

# Cradle-to-Career Community Engagement Advisory Board

## Staff Report

Date Report Issued: March 13, 2024  
Attention: Members of Community Engagement Advisory Board  
Subject: **Feasibility Study**  
Staff Contact: David Lang, Research Manager

At this meeting, the Community Engagement Advisory Board (CEAB) will have the opportunity to hear the results of the feasibility study on a proposal from the September 12, 2024 CEAB meeting.

### Possible Action:

- ❖ Motion: The Community Engagement Advisory Board recommends to the Governing Board that two seats be reserved for current students (at least aged 18) on the Community Engagement Advisory Board or the Data and Tools Advisory Board. The CEAB recommends that the Governing Board seek additional funding and position authority for staff support to recruit and support student members. The CEAB notes that the Governing Board would also benefit from having students represented, but understands that appointments to the Governing Board are outside the authority of the Governing Board.

### Background:

Please find the attached feasibility study, Attachment A, that the Office of Cradle-to-Career Data conducted in response to proposals from the CEAB meeting on September 12, 2024.



## Feasibility Study for Fall 2023 Proposals from the Community Engagement Advisory Board

The Cradle-to-Career (C2C) Community Engagement Advisory Board is considering a proposal by Member Curry-Nuñez, which was introduced at the September 12, 2023 meeting. After amending the proposal, the Advisory Board voted to advance the proposal to the feasibility study stage. For more details, see the [Curry-Nuñez Proposal Document](#).

The amended proposal addresses three concepts:

- Requiring Student Board Members
- Additional Supports for Student Board Members
- Additional Board Member Composition Requirements

### Entities Affected by the Proposal:

- The following entities may be affected:
  - C2C's Governing Board
  - C2C's Data & Tools Advisory Board
  - C2C's Community Engagement Advisory Board
- No Data Providers would be affected by this proposal

## Background

The Community Engagement Advisory Board was established with the “responsibility for examining whether the managing entity is creating strong feedback loops with data users, supporting evidence-based decision-making and analytical capacity, and ensuring equitable access to actionable information.” ([Education Code 10865 \(b\)\(1\)\(B\)](#)). The [Governance Manual](#) of the Office of Cradle-to-Career Data (Office) designates the Community Engagement Advisory Board as the entity that:

- Recommends ways to improve feedback loops with data users and ensure equitable access to actionable information
- Recommends professional development and technical assistance models that foster evidence-based decision-making, strengthen analytical capacity to use available data tools, and enable end users to understand structure factors that influence outcomes
- Suggests communication structures that ensure a broad range of Californians know about and are using the tools
- Suggests additional tools that will address strategic objectives for the data system

At this Community Engagement Advisory Board meeting, the Office will present on the feasibility study. The Community Engagement Advisory Board will discuss the findings, amend the proposal if needed, and then vote on whether the proposal should be advanced to the Governing Board as a recommendation.

The feasibility studies are integral to the recommendation process, ensuring that any proposed changes or additions are viable, sustainable, and align with the overarching goals of the C2C Data System. This feasibility study considers the following:

### Cost

- **Startup Costs:** Costs to execute the proposal, including both direct costs and associated staff time.
- **Ongoing Costs:** Costs necessary to maintain the proposal.

### Compliance

- **Legal Requirements:** The feasibility study will assess any potential legal hurdles or considerations related to the proposal. This includes ensuring compliance with privacy laws, intellectual property rights, and any other relevant regulations.

- **Scope:** The study will gauge whether the proposal is consistent with the scope of work that is described in the [Cradle-to-Career Act](#).
- **Neutrality of the Office:** The feasibility study will assess if the proposal might jeopardize the Office's neutral stance in any way.

### Concept One: Requiring Student Board Members

**Proposal:** The proposal would seek to add student board members to C2C's Governing Board or Advisory Boards. The proposal seeks to add two student members to at least one of the three boards.

This proposal states that student board members who are currently undergraduates or in high school will provide valuable feedback on the design of practical tools and outreach efforts. This proposal also cites student board member requirements as a practice at several of the P20W Data Providers (See Appendix).

