California Cradle-to-Career Workgroup Meeting Summary
August 31, 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 August 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 & Universities; Michael Marion, Bureau for Private Postsecondary Education; Ben Allen, Cindy Kazanis, Sarah Neville-Morgan, and Mary Nicely, California Department of Education; Akhtar Khan, California Department of Social Services; Brenda Bridges Cruz, California Department of Technology; Elaine Scordakis, California Health and Human Services; Jeanne Wolfe, California Labor and Workforce Development Agency; Amy Fong, California School Information Services; Ed Sullivan, California State University, Office of the Chancellor; Patrick Perry, California Student Aid Commission; Barney Gomez, California Community College Chancellor's Office; Sara Pietrowski, California State Board of Education; Michele Perrault, Commission on Teacher Credentialing; Amy Faulkner, Employment Development Department; Joy Bonaguro and Julie Lee, Government Operations Agency; Chris Furgiuele, University of California, Office of the President; and Ben Chida, Governor's Office.

Public Comment
The meeting opened with public comment from a number of organizations, which focused on the proposal for the governance structure.

Anna Alvarado of the California EDGE Coalition expressed concern that the proposal for a small Executive Board removed opportunities for adult learners and apprentices to help shape the state data system. The governing board size should be expanded to ensure there is a strong voice from community members and advocates.

Stephen Blake of Children Now, referencing a letter signed by four organizations, urged the workgroup to reject the proposal for a small Executive Board and encouraged them to return to an earlier potential structure that reserved a larger share of voting positions for community members. He also reminded the group that the goal of the data system is to provide actionable information to educators and service providers to strengthen student outcomes.

Christopher Nellum of Ed Trust-West echoed concerns that the discussion was focused on the partner entities as owners of the data, whereas the data truly originates from students and families. Community based organizations and nonprofits should have a vote on the governing board to ensure the data system focuses on the needs of the public.

Katrina Linden of the Campaign for College Opportunity felt that the governing proposal lacked meaningful input in its development. She recommended that the workgroup adopt a larger governing board that ensures representation for all stakeholders.

Angela Perry from The Institute for College Access & Success (TICAS) noted that the highest priority of the data system must be to address student needs and to serve the public. Given that there had not been enough time for others to review and comment on the proposal, the workgroup should not vote on the proposal today.

Rigel Massaro of Public Advocates stated the design process was complex and moving quickly. The governance board must seek input from end users and the intended beneficiaries of the system. Therefore, community voices must be represented in a transparent governance process, and they should have voting rights.

Data Request Process Proposal

Ed Sullivan of CSU, representing a homework team that developed a proposal for the data request process, walked the group through the key features, including a differentiated request process for partners and third parties, multiple review and feedback loops to help requestors navigate the process and reduce workload on partner entities, ensuring that expertise from data contributors informs access, focusing on data security for unitary data, and providing public information about the request process and outcomes.

Kathy Booth of WestEd flagged several concepts embedded in the proposal, including:

- constraining information available for data requests to the P20W data set and predetermined variables from CDSS, CHHS, CLWDA, and CTC

- rather than create a separate partner research data set, having partner entities access the P20W data set

- tasking the managing entity with fulfilling approved data requests from repositories of data that have already been uploaded by the partner entities

- requiring requestors to access information within a secure data enclave

Kathy Booth also shared input from the Research Agenda Subcommittee. The subcommittee unanimously supported the proposal, but encouraged additional documentation at the point of implementation, including: the intent of the system to approve and post findings for all credible requests, not denying research if the topic is outside of the priorities of an individual data partner or could cast partners in a negative light, and releasing clearly stated criteria regarding why requests could be denied or why reports would not be posted.

Tom Vu of AICCU asked whether individual colleges would use the same expedited process as other partner entities—an issue of particular concern for independent colleges because they are not represented by a state agency. Ed Sullivan asked if individual institutions (such as the individual colleges of the CCC, CSU, and UC) would be allowed to go through an expedited process. Bruce Yonehiro of CDE clarified that state agencies would sign a Business Use Case Proposal (BUCP)—a use-specific document available to state agencies that have signed the Interagency Data Exchange Agreement (IDEA). However, because IDEA does not apply for individual institutions, local education agencies and colleges would need to follow the third party request process.

