



CITY OF
BAINBRIDGE ISLAND

CULTURAL FUNDING ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
MONDAY, OCTOBER 14, 2019
6:00 – 8:00 PM
CITY HALL
COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM
280 MADISON AVENUE NORTH
BAINBRIDGE ISLAND, WA 98110

CULTURAL FUNDING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
2020-21 FUNDING CYCLE
AGENDA

MEMBERS: JIM CASH SAL DEROSALIA
BECKY CROOK STEVE RABAGO
TARA DECOSTER DIANA URBAITE-SOSONKINA

LIAISONS: COUNCILMEMBER RASHAM NASSAR
COUNCILMEMBER LESLIE SCHNEIDER

ALSO ATTENDING: ANNE KATAHIRA, THE GIVING PRACTICE

MEETING GOALS

- CFAC MEMBERS AGREE ON APPROACH TO INITIAL PROPOSAL REVIEW
- CFAC MEMBERS CONDUCT INITIAL REVIEW OF PROPOSALS AND IDENTIFY ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NEEDED OR SPECIFIC QUESTIONS TO ASK ORGANIZATIONS

6:00 – 6:10 CALL TO ORDER
AGENDA APPROVAL
CONFLICT OF INTEREST DISCLOSURE
APPROVE MEETING MINUTES FROM SEPTEMBER 9, 2019

6:10 – 6:25 RECAP OF COMMITTEE APPROACH TO INITIAL PROPOSAL REVIEW

6:25 – 7:55 INITIAL DISCUSSION OF PROPOSALS AND QUESTIONS FOR APPLICANTS

7:55 – 8:00 NEXT MEETING DATES AND TOPICS
OCTOBER 28, 2019 – APPLICANT PRESENTATIONS (4:00 – 8:30 PM WITH DINNER BREAK)

8:00 ADJOURN

For special accommodations, please contact Roz Lassoff
206-780-8624 or at rlassoff@bainbridgewa.gov



CULTURAL FUNDING ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 2019
CITY HALL
COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM
280 MADISON AVENUE NORTH
BAINBRIDGE ISLAND, WA 98110

MINUTES

MEMBERS: Jim Cash Sal DeRosalia
 Becky Crook Steve Rabago
 Tara DeCoster Diana Urbaite-Sosonkina

LIAISONS: Councilmember Rasham Nassar
 Councilmember Leslie Schneider

ALSO ATTENDING: Anne Katahira, The Giving Practice

The meeting was called to order at 6:09 pm.

The agenda for the meeting was approved. The Cultural Funding Advisory Committee (CFAC) members (the “committee”) introduced themselves to one another. There were no conflicts of interest disclosed.

The committee received a training on the Public Records Act and Open Public Meetings Act led by Robbie Sepler, Deputy City Attorney.

Anne Katahira, consultant with The Giving Practice, facilitated the remainder of the meeting beginning with an overview of committee roles and responsibilities, along with an overview of the RFP and the process.

The committee reviewed upcoming meeting dates, discussed the purpose of a community review panel, expectations and ground rules for a successful process.

The committee reviewed the eligibility requirements for applicants and received a brief introduction to elements of a successful grant review process.

The next meeting will be held on October 14, 2019 to discuss the committee’s initial feedback on proposals.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:27 pm.

Liaison

Reviewer Overview and Instructions

Why Use a Community Review Panel?

The objectives of community review panels are:

- 1) to gain a wide variety of perspectives and experiences that can inform the grant making process and, in this case, allow the City to benefit from the community's own extensive knowledge about our cultural sector, and tap the enthusiasm and experience of local leaders;
- 2) make the award process transparent, fair, and as free from influence and bias as possible; and
- 3) to create a mechanism for direct input from community members in the stewardship of public funds. The City of Bainbridge Island (COBI) recognizes the critical role committee members serve in this capacity and is appreciative of their commitment to upholding a fair and diligent review process.

