when we are talking about validity and reliability.

Member Schak: One clarifying question about the process, in terms of the number of proposals can be made and who can put forward proposals, those sort of process items, are they all decided by the Governing Board? Is there anything written in statue that sort of goes beyond the Governing Board? I am just curious to learn a little bit more about that.

Marykate Cruz Jones: Any seated Advisory Board member can submit a recommendation. The recommendation happens over the summer. This time we got seven recommendations. One member submitted four, other members submitted one.

From there you all will determine the prioritization of the three that we will hear, so that is the cap currently by the Governance Manual that we will only hear three recommendations at this meeting. As seen through the process this year, there is not a limit in terms of how many recommendations a member can put in. Any seated member can put this in, even if you are falling off the Board, coming up against your term limit.

Mary Ann Bates: I can add one more piece of context, our Governing Board updated the Governance Manual annually, usually over the winter, so December/January timeframe. Last year we convened an Ad Hoc Committee of the Advisory Boards to identify ideas for the Advisory Board's own governance and decision-making. Questions like, should there be a chair of each Advisory Board. The Advisory Boards said no we do not want that. This process of how recommendations come from the Advisory Boards to the Governing Board was something that we first discussed with the Advisory Board Ad Hoc Committee focused on governance and then that fed into the Governing Board's Ad Hoc Committee on the Governing Manual as well. We tried to create an opportunity for the Advisory Board's views on that to inform the Governing Board's updates to the Governance Manual. That is what we did last year and that is how this came about.

Julia Blair: I can answer the statute question, there is nothing in statute that limits three, but statute does give the Governing Board the power to adopt a Governance Manual, so they are given the authority to do that within the Governance Manual. That three is not in statute, it is in the Governance Manual which is still binding.

Member Schak: That is really helpful and it sounds like overall the answer is that there is a fair bit of flexibility to sort of adapt and adjust over time if we are not necessarily tempted by sort of specific requirements in statute or anything like that that would hinder the process changing over time.

Mary Ann Bates: That annual process of the Ad Hoc Committee of the Governing Board that updates the Governance Manual is the mechanism for that.

<u>Member Catanzarite</u>: I want to follow onto Member Chavez's suggestion or recommendations. If we as a Board decided that we liked some of those ideas, what would be the process for getting this in front of the Governing Board for their winter meeting? Would the time allow for the change by the time of the next summer meeting when we are recommending for the following year?

<u>Mary Ann Bates</u>: Yes, the short answer is that time would allow for that, so there are a couple of mechanisms. One is that we take careful notes of all of these meetings, and usually an Advisory Board member reports out to the Governing Board at each Governing Board meeting. The next one is November 1. One possibility would be to use the mechanism of the report out to the Governing Board at the November meeting to say here is the discussion that was had during the Advisory Board meeting, here is some that the Governing Board could take into consideration. At that November 1 meeting, we expect that the Governing Board would as it did last year reconvene the Ad Hoc Committee to revise the Governance Manual between the November and February Governing Board meetings. The timing is right for bringing that to the Governing Board at the November 1 meeting and that would then be in effect for the next cycle if the Governing Board would choose to take any action on that.

<u>Member Reddy</u>: I am going to preempt this, because I have a feeling it is going to come up; I put in a proposal, I conceived of the proposal more as a suite of points. I have elements on A-G, AP, a couple of things in one proposal, my colleague Marshall had four different points that were related and I think could have taken the approach that I did, but put in four, so subsequently we are hearing one of these proposals. I think this goes to the efficiency point and are we submitting a data point? I think that question is on my mind. My conception, similarly if I had just done a proposal for each, you know it would be 2037 before I see the set that I need to see. This is why I thought that is kind of what we were going for, but I would to open that, lest anybody thought that I was taking advantage of the system or breaking things first and asking for forgiveness later.

Mary Ann Bates: I think that you are highlighting is what happens when we go through a process for the first time and different people interpret words differently. We should go back to the Governance Manual and look very carefully at the language and see if there is anything that we can clarify. To your point, if one recommendation recommended 347 data points across 15 different domains, is that one recommendation or more than one? At the same time, if there is a cohesive recommendation about what conceptually suggest needs to be more visible or possible to see in the data and it involves more than one data point, I do not recall the Governance Manual excluding that, but I would have to go back and look. This experience is suggesting at the very least an opportunity to clarify it so we do not have a situation where one person says oh that is why I split it apart and another person lumps it. This is an opportunity to clarify.

Member Borgen: I have some concerns with the voting, because I felt like it was very much in isolation. We had to use the form; there was no discussion around those proposals. I understand that only three move forward, if there is time for the Advisory Committee to create a work group that actually discuss that and determine these are the top three and bring to the Advisory Board. I think that would would be more formalized and appropriate plan to be able to really use the members as a whole to discuss what comes forward.

Julia Blair: I would just note that we still have to be subject to Bagley-Keene, so part of the reason the process happened the way that it did is because we could not do serial meetings by having discussions via electronic means. A work group could happen but it would be subject to Bagley-Keene, unless it only had two people.

Marykate Cruz Jones: Could they create a committee?

Julia Blair: I think they can create a committee.