Tom Vu asked that the homework team outline a streamlined process for individual institutions to request data. Chris Furgiuele of UC supported this focus on making data easily available to individual campuses, particularly because it would encourage college representatives to review and address issues of data quality. Ed Sullivan recommended that this process clearly distinguish between a representative

of an institution, such as the institutional research office, as opposed to individual employees of an institution.

Chris Furgiuele asked how the P20W data set relates to the unitary data that would require partner entity and institutional review board (IRB) approval before it could be accessed.[1] Ed Sullivan clarified that the P20W data set would be a set of data points that can be used in various ways, including to create the public-facing tools, to generate summary data sets, or to be accessed at a unitary level for analytical purposes. Requestors will need to balance whether they would rather go through the expedited process and work with summary data (which does not require an IRB) or if they want to go through the comprehensive review process.

Chris Furgiuele asked for further clarification about whether the managing entity approves data requests before they reach the partner entity. Kathy Booth indicated that the managing entity ensures that data is not available through public sources and provides project management support to ensure timelines are on target. The Research Advisory Group evaluates the research methodology and alignment to the research agenda and system goals. The partner entities only review proposals that have met these requirements, at which point they can work with the requestor regarding topics such as whether the appropriate data elements have been requested to address the research question.

Elaine Scordakis of CHHS asked whether the process addresses the diverse legal requirements for education and health data. Baron Rodriguez of WestEd noted that unitary requests would go through the same IRB process used by CDE, CHHS, and many other state agencies, which addresses key state and federal rules. In addition, the partner entities will review whether the request meets their legal requirements. Cindy Kazanis of CDE asked that the proposal be amended to clarify that partner entities will evaluate the request based on laws specific to their agencies, as well as broader state and federal regulations.

Chris Furgiuele asked whether all unitary data requests would require an IRB. Baron Rodriguez noted that they would, because it is best practice to treat all unitary data as identifiable. Kathy Booth noted that this issue had been flagged by the Research Agenda Subcommittee, the Legal Subcommittee, the Technology & Security Subcommittee, and the Common Identifier Subcommittee. Even when names or dates of birth are removed, there will be enough information available for each individual that it could be possible for a skilled researcher to determine the identity of the person associated with each record.

Chris Furgiuele inquired whether the data system could have tiers of unitary data, such as a data warehouse of deidentified data that does not require an IRB. Baron Rodriquez indicated that this might be possible if only education data are included.

Amy Fong of CSIS raised a concern that it may be difficult for partner entities to respond in a timely way and encouraged that additional resources be provided to partners to support the review and approval of data requests. Ed Sullivan noted that there are costs involved with pulling data for the partner entities and managing entity. Kathy Booth noted that the Legal Subcommittee will work on payment policies later this fall.

VOTE: The group voted unanimously to forward to the advisory groups the proposed data request process with the following changes: 1) Clarify that requests must meet agency, state, and federal legal

---

[1] Unitary data are records for a single individual, with some personally identifiable information—such as name or birthdate—removed. In contrast, summary data only display results above a threshold for the number of individual records and remove all information that would enable an individual to be reidentified.

criteria and 2) develop a process where individual local educational agencies (LEAs) or colleges can request data.

The Data Request Process homework team will develop a proposal for how requests from individual LEAs and colleges will be handled for the September workgroup meeting.

Discussion with Ben Chida, Governor's Office

Ben Chida of the Governor's Office reflected on the extraordinary process underway—more than a year spent determining implementation specifics that will inform the Governor's proposal and budget. The process was designed to build trust and examine the best way to link existing efforts. He commended the group on their work to date and reminded them to keep the big picture in mind. As noted in the public comment, the data system is intended to serve students, families, and service providers.

Tom Vu of AICCU asked whether the proposal for phase one of the Cradle-to-Career system is on target, particularly regarding the scale of what would be included. Ben Chida confirmed an appropriate scope had been identified, because it addresses long-term goals and the systems necessary to create durability. California has struggled with underinvestment in data systems. The governor sees information as critical for decision making and is seeking to improve that infrastructure.

Mary Nicely of CDE inquired whether the public comment aligned with the Governor's vision. Ben Chida clarified that the Governor's Office did not have specific requirements for the governance structure and trusts the workgroup to develop an appropriate approach. However, this approach should foster the vision for the system, which is to provide information to a range of stakeholders so they can identify ways to improve policy and practice and act on those insights. This will require that education data be linked to social services data, and that operational data is provided in addition to analytical data. As the advocates noted, the information in the data system should primarily serve the people of California.

