

# California Cradle-to-Career Workgroup Meeting Summary

December 16, 2020

The California Cradle-to-Career Data System Workgroup, which is comprised of partner entities named in the authorizing legislation, provides recommendations to the Governor's Office regarding data system development.

This document provides a summary of the key points that emerged from substantive discussion over the course of the December 1, 2020 Workgroup meeting. More information about the meeting, including support materials, 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; Leeza Rifredi, Bureau for Private Postsecondary Education; Barney Gomez, California Community College Chancellor's Office; Mary Nicely, Sarah Neville-Morgan, and Cindy Kazanis, California Department of Education; Brenda Bridges Cruz and Tim Murphy, California Department of Technology; Akhtar Khan and Natasha Nicolai, California Department of Social Services; Elaine Skordakis, California Health and Human Services Agency; Amy Fong, California School Information Services; Ed Sullivan, California State University; Patrick Perry, California Student Aid Commission; Michele Perrault, Commission on Teacher Credentialing; Amy Faulkner, Employment Development Department; Joy Bonaguro, GovOps; Jeanne Wolfe, Labor and Workforce Development Agency; Sara Pietrowski, State Board of Education; Chris Furgiele, University of California Office of the President

## Public Comment

Allison Jones, who led an earlier planning process with the Intersegmental Coordinating Committee and California Education Round Table, commended the workgroup and noted the important consensus building and groundwork that was laid by the earlier effort.

Alan Guttman of Johns Hopkins School of Education applauded the data system proposal, indicating that it would serve as a model for the nation. He also encouraged the proposal to focus more on data points related to birth to five data. For example, it would be valuable to integrate information from the National Early Childhood Workforce Registry and to link it with information on early education training programs to improve services for children and families.

Gail Yen of California Competes expressed concern about the governance voting threshold, which would not require support from public members to pass a motion. She suggested increasing the size of the board to 24 members, which would be smaller than the boards of the UC Regents and CSU Trustees.

Ana Fung of TICAS shared the concern about there being an insufficient number of seats on the governing board for public members. She noted that the decision to not have the managing entity conduct independent research is a missed opportunity but is supportive of the written summaries that the managing entity will produce. She urged earlier inclusion of data on private colleges, in tandem with the development of BPPE's data system.

Liz Guillen of Public Advocates expressed gratitude for the support of Governor Newsom and noted that prior efforts to build a longitudinal data system failed because there was insufficient political will. She

argued that for this effort to succeed, the public must feel that they matter to the process. She noted that concerns about the governance proposal had been raised earlier in the fall and the last-minute addition of one more data provider to the governing board shifted the voting balance.

Angela Perry of TICAS expressed appreciation to the workgroup, advisory group, subcommittee members, and facilitation team. She noted that concerns about the governance proposal were discussed by advisory group members in the late summer and fall. She felt that the advisory group recommendations should be included in the legislative report.

## Legislative Report

After the facilitator shared recommendations from the two advisory groups, the workgroup considered several revisions to the report based on their input.

### Clarifying the Value of the Data System

The workgroup members examined a list of potential uses of the data system that had been added to the executive summary, and suggested edits including:

- Remove the reference to consolidating costs, given that the data system may result in redistributing costs rather than eliminating them
- Clarify that the data system will reduce technical barriers to data sharing while ensuring individual privacy
- Highlight that a key value of the data system will be to build state resiliency to respond to unexpected crises
- Ensure that the framing goes beyond immediate needs caused by the pandemic and articulates why having data makes a difference for closing gaps
- Emphasize the longitudinal nature of the data system
- Reference the workforce and social service data sets that will be included, particularly apprenticeship information, and how they could be used to examine career trajectories
- Spell out the action that could be taken related to each of the suggested items and who will be taking that action
- Consider creating vignettes that clarify what might be different for specific types of people, leveraging empirical examples when possible
- Reduce the length of the list, particularly so that readers do not believe it is an exhaustive list
- Move this list into the body of the report and replace it with the list in a later section that groups benefits by stakeholder type
- Make the items less wordy and easier to skim, such as by putting items in a table

### Proofs of Concept

In order to demonstrate that the data system could return value in a short timeframe, the legislative report was edited to describe two ways that the work can begin in early 2021, using funds allocated for the Cradle-to-Career planning process.

Cindy Kazanis of CDE described the pilot project that will serve as a proof of concept for the analytical components of the data system. By July, the GovOps and WestEd will work with CDE, CTC, and CSU to create a dashboard with information on teacher workforce retention by linking information on teacher preparation programs, teacher credentialing, and teacher employment. CSU will provide the first teacher preparation data set because it trains about half of the educators in the state, but other

postsecondary institutions that provide teacher training will be engaged in the design of the dashboard. This project will allow a law passed in 2005 to be implemented and consolidate information that is currently be linked in a piecemeal fashion. This information can serve as the first step in a process to further link teacher preparation and workforce data that can help to address the impending teacher shortage. As a result, the timeline for integrating CTC data would be moved up from year four to year two.