Marykate Cruz Jones: They could create a committee and house a public meeting; this could be a thought. We could vote on this and members of the Advisory Board could create a committee and could convene in public session to have this discussion, should

the Advisory Board not want to be limited to two members as there are 16 members on the Advisory Board. This would be a heavy lift for two folks. Again, if it is helpful to share out loud, this procedure of the survey is rooted in the Governance Manual.

Member Livingston: Going back to the point of how many data points we can add, I realize C2C has limited resources and part of our job is to say which data points give us the most bang for our buck that we want to do first, but is there a resource constraint? We have heard about feasibility studies, but are there other resource constraints, where you think that we could not add lots and lots of data points?

Mary Ann Bates: There are two ways to think about the resource constraints. One is our staff time and our data partners staff time in doing through feasibility studies. We have a total of 16 members on this Board and we also have ideas on other changes to the data system that could come from the Community Engagement Advisory Board. Given we had 16 positions this past year, 26 this year, it would be very challenging to be able to do 32 feasibility studies each year. It would also tap the time of our data providers, that is the other piece that we would like to be sensitive to and just the sheer quantity. I believe part of the motivation for why the Governing Board created this mechanism to support the Advisory Boards in prioritizing a few each year. On the resources for the actual data points, going back to what member Chavez said, that will look very different based on the different ideas that come forward. If it is a data point that is already collected and validated at the State level, the resources likely to be involved and this will look different in different circumstances, involve the effort that it will take for our data provider to validate that data and submit it to us, and for us to be able to link it to the data we already have. That is obviously a much lower and very different lift than a data point that is not yet collected and validated at the State level, where is might take action for say local entities to collect something new and submit it to State entities who then validates and sends it to us. That is not to say things like that could not be recommended, but just the outcome of the feasibility study is likely to say here the resources required or any statutory changes that would be required for that. That is a strategic question around low hanging fruit versus most impactful that you all can consider.

<u>Member Livingston</u>: Does C2C provide resources to these data collection agencies since we will start expanding this data set. Are we compensating these data collection agencies at all for their time to collect the data for C2C?

<u>Mary Ann Bates</u>: We will be speaking to this a bit at the November Board meeting. The short answer is that we have a line item in the budget for our office. That funds the work of our staff and the work that we do directly. A subset of our data partners also received additional resources both for the planning process and for their ongoing work, especially the K-12 and higher education entities received resources in different ways to enable their participation in Cradle-to-Career. The one additional asterisk is that we do provide a fee based relationship with EDD on the employment data based on the federal framework that they operate within.

<u>Member Orlick:</u> There is the agency system collector and then there is also the agencies collecting; as a school district then having to create ways to figure out how to collect a potentially new source of information is definitely not directly compensated. A really like the idea of having a separate or parallel process to consider data points that do not already exist or through the feasibility study are determined to be high capacity projects and what that would look like. Speaking from the K-12 system any new data point you are talking about years long process and that does not mean that it is not worth doing, but we need maybe a more indepth both amongst us and then partnership with C2C and those agencies. I had a question about the feasibility study process. I love the idea of improving the governance manual and seeing how this goes to make that more flexible, add more opportunities for creative or new ideas that do not already exist in our systems, even through the feasibility study process, will there continue to be some partnership? If I bought a proposal and I have some subject matter expertise about it; I have already talked with some of your folks, but I would love to continue to be involved as that process moves forward.

David Lang: Certainly there are opportunities for that communication to take place. I would refer to the Governance Manual and Counsel in terms of what the most appropriate form of that communication looks like, but I think that is feasible.

Julia Blair: If staff is working with one or even two Board members on a proposal, there is no issue with regard to Bagley-Keene. It is when you would say something and then David would meet with two other people and they would say something and then David would talk to you again, that is where there are issues.

October 31, 2023

RE: ***Recommendations on Improving the Data and Tools Advisory Board Data Inclusion Process***

Dear Chair Tagorda and Governing Board Members,

The organizations joining this letter are all dedicated to racial equity in the education system and are invested in the potential of the Cradle to Career (C2C) Data System to advance equitable policy and practice. We would like to submit the following comments and recommendations in response to the data inclusion process recently undertaken by the Data and Tools Advisory Board. As stakeholders of this work, we appreciate the thoughtful process facilitated by C2C staff as well as the robust conversation by Advisory Board Members on the proposals seeking to expand the P20W data set.

As currently written, the Governance Manual sections on "Adding Data Points" and "Member Expectations and Responsibilities" outline a process for Data and Tools Advisory Board members to bring forth proposals that seek to address significant gaps in the data request process, dashboards and operational tools, or data points. As C2C has begun to implement this process for the first time, we are at once encouraged and pleased with the existence of a formal structure for continuously adding to and improving the data system and also believe that adjustments to the process could be made in future years to improve transparency, inclusivity, and efficiency.

