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 12, 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

ICJIA R3 Grant Program Manager Mitchell Troup

ICJIA Federal and State Grant Unit Associate Director Greg Stevens

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 10:15AM

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 12, 2021, and the minutes for October 6, 2021**

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

**D. Old Business—Follow up on Collaborative Applications**

1. Mitchell Troup

a. In reference to the previous meeting explained that he drafted some very preliminary language to elaborate on the collaboration aspect of the NOFO application in the following categories: (i) as to the local preference category, proposed including an area for each collaborative member to include their contact information; (ii) as to the program design category, added draft language to ask each collaborative member to provide information on the members and their roles within the collaborative program; and (iii) as to the applicant capacity category, the added draft language would ask collaborative members to provide information on their experience within the community.

i. Charise Williams asked for clarification on the purpose of the added language.

ii. Mitchell Troup explained the objective is to obtain more detailed information about the collaborative members’ roles in the overall program; further explained that this will help identify the collaborative members and their specific roles.

iii. Charise Williams asked to confirm that language was still in draft form; explained that there is a need to balance getting information with the burden on applicants.

iv. Dagene Brown asked Mitchell Troup to make sure the questions in the applicant capacity category were consistent with each other to avoid the questions appearing to be disjointed and/or eliciting different responses to each—this was about the omission of the term “history” in the collaboration question.

v. Mitchell Troup noted the concern and stated he would make sure the questions in the NOFO were consistent; also asked if there were suggestions for alternatives to the use of the term “history.”

vi. Dagene Brown suggested the term “contributions.”

vii. Mitchell Troup further explained that the goal of the questions in the applicant capacity category is to provide applicants that have not received much grant funding but have done work on an informal level the opportunity to provide information about their work.

**E. New Business—Objectives, Goals and Performance Measures**

1. Mitchell Troup

a. Concerning the objectives, goals, and performance measures section, stated that the challenge was how to account for objectives, goals, and performance measures when dealing with such a broad range of programs within the five R3 program priorities; it was very difficult to develop pre-defined objectives, goals, and performance measures that all grantees must meet; explained that in round one, that the NOFOs provided definitions for process objective, outcome objectives along with some examples of each but that this area was left blank and each applicant was able to provide their objectives, goals, and performance measures; this was different than other NOFOs in which ICJIA has included predefined objectives, goals, and performance measures and then allowed applicants to also add their own; asked the workgroup for feedback on whether to continue to leave it blank or whether to develop pre-defined objectives, goals, and performance measures.

i. Marlon Chamberlain asked for clarification on the request for feedback.

ii. Mitchell Troup noted that there must be objectives, goals, and performance measures to evaluate a program and to assist the reviewers to review the applications

iii. Charise Williams noted that the inclusion of objectives, goals, and performance measures was required by the rules and restated the question: should the NOFO include predetermined evaluation measures or just leave the section blank for an applicant to provide their own or a combination of both (Mitchell Troup confirmed the restated question); provided additional context on the issue, stating that ICJIA was currently working with external parties on this matter but noted that there was not enough data given the newness of the R3 grant program. Charise Williams further remarked that it might not be feasible to change this aspect of the NOFO process for the new round given the lack of data points; further stated that it was not clear if it was possible to have predetermined performance measures with so many different programs.

iv. Dagene Brown noted that she would need to look at the objectives, goals, and performance measures together with the objectives of the NOFO itself; remarked that she would need to see what the NOFO was asking the grantees to do in terms of service to the community to determine if it is related to the objectives, goals, and performance measures; she acknowledged Charise Williams’ comment concerning a lack of data at this time; stated that she favors creativity so she would like to give applicants the ability to provide what they think their program is going to do but the objectives, goals, and performance measures should tie back to the objectives of the NOFO.

v. Mitchell Troup proposed adding a narrative question before the objectives, goals, and performance measures section restating the legislative purpose of R3 and asking applicants to provide objectives, goals, and performance measures that will further the legislative purposes.

vi. Dagene Brown cautioned against overburdening applicants by requesting more information.

vii. Marlon Chamberlain stated he would like to see more creative ways to measure performance beyond numerical metrics; provided an example of an organization having participant sign up for services and then once that was accomplished, the agency was no longer interested in helping the participant; wants a way to measure performance beyond just signing up a participant to simply say he went through the program; wants a way to measure a program’s impact on a participant’s quality of life.

viii. Mitchell Troup acknowledged Marlon Chamberlain’s desire to go beyond just numbers; asked about the option to include a second component to this section requesting information on how the quality of life of a typical participant was improved; noted that this would shift the focus to outcomes and not just measure the process or that the program is operating but that there are specific achievements; noted that there is a distinction between the process which measures things like people coming to the program and the outcomes which focus on people in the program reaching the desired result of the program, i.e., gaining employment, securing permanent housing, etc.

ix. Marlon Chamberlain and Charise Williams agreed the second component would be helpful (Marlon Chamberlain provided an example of a violence prevention organization that used real-time restorative justice principles to prevent fights from escalating into violence in the streets to illustrate how some outcomes could not be quantified numerically but they were valuable nonetheless).

x. Justin Escamilla confirmed that ICJIA was doing work along the line of Marlon Chamberlain’s idea; noted that they have also identified a couple of basic process measures that might be suggested to applicants; stated that providing applicants with information to guide them on what is a good measure, i.e., SMART principles for goal setting, might also be helpful; stated there could be room for narrative updates on successes and/or challenges of a program consistent with Marlon Chamberlain’s point.

xi. Mitchell Troup also explained that ICJIA was currently working on a “menu” of measures for different programs; also highlighted fact that last year’s NOFO included an appendix that contained examples of each R3 program priority; noted that applicants could be given the option to participate in technical assistance on objectives, goals, and performance measures (Dagene Brown remarked that she assumed this was already provided in existing technical assistance webinars); Mitchell Troup clarified that although this was already covered in current technical assistance sessions, this could be built out more as a separate module.

xii. Emily Harwell concurred that technical assistance on this topic would be helpful and that a standalone session might be the better option (Dagene Brown agreed that a separate module would be preferable).

2. Mitchell Troup

a. Asked the workgroup if they had comments or feedback as to whether this section should be scored; noted that it was not scored in the previous round but that the reviewers were asked to refer to it when evaluating the program design category.

i. Dagene Brown stated that there should be some connection between a program design and the objectives, goals, and performance measures since both components go together.

ii. Mitchell Troup suggested moving the objectives, goals, and performance measures table to the program design section so that it would be clear that the two components should be considered together.

iii. Charise Williams and Dagene Brown agreed that moving the objectives, goals, and performance measures table to the program design section made sense.

3. Mitchell Troup

a. Moved on to discuss the implementation schedule and asked if that too should be moved to the program design section along with the objectives, goals, and performance measures table.

i. Dagene Brown remarked that it might seem to be out of sequence if asked about implementation before staffing information was provided.

ii. Mitchell Troup noted that it might also be helpful to add a column to the implementation schedule asking for the name of the collaborative member that will be responsible for the completion of a specified task; also suggested moving the implementation schedule to the program staffing section (Charise Williams and Dagene Brown agreed with the suggestion to move the implementation schedule to the program staffing section).

**F. Member Updates**

1. Mitchell Troup

a. Reminded the workgroup of the importance to meet the quorum of three given the small size of the group and the fact that a substantive vote would take place at the last meeting; explained 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. The final meeting will be held on 10/13 at 12:00PM
2. Moved by Dagene Brown at 11:21AM
3. Seconded by Charise Williams
4. All in Favor
5. No oppositions
6. No abstentions