Collective of Results and Evidence-based (CORE) Investments Framework

Panelist Training
March 17, 2022
Welcome and Thank You!

CORE Investments Team & Training co-hosts
Santa Cruz Human Services Department

George Malachowski
Kimberly Petersen
Deborah Bresnick
Alex Dami

Jane Conklin (consultant)
Jasmine Sanchez (consultant)
Meeting objectives

1. Provide background on CORE RFP and key CORE concepts

2. Ensure panelists understand their overall role, review process and timeline, and where to ask for help if needed

3. Train panelists on the tools they need to conduct the review
   • Reviewr online scoring tool
   • Scoring matrix
Agenda

1. Overview of RFP process & timeline
2. Responsibilities of panelists
3. CORE background
4. Request for Proposals and application
5. Scoring overview and key definitions
6. Reviewr training (web-based scoring)
7. Tier-specific breakout rooms
Collective of Results and Evidence-based (CORE) Investments Request for Proposals (RFP)

Issued jointly by County and City of Santa Cruz

$5,879,000 annually for 3 years: $4,799,000 County & $1,080,000 City

Improve conditions of well-being for community members experiencing the greatest challenges and barriers in the County
CORE RFP: Key intentions

Address “Core Conditions” for wellbeing

Focus on equity / addressing inequity

Explicitly (but not exclusively) on racial equity

Contribute to collective impact
“Tiered” approach

Funding organized by size of award or ‘tiers’

Most funds for direct services to the community
  • Small: $5,000 - $25,000
  • Medium: $25,001 - $150,000
  • Large: $150,001 - $450,000

One collective impact grant
  • “Targeted Impact”: $795,000

Applicants evaluated with others in the same tier, e.g., applicants for small tier in same pool, assessed with same scoring criteria

Panelists will only review applications in one tier
Requested vs. Available Funding (in millions of dollars)

Applicants requested nearly 3 times the available funding
Medium is the most competitive tier
Subject to adjustment
RFP Overall Timeline

November 16, 2021  RFP Released
March 4, 2022  Applications due
March – April 2022  Applications reviewed
May 2022  County Board and City Council approve recommendations
June 2022  County Board and City Council adopt/finalize awards
Panelist Scoring Timeline

March 16-17  Panelist training
March 18  Panelists receive proposals
March 31  Panelists scores due
April 7 – 22  Panel follow-up discussions, if needed

Large variances between panelists
Tightly clustered set of applications
Panel Reconvening Tentative Date(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>April 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>April 11 - 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>April 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Impact</td>
<td>April 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Be on the look out for more information soon
Agenda

1. Overview of RFP process & timeline
2. Responsibilities of panelists
3. CORE background
4. Request for Proposals and application
5. Scoring overview and key definitions
6. Reviewer training (web-based scoring)
7. Tier-specific breakout rooms
Panelists’ Role

Review proposals to identify strongest applications

Provide insight into strongest proposals + areas for improvement

Provide insights to both funders AND to applicants

$5,879,000  $16,565,000
Panelists’ Responsibilities

Review applications and complete on-line scoring tool

Follow Code of Conduct

   Maintain confidentiality

   Disclose Conflict of Interest

Remain open to input / share opinions, if needed

Ask for help! COREReview@Santacruzcounty.us
Code of Conduct

Sign code of conduct **before** receiving proposals

Docusign – electronic signature

We’ll direct message in chat if you have not yet signed the code of conduct
Code of Conduct, Conflict of Interest

*Situation in which someone cannot make a fair decision because they will be personally affected by the result* (Cambridge Business Dictionary)

Actual or appearance

If you or a close family member have volunteered, worked, or received services from an applicant *in last two years*

Disclose to the CORE Investments team prior to starting your review
Code of Conduct, Confidentiality

No discussion of proposal materials, information learned in review (even with other panelists)

Refer all questions to CORE Investments team during AND after the review

No duplication of any application materials

Delete application materials after review process complete
Equity Stipend

Recognize financial barriers can deter some panelists from participating.

Stipend of $250 gift card is available as equity stipend.

Intended for individuals at or below 200% of Federal Poverty Level.

Panelists whose employer is supporting their involvement (i.e., paid for their time by their employer) are not eligible for stipend.

If interested in more details about the equity stipend or receiving an equity stipend, please email the CORE Investments team.

COREReview@Santacruzcounty.us
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7. Tier-specific breakout rooms
The Collective of Results and Evidence-based (CORE) Investments is a funding model and a movement to achieve equitable health and well-being in Santa Cruz County, using a results-based, collective impact approach that is responsive to community needs.
CORE Vision
Santa Cruz County is an equitable, thriving, resilient community where everyone shares responsibility for ensuring the health and well-being of all people, at every stage of life.

CORE Mission
To inspire and ignite collective action to ensure Santa Cruz County is a safe, healthy community with equitable opportunities for all to thrive.

CORE Values
Equity • Compassion • Voice
Inclusion • Collaboration • Transparency
Innovation • Accountability

CORE Conditions for Health & Well-being
Fulfilling the CORE vision and mission requires investing in programs, practices, policies, and transformational systems changes that create equitable opportunities to experience these vital, interconnected CORE Conditions for Health & Well-being across the life span, throughout the community.
What is Collective Impact?