We believe that providing additional clarity on the process within the Governance Manual, refining the process to differentiate between data already collected by data providers and new data points, and building in dedicated time for Advisory Board members to discuss the relative merits of proposals and deliberate would foster greater awareness, deeper community engagement and a more comprehensively understood data point request process for *all* stakeholders. In order to do so, we would like to voice support for ideas for improvements to the process mentioned by Member Chavez and others during the October Data and Tools Advisory Board meeting, and recommend the following:

1. **We ask the Governing Board establish an ad hoc committee charged with reviewing the proposal process and outlining recommendations on how to make it more effective. Some of these improvements could be inclusive of, but not limited to:**
   a. **Amending current language in the Governance Manual and [Proposal Form to provide additional clarity about permissible scope of proposals.](#) The language currently suggests that members may propose to add a singular "data point" per proposal. However, in many instances, adding additional related data points housed in a single dataset may be beneficial and require comparable capacity to adding a single data point. We therefore recommend clarifying the limitations of the last proposal type by stating "*a***

       proposal may include either a single data point or several clearly related, relevant data points"

   b. **Creating a differentiation in the data-point(s) request process/proposal between 1) requests for the addition of data points that already exist and are collected by data providers and 2) data points that are not currently collected in a comprehensive manner at the state level by data providers. Delineating two separate "tracks" or processes for these two types of requests is appropriate given that each requires different considerations in terms of feasibility**

   c. **Expanding the cap on proposals to be heard and voted upon annually by the Data and Tools Advisory Board for each aforementioned track, which may result in additional data point request proposals voted upon for action annually**

   d. **Clearly outlining ways in which advocacy organizations, researchers, and community members–including a mechanism for members of the public to make data proposals directly–can provide feedback throughout the proposal process to strengthen the feedback loop between C2C and end users**

2. **Have the Governing Board consider those recommendations and charge the Governance Manual Ad Hoc Committee with amending the Governance Manual to be inclusive of the recommendation from the Advisory Committee.**

We believe these recommendations will clarify the process, allow for a more robust conversation on an actionable longitudinal data system, have the potential to expand accessibility to underserved communities currently not reflected in the P20W data set, and build greater accessibility and opportunity for members of the public to provide input and share feedback on additional proposals that may bolster the data system as a whole. It is our hope that these refinements can be implemented in a manner that is mindful of the staff time and capacity.

As always, we greatly appreciate the work that the Office of Cradle-to-Career continues to do in order to make these processes and meetings as visible and accessible as possible. We also appreciate the opportunity to weigh in on discussions relating to data governance. We look forward to continuing our collaboration with you to address the needs of California's most marginalized students and communities through C2C's ongoing development and implementation.

Thank you for considering our views.

Sincerely,

The Education Trust—West	CALIFORNIANS TOGETHER CHAMPIONING THE SUCCESS OF ENGLISH LEARNERS	Loyola Marymount University Center for Equity for English Learners	The Children's Partnership
Natalie Wheatfall-Lum Director of TK-12 Policy	Martha Hernandez Executive Director	Magaly Lavadenz, Ph.D. Executive Director	Eva Rivera, MSW Policy Director, Early Childhood Development
CALIFORNIA edge coalition Education, Diversity, and Growth in the Economy	BERKELEY INSTITUTE FOR YOUNG AMERICANS	PARENT INSTITUTE FOR PIQE SINCE 1987 QUALITY EDUCATION	TICAS
Zima Creason Executive Director	Sarah Swanbeck Executive Director	Gloria Corral President and CEO	Manny Rodriguez Director of Policy & Advocacy, CA
CREATE CA	gia GROWING INLAND ACHIEVEMENT	Abriendo Puertas Opening Doors	JBAY JOHN BURTON Advocates for Youth
Abe Flores, Deputy Director of Policy & Programs	Ann Marie Sakrekoff Interim CEO	Cristina González Implementation and Advocacy Manager	Debbie Raucher Director of Education
cabe California Association for Bilingual Education	YOUNG YI INVINCIBLES	EDvance COLLEGE	UNIDOSUS STRONGER COMMUNITIES. STRONGER AMERICA.

		Carola Oliva-Olson	
Edgar Lampkin, Ed.D. Chief Executive Officer	Alfredo Camacho Western Regional Director	Carola Oliva-Olson, Ph.D. Vice-President of Early Childhood Studies	Esmeralda López California State Director

PUBLIC ADVOCATES MAKING RIGHTS REAL Angelica Salazar Senior Policy Advocate	**UNITE**LA Education Innovation Through Collaboration Alysia Bell, President

CC: Members of the Data & Tools Advisory Board
Mary Ann Bates, Executive Director, Office of Cradle-to-Career
Ryan Estrellado, Director of Data Programs, Office of Cradle-to-Career
Shannon Serrato, Director of Engagement, Office of Cradle-to-Career
Marykate Cruz Jones, Chief of Strategic Initiative and Partnerships, Office of Cradle-to-Career

Key Findings to Themes Heard During Meetings with Data and Tools and Community Engagement Advisory Boards Representatives

- There should be two different tracks of data; one for data that already exists and one for new data points.
- With only three recommendations allowed each year, this could be a very slow process.
- The benefit of having time and space for members to come together to discuss the recommendations, priorities, and metrics.
- Amend the Governance Manual to clearly define if there is a limit to the amount of recommendations each Advisory Board member can submit annually.
- Create a repository of all recommendations submitted.