STATE OF CALIFORNIA CALIFORNIA STATE AUDITOR'S OFFICE (CSA)

In the matter of:

2020 CITIZENS REDISTRICTING COMMISSION (CRC) Applicant Review Panel (ARP) Public Meeting

621 Capitol Mall, 10th Floor Sacramento, California 95814

TUESDAY, MARCH 17, 2020 8:58 A.M.

Reported by: Peter Petty

APPEARANCES

APPLICANT REVIEW PANEL MEMBERS:

Angela Dickison, Chair

Ben Belnap, Vice Chair

Ryan Coe, Member

APPLICANT REVIEW PANEL STAFF

Christopher Dawson, Counsel

Shauna Pellman, Auditor Specialist II

APPLICANTS

Peter Blando

Teresa Liang

Katherine Burns

3 INDEX PAGE Applicant Interviews: Peter Blando 4 Teresa Liang 60 Katherine Burns 99 Adjournment 147

PROCEEDINGS

8:58 a.m.

CHAIR DICKISON: Calling the meeting of the Applicant Review Panel meeting to order. It is 8:58 and we are here.

We'd like to welcome Mr. Peter Blando. Did I say that correctly?

MR. BLANDO: That's good, yes.

CHAIR DICKISON: For his interview. At this time, I'm going to turn it over to Mr. Chris Dawson. He will be reading you the five standard questions.

MR. DAWSON: Good morning, Mr. Blando, thank you for being here. I'm going to ask you five standard questions which the Panel has requested that each applicant respond to. Are you ready, sir?

MR. BLANDO: Yes.

MR. DAWSON: The first question. What skills and attributes should all Commissioners possess?

What skills or competencies should the Commission possess collectively?

Of the skills, attributes and competencies that each Commissioner should possess, which do you possess?

In summary, how will you contribute to the success of the Commission?

MR. BLANDO: Thank you. For the skills and

attributes the Commissioners should possess, I would say it's a mix based on what the goals are. So, it's a combination of the soft skills, so ability to communicate, ability to work within the team. Ability to engage people and get people engaged. Ability to, I guess, to encourage input to not have to -- say, not have some separation.

So, as a Commissioner, you will carry the title of Commissioner and that ability to say, well, yes, that's my title but I'm here in the public setting, talk to me, encourage me, and ability to encourage people to provide some information, humility, sense of humor, adaptability.

For the hard skills, I would say some experience and skills in conflict management. You can bring together a group of people who have a variety of -- who are diverse and you want that diversity, and that diversity has conflict. Conflict is good, but it needs to be managed.

Change management. So, throughout the process we need to be adaptable and do the change.

Of course, analytical skills, these folks are going to be looking at data, lots of data, ability to interview and listen, active listening. One of the skills or attributes is inquisitive, and you ask questions.

What should they possess collectively? I would say individually and collectively the skills and experience to be in a Commission, in a public setting. People have a

lot of experience with committees and different things, but a high profile committee that's very public, and a camera, in a public setting where you have a lot of people coming to a public setting and providing input. Some of them might be emotional and ability to work within that environment.

The skills and attributes that each -- so, collectively and each of them should possess some level, as I mentioned already.

What can I contribute to the success of the Commission, my background, my education as an engineer, as an MBA, very analytical, problem solving and, by the way, that's one of the skills to have, decision making, as well. I think I bring that to the committee. I will have the decision making skills, the ability to work within a committee setting, a commission setting, the ability to interact with a variety of people from different backgrounds, the experience to work with a lot of data, and, of course, the inquisitiveness. And I hope I also can bring the ability to encourage people to be engaged.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. Question two. Work on the Commission requires members of different political backgrounds to work together. Since the 2010 Commission was selected and formed, the American political conversation has become increasingly polarized, whether in

the press, on social media, and even in our own families.

What characteristics do you possess, and what characteristics should your fellow Commissioners possess, that will protect against hyperpartisanship?

What will you do to ensure that the work of the Commission is not seen as polarized or hyperpartisan and avoid perceptions of political bias and conflict?

MR. BLANDO: Thank you. I would disagree in some case of the hyperpartisanship because I engage with people and they would comment on social media. When you engage with them one-on-one, and individually, and in person they become a different person. They're almost agreeable. It's almost like they have, in some cases, a different persona online. So, the online and the social media sort of brings out the bad in people. I think there's more commonality than people realize and to understand that part.

So, how can we protect against hyperpartisanship? Well, it's about bridging the gap and talking about what's mostly common, rather than what is different. And if there's differences, celebrate those differences. And part of it is also acknowledging. So, not being dismissive, saying that I may not agree, but I understand. That's where I don't disagree with your perception. That is your perception. That is your perception. And this is working within the team and other

Commissioners, so part of it is with the people with different parties and different opinions is they're going to have the different perspectives. Listen. And part of it is active listening that ought to be a skill early on. Repeat what they said. And that's a sense of acknowledging what they said. So, you sort of disarm them in a sense because they are engaging with you, and you're engaging with them, telling them I hear you. And in many cases, a lot of people that's all they need.

Part of the characteristics I possess, in those settings when you're arguing and you are debating is to be able to take the opposite side. So, if you could argue both sides. So, the analogy is if you could play chess on both sides against yourself, you know. Not unless you understand, you know, what do I see from this side and what do I see from the other side. And I would say there's typically more than one side and more than one thing.

The other characteristic again is to find out what's common and to bridge that gap. So, if we're working with the Commissioners, each Commissioner, and we're going to be working for a year. Part of it is there's going to be some down time, less formal time, get to learn about each other. Get to say, yeah, I play softball, too. I'm also a runner, I jog. So, build on those commonalities so you already have a frame of reference that says you are

your own tribe. And I think that's part of the thing is that in the hyperpartisanship people forget that they are members of many tribes.

So, I, myself, you know, I work for the University of California, I'm a Rotarian, I'm Catholic, I'm Republican. People focus on the Republican and they forget everything else. And part of what I hope to bring is that.

So, to ensure that the work is not polarized or hyperpartisan, the perceptions of people are very difficult, you know, and you may not be able to change their perception. But one of the things I would try to hopefully work through in the group is try to have more consensus rather than voting. Voting, and that's what you see most of the time in the political arena is people vote one side versus the other.

Compromise is a little bit better. Consensus is where you find what is common and you agree on that and everybody concurs. And I think I've seen some of the videos, a few of the videos here of the group where you are debating who should go next, and that's building the consensus to say, yes, I said no initially, and now I think — and you've discussed that and all can say yes, now. So, that's a building of consensus that says regardless of what party you belong to, regardless of what opinion the entire group concurred. So, they can't point and say the

Republicans voted this way, the Democrats voted this way, there's partisanship there.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. Question three. What is the greatest problem the Commission could encounter, and what actions would you take to avoid or respond to this problem?

MR. BLANDO: The greatest problem that I see and the greatest worry I would have is that we've drawn the district lines and it's a poor quality. It's bad because it's not reflective of the community or what it is. And the problem is rooted in that we did not get the information, there's a big gap in the information.

We're going to get hard data, cold data from the Census and we're going to get other things. When you get to the communities and you're engaging the community, and you have the town hall, whatever public setting, does anybody show up? I've had this issue with some public committees, the Police Accountability Board, where we have public meetings, inviting the public and it's like, well, one person, two people show up, and that's it. And you're struggling to communicate and get people in.

Or, who shows up is not reflective of the community. It is a vocal minority perhaps. Well, that skews your information. The committee, how do they get the information to know the neighborhood, to know that there's

-- what is the commonality of the neighborhood, in addition to the data that we've collected. And I think that's the one big problem we'll see.

And, you know, as an example for this committee and the applicants I looked at the data, and it's like, well, you have an entire Northern California area, we've got three counties, and there's nobody applied. How can you represent that if they don't even show up, they're not even in the pool? And I see that as a difficulty as we go through different places. We'll be in the town, we'll be in the locality, how can I get them to show up.

MR. DAWSON: Question four. If you are selected, you will be one of 14 members of the Commission which is charged with working together to create maps of the new districts. Please describe a situation where you had to work collaboratively with others on a project to achieve a common goal.

Tell us the goal of the project, what your role in the group was, and how the group worked through any conflicts that arose.

What lessons would you take from this group experience to the Commission if selected?

MR. BLANDO: I can tell you a bad group experience, because typically bad experiences teach you more than good experiences.

So, the goal of the project was a work in the University of California. Some work is reflected -- we bill the work, for some of the work. So, in this case we have an ancient billing system that needs to be replaced. Everybody knows it needs to be replaced, everybody complains about it.

I was the coordinator for this group. I was not the project sponsor, but I was asked to convene a representative of different departments that use this billing system. And everybody was on the same board that it needs to be replaced and we brought it through. And the conflicts arose with what solutions and what are the -- what are the requirements and what's the solutions? What solution should we pick? What product should we pick?

What lesson I took was I did not know and I did not undertake the human element. We had the same goal of the billing system needed to be replaced. Everybody already had a solution and their goal was to replace it with their solution. So, I did not recognize the secondary goal or a secondary incentive for people. They're there because of their own. And there were four or five different options. And it was difficult to bring them together because they already had a preconceived system that they wanted to push. That was one.

And two, there wasn't any mechanism set up on how

to break the deadlock, how to reset the group, how to come back. There wasn't a process for change management. I mentioned that and that's one of the things why. We need to change. We need to adjust. What should we do?

And lastly what I took was, and I don't know if that's the same for this Commission, in that case I had a project sponsor in which I can say you need to come in because we're in a deadlock, we need to move forward.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

MS. PELLMAN: We have about 16 minutes.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

MR. BLANDO: Did you want a good example? I mean, is that --

MR. DAWSON: Oh, if you'd like to continue, sure.

MR. BLANDO: So, it's more the committee work that I've been in. So, in the Police Accountability Board our goal really is to listen to complaints about officers and decide if that's sustained, not sustained, unfounded or they exonerate the officer. There's details that I can't share with the group.

But in our -- so, part of the goal is to review and provide feedback to the police chief. The other part is also to provide -- on that specific incident. The other part is to provide input on policy.

My role at the time was just as a member of that

committee, of that board. I was the chair of that board later. But the issue I identified, the issue that was going on was we were looking at things independently and not looking at a pattern. And what I brought to the group in that case was I said, well, there seems to be a pattern. And this part is public because it was in the report, and it says there's a lot of reports of -- between UC Davis health staff and UC Davis police officers. And I brought to the fact, well, these are all paid by UC Davis and this is not a member of the public. Can we do something internally to work together as employees, just like any other department would and let's bring that together?

So, what lessons I take from this is to sometimes take a step back from this meeting, and this meeting, and this meeting, and let's put some things together and can we discuss that. Is there a pattern that we're seeing here?

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. Question five. A considerable amount of the Commission's work will involve meeting with people from all over California who come from very different backgrounds and a wide variety of perspectives.

If you are selected as a Commissioner, what skills and attributes will make you effective at interacting with people from different backgrounds and who have a variety of perspectives?

What experiences have you had that will help you be effective at understanding and appreciating people and communities of different backgrounds and who have a variety of perspectives?

MR. BLANDO: So, the skills and attributes, I'll go back to what the first question was so the ability to engage with people. So, that's one of the attributes I have from my experience, and various committees, and various roles, and many of them volunteer roles to engage with people, and to listen to them, to ask questions.

In the university, in the different committees, in my experience a lot of that is with different people. In general, a lot of the committees were representative from facility. You had some administrators, you had staff. I usually represented the staff. You had students, both the undergraduate and graduate students. And even with the faculty you had tenured faculty and you had Academic Federation, which is non-tenured faculty. And sometimes there's different ages as well and many of them come from different backgrounds. And at UC Davis, especially, the students can come from different areas of the state.

So, ability to work with that and work with the team, and work with them as a team to solve problems, and that's what I have been able to do. But also, when we go group to go back, so that when I was staff and chair, sort

of separate myself and go and ask, oh, what does everybody see? What does everybody -- you know, go and reach out to them and ask them questions.

One example was a committee hearing, not unlike this, where I was asked to represent the staff and present in a panel. While I was waiting outside there were security folks outside, plain clothes police officers and I just talked to them. I'm here and I need to know what staff, I need to represent what staff think and you guys are also staff. What do you guys think is important. And then, just the sense of how do you interact? You just start interacting.

For your AV folks here, I worked in a group that had AV, so one of the things I learned was, well, how do you roll the cables? And they had this specific way to roll a cable so it doesn't get caught and it doesn't get -- you know, when they unroll it, it's easy to unroll.

So, you listen to those little things and you engage them on those things that they know, and they are expert, and that's a way to interact with people.

And the experiences I've had, and basically those are the experience. I believe that's -- so, the experiences I've had that will help to be effective in understanding and appreciating people of communities in different backgrounds and a variety of perspectives, I

think my journey in life. So, I'm an immigrant. So, I come here as somebody from a different country, a different culture. I get dropped down into San Francisco. And then, I moved to a very rural town in Orland. And then, back to San Francisco, and then Vacaville, Davis.

So, in that case, you know, as a kid growing up you interact with people, and you adjust, and you adapt, and you don't stay in a shell. Part of it is getting to learn what people are doing. And in Orland it's baseball, you do baseball as a kid. You ride around with a bike and people are very accepting. You go in the rural communities and it's like, well, let's just go get our fishing rods, there's some fishing holes over here, and just explore.

In the city it's a different kind of exploration, it's a different kind of freedom. It's like, well, with a pocket full of change you can go anywhere. You can go to another city. And that was very interesting.

In that experience, too, I've gone to my friends' residences and homes in Orland, both in the country, to how they lived in the country, and I lived in the country as well. But I visited some of the friends who lived in a trailer park. It was very interesting and I hang out with them.

In the city I know I've had some friends, and it's later in junior high and high school, to a very dense

apartment complex high rise, where this friend had their family of I don't know how many, it seemed like a dozen of them, but they were cramped in there, but that's how they lived. And that's part of understanding the communities and, you know, how they live, where they are.

2.2.

I've also gone to different churches. So, the same venues, going with my friends, so I'm Catholic, but I had a friend whose family was more Evangelical, and I went to their church a couple times. My sister is a Mormon and I went to her church several times as well. So, being engaged and being open to -- I mean that's more extreme. Some people are not -- that's religion, so people are heinous on the subject of religion, but getting to know and engage people that way.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. At this time we will go to Panel questions. Each Panel Member will have 20 minutes to ask his or her questions. And we will start with the Chair, Ms. Dickison.

CHAIR DICKISON: Good morning, Mr. Blando. Thank you for meeting with us today.

So, you are currently working at UC Davis, is that correct?

MR. BLANDO: That's correct.

CHAIR DICKISON: Okay, in the Information and

25 Education Technology Department?

MR. BLANDO: Yes.

CHAIR DICKISON: Okay. What do you do there?

MR. BLANDO: I'm the Business Systems Analyst, so
I'm actually assigned to the Project Management Office.

And I've been assigned to two departments. So, the
business systems analyst, their job is a variety of things.
So, a lot of what I'm doing right now is trying to gather
requirements, somewhat similar to what this committee would
need. Work with a group; bring them together, saying what
are your needs? What are your wants? What's the problem?
What's the system? A lot of it is about change, so
something is not working correctly, or when something needs
to be more efficient, or they don't know what's wrong but
they know it could be better.

I do the analysis, so I would interview them, I would talk to them, I would look at their processes, I would provide feedback. In a new system, as I mentioned, I'd gather requirements, write it all down and say, and verify is this really what you want? Is this really what you need? So, what I'll do today, for example, is gather requirements for a new governance risk and compliance system because it's about the cyber security. So, there's a lot of rules around managing data. So, so there's a belief that we need a new system, or we need to investigate new systems, so there's a request for information. And I

need to craft up what is the problem, what is it that we need, and sufficient to what vendors will come in and present to the group, to then further refine the requirements. And then, once the requirements are in place walk it through the process of the RFP, which I just did for another project to, say, vendors are bidding, vendors are providing their solution. And checking with the stakeholders to say this is the right, this is the best solution, and then working with them on the implementation. And part of that is taking what they have as their process, so both manual and automated, and looking at it and saying is this what you — this is the current state, looking at the future state with this system this is what we should do, which is what we should look, and then shepherding through that process.

So, in another project that's essentially what I'm doing is it's a vulnerability response management system, which is identifying when there's a vulnerability, reporting to people it's like, hey, this computer has a problem and you've got to fix it. And working through that and saying this is how you use the system, these are the steps to use the system. These are the things outside the system that you have to do yourself. And trying to — learning about the system, learning about the job, and marrying the two so work goes efficiently.

CHAIR DICKISON: So, do you work with large data sets at all?

