PCEF Grants Subcommittee Minutes
DATE: 1.29.20

Attendance:
Committee Members: Megan Horst, Robin Wang, Ranfis Villatoro, Faith Graham
Staff: Sam Baraso, Cady Lister, Janet Hammer

Logistics:
• Next meeting Feb 5th, Wednesday, 1:00 to 2:00pm
  o Staff will send agenda and any additional material by Feb 3rd

Next steps:
• Develop draft matrix to record examples of RFPs, evaluation methods, award agreements and overall grantmaking process. Staff will develop and store with input from subcommittee members, starting with draft offered by Ranfis.

Resources noted:
• Giving circles
• From Faith: Example screening and scoring methodology
• From Ranfis: Transforming Resist: An Introduction to a Series on Radical Philanthropy
• From Ranfis: A Practice in Emergence: Creating Resist’s New Theory of Change, Strategic Priorities, and Culture of Care

Discussion summary:
Frame design of different processes, review criteria, requirements around different types of projects (e.g., capital, operating, research, etc.). Size of grant will also likely impact these design elements. Need to define what is small.

Request to see grant reporting reflected in a timeline at some point to show the total grant cycle. This will have to come after reporting requirements are developed for different grant types/sizes. Note that an appeal process needs to be considered.

Staff provided examples of the level of effort (staff and external review time) needed to complete review process - one from a private foundation and one from a government granting body. While the
number of grants PCEF will receive is unknown, we will need to consider capacity as we discuss what is included in the review process, particularly in the first year.

Group agrees that a scoring process should be required. Increased transparency is helpful to applicants and reviewers (e.g., clear guidelines) and supports more rigorous and defensible decision-making. Need to make sure that a social justice lens is included in scoring criteria.

Committee has heard testimony from public and presenters at full committee meetings that one area that could be helpful is scoring associated with the strength of partnerships in applications. How do we evaluate how strong a partnership is? Examples include description of the type and length of partnership, investments made in equitable partnership (e.g., trainings attended), reviews of partner, process in place for monitoring and addressing partnership issues, letters of support.

Note that not all scoring needs to be used for ranking - e.g. assessing the capacity of an organization could be used to determine the level of oversight and monitoring as well as TA to increase organizational capacity rather than being a barrier to scoring well enough to access funds for good projects.

Capacity building/technical assistance will need to be provided in some way to potential applicants, particularly smaller or emerging community-based organizations.

Request to create a matrix of example RFPs, evaluation methods, award agreements and overall grantmaking process.

Discussion about whether the review/scoring would include members of the community as a way to elevate community voice and power. Suggestion that such a process might hold applicants more accountable to community. Discussion about the intention behind creation of the committee as filling that role (bringing insights/voice and having power to make decisions). Suggestion that committee members be on review panel at earlier/scoring stage. This is an area that needs to be explored as there are a lot of factors to consider including: what can/should we ask of volunteers, staff capacity, etc. If there is a decision to involved external community members in the application review process that may have to be developed over time and not be in place by year one funding round.