### Office Analysis

#### Relationship to Existing Policy and Protocols

- The Office currently supports 53 board members serving across three distinct boards:
  - A Governing Board with 21 members
  - A Data and Tools Advisory Board with 16 members
  - A Community Engagement Advisory Board with 16 members
- Two C2C staff members have board operations and support as their primary duties. The Office, in total, has 26 authorized positions.

#### Context: Governing Board

[Education Code 10864\(a\)](#) defines the composition of the Governing Board's 21 members:

## Attachment A

- 10 seats: 10 data providers have one seat each. In each case, the seat on the board is for the entity's executive, or the executive's designee. (For example, "The Secretary of California Health and Human Services or the secretary's designee.")
- Two seats: Legislators
  - One Senator, or the Senator's designee
  - One Assembly Member, or the Assembly Member's designee
- One seat: the Chief Operations Officer of California School Information Services
- Eight seats: Public member appointments
  - 4 seats: Appointed by the Governor:
    - Two elementary and secondary education practitioners to serve as a representative of elementary and secondary educators, counselors, and administrators
    - Two additional members of the public
  - Two seats: appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly
  - Two seats: appointed by the President Pro Tempore of the Senate

For the first 12 seats described above (data providers and legislators), the seat is for a specific person or their designee. These designees act on behalf of the person named in statute. Thus, a designee is an employee of that entity who acts at the direction of the person named in statute as the member of the Governing Board.

For the eight public member appointments, [Education Code 10864\(c\)](#) states:

“(1)It is the intent of the Legislature that, in appointing members, the appointing authority shall make every effort to ensure the membership of the governing board is reflective of the cultural, racial, geographical, economic, and social diversity of California, taking into consideration factors including, but not limited to, diversity in data user experience, diversity in expertise with educational data, diversity in professional experience, and representation from different geographical and socioeconomic backgrounds.

(2) The public members shall represent the public beneficiaries of the data system, including, but not limited to, practitioners, families, students, adult learners and workers, community organizations, research organizations, or advocates.”

Statute includes “students” as one of the public beneficiaries the appointed public members shall represent, and the Office found no language prohibiting the appointment of people who are students.

**Context: Advisory Boards**

Per [Education Code 10865\(b\)](#):

“(b) (1) There are hereby established two advisory boards to provide input and feedback to the governing board on topics as follows:

(A) The Data and Tools Advisory Board, with responsibility for examining whether the data system is providing actionable information and identifying ways to improve access to that information.

(B) The Community Engagement Advisory Board, with responsibility for examining whether the managing entity is creating strong feedback loops with data users, supporting evidence-based decision-making and analytical capacity, and ensuring equitable access to actionable information.

(2) Members of each of the advisory boards shall be appointed by the governing board, and shall serve three-year terms, with the initial appointment term staggered such that one-third of the positions expire each year.”

The [Governance Manual](#) states Advisory Board members include “the end users of the data system including practitioners, families, students, adult learners and workers, community organization staff, research organization staff, and advocacy organization staff.” The Governance Manual also specifies that:

- The Governing Board will develop rubrics for potential candidates each year based on the planned activities for the next three-years of the C2C Data System.
- Advisory Board members may not work for organizations or persons on the Governing Board. Representatives of institutions may serve no more than one consecutive term and can have only one seat on the specified Advisory Board. Barring these concerns, there are no other rules preventing an individual from acting as a member of the Advisory Board.

There are currently two students serving on the Community Engagement Advisory Board, Mike Nguyen (undergraduate student) and Alexis Takagi (graduate student). Previously, there was one student, Davis Vo (graduate student), that served on the Data and Tools Advisory Board.

### Office analysis: Channels for Student Feedback

In addition to having students on C2C's boards, the Office notes that the following other policies and protocols can facilitate student feedback to the Office:

- The Office must conduct a student experience audit to describe the challenges students experience navigating the transition from secondary to higher education ([Education Code 10867 \(5\)\(A\)](#)).
- C2C is mandated to engage in user-centered design ([Education Code 10867 \(4\)\(A\)](#)) and solicit public input regarding the data system ([Education Code 10867 \(4\)\(D\)](#)).
- C2C is also engaged in student-targeted focus groups on the development and design of its first dashboards, like the [Student Pathways Diagram](#).

