

**PCEF Reporting Subcommittee**  
**Meeting #6 Meeting Minutes**

**Date/Time:** March 17 2021, 10:00 to 11:30 am

**Location:** remote teleconference via Zoom Meetings

**Committee Members Present:** Maria Sipin, Megan Horst, Ranfis Villatoro

**PCEF Staff Present:** Angela Previdelli, Janet Hammer

**Members of the public:** None

**Agenda**

- Welcome
- Approval of Minutes 2-26-21
- Review draft evaluation questions
- Confirm Subcommittee name and purpose
- Discuss next steps

**Meeting Decisions/Action Items:** None

**Minutes:**

Review draft evaluation questions – Sub-committee provided feedback.

- General comment that thoughtfulness and thoroughness are good.
- Clarify priority population (P2) definition. Disaggregate as much as possible. Consider the intersection with organization size and whether they are an emerging org. Interest in connecting those three pieces.
- Geography- would be helpful to know beyond the large group of “E of 82<sup>nd</sup>” - more granular detail. Consider the organizational home as well as the project location.
- Fiscal sponsorship questions to consider - Do we have an insight into how these relationships did or didn't work? Did that impact success or not? Did some organizations fiscally sponsor many – and how did that affect things? Are there any trends?
- For committee and panel interviews - remind folks that everyone was encouraged to take notes during the scoring process and encourage to bring those up and refresh themselves. Items to consider:
  - Time commitment.
  - Remind about the tools that they were provided and process, including the bias training, scoring booklet.

- Would be nice to have someone who is a little removed conduct the interview.  
There are resource constraints to who is available to conduct interviews.  
Agreement that it would be nice if someone other than staff but ok if need be.
- Opening question – Consider a temperature check question.
- Consider encouraging reviewer to walk through all the questions and criteria. Highlight “problematic” ones. Have draft on hand for folks to refer to.
- We are interested in knowing what would make the process more inclusive and accessible. Were expectations met, were they able to share the strengths of their program, what was transactional versus transformational?
- Perhaps ask interviewees for examples from other funders of things that worked well.
- Next meeting: Tentatively March 31<sup>st</sup>.