MR. BLANDO: One of the projects is about metrics. So, in the cyber security arena, the current project is to find out information from disparate systems, many different systems and a log system. The system we're looking at is End Point Management System. It's what software's on the computer, everybody's computer. And saying, well, there are these old software, old system, unpatched software, unpatched browser, that's the way for the bad guys to get in and hack your system.

And getting all that data from thousands of data points and aggregating them, and the project is to aggregate it, deliver it in a dashboard kind of thing to senior leadership. So, this is the deans and the people who report to them that says here's what your college, your area looks like. This is where you need to focus your resources. This is your risk level. Do you accept the risks? Do you want to do something else? Do you want to do something about it? And to do it at an aggregated level for them to actually do something about it as opposed to --because they're at their level too detailed, because that's what the starting point is a lot of detailed information, because it's this computer has this issue. And, well, just roll it up. This department has 50 computers that are at

risk.

So, that's the big data. So, part of it is developing that system as well, so finding out where we're going to store it, we're going to log it, how frequent and the tool to use, so the tool we're thinking is Tableau.

But I know in another department they have other big data and they chose like how to call the data and to present it. So, it's all about visualizing the data so it's easy to make decisions.

CHAIR DICKISON: So, have you worked with any datasets such as the Census data or mapping tools at all?

MR. BLANDO: Not -- so, in mapping tools, in Tableau there's latitude and longitude as an attribute. In another, older project I was with, I was working on was about facilities, rooms, locks, and those types of things. And that data had location, building, but it also had floors. And the interesting thing with keys is apparently there's a door data, door location. So, an east door could be opened with one key, but you can't go through it with the same -- go the other way with the same key. So, some nuances of location data there.

CHAIR DICKISON: Do you think the experiences that you have with working with that kind of data could translate into the work of the Commission and if so, how?

MR. BLANDO: When I look at data it's the source,

how it's created and the attributes around that data. So, my previous experience it was financial data, which is not just dollars. It's like how did we get that, who's spending it, where's it being spent, when was it spent?

When you have location, you definitely have latitude and longitude information, and you can have it broken down into counties, and cities, towns. It's all about the attribute and how you slice up the data. And then, separately, how the system can handle it and visualize it.

So, as I mentioned with Tableau, we have -- I've not used it because they're -- I don't need it for the university in what I'm doing, although we talked about it. It was like, well, if I had to put in the data of computers, and their locations, and where they had an issue, we could put that in if we had that dataset. So, to me data is data. It's the attributes that come with it and understanding how those attributes interact.

So, geographic data, which would be latitude and longitude, neighborhood, what else is attached to it, and then aggregation from this specific point, this table, to this room, to this building, to this block. So, can we aggregate the data in the relationship with data?

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you. So, in your application you talked about traveling when you were a

delegate for the Council of the UC Staff Assemblies. And then, you also talk about serving on the Rotary Group Student Exchange and how you --

MR. BLANDO: I made an error there. It's Group Study Exchange, sorry. It's actually the Group Study Exchange, sorry.

CHAIR DICKISON: Okay.

MR. BLANDO: I made an error.

CHAIR DICKISON: Group Student, oh, okay, Study Exchange. And you had to engage and learn enough about different regions in Sacramento, in the Sacramento region. What did you learn about all the different groups as you were going through to various campuses throughout California, and through your Rotary group?

MR. BLANDO: Uh-hum.

CHAIR DICKISON: What did you learn that will assist you in working with communities throughout California?

MR. BLANDO: In general, when you work with these groups, they have things they were proud of and they want to show it off. So, what is it in this area? So, I think like Yuba City, it was like prune capital, I think. And there is -- I forget now where the smallest mountain range is in the world. Sacramento, the City of Trees that's very proud of their trees.

When we go through these various UC systems they'll say what they're proud of, not just in each UC campus, but in their community. So, if they're in the city community and how it's easy to get to everything, and how it's active and bustling, where it's another community where, you know, it's San Diego, a very nice beach area. And we got to stay at the -- had dinner at the Scripps's Institute down there.

So, these are features and areas in their community that they want to show off and they're very proud of, so in each of them. And part of it is you realize in that role you are -- people want to share. So, it's what they want to share about. I don't know if there's some things they didn't want to share about, which is the reality of the communities. But that's what I gained from them, those are the things, so either geographic features, some things in the economy, some business that they're proud of, or some area that they want to show off.

CHAIR DICKISON: So, that covers groups that are willing, and able, and ready to share and engage. So, can you think of some ways you can find or get to communities that are not so willing to engage in the public process? How would you identify it? Because one of the things the Commission needs to do is identify communities of interest throughout California. So, how would you go about finding

these difficult to reach communities?

MR. BLANDO: Well, as I stated before, we can talk to people working the public forum, so, as the AV group, or somebody else supporting it and cares. Part of it is you go out. You don't stay in your hotel if you're traveling. You have to eat somewhere and you go to the restaurant, and you ask them. As a Rotary member, you might engage the Rotarians to tell me about this community, tell me where I should go. Tell me where people hang out. And just be present and tell them, hey, there's this public forum going on, it's maybe a once-in-a-decade instance and we'd like to hear from you what this community is about.

But before you get there, you might be talking to them and say, hey, I'm here, this is what I do. What do you do? You know, on a Commission, as opposed to an individual, so without a title maybe. And that's how I saw my previous roles and even my work role.

It gives you an excuse to ask questions so people aren't like, well, why is this person asking questions?

Well, it's kind of my business and my role, I need to ask questions. So, as a business analyst I get to ask questions, and nobody -- you know, wouldn't be why are you asking this question? As you folks, as auditors, you get to ask questions, you know, because that's your role.

As a Commissioner and to my earlier point on the

first few questions, like you can't be standoffish. You can't use your title to provide some distance between you and everybody else. But at the same time use that, your job, as I need to ask, you know, what goes on in this community? What do you do? Where do you go? What's life like over here? And I think that goes back to my early days as a journalist, where I just ask questions. You have a job and your job is to ask questions. And while asking questions you say, we'd like to hear about it. The rest of the group would love to hear your story. And part of that is maybe that's one of the attributes, as I mentioned, is you have to have an inquisitive nature.

MS. PELLMAN: And we have 5 minutes and 51 seconds.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you. What do you think are some of the things that may influence a person's preference when it comes to representation?

MR. BLANDO: Well, I would say media definitely influences them a lot. But I would say in a lot of cases it would be their friends, their family, who they associate with, their colleagues at work. Anywhere where there's a commonality. I mean it could be even a baseball team or a softball team that they belong to, a church group. So, those are the things that influence people.

And I think I mentioned in one of the essays

everything in life really influences you, whether you realize it or not, and it's your interaction. You're being programmed on a daily basis and you need to be aware of it.

CHAIR DICKISON: So, you've talked a little bit about your work on committees and you mentioned that you've served on a variety of them, and got public input from serving on those committees. What form of input? Was it all public comment? Was it email, or online comments?

MR. BLANDO: So, it's a variety. So, it depends on the committee and the context. So, the Police Accountability Board, as I mentioned it's a public setting, it has to be a public setting that's the way it's prescribed specifically.

With Staff Assembly it was a variety of things from the town hall to email, or let me know. We had a publication, so we were able to reach out by email to all the staff and send out here's where we're going, and I could write a piece about one particular area as a question and then say, what do you guys think.

CHAIR DICKISON: Okay. One of the things that the last Commission encountered was they received a large amount of public input and it was difficult to get through all of it. What have you learned through your interactions with the public, in receiving public input that would help in that instance?

MR. BLANDO: I don't know what a lot would be, but the one example I can bring up was during the time the state was going through a budget crisis and the writing was on the wall that we will have furloughs, I was the Staff Assembly Chair and I said we need to get input on what people -- not if they want a furlough or not, but how it should be applied. And that was sent out by email, and there was a survey, and a survey link. And I think at the end there was 5,000 or so respondents, which was the best survey response we've ever had.

So, part of it is to say it's important and it will impact you. And the experience with handling the data was it was just a lot of work, it was just a lot of reading. I don't know how that input is delivered, if it was just like an open statement or is it a specific survey with saying here's your -- you know, this is the data side which is fill this field, and there's checkboxes plus comments.

In that case there were options, checkboxes, other and then comments. You just filter through it and you just read through it. You organize it. Perhaps there's a commonality, so these things seem to have this theme, these things seem to have this theme, and then you summarize it and you present it.

If there's a way to gather it, and digitize it,

and use some system to highlight it, so I know there's been some data that you could highlight, what's the most frequent words used, what are they? And some people have used that type of survey before. So, just like an open statement, but let's use the technology to tell me what is the most frequent, the ten most frequent words and it will give you a little visual of that. And then like, well, then, there's more. So, it depends on the data and how you got it. Essays would be the most difficult.

MS. PELLMAN: You have 45 seconds.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you. One quick, the first eight Commissioners are selected randomly and they select the last six. If you were one of the first eight, what would you look for in the last six?

MR. BLANDO: Well, I think it's a -- there's some things that's specifically prescribed by the process. So, there has to be two, two, and two, Democrats, Republicans. So, the question for me is did you guys do your job and these finalists have all the skills which is -- which you're looking for, analytical, diverse, and they understand the -- they're able to be independent -- not independent, but impartial.

Beyond that you would look at what you got in the eight. Who are they? What do they have? Is there a gap? So, if I just want to just pose an analogy, you're creating

31

a dream team. What's your dream team? So, what are you missing? Am I missing a specific like a -- like if it was basketball, I'm missing a center and we have to focus on that.

Is there a geographic area missing, for example?

Is there another demographic like salary range? That's not a political party because those are already prescribed.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you.

MR. DAWSON: So, be fair to each of the Panelists, we'll add an additional minute to Mr. Belnap's and Mr. Coe's allotted time.

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: Good morning, Mr. Blando. Do
you play softball?

MR. BLANDO: Not recently.

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: Oh, okay.

MR. BLANDO: Because all the people I've played with are kids or hurt.

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. Some of your examples seemed like you played softball.

MR. BLANDO: I have, though.

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: Okay.

MR. BLANDO: So, a lot, at some point a lot.

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: And tell me about the teams

24 you were on in softball?

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

18

19

20

21

25

MR. BLANDO: Well, in college I was on a team

that for three years did not win a single game. That was particularly difficult. But we played. We still went out and played.

I was on a team in graduate school. So, the business school had a first year and second year. It was very competitive year one and year two, and they were very good. I was on a team where we struggled to get players. So, the co-ed teams, specifically. Where it's like, unfortunately, where's the women? We need to get the women because we can't play and we're going to forfeit otherwise.

We've had teams where it's later in life and it's like, well, we've got an audience. It's their significant others and even their kids showing up, now.

And the last team I played with, it was not my team actually, it was another team and they just needed people, so I didn't know any of them.

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: Yeah. So, on every team there's kind of a team dynamic that kind of develops over time. And every person kind of plays a role in that team dynamic. What role do you tend to play in your teams, either softball or otherwise?

MR. BLANDO: So, most of the time I was the pitcher so they tended to have some level of leadership role, although I'd try to defer. So, in a lot of cases — in one case I was the pitcher and the manager, so I'd draw

up the lineup. That's what they asked me to do. In other cases it's just like -- in a few other teams like just put me where you need me and I'll do whatever you need me to do.

So, the dynamic, it varies. So, and I would say they were pretty close because they had something in common already to develop as a team. So, in the early years in college the team was from my -- the California Aggies. So, it's the college newspaper. We got together and that was what we did, and so we already had some commonality.

The sports writers, they tended to dominate more in that because they were the sports writers, they were the sports guys. And the rest of us are like, okay, whatever, we'll just play along.

And then, as I mentioned later in life it was more bringing in their spouses, or their kids, and they just wanted to be out there doing something. And then, we actually, for some people, as I said, when you get older I tell people -- for some people, they were still very competitive. And we told them, you know, we're just out here to have fun, don't hurt yourself, which unfortunately they did.

So, the dynamics, it's a bit skewed because they already had something in common, together. I mentioned the last team because really, to me, it was strange because I

didn't know -- I knew a couple people, I didn't know the rest, so it was very strange. So, we did not get, what was it, the team dynamics. There's the forming, norming, storming, performing. So, it's just like just got dropped into performing. Just do this thing and we need you for these two games.

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: Right and that was it?

MR. BLANDO: That's it.

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: Yeah. So, when you envision, if you're placed on the Commission and you have a team of 14 other Commissioners, what role do you think you'll play? How do you envision yourself in that dynamic?

MR. BLANDO: I'll go back to one of the other -- I don't know if I mentioned this earlier. You have to be adaptable.

I'll give you an example in the softball team.

Somebody else was a pitcher and they were a left-handed pitcher. I'm like, okay go pitch. I don't need to be a pitcher. I'll be in right field, or wherever, or I'll be a catcher. And we did that. So, if there's a strength, I don't need to be there, I'll go somewhere else.

In other areas, like the Police Accountability
Board, I was like -- they voted on who the chair would be
and they voted me in. I don't know exactly the qualities,
but somebody nominated me and I didn't say, no, I don't

want to do it. I said, okay, and they voted. I didn't even get a chance to say, well, these are my positions, this is how I -- they just did it based on how you are doing.

I guess it evolves, so early on you're working as a group, you're feeling out each other. Who's got strengths in which area and you figure it out, and who wants to do what? And in some cases like, well, nobody wants to do this part, I don't know if that will be the case, well, somebody will volunteer or maybe I'll volunteer because nobody else wanted to do that part. And that's usually why I get to volunteer in different things is because nobody wanted to do some things.

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: So, I want to take that question to the UC Davis Police Accountability Board. Are you still on that board?

MR. BLANDO: No.

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: No, okay. How did you come to be on that board?

MR. BLANDO: So, the Staff Assembly nominates people, so the chair, the Staff Assembly chair will send people, one or more to, I forget now, the Vice Chancellor of Community Relations, the group in charge of that. And they will interview them to see if they're a fit and they will then be appointed.

was on the Pepper Spray Committee and the Police Account ability Board was a direct output -- outcome of the recommendations. Now, I was not there as the first appointed on the Police Accountability Board, nor the second one, and they were looking for somebody. And I said, well, if you can't find anybody, I'll do it. And I did it. So, that's the nature of the volunteer work that I do. So, sometimes I am not pursuing it. I make myself available and they said, sure, you go.

In a similar sense, the Pepper Spray Committee was the same thing because of its controversial nature, its difficulty with the staff. Some people are very wary of what will happen, it's very public and I said -- at that time I was stepping down as -- I had just finished a term as Staff Assembly Chair, and they said, well -- the chair coming in said, Peter, you do it. I think you're the best and nobody else is going to do it. And I'm like, all right, I'll do it.

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: So, I do want to ask about that committee in a moment. But I want to stay on the board for a moment. So, you said that you were chair of the board. What were your duties and responsibilities in that role?

MR. BLANDO: Well, I worked with the staff

support to develop the agenda, or provide the agenda and say this is what we're going to do. And I think when following the Roberts Rules of Order, if anybody has a motion to do -- you know, to discuss, or you know, anybody call the motion accepted, and vote. So, those are the formal parts.

And then, just verifying with the staff support if there's -- if there's no complaints, nothing to review should we cancel, should we move on? Is there any other business and as part of the agenda.

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: And you mentioned that you didn't get that much visitation from the public. How often did you have to have to manage public input in those meetings?

MR. BLANDO: I don't know what you mean by manage. There's one or two and it was a simultaneous public forum. One at the UC Davis campus, one in the Sacramento campus, so we'd get one or two, maybe three or four at most, maybe four at most. And one of them was a member of the press. So, managing it is most of the time they're asking questions, what's it about, what do you guys do?

In the last couple of public forums that I did attend, it was mandatory for us to attend, there were more emotional presenters, one individual in particular who was

very emotional and did not have a good opinion of the police on campus, and would prefer that they are not on campus at all. And she made the committee know her opinions.

And I don't know on managing her. So, part of my management there was just responding, since she didn't believe in the police and everything I said, well, we're members of the community. And if we believe that this is not useful, we would not be doing this because it would be a waste of our time. And she sort of stepped back and she actually acknowledged, yeah. Because I think she was a new staff member, a younger staff member, and I didn't know if that was part of her experience, what her experience was before, but she definitely had strong opinions.

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. So, let's talk about the -- so, is the UC Cruz Reynoso Task Force also called the Pepper Spray Committee?

MR. BLANDO: Yeah.

19 VICE CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. Did that result in a 20 report?

MR. BLANDO: Yes.

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. And you guys that were on the committee helped prepare that report?

MR. BLANDO: That's correct?

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: Or wrote the report, okay.