The Office wants to highlight these channels for ensuring student voice is included in C2C's work, as these are complementary to student representation on the board. These channels are also important for ensuring the burden of speaking on behalf of all of California's students does not rest solely on a few students who may be seated on a board.

**Office analysis: Number of seats on the Governing and Advisory Boards**

As described above, the C2C Office is tasked with supporting and staffing 53 board members. It has 26 authorized positions, of which 2 have board strategy, operations, and support as their primary responsibilities.

It is the Office's analysis that if the Advisory Boards wish to advance a recommendation to the Governing Board to reserve any seats for students on these boards, that those seats should be allocated from the existing number of board seats. The Office does not have the capacity to staff even larger boards than it currently does. That analysis holds even if resources for additional staff positions could be secured, as the complexity of leadership and strategic capacity is already maximally stretched with the current 53 board positions.

**Office analysis: Proposed student seats on the Governing Board**

The Governing Board may make a non-binding recommendation to the appointing authorities. The appointing authorities for public member seats are under no obligation to act upon these recommendations. The appointment process for members on the Governing Board is determined by [Education Code 10864](#), and the Governing Board does not have appointing authority over its own members.

If the Community Engagement Advisory Board makes recommendations to the Governing Board regarding student seats on the Governing Board, The Office recommends the following language:

- *The Governing Board can make a non-binding recommendation that the three designated appointing authorities (Speaker of the Assembly, President Pro Tempore, or the Governor) allocate two of their designated seats for members of the public to students on a rotating basis.*

**Office analysis: Proposed student seats on the Advisory Boards:**



## Operationalizing the Proposal

To aid the discussion by Community Engagement Advisory Board members about whether to move Concept One to the Governing Board for consideration, The Office operationalized this part of the proposal as the following:

- *Amend the Governance Manual to require a designated number (e.g. two) of Advisory Board seats be allocated to students. Under this policy, students would be operationalized as individuals attending a secondary or postsecondary institution and are 18 years or older.*

## Cost

- Ongoing costs would be carried by the Office. The Office estimates that this proposal would require approximately one additional authorized position at the Staff Services Manager I level. This position would provide support as described in the proposal to modify recruitment materials and engage in outreach to ensure a sufficient pool of candidates. Additionally, this position would provide onboarding, and ongoing engagement and technical assistance so that student members may fully participate in the board's work.

## Compliance

- The Office notes that it is technically possible for individuals who are under 18 years of age to act as board members. Individuals under 18 will require parental disclosure and consent to act as board members. The Office remains concerned about logistical and other challenges that may occur when supporting board members who are under 18 years of age.
- The Office identified no material compliance issues with this proposal.

### Potential Actions by the Community Engagement Advisory Board

If the Advisory Board decides to move forward with this proposal, the Office recommends it be interpreted as a recommendation to the Governing Board along with accompanying proposed revisions to the Governance Manual about Advisory Board seats. These revisions should specify the number of seats, the affected boards, and the requirements for an individual to be eligible for a student member seat.

### Concept Two: Additional Support for Student Members

**Proposal:** This proposal seeks to add additional support for student members who serve on C2C's Governing or Advisory Boards.

This proposal's reasoning is that student members may experience distinct and unique costs as a result of participating in this process. As a result, this proposal explores ways student members could receive additional support such as:

- Additional staff time
- Additional remuneration or stipends
- Allocation of course credit

### Office Analysis

#### Relationship to Existing Policy and Protocols:

- Board members are currently eligible to receive per diem for attending board meetings (see [Governance Manual](#)).
- This policy is similar to the practice at some of C2C's Data Providers (See Appendix).
- Additional travel and transportation expenses can also be reimbursed so long as they comply with existing state [guidelines](#).

## Operationalizing the Proposal

To aid the discussion by Community Engagement Advisory Board members about whether to move Concept Two to the Governing Board for consideration, the Office operationalized this proposal as exploring whether any of the discussed supports could be provided.

## Cost

- As described above, the Office estimates that this proposal would require approximately one additional authorized position at the Staff Services Manager I level. This position would provide support as described in the proposal to modify recruitment materials and engage in outreach to ensure a sufficient pool of candidates. Additionally, this position would provide onboarding, and ongoing engagement and technical assistance so that student members may fully participate in the board's work.
- Providing per diem and travel expenses for a student member would not differ from the process for other Advisory Board members.
- Ongoing costs would be carried by the Office. These costs would be significant.

