

California Cradle-to-Career Governance Structure Homework Team Meeting Summary

August 13, 2020

A subset of the California Cradle-to-Career Data System Workgroup scheduled two additional meetings in August 2020 to investigate possible solutions for the governance structure for the state data system. This document provides a summary of the key points that emerged from the second meeting, which shared feedback from partner entities on a draft model and resulted in the development of an alternative model. More information about the meeting, including a recording of the meeting, and the PowerPoint, are available at <https://cadatasystem.wested.org/meeting-information/workgroup> (click on “Meeting Materials”).

The following workgroup representatives attended the meeting:

Thomas Vu, Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities; Amy Fong, California School Information Services; Ben Allen & Sarah Neville-Morgan, California Department of Education; Akhtar Khan, California Department of Social Services; Ed Sullivan, California State University; Patrick Perry, California Student Aid Commission; Joy Bonaguro, GovOps Agency; Chris Furgiuele, University of California, Office of the President.

Feedback on Draft Governance Model

After the first meeting of this homework team, the facilitator sent out a draft governance structure that reflected common practices in other states and input from the first meeting. All workgroup members had an opportunity to provide feedback on this model through a survey.

Executive Board

The proposal outlined a large executive board, which includes all partner entities that are data contributors plus a slot for GovOps and five slots for community members appointed by the Governor’s Office, which would make decisions using a two-thirds majority, hold public meetings, and would be focused on strategic direction rather than operational issues. While a majority of workgroup members agreed with the proposed composition, decision-making, appointment process, and responsibilities, several partners had significant reservations, including AICCU, CDE, CDSS, CHHS, CSIS, and the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (CLWDA). These included:

- AICCU & CDE: The managing entity (represented by GovOps) should not serve on the executive board.
- CDE: The board should have the authority not only to hire the executive director but also to review and fire this individual.
- CDSS/CHHS: The structure focuses too heavily on education agencies and does not provide enough focus on health, public health, social services, developmental and rehabilitative services.
- CLWDA: There should be more slots for apprenticeship, adult education, workforce training, and community members.
- CSIS: It may not be appropriate to ask partner entities that are not data contributors to share slots with data contributors that represent the same type of service (such as having one slot for

CDE and the State Board of Education). Also, there should be more representatives from local education agencies.

Membership

Akhtar Khan of CDSS emphasized the importance of having one slot for CDSS and a second slot for CHHS because of the scale of the data that these entities could potentially contribute to the Cradle-to-Career system and the number of different departments housed under the larger agency. However, Tom Vu of AICCU felt that this was duplicative, especially because other agencies that oversee multiple, disparate data sets would not have two slots (such as the employment data provided by the Employment Development Department, distinct from workforce training data provided by several departments under CLWDA). Patrick Perry of CSAC concurred. Akhtar Khan suggested that the executive board be expanded to include one slot for EDD and one for CLWDA.

Several members of the group expressed concern that the proposed governing board is too large, which could dilute engagement. Gavin Payne of the Data Quality Campaign noted that most state data systems have smaller boards that are comprised of the agencies contributing the data. However, most states have a more consolidated agency structure, such as a single postsecondary agency. Nevertheless, with clear processes and well-structured subcommittees, it is possible for large boards to be functional.

Ed Sullivan of CSU suggested that the slots could be assigned based on the type of services provided—for example there could be one slot that would rotate among the three public higher education providers. Chris Furguele of UCOP noted that if this approach was taken, terms should be limited to one year, to allow each entity to have a regular voice. Akhtar Khan of CDSS expressed concern that with a rapid turn over of the executive board, there may not be sufficient institutional memory.

Chris Furguele of UCOP suggested that rather than establish fixed roles for the slots for non-data contributors (such as researchers or students), these positions should be left flexible.

When polled, almost all workgroup members supported the approach suggested by Ed Sullivan. However, Amy Fong of CSIS suggested that a broader board develop recommendations that would be voted on by this smaller group and noted that it will be vital for local education agencies to have a strong voice.