What was your role in drafting or approving that report? MR. BLANDO: So, we all contributed to the wording. We all verified. Part of my role is saying, hey, we discussed this and this is not in there. Or, this is stated this way, I'm not sure, maybe there's a better way to state it. And everybody was providing input to that and that was basically consensus driven, everybody had to There were some nuance where we may not all have concur. agreed on a certain term, but the report as a whole we agreed to. So, contributing to the discussions, contributing to the conclusions, so what the report said, in addition to writing and wordsmithing. Writing and wordsmithing, it's contentious and time consuming, but the meat of it was, well, what is the conclusion that we have from the evidence? Do we agree to this conclusion? And then, finally just stating it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And then afterwards, going to a public forum, a town hall, and then going before cameras. And then, I think that it is Freeborn Hall. I think they're renovating since that -- they've renovating since then, the large hall, and answering questions.

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: And how did that go?

MR. BLANDO: There were a lot of strong opinions,
especially from students. I think it went well because the
entire group was there, including students. And we were

able to -- I think that was part of the benefit of having a diverse committee, we were able to anticipate the logic, and the issues, and the questions. Remember one said, and I think I answered one, I don't recall the specific question, but a student got up and everybody was very agitated, heated, and they made a statement and said -- and then at the end they said did you consider this? And I answered that question and said, yes, we did this, and this, and this and, yes, we did consider it. So, but, yeah, it was contentious but we went through it and we completed it.

And I think Cruz Reynoso's issue was that we did not have enough information in our report. Going out it was heavily redacted.

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. And you mentioned that the Accountability Board was one outcome from the Pepper Spray Task Force. Any other outcomes from that task force that you can think of?

MR. BLANDO: Well, one of the outcomes was who does the police chief report to? So, the police chief was reporting to somebody, I think the Vice Chancellor. I forget the exact role, but more on the administrative section. And then, the police chief then reported to the Provost, which is more of the academic wing. And I think part of it was also the engagement with the students and

how people would be -- folks would try to -- not disarm, but work with the students to see if we could remedy the situation before police get there, and not -- it's not about -- part of it, the conclusion was they were using police to enforce policy, not law. And we need to be clear on that. And there's some other nuances like I think part of the committee's discussion was when you convene a meeting and you're making decisions, who's taking notes? How are you convening this? How do you make decisions? And is everybody getting -- providing input?

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: So, what do these two experiences demonstrate regarding your ability to be impartial?

MR. BLANDO: So, in those two roles I have to step back and say it's not my view. I have to represent a larger view. Why am I here? It's because people are not here and they depend on me to state here's the staff view of this issue. Here is the opinion of the staff. Not my view. To listen to the data and the data could -- and listen to people, and understand what the data says, and the information says, and be rational about the conclusion.

I think I mentioned this in the things the Cruz
Reynoso Task Force was difficult because like, well, it
could be very critical of the administration. Well, I'm an
employee of that administration. It might be I might turn

myself in, my own career. Well, this is the job we have to do and hopefully it doesn't happen, but I'm not going to be biased when I listen to information that says -- I'm not going to lean towards and I have to be aware if I'm leaning towards protecting the administration and why.

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: Yeah. Do you believe that either of these experiences did end up hurting your career?

MS. PELLMAN: We have 4 minutes and 40 seconds.

MR. BLANDO: I don't know.

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: Okay.

MR. BLANDO: It's not like I applied for a dean job or anything like that. And actually, everybody knows what happened to the Chancellor Katehi, you know,

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: Right.

MR. BLANDO: The issues there. So, I would say there was a change in administration and I don't think there was ever an opportunity for it to hurt my career. I was not ambitious to go to other things and I don't know — I hope, and this is the thing for the Staff Assembly chair and those positions, I hope it's not something that anybody putting in that position is there because they believe it's going to impact their career because they are engaging in supporting the administration. It would impact their career because of how they conduct themselves, not because of support of the administration.

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: And do either of these experiences, have they affected your view or appreciation of diversity in having an inclusive group?

MR. BLANDO: Yes.

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: How so?

MR. BLANDO: If I was just an employee, an employee in the IT world, my view is this narrow department and issues, technical issues, you know, the stuff for geeks and nerds. That's it. I would not say, hey, there's this other world.

And even to that extent, with the Staff Assembly chair position, these other UC campuses, I would never have experienced, hey, this is what they do here, this is what they do here, there's other folks here. These are the interesting things.

That is a diversity as opposed to I'm just with my group, my tribe, and that's it. You have to work with other -- when you're put together and you have to work with these other folks. It's like you have to work with these other folks and you get to listen to them. And in some of those committees you're working long hours, and the evenings and, you know, you engage with them and you get to know them, which you see how different they are, but also how there's a lot of similarities.

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: All right, thank you. No

further questions.

CHAIR DICKISON: Mr. Coe?

PANEL MEMBER COE: Okay, thank you. Good morning, Mr. Blando, thank you for being here.

Something that stuck out to me in your application is that you mentioned that you're a kidney donor.

MR. BLANDO: Yes.

PANEL MEMBER COE: I don't want to violate any HIPAA laws here or anything, but I was wondering if you'd tell us more about that. What motivated you to donate a kidney?

MR. BLANDO: Sure. It was my sister and I knew she was on dialysis. And she was, I thought, because she had two sons would be donating and then, you know, in another gathering and found out, oh, they're not. And I was like, well, and apparently I found out later, because she has issues and her husband also had issues, so it's like the probability that the kids would have health issues down the road genetically is higher.

I said, well, at that point I said this is my sister and I have two kidneys, and you can function with one. Well, I'll go through the process and donate the kidney. Which was kind of difficult because she was down south, so I had to fly down. And that's actually how I got

into running. I said I need to get healthy because they're not going to take me and they're not going to take it if they think I'm not healthy. So, I said, okay, I'm not in the best shape, so I started running to do that, and I'm still running.

So, she's very happy. She sent me a card the other day. But basically I was like, well, she needs one, I've got two.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Okay, thank you. I want to talk briefly, and my colleagues have already touched on your several committee memberships you've had over the years, and I'd like to know if there's any particular committee or experience for a committee that will specifically be applicable to the work on this Commission, and what you could bring from your work on those committees that would make you an ideal Commissioner.

MR. BLANDO: Perhaps the closest is the Council of UC Staff Assemblies because we had to go to different campuses, so there's the travel. We had to do some formal -- we did have open forums. We did have specific individuals who we worked with apart from the community, which is the campus, to make sure additional campus leaders are there, our Regents are there on some occasions. So, it's combination of both formal and informal as well, because we were -- we had scheduled events and down time.

It was like, okay, we need to work together, and part of it is learning how to do two jobs at once. So, I'm still going to be employed. I'm not quitting my job if I'm on the committee, so it's that ability to okay I need to do two jobs. And if some other people on the committee have a similar thing I'll know what they're going through because they have multiple obligations, and this is just one of them. So, it's travel, listen, and gather information.

And those at council, these Staff Assemblies also had reports, and they also belonged to subcommittees focused on specific issues, whose output is a recommendation to the UC president. Here's what we see. Here's, you know, this is what we worked on, this is the problem, this is our recommendation.

So, that's where I would say is the most similarity that would help is my experience there and like traveling, sort of the disconnect from what you normally do, focusing on a problem focusing on working with people that you don't see every day, but then reacquainting yourself, resetting, working on a task, going home.

PANEL MEMBER COE: So, you mentioned traveling. You were traveling to different campuses --

MR. BLANDO: That's correct.

PANEL MEMBER COE: -- as part of this. So, in your travels, and I think briefly you've mentioned before

to different areas of the state, working with different people of different backgrounds or cultures, what did you learn from your interactions with those people that would make you an effective Commissioner in the context of this work?

MR. BLANDO: So, what I learned and from others in the areas is that they want to tell a story, they want to share. And I think that's part of a Commissioner, you just need to find a way to get them to share, and share the right thing. So, I mentioned earlier that people want to show off, but in some of those public forums and when we're in a suit and tie, and we're in the group people are actually saying here are the issues, here's what I see, here's the problems. Now, this is how you guys can help me.

So, that's the contrary to here's the area I want to show off, but here's the problem that's going on, here's where the dirt is, and we need to get this cleaned up, or here's where there are issues with the processes.

So, I think that part will help tremendously.

PANEL MEMBER COE: So, I want to switch a little bit to your essay on impartiality. And in that essay you indicate that to be impartial one must first recognize their own biases. How does one go about recognizing and acknowledging their own biases?

MR. BLANDO: Well, you recognize your own bias by the emotions of this is where you have to have selfawareness, and self-actualization. So, somebody -- so as an example, somebody comes in and then they're presenting, and it's like and they say they're part of a softball team. Like, oh, I'm part of a softball team. I'm going to start listening to this person because I associate with them. Well, wait a minute, this other group they're not on a softball team, I've never done that. Am I biased there? Am I listening more to this person than this person? I have to be aware of those subtleties because -- and maybe that's part of the emotion. So, when you go into a room and you listen to people, and I think part of human nature is you want to find what's common and who am I going to hang out with? Who is most like me? Or, think like me, dress like me, I don't know, look like me? And you have to think to yourself, no, I'm going to talk to everybody, I'm going to be engaged with everybody equally.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Bias recognition is -- you know, I think about it, I actually constantly think, well, why did I do this? So, this is the analytical component and self-actualization, did I do that because it made rational sense? Was it an objective decision? No, because I like it and that's it. And, well, wait a minute, is that -- so, that's fine in your personal life, but in the role of the

Commission that's not okay.

So, for example today, getting out I was like, well, what shirt should I wear and what tie should I wear? That impacts me. That's my choices, my preferences. If, in a committee I look around and it's like I prefer to listen to and emphasize what this person is because of what they're wearing that's bad. And that's part of the recognition to say, you know -- and part of it is, you know, I take my glasses off sometimes and I'm like, okay, well, let me focus on listening. What is the content of what they're saying, not anything else.

So, in some cases you have to -- if you know that you could be influenced by other things, you need to say, okay, let me focus on what is the objective information. That's the analytical, give me the data. Which is difficult because you also want to get the story, you want to listen to their story.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Can you give us an example where in the course of making a decision you recognized maybe one of your internal biases and where you had to actively engage yourself into putting that aside to make a decision?

MR. BLANDO: So, the example, the Police
Accountability Board, the strongly opinionated person.
When somebody starts being strongly opinionated and overly

emotional, and part of my bias, because I'm more of the analytical, the engineer, it was like they're just going to be emotional, should I turn it off? But that woman actually had some good input. So, what are the input? So, wait a minute, and so this is where I'm listening, and I say wait a minute, and if you imagine if it's like a movie it's like stop, rewind, what was that was said, so keep listening that's important.

So, the statement was the Police Accountability
Board did not -- was invisible. They have a report once a
year and otherwise nobody knows what's going on. Oh,
that's important, the lack of visibility except the end.
People need to know. I remember that and that's a thing
and I was like, well, wait a minute, stop. There's a lot
of I won't say ranting, emotional things that may not be
relevant to the committee, it may or may not, but you get
the point. Wait a minute, there's information there that's
relevant.

I would say, yes, I was biased to start, but I always have to -- you know, because that's the job to listen to get the information. And part of it might be the emotions. Like, well, they're angry about a specific thing, but ask them a question, why? I didn't need to get there because she was clear. So.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Okay, thank you. I'd like to

go back to some things that were discussed I think when Ms. Dickison was asking questions regarding data analysis, and particularly one of your answers that perked my ears up is data visualization, as somebody who's done a lot of that myself. Where or do you see data visualization as a useful tool in the work of the Commission? And if so, in what way?

MR. BLANDO: Well, when we're looking at drawing lines, it's the visual of the map. But the visualization might be color coding or doing some other icons to say what is that makeup of the map. So, you imagine the California state map, and the shape, greens and browns, and you zoom in, and you see the cityscapes. But there's something more than that. So, where are the -- from the Census and the other data it's like, well, this area, this is a colorcoded or highlighted, this is this area. And then, if you had filters and you had settings like, well, let me see if I apply this filter what does it look like? If I apply this filter, what does this look like? So, filters could be on the race. It could be on their age, the general age group.

So, I mean that's part of the visualization. You can have an overlay that says, okay, it's not just this particular racial background for this neighborhood, but there's this age thing which you could have a different

color or a different shape.

I mean the most recent example right now, the Coronavirus stuff. So, you see a specific location, a size, and in some cases they're using color. So, all of those are visualizations that you can easily see and interpret the data more naturally, I guess, rather than looking at numbers and a spreadsheet, and see the relationship of one area versus another area, versus another area, in whatever way you want to see it, by age, by race, by whatever attributes you have in the data.

PANEL MEMBER COE: And who do you envision that would be the target audience for such visualizations?

MR. BLANDO: I would say everybody. So, the Commission, definitely, because they have to make a decision. When we go to the public forums I would hope, and say this is what the data shows. Now, tell us if it's wrong. Tell us if we've missed something.

And then when it's public, when we've made a decision those data visualizations will be used by everybody who's curious how did this get done this way. I imagine it being used by people running by office to understand here's some demographics, here's the interest groups, perhaps, the commonality.

And, yes I should, or maybe somebody interested, yeah, I should run for office because, you know, this is

the commonality and I belong to that group and I can represent this area.

And I'm sure lawyers will be interested in it afterwards to verify the Commission did its job.

PANEL MEMBER COE: One more question on the topic of data visualization. A large backbone of what would go into those visualizations would be the data from the United States Census, which is going to be a large information portal for the Commission to inform their work. But the other side of the work of the Commission is information that's less hard data, and a little squishier in terms of opinions and feelings of diverse residents of the state. If you were making a data visualization for the work of the Commission, how would you incorporate the kind of squishier data, the input from the people in with the visualization, mixing it with the Census data?

MR. BLANDO: So, in my experience one of the elements I've done was a hover over. So, in a computer you can do that extra dimension, which is you see the data, you see the information, put the mouse over it, get the additional data. That's one way. It would be difficult on paper. But that's what I mentioned earlier is like you have to go out there for the squishy data.

So, I envisioned, so for example one scenario that I could see is like, well, there is a -- where the

content from the community is important, if I see a neighborhood and it's a neighborhood of families, it's dense apartment complexes, and the data says that it's mixed race but the average salary is below \$35,000. Well, that's an impoverished community. It might be an immigrant community as well. But I can take that to UC Davis and say that's the married student housing area, they're going to be here. That's the same attributes that they would have is they have families; they are not making a lot of money because they're going to school. School might be -- you know, they might have some grants, some scholarships, and it's dense housing. So, as opposed to an immigrant community. Two varied things, but the Census data could produce the same output.

So, how would I -- so, the hover over at this point is the only way I can do that, as opposed to, you know, you put a little footnote in the thing that says this is why it's different. You can do the color coding, you can do a shape. So, I'd have to think about that and see what's the options because I need to understand what are the other layers, what's the other data because I want to know why you shape this, and why you shape somewhere else, and color somewhere else. Like I've got to come up with something different, so maybe it's a pattern. I don't know.

MS. PELLMAN: We have 3 minutes and 35 seconds.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Okay, thank you.

If you were appointed to the Commission, which aspects of that role do you think that you would enjoy the most and, conversely, which aspects of that role you think you might perhaps struggle with a little bit?

MR. BLANDO: I'm more analytical. And I've focused a lot of my volunteer work has forced me to go out and engage. And a lot of things I've done in the past is actually to force me to not be too analytical. Why did I become a journalist when I was an engineering student at UC Davis? Because I know that I will be mostly analytical. I need to exercise the other part which is engage people, ask questions, be out there, do something that I'm not comfortable doing, so I do it.

I get enjoyment at the output, but it's not naturally. I will gravitate towards the data, and the information, and the analytics, and how to make a decision based on this. So, engaging people will be -- it's not natural. I've done it. I can do it. I'm skilled at it. But this where, as I mentioned earlier, I have to recognize, yeah, my bias is I tend towards the data. I have to listen to the story. Well, as I mentioned earlier, I have to -- I give myself an excuse now. So, why, because, you know, whether it was before I was Staff

Assembly Chair, or a Commissioner, that's what I've got to do. This is the job, I have to do this and listen to people because the output of the decisions depend on it.

But I would say it might also be the venue. So, if it's in this venue, very public, and it's structured, you know, I might be more comfortable with it. When it's unstructured, and I say that like an example, like I'm an introvert. So, I've had friends and I've had a relationship with a partner who is more extroverted, so they can -- nobody -- the statement nobody's a stranger, so they can strike up a conversation with anybody, at any time, about anything. I struggle a little bit. But for me it's assured because I have context.

If I have context, which is I'm the Commissioner and I'm here to do this, it's a lot easier versus if you drop me in a neighborhood and just go. It's not my natural tendency to engage people and ask them about what's going on.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Okay, thank you. No further questions.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you. Mr. Dawson?

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. Mr. Blando, I have a couple of follow-up questions.

You talked about that you came to the states when you were a child. Did I understand that correctly? And

then, you grew up in Orland?