Mary Nicely asked whether it would be possible to postpone the vote on the governance structure, given the concerns raised in public comment. Michael Marion of BPPE suggested that the workgroup use today's discussion to develop recommendations on how the proposal could be restructured to address the concerns of the advocacy community.

Mary Nicely asked whether the partner entities should develop budget proposals for the cost of their participation in the Cradle-to-Career system. Ben Chida indicated that he would check with the Department of Finance, but that his goal was to create one consolidated proposal, which includes the costs necessary for the partner entities.

Governance Structure Proposal

Chris Furgiuele of UC, representing a homework team that developed a proposal for the governance structure, walked the group through the key features, including:

- an Executive Board that is focused on strategic direction, has a small membership to foster meaningful engagement, uses short terms to ensure many voices are heard, requires a super-majority for decisions, and has meetings that are open to the public[2]

---

[2] The Executive Board would have nine seats, most of which would be shared by more than one partner entity using rotating terms: 1) CDE, 2) CCCCO/CSU/UCOP, 3) AICCU/BPPE, 4) CSAC/CTC, 5) CLWDA/EDD, 6) CDSS, 7) health and new partner identified over time, 8 & 9) community representatives appointed by the Governor's Office. Read the proposal here.

- a Data Use Priorities Advisory Board where half of the participants are from the public, which develops recommendations for available data points, content for public tools, and priorities for research studies

- a Community Engagement Advisory Board where half of the participants are from the public, which recommends ways to improve feedback loops with data users and ensure equitable access to actionable information

- flexible taskforces created by the managing entity to provide expertise as needed

Barney Gomez of CCCCO expressed concern that one-year terms would be too short to weigh in meaningfully, especially given the complexity of the system, and was uncomfortable with the idea of one person representing multiple agency perspectives.

Ed Sullivan of CSU noted that large boards dilute voices and argued that the partner entities could build sufficient trust that agencies could articulate each other's concerns. He warned against reinforcing current agency silos.

Michele Perrault of CTC indicated that while public postsecondary institutions are likely to share common concerns and could be grouped together, teacher credentialing and financial aid—which were also grouped together—address very different topics. However, she thought it would be feasible to share one slot on the governing board across the two commissions.

Barney Gomez recommended that each of the public postsecondary agencies get an independent seat, which would make an Executive Board with eleven people. Michael Marion of BPPE, although he shared concerns about a board of twenty or more people, thought that his agency should not be grouped with AICCU, which would bring the total to twelve.

Sara Pietrowski of SBE, Brenda Bridges Cruz of CDT, and Amy Fong of CSIS all felt that their entities did not need separate seats on the Executive Board, particularly given concerns about the group getting too big. Amy Fong further noted that the Advisory Boards would create a forum in which community voices could be heard.

Joy Bonaguro of GovOps wondered if rotating representation could be an avenue for strengthening trust while ensuring the manageability of the governance structure. Amy Fong noted that by representing the goals of the data system, rather than one specific entity, the Executive Board could stay true to its vision.

Sara Pietrowski asked how large governing boards are in other states and whether those boards are effective. Gavin Payne of the Data Quality Campaign indicated that governance rules are more important than the board size. However, most states have Executive Boards with between five and nine representatives, augmented by various committees. The number of representatives is also shaped by the agency structure—most states have only one agency for all higher education segments, which also often includes teacher credentialing. Similarly, social services are generally provided under a single agency.

Baron Rodriguez of WestEd noted that the issue is complicated in California by linking so many different types of data that have diverse legal requirements. The proposed system will already be integrating education and health requirements. These will grow more complex as data sets such as criminal justice are added. He further noted that representation is also a political issue, such as whether entities with a separately elected official get their own seat. Finally, he pointed out membership should be driven by the specific responsibilities of each committee.

Chris Furgiuele noted that the size of the governing structure should be examined in proportion to the size of the managing entity. For example, would it be appropriate to have a twenty person board if there are only five staff? Patrick Perry of CSAC noted that if there is a large governance structure, the managing entity would spend an inordinate amount of time in board management.

Tom Vu of AICCU suggested assigning seats based on agencies. For example, CHHS should have only one seat rather than having both a seat for CDSS and a seat for health. Similarly, CLWDA and EDD should remain grouped together. Elaine Scordakis of CHHS, Jeanne Wolfe of CLWDA, and Amy Faulkner of EDD agreed.

