

Governance Structure Homework Team Meeting Summary

September 21, 2020

This document provides a summary of key points that emerged over the course of the meeting. More information about the meeting, including the draft proposals, PowerPoint, and a meeting recording are available at <https://cadatasystem.wested.org/meeting-information/workgroup>.

The September 21, 2020 meeting had the following goals:

- Edit a draft proposal for the governance structure
- Edit a draft proposal for the Managing Entity responsibilities

The following representatives attended the meeting:

Thomas Vu, Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities; Craig Hayward, Bakersfield College; Barney Gomez, California Community College Chancellor's Office; Su Jin Jez, California Competes; Ben Allen and Cindy Kazanis, California Department of Education; Akhtar Khan, California Department of Social Services; Anna Alvarado, California Edge Coalition; Amy Fong, California School Information Services; Patrick Perry, California Student Aid Commission; Samantha Tran, Children Now; Carlise King, Child Trends; Andrea Venezia and Colleen Moore, Education Insights; Joy Bonaguro, GovOps; Rigel Spencer Massaro, Public Advocates; Angela Perry, TICAS; Chris Furgiuele, University of California Office of the President

Governance Structure Proposal

The meeting began with the facilitator sharing comments on the draft proposal from Ed Sullivan of CSU, who was unable to attend the second meeting:

- There should be clearer language regarding the requirements that the state underwrite both one-time and on-going costs for new data elements
- The feasibility study must address legal requirements associated with data collection
- The threshold for voting on the following items should be a two-thirds majority:
 - Access to additional, existing data elements
 - Collection and inclusion of new data elements
 - New dashboard visualizations
 - New query builder data points

Cindy Kazanis from CDE shared these concerns, particularly regarding the lack of alignment with the legal framework already established by the Cradle-to-Career Workgroup.

Other input on the proposal is grouped by topic below.

Public Member Seats

- Rather than specifying a K-12 administrator, use the broader term of K-12 leader.
- When the Governing Board is first established, ensure that all six members are appointed at same time and limit the length of some terms to create a staggered approach.
- There should be specific roles designated for all six public appointees, such as clarifying that they should have expertise in data systems and data use.

- There should be designated roles, but they should be for types of end users, such as students and parents.
- There should also be designated roles for adult learners and workers.
- There should be more seats for public representatives.
- The public representation should be determined by listing the roles that are critical for the data system to serve its intended purpose (such as parents, students, and data scientists).
- Additional seats should be appointed by the Legislature.
- Voting representation is a different task than providing input into the user design. There are many methods used to get meaningful representation to ensure data usability.

Other Seats

- The head of each data provider should have the ability to have someone outside the agency represent the agency (such as a member of the State Board of Education representing CDE).
- The board could include non-voting ex officio positions for the Legislature or the state's Chief Data Officer.

Collecting or Revising Data Elements

- Expanding the responsibilities of the Governing Board so that it can require state agencies to collect additional data elements seems out of scope.
- Given the volume of data that has been identified for phase one, the Governing Board should ensure this data is put to good use before trying to gather new types of information.
- The Governing Board could identify potential additional data points but not mandate them. The process should not be used to politicize the Governing Board.
- For new data elements, recommendations could be referred to the Legislature.
- The feasibility study should determine the feasibility, cost, validity, and reliability of the suggested new data elements. More specificity is needed about the feasibility study process.
- Allow the Managing Entity to collect information on behalf of the state.
- The Governing Board should be able to sunset or restructure data elements based on shifts in how information is collected at the local level.

Summary Reports

- Including neutral summary reports would be beneficial for the public because it would provide a common knowledge base about long-term student outcomes. The reports produced by the National Center for Education Statistics provide an excellent example of how this can be accomplished.
- More clarity is needed about the reference to equity in this item.

Annual Schedule for Board Meetings

- Meeting topics should remain flexible to allow the Governing Board to respond to unexpected developments.
- The proposal does not need to include this level of specificity.

Voting Thresholds

- Data display issues should not have a high voting threshold.
- When recommending new data elements, the vote should be unanimous, even if it is a non-binding vote.
- Requiring unanimous votes would allow a single entity to halt work on the data system.
- Two-thirds votes are appropriate.

Advisory Boards and Task Forces

- It would be helpful to establish Advisory Boards in statute to ensure an avenue for end user perspectives. Use examples such as language in the Local Control and Accountability Plan and make it clear that these seats are intended for public participation.
- It may not be necessary to provide specifics about the membership or focus of the Advisory Boards in statute.
- More clarification is needed about consensus decision making to note this does not mean a unanimous vote.
- Task forces should be subject to Bagley-Keene.

Managing Entity Proposal

- The Managing Entity should have analytical capacity for purposes such as engaging in discussions of data providers, establishing data definitions, and helping others interpret information appropriately.
- The Managing Entity should provide information from single data providers at the request of those agencies.

Additional Feedback

Participants were encouraged to provide additional feedback in writing to inform the final proposal.