Then, Tessa Carmen de Roy of the California College Guidance Initiative (CCGI) described how planning funds would be used to expand CCGI in the Inland Empire and Central Valley, two regions where an investment in supporting college planning could help to address equity gaps. In addition, CCGI would work with CDE on upgrading the CALPADS data system to increase the frequency of data loads necessary to populate electronic transcripts. In addition, they will work with CDE to validate the quality of a-g flags. Finally, CCGI will coordinate with CSU and CSAC on integrations that will make college and financial aid application more seamless for students.

### Theory of Action

The group made minor wording edits to a new statement that clarifies why the proposed scope of the data system is necessary to accomplish the vision.

### Governance

The group considered a recommendation from the advisory groups that the size of the board be expanded from 18 to 24 seats so that there would be an equal number of data providers and public members.

Cindy Kazanis of CDE, noted that the original governance proposal had been jointly developed with advisory group members, questioned why a change was being suggested at this point in time. Chris Furgieuele of UC, Michele Perrault of CTC, Barney Gomez of CCCC, Sarah Neville-Morgan of CDE, Ed Sullivan of CSU, Akhtar Khan of CDSS, and Elaine Scordakis of CHHS agreed.

Chris Furgieuele of UC was concerned that including a call out that describes an alternative vision could undermine the overall report. Amy Fong of CSIS, Amy Faulkner of EDD, and Barney Gomez of CCCC concurred.

Natasha Nicholai of CDSS reminded the group that this discussion will happen with the legislature, whether or not it is addressed in the report. While the proposal can stand, it will be important for the workgroup to keep an open mind. Barney Gomez of CCCC agreed.

Cindy Kazanis of CDE suggested using narrative to describe the governance discussion rather than a minimal pullout box in order to provide context, particularly to note that the workgroup members were supportive of the public having a voting voice.

Ed Sullivan of CSU clarified that his concern about having an equal number of public members is related to federal legal restrictions. He would not want the data providers to be put in a position where the board could require them to release data that would result in the loss of federal funding. His agency could not support a proposal that would put them in this type of legal jeopardy.

Chris Furgieuele of UC noted that his concern is related to the planning process, because the advisory group had been openly engaged in developing the proposal. He also explained that the data providers

shoulder more than half of the risk and costs for the data system, and provide critical expertise, which should be reflected in the voting structure.

Amy Fong of CSIS stressed the importance of the trust-building that was accomplished through the process of developing the proposal and the need to also build trust with the advisory groups. She was concerned that the framing of the governance discussion could foster an end-run around the process, which would reduce trust and transparency. Tim Murphy of CDT, Chris Furgiuele of UC, Sarah Neville-Morgan of CDE, Tom Vu of AICCU, and Joy Bonaguro of GovOps agreed.

The group discussed the possibility of assessing the governance structure several years into implementation, similar to the proposal to examine whether the managing entity should stay at GovOps at the end of five years. Joy Bonaguro of GovOps said this would entail assessing if there are repeated splits between public and partner entity votes, when those splits happen, and if they are more around data or overall governance issues.

Chris Furgiuele of UC noted that the governance proposal provides space for reviewing these types of issues through its continuous improvement processes, which would provide transparency about decision making. Barney Gomez of CCCC, Natasha Nicolai and Akhtar Khan of CDSS, Tim Murphy of CDT, and Amy Fong of CSIS agreed that a focus on continuous improvement and transparency will be critical for the governing board.

Ed Sullivan of CSU was concerned that if there was a sense that the board structure was temporary it could undermine decision making, particularly on difficult topics. Amy Fong of CSIS and Akhtar Khan of CDSS agreed. Chris Furgiuele of UC concurred and further noted that this approach sets up a sense that there is pending confrontation.

Tom Vu of AICCU was concerned that failing to present a clear vision for governance could impact the way the legislature elects to implement the recommendations.

Amy Faulkner of EDD indicated that it is important to acknowledge the advisory group recommendations but that it would be challenging to evaluate whether there had been sufficient public voice. Would the current structure only be kept if the public members agreed with all decisions? What is the threshold at which the board would consider changing the number of seats for public members?

Natasha Nicolai of CDSS thought it was more important to constantly evaluate the balance of public input, rather than benchmarking it in a specific year of the data system implementation. This is a stronger approach for building trust. Ed Sullivan of CSU agreed.

The group ultimately recommended that the report describe the process for developing the governance proposal, acknowledge the concerns raised by the advisory group, and clarify the workgroup's position. Draft text will be shared with the workgroup members for approval by email the following day.

### Agency-Specific Input

Each partner entity was given an opportunity to comment on the report and the planning process.

**AICCU:** Tom Vu expressed thanks to the planning facilitators and gratitude for the inclusion of independent colleges, even though they are not represented by a state agency. His organization is comfortable with the report.

**BPPE:** Leeza Rifredi echoed the kudos for the facilitation team.

**GovOps:** Joy Bonaguro appreciated the wealth of experience and the delicacy with which the group approached challenging conversations.

**CCCCO:** Barney Gomez noted that his agency needed until the following day to provide their edits. He thanked everyone for all of their work.