Sarah Neville-Morgan of CDE noted that seats could be assigned based on proportionality. For example, CDE serves 6.2 million students and so should have more voting power than higher education, which serves fewer students. Patrick Perry noted that by this benchmark, the largest voting share would go to CHHS because they serve 35 million people.

Barney Gomez suggested that representation should be based on the number of variables that each entity is providing.

Patrick Perry suggested that a small executive committee, with five to seven people, could be created within a larger board to handle items that need a swift resolution. The larger board could just weigh in on policy issues. However, clear responsibilities would need to be established between the executive committee and the larger board.

Joy Bonaguro reflected that having a seat on the Executive Board was being conflated with having meaningful input. She wondered what decisions people are worried about that could be made without their agreement. Barney Gomez indicated that he did not believe that the other higher education segments could adequately represent career and technical education and adult education.

Ed Sullivan expressed concern that the discussion had become focused on protecting turf, with students and families absent from the conversation. He warned that a self-interested recommendation could lead to the legislature enacting an entirely different approach to governance.

Chris Furgiuele noted that the managing entity could be tasked with working with the partner entities to vet proposals in advance, to ensure that appropriate feedback was integrated before a vote. Sara Pietrowski and Akhtar Khan of CDSS agreed with this idea.

Baron Rodriguez noted that it is fairly common for state longitudinal data systems to assign multiple agencies to a single voting slot. This approach requires that proposals that impact other agencies must be vetted beforehand, so that the affected parties share their thoughts with the voting representative. This responsibility can be recorded in a charter or bylaws.

Sara Pietrowski shared that it would be much easier to design a structure if there was clarity about what decisions the Executive Board or Advisory Boards would be making. Marcy Nicely of CDE agreed. Chris Furgiuele argued that it is also important to have more clarity out the managing entity's responsibilities.

VOTE: The group voted unanimously to have a homework team that includes both workgroup and advisory group members develop a more granular governance structure proposal that directly addresses the responsibilities of the managing entity and the responsibilities and voting rights for data contributors, practitioners, and representatives of the public, for discussion with the advisory groups, partner entities, and Governor's Office.

The following workgroup members volunteered to be on the homework team: Tom Vu, AICCU; Ben Allen, CDE; Patrick Perry, CSAC; Amy Fong, CSIS; Ed Sullivan, CSU; and Akhtar Khan, DSS; Sara Pietrowski, SBE; Joy Bonaguro, GovOps; and Chris Furgiuele, UC. The following advisory group and community members also volunteered: Anna Alvarado, California Edge Coalition; Jessie Ryan, Campaign for College Opportunity; Samantha Tran, Children Now; Christopher Nellum, Ed Trust-West; Rigel Spencer Massaro, Public Advocates; and Angela Perry, TICAS.

The facilitators requested that partner entities and members of the public contact WestEd to document other concerns that they had about the proposal, such as the length of terms, the voting thresholds, and the board chair role. This input should also address items that should not be assigned to the governing board. Dates for the public meetings of this homework team will be posted on the project website and included in listserv alerts once scheduled.

Managing Entity Proposal

At the July meeting, the workgroup provisionally recommended that the managing entity should be a new department or program under GovOps and determined it would revisit the decision after developing the governance structure proposal. Julie Lee, the GovOps undersecretary, attended the meeting and outlined the resources that GovOps could bring to the table, particularly related to the criteria discussed at the July meeting.

GovOps is experienced with getting new programs underway, particularly in supporting operational needs. As the agency that oversees the various control agencies for the state, GovOps is familiar with a broad range of models for how departments can be constructed, which can be adapted to address the priorities for the Cradle-to-Career system.

GovOps has experience with hiring technology staff, as it oversees CDT, the Office of Digital Innovation, and the state's chief data officer. The agency has been modernizing its hiring efforts to create a workforce that reflects the state of California, particularly related to equity, diversity, and inclusion. It is also reviewing job classifications that deal with information technology, data, and digital services to ensure they have proper specifications and qualifications that align with the private sector.

Other GovOps departments such as the Department of General Services and CDT have developed robust relationships with vendors and stakeholder communities that can support public-private partnerships. GovOps is also familiar with models for creating nonprofit foundations that can help to secure foundation funding.