MR. BLANDO: Yes.

MR. DAWSON: And so, one of the criteria for membership on the committee is an appreciation for California's diverse demographics and geography. And the ultimate makeup is supposed to be representative of California's diversity. Now, it's not necessary that somebody live in a place to have appreciation for it. But do you think that your experience growing up in the North Valley gives you a special appreciation for that part of the state?

MR. BLANDO: Well, in a rural community in North Valley, it's more the rural area, perhaps. So, the appreciation says who are these people and what do they do? So, in some sense it's lower, a different -- I know growing up I didn't have cable TV. So, they might not have internet access, they might not have fast internet access, so it's a very different way. And in an agrarian, rural community they're job is their land and you do a lot of work. So, part of it is I know, as a child, well, there's no child labor laws in farming, so that's what you did as a child you helped with the farm, and that's how you grew up. You didn't, you know, play games and other things, so that's what you did.

So, it's a very different set perhaps when you

live up that way and you live in that area, and in a small area where you know everybody, which is the -- almost the opposite, I would say in some cases, where you say you want to get away from people and you want to go to a rural area, where you realize because it's rural and there's so few, everybody knows who does what and who you are. So, that's where you go, and you're at the store and somebody will say to me, hello, Peter, somebody's parent, like you don't do that in a larger community. So, you know everybody.

MR. DAWSON: Uh-hum.

MR. BLANDO: I don't know if that's the same in the rest of the Northern California area. I can say that was my experience in Orland. An experience of you have to drive miles to go shopping somewhere, to a mall. I know the experience of you have to go -- I don't know where we got the dentist or the healthcare. I remember driving far to take me there. So, and there's fewer amenities than you would see in the cities or highly populated towns than you would there. I think it's changed over time though and they might be more populated there.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. So, we have 3 minutes and 50 seconds left in the 90-minute period. Do any of the Panel Members have a follow up?

CHAIR DICKISON: Mr. Belnap?

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: I do not.

CHAIR DICKISON: Mr. Coe?

PANEL MEMBER COE: No follow-up questions.

CHAIR DICKISON: I don't, either.

MR. DAWSON: Mr. Blando, would you like to make a closing statement to the Panel in your remaining 3 minutes and 30 seconds?

MR. BLANDO: Sure. I want to thank the Panel for their work on behalf of the citizens of California, because I think you started with thousands and you had to go through that, and narrow it down to this. And 120 interviews is a lot, I can say.

I want to say that in my experience it seems to be when this was posted and I saw this, I said, well, it appears that with the qualifications needed, it is one of the most ideal committees I've ever seen for my experience. So, the analytical component is my job and my tendency is the committee work, impartiality from my committee work in the past, and then my life experiences in different areas, growing up in different places, and living in different places in California. I hope to serve, but I understand that there's only so many slots. And for the few other interviews I've taken a look at, they have very impressive qualifications.

But I thank you for giving me this opportunity.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

60

1 CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you. Our next interview 2 today is at 1:15. So, we are going to go into recess until 3 1:14. 4 (Off the record at 10:27 a.m.) 5 (On the record at 1:13 p.m.) 6 CHAIR DICKISON: Good afternoon. The time being 7 1:14, we're calling the Applicant Review Panel back to 8 order. 9 I'd like to welcome Teresa Liang. Did I say that 10 correctly? 11 MS. LIANG: Liang. It's close enough. 12 CHAIR DICKISON: Liang, okay. Welcome for your 13 interview today. And I'm going to turn it over to Mr. 14 Dawson to read the five standard questions. 15 MR. DAWSON: Good afternoon, Dr. Liang. I'm 16 going to ask you five standard questions that the Panel has 17 requested that each applicant respond to. Are you ready? 18 MS. LIANG: Yes. 19 MR. DAWSON: Ouestion one. What skills and 20 attributes should all Commissioners possess? 21 What skills or competencies should the Commission 22 possess collectively? 23 Of the skills, attributes and competencies that 24 each Commissioner should possess, which do you possess? 25 In summary, how will you contribute to the

success of the Commission?

MS. LIANG: Okay. Well, first, before I start answering questions, I'd like to thank the Panel for inviting me up here. And also to thank the Panel for the tremendous amount of work it's done. It's a lot of work in a short amount of time.

So, getting to the question. What skills and attributes should all Commissioners possesses? Well, analytical skills. The skill to apply the legal aspects, to be impartial. Also, I think a strong and important aspect is to have good communication skills, to be able to work well with others. To be able to listen respectfully to other opinions.

And for this Commission, especially, I think Commissioners need to have passion and integrity. They need to realize that we're working towards a common goal and an important common goal.

And finally, but not least, each Commissioner needs to have time management skills to be able to work efficiently because there is a hard deadline, a timeline here. So, each Commissioner has to be able to read and understand, I assume, a huge amount of documents to be able to distill the documents into an understandable form, and then to apply the applicable laws relevant.

Let's see, what skills or competencies should the

Commission possess collectively? Well, all of the above. But also, the ability to work together as a cohesive group and to respect each other, to listen respectfully to each other. And again, I think I'm emphasizing this because it's so important, but time management skills because there is a hard deadline for the project to be finished.

Of all the skills, and attributes, and competencies that each Commissioner should possess, which one do I possess? I believe all of the above to some extent or other. Throughout my career I've been part of large collaborative groups where there have been several disparate subgroups, with several disparate opinions.

For example, when I'm working in a pharmaceutical company, I work with a group trying to decide whether to push through a drug to market. So, I'll be working basic researchers. I'll be working with clinical researchers. I'll be working with business development. I'll be working with regulatory affairs. And I represent the legal patent aspects of the group. So, we all come together and we all discuss our views from our vantage point, and we all listen respectfully to each other.

I am a collaborator. I am a good listener. And I will speak up when I feel there's a need to. I believe my scientific and legal training provides the required analytical ability, and the ability to read and absorb a

large amount of documentation, and to do it in an effective and timely manner, and then to apply the relevant rules and regulations.

How would I contribute to the Commission? Well, because I am a practical person, my contribution would be all of my skills that I mentioned above, but also I have a focus. I focus on the goal. So, I will be able to keep the Commission focused and on time to get to the end of our goals.

In the past I have been a bridge between disparate communities. For example, I am a bridge between the legal and the scientific communities and quite often those communities do not at all understand each other. And I have been the liaison between these communities and interpret for each other, for these two communities.

I also enjoy being part of a large group, working together for a common good, a common goal. Previously, it was to get a drug to market so that people, patients in need will be treated. Here I hope to contribute my skills to the Commission.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. Question two. Work on the Commission requires members of different political backgrounds to work together. Since the 2010 Commission was selected and formed, the American political conversation has become increasingly polarized, whether in

the press, on social media, and even in our own families.

What characteristics do you possess, and what characteristics should your fellow Commissioners possess, that will protect against hyperpartisanship?

What will you do to ensure that the work of the Commission is not seen as polarized or hyperpartisan and avoid perceptions of political bias and conflict?

MS. LIANG: So, what characteristics do I possess and should the other commissioners possess? I strongly believe that each Commissioner should have the belief that the work of the Commission is essential, and that each Commissioner has to be impartial and working towards the common good for protecting our voting system.

My belief here is based on an idealistic and a practical reason. The idealistic reason is because I strongly believe that each person should have their vote weighted equally. And then, we are in a representative democracy after all.

Then also, the practical reason. If we allow bias into the Commission, then we leave the California taxpayer, us, we leave us open to expensive litigation and we leave ourselves open to acrimony. And if the voter loses faith in the voting system, they will not engage. So, our democracy will lose.

What will I do ensure that the work of the

Commission is not seen as polarized or hyperpartisan, and avoid political -- perceptions of political bias and conflict?

I will say to be as transparent as possible about the process and to explain the process as much as possible to the public. I believe that most people have a sense of fairness and that if the Commission explains the reasoning, the careful considerations that goes into the reasoning, and allow comments, and to allow the comments to be heard, to have the commenters feel that they are heard, then I think most people will be satisfied with the fairness of the Commission's work.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. Question three. What is the greatest problem the Commission could encounter, and what actions would you take to avoid or respond to this problem?

MS. LIANG: One pitfall I see is partisanship between the groups on the Commission. It is, after all, five Democrats and five Republicans, and coming from very extreme ends of the political spectrum.

Another potential problem is perhaps an intransigent outlier Commissioner who has their own opinion. What I would do depends on the situation. But first, I would try to understand and be informed. Maybe there is a point of view that I had not seen, so I would

want to understand that. And then, I would want to talk about it. Point out my point of view, understand the other person's point of view, and perhaps to negotiate. So, that's how I would work through conflict.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. Question four. If you are selected, you will be one of 14 members of the Commission which is charged with working together to create maps of the new districts. Please describe a situation where you had to work collaboratively with others on a project to achieve a common goal.

Tell us the goal of the project, what your role in the group was, and how the group worked through any conflicts that arose.

What lessons would you take from this group experience to the Commission if selected?

MS. LIANG: Okay, as I mentioned previously, I have been on large groups, collaborative groups for example in the pharmaceutical industry to determine whether a drug goes to market. As I described there were disparate groups and people in these collaborative meetings. The basic scientist, the clinical researchers, business development, regulatory affairs, and legal patents.

Our goal was to push through a drug to market if it made sense, and that's what we had to discuss.

Conflicts arose when one group wanted to push

through the drug and perhaps another group did not. The basic researchers would present their data to show that this drug works very well in animal models of human diseases. Then the clinical scientists would say, would present a blueprint for how to take this drug to clinical trial and give us an estimate of the expenses. The marketing people would tell us there's this market, big or small. And then, the regulatory affairs would give us a blueprint of how this drug would be shepherded through the FDA approval process. And then, I would give the group information about whether there is any intellectual property concerns about this drug.

So, conflicts arose, for example, when let's say the basic researcher wanted to push the drug ahead, but the marketers -- the marketing executive said there is no market for this. But then, then we would have to discuss maybe there is a market, maybe there's a submarket, maybe there is other ways of marketing this drug.

Or, if the clinical people said to do a clinical trial would be very hard, it would be very expensive. Even if the market is large, we have no guarantee that it would be efficacious in the human population. So, would we want to spend hundreds of millions of dollars to take this drug into clinical trial?

So, we would also discuss this. Quite often we

would not come to a conclusion in the first, second, or third meeting. We would have to go back, we would discuss it some more. We'd go back, we would gather some more information, and each one of them would then present and talk some more until we came to a consensus.

However, I have to emphasize we did have to do this in a timely manner because we don't want this drug to either -- to be hanging around and not go to market, or just to be hanging around and costing the company a lot of expense and manpower. So, we had to be efficient, as well as cohesive in our deliberations.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. Question five. A considerable amount of the Commission's work will involve meeting with people from all over California who come from very different backgrounds and a wide variety of perspectives.

If you are selected as a Commissioner, what skills and attributes will make you effective at interacting with people from different backgrounds and who have a variety of perspectives?

What experiences have you had that will help you be effective at understanding and appreciating people and communities of different backgrounds and who have a variety of perspectives?

MS. LIANG: My skills and attributes are that I'm

a good listener and I generally believe that everybody's entitled to express their opinion. I'm also very culturally sensitive and my experiences give me empathy with many groups of people. And I'll explain here. I am of a Chinese ethnic background and I've lived in Southern California for most of my life. I moved to Southern California when I was seven years old. So, I've been the beneficiary of living in this great state and going through our educational system from primary through -- primary school to my post-doctoral fellowship at UCLA.

I understand how immigrants think. I was not born in the U.S., so I understand how immigrants think and how they do not trust the government maybe perhaps because of language and/or cultural barriers.

I have encountered racial discrimination in my past. Thankfully not very much because we are in a very diverse state. It's just that the state is getting more diverse as we go along. So, I understand the fear in some of these communities and the desire not to engage with the government or government officials.

I'm very sensitive to English language usage.

Even though English is my primary language, it's not my

first language. And because I work with many multinational

people in the U.S., and also abroad, I have to be careful

about my English language usage. We can be in a room full

of English language users, everybody understands English perfectly, but because of the culture there may be misunderstandings arising.

For example, in cultures which have a culture of politeness, when somebody else is talking we commonly nod our head, we're always nodding our head when somebody else is talking. I had to stop myself from doing this in my career because people think you are agreeing with them. You're not agreeing with them. You may vehemently disagree. You're nodding your head because you are hearing them, you are hearing what they're saying, not because you agree.

My British colleagues, on the other hand, they'll say something like that is interesting, which means in American English that is rubbish, let's drop the subject.

So, I understand English language usage very well and I'm very sensitive to the nuances of these different types of usages.

I also understand the need to connect to people through their communities. For example, if I wanted to find a person of a specific community, I would have to go to areas that perhaps are not -- that perhaps the general population is not aware of. Say social media, not everybody is on Facebook, even though that's the dominant application in the U.S. If I wanted to find somebody from

India, or an Indian group, I would go to WhatsApp. If I were -- the same with the Europeans. Some of the European groups use WhatsApp and the Indian groups use WhatsApp.

They don't use text messaging like what we have on our i-Phones.

If I was looking for somebody from the Chinese group, I would go to WeChat. If I were looking for somebody from Korea, I would go to LINE. Taiwan uses LINE, also. So, I would go to these different media platforms to find these people and to engage with them.

As a long-time California resident, I also understand the concerns of other long-term California residents. I'll say this, I'm older than some of the freeways around here. So, I've seen the change in California through the decades. Once upon a time Southern California, especially Orange County, Irvine, were all farms.

My parents would take us on a trip on the weekends to go and buy -- to go to the Japanese farms and to buy some beansprouts, staples that you could not buy in the regular grocery stores. Now, you can go down to your regular Safeway and get beansprouts. So, there is a big change and not everybody is comfortable with this change. So, I understand that and I can empathize because I have lived through this change.

I have experience also financial and disparities. So, I can empathize with people from different economic level. When I was young, I lived in a blue collar working neighborhood. And then, when I -- then, when my parents became more prosperous, we moved to a white collar, middle class neighborhood. And I have to say I did experience culture shock moving from the two neighborhoods. It was disconcerting and a little bit distressing in some respects.

So, I can understand that there will be miscommunication between the two, the multiple strata of socioeconomic levels in California.

Now, how to bridge the distance between disparate communities and the Commission? Simply by getting to know each other. I believe that people are not afraid of what's familiar. Younger people nowadays are very comfortable with the plurality of minorities that we have in this country, more so than say an older person. So, what is familiar is not scary.

So, I would encourage the Commission to hold multiple public meetings and to get the public familiar with the goals and the workings of the Commission. So, that's how I would encourage the Commission to interact with the public.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. We will now go to Panel

questions. Each Member of the Panel will have 20 minutes for his or her questions. And we will start with the Chair, Ms. Dickison.

MS. LIANG: Okay.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you, Dr. Liang. So, I see here you have a doctorate in experimental pathology?

MS. LIANG: Correct.

CHAIR DICKISON: And so, you currently work as a patent agent. How did you get into that line of work?

MS. LIANG: Serendipity. I was doing my postdoctoral fellow at UCLA when another one of my postdoctoral fellow colleagues came over and said to me, hey, the law firm I'm working for needs a scientific consultant in biology. Would you be interested? I said, sure. And that's how I veered off my scientific career into the legal field. It's both fields are fascinating. It's very interesting.

CHAIR DICKISON: And so, your knowledge and skill set in the legal field is through that avenue?

MS. LIANG: Yes. As a patent agent I am federally barred. So, that means I had to take the Federal Patent Bar. The Federal Patent Bar is open to lawyers with a certain skill set, a certain knowledge of science. Or, to non-lawyers who can learn enough of the legal rules and regulations surrounding the patent field to pass this Bar.

So, it is a legal Bar.

CHAIR DICKISON: Okay, thank you. You answered some of my questions as you were going through the last one. You talked a little bit about your experiences growing up and how that would help you bridge the gap. Are there any other ways those experiences would help you with the work of the Commission?

MS. LIANG: Well, like I said, I'm rather culturally sensitive, partially because of my background growing up here in California, but also because once you are at university you can't help but be mixing with a whole bunch of different people from different ethnic backgrounds. And what I've learned most is that if people are nice and tolerate each other's mistakes, then we all get along.

For example, eating is a must for everybody and I'm a bit of a foodie, okay. So, when I have parties at my house for all my various colleagues, the easiest thing for me to do is have a hot pot. I don't know if you know what a Chinese hot pot is. But it's, you know, you throw a lot of ingredients into a central pot and you eat out of it. I usually have to have three hot pots at any of my parties. One hot pot for the vegetarians who choose to be vegetarian by choice or are vegetarian by religion, Hindus. Then, I have a pot that is composed of lamb, no pork, no shrimp,

for my halal and kosher friends. And then, I have an omnivores' pot for everybody else. So, that's how I manage to get my friends and colleagues together, and just to comingle. Otherwise, you know, if you don't eat together, how can you mingle together in some respects?

