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 6, 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

Lt. Governor’s JEO Policy Emily Harwell

Lt. Governor’s JEO Program Manager Ariana Correa

ICJIA R3 Grant Program Manager Mitchell Troup

ICJIA R3 Advanced Grant Specialist Rise Evans

ICJIA Federal and State Grant Unit Associate Director Greg Stevens

ICJIA R3 Program Research Manager Dr. Justin Escamilla

ICJIA General Counsel Karen Sheley

ICJIA Associate General Counsel Blanca R. Dominguez

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

1. Mitchell Troup called the meeting to order at 12:02PM

2. Blanca Dominguez took roll

3. Quorum was established

4. Marlon Chamberlain joined the meeting at 12:20PM

5. Sen. Celina Villanueva exited the meeting at 1:01PM

**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 6, 2021, and the minutes for September 29, 2021, and October 1, 2021**

* 1. Moved by Dagene Brown
  2. Seconded by Sen. Celina Villanueva
  3. All in Favor
  4. No oppositions
  5. No abstentions

**D. Old Business—Equity Scoring Criteria, Overall Scoring, and Weights**

1. Mitchell Troup

a. Began discussion by reviewing the drafts of narrative questions to accompany the three equity categories previously discussed on September 29, 2021. Further noted that the scoring for each equity category had been changed to 10 points each. Proceeded to review the draft questions for the first equity category which asked an organization to describe how its leadership reflects the proposed community to be served. Stated that the second component of that draft question was to ask an organization to relay a real-life story on how the organization’s leadership has used its roots in the community to improve its programming.

b. About the third equity category proposed a draft question asking for a success story narrative as an example of how the program is benefitting the community

i. Senator Celina Villanueva indicated that the draft questions were fine.

ii. Karen Sheley noted that the reviewers would need training on how to score this type of question

c. Mitchell Troup went on to explain that, as to the second equity category, the proposed draft questions would ask an organization to describe how it employs mentors, credible messengers, practitioners, and front-line staff and whether such persons had lived or work experience. Further stated that the second component to that draft question would ask for a real-life example of how the staff used their roots in the community to inform their work within the community.

i. There were no additional comments from the workgroup on the draft questions.

d. Mitchell Troup then summarized the overall scoring of the application and asked for comments on the proposed scores of 15 points for local preference, 25 points for statement of need, 40 points for program design, 5 points each for program staffing and applicant capacity, and 10 points for the budget.

i. There were no additional comments from the workgroup on the overall scoring of the application.

**E. New Business—Collaborative Applications**

1. Mitchell Troup

a. Began with a general overview of how collaborative applications were used in the previous round: applicants were allowed to apply as a single organization for either NOFO or as a collaboration; if an organization applied as a collaboration, they could so do as one project under one application; there was a responsible organization that would have the task of applying on behalf of the collaboration, meet all GATA requirements at the time of application; collaborative organizations were seen as being a unified entity with all organizations in the collaboration being equally responsible for the proposed program; collaborative applicants were provided information on their role in the collaboration.

b. Explained that the collaboration model allowed smaller organizations to create stronger applications by joining with other groups.

c. Further stated that applications also presented different models of collaboration such as different organizations focused on one community deciding to work on one project or organizations working on a large program, i.e., re-entry, with all of the organizations within the collaboration working in different communities to bridge gaps in service; reiterated that collaboration applications allowed for smaller organizations to compete with larger organizations. Stated that there would be more detailed information in the NOFO clarifying the expectations of collaboration and request for an explanation of the roles each organization would play in the collaboration.

i. Pablo Mendoza asked if there was any feedback on the collaboration aspect.

ii. Mitchell Troup provided information based on his experience which indicated that the collaborative model was seen positively by the majority of applicants; explained that the organizations said that the collaborative model allowed them to make linkages they would not have ordinarily made or deepened existing relationships; allowed for the division of work on the application; did also note that there were some instances where there was tension in the collaboration such as collaborations starting with good intentions but later broke down; reiterated that the majority of the feedback was positive

iii. Justin Escamilla stated that ICJIA received some responses to a survey that indicated that applicants would like more information on the distinction between collaboration and partnership. Further stated that other results demonstrated that applicants had a positive interaction with the R3 website, found technical assistance helpful, noted difficulties with GATA requirements, stated the application process was easy across all aspects except writing the application and requested more assistance with grant verbiage, objectives and performance measures; noted that not all responded to survey.

