Review both the values in the CERF RFP and values as expressed by the committee members in previous conversation. Determined shared values.

What are the areas of governance to be undertaken? What are the decisions that need to be made?

In shaping a model, we will start with a series of questions that asks the group to consider priorities and test assumptions.

What might a model look like and what are the roles, responsibilities and communications structure we would expect.
Step 1: Identify group purpose and nature of accountability
Step 2: Determine entity type
Step 3: Create a collaborative governance framework
Step 4: Create governance documents
Step 5: Adapt the framework as the group evolves
VALUES – **THE GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE HAS**…

**Transparency**
CERF data, processes and information is publicly available and easy to access. It is clear on what timeline will be used and how decisions will be made.

**Inclusion**
CERF governance seeks to engage all peoples, parties, businesses and entities in LA County by varying and adapting the modality (virtual, in-person, etc), languages, formats that are used to ensure full participation of all.

**Accountability/Risk Testing**
CERF governance structure is accountable to the wider community and allows for risk assessment and modification and needed.

**Confidence in structure**
CERF governance structure should continually strive to instill confidence of transparency, inclusion and accountability.

**Unheard voices in decision-making**
CERF governance will actively create seats at the decision-making table(s) for leaders from disinvested communities. The governance process will center, lower barriers and proactively seek to tip the scales toward community-led decision making.
VALUES – THE GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE LEADS TO...

**Equity**
Regional Priorities and Strategies that seek to eliminate or lower barriers to ensure that economic opportunity is accessible to all regardless of their status or circumstances.

**Sustainability**
Regional Priorities and Strategies focus on a perpetual future tilted toward clean production for people and communities that deemphasize short term gains.

**Job Quality**
Regional Priorities and Strategies that favor jobs that have living wages, predictable hours, quality of life and health benefits and retirement savings mechanisms.

**Economic Competitiveness**
Regional Priorities and Strategies that favorably position the LA County region by investing in training/workforce, business sectors, redevelopment (land), infrastructure.

**Resilience**
Regional Priorities and Strategies that lift up investment in resources that communities can utilize to effectively withstand and recover from adverse circumstances (weather, disease, economic, natural disasters, etc.)
DECISION POINTS

• BUDGET

• GOALS/TYPES OF DATA ANALYSIS

• OUTREACH STRATEGY

• PHASE 1: REGIONAL PRIORITIES – What are the types of strategies that should be pursued based on data analysis?

• PHASE 2: PROJECT STRATEGIES – What projects should be prioritized, supported and funded?
GROUP DISCUSSION / ASSUMPTIONS

- Measure Success of Model and/or Outcomes
- No Decision-making at the Executive Committee level
- Steering Committee
- Risk Review

- A process that builds Trust
- A process that promotes Accountability
- A process that is Efficient
- Executive Committee seeks clear instructions from the Steering Committee

- Check-in process among groups to make sure there is active participation
- Voting can happen but their must be a clear sense of who is eligible
- Where consensus can be achieved the model should move in that direction
GROUP DISCUSSION / ASSUMPTIONS

