



CVSD Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

CVSD Conference Room, Suite 150A (Lower Level)
Thursday, November 6, 2014, 8:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.

Committee Members in Attendance: Desiree Coyote, Shirley Didier, Jenna Harper, Kim Larson, Cheryl O'Neill, Bob Robison, Michele Roland-Schwartz, Tim Moore (for Daniel Staton), and Lynne Whiteman

Committee Members via Teleconference: Yelena Hansen, Sybil Hebb, Rebecca Orf, Barb Palicki, Vanessa Timmons, and Merle Weiner

Guest: Lauri Stewart, Annie Neal, and Stephanie Striffler

CVSD DOJ Staff Present: Becky Smith, Cathy Relang, Jeanette Ewald, Mackenzie Gray, Diana Fleming, Caitlin Brown, and Mike Maryanov

Committee Members Absent: Vanessa Becker, Steve Bellshaw, Kris Billhardt, Allison Cleveland, Erin Ellis, Amy Holmes-Hehn, Leona Ike, Kathryn Kelley, Kelsey LeBrun Keswani, Terri Neimann, Justin Nelson, Tawna Sanchez, Robin Selig, Chanpone Sinlapasai, and Letetia Wilson

Welcome and Introductions

Mackenzie welcomed the committee members and CVSD staff in attendance and everyone introduced themselves.

Minutes

The last CVSD Advisory Committee (AC) meeting was held August 7, 2014.

- Tim Moore moves to approve minutes
- Michele Roland-Schwartz seconds the motion

The motion to approve the August CVSD AC Meeting minutes passed with no edits or changes necessary.

Introduction to Indian Law, Tribal Relations and Criminal Jurisdiction in Indian Country

Diana introduced Stephanie Striffler, the Senior Assistant Attorney General and DOJ Native American Affairs Coordinator. Stephanie came to present the next steps after the Listening Tour



and the VAWA IP plan. She has been with DOJ for 25 years and working with the tribes for 17 years. The PowerPoint and handout with more detail was emailed to the AC prior to the meeting.

Desiree, along with other Tribal representation, will present a Part 2 as follow-up to Stephanie's presentation today. The group can consider what they would like to hear from Desiree during the January AC meeting and send any questions to Diana Fleming.

Questions asked after the presentation for follow-up at the January AC meeting:

- Tim Moore would like to hear more about examples of cases that aren't being addressed appropriately, either from the perpetrator or the victim, within the Tribes. Hearing about gaps in services would be helpful on a practical level for the present state of Tribal law and jurisdiction.
- Becky S. would like to learn more about what is appropriate to ask of the Tribes when it comes to them now being grantees of CVSD compared to other programs. She will make a list of questions she has come across since the Tribes have been brought into the Joint process.

Discussion of 2014 SASP and VOCA Competitive Application Reviewer Feedback:

The surveys were sent to the AC, along with the compilation of the results, prior to this meeting. Many AC members probably responded to the survey we sent out to the reviewers. Cathy and Jeanette reviewed the comments we received and sorted the responses in the categories listed below. We have two competitive review processes coming up in the next year and we hope to use these survey responses to help guide these upcoming processes.

Scoring Disparity:

The group acknowledged that being a reviewer is a major time commitment, but discussed the benefits of having well trained reviewers considering the importance and the impact of the reviews. Having the review teams receive more training might result in less disparity between scores, but it would not alleviate having an array of scores. Kim and Lauri discussed options for helping all reviewers utilize the scoring criteria in order to try and get more consistency in scores. Currently there is a lot of room for disparity and variability with the global measures that CVSD gives to the reviewers. The wide point range currently being used leaves a lot of room for individual judgment and this creates a lot of disparity between scores.

Suggestions for the point scale disparity:

- Eliminate the bottom and top scores from each application to get a more realistic average.
- Have CVSD create a detailed reviewer sheet to reduce some subjectivity and only have "is this component here" with a yes or no option. Lauri believes this would make it easier, simpler, and more objective for reviewers.
- Create a smaller point range in the global measures to create less disparity.
- Create a scoring guide with more specific questions rather than one score for a section; this may create a longer review, but it would be simpler and quicker overall for the reviewers.



