

Practice & Operations Advisory Group Meeting Summary

September 15, 2020

The Practice & Operations Advisory Group provides a means for the public to offer recommendations to the California Cradle-to-Career Workgroup about how the data system could address improvement efforts at the institutional and regional level, support a case management approach to service delivery, and create tools that would be useful to students, families, and teachers.

This document provides a summary of the key points that emerged both during a half-day meeting and a follow up survey. More information about the meeting, including a recording, materials referenced during the meeting, and the PowerPoint, are available at <https://cadatasystem.wested.org/meeting-information/practiceoperations-advisory-group>.

The following advisory group representatives attended the meeting or responded to the survey:

Craig Hayward, Bakersfield College; Jessie Ryan, Campaign for College Opportunity; Susan Savage, Child Care Resource Center; Rick Miller, CORE Districts; Anthony Dalton, Futuro Health; Roneeta Guha, Linked Learning Alliance; Kathleen Porter, Poway Unified School District; Catalina Cifuentes, Riverside County Office of Education; Marcy Lauck & Joell Hanson, Santa Clara County Office of Education; Lange Luntao, Stockton Unified School District; David Rattray, UNITE-LA; and Tyler Wu, uAspire.

Governance Structures

The facilitator described the process used to develop the governance structure proposal, summarized the public comment on that proposal, and noted the recommendation of the Cradle-to-Career Workgroup to have a homework team made up of both workgroup and advisory group members revise the proposal.

Paige Kowalski from the Data Quality Campaign provided a national perspective, clarifying that building trust and establishing clear roles is more important than the size of the board. She explained that participating agencies must be on the governing board to serve as data stewards, and that very few states include members of the public on their executive boards. She highlighted Maryland as an example of a state that has expanded its governance structure to include stakeholders, with a focus on individuals that have expertise in large data systems, as well as practitioner voices.

Through small group discussions and the follow up survey, advisory group members provided this input regarding governance priorities:

Overall

Membership and Voting Rights

- The governing board needs to be made up of people who can work creatively in partnership to create a unified data system that fulfil its intended purpose, which will require including representatives of the public. (*Susan Savage, CCRC; Rick Miller, CORE; Roneeta Guha, Linked Learning Alliance; Kathleen Porter, Poway Unified School District; Marcy Lauck, Santa Clara County Office of Education; Tyler Wu, uAspire; David Rattray, UNITE-LA; Kristin Clark, West Hills Lemoore College*)

- Representation is skewed toward post-secondary. There should be more slots to represent K-12 (*Marcy Lauck, Joell Hanson & Nabil Shahin, Santa Clara County Office of Education; Rick Miller, CORE*)
- Members of the public who are on the governing board should have a full vote. (*Susan Savage, CCRC; Marcy Lauck & Joell Hanson, Santa Clara County Office of Education; Lange Luntao, Stockton Unified School District*)
- Votes should be made by a simple majority. (*Susan Savage, CCRC; Craig Hayward, Bakersfield College; David Rattray, UNITE-LA*)
- There should be flexibility to change the governance structure after that start-up phase. (*Kathleen Porter, Poway Unified School District; Marcy Lauck, Santa Clara County Office of Education; David Rattray, UNITE-LA*)
- A ratio of 4 community members and practitioners to 7 data providers (36%), as is the case in Maryland, feels appropriate. (*Susan Savage, CCRC*)
- There should be a specific voting slot set aside for early learning and care, which should not be combined with CDE's slot. (*Susan Savage, CCRC*)
- When given a vote, the data contributor should be voting on behalf of their constituents. More detail is needed on how the board would vote on budget and staffing. (*Lange Luntao, Stockton Unified School District*)

Responsibilities

- The executive board should have responsibility for ensuring that the data system is fulfilling its mission, including ensuring that data are made available to close opportunity and achievement gaps. (*Susan Savage, CCRC; Rick Miller, CORE; Tyler Wu, uAspire; David Rattray, UNITE-LA*)
- Expectations should be articulated about attendance and the need for a quorum. (*Jessie Ryan, Campaign for College Opportunity; Joell Hanson, Santa Clara County Office of Education; Kristin Clark, West Hills Lemoore College*)
- The executive board should meet more frequently than quarterly, such as monthly, in order to build trust and momentum. (*Roneeta Guha, Linked Learning Alliance; Kathleen Porter, Poway Unified School District; Lange Luntao, Stockton Unified School District*)
- The executive board should identify additional partners and data sets, particularly related to state licensure data held by the Department of Consumer Affairs. (*Kathleen Porter, Poway Unified School District; David Rattray, UNITE-LA*)
- The executive board should review its focus and policies at least once a year to ensure it is responding to changes related to regulations or community needs. (*Susan Savage, CCRC*)
- The governing board should have responsibility for identifying how the data system should evolve over time. (*David Rattray, UNITE-LA*)
- Meeting rules such as Roberts Rules of Order should be spelled out, and governance committee members should be trained in these protocols. (*Tyler Wu, uAspire*)
- There should be an onboarding process for new executive board members. (*Kathleen Porter, Poway Unified School District*)
- The proposal discussed at the August 31 workgroup meeting focuses on appropriate areas of responsibility for the executive board. (*Kathleen Porter, Poway Unified School District; Marcy Lauck, Santa Clara County Office of Education*)

