

Cradle-to-Career Community Engagement Advisory Board

Staff Report

Date Report Issued: October 2, 2024
Date Report Modified: October 14, 2024
Attention: Members of Community Engagement Advisory Board
Subject: **Proposal Overview (Agenda Item Four)**
Staff Contact: Ryan Estrellado, Director of Data Programs and
Stephanie Gutierrez-Valdez, Board Liaison and
Governance Specialist

At this meeting, the Community Engagement Advisory Board (CEAB) will have the opportunity to learn more about the proposal process.

Requested Action:

There is no requested action for this item. This is an informational item only.

Background:

Page 33 of the [Governance Manual](#) states that the Office of Cradle-to-Career Data (Office) “will convene a summer meeting where Advisory Board members can learn more about available data points and ask questions of the data providers about additional information that might be useful to access through Cradle-to-Career Data (C2C). This meeting would help share information about data that are only available through C2C’s data providers.” The DTAB and Community Engagement Advisory Board (CEAB) convened for their joint, summer, public meeting on July 10, 2024. Also in attendance were data provider subject matter experts (SMEs).

During the Summer joint Advisory Boards meeting, the Office provided a high-level overview of the P20W data set, which laid the foundation for the question and answer session with SMEs. The question and answer session allowed SMEs the opportunity to provide more information, insight, and clarity, and also

provided a space for the DTAB and CEAB members to ask questions of the SMEs or the Office. The Office also provided a high-level overview of the Community Engagement Framework, providing members the opportunity for further discussion and the development of proposal topics. Afterward, the Office reviewed the proposal process, providing key [resources](#) to DTAB and CEAB members.

Ad Hoc Committee:

The Governance Manual states that at the summer meeting, “members will determine if they would like to form an Ad Hoc Committee of up to five members who will convene publicly and be charged with writing a report with the recommended prioritization of the proposal forms received” (pg. 33). At the July 10 meeting, the CEAB voted to establish an Ad Hoc Committee that met on August 22 to identify the top three proposals and related reasonings and delegate two members to work offline to draft a report reflecting the Ad Hoc Committee proposal prioritization. The Ad Hoc Committee subsequently met on September 4 to approve the [proposal prioritization report](#) that was shared with CEAB members as a resource with the pre-meeting survey.

Amendment Process:

Proposal forms were due to the Office one month before the Fall CEAB meeting and were posted on the [Cradle-to-Career \(C2C\) website](#). As the Office received more than three proposals, CEAB members participated in a pre-meeting survey, to rank order proposals, utilizing the [rubric](#) developed by the Office to evaluate the proposals to examine potential impact and to align it with the C2C vision, mission, and authority. **To provide transparency into the results of the pre-meeting survey, the Office has shared the results of the CEAB pre-meeting survey, which can be found in Attachment A.**

Beginning 2024, in order to bring more structure and efficiency to the amendment process, the Office developed an [amendment form](#) as a resource to help CEAB members deliberate and clarify their thoughts so that the Office can capture the amendments as the author(s) intend. The submission window

for all amendments is from October 2-7, 2024. An amendment is defined as a clarification to the proposal.

Fall CEAB Meeting:

At the October 16 CEAB meeting, CEAB will receive a presentation from the members who submitted the top three ranking proposals, followed by public comment. Then Advisory Board members will discuss each proposal and evaluate whether they would effectively address the issues being flagged and would meaningfully advance the work of C2C. Advisory Board members will also be asked to vote on whether the proposal should be advanced to the Office, so that it can conduct a feasibility study regarding legal requirements; startup and ongoing costs to the Offices; and any political or other implications that would jeopardize the neutrality of the Office. 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 system. Examples of prior feasibility studies can be found on the [C2C website](#), and components of the feasibility study are broken down in Attachment B.

Next Steps:

Per the Governance Manual, “at the spring Advisory Board meeting, the Office will present on the feasibility study. The 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” (pg. 37).