iv. Pablo Mendoza noted that the concern raised in the survey is going to be addressed in the upcoming NOFO.

v. Dagene Brown asked if information from collaboration leaders was requested and whether there were requirements that organizations in collaboration work together versus hierarchical relationships.

vi. Mitchell Troup indicated that there would be contact information obtained from all organizations in a collaboration and all will receive invitations to technical assistance sessions.

vii. Dagene Brown clarified her question asking if there was an opportunity to stipulate that there can be no change to the collaboration once it is funded; the collaboration should maintain its structure for the duration of the grant.

viii. Mitchell Troup explained that there may be a limited ability to do so and would have to confer with legal; also stated that it would make sense to keep some flexibility on this issue, noting that while arbitrary swapping should not be encouraged, it would be beneficial to be able to address a situation in which a collaborating organization was not able to perform or found itself stretched too thin after funding by allowing for the addition of a new collaborating organization after a competitive process; noted that guardrails would be advisable to avoid organizations indiscriminately cutting off collaborating organizations.

ix. Dagene Brown noted that she did not want to be punitive but did want to prevent an organization from eliminating a collaborating organization after they were funded.

x. Blanca Dominguez stated that there would have to be a review of the legal parameters on that matter; also noted that, on the front end, the NOFO will have details on expectations for collaborative organizations to minimize the potential for this type of concern.

xi. Sen. Celina Villanueva asked if there would be sample collaboration questions provided to the workgroup.

xii. Mitchell Troup stated he would provide draft questions at the next meeting as part of old business.

d. Mitchell Troup asked if there were any suggestions as to whether the NOFO should include examples of collaborative models; noted that the last NOFOs did provide some examples such as the ones he mentioned previously (one community being served by different organizations with different focuses or collaborations where a large organization provides technical assistance to smaller organizations, serving as a mentor); further noted that the previous NOFOs did not restrict the types of collaboration types.

i. Dagene Brown asked if there was an opportunity for the applicants to ask questions about their proposed collaboration model in either the FAQs or technical assistance sessions.

ii. Mitchell Troup confirmed the availability of some guidance available via the FAQs and/or technical assistance; noted the guidance would be limited to providing information on an organization’s eligibility but would not be able to provide information as to whether a proposed program or collaboration would be successful or similar inquiries; further noted that all collaborating organizations would have to be minimally eligible to receive state funds as those requirements were the law and could not be overridden.

iii. Dagene Brown noted that she would like to allow applicants to be able to propose creative ideas for collaboration models.

iv. Mitchell Troup stated that the NOFO could contain language to make it clear that any examples of collaboration styles were not exhaustive to allow for creativity; further stated that the intent is not to have ICJIA direct the programs but rather to allow organizations to take the responsibility for their program and roles since they are the ones that know the community and the expertise to meet the community’s needs, which is why the statement of need and program design portions of the application had higher point allocation; explained that organizations would need to explain what is needed in a community and justification for a proposed program for review; also said that there would be a need for guardrails to make sure that collaborating organizations explain their roles and agreement on the type of program being proposed in which they all have some responsibility for carrying out.

e. Mitchell Troup proceeded to note that there is a local preference component regarding the collaborative application, namely an applicant may be eligible for local preference points if 50% of the collaborative organizations were located within an R3 zone, asked the group for comments on this aspect.

i. No comments were provided on the local preference aspect of the collaborative application.

f. Asked the group for comments/suggestions as to whether collaborative applications should be reviewed separately; noted that there is not much difference between single organization and collaborative applications since they all must answer the same questions.

i. Dagene Brown asked if the comparison was apples to apples or apples to oranges.

ii. Mitchell Troup noted the validity of Dagene Brown’s concern; stated that in his experience, there was little impact in terms of who was selected or the quality of the programs in the last round; many collaborative applications were selected. Further stated that with five program priorities and a multitude of different types of proposed programs within those priorities, there is no exact comparability amongst the applications. Also explained further separating the applications would add another level of complexity to the review process given the existing levels of funding, tiers, etc.

iii. No further comments were made by the workgroup.

**F. 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.

**G. Public Comments**

1. No public comments.

**H. Adjournment**

1. Upcoming meetings will be held on 10/12 from 10:00AM to 12:00PM, 10/13 at 12:00PM
2. Moved by Dagene Brown at 1:08PM
3. Seconded by Pablo Mendoza
4. All in Favor
5. No oppositions
6. No abstentions