

Governance Structure Homework Team Meeting Summary

September 17, 2020

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

The September 17, 2020 meeting had the following goals:

- Refine list of the core responsibilities for the Governing Board
- Identify how to measure the concept of serving the public good
- Review potential makeup of the Governing Board

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; Ed Sullivan, California State University; Andrea Venezia, Education Insights; Joy Bonaguro, GovOps; Rigel Spencer Massaro, Public Advocates; Lange Luntao, Stockton Unified School District; Angela Perry, TICAS; Chris Furgiele, University of California Office of the President

Core Responsibilities of the Governing Board

The group reviewed a preliminary list posted at bit.ly/gov-do-9-17. Participants noted other items that should be included and provided additional nuance for the listed items. Key concepts included:

- Ensure the data are accessible. Specifically, assess whether the Managing Entity is providing support that allows members of the public to use the data.
- Where possible, reference language directly from the California Cradle-to-Career Data System Act. This helps to clarify that the data should be usable for teachers, parents, and policymakers.
- Spell out the different data sets that will be included and emphasize the longitudinal focus.
- Advocacy responsibilities should include ensuring there is sufficient funding to achieve the mission and vision. Greater clarity is needed on how the Governing Board and Managing Entity will share this responsibility.
- Include language clarifying the focus on fostering evidence-based decision-making.
- Ensure there is not mission slip that would cause the data system to illegally release information.
- Determine topics for neutral, annual reports that the Managing Entity would create from information available in the public tools that help to advance the public good and highlight equity issues.
- Identify areas where legal structures or policies could be modified to support the mission and vision and offer recommendations where appropriate. Develop recommendations with support from the Managing Entity, ideally in a neutral fashion that does not create conflict with data providers regarding local policies.

- The Governing Board should not be able to set policies for what partner entities must collect, but it should be able to review and approve data standards for the information that is submitted to the Managing Entity.
- While the Governing Board does not need to be familiar with the granular details, they would be accountable to stakeholders for what gets implemented.
- User-centered design should be implemented by experts and understood to include testing to make sure that tools will function in contexts with limited technology and broadband access. The budget should reflect this level of effort to ensure usability.
- The only dashboards that the Managing Entity would be responsible for would be those created by the Managing Entity and its subcontractors—not dashboards or reports that others create using data from the Cradle-to-Career data system.
- Changes to the governance structure should be subject to a higher vote threshold to make sure the data system does not get directed away from its vision and mission.

Quantifying Service to the Common Good

Participants identified possible ways to assess whether the Cradle-to-Career data system is serving the public good, including:

- Surveys and feedback from intended audiences
- Evaluating whether the intended audiences are using the data system and how many are using the tools
- Changes to student outcomes that reflect information accessed through the data system, such as greater awareness of postsecondary options, more applications to college and for financial aid, more opportunities made available to students, and the number of bills that use information from the data system to propose ways to improve student outcomes
- A strategic plan and associated evaluation plan that reflects a theory of action

One participant asked for examples of how other states have measured success. Another participant provided the following information from the Virginia longitudinal data system website:

This review assesses the overall quality of the [data system] by considering the nature of the organization maintaining the data system, those agencies and institutions providing inputs to the data system, and to which agencies and institutions the data systems' outputs are available. The assessment also considers the data system's funding mechanisms, internal and external researcher data accessibility, the quality of the data system's public user interface (dashboard), and the data system's current Data Quality Campaign ranking.

Review Potential Makeup of the Governing Board

The facilitator shared a document with a possible model that addresses concerns raised at the August 30 Workgroup meeting, available at bit.ly/gov-model-9-17.

The group offered input on this draft approach, including:

- It would be important to determine how the configuration will be affected when new data sets are added. For example, if information comes from an agency that is already represented on the Governing Board, would that change the ratio?

- It is valuable to include the specific departments that are represented rather than defaulting to the parent agency. For example, BPPE should still be represented on the Governing Board if licensure data is added, rather than providing one seat to the Department of Consumer Affairs that represents both data sets.
- It is important to take into consideration how much information each data provider is contributing. For example, CDE will be providing ten years of data on dozens of data points for millions of individuals. Other data providers may provide only a few years of data on a few data points for smaller numbers of people. The proposal to include additional practitioner slots for CDE is an elegant way to recognize this differential.
- The Governing Board structure should recognize that early learning and care data will be coming from both CDE and CDSS, and that the data for this population is both partial and of questionable quality.
- CDSS should have its own seat, in addition to CHHS.
- There needs to be a seat that can represent early learning and care that will think about the population rather than a department or program.
- There could be seats reserved for public representatives from each issue area, including K-12, higher education, health, and workforce.
- There should be one seat reserved for parents and one for students.
- There should be a seat reserved for adult learners and workers.
- It can be difficult for a single representative from a group that does not have a structure for developing recommendations to adequately reflect the needs of their community.
- It is vital for members of the public to have a vote to balance the perspectives of the state agencies.
- State agency staff may be effective representatives of the people they serve, especially if there are focused efforts to collect community input and strong onboarding practices for new Governing Board members.
- The advisory boards will be an important venue for developing stakeholder proposals from entities other than state agencies, so care should be taken on how those advisory boards function.
- Members of the public will be guaranteed a voice in Governing Board meetings that are subject to the Bagley-Keene act, because time must be reserved for public comment.