Training of the Review Teams:

We had nine of 14 responders say that CVSD should provide a more extensive training for the reviewers. Feedback was requested from the AC about reviewer training in addition to the optional Orientation since it is already a significant time commitment.

Suggestions for training of the reviewers:

- Change the Orientation from optional to required whether reviewers are new to the process or not
- Provide more in-depth training up front to reduce the time required later when trying to figure out how to comparatively score all the assigned applications
- Go through a mock application in the training
- Have two orientations, one for new reviewers, and one for returning reviewers.

Conflict of interest:

Becky O. expressed concern around a reviewer possibly having knowledge of a program that would not necessarily result in a conflict of interest based on current CVSD guidelines.

Comments regarding conflict of interest:

- Consider making the conflict of interest broader to try to reduce the impact of reviewer program knowledge.
- Some state agencies, such as the AGSATF, have knowledge of programs around the state and most of the AC members are on the committee because of their knowledge of programs across the state.

Number of Applications Per Team:

Jeanette and Diana discussed the difficulty of having one team review all applications because it would result in a lot of reading and a considerable amount of time. Currently we try to give no more than 9-10 applications per team to alleviate some of the pressure and time commitment. With VAWA Diana usually has one team per type of application and last year that meant 16 applications for prosecution and 9 applications for law enforcement. With the changing of parameters around VAWA applications there may be more in the law enforcement category this coming year.

Criteria and Rationale:

Jeanette: there was a long list of suggestions in the criteria and rationale category. A few suggestions that stood out were using paper copies instead of digital, coming up with a process whereby reviewers would not have to go back and forth between the criteria and rationale and the application all the time.

Suggestions for criteria and rationale:

- Reviewers can create notes on the actual application page in E-Grants instead of writing comments elsewhere in E-Grants.



Length of Applications:

Suggestions on length from reviewers:

- Less would be better as a reviewer on the VOCA Competitive review team.
- SASP review team did not have a problem with the application length.
- Didn't have a problem with the length (VOCA reviewer), but rather the order of the questions and some overlapping/repetitive questions.

Suggestions on length from applicants:

- The overlapping questions can be hard for an applicant because they think there should be different answers even if the questions seem to be the same and are just worded differently.
- The last couple of questions you feel like you have already answered them somewhere else.
- Having more specific items that CVSD is looking for would make it easier to answer these types of questions.

Scoring and Ranking:

The scoring and ranking section of the survey had different sections. One of those was the budget section and how it is best reviewed. The most popular response was that both CVSD and reviewers score the budget resulting in a combined score.

Suggestions for budget review:

- CVSD do an initial review of the allowables and unallowables, and then give the information to the reviewers so that it helps those that do not feel like budget experts.
- Would rather see the budget and the narrative for that budget together for the pieces that would be funded by the grant funds
 - Negative to that would then be only seeing what is of that ask rather than their entire budget
- Ask for more narrative around the entire budget
- Hard to go between pages to find answers about the budget; it would be easier if they were on the same page
- Request a narrative description of other funding that will be used for the project/position and how those funds will benefit/impact the project.
- Some reviewers do not feel comfortable scoring a budget
- Score budget narrative questions rather than scoring the computation and allowability of the budget. For example, ask if the budget is realistic and supports the project rather than if it is allowable.
- No actual scoring for the budget, but rather there should be a space for reviewers to give feedback in a more generic manner and "score" good, fair, or poor.



Additional discussion:

- Currently, during review team meetings, CVSD Fund Coordinators share with the reviewers any parts of the budget that would require revision should the grant be awarded. If CVSD could provide the reviewers with these budget issues before the review process that would be beneficial.
- In practice, if an application has issues with the budget and/or goals and objectives, CVSD will request modifications during the grant negotiation phase. This is done without changing the scope of the project.
 - Should those applications be scored differently than ones that have no issues with budget and goals and objectives?
 - Should reviewers even score these sections if it they can be modified?
 - If reviewers think an application is good overall, except for the budget which can be modified, should the budget even be scored?