Overall Expectations

Reviewers are expected to:

- Follow open meeting and public record rules (*COBI advises that you limit the amount of information you create related to this process as this information becomes public record.*)
- Remember that this is sensitive information
- Thoroughly understand the evaluation criteria in the Request for Proposals (RFP) and match those criteria to an applicant's proposal
- Understand the Cultural and Economic Elements of the City's Comprehensive Plan (located on COBI website)
- Report any conflict of interest to COBI and refrain from evaluating proposals with which you have a conflict
- Refer to the City Funded Cultural Activities page of the COBI website for all reference materials cited (RFP, proposals, etc.)

URL: <http://www.bainbridgewa.gov/948/City-Funded-Cultural-Activities>

Committee-Determined Ground Rules

- Show up! Be present.
- Come prepared. Read everything, including the RFP, instructions, proposals, etc.
- Be thoughtful.
- Be respectful of fellow committee members and applicants.
- Allow everyone to speak uninterrupted. Hear from people who say less.
- Work toward consensus.

Review Process

The review of Cultural Fund proposals will be a blend of self-directed work and committee work. Committee members are expected to review proposals independently and to come together as a committee to discuss how to prioritize those proposals. The steps outlined below are intended to help committee members develop and conduct an efficient and effective review process.

The proposal is intended to give reviewers all of the relevant information needed to help them make an informed decision. Reviewers will have a chance to ask additional questions of the applicants if they feel they need to do so before the final funding decisions are made.

See below for recommended steps in reviewing each proposal and the process for discussing a proposal's merits.

Attachment

- Reviewer Worksheet – an optional tool to refer to or use as a guide in your individual review of applications. It is not required at any time in the committee discussions and recommendations process. However, please do come to the Initial Proposal Review prepared with questions prompted on page 3.

STEP ONE – Understand Funding Program and RFP

- Read the 2020-21 Cultural Funding Request for Proposal (provided on website)
 - Specifically, please become familiar with:
 - Cultural Element and Economic Element
 - General guidelines
 - Applicant and proposal eligibility criteria
 - Evaluation criteria
 - Application requirements
- Review and understand the weighted scoring of the evaluation criteria
- Read and understand the Proposal Narrative
- Please make sure to set aside enough time to review each of your proposals thoroughly. This is NOT a quick process.

STEP TWO – Initial Read-Through (without sorting)

- The proposal materials are available via the website. Please begin your review as soon as is possible.
- Complete an initial read-through of each applicant's proposal but don't sort/rate them this time.
- Use this initial read-through of the proposals to get a sense of what the proposals are about and how they are organized.

STEP THREE – In-depth Read-Through (with sorting)

- Re-read each proposal and begin sorting using Joel Orosz's Four-Category Sorting System (see last page of this packet) to sort and rank the proposals prior to the committee discussion. What falls into the "strong" (Good Idea/Good Proposal) bucket?
- Make sure to keep track of proposal strengths and challenges. You can use the Reviewer Worksheet as a guide to consider the proposal against the evaluation criteria. Proposals will begin to blur after a while!
- Make sure to keep track of any questions you have about the proposal and/or wish to ask the applicant per the instructions on page 3 of the Reviewer Worksheet. Craft questions to seek clarity on the elements of the proposal or about the organization; attempt to keep tone neutral. Anne will compile a list of the committee's questions during the initial review meeting on October 14.
- Review the budget to seek alignment to proposed project goals, when applicable, and whether it's realistic to meet proposed timeline and outcomes.
- Understand how the proposal is addressing unmet need(s).
- Anne will provide an optional Proposal Ranking Matrix as another optional tool to guide for use in your proposal review.