## Compliance

- The per diem rate and travel reimbursement policy is determined by the California Department of Human Resources. Providing additional support to student members would require a statute change.
- The Office is not able to grant course credit to student members but found no issue if a student's institution were to award credit for acting as a board member.

## Potential Actions by the Community Engagement Advisory Board

The Office has not been able to identify any potential implementations that do not require a statute change or significant costs. If the Community Engagement Advisory Board decides to move forward with this proposal, the Office

recommends it be interpreted as a recommendation to the Governing Board along with accompanying proposed language of what specific actions it should take.

### Concept Three: Additional Board Member Composition Requirements

**Proposal:** This proposal seeks to explore any additional legal requirements or challenges surrounding allocating Advisory Board seats to specific types of individuals such as parents of young children or students in attendance of particular higher education segments (e.g. community colleges, trade schools, undergraduate institutions etc.)

This proposal's reasoning is to ensure that the Advisory Board reflects representation across all of C2C's populations of interest.

### Office Analysis

#### Relationship to Existing Policy and Protocols

- Advisory Board members may not work for organizations or persons on the Governing Board. Representatives of institutions may serve no more than one consecutive term and can have only one seat on the specified Advisory Board. Barring these concerns, there are no other rules preventing an individual from acting as a member of the Advisory Board.
- The [Governance Manual](#) states Advisory Board members include “the end users of the data system including practitioners, families, students, adult learners and workers, community organization staff, research organization staff, and advocacy organization staff.”

#### Channels for Public Feedback

In addition to selecting individuals for representation on the board, the Office notes that there are other channels that can facilitate parents and other groups providing feedback to the Office:

- The Office is mandated to engage in user-centered design ([Education Code 10867 \(4\)\(A\)](#)) and solicit public input regarding the data system ([Education Code 10867 \(4\)\(D\)](#))
- Members of the public can also submit proposals for the Summer Advisory Board meeting which Advisory Board members may choose to sponsor
- The Office is actively engaged in publicly accessible outreach efforts across the state where individuals can give feedback on the following topics:
  - Communication Strategy
  - Design of Data Tools
  - User Types and Data Literacy

### Operationalizing the Proposal

To aid the discussion by Community Engagement Advisory Board members about whether to move Concept Three to the Governing Board for consideration, the Office operationalized this proposal as an exploratory analysis identifying any potential issues with parental board members or students from specified higher education segments.

### Cost

- The initial costs to reflect changes to board recruitment materials would be carried by the Office. These costs are not anticipated to be significant. However these estimates are sensitive to the definitions of parent or which higher education segments are being targeted. If the Office must recruit board members from a specific higher education segment or meet a very specific definition of parents, then additional costs and material effort would be required to guarantee a sufficient pool of candidates for the Advisory Boards.
- Ongoing costs would be carried by the Office. These costs may be significant.

## Compliance

- The Office identified no material compliance issues with this proposal.

The Office notes a few trade offs for the Community Engagement Advisory Board to consider: Reserving specific seats for different higher education segment students and a specific parent seat may be challenging to implement across time as individuals serve overlapping three-year terms.

## Potential Actions by the Community Engagement Advisory Board

If the Community Engagement Advisory Board decides to move forward with this proposal, the Office recommends it be interpreted as a recommendation to the Governing Board along with accompanying proposed revisions to the Governance Manual about Advisory Board seats. These revisions should specify the number of seats, the affected boards, and the requirements for an individual to be eligible for the specified seats. In particular, it would be helpful to more specifically define what criteria the Advisory Board would use to define eligibility for a parent seat.

## Appendix

**Student Representation On State Boards**

Entity	Number of Student Representatives	Student Type	Compensation
California Student Aid Commission	2	Undergraduate or Graduate	100 dollars a day per diem
State Board of Education - California Department of Education	1	High School Seniors	100 dollars a day per diem
California State University Board of Trustees	2	Undergraduate or Graduate	100 dollars a day per diem
University of California Regents	2	Undergraduate or Graduate	Tuition Waiver
California Community Colleges	2	Community College Students	100 dollars a day per diem