So, and they are very generous because I know that I am not strictly kosher and I'm not strictly halal, but they are tolerant of the deficiencies and we all get along.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you. So, you talk about in science you've been trained to identify bias, your own and then otherwise. How do you identify your own biases, first?

MS. LIANG: That is hard because you try -- you don't want to think of yourself as having bias. But if I feel discomfort about something, then I ask myself why. Is it really discomfort that has a rationale that has a rational reason for it or is it just a gut reaction that has no rational reason for it. And I try to question my own assumptions. Especially, the stronger I feel about something, the more I question it. That's how I try.

CHAIR DICKISON: And is that how you deal with your own biases to ensure that they're not coloring your decision making at all?

MS. LIANG: If I know, if I realize I have a

bias, then I'm very strict with myself. Because a bias has no place in science, has no place in the legal -- well, I take that back, a little bit. It has no place in science. And if you do have any internal biases, you could waste millions of dollars and waste decades of your life. So, that bias is a strongly discouraged characteristic in science.

CHAIR DICKISON: Okay. What about identifying bias in otherwise, or others? Is that what you mean by otherwise?

MS. LIANG: Otherwise, I'm not quite sure. But I'm thinking that in others we discuss it. If I feel strongly about something, I will have a discussion with somebody about it. And try to see maybe it's my bias that is interfering, not the other person's bias. Maybe it's something that I didn't see that is a valid point and that needs to be taken into consideration.

CHAIR DICKISON: So, one of the things the Commission is going to need to do is identify communities of interest up and down the state. What methods do you think the Commission could employ to identify some of these communities?

MS. LIANG: As I mentioned before some of the social media groups, but you have to strategize and figure out which social media platform for which community. It's

pretty segregated in that manner, actually.

I would also go to grocery stores and do outreach there because everybody goes to a different grocery store, ethnic grocery store for their own comfort food. If I, for example, if you're Filipino, you to Seafood City, that grocery chain. If you're Chinese, you go to Ranch 99. It's all segregated to some extent. Not deliberately, it's just because of the comfort food that's available at those particular places.

And so, depending on what particular ethnic group that you may see a lack of participation, you may want to go over there and talk to the owners of the grocery store, and have some fliers or some information posted there.

CHAIR DICKISON: Okay, thank you. So, you mentioned growing up in a blue collar neighborhood and that was in Fullerton?

MS. LIANG: Yes.

CHAIR DICKISON: And then you moved to Claremont. And then, you also mentioned that, you know, you have experience of pros and cons living in suburban and urban areas. And just thinking of those different communities that you've experienced, what do you think is -- what do you think binds those communities together?

MS. LIANG: I would say just people. People usually like people, in my experience. So, I think whether

you're in an urban setting, or in a suburban setting, or a rural setting your friends of your neighbors. And you get to know your neighbors, and you get to know the people at your church, or synagogue, or temple, and you get -- and people help each other.

For example, there's now this app called

Nextdoor, and during this Coronavirus situation one of my

neighbors sent out an email blast to the whole neighborhood

saying I have some citrus fruit, lemons, oranges, and

grapefruit in my trees. If anybody wants some, come over

and get some because the grocery stores are crazy right

now, so just bypass the grocery stores and come over and

pluck some from my tree. So, people are nice.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you. So, the way the Commissioners are selected, the first eight are selected randomly through a lottery. And then, those eight are responsible for selecting the next six that will round out the Commission. If you were one of the first eight, what would you be looking for in those other six Commissioners?

MS. LIANG: I'd have to take a look and see what skills that the first eight have, and what's lacking, and what attributes are lacking in those eight before being able to select the next six. Whether it's a different ethnic group, or geographical location, it just depends on what the eight have already.

CHAIR DICKISON: What would you like to see the Commission ultimately accomplish?

MS. LIANG: One reason why I'm so passionate about this Commission is because I was very disappointed in the Supreme Court decision a couple years ago that aggregated the judiciary's role in gerrymandering. I was so mad with it that I became interested in this Commission when I heard about it.

And I believe that the Commission needs to -first, I'm thankful that I live in California which set up
this Commission more than ten years ago. And so, I believe
the Commission not only needs to set the districts and
prevent gerrymandering, but also to relieve the voting
population of its concerns that there is unfairness in the
voting situation.

As I mentioned, I'm afraid that if people think it's unfair they'll tune out, tune off, say why should I even bother the way I vote's not going to affect anything.

So, I hope that this Commission and its ability to be transparent, and its ability to connect with people, and as many people as possible would allow the general population to feel that there is no issue in California, and that we are still a representative democracy.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you. That's all my questions for right now.

Mr. Belnap?

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: Okay, thank you. Thank you for being here? What does a patent agent do?

MS. LIANG: Okay. We try to -- and I say try, we try to get patents for our clients or for the companies that we work for. As I had mentioned previously, you can be a patent attorney or a patent agent. Decades ago, the federal government threw open the Patent Bar for non-attorneys because there were -- not every attorney has the requisite scientific ability, scientific knowledge to understand the very intricate inventions.

And so, my specialty is biology. Since I have a PhD in pathology, I understand the workings of the human body from an academic stand point. And so, I work for a pharmaceutical company making drugs to treat human diseases. So, I try to obtain patents for my company or for my client.

Now, part of my job is also to supervise obtaining patents worldwide, depending on how big the market is for this drug. For example, one of the drugs I worked on makes several hundred million dollars a year for a patent -- for a drug company. And for that particular drug I had to supervise entry into the patent field for over 30 countries. So, I was supervising lawyers from over 30 countries and talking to them. Their English is very

good written. Not so good, sometimes, spoken. And so, I would supervise these 30 plus lawyers from all over the world, trying to obtain patents under their patent laws. So, I would take their advice and try to tailor a strategy to obtain protection for our drug in their country.

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. So, you represent your company or your client in obtaining patents. One of the things that you talked about in your impartiality essay is your work as a patent agent. So, help me with the link between a patent agent and being impartial.

MS. LIANG: Okay. Because -- okay, I'll take the U.S. example because that's what I'm most familiar with. In the U.S. if, for example, the inventorship is wrong on a patent that could potentially invalidate the patent. That means after all that work and expense the patent is not enforceable.

So, you have to get the inventorship correct.

And, of course, everybody working on a particular project wants to have their particular input acknowledged. And so, many people think that they should be on this patent.

However, patent inventorship, or inventorship of a patent is a very strict -- has very strict legal definitions, has very strict -- has lots of case law on it. And so, you have to go through an analysis to see who is properly deemed an inventor.

Now, working in a pharmaceutical company, most of these people who have worked on these drugs, they're my friends. So, it's very difficult to tell a friend you're not an inventor, especially since they could get merit points or promotions based on having their name on the patent. So, I have to walk them through the process of determining who is an inventor or not.

I have to go through and very decisively, and yet gently because they're my friends, tell them you are not an inventor on this and I cannot do anything for you, even though it may -- even though your promotion depends on this, because you are not properly an inventor because it is -- there's a strict guideline of who are inventors.

It's also difficult to tell a client when you're in a law firm, because the client may decide to go to another law firm who has a different idea of whether they are inventors or not. You just have to let that happen. If you don't think that person's an inventor cannot change your mind, cannot bend. You have to let the person walk, if necessary.

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: All right, thank you. In your analytical skills essay you say: I have the ability to dispassionately analyze Census data and make informed decisions based on the data. Have you worked with Census data before or have you worked with data like Census data?

MS. LIANG: Data like Census. For example, epidemiological data. I'm constantly during my academic career, also in the pharmaceutical field looking at epidemiological data, looking at patient cohorts, looking at whether -- looking at, oh, if this drug is not working for this patient cohort, maybe there's a sub-cohort that it could be applied to, stuff like that.

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: So, how big is this data, typically?

MS. LIANG: It depends. If it's an orphan drug, maybe a few. Maybe one person, two people, to persons, three people. It could be as small as that.

But some of the big epidemiological cohorts are thousands and tens of thousands of people, so you have to look at that.

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: And when it's tens of thousands of data, what programs do you use to analyze that data?

MS. LIANG: I rely on our statisticians. So, I rely on the experts because I am not an expert. But I will be talking to them constantly about it and trying to data mine and see if there's a smaller cohort who would benefit from our drug.

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: Okay, thank you. Under the diversity essay, appreciation for diversity, you talked a

lot about your travels. And I don't need to talk about that. But what I needed to hear from the essay and what I want to ask you is can you provide an example of a project you worked on with people from different backgrounds, a project that demonstrates your appreciation for diversity?

MS. LIANG: Well, the projects for example are I supervised 30 or more foreign attorneys. And in one instance when -- in one instance I remember calling Pakistan and when there was a power outage in Pakistan, and tried to get contact them, and they were telling me, oh, we only have power by so and so time, could you call at these times. That was a long time ago, that was 20 years ago, so I think Pakistan's much better now, power outage wise.

But I am used to working with people from disparate backgrounds, and disparate viewpoints. And so, and disparate technological abilities to be able to work together.

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: Okay, thank you. In question four you talked about the pharmaceutical companies that you've worked for, and when you're trying to get a drug to market that there's all these people that come in with different perspectives, and how that -- there could be conflict. What I want to know is how did you personally help resolve the conflict that occurs in those situations?

MS. LIANG:

Talk, lots of talks. And also,

making the process extremely transparent because in patents, inventorship is based on what's called claims, the claims of the invention, which is the description of the invention. So, I would go down the list of claims and talk to the potential inventors and say what did you contribute to this? What did you contribute to this? What was your contribution to this? And so, talk, talk, and talk, trying to figure out what was the underlying contribution and why this person thought they were a contributor. Maybe there was some aspect that I didn't see and sometimes there was. After my initial assessment, maybe there was something that I did not see and somebody came to me and said, hey, I did this, so I should properly be a co-inventor. And I would say, yes. It just depends on what the issue was. I can't be more specific in that, sorry.

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. My final question.
You said that people are nice.

MS. LIANG: Uh-hum, yes. Usually.

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: So, people are generally nice. Yeah, usually. So, can you think of a person in your work or other experiences that was not nice, difficult to work with? And then, I want to know how did you work with that person?

MS. LIANG: Okay. As with any group of people there are some people who are not nice. They -- to work

with these people, you have to maintain a calm demeanor and to respect their opinions. Some of these people are very intelligent, they just think that they are always right sometimes. So, you have to work with them and talk to them, and see whether -- and basically talk to them and get their point of view, and to be firm in your point of view when you talk to them.

So, for the not nice people, you still have to work with them no matter what. Just talk.

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: Okay, thank you. I have no further question.

CHAIR DICKISON: Mr. Coe?

PANEL MEMBER COE: Okay, thank you. Good afternoon, Dr. Liang, thank you for being here. Many of my questions have been addressed already by my colleagues or by your answers.

But I did want to discuss something you mentioned in your essay. You talk about your volunteer and donation efforts, which are focused on those in need.

MS. LIANG: Uh-hum.

PANEL MEMBER COE: In your case, both people and animals, with your donations to the L.A. Food Bank, and the Downtown Women's Center, as well as your volunteer efforts with animal rescue groups. And you state that your focus on those has to do with your ability to empathize with

those in need due to your background. You've spoken about your background a little bit already.

My question is that ability to empathize that you speak of, how do you think that will help you if you are a member of this Commission?

MS. LIANG: I think I can understand where people -- may understand where people come from. For example, somebody who is not a native English speaker, when they come up it's a daunting task for them to come up to a Commission and speak to it, to speak publicly. Sometimes they're hesitant, sometimes they're looking for the proper English word. If you rush them, they will shut up. They will not say another word. They will shut off. You cannot rush people. You have to be there patiently listening and be open to them, to what they're saying, and to encourage them to speak up.

So, I have noticed or have had situations in my background where people I know, they wanted to say something, they were rushed or they perceived they were brushed off. In my perception they were not brushed off, it was just a regular American manner in which they were treated. But from their cultural perspective, they were grossly offended. And so, they said no more, don't want to deal with it. Never dealt with it again.

So, I have that cultural sensitivity because of

my experience.

PANEL MEMBER COE: I kind of want to continue the thought of cultural sensitivity. In one of your answers to Ms. Dickison earlier, about communities of interest, you talked about social media groups, and grocery stores. Your discussion was primarily focused on racial/ethnic groups in terms of communities. What about other communities that are bound together by different aspects that aren't necessarily ethnicity, how would you go about finding those and getting those communities to engage?

Again, I would go to the supermarket or something like that because everybody has to eat, everybody has to buy something. Go to where they congregate, whether it's their church, their synagogue, their temple. That's not quite ethnic, because different people of different ethnic groups can be bound by the same religion.

Socioeconomic groups that would be harder. That, I would have to think about a little bit more before I can answer that.

PANEL MEMBER COE: So, we talked about those demographic items that could bind people together in a community. What about regional communities? And do you think the cultural sensitivity that you think you possess could be applied to different people in different regions based on the different perspectives they may have,

depending on where they reside?

MS. LIANG: As I mentioned in my essay I've lived a long time in California. I've lived from Southern California, San Diego, all the way up to San Francisco Bay Area. So, I've lived for a few years here or there, in all these different regions. So, I'm familiar with Northern California and I have -- and Southern California, and San Diego.

So, I have also, because I've been here for so long, friends throughout the state, whether it's the Central Valley, whether it's Sacramento. I have friends in Santa Maria, Santa Barbara, as well as San Diego. So, I have contacts that I can connect with, if I have questions about those regions.

But also, there are many minority groups in these regions, maybe under-appreciated minority groups that are not on the radar of most people. But they are present and because -- I'll relate this back to my food, being a foodie. I love going and exploring other cultures. So, for example, when driving up from San Diego to, say, San Francisco, I'll stop in Bakersfield because I love the Basque food there. I would stop there and, you know, go to the Basque restaurants and chat, and just find out about the cultures there.

So, I just love going to all around California,

figuring out the culture, trying the food. I love going to Little Ethiopia in Los Angeles. I love going to Little Tokyo in Los Angeles, all these different places, and just having a good sense of -- and talking to people, and finding out about their culture and their food.

PANEL MEMBER COE: And in your travels what have you learned about the people in those areas, their concerns, and their preferences, and those types of things? What have you learned and how would that inform your work as a Commissioner?

MS. LIANG: I do -- you know, I just talk with them. I think, for example, water rights are a very important thing in the Central Valley. Farming issues are a very important thing as connected to the water rights are very important in the Central Valley.

Once upon a time, when I was growing up in Southern California two cities over Fontana had tons of dairy farms. They all moved up to the Central Valley because land had just gotten too expensive in Southern California.

So, I am aware of some of the agricultural concerns in California. We are one -- we are the biggest bread basket for the U.S. We are the fifth or sixth biggest economy in the whole world. I am very -- I find it very interesting when I read about our economy, and our

agricultural roots, and our history. And I just love connecting with people and talking about it. So, I think people will talk to me if I am a Commissioner.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Okay, thank you. I wanted to ask you something about something you mentioned in your analytical skills essay, and you mentioned that you're trained in the IRAC method, Issue, Rule, Application and Conclusion method.

MS. LIANG: Uh-hum.

22.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Do you think this methodology could benefit the Commission in some way?

MS. LIANG: It could, I definitely think it could. But I am open to many different analyses' forms. Not everybody thinks the same. You have to respect other people's different way of thinking. They could have a totally — they could see something that I have totally missed and that has to be respected. And I do respect it. I'm very open. I think it's because of my scientific training that I am so open to other ideas. Because if you make a mistake and if you have a bias in science, like I said you could waste decades of your life chasing the wrong rabbit down the hole.

PANEL MEMBER COE: So, if you were to be appointed as a Commissioner, which aspects of that role do you think that you would enjoy the most and on the other

side what aspects of that role do you think you might struggle with a little bit?

MS. LIANG: I'm a data junkie. I love looking at data. I love looking at -- I love order. I love putting together puzzles. So, I think the work will be very enjoyable for me.

I do like talking to people, but it is tiring for me to talk to people and to be open and engaging all the time. So, I think that would be not hard for me, but a little bit tiring for me. And I think that the Commission needs to have a lot of open sessions, or open consultation with the public in general. So, I think that would be a little bit tiring for me, but it's something that I would still enjoy to some extent because I like talking to people.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Okay, thank you. No additional questions.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you. Mr. Dawson?

MR. DAWSON: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Dr. Liang, I wanted to follow up on that question that you had from Mr. -- your answer to the question that you gave Mr. Coe. You talked about being careful of bias in the data. So, it seems that the Commission will be taking data from a number of different sources, harder data including Census data, and then also sort of softer data,

which is more community engagement.