Instructions on ranking from the Survey:

"Please rank proposals in order from one to six. Please ensure each proposal is assigned a response and do not duplicate a response."

Point Ranking System:

- 20 points: 1st position
- 15 points: 2nd position
- 10 points: 3rd position
- 7.5 points: 4th position
- 5 points: 5th position
- 2.5 points: 6th position

If a response was left blank, the average weight of the missing choices was applied.

Please note: This is the point system the Office has used for prior rounds of the Data and Tools Advisory Board pre-meeting prioritization surveys

Ranking Results:

Member	Data Literacy Outreach Tools	Points	C2C Mobile Application	Points	Expansion of Constituent-Based Community Conversations	Points	Foundational Ground the Workforce Vision	Points	From Data to Impact-Educational Case Studies	Points	Strategic Engagement and Targeted Training Platform	Points
Takagi	1st Choice	20	6th Choice	2.5	5th Choice	5	3rd Choice	10	4th Choice	7.5	2nd Choice	15
Nguyen	3rd Choice	10	1st Choice	20	2nd Choice	15	6th Choice	2.5	4th Choice	7.5	5th Choice	5
Gottlieb	3rd Choice	10	6th Choice	2.5	1st Choice	20	4th Choice	7.5	2nd Choice	15	5th Choice	5
Tonatiuh Gonzalez	2nd Choice	15	1st Choice	20	3rd Choice	10	6th Choice	2.5	5th Choice	5	4th Choice	7.5
Rodriguez	2nd Choice	15	1st Choice	20	5th Choice	5	6th Choice	2.5	4th Choice	7.5	3rd Choice	10
Jones	4th Choice	7.5	3rd Choice	10	2nd Choice	15	6th Choice	2.5	5th Choice	5	1st Choice	20
Lopez-Valdes	3rd Choice	10	6th Choice	2.5	1st Choice	20	2nd Choice	15	4th Choice	7.5	5th Choice	5
Largo	1st Choice	20	5th Choice	5	4th Choice	7.5	3rd Choice	10	2nd Choice	15	6th Choice	2.5
Nevarez	3rd Choice	10	6th Choice	2.5	4th Choice	7.5	1st Choice	20	5th Choice	5	2nd Choice	15
Gambia	1st Choice	20	5th Choice	5	2nd Choice	15	3rd Choice	10	4th Choice	7.5	6th Choice	2.5
Countryman-Quiroz	6th Choice	2.5	1st Choice	20	3rd Choice	10	4th Choice	7.5	2nd Choice	15	5th Choice	5
Aseltine	3rd Choice	10	1st Choice	20	4th Choice	7.5	6th Choice	2.5	5th Choice	5	2nd Choice	15

Attachment A

Cheang	5th Choice	5	3rd Choice	10	2nd Choice	15	6th Choice	2.5	4th Choice	7.5	1st Choice	20
Viveros-Walton*	5th Choice	5	1st Choice	20	2nd Choice	15	6th Choice	2.5	3rd Choice	10	4th Choice	7.5
Khosravi*	2nd Choice	15	-	5	-	5	3rd Choice	10	-	5	1st Choice	20
Lopez [on leave]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total – Results received by deadline		155		140		152.5		95		110		127.5
Total – *Results including late submissions		175		165		172.5		107.5		125		155

* indicates that a member submitted their survey after the deadline

Cost Considerations:

- **Startup Costs:** Initial costs required to kickstart the proposal will be estimated.
- **Ongoing Costs:** Recurring costs, such as maintenance, and support, will be evaluated to ensure the sustainability of the proposal.

Compliance Considerations:

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.

Conclusion:

The feasibility studies are a vital step in the recommendation process, ensuring that every proposal is thoroughly vetted and aligns with the mission and vision of C2C. Through these studies, Community Engagement Advisory Boards and the Office can make informed decisions that benefit the entire C2C system and its stakeholders.