OFFICE OF THE ILLINOIS LT. GOVERNOR, JULIANA STRATTON

Restore, Reinvest, and Renew (R3) Program Board

Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) Workgroup

Regular Meeting Minutes

October 1, 2021

|  |
| --- |
| **A present majority of R3PB member/designee positions shall constitute a quorum, i.e. 3** |
| **Position**  | **Name** | **Present (via WebEx)** | **Absent**  |
| **R3PB Members/Member Designees** |
| Elected Official | Sen. Celina Villanueva |  | **X** |
| Designee (Dept. of Children and Family Services | Dagene Brown | **X** |  |
| Designee (Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (ICJIA)) | Charise Williams, Deputy Director | **X** |  |
| Formerly Incarcerated (over 24 years of age) | Marlon Chamberlain | **X** |  |
| R3 Area Resident or Worker | Pablo Mendoza |  | **X** |

Also, in attendance were:

Lt. Governor’s JEO Legislative Liaison Kirsten Davis-Franklin

ICJIA R3 Grant Program Manager Mitchell Troup

ICJIA R3 Program Research Manager Dr. Justin Escamilla

ICJIA Associate General Counsel Blanca R. Dominguez

**A. Call to Order and Roll Call**

 1. Mitchell Troup called the meeting to order at 9:37AM

 2. Blanca Dominguez took roll

 3. Quorum was established

**B. Acknowledgement of Need for Videoconference Meeting**

 1. Mitchell Troup acknowledged the continuing need to convene by videoconference because the public-health challenges presented by the COVID-19 pandemic are still present

**C. Motion to Approve the Agenda for October 1, 2021**

* 1. Moved by Charise Williams
	2. Seconded by Dagene Brown
	3. All in Favor
	4. No oppositions
	5. No abstentions

**D. New Business—Equity Scoring Criteria**

 1. Mitchell Troup

 a. Noted that the discussion for the day revolved around the general overall scoring criteria with the goal being to solicit suggestions from the group as to questions that should be included as well as suggestions on the allocation of points for each criterion.

 b. Began discussion with the local preference criterion, explaining that it was composed of two parts: (1) whether the organization is located within an R3 zone, noting this question includes the location of collaborative members if part of a collaboration, and (2) whether the employees reside in an R3 zone.

 c. Further explained that some past issues with the local preference criterion related to having a location that was near an R3 zone, i.e., across the street, with services being rendered within an R3 zone; stated that for the previous round, organizations in this situation were not excluded from eligibility for a grant but were not awarded the local preference points; asked for thoughts on this criterion.

 i. Dagene Brown remarked that this issue touched upon Sen. Celina Villanueva’s remark at the previous meeting relating to organizations that are located just outside an R3 zone; asked what happened to organizations in that situation.

 d. In response to Dagene Brown’s comment, Mitchell Troup responded that an organization that was outside the R3 zone would not have received points for local preference on that aspect but could still have qualified for some points if 50% of their employees resided within an R3 zone, so they could have received at least half the points in that criterion if they met the employee portion; proceed to ask the group what they thought about allowing organizations within a certain radius of an R3 zone to qualify for the local preference points; noted that this would pose a challenge to ascertaining the proximity since the current map on the website only recognized locations within an R3 zone.

 i. Charise Williams asked if R3 grant awards were intended only for organizations within an R3 zone.

 e. In response to Charise Williams’ inquiry, Mitchell Troup responded that the process adopted in the last round was to allow only those located in an R3 zone to obtain the local preference points but all organizations were eligible to apply for a grant if they were providing services within an R3 zone

 i. Kirsten Davis-Franklin noted that some may have concerns for awarding local preference points to organizations outside the R3 zones given the intent of the statute.

 ii. Blanca Dominguez stated that the statute itself did not contain language requiring an organization to be within an R3 zone to be eligible; noted that services must be provided within an R3 zone and that the statute did contain language referencing eligibility of local groups within an R3 zone to apply for funds; added that awarding local preference points as discussed (to organizations within an R3 zone) was in keeping with the spirit and intent of the law.

 iii. Mitchell Troup reiterated that the idea was not to restrict eligibility for grants but to give additional points to organizations located within R3 zones.

 g. Discussion was moved to the next criterion—statement of need; explained that, in this section, the applicant may provide information on why the proposed services are needed in the particular R3 zone and present supporting data; further explained that the applicant could also provide information on the R3 program priorities that the organization planned to address; stated that the response would be mostly in a narrative format but he intended to include checkboxes listing each of the R3 program priorities (youth development, violence prevention, civil legal aid, reentry, and economic development) to make it easier to discern which priorities an organization is addressing; no comments were offered in this criterion.

 2. Dagene Brown

 a. Asked if there was a conclusion to Wednesday’s discussion as to the inclusion of anecdotal examples (Mitchell Troup explained that he would be presenting the group with sample draft questions on that issue at the next meeting for further discussion).