Length of Terms

- Have members serve staggered two-year terms, including advisory group members. (*Susan Savage, CCRC; Roneeta Guha, Linked Learning Alliance; Kathleen Porter, Poway Unified School District; Marcy Lauck, Santa Clara County Office of Education*)

Advisory Boards

- More clarity is needed about how the advisory groups relate to the executive board and the responsibility of the executive board to respond to those recommendations. (*Marcy Lauck, Santa Clara County Office of Education; Tyler Wu, uAspire*)
- In order to ensure a balance of power and accountability, have an entity other than the executive board determine the composition and rules for the advisory boards (*Jessie Ryan, Campaign for College Opportunity*)

Managing Entity

The facilitator described the process used to develop the managing entity proposal and summarized the evolution of the workgroup position that led to the unanimous recommendation that the managing entity be a new office or program in the Government Operations Agency (GovOps), with the option of reconsidering where the managing entity is housed after the start-up phase.

Through a full group discussion and the follow up survey, advisory group members provided this input regarding the managing entity:

Criteria

- The managing entity should be selected based on its ability to leverage a return on the investment in the data system, such as how more accurate identification of students eligible for services yields additional federal funding. (*Kathleen Porter, Poway Unified School District; Catalina Cifuentes, Riverside County Office of Education; Marcy Lauck, Santa Clara County Office of Education*)
- The managing entity should be positioned so that it has standing or a political profile with the Governor's Office and the legislature. (*Marcy Lauck, Santa Clara County Office of Education; David Rattray, UNITE-LA*)

Responsibilities

- Ensure that the data provided does not reinforce structural racism and supporting the public in applying an equity lens to the available data. (*Susan Savage, CCRC; Marcy Lauck, Santa Clara County Office of Education; Kristin Clark, West Hills Lemoore College; Tyler Wu, uAspire; David Rattray, UNITE-LA*)
- Produce reports with basic information that support visibility and use of the data. (*Lange Luntao, Stockton Unified School District; Craig Hayward, Bakersfield College*)
- Ensure that the breadth of voices on the board do not result in mission creep. Serve as a skilled translator between the board, researchers, and the community. (*Susan Savage, CCRC*)
- More specificity is needed on how the managing entity will serve as a conduit for information from the public and ensuring the data is on target for the needs of community members. (*Tyler Wu, uAspire*)

Vote

Of the four advisory board members that responded to a post-meeting survey, all endorsed the workgroup recommendation to have the Government Operations Agency incubate a new program or office that would fulfill the responsibilities laid out for the managing entity.

Research Agenda

The facilitator described the process used to develop the draft research agenda, pointing out that it would offer more public information than most states provide and seeks to incorporate the full spectrum of data types (education, employment, and social service information) in phase one. Through small group discussions and the follow up survey, advisory group members provided this input regarding the content of the document:

Missing Data Elements

- The data system needs more socio-emotional information, climate surveys, and non-traditional education providers. (*Craig Hayward, Bakersfield College; Jessie Ryan, Campaign for College Opportunity; Roneeta Guha, Linked Learning Alliance; Marcy Lauck, Santa Clara County Office of Education; Kristin Clark, West Hills Lomare College*)
- The data system needs more information on remote learning. (*Jessie Ryan, Campaign for College Opportunity; Susan Savage, CCRC; Roneeta Guha, Linked Learning Alliance; Marcy Lauck, Santa Clara County Office of Education*)
- Have the Cradle-to-Career system conduct surveys on behalf of the state. (*Craig Hayward, Bakersfield College*)
- The data system does not include robust information on early learning and care. (*Susan Savage, CCRC; David Rattray, UNITE-LA*)
- Collect and include data on work-based learning, in coordination with work already underway by CDE and CCCC. (*David Rattray, UNITE-LA*)

Dashboard

- Care should be taken in the design to ensure that data is presented in a way that engages the user and makes equity issues clearly apparent, such as providing guidance about how to interpret the information shown. (*Craig Hayward, Bakersfield College; Roneeta Guha, Linked Learning Alliance; Marcy Lauck & Nabil Shahin, Santa Clara County Office of Education; Tyler Wu, uAspire*)
- Given that the dashboard will present aggregate results, the primary value will lie in the ability to compare data across institutions and the ability to identify issues worthy of additional investigation. (*Roneeta Guha, Linked Learning Alliance; Marcy Lauck & Nabil Shahin, Santa Clara County Office of Education*)
- Don't limit outcomes to short-term gains, such as the impact of early learning and care on third-grade outcomes, and instead also show long-term gains. (*Susan Savage, CCRC; Marcy Lauck, Santa Clara County Office of Education*)

Marcy Lauck noted that the California Department of Justice's [Open Justice Portal](#) provides a strong example of how to tackle structural bias when present data.