2.2.

MS. LIANG: Uh-hum.

MR. DAWSON: So, focusing on the Census data, do you have any concern about bias in that data and, if so, how would you address that?

MS. LIANG: I don't believe I have any concerns about bias in my own, in me looking at the data, because I firmly believe that each vote should count as much as possible, and equally to another vote.

Now, having said that, I realize that there are practical aspects and that it may not be completely equal. But in the time allowed, I will try to make it as equal as possible.

MR. DAWSON: Well, what my question was getting at, and I'm sorry I wasn't very clear, but there is always the possibility of an under count. Certain Californians will not be counted. That's just a fact, but it tends to involve some groups more than others. And is there something that you could do as a Commissioner, with your scientific background, that would allow you and the Commission to deal with that possible -- that possible bias?

MS. LIANG: I'd have to look into the data a little bit more before I can answer that question. For example, I know statisticians have algorithms that they can

use.

MR. DAWSON: Uh-hum.

MS. LIANG: But whether that would be appropriate or not in this situation I don't know. I'd have to look into it more before I can answer that. But there are algorithms that they do, statisticians do use. They don't count everybody, they do use algorithms to make up for a certain lack, or fill in certain gaps.

MR. DAWSON: Uh-hum.

MS. LIANG: Whether that's appropriate or not, at this point I don't know. It depends on the data that comes in.

MR. DAWSON: Okay, thank you. I wanted to follow up on one of your answers to the questions, the standard questions. You talked about sort of the subtleties of language, and picking up nuances of when people are speaking, particularly for whom English is not their first language. And could you expand on that? Is that something that you think came out of your immigrant background, or your work experience, or maybe a combination of the both?

MS. LIANG: Definitely a combination of both.

For work right now I'm very conscious to speak standard

English, not American English because it is -- English is
the international business language. Everybody knows

English when we're working together in big groups around

the world. But they may not understand American colloquialism or British colloquialism. It's actually, sometimes the Americans and the British colleagues have the most trouble being understood by the rest of the English speakers from, let's say Thailand, or the Philippines, or even Germany. They have a hard time, sometimes, understanding American colloquialisms.

Or the reverse. Sometimes somebody from India will say something and we will all be startled because that's not the normal word usage we have in the U.S. And we would have to clarify what he meant. So, it is -- you have to be sensitive about it.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. Did you always want to be a scientist?

MS. LIANG: Yes, I did.

biologist?

MR. DAWSON: Did you always want to be a

MS. LIANG: Yes, I did because it's very interesting. It's fascinating out the human body works and how nature works. Why is a constant question I always asked my parents, why, why, when I was younger. And so, they said, well, you have to look it up.

MR. DAWSON: We have interviewed -- or, I'm sorry, the Panel has interviewed quite a number of attorneys, but you're the only one to mention IRAC as an

analytical framework, so I appreciate that.

It seems to me that as a scientist you tend to the analysis of hard data, but in your legal career sometimes it's more soft data. Do you have an approach for melding those?

MS. LIANG: Yes and no, because in science the data is what it is. You can try to data mine a little bit, but you cannot fudge the scientific data, otherwise you will be hurting somebody, a future patient.

Melding it with the legal field, like I said,

I've needed to be the bridge between the scientific and the legal communities. Because the scientists will always say yes or no, maybe. Maybe is a very often answer from a scientist. Whereas the legal field wants to have more concrete answers from the scientists.

So, I've had to be the interpreter between the two fields. For example, the scientist will say why can't I be an inventor on this? It's just putting my name on a paper. And from the legal stand point I'll say, no, it is not. It means whether the patent falls or not if we get the wrong inventorship.

Versus a scientist, they're used to having their name, putting everybody's name on a paper. It's not a big deal for them to be a co-inventor on a patent. But in the legal field it is. So, you have to interpret from both

sides.

MR. DAWSON: I see. You are registered as no party preference.

MS. LIANG: Uh-hum.

MR. DAWSON: The Commission will be composed of five Democrats, five Republicans, and four persons not affiliated with either of those two parties.

Do you see the nonaffiliated members as having a particular role to play in this structure?

MS. LIANG: Definitely as mediators, mediating the two groups. And I believe and I hope that everybody who has been applying for the Commissioner's position realizes that this is beyond party preference. But if not, I think the impartials are not — the no party stated will be mediators between the two parties.

MR. DAWSON: I see. And do you feel that that is a role that is particularly personally suitable to you?

MS. LIANG: I believe so because I have been a bridge between multiple communities, the legal, the scientific, my immigrant community, the community at large, the American community and the international business community I've been a bridge.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. I have no more follow-up questions. We have roughly 25 minutes remaining in the 90-minute period. Do any of the Panel Members have any

98

1 additional follow ups? 2 CHAIR DICKISON: I don't have any. 3 Mr. Belnap? 4 VICE CHAIR BELNAP: I do not. 5 CHAIR DICKISON: Mr. Coe? 6 PANEL MEMBER COE: I do not have any follow-up 7 questions. 8 CHAIR DICKISON: No further questions. 9 MR. DAWSON: Okay. So, at this point Dr. Liang, 10 I'd like to offer you the opportunity to make a closing 11 statement to the Panel, if you wish. 12 MS. LIANG: Okay, thank you. So, this will be 13 really brief. So, if chosen to be on the Commission I will passionately strive to fulfill my responsibilities to the 14 15 Commission in an ethical, pragmatic, and timely manner. 16 That's it. Thank you. 17 MR. DAWSON: Thank you. 18 CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you. 19 Our next interview today is at 3:00 o'clock, so 20 we are going to recess until 2:59. 21 (Off the record at 2:19 p.m.) 22 (On the record at 2:59 p.m.) 23 CHAIR DICKISON: It being 2:59, calling the 24 Applicant Review Panel meeting back to order.

I want to welcome Katherine Burns.

25

MS. BURNS: Thank you.

CHAIR DICKISON: For her interview today. And I will turn the meeting over to Mr. Chris Dawson to read you the five standard questions.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. Good afternoon, Ms. Burns. I'm going to ask you five standard questions that the Panel has asked each applicant to respond to. Are you ready, ma'am?

MS. BURNS: I'm ready. Thank you.

MR. DAWSON: The first question. What skills and attributes should all Commissioners possess?

What skills or competencies should the Commission possess collectively?

Of the skills, attributes and competencies that each Commissioner should possess, which do you possess?

In summary, how will you contribute to the success of the Commission?

MS. BURNS: So, I think one of the most important skills that the team should have collectively is a sense of collaboration and the ability to work together. Also, critical thinking skills so that they can review information and data, talk about it, have that sense of problem solving and ability to make decisions. And again, I just think that sense of collaboration is so centrally important to the process. Because if the team isn't

working well together, they're not going to achieve their goal of finishing the work.

And so, along with collaboration I think is a sense of having good listening skills, the ability to have strong communication skills both to express what their ideas are, their opinions, and also to be able to participate equally. So that those who tend to talk a lot maybe give room to those who tend to be more introverted so that they have the opportunity to provide their input as well. And for those who are more introverted, which I'm usually along those lines, to be responsible to offer their input as well, and not just sit back and not be a part of the process.

I have had a long history of being a part of collaborative projects, both when I was in the insurance industry and then now, as an educator. And I know from working on successful projects and projects that weren't as successful that, again, this sense of collaboration is super important. And I know that I have the skills to support a team in reaching a great result, finishing a project, and making the best use of everyone's strengths so that we can all work together to achieve the goal.

I know that I have had many instances where collaboration -- excuse me, where communication has been critical in giving outsiders and those within the group

updates in terms of what the efforts are, what the progress is that we're making, questions that we have so that everyone can be a part of the process and kind of understand what's going on.

And I think listening is part of that as well, being patient, listening to others' ideas. And I think I've had a good track record of that as well based on my life experiences and work experiences.

So, in short, I think that the sense of collaboration is critical collectively and individually, and my experience all ties into that. I think I would make a great contribution to the Commission.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. Question two. Work on the Commission requires members of different political backgrounds to work together. Since the 2010 Commission was selected and formed, the American political conversation has become increasingly polarized, whether in the press, on social media, and even in our own families.

What characteristics do you possess, and what characteristics should your fellow Commissioners possess, that will protect against hyperpartisanship?

What will you do to ensure that the work of the Commission is not seen as polarized or hyperpartisan and avoid perceptions of political bias and conflict?

MS. BURNS: One of the first things that came to

mind as I saw this question is in our culture today how there seems to be a lot of name calling. That if you don't agree with someone's opinion, there's name calling that happens. And, certainly, there's absolutely no room for that on the Commission and there should be no room for that in our society.

I have always believed that it's very important in terms of how I view the world to first of all ask questions and listen. I very much appreciate hearing what others have to say and what they believe. It has actually helped me learn a lot as a citizen. I learn from my colleagues, and my friends, and my neighbors based on just conversations and hearing their ideas. So, listening is absolutely critical.

And I think that having the ability to think about life in terms of someone else, like living in someone else's shoes for a while. And I will bring up the example of just working as a middle school teacher, which I know this isn't directly related. But the idea that the students that came to me every day are going through a lot, and I was always aware of that. I always tried to imagine what kind of day they were having, where their ideas were coming from because some of them were fairly crazy. But just that listening and being aware that what they have to say is really important to them and I don't ever want to

minimize that. I want to appreciate, you know, their opinions. And if I don't agree ask questions, like why do you think that, and not in a confrontational kind of way but really with a genuine feeling that I want to understand what their beliefs are and why.

2.2.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. Question three. What is the greatest problem the Commission could encounter, and what actions would you take to avoid or respond to this problem?

MS. BURNS: I think one of the biggest concerns I would have would be that they would not work well together as a group. That there would be inner conflict. That this would get in the way of getting work done.

And in my lifetime I've worked on a couple of committees that have had that problem and it's been very frustrating, and has taken a lot of valuable time, and gotten people very frustrated, and angry, and emotional.

What I have found is again it gets back to communication and also a sense of purpose. I think it would be very important that the Commission knows their purpose, has the goal in mind, and that everyone understands what that vision is.

I think it's important to set norms right out of the gate so that everyone knows their roles and responsibilities. Even just setting some guidelines for

how we communicate with one another, that sense of fairness again that we're going to -- we're equal participants.

That all of our opinions are very important, and matter, and should be heard.

And so, I think that without establishing those norms at the beginning, I think that the group dynamic could really break down. And so, I think that is one of the most critical things in the groups where I've been successful is having just some ground rules that we all follow.

And in groups that I've worked in where we've got off to a rough start, we kind of hit the reset button. And I even very recently, with a group I was working with at work had to say, okay, let's just start over. You know, what are we doing here? What's our goal? And how are we going to accomplish this? And sometimes it's even a matter of assigning certain jobs. Maybe someone has a strength in one particular area, that's their task. And whatever my task might be is based on my strengths. And then, putting all those puzzle pieces together. But I think when you have those norms in place you can begin to establish trust and open communication.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. Question four. If you are selected, you will be one of 14 members of the Commission which is charged with working together to create

maps of the new districts. Please describe a situation where you had to work collaboratively with others on a project to achieve a common goal.

22.

Tell us the goal of the project, what your role in the group was, and how the group worked through any conflicts that arose.

What lessons would you take from this group experience to the Commission if selected?

MS. BURNS: So, probably the largest project, collaborative effort that I've ever been involved in was with a school I was working with in South Stockton. It was a historically low performing school that during the race to the top era was in great -- at a great risk of being closed. And I can understand why there were some arguments being made in favor of closing the school. The thought was that, hey, they've never been successful. The students are not being given to the proper access to a quality education, so we should just close that school.

But the problem was that some teachers and I at the school were concerned that it was a location within a neighborhood, kind of an isolated neighborhood in South Stockton. And our fear was where are the kids going to go to school? If they close our local school, they're going to get put on buses. How is that going to look? How is that going to affect their lives when they're on buses all

day, away from their friends in their neighborhood.

So, we started an effort to convert the school to a charter. And it started with just a little idea. A good friend of mine talked to a school board member and it began to take shape after that. So, I wasn't the first leader on the group, but I was a very active participant. And the entire process took us almost a year to convert the school into a charter. We knew nothing about how to create a charter school, we just had this idea.

And so, initially, it again began with this idea of what are our goals, so we mapped out our goals, what do we want. And then, we also included community members. We included school board members. We included local experts who could help us design the school. We set a schedule at meetings. We made sure everyone was heard. We didn't want this just to be the teachers' idea of a school but, really, what did the neighborhood want. So, that parent component, and even the students' opinions were very important to us.

We faced many obstacles along the way, mostly because we didn't -- we weren't experts in, again, creating a charter school. We didn't understand all of the laws. And so, as obstacles came before us we would find a community member who could help us, who had special knowledge, that we could meet with and ask all kinds of questions. And it was, in the end, we're really proud of

the school that we created and it's still there today.

And we also, as it got to the end we had to get final approval for the charter school, so that meant going to a series of school board meetings, state school board meetings, and so we had to prepare for those as well and make decisions about who's going to present our platform, who's going to go over all of our plans. And so, that was a very thoughtful process as well.

But we worked really well together as a team because there was open communication and we had a shared vision, and we appreciated everyone's expertise that they brought to the table.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. Question five. A considerable amount of the Commission's work will involve meeting with people from all over California who come from very different backgrounds and a wide variety of perspectives.

If you are selected as a Commissioner, what skills and attributes will make you effective at interacting with people from different backgrounds and who have a variety of different perspectives?

What experiences have you had that will help you be effective at understanding and appreciating people and communities of different backgrounds and who have a variety of perspectives?

MS. BURNS: So, for myself, I grew up in the Bay Area, so I've had many years of living in the East Bay.

After college, I lived in Sacramento, and then I left the state for a while, moved back to the Bay Area. I live in San Joaquin County now. So, I have a great perspective of what it's like to live in these areas.

But thinking back to when I was in the insurance industry, I traveled throughout the state visiting a variety of different companies and organizations who were our policyholders, and had contracted for services with us, whether it was for claims services, or safety, risk management, things of that nature.

As I traveled throughout the state for that particular job, or when I was in that industry, I met with CEOs, CFOs, human resources officers, and managers. But I also met with line managers in factories, and workers who, you know, were on the factory line every day. And I would get to know a particular business from multiple perspectives.

So, one of my favorite places to go, for example, was a plant down in the Central Coast that produces apple juice. And so, we would tour the entire factory from when the apples came off the truck to where they went through and were cleaned, and mashed, and you know, just through the whole process.

And so, getting to know all of the people throughout that organization was important for my ability to provide service to them. But it was interesting to me and wonderful to see the unique perspectives that they offered just in terms of that business.

2.2.

As I traveled throughout the state to many different companies and meeting employees, and managers, and what have you, I got to know them as people and also it was pretty wonderful to visit different businesses in geographic areas of the state. And so, I have a great appreciation for everything that we do here. To the point of everywhere I would go I'd say I want to live here. But anyway, I always end up going home.

As an educator, I have spent the past several years in my role, I now manage grant programs for a college. It's called Teachers College of San Joaquin. And a lot of that work has taken me throughout the Central Valley and up into the foothills. And I've gotten to know many educators, both teachers and principals, superintendents in a variety of areas. And I've learned a lot from their perspectives in terms of their relationship with their communities. And their views are often different than mine and it's been interesting, again, to learn from them.

I just have really taken note, even thinking in

terms of politics how I can drive a half-hour away from where I live and see signs of a political, you know, stance that are completely different from the ones in my neighborhood, where I see on everyone's front lawns. And so, I know that there are very diverse opinions among people that I enjoy spending time with, working with, and I love that you put all of those pieces together and it creates, you know, the great system that we have for education.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. At this point we will go to Panel questions. Each Panel Member will have 20 minutes to ask his or her questions. And we will start with our Chair, Ms. Dickison.

CHAIR DICKISON: Good afternoon, Mrs. Burns. So, you talked a little bit about the fact that you moved around the Bay Area, and Sacramento, and San Joaquin. What did you learn from those experiences in moving around about the communities, and how they may differ from region to region that you can use in working with the Commission?

MS. BURNS: So, I found that when I lived in the Bay Area, first I was in a suburban area, but then I lived in Oakland for quite a few years, and worked in San Francisco. What I saw was real estate prices were of concern, traffic congestion. The neighborhood where I lived was very diverse. Neighbors with, again, many

different backgrounds, different cultures. We had a really close knit neighborhood where I grew up. And even when I lived in Oakland, my neighbors, we were all really close. And just getting to know people on a personal level and appreciate, you know, the different food they cooked, and the places they had traveled and having those conversations was really amazing.