 3. Mitchell Troup

 a. Moved onto the next criterion—program design; explained that this comprised the biggest points allowance; provided an organization with the opportunity to describe its proposed program and how it would address key points mentioned in the statement of need; also asked for detail on the types of activities involved in a program, how a program would address the different program priorities

 b. Highlighted two questions in the program design section: (1) question on how an organization drew from community feedback to design its program, and (2) questions relating to how an organization incorporated restorative justice principles into its program; noted that the restorative justice question was probably the weakest in terms of responses since many organizations had a difficult time responding to it due to a lack of familiarity with restorative justice principles if their programs did not already include that concept.

 i. Dagene Brown acknowledged the challenges related to restorative justice because it is hard for people to speak on the topic if they do not know the principles behind it.

 ii. Justin Escamilla asked if there was a way to frame the question around the principles of restorative justice, i.e., state a restorative justice principle and ask the organization how their program implements that principle or embodies it.

 iii. Dagene Brown agreed that there are principles that can be used to frame questions.

 iv. Marlon Chamberlain stated he was a trained Restorative Justice Circle Keeper and could provide information on restorative justice principles.

 d. Mitchell Troup then began the discussion on the next criterion—program staffing; explained that this was where an organization could provide information on who was going to administer the program, information on the supervisory structure, responsibilities of the various program staff (could include information on experience, education, past work history, etc.); if the organization had not yet staffed various program positions, they could provide information on desired characteristics for prospective candidates; proposed adding a question to ask if program staff had loved experience in the program priorities an organization was addressing; no comments were offered on this criterion.

 e. Discussion proceeded to next criterion—applicant capacity; recognized challenges with this category because while it was helpful to have information on an organization’s ability to offer a program by asking about their experience did not want to dissuade newer organizations from applying due to a lack of capacity; noted that this section was only scored 5 points and that responses in this section were mostly intended to guide types of technical assistance that was provided.

 i. Dagene Brown suggested not weighing this section because did not want to punish any organization that may not have the capacity yet; agreed that using it as a guide for technical assistance as appropriate.

 ii. Mitchell Troup suggested replacing this question with another or perhaps reallocating the 5% to another section.

 iii. Dagene Brown suggested adding the question to the program design section but perhaps rephrasing it

 iv. Mitchell Troup stated this question was used in the last round in response to Charise Williams’ question and reiterated that it was 5%.

 v. Dagene Brown repeated that, for smaller organizations that do not have experience, this question would be punitive because they would not get the points.

 vi. Charise Williams acknowledged Dagene Brown’s statement; noted that it was necessary to have a way to assess the capacity of an organization; recognized it was also important to help organizations that were traditionally unable to get funding access funding; suggested including this question in the program description section.

 vii. Blanca Dominguez read the actual question that was used in the previous round (document found on R3 website): “ Describe your organization’s history of providing services in this community”; remarked that the question did allow for an organization to provide background on its formation or activities before becoming a formal organization.

 viii. Charise Williams noted that the question as currently written allows for an organization to tell their story, i.e., group started in the basement until they were ready to go out and do work outside.

 ix. Mitchell Troup suggested adding language for newer organizations to allow them to explain how they intend to gain the capacity to carry out their proposed services.

 x. Dagene Brown and Charise Williams agreed that including the proposed language would address some of the concerns relating to newer organizations.

 f. Mitchell Troup proceed with the discussion on the final criterion—budget; explained that this year, due to difficulties encountered with finalizing budgets for execution, was proposing changing the score to 10% from 5%; further stated that, in recognition of the difficulty of providing budget information, budget-specific technical assistance would be offered to applicants to go over the various aspects of a budget and allow for questions and answers.

 i. Dagene Brown remarked that she would have suggested the same— budget-specific technical assistance and noted that this will be helpful especially for smaller organizations.

 g. Mitchell Troup proceeded to discuss the following proposed scores for each of the sections: (1) 15% for local preference; (2) 25% for statement of need; (3) 40% for program design; (4) 5% for program staffing; (5) 5% for applicant capacity; and (6) 10% for budget. No comments about the proposed scores from the group.

 h. Justin Escamilla

 a. Concerning program design, Justin Escamilla asked if it was possible to add a little more structure to questions to provide information but also help reviewers.

 i. Mitchell Troup stated he would work with Justin Escamilla on this issue to ensure that any such structure was communicated in layman’s terms.

 ii. Mitchell Troup summarized that the overall scoring would consist of 130 points, assuming that 30 points were allocated to equity categories; asked once again if there were any calls to adjust the proposed scoring; no further comments were made by the workgroup.

**E. Member Updates**

1. Mitchell Troup

 a. Reminded workgroup of the importance to meet the quorum of three given the small size of the group and that member updates were an opportunity to provide updates on any scheduling conflicts.

 b. No additional member updates provided.

**F. Public Comments**

 1. No public comments.

**G. Adjournment**

1. Upcoming meetings will be held on 10/6 from 12:00PM to 1:30PM, 10/12 at 10:00AM, and 10/13 at 12:00PM
2. Moved by Dagene Brown at 10:39AM
3. Seconded by Charise Williams
4. All in Favor
5. No oppositions
6. No abstentions