EVALUATION RULES AND TIPS

- Everyone evaluates proposals differently – that’s okay! Just make sure to be consistent in your approach
- Only evaluate a proposal based on the information provided – don’t assume anything
- Evaluate proposals against the criteria in the RFP– not against other proposals
- Make sure all information required is contained in the proposal
- You can lower an incomplete proposal in your ranking but make sure your evaluation is primarily based on the quality of the responses. Remember that this still process is brand new for some applicants!
- Proposals should make a strong case, show a compelling need and show that the proposed activities will effectively address that need
- As stated in the RFP, special consideration should be given to proposals that will:
 - Advance community objectives identified in the Cultural and/or Economic Elements of the City’s Comprehensive Plan;
 - Provide public benefit (as described on page 5 of the RFP);
 - Involve significant community participation;
 - Create access to cultural activities for underserved or underrepresented communities, or include underrepresented art forms;
 - Strengthen organizational capacity; and
 - Foster opportunities for collaboration within the cultural sector.

STEP FOUR – Meeting 2: Initial Proposal Review – Monday, Oct. 14 (6:00 – 8:00pm)

- In-Person Review/Discussion with Committee
 - Arrive on time, prepared and ready to discuss each proposal.
 - Make sure to bring your materials and opinions on proposal strengths and challenges, and any outstanding questions. (You may wish to bring a laptop to reference the proposals.)
- Committee will discuss each proposal and prepare questions for Applicant Presentations

STEP FIVE – Meeting 3: Applicant Presentations – Monday, Oct. 28 (4:00 – 8:30pm with 30 minute break)

NOTE: In the absence of adequate time to follow the procedure listed below, priority will be placed on the committee asking questions of the applicants.

- Committee will hear a brief 5-minute presentation on the applicant’s proposal
- Committee will be allowed to ask specific questions of the applicant for 5 minutes only. Committee members will come prepared with clear and succinct questions to allow time for answers and to keep the meeting on schedule.
- Committee members will independently revise ratings as needed following the Applicant Presentations

STEP SIX – Meeting 4: Deliberations – Monday, Nov. 4 (6:00 – 8:00pm)

- Committee will discuss each application
- Committee will develop funding recommendations
- Committee will agree on funding recommendations for Council approval

STEP SEVEN – Meeting 5: Final Deliberations (if needed) – Monday, Nov. 6 (6:00 – 8:00pm)

- Committee will discuss each application
- Committee will develop funding recommendations
- Committee will agree on funding recommendations for Council approval

Sorting and Evaluating Proposals

NOTE: This version is slightly updated from the one in your orientation packet.

Many grantmakers develop a system to place proposals into bins, or categories, prior to making a recommendation. This categorization provides the basis for treating similar proposals equitably and for clarification on how to proceed. Joel Orosz, who served as a program officer at the W.K. Kellogg Foundation for many years, separated proposals into the following four categories:

Joel Orosz's Four-Category Sorting System

1. Good idea/Good proposal
2. Good idea/Bad proposal
3. Bad idea/Good proposal
4. Bad idea/Bad proposal

1. Good Idea/Good Proposal and 4. Bad Idea/Bad Proposal

These categories lead to easy decisions: fund in the first case, do not fund in the second case.

2. Good Idea/Bad Proposal

This is undoubtedly the most challenging. Proposals that fall into this category most commonly represent smaller, less-sophisticated, and/or new organizations that have worthwhile ideas, but cannot afford to hire skilled grantwriters to present them in a compelling way. The risk that a grantmaker faces is making an automatic assumption that second-rate writing, spelling, and grammar reflects a second-rate project. This can be the case in some instances, but not in others. The challenge, therefore, is to conduct a careful analysis and make a clear and fair distinction. And this, in fact, is only the start of the challenge. It is extremely difficult to present poorly presented proposals to a board for consideration.

Large institutions have grantwriters who know how to put a proposal on paper. Small, community-based organizations often lack these resources, yet they still might be among the best partners for a funder and ones that might be in a strong position to create a significant social return on a grantmaker's investment.

3. Bad Idea/Good Proposal

Making a sound decision about a bad idea/good proposal requires separating the beauty of the prose from the value of the proposal. Once this is done, the decision is quite simple: do not fund.

Source: "Proposals: How to Separate the Good, Bad, and the Ugly," *The Insider's Guide to Grantmaking*, Joel Orosz