

## Sasha Linker

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 20, 2022 7:43 AM  
**To:** CommAsst  
**Subject:** Claire Crandall Stipulation; FPPC No. 16/741

### EXTERNAL EMAIL

Fair Political Practices Commission

RE: Claire Crandall Stipulation; FPPC No. 16/741

Dear Commissioners,

I was subpoenaed by the FFPC and the line of questioning by the special investigator was comprehensive and indicative that the FPPC had extensive source documentation regarding many of aspects of the case. Thus, the facts known to me and likely the FPPC appear in stark contrast with the limited findings and proposed fine in the stipulation.

I suggest that the commission go back to 2012 and thoroughly examine all evidence regarding Claire's behavior in her role as a Coordinator and employee at San Diego County Office of Education (SDCOE) and how she was able to utilize her position from the inception of Pinwheel for her own personal gain. In her SDCOE Coordinator position, she influenced First 5 San Diego that SDCOE needed a data system to complete the Preschool For All (PFA) work and she herself wrote the Request For Proposal for the data system specifically tailored to be a data system that Early Quality Systems, Inc (her husband) could design and develop. She also did not disclose to fellow Coordinators that she was connected to Early Quality Systems, Inc. until contracts had been signed and there was nothing that could be done to prevent it from happening. She secured millions of dollars from First 5 for the data system, had the system developed by EQS (the company her husband owned), had staff at SDCOE giving EQS information on what was needed and how the system was to run and look (intellectual property of Early Childhood Education staff at SDCOE went into the development of Pinwheel). Further, she alone supervised the data team (one of her responsibilities was to write their yearly evaluations) and directed their every move in support of the development of Pinwheel. Once the first version of Pinwheel was 'pushed out to the sites' she had the sites report all the difficulties with the system (these were called 'bugs') and then proceeded to continue to develop the system so that it would meet the needs of San Diego County participants in the First 5 grant. To receive funding from First 5 and SDCOE, each provider was required to sign a contract stating that they would utilize the Pinwheel data system for the grant data---so whether they were a school district that already had a data system, a head start with a robust data system in place, or any other provider they were required to utilize Pinwheel in order to receive funding. First 5/SDCOE paid for all 'licensing costs' that Pinwheel required. Claire made millions of dollars from the development of Pinwheel (in essence: First 5, taxpayer funding covered the cost of development of Pinwheel).

Then, in 2013 once Pinwheel was a viable system, Claire began marketing it up and down the state of California, all while she was still an employee of SDCOE---evidence of this is the basis of the \$5,000.00 fine that has been suggested for her work with one county. There are many more counties that have purchased Pinwheel and have been utilizing it.

What concerns me to this day is that this behavior was allowed to occur and that there was no check and balance in place to prevent it from happening. I believe that it is on record that SDCOE has had problems with oversight in the past.

The commission has spent a lot of money into this investigation and has interviewed people who have spoken the truth about the development of Pinwheel; specifically: how Claire utilized her position as a Coordinator at SDCOE to ensure that EQS (her husband) was awarded the contract to develop a data system (Pinwheel) and that she personally benefited and profited from her behavior at the expense of others and profited millions of taxpayer dollars. Millions of taxpayer dollars have been funneled to EQS---and Pinwheel remains on the market. You have evidence before you that in her full time position as a Coordinator at SDCOE for a period of time she also worked one day a week at the 'Pinwheel offices'-- this appears to be a clear conflict of interest and example of how she and her husband directly benefited from the development of Pinwheel.

So while it is appropriate that the matter has been brought before you and there is a fee before you---this is literally the tip of an iceberg. I would suggest that the commission take another look at all of the evidence regarding this case and how Claire, in her role of Coordinator at SDCOE was able to directly influence and funnel millions of taxpayer dollars into a company owned by her husband for the development of a product that they were also able to own--perhaps you will see the iceberg that is before you. It appears that there were no checks and balance in place to prevent it from happening in the first place and from stopping it once it came to light.

I was subpoenaed by the FFPC and the line of questioning by the special investigator was comprehensive and indicative that the FFPC had extensive source documentation regarding many of aspects of the case. Thus, the facts known to me and likely the FFPC appear in stark contrast with the limited findings and proposed fine in the stipulation.

Sincerely,

Evette B. Callahan, PhD