- Stipend (meaningful)
- Capacity building for community at all levels
- Collective Input Agencies, Concept Formulation Committee, BIPOC Approval Stewards, and Executor Task Force?
- XX
## SHAPING A SHARED/INCLUSIVE GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>WHO1 (Responsibilities)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Community / Business / Sector / Industry Cluster Tables  
Pre-established tables (may or may not be formed just for CERF HRTC) | • Responding to Data Analysis  
• Advising on Needs and Analysis  
• Sharing with other community/business members  
• **Summarizing ideas/concepts to share with Table Leads** |
| Table Leads (A)  
Regional Leads (SPAs w/2 in South LA)  
CERF Affinity Area Leads  
Other Affinity / Countywide topic Leads (i.e. Education (primary + secondary), Immigrants, Justice Involved, Transition Age-Youth, Public Health, Personal Health, Income & Wealth, Jobs, Prone to Personal Violence, Community Violence) | • Responding to Data Analysis  
• Advising on Needs and Analysis  
• Sharing with other community/business members  
• Capacity building of Community/Business to be effective contributors to process  
• **Summarizing ideas/concepts that are shared by Steering Committee** |
# Shaping a Shared/Inclusive Governance Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>WHAT (Responsibilities)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Steering Committee (B)**  
  Subset of Table Leads?  
  CERF Noted Voices  
  Number of members?  
  What percent of the membership are community-based/led? | • Responding to Data Analysis  
• Advising on Needs and Analysis  
• Sharing with other community/business members  
• Summarizing ideas/concepts that are shared by Table Leads  
• Summarizing ideas/concepts that are shared by Stewardship Committee  
• Voting on Major Decisions |
| **Stewardship (Central) Committee (C)**  
  Convenor  
  Fiscal Agent  
  Community Leads/Residents | • Responding to Data Analysis  
• Advising on Needs and Analysis  
• Sharing with other community/business members  
• Summarizing ideas/concepts that are shared by Data Consultants with Steering committee  
• Summarizing and present ideas/concepts that are shared by Steering Committee  
• Implementation of Major Decisions |
## SHAPING A SHARED/INCLUSIVE GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>WHAT (Responsibilities)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Community / Business / Sector / Industry Cluster Tables (A)  
Pre-established tables (may or may not be formed just for CERF HRTC)  
Cut across regions, sectors, affinity areas, and shared challenges. Existing/pre-established tables, advisory groups, collaboratives, coalitions, etc. | • Responding to Data Analysis  
• Advising on Needs and Analysis  
• Sharing with other community/business members  
• Summarizing ideas/concepts to share with Table Leads |
| Residents/leaders/organizers, workers, labor orgs, worker centers, small businesses and industries | • Multiple number of tables |

**HOW will the table be set?**

Any individuals, small businesses, community, business or industry groups with an interest in participating in the CERF process and providing feedback.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>WHAT (Responsibilities)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Table Leads (B)**  
Regional Leads (SPAs- w/2 in SouthLA 9)  
CERF Affinity Area Leads  
Other Affinity / Countywide topic Leads  
(I.e. Education (primary + secondary), Youth, Immigrants, Justice Involved, Transition Age-Youth, Public Health, Personal Health, Income & Wealth, Jobs, Prone to Personal Violence, Community Violence, LGBTQ+) | • Responding to Data Analysis  
• Advising on Needs and Analysis  
• Sharing with other community/business members  
• Capacity building of Community/Business to be effective contributors to process  
• Summarizing ideas/concepts that are shared by Steering Committee |
| **Regional Leads**: Made up of 12 anchor organizations serving as regional leads with appropriate compensation structure to lead soliciting ideas, developing content, gathering feedback and decisions from community members across Community Tables. | Approximately 50+ Tables |
| **Affinity Leads**: inclusive of topics herein+ |  |
| **Space for Table Leads** to convene with each other to discuss unique regional challenges and communication across topics from Countywide lens. Building consensus around decisions brought to the Steering Committee. |  |
## Table Leads (B)
- 12 Regional Leads (SPAs- w/2 in SouthLA 9)
- CERF Affinity Area Leads
- Other Affinity / Countywide topic Leads (i.e. Education (primary + secondary), Youth, Immigrants, Justice Involved, Transition Age-Youth, Public Health, Personal Health, Income & Wealth, Jobs, Prone to Personal Violence, Community Violence, LGBTQ+)

### Selection Principals
- Inclusive
- No Voting
- No Exclusionary practices
- Open to new members/voices
- Hub leads should be selected to ensure a cross section of topics, language, modalities for reaching community members
- Hub leads should commit to consensus building
- Hub leads should have convening experience
- Hub leads should be prepared to share their proposed outreach strategy (who, what, where, when and how)

### Stewardship Committee:
- Select Hub leads
- Design application / Timeline
- Outlines key Characteristics of Hub Leads
- Outline requirements for Hubs to follow - outreach plan, required number of meetings in the community, attendance at Steering Committee meetings, Summary of activities, etc.