Query Builder

- Being able to disaggregate information at the regional and Assembly/Senate district would be very useful for practitioners and policy makers. *(Susan Savage, CCRC; Catalina Cifuentes, Riverside County Office of Education; David Rattray, UNITE-LA)*
- Add features allowing for analyses at the zip code level. *(Susan Savage, CCRC; Catalina Cifuentes, Riverside County Office of Education)*
- In order to be useful, it will be important to work with education entities to understand how to use the data to drive programmatic and intersegmental efforts. *(Jessie Ryan, Campaign for College Opportunity; Kristin Clark, West Hills Lemoore College)*
- The disaggregation on language should address English language proficiency and collect information on language proficiency over time. *(Craig Hayward, Bakersfield College)*
- The list of variables is comprehensive and would provide powerful analytical capability. *(Kristin Clark, West Hills Lemoore College)*
- The data points for early care and learning need to be reviewed. For example, including Desired Results Developmental Profile scores for early learning and care may not be appropriate for the query builder tool, as this is a developmental measure rather than an outcome. The Quality Rating and Improvement System is problematic because it does not provide data on all providers and may be constructed in a manner that may reinforce bias. Data are not available on the intensity of participation for all types of early education. *(Susan Savage, CCRC)*

Priority Research Questions

- Although the information would be historical and not about individual students, understanding trends would be valuable. *(Susan Savage, CCRC; Catalina Cifuentes, Riverside County Office of Education; David Rattray, UNITE-LA)*
- Solicit input from equity experts about the way structural issues can be masked by the limited types of information available in administrative data sets. *(David Rattray, UNITE-LA)*
- Include research questions that look at capacity issues, such as whether there are enough seats in public postsecondary institutions to fulfill the need for workers with bachelor's degrees. *(Craig Hayward, Bakersfield College)*
- Language should be edited to focus on the relationships between variables rather than assigning causality. Reports should be reviewed to ensure they don't reinforce bias and to allow for frank examination of structural factors that contribute to inequitable outcomes. *(Susan Savage, CCRC)*

Vote

Of the four advisory board members that responded to a post-meeting survey, one endorsed the adoption of the Draft Research Agenda, three voted "yes, with reservations."

Data Request Process

The facilitator described the process used to develop the data request proposal, described a proposal that clarifies how individual colleges and local education agencies could get expedited access to

information, and summarized the legal concerns that shaped the requirements for requesting unitary data.¹

Overall

- The process needs to balance the input of data requestors and data providers. (*David Rattray, UNITE-LA*)

Access for Local Education Agencies and Postsecondary Institutions

- Allow local education agencies and postsecondary institutions to sign onto an agreement similar to IDEA. (*Craig Hayward, Bakersfield College; David Rattray, UNITE-LA*)
- Local education agencies and postsecondary institutions should be given the same priority as partner entities. (*David Rattray, UNITE-LA*)
- Rather than prioritize based on role, requests should be prioritized based on alignment with the research agenda or urgency of the request. (*Susan Savage, CCRC*)

Comprehensive Review Process for Unitary Data

- Rather than require an IRB process for each research proposal, allow pre-approved research teams and individual postsecondary institutions/local education agencies to access pre-approved data elements. (*Craig Hayward, Bakersfield College; Susan Savage, CCRC; Lange Luntao, Stockton Unified School District*)
- There should be an overarching principle that reasonable data requests should be approved and more specificity about why requests can be denied. (*Craig Hayward, Bakersfield College; Susan Savage, CCRC; David Rattray, UNITE-LA; Kristin Clark, West Hills Lemoore College*)
- The proposed approach of having all data requests and reasons for rejections be posted to the website would help to establish accountability for sharing data, particularly if it noted that the Research Advisory Board had approved it. (*Craig Hayward, Bakersfield College; David Rattray, UNITE-LA*)
- The Research Advisory Board should hear appeals in cases where requests are denied, and the Research Advisory Board should include a broader range of individuals, such as representatives from policy-focused entities and the general public. (*Susan Savage, CCRC*)

Craig Hayward of Bakersfield College asked for the legal justification for requiring data contributors to approve data requests.

Vote

Of the four advisory board members that responded to a post-meeting survey, all voted “yes, with reservations.”

¹ Unitary data are information on a single individual, from which information such as name or birth date has been removed. Summary data are information where a minimum number of individuals are represented in the results, to ensure that individual identities cannot be determined.

Planning Process

In the survey, advisory group members had an opportunity to weigh in on the planning process. Susan Savage of CCRC commended the extensive work and collaborative/transparent process in sharing information when developing proposals.