Suggestions for goals and objectives review:

- Instead of scoring the goals and objectives, reviewers could instead score the rest of the application and have CVSD work with applicants on appropriate performance measures. Some programs do not have staff that are good at writing the goals and objectives.
 - This goes back to Lauri's earlier suggestion of certain sections just having a simple question on the reviewer score sheet to indicate if a section good or needs extra work if they are awarded.
- Train applicants on how to build a logic model; CVSD can provide the training, but cannot tell applicants what to specifically include in a logic model.
- Remind applicants that the people reading and scoring their applications may not know anything about their programs.
- Provide more information in the Show Help for the applicants with examples of what CVSD is looking for.
- Add links in the Show Help that go to good logic model examples.
- CVSD provides a mandatory training when the RFA is released to orient applicants on building logic models in addition to the regular RFA training topics.
- No actual scoring for the goals and objectives section, but rather there should be a space for reviewers to give feedback in a more generic manner and "score" good, fair, or poor.
- Ask questions that get to the concern of how the applicant will fill the gaps if the grant is not awarded for their project.

Purpose and Priorities:

This section will be discussed at our next AC meeting, as we will not have time for it today.



Frontier Bonus Points:

The feedback from the survey seemed clear that the bonus point system is liked in one way or another. During the discussion, the majority of the AC members agreed that in order to receive the frontier bonus points applicants would need receive a minimum score of 75, an increase from the current 70 points.

Level of bonus points awarded:

- SASP awarded 10 bonus points to all applications that would deliver services in frontier counties.
- VOCA awarded 10 bonus points to applications that would deliver services 100% in frontier counties and 5 points if the application would deliver services in a mix of frontier and non-frontier counties.

Reasoning behind bonus frontier points:

- Historically CVSD has funded more projects from the I-5 corridor.
- Frontier and rural communities have had less opportunity, practice and dedicated staff for applying for grants.
- All of our awards require that we distribute funding throughout Oregon, that is, that we fund both urban and rural projects.
- Bonus points might encourage applicants from rural areas to apply since they might believe they could successfully compete.
- Implementing bonus points was the result of conversations with the AC Subcommittees to possibly receive more diverse applications from all across the state.

Discussion around awarding frontier bonus points:

- Should CVSD increase the minimum score required to “earn” bonus points from a minimum score of 70 to 75?
- Is 10 bonus points too high?
- Would it be better to have two different application pools, one general and one specific to frontier/rural so they would only compete against similar applications?
 - How much would be set aside for each pool and what would their standard be compared to the other applicants?

Decisions made for frontier bonus points:

- ✓ CVSD should continue to use the frontier bonus points
- ✓ Increase the minimum score required in order to earn bonus points from 70 to 75
- ✓ Potentially reduce the points from 10 to 5.
 - Five of the six rural programs that were awarded in the VOCA Competitive process received bonus frontier points so it really did make a difference.



Action items for the next AC meeting in January regarding the reviewer survey:

- Purpose and priorities of funding will be discussed.
- We will also come back to any other question you have from the survey results.

Joint Application Subcommittee Update: Becky Smith

A subcommittee with broad representation including both CVSD and DHS Advisory Committee members and grantees is reviewing the Joint application for non-competitive funds for release in late March. The subcommittee is looking at language, expectations, inclusivity, and appropriateness for grantees that also now includes Tribal Nations. The recommendations of the subcommittee will go to CVSD and DHS fund coordinators.

Four meetings are planned: overview and governance, sexual assault funding, culturally specific funding, and financial information/accountability. This committee is important to ground our work with the input from those in the field. We appreciate everyone that takes part in these processes.

Announcements and Adjourn

We hope to have a new and improved sound system in time for our next AC meeting in January.

Next meeting is January 22, 2015 at the CVSD Conference Room in Salem at 9:00am.

Meeting adjourned at 12:35pm.