Joy Bonaguro of GovOps inquired how the structure would change as new data contributors are added—would the size of the board increase to include each new entity? Sarah Neville-Morgan of CDE reminded that group that the legislation envisions an education data system augmented by contextualizing information. She recommended that the core of the executive board should not become too large and should focus on education entities. Tom Vu of AICCU and Chris Furguele of UCOP concurred, noting that it is important to remember the goal of delivering low-hanging fruit. This issue was flagged for further discussion at the August workgroup meeting.

The group sketched out an alternative proposal, where an executive board would be limited to eight slots, with rotating one-year terms:

1. PreK and K-12 (CDE)
2. Public postsecondary (CCC, CSU, UC)
3. Private postsecondary (AICCU, BPPE)
4. Education-related entities (CSAC, CTC)

5. Employment and workforce training (EDD, CLWDA)
6. Early care and social services (CDSS)
7. Health and new data sources
8. Community members

Voting

Chris Furgiuele of UCOP expressed concern about non-data contributors having the ability to vote on items that have direct impact on the operations of data contributors and suggested that they be excluded from those types of votes.

Responsibilities

Through an informal poll, workgroup members agreed that the executive board should focus on strategic direction rather than operations. However, some members noted that in the start up phase, partner entities may have to join ad hoc taskforces to provide their expertise on topics such as how data elements are constructed within each contributing entity.

Patrick Perry of CSAC asked for clarification on how the executive director of the managing entity would be hired and whether that person would be vetted by the Governor's Office. This issue was flagged for further discussion at the August workgroup meeting, with input from GovOps.

When asked whether a homework team should be convened during September to start work on a manual or charter that further defines the responsibilities and procedures for the executive committee, workgroup members thought this activity should be deferred until legislation is passed that finalizes the governance structure.

Advisory Boards

The proposal included five advisory boards similar to the existing subcommittees: research, technical, data, legal, and community engagement and assistance. In addition to data contributors, other entities would be included on the advisory boards such as academic researchers, the California Department of Technology, CSIS, and GovOps. While a majority of workgroup members agreed with the proposed composition, decision-making, appointment process, and responsibilities for the research, legal, and community engagement and assistance advisory boards, there was greater concern about the technical and data subcommittees. In addition, several partners had significant reservations, including CDE, CDSS, CHHS, CLWDA, CSIS, and UCOP. These included:

- CDE: It is not appropriate to have the state data system have its own research agenda—the Cradle to Career system should defer to the research agendas of the data contributors.
- CDE/CLWDA: The structure is too restrictive. The board should have more flexibility to create working groups when relevant and necessary.
- CDSS/CHHS: The structure focuses too heavily on education agencies and does not provide enough focus on health, public health, social services, developmental and rehabilitative services.
- CSIS: The research and data advisory groups should be combined because research requests are dependent on a thorough understanding of the underlying data. The technical advisory group should bring in external technology experts rather than data contributors.
- UCOP: The structure is too complex and will require an unreasonable workload from the data contributors.

Chris Furgiuele of UCOP noted that advisory boards that develop a research agenda and address community engagement & assistance seemed critical, but that the other three advisory boards did not necessarily need to be kept as standing committees. Instead the managing entity should be able to create taskforces as needed to support its work.

In addressing the question of workload, several members suggested that proposals from the advisory boards would go to the managing entity, and only be elevated to the executive board if they address the strategic direction. Ed Sullivan of CSU suggested that the executive board should also be empowered to add or remove advisory boards to provide a check on the managing entity.

Several workgroup members stressed that the advisory boards should include non-data contributors, such as community members. They suggested that the managing entity convene these groups, but that care should be taken to determine how individuals would be nominated for these advisory boards. Amy Fong of CSIS noted that these meetings should be open to the public to provide more avenues where other voices can be heard.

Through an informal poll, the workgroup members supported a proposal to only list two advisory boards in the authorizing legislation as suggested by Chris Furgiuele. These advisory groups would meet periodically to provide input about the strategic direction of the data system. Workgroup members also supported the concept of providing flexibility to the executive board and managing entity to add and remove other advisory groups and taskforces as needed.