When I moved to Sacramento, it was a little, I would say, more emphasis on suburban. I lived almost in a rural area outside of downtown. And I was in a neighborhood where most of my neighbors all looked alike. We were all white and kind of around the same age. Some had kids, some didn't. I didn't know my neighbors as well there. It seemed like they were commuting to and from work.

But I know that one of the biggest concerns where I lived was, at the time, the air quality because they were burning the rice fields. And so, I remember in particular that one of my neighbors had asthma and that affected his asthma, and so we would talk about that a lot.

And also, the idea just about smog, and the thought that, oh, this bad air is coming, blowing in from the Bay Area. And so, a little bit of blaming, you know, the Bay Area and the traffic for that. But it was, you know, just a little bit of a different kind of a feel

living where I did.

When I moved to San Joaquin County, to Stockton, I used to always make fun of Stockton, I will be honest with you. I have some very close friends who live there and that's why I ended up in Stockton. But I used to make fun of, you know, I'll never live there.

And once I got to Stockton, it's actually my favorite place that I have ever lived. The people are so kind. There are so many community events going on. Lots of beautiful trees. And I know that what we often talk are water issues because of the San Joaquin Delta and the fight over water.

Interestingly, I think about the water a lot and access to water, especially with the drought that we had several years ago. And it was around the time I was going up to the foothills and visiting teachers in Tuolumne County. And they would -- we would talk about water and they'd say, oh, no, the water starts here up in the mountains, and it was just something I hadn't really thought about before. So, we all have this connection with water, and access to water, but looking at it from a different perspective based on where we live.

So, the focus on Northern California I know does not represent the entire state, but having lived here I also just want to point out, too, that the political views

are different, I think. Growing up in the Bay Area I felt that most of my neighbors were more, you know, like Democratic Party kind of side of things. Now, where I live in San Joaquin County, more of my neighbors -- well, I would say it's kind of -- kind of probably 50/50, Republicans and Democrats. But it does seem to be generally more conservative where I live now, compared to when I was in the Bay Area.

But I was going to point out that I have also traveled throughout the state. I have friends in Southern California that I visit quite often. I have friends in Northern California, up near Yreka that I visit, so I get to see the state from many perspectives.

CHAIR DICKISON: You talked about the work you did in converting the school into a charter school.

MS. BURNS: Uh-hum.

CHAIR DICKISON: And one of the things you talked about in your application was during the effort you took care to meet with the local parents and get their input. How did you do that? Was that through public meetings or --

MS. BURNS: Actually, what we ended up doing, we met with some informally at coffee shops in the early phases. There was a Starbuck's near our school where we met quite often, and a Denny's, where anyone who knew about

this, the initial effort, we would meet. That was kind of our hangout, but sometimes also at the school.

As we got through the first couple of months, we established a partnership with a local group of churches, who were neighborhood churches near the school, and they had many connections with the parents and families in our area that the school served. And so, as we progressed through our effort, we tended to meet more at the churches than anywhere else.

And we would send emails, and a lot through word of mouth. And the pastors would, at their Sunday gatherings, make announcements so that we could get community members to attend our meetings.

CHAIR DICKISON: So, one of the things that the Commission is charged with is determining or identifying communities of interest throughout the state. Based on your experience here, how do you think that would translate into identifying those communities of interest in areas that you don't know anyone?

MS. BURNS: What we -- what we did is we asked questions. Even I'm involved in a small group that's starting to take shape now, connected with environmental literacy in California. We invite the people we know to start and then we ask who else should be here? And then that group comes and we continue to ask who else should be

here? Who else do we want to talk to? And not just in terms of those who are most focal, but who is going to be impacted by these efforts and decisions, and so who do we want to have at the table, who can we work with? And so, that was the approach we took. There might be a better approach that I'm always happy to learn, but it worked for us at the time.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you. So, you worked in the insurance industry and then went back to school to be a teacher, is that correct?

 ${\tt MS.}$ ${\tt BURNS:}$ I actually -- in a sense, yes.

CHAIR DICKISON: Okay.

MS. BURNS: I actually became an intern teacher. So, because of the teacher shortage which has been going on for many years, California has an alternative pathway that allows, if you meet certain requirements you can become a teacher of record in a classroom. And you are an intern. So, you're the teacher of record and you go to school at night. It's a two-year program. And so, that's what I ended up doing.

CHAIR DICKISON: What made you decide to change your career and go into teaching, from the insurance industry?

MS. BURNS: So, I was at a time in my career wherein I was traveling a lot and I literally would wake up

and not know what city I was in, and I just was so tired of the traveling. It was constant. I missed my family, I missed my friends, and so I was reflecting a lot about that.

But also, there was a chain of events where the insurance company I went to -- or, I worked for, excuse me, in San Francisco went out of business. And that's ultimately what brought me to Stockton. And when I first moved to Stockton, I remained in the insurance industry but I was still thinking I love this community, what can I do here that's going to have more meaning and allow me to contribute more. And so, just by chance I kept kind of crossing paths with many different educators, whether it was private school, public school.

I began doing a lot of volunteer work for academic competitions and it just came together that I thought, well, I want to be -- just an epiphany I want to be a teacher. So, I made the decision to take that route and I'm really glad that I did.

CHAIR DICKISON: So, you kind of talked about how you tried not to influence how your students thought.

MS. BURNS: Uh-hum.

23 CHAIR DICKISON: You just asked questions to find out what they think.

MS. BURNS: Yes.

CHAIR DICKISON: What subject matter were you teaching?

MS. BURNS: I had -- I worked -- my school was a K through 8 school, so I taught -- there were several years where I just taught math and science. But in later years they decided that a self-contained model was better, which meant I had the same group of students for the whole day, and so I taught all the subjects. And that required me to learn a lot more, remember my skills in English, and social studies.

And so, we were a project-based learning school, which is what the focus was of the charter. And so, we taught integrated curriculum that involved math, science, social studies, English, you know with the writing. And so, we wanted always whatever the project was to have some real world connection. And oftentimes that connection was through social issues, whether it was the election or some other thing, maybe the dog shelter. And so, students would be asking all kinds of questions that they would investigate. Because in project-based learning they kind of drive -- they drive it and I'm the director. And they would ask me what do you think? And I'd say, well, what do you think? Because I know that teachers do have a lot of power in the classroom, especially if they're working with really young children. And I would never want to force

them to believe something or -- I mean that's not really the right word. Have them feel pressured to, you know, be aligned with my beliefs so that they can make a good impression on me. I want them to think what they think.

And I also, at the same time, I think I wrote in my application that I would never want, maybe if I have a student who doesn't agree with me, I wouldn't want them to think anything less of what their opinion is because it's every bit as important as mine. So.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you. So, you talked about that you learned a lot from your students by taking that approach. What did you learn from them?

MS. BURNS: I learned that sometimes I'm -- maybe the word learning isn't the right word, maybe it's just refocusing. It's just sometimes the smallest things are so important to my students. Things that I might look over and just kind of take for granted because I've lived through that experience. It could be something as simple as, you know, they're building a warehouse across the street. Where am I going to ride my bike, now? Just everyday issues were super important to them.

Another thing that I learned along the way were some of the struggles that my students were going through. And, for example, I had a student who would come to school grouchy every day. He always showed up late. And I would

think, oh, you know, he's late, he's going to disrupt my class again. Until one morning I was driving to work and he was behind me, in the car behind me, I could see them in my rearview mirror, and his mom was yelling at him. And I thought, ah, that's how he starts his day. Like that's maybe why he comes in grouchy every day. And I made an effort to talk to him more and just, hey, how's it going. And that was a defining moment for me as a teacher in my early years that I can't just make assumptions like, oh, he's coming into my classroom to be disruptive. There's something else going on and so it's up to me to listen, you know, ask questions, figure out what's going on, and then we can work together a lot better.

MS. PELLMAN: You have about six minutes.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you. If you're selected as one of the first eight Commissioners, which are selected by lottery, you would be one of the eight that are tasked with selecting the remaining six to round out the Commission. What would you be looking for in those remaining six Commissioners?

MS. BURNS: Again, I would be looking for candidates that have the ability to be collaborative, that have the ability to -- you know, critical problem solving or analytical skills so that they can review a lot of information and make decisions.

But I also think it's important that we have a balance of people with different ideas. Because my understanding with the point of this Commission, and I can see from everything that's happened it's been a very careful process to make sure that the Commission is representative of everybody in the state as much as it can be. And so, I would be really careful in not wanting everyone to have exactly my same background because I know that my perspective is different than someone who has maybe had different work or life experience. And so, for me that would be important as well.

CHAIR DICKISON: What would you ultimately like to see the Commission accomplish?

MS. BURNS: I would like to see the Commission accomplish an analysis of all the Census data, looking at communities and population groups that live within those communities, and making appropriate decisions about where the lines should be drawn. And being as fair as possible, listening to community members as much as possible so that ultimately decisions are made with the best interest of our state in mind.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you. I don't have any further questions at this moment.

Mr. Belnap?

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: Good afternoon. Thank you

for being here. At the time of your application you indicated that you're going to the University of Pacific, working on a doctorate in educational leadership.

MS. BURNS: Yes.

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: But you said your -- it's pending. So, what did that mean it was pending?

MS. BURNS: What had happened was that I had defended my dissertation in June, but it takes a while to have everything finalized. My dissertation has to be edited and published, and then it goes through a process with the registrar at the college. And so, ultimately, my degree was conferred in December of 2019.

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: Okay.

MS. BURNS: So, I had finished all of the work, just was waiting for the rest.

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: So, in that course of study -- well, what was your dissertation about, just out of curiosity?

MS. BURNS: So, my dissertation, because of my work with teachers in rural schools I was very interested in rural communities and what goes on with education in rural communities, and how they're similar and how they're different from suburban or urban communities. So, that was part of the focus. But what I honed in on was math instruction and the work that a group of teachers were

doing to kind of build a bridge between a network of schools that were, you know, up to 100 miles apart from one another, and how they ended up working together for the betterment of math instruction to serve their students.

So, it was a focus on the teacher groups.

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. So, in this study that you did, or maybe other work you did as part of your education, how much did you use like data analysis?

MS. BURNS: Extensively. So, my dissertation was a mixed method study, so I collected interview data, as well as survey data, and then I analyzed that. And looking for statistical significance using computer-based tools, and also doing some of it manually when I -- anyway, the computer-based tools sometimes were a challenge for me and sometimes it was just easier to figure it out manually.

And I thrive on that. I thrive on looking at data. I love that data can tell a story and can help shape the way that we make decisions.

Before my dissertation and as an educator, we really practiced, learned and practiced the idea of data for informed instruction. So, making decisions about what we teach, and how we teach, and meeting the needs of each individual student based on data. Based on their assessment scores, based on like their everyday kind of assignments that they turn in. There are many different

kinds of assessments that are given in the public schools. And they really have no purpose unless we use that data to do something. I would hate to think that the students were going through tests for no reason.

And so, we were constantly looking at that information as a team and saying, oh, well, here, you know, I'm kind of weak at teaching writing in this particular section. I would notice maybe my scores weren't as high. So, I would ask my colleagues, well, your scores are higher, what are you doing differently than I am? And so, we'd use data for just every day as a teacher.

And then prior to that, in the insurance industry it was critical that we looked at actuary data, we looked at loss data. That helped us provide counseling to different companies. Gee, you're having a lot of truck accidents, you know, here's where we notice they're happening. So, we would look at trends as far as how accidents were happening, where they were happening, maybe who was involved. Maybe you have a particular employee that maybe needs some help for the review of safety procedures. So, data has always been part of my work.

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: All right, thank you. In your impartiality essay you emphasized the role of a teacher, and you talked about it today with Ms. Dickison.

25 I was wondering, can you think of -- outside of your

experience as a teacher, can you think of any other examples where you've had to put aside your personal opinions and interests to achieve a broader objective?

MS. BURNS: I noticed that -- again, kind of going back to when I was in the insurance industry, there were times when I wanted to pay a claim, where it seemed like this -- I really -- you know, this was something that I felt was the right thing to do. Morally it was the right thing to do. It's still very hard sometimes when I think back to some decisions that I had to make where a claim wasn't paid. But ultimately we had to go back to the contract and to see what was covered under the insurance policy and what wasn't covered.

And so sometimes, unfortunately, you have people in these terrible circumstances where they've lost their house, or their car's been stolen, and within the contract there is no coverage for that. And so, to have to deliver that difficult decision is very difficult, even though I would want to, you know, issue the check. But it was not part of the contract.

I think that just on a personal level I tend to be more centrist in my views. When we talk about the political culture and, you know, one side versus the other, I've never really been like that. I've always just been kind of the center. And I listen a lot and, again, just

try to understand why people think the way they do. But I don't have any other examples.

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: Well, that was a fine example, thank you.

MS. BURNS: Okay.

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: So, the other question I want to ask you is in your appreciation for diversity essay you emphasized that that experience, where you just talked about today, from transition from that public school to the charter school and how you got input from people. I don't want to ask you about that.

What I want to ask you is do you have another experience where -- that demonstrates your appreciation for diversity?

MS. BURNS: I don't know if this is -- it's still

-- it's still kind of -- it's connected with my work at the
school. But getting to know the families that were in, you
know, involved and connected with the school. I remember
the first time I drove by, because I actually interviewed
for the job as a teacher, I had never been to that
neighborhood or to the school before. And I remember
driving to the school my very first time thinking, okay,
what have I gotten myself into. This neighborhood does not
look like my neighborhood and wondering, you know, how's
this experience going to be. And making sure, you know, is

my car locked, where am I parking? Just making some assumptions that when I look back I think they were crazy because it was, you know, one of the best places I've ever worked.

But as I got to know families, even before this whole business of the charter school, I was very lucky in that I would get invited to their homes for dinner, or to make tamales, or they would come visit me and bring asparagus. And I loved, especially in talking with my students, how proud they were of their families, and what their parents did. I remember one time having this whole conversation, we were reading a story about the main character had calluses all over her hands, and so we just kind of spent a lot of time talking about that, about calluses, and what do calluses mean?

And in the story, it didn't really go into a lot of detail about calluses, but I had explained to them how my father had calluses on his hands, and he did a lot of woodworking, and he worked on cars and things. And so, my students were really excited to talk about their parents and how hard their parents worked. And I just love that in the community where I was working I had students who had wonderful families. They weren't like, exactly like my family, although there were many similarities in some of the values about, you know, going outside and playing, and

riding your bike. And your neighbor, you know, if you're not behaving they're going to tell your mom. So, I saw a lot of similarities, but also a lot of differences.

I would have never learned how to make tamales had I not taught at that school. I would have never learned about my students', you know, travels outside of the United States to visit family. Anyway, it was just a wonderful experience.

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: All right, thank you. No further questions.

CHAIR DICKISON: Mr. Coe?

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you. Good afternoon,

13 Ms. Burns.

MS. BURNS: Hi.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

25

PANEL MEMBER COE: It's been talked about a little bit already, but I wanted to talk about your career change to be a teacher.

MS. BURNS: Uh-hum.

PANEL MEMBER COE: In your application you said you chose that profession in part because you wanted to give back to your community.

MS. BURNS: Uh-hum.

PANEL MEMBER COE: What do you feel that you are giving back to your community as a teacher?

MS. BURNS: One of my proudest moments was as an

eighth grade teacher. In our district the students had a choice to go to any high school that they wanted to go to. There are many different high school options in Stockton. And traditionally, before, you know, in just the years prior, most of our students kind of filtered into one high school, which is a comprehensive, really large school, thousands of students. And they just really didn't know that they had a choice.

And so, one of the things that I instilled was, you know, we started having conversations about high school, and their career interests. And I arranged for field trips to different high schools so they could see what the options were. I involved parents, you know, in meetings. And there are little, specialty high schools in Stockton that would be a great fit for many students.

And the last year when I was at the school, more than half of my students were going to some of the specialty high schools. Some with work skills focus, some with a college prep focus, some that were aligned with Delta College, which is the community college in our area. And some went on to the comprehensive high school.

But I was excited that they realized that they had choices and that they were empowered to make those choices. And I think I had a role in making that happen.

I also had a role just within the creation of the

charter school. It completely transformed what was going on in our community. When I first started teaching there we were only allowed to teach math and reading all day Students did not have access to science or long, and P.E. to social studies because those subjects weren't really tested. And when we transformed the school to a projectbased learning school now students were having science and social studies, and they were excited to come to school. Our attendance increased. Our behavior is completely transformed. It was so nice and calm, and wonderful to walk around the campus. People getting along, students engaged in their learning. And I believe very strongly that we provided more opportunities for our students than they had had previously. So, I feel I made a definite difference there.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And in my role now with, I work for Teachers

College of San Joaquin, we are training generations of new
teachers to provide equitable learning experiences for all
students, no matter where you work, no matter whether
you're a student, you know, is excelling and grasping ideas
really quickly, then you need to be pushing them, or if
they need more support and they're not quite where they
need to be at, you need to figure out how are you going to
get them ready for where they need to be. Or, with
students who have special needs, it should be very

inclusive and just everyone should have access. So, we just keep spreading the knowledge.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Okay, thank you. In your essay on impartiality, this has I think been touched on a couple of times, but I wanted to ask a slightly different question. You discuss an approach that you've taken to teaching your students. I think Mr. Belnap mentioned you strive to allow them to ask questions -- well, I forget who, somebody asked. Strive to allow them to ask questions about be curious about -- and be curious without you directing their path with your own views.