Tom Vu of AICCU asked about whether it would be possible for GovOps to incubate the managing entity in its first phase, with an option for potentially having it become an independent commission at a future date, and if so, how long the startup phase is likely to be. Julie Lee indicated that GovOps was flexible, but that five years might be a reasonable timeframe. She recommended that the enacting legislation specify a review date.

Patrick Perry of CSAC inquired about whether the board would have the authority to hire, review, and fire an executive director as a program under GovOps. Julie Lee responded that if the authority is enshrined in statue, it can be done. For example, in the California Constitution, article 7, section 4 lists positions that can be hired outside civil service and allows boards one exempt appointment. There is precedent for the Governor to defer to boards and commissions for hiring an executive director, including the California Earthquake Authority, the Franchise Tax Board, the State Personnel Board, and the Victim Compensation Board.

Julie Lee also noted that while there are a variety of board structures, when board members are unpaid, the majority of the work is done by staff under the leadership of the executive director. Therefore, the governance structure needs to clarify which decisions should be made by the board.

VOTE: Fourteen workgroup members voted to forward to the advisory groups the proposal that the managing entity would be a new office or program in the Government Operations Agency, with the option of reconsidering where the managing entity is housed after the start-up phase. Tom Vu of AICCU and Ed Sullivan of CSU voted yes, with reservations, on the grounds that the managing entity may remain under GovOps permanently. Joy Bonaguro of GovOps and Brenda Bridges Cruz of CDT abstained because they are part of GovOps.

Subcommittee Updates

AICCU Role

Tom Vu worked with the board of AICCU to clarify how the independent colleges would like to participate and be represented in the Cradle-to-Career system. They requested that:

- AICCU should represent independent colleges and universities on the Executive Board and facilitate interactions between the Cradle-to-Career system and its member institutions

- Institutions would upload data that they already collect once a year, in their native form

- AICCU and independent colleges and universities should be able to freely access data in the Cradle-to-Career system using the data request processes

Patrick Perry of CSAC asked if there are cost implications of the state collecting data from independent colleges, particularly regarding regulations that require cost recovery. Tom Vu replied that independent colleges provide data on various topics, such as financial aid and whether they accept associate degree for transfer students, without being charged. This issue should be clarified with the Department of Finance.

Cindy Kazanis of CDE asked whether AICCU represents all independent colleges in the state. Tom Vu responded that they represent 85 of the 113 entities that are accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). There are some additional nonprofits that are not accredited, which are also not members of AICCU.

Chris Furgiuele of UC asked whether the managing entity would be tasked with working with the independent colleges related to standardizing the data that they provide. Tom Vu indicated that the managing entity would need to provide this support.

Research Agenda Subcommittee

The Research Agenda Subcommittee has completed the draft research agenda, which includes specifications for the dashboards, query builder tool, priority research questions, and P20W data elements. Earlier versions of this document were vetted with the primary data providers earlier in the summer. However, all partner entities should review the updated draft carefully, given some final adjustments that were made in August. The research agenda will be shared with the advisory groups in September and will be voted on by the workgroup on September 29.

Master Data Management Request for Information

CDT received 27 responses for requested information on technology solutions that conduct person-matching and assign unique identifiers. The Common Identifier and Technology & Security

Subcommittees are meeting tomorrow to develop a recommendation for the September workgroup meeting on a common identifier solution.

Community Engagement

LeAnn Fong-Batkin of WestEd updated the group on the development of materials and coordination efforts with workgroup and advisory group members. The following community engagement webinars will be held in October:

- Data Experts (researchers, advocacy organizations, and policy makers): October 14, 12-1
- Practitioners/Educators (teachers, faculty, school and college administrators, and educational technical assistance providers): October 15, 4-5
- Students/Families in English (students, families, and community-based organizations): October 14, 6-7
- Students/Families in Spanish (students, families, and community-based organizations): October 15, 6-7

WestEd will send out an alert through the listserv shortly.

Focus for the Remainder of 2020

Kathy Booth of WestEd outlined the documents that will be developed over the fall and brought to the workgroup for review, including:

- Data classification scheme
- Legal agreement with the managing entity
- Legal agreement with the partner entities
- Payment policy
- Deidentification policy
- Privacy policy
- Opt out language
- Service level agreements
- Technical architecture options for the analytical data set
- Technical and legal model for the California College Guidance Initiative
- Technical and legal model for the eTranscript California