Stewardship committee can look at other processes for inspiration (i.e. Care First Community Initiative selection)
## SHAPING A SHARED/INCLUSIVE GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>WHAT (Responsibilities)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Steering Committee (C)</strong>&lt;br&gt;Subset of Regional and Affinity Table Leads&lt;br&gt;CERF Noted Voices&lt;br&gt;Community Members</td>
<td>• Responding to Data Analysis&lt;br&gt;• Advising on Needs and Analysis&lt;br&gt;• Sharing with other community/business members&lt;br&gt;• Summarizing ideas/concepts that are shared by Table Leads&lt;br&gt;• Summarizing ideas/concepts that are shared by Stewardship Committee&lt;br&gt;• Voting on Major Decisions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Made up of 31 seats representative of critical voices from government, labor, business, industry, and community stakeholders that serves as the primary decision-making body for the High Road Transition Collaborative.

1. **Community-Based Leaders (24 seats)** – 75-80% of leadership represented by grassroots and community-based organizations (tied to targeted outcomes and funding priorities).
   - a. Organizations committed to equity, environmental justice, and serving disinvested communities (19 seats)
   - b. Residents, workers, community partners (5 seats)
2. **Business, Industry (2 seats)**
   - a. Prioritize local, small businesses
3. **Labor (2 seats)**
   - a. Union leaders and organizers
4. **Municipal Partners (2 seats)**
   - a. Economic Development and Workforce Agencies
5. **Education Partners (1 seat)** K-12, Post-secondary

*No member of the Stewardship committee will serve on the Steering Committee*
# Shaping a Shared/Inclusive Governance Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>Selection Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Steering Committee (C)</strong>&lt;br&gt;Subset of Regional and Affinity Table Leads&lt;br&gt;CERF Noted Voices&lt;br&gt;Community Members</td>
<td>• Commits to attend Meetings&lt;br&gt;• Reviews Materials/data&lt;br&gt;• Actively attends table convenings to hear firsthand from the community&lt;br&gt;• Commits to CERF principals to prioritize disadvantaged communities&lt;br&gt;• Commits to Consensus Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stewardship Committee:</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Selects Steering Committee&lt;br&gt;• Design application / Timeline&lt;br&gt;• Outlines key Characteristics of Steering Committee members&lt;br&gt;• Outlines requirements of a Steering committee member</td>
<td>Stewardship Committee may want to increase transparency by:&lt;br&gt;• Outlining the Selection Process (inviting feedback)&lt;br&gt;• Sharing the Selection Criteria - application, timeline, etc. (inviting feedback)&lt;br&gt;• Inviting non-HUB leads and non-Steering committee applicants to participate in the selection process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other questions:**<br>• Term length?<br>• Term limits?<br>• Staggered Terms?<br>• Once Steering Committee is set; should Steering Committee select new members?<br>• Is the non-voting member needed?
## SHAPING A SHARED/INCLUSIVE GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>WHAT (Responsibilities)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Stewardship Committee (D)  
   - Convenor  
   - Fiscal Agent  
   - Training/Capacity Building Lead  
   - Outreach Lead  
   - Data Lead  
   - Governance Mgt Lead |  
   • Responding to Data Analysis  
   • Advising on Needs and Analysis  
   • Sharing with other community/business members  
   • Summarizing ideas/concepts that are shared by Data Consultants with Steering committee  
   • Summarizing and present ideas/concepts that are shared by Steering Committee  
   • Implementation of Major Decisions  

Stewardship Committee is lead by the Convenor and the Fiscal Agent. These members will need to share and/or clarify who sits on the Stewardship committee.

The leads outlined above were envisioned to provide support and implementation activities for each of the tables (A, B, C, D).

- **Not a decision-making body.** Supports implementation of major decisions. Provides resources for training and capacity building, communications, ongoing engagement, contracting and subcontracting.
SHAPING A SHARED/INCLUSIVE GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

KEY DECISIONS

Decision Points
- Budget Allocation
- Goals/Outcomes and Types of Data
- Outreach and Engagement Strategy
- Regional Strategy (Phase 1)
- Project Strategies (Phase 2)