**CDE:** Cindy Kazanis echoed her appreciation. She praised the many team members at CDE who have participated in the planning process and the large team that will be pivotal to providing information for the Cradle-to-Career Data System. She noted that CDE values the opinions of the advocates and strives to be both transparent and to make actionable data available to the public.

Sarah Neville-Morgan affirmed comments by Cindy Kazanis that the plan for the data system needs to include more on early learning and care. With the transition of staffing underway between CDE and CDSS and the Master Plan for Early Learning and Care complete, it is now possible to dig more deeply into these recommendations. She also asked for the legislative report to include more examples about early learning and care.

**CDSS:** Natasha Nicholai expressed gratitude for the work done to keep everyone engaged as they were facing with the demands of responding to the pandemic. She agreed with CDE that planning should begin now on how to integrate the Cradle-to-Career Data System with emerging efforts to develop an Early Care Integrated Data System.

Akhtar Khan heralded the positive experience of working the other partner entities and the facilitation team. He believes the proposed model will be a valuable system for the state.

**CDT:** Tim Murphy echoed the long-term value of the data system for state and the model it would serve for the nation. He commended the level of attention and expertise on the workgroup.

**CLWDA:** Jeanne Wolfe praised the planning process and the thoughtful input she witnessed in various subcommittees as well as the workgroup. She also expressed thanks to members of the public for attending meetings and providing helpful insights that can help build trust and ensure stakeholder input. She noted that her agency is committed to contributing to the proposed system because it would provide such a strong value for the state.

**CSIS:** Amy Fong was grateful to participate in the conversation even though her organization is not a data contributor. She noted that while the process has not always been easy, the discourse when there was disagreement helped move the group to better recommendations. This is a model for how good government can work. She evoked the shared passion for bringing data together and applauded how the data system could focus state resources. She indicated she is comfortable with the report and looks forward to the next phase of the planning process and the implementation work ahead.

**CHHS:** Elaine Scordakis thanked the facilitation team for capturing the opinions and comments of all the partner entities. She expressed thanks to Ben Chida and the Governor's Office for their sponsorship of the data system. She echoed the value of public participation, which helps to remind the workgroup of what is most important. She thanked the many departments and their staff within CHHS who met to provide input into the planning process.

**CSU:** Ed Sullivan noted that he had sought to balance the needs of students and families with ensuring that his agency would not be harmed. He noted that the most beneficial aspects of the data system are

likely to be CCGI and eTranscript California. While they may not be what some envisioned for the data system, they will put actionable data directly into the hands of the public. Helping students understand what their college options are and how to get financial aid will make a tangible difference.

**CSAC:** Patrick Perry highlighted how in-depth the planning effort was, producing a significant amount of detail necessary for implementation. He reflected on what it has been like to work without a longitudinal data system and looks forward to being able to more easily share data. He acknowledged the tension that exists between data providers and users and emphasized the power of partnering with researchers to make use of available information. Finally, he reminded the group that the Cradle-to-Career Data System will be accountable to the public. If the contours of the data system change as it moves towards implementation, it still behooves the partner entities to get to yes.

**SBE:** Sara Pietrowski reflected on her experience with participatory planning processes and highlighted this effort as being especially strong because it built trust and engaged hundreds of people to envision what the system could look like. She highlighted the excellent work done by the many different committees. She echoed the sentiment that the operational tools will have a tangible direct impact on students as they plan for their education.

**CTC:** Michele Perrault echoed praise on the collaborative nature of the planning process and appreciated the candor of the group. Her organization is comfortable with the report and excited to be involved in the process, particularly the upcoming proof of concept. She acknowledged the challenges of ensuring that data can be shared in a secure way while providing valuable information to the public and researchers.

**EDD:** Amy Faulkner enjoyed the opportunity to work toward common goals with both the workgroup and the public. She commended all of the subcommittee and advisory group members. Her agency is pleased with the report.

**UC:** Chris Furguele praised the decision-making process that solicited input from workgroup, advisory group, and subcommittee members. He highlighted the civility of the process, which built trust despite disagreements, and should serve as a model for other efforts. He expressed appreciation for the support of Ben Chida and the Governor's Office. As a veteran of prior planning efforts that did not succeed, he is pleased to be part of this one because it will create a stronger model than anywhere else in the country, particularly through the inclusion of operational tools. UC looks forward to supplying data that will benefit stakeholders, students, and faculty.

**VOTE:** Most workgroup members voted to submit the legislative report as edited, minus the changes to the governance section. Comments on the governance section will be submitted via email once the revised language is shared.

Tom Vu of AICCU, Ed Sullivan of CSU, and Chris Furguele of UC voted yes with reservations, on the grounds that the report should describe the recommendations of the workgroup on the governance structure, rather than include the recommendation of the advisory groups that was not adopted. Ed Sullivan of CSU further noted that he was concerned that the size of the board would discourage meaningful participation.

Barney Gomez of CCCC voted yes with reservations until he could complete gathering his agency's input. The following day he changed his vote to yes and affirmed the content of the legislative report.