You went on to say that there have been times that using this approach and listening to their views and thoughts has actually caused you to change your opinion on some things.

MS. BURNS: Uh-hum.

PANEL MEMBER COE: And I was wondering if you could give us an example of a time where you received a different perspective that caused you to change your view on something?

MS. BURNS: One of the memories that I have is when we were working on a whole unit that was -- the goal was they were reading the Hunger Games novel. And so, we had some writing, obviously reading that they were doing in connection with that. But also, comparing this futuristic

society with what our society used to look like and what it looks like now.

And just my students' connections that they were making to social media and how behaviors now are being changed, potentially, to influence status in social media. They were making these connections about -- to the novel and how sometimes people aren't behaving in a way that's real so that they can get more publicity. And they talked a lot -- it was just something I hadn't really thought about at the time.

And then, that led to questions about just what they were viewing on the media and is that real? And so, I just would have them keep digging, like how can you verify what you, you know, hear in the media? How can you trust what you hear in the media?

And so, they were just digging and digging trying to fact check. They would, you know, get caught up on a story and fact check, and just also keep comparing it to maybe what's happened in the past. How is history repeating itself or what can we learn from what we're doing now to make the future better? So, that was very interesting.

PANEL MEMBER COE: In your essays you mention that you're aware of your own biases. What might some of those be?

MS. BURNS: So, I have biases just because of my life experience growing up. And so, I, going into again teaching in the school where I taught, just that again, the idea of driving down the street that didn't look like where I lived, thinking is someone going to, you know, break into my car. And that's a bias. You know, that's a bias. And I now know from personal experience my car can be broken into anywhere.

I have had really good fortune in my life to have many opportunities through education, through work, through people that I've met. People like when I've done my volunteer work that has opened doors for me from opportunities. And I realize that I have opportunities that maybe some others don't have, because they have not had access.

And so, I was going to just explain to you about a bias, and I didn't write this in my essay. But there was once a student who was telling me a story about how her father had built her a new bed, and she was talking -- it was made out of wood, and it had blankets, and she -- the reason for having it built was that she, you know, was getting taller. And so, she's explaining this, explaining this. And all through my head as she's talking I thought I need to buy her a mattress and box springs, like they don't have a mattress and box springs. And I was thinking how

can I have it delivered to the house? Because that's what I've always had in my life. That's what I've, you know, slept on. But as the conversation was going on I realized she was proud, she was so proud that her father had taken time and care, and was doing this for her.

And so, again, just another defining moment was thinking who am I to -- you know, my life is different, my life experience. She has, you know, wonderful things going on at home. And so, that's a bias that I had as well, just trying to kind of think of, you know, what I think of is a good life and thinking, well, that's true for everyone, but it's not always. You know, different is different, so.

PANEL MEMBER COE: How do you ensure that any of those biases that you may have been aware of don't seep into your decision making process?

MS. BURNS: So, one of the things that I have practiced in my later years as an educator, and especially through my dissertation in a very purposeful manner is at the beginning of any kind of data analysis or review, sometimes even writing out what I think might be some obstacles or biases that I need to be aware of, and just keep them in check. And to have, with data analysis, even sometimes another pair of eyes look over, like here's what I'm thinking right now, what do you think?

And I think, again, if you are getting diverse

viewpoints and being that second set of eyes, or third pair of eyes then you can get a more fair -- you know, a more fair view of reality. It's just having to be very conscious of it. And I don't think I'll ever completely get rid of my bias, but to just try and be aware as much as possible and keep it in check.

PANEL MEMBER COE: I wanted to switch gears a little bit onto your essay on your appreciation for diversity.

MS. BURNS: Okay.

PANEL MEMBER COE: In that essay you discuss your awareness of how your life experiences, your culture and where you live have an effect on how people view issues and what they find important.

As a Commissioner, you'll be finding out what is important to many different groups, in different regions of the state in order to make sure they're properly represented. How would you go about learning what is important to various citizens of the state?

MS. BURNS: I think in any opportunity possible to listen, to meet with people, talk with them, and just listen. And if possible, if it makes sense to visit a place that maybe I don't have an understanding of or haven't been there before. The listening is just critical and being open to hearing, and really hearing what is being

said, and being present during that listening session. And making sure that the person or people are heard.

And again, thinking about biases, just putting those aside and really being open, even though it may present something I have not had experience with, you know, an idea I'm not experienced with or I might necessarily agree, and just continuing to ask questions to really understand.

PANEL MEMBER COE: So, earlier I think Ms.

Dickison was asking about communities of interest. And I want to take a little spin on that, on that topic. I'd imagine in a classroom, as a teacher, there are students that are less engaged, on the quieter side, you don't hear from them a lot. In the Commission's work there are undoubtedly going to be communities who are similar, less engaged, that may be uncomfortable engaging government entities for one reason or another. How do you go about getting those groups of people engaged in the process so you can gather their perspective as you go about making decisions for the Commission?

MS. BURNS: So, I have had this happen with students, even to the point where I would put a note on my calendar, be sure to talk to so and so, and being very purposeful. Because sometimes people, and I would imagine communities that are quiet, they're very easily overlooked.

Even the neighborhood in the school, you know the school were I served as a quiet community. They didn't attend school board meetings. They were often overlooked. But we worked with them to be more vocal.

2.2.

So, being purposeful about reaching out and making sure that the connections are made with people or groups who are on the more quiet side, or less engaged. I don't think that people are not engaged because they don't care. I think it's because they think no one else cares. That's -- I think maybe that's a bias.

I have -- I'm just thinking, too, in my current work with some of the teachers I work with, who aren't speaking up, sometimes they're struggling the most and need the most help, but they're not quite sure how to ask for help, or there's a little bit of shame in asking for help.

And so, if I'm proactive and I reach out and check in like how's it going, and I again genuinely want to know how it's going and take time to listen, I think you begin to build trust and build bridges so that you can involve everyone.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you. How much time do I have?

MS. PELLMAN: Five minutes and 45 seconds.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you.

I'd like to go back for a second to the example

you gave on the standard question four that Mr. Dawson asked earlier, about working collaboratively with others on a group, and the example you gave about transforming a school into a charter school to keep it from closing. But I was unclear on your answer where the conflict was within the group.

MS. BURNS: Oh,

PANEL MEMBER COE: And if you could expand on that, if there was one within that group. And if there wasn't, is there another example you can provide that had some conflict and how you worked through it?

MS. BURNS: Okay. So, in the context of that group we had some internal conflict because this idea about becoming a charter school -- so, first we wanted to engage all of the teachers on our campus. And there were many teachers who -- I don't know that it was they didn't agree or they were afraid about speaking up. They were afraid of retaliation, or possibly didn't agree with us.

And so, we held a series of meetings just internally with the teachers to communicate like this is our plan, here is what we're doing so far, here are our next steps. Asking them questions about how they felt about what we were doing? Would they be willing to help us? Giving them projects that were aligned with their skills so that we could bring them into the fold.

In the end we had two teachers that just didn't think it was a good fit for them and they ultimately made a decision to leave the school.

22.

One of our priorities was that teachers invest additional time and stay after school to support students in their learning. And there were a couple teachers that with their family obligations they weren't able to do that. And so, they ultimately left.

So, just I would say the conflict wasn't huge internally, but we, just through having conversations and again trying to get perspectives that might shape our goal a little bit differently, or refine it, that seemed to resolve the conflict that we had.

We did have conflicts externally. There were some interests that were fighting against the charter. And so, we addressed those with as much communication as we possibly could, inviting the external entities to our meetings to have conversations. Trying to understand, so if you don't agree with our plan, what is your plan? Maybe we can work together or we can, you know, merge our plans. Because, ultimately, we wanted to do what was best for our students.

I have worked on other teams that were in just sheer conflict. When I was in insurance, I was part of a team that was involved with -- they were changing the

computer software that we used to, you know, manage the claim system. And the people on the team were from all over the United States and had very different viewpoints. We were all just kind of thrown -- we didn't know each other very well before. And so, there was a lot of conflict. There was a lot of kind of jockeying for position on who was going to be the boss, and who was going to make the decisions. Some people who were very focal, some people who were just very quiet.

And what I -- I got together with a small group, initially, and how can we solve this problem? You know, how can we get everyone on board? And so, we began just having some social activities so that we could get to know each other a little bit better. And then, in hopes that once we get to know each other that we'll work better together.

And so, that started to take hold. And then, we got the thing with the norms. Like who's going to do what? How are we going to work together as a group? And then, it took a very long time to fix that but --

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you. Are we about out of time?

MR. DAWSON: One minute.

MS. PELLMAN: One --

MR. DAWSON: I'm sorry, one minute and 20

seconds.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Okay, really quick. If you were to be appointed to the Commission, which aspects of that role do you think you would enjoy the most and which aspects do you think you might struggle with a little bit?

MS. BURNS: I love the idea about analyzing the information that comes in, applying it to maps, seeking advice from experts, putting all those puzzle pieces together. To me that is exhilarating. I love good data part and doing all of that analysis work.

I do think the hardest part for me, and I have to be mindful of this, is finding my own voice. I listen a lot. And because I am kind of centrist and this person has an opinion, and this person, and yeah, that seems right, and that seems right that, you know, two people can have different opinions and I can identify with both. I think the biggest struggle is ultimately if a decision had to be made versus one or the other that would be hard for me to do.

But I just know that it's something I have to be very conscious about and do what's best so.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Okay, thank you. No additional questions.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you. Mr. Dawson?

MR. DAWSON: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Ms. Burns I have a couple of follow-up questions.

I wanted to ask you about your dissertation.

MS. BURNS: Okay.

4 MR. DAWSON: So, you said it was about education

in rural communities?

MS. BURNS: Yes.

MR. DAWSON: And was that specific to California

8 or --

3

5

6

7

9

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. BURNS: Yes.

MR. DAWSON: Okay. Did that involve -- your

11 work, did that involve using mapping software?

MS. BURNS: No.

MR. DAWSON: Did you analyze maps?

MS. BURNS: Not extensively, no.

MR. DAWSON: Okay, thank you. As I'm sure you know better than most anybody else, rural high school grads are historically under-represented at UC, including Berkeley, where you got your bachelors. Why does that happen?

MS. BURNS: So, surprisingly there is a lot of poverty in rural communities. Access to good paying jobs is somewhat limited in the communities unless you have residents who want to commute, or have the -- well, unless they want to commute to more urban areas. I was going to say telecommute, but one of the things I found in my

travels is that we still have many people in our state who don't have Wi-Fi access. And so, telecommuting might not even be an option for some people.

I think that another factor that I observed as I was working with the schools is that it's hard to recruit teachers into the areas because typically the pay is lower than urban communities. Typically, and the issue that I dealt with on a day-to-day basis is their access to professional development is very, very limited. And so, if a teacher wants to enter the profession and have opportunities to take classes, and grow, and become, you know, a better teacher in rural communities disproportionately have — they don't have access to PD.

And so, I think that as far as the high school students, I think sometimes it's having access to maybe teachers of computer science, or some of the specialized fields that you might find more prevalence in the Bay Area are more limited in the foothills or rural communities because of a lot of funding issues.

MR. DAWSON: So, changing the frame of that to what your job would be on the Commission, if selected? Is that perspective on rural communities as a community of interest, is that something that you think that you could bring to the Commission?

MS. BURNS: Because I have not -- well, you know,

Stockton has close access to rural communities. I would say definitely where I live is much more of kind of a suburban, urban kind of a feel.

I do believe I have a lot of perspective on rural communities. But that said, I have not lived in a rural community. And so, it would just be through the lens of having worked with and researched people in those communities.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. Do you think it's important for the Commission to have representation from the San Joaquin Valley, or the Central Valley in general?

MS. BURNS: I absolutely think it's critical. I know that often Stockton is -- well, it's my perception that Stockton is often overlooked by larger communities. I know for certain that my students' families are impacted by decisions that are made outside of San Joaquin Valley, and that they're living with that every day.

In fact, I have had some instances of being impacted by decisions that are made outside of my community. And I think that it's important to have the voices of people represented who live in either rural communities, or in San Joaquin Valley because any -- again, any decisions that are made are going to impact all of us. And so, to have that voice is critical.

MR. DAWSON: So, I want to dig a little deeper on

that. The differences, are they political, or are they cultural, or are they ethnic? How would you describe those?

MS. BURNS: The differences with like San Joaquin

MR. DAWSON: The Central Valley --

MS. BURNS: -- or the Central Valley versus

elsewhere?

MR. DAWSON: -- compared to elsewhere. Say the Coastal communities.

MS. BURNS: I would say there are definitely some political differences. I think that where I live now, again compared to where I have lived throughout my life, the perspective of those in my community tends to be a lot more conservative than where I have lived before. So, I do see some political differences.

I see political differences. Again, in my driving around, you get 30 minutes from home and you see the signs for the State of Jefferson. And so I wonder, you know, okay, well, I've even asked people like tell me about that? Why do you have that sign in your yard. And I know that that's aligned with a whole mindset. And my perception is the feeling that people, you know, have been overlooked and not part of the process, so you have this movement for the State of Jefferson. And so, it's

important that all of us are represented at the table.

In terms of cultural differences, where I live now much more emphasis on agricultural and connections to agriculture. Whether you own land, and own orchards or, you know, raise crops to whether you are working in the fields and supporting like the harvesting of the crops. There's a whole different perspective and a whole different power structure, really, in terms of your connection with the land, and the water.

I've known people, even throughout the drought who had different relationships. I know some people who own farms, who were worried about getting their water. And so, anyone who makes decisions that can possibly, you know, impact the Central Valley, I just think the Central Valley should have a say.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. I want to go back to one of your responses to one of the standard questions. I can't remember, I think, believe it was number two. You talked about the importance of establishing norms at the start.

MS. BURNS: Uh-hum.

MR. DAWSON: How do you do that? What steps would you take?

MS. BURNS: So, we -- I do this every day. I have workshops with teachers, I teach courses to teachers who are -- people who are wanting to become teachers. And really, just thinking about what is our purpose for being here. And sometimes we'll have some norms that are already established. Like here's our list. What do you guys think? What should we add? What should we not, you know, what should we take out?

But sometimes we start with just creating norms right from the get go where everyone has a say. And what's important to you in terms of how we should treat each other? What's important to you in terms of behavior so that we can get the work done that we need to get done? And just literally making a list of everyone's ideas, and pairing ideas up that are similar, taking out ideas that we ultimately decided aren't going to work best for us.

And then, also being open to updating the norms if something unexpected comes up later on that we kind of need to have an agreement on how we can address that then, you know, we can always add to them.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. Those were all my follow ups. We have roughly 18 minutes left in the 90-minute period. Do any of the Panel Members have any follow-up questions?

CHAIR DICKISON: I do not. Mr. Belnap?

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: I do not, either.

25 CHAIR DICKISON: Mr. Coe?

PANEL MEMBER COE: I do not have any follow-up questions.

MR. DAWSON: All right, thank you.

Ms. Burns, at this point we would like to offer you the opportunity to make a closing statement to the Panel, if you wish.

MS. BURNS: Oh, I think more than anything I want to thank you all for the opportunity to be here today. This, so far, has been such a great learning opportunity seeing this process, and the careful consideration for all of the applicants. And I'm really proud to have been part of that.

I am confident that if I am selected as a Commission member that I would collaborate well with other persons on the Commission. That I would take care to make sure that everyone's voices are represented. That I would listen. And I would look forward, again, to doing the analysis of the data and making great recommendations for our state. But that's about it.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you, Ms. Burns, for speaking with us today.

MS. BURNS: All right, thank you.

CHAIR DICKISON: Our next interview will be tomorrow morning at 9:00 o'clock, so we will go into recess

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

the foregoing hearing was taken at the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of said witnesses were reported by me, a certified electronic court reporter and a disinterested

person, and was under my supervision thereafter

I do hereby certify that the testimony in

transcribed into typewriting.

And I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 15th day of April, 2020.

PETER PETTY CER**D-493 Notary Public

TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE

I do hereby certify that the testimony in the foregoing hearing was taken at the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of said witnesses were transcribed by me, a certified transcriber.

And I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 15th day of April, 2020.

Barbara Little Certified Transcriber AAERT No. CET**D-520