Collective impact is a type of collaboration that brings people together in a structured way to achieve social change.

https://www.collectiveimpactforum.org/what-collective-impact
## CORE Institute Videos & Materials


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>YouTube Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Collective Impact</td>
<td><a href="https://youtu.be/zNEObex5jo8">https://youtu.be/zNEObex5jo8</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploring the CORE Conditions of Health &amp; Well-being</td>
<td><a href="https://youtu.be/Yc-idQ0qzPg">https://youtu.be/Yc-idQ0qzPg</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing a Theory of Change and Logic Model with an Equity Lens</td>
<td><a href="https://youtu.be/M1p5tRA5Uzk">https://youtu.be/M1p5tRA5Uzk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using CORE Tools to Develop Your Proposal</td>
<td><a href="https://youtu.be/7g6EA7LBOhA">https://youtu.be/7g6EA7LBOhA</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Data and Stories for Continuous Learning and Improvement</td>
<td><a href="https://youtu.be/Lx-6CmVbP_A">https://youtu.be/Lx-6CmVbP_A</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CORE RFP not prioritized in a traditional sense

Community/applicants drive priorities

- No CORE conditions, populations, needs, services prioritized over another
- Rely on applicants to provide data & make case for funding

As panelists, you are looking for cohesive, complete story
# Characteristics of CORE RFP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOT Scored</th>
<th>Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CORE Condition(s) selected</td>
<td>How well applicant makes case for programming that addresses the CORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population / area served</td>
<td>conditions, serves population, addresses needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs addressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where programming falls on the CORE continuum of evidence</td>
<td>How well applicant presents their evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which dimension of equity applicant chooses to address</td>
<td>How well applicant makes case for the dimension of equity they select</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Requests for Proposal (RFP) & Applications

RFP guides the application and selection process

Application due date extended due to COVID

Tier-specific applications submitted on-line

Drop down

Tables

Narrative with character limits

RFP is in Reviewr documents tab
Review RFP before you start scoring applications

Particularly relevant sections for panelists

Summary

CORE Framework x 2

Scoring Criteria

Application Instructions

Glossary of Terms

CORE Investments: Continuum of Results and Evidence
Agenda

1. Overview of RFP process & timeline
2. Responsibilities of panelists
3. CORE background
4. Request for Proposals and application
5. Scoring overview, key definitions and concepts
6. Reviewer training (web-based scoring)
7. Tier-specific breakout rooms
Deep dive on scoring

- Overall process
- Categories
- Criteria
- Components
- Tips for scoring
- Reconciliation meetings
Application Assignment Process

CORE Investments team

- Screens applications for eligibility
- Assigns applications to panelists by CORE condition area of expertise
- Some panelists review multiple CORE conditions, some only one
- Small, Medium, and Large reviewed by 3 panelists
- Targeted Impact reviewed by 4 panelists
Scoring Process

Panelists review applications independently
  • Do not discuss with others, even other panelists

Use on-line platform (Reviewer) to view applications and enter scores

Quantitative (numeric) scores linked to application question or sets of questions

Qualitative (comments) for main sections
Scoring Criteria and Categories

4 main categories, with different point values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why do it?</td>
<td>25 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What should be done?</td>
<td>30 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency capacity</td>
<td>25 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>20 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scoring criteria, from RFP

Criteria associated with each category

Different criteria for each tier

Review criteria for your tier

Small, medium, large tiers pp 7-8

Targeted Impact on page 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why do it?</th>
<th>25 points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For S, M &amp; L tiers, to what extent does the application present a review and understanding of needs and inequities?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>Why do it?</th>
<th>25 points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Application identifies a need or challenge, as well as strengths in the community and/or within a target population, facing mortality, and illustrates them through community data, stories, and/or other types of information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Application identifies a need or challenge, as well as strengths in the community and/or within a target population, facing mortality, and illustrates these through a broad range of data.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Application demonstrates a thorough &amp; comprehensive review and understanding of strengths and needs within a target population, focusing on both quantitative and qualitative data. Quantitative data includes community indicators from sources that are considered valid and reliable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What should be done?</th>
<th>30 points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For S, M &amp; L tiers, to what extent will the proposed services influence needs and inequities that have been identified?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>What should be done?</th>
<th>30 points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMALL</td>
<td>Proposed program or project’s clear strategies and desired achievements and/or outcomes are specific and realistic. Information included suggests it will influence the desired outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>Proposed program or project’s solution is clearly described with specific strategies that are outlined clearly and include specific strategies that are short or intermediate outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARGE</td>
<td>Complex program or project is described clearly with specific strategies that are outlined clearly and include specific strategies that are short or intermediate outcomes. Information on the proposal will influence needs and/or inequities, as well as achieving the desired outcomes through data that informs the approved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Targeted Impact Tier

Why do it? 25 points

To what extent does the application present an understanding of needs and racial inequities within a CORE Condition?

Application demonstrates a thorough and comprehensive review and understanding of needs within a target population facing racial inequity through a discussion of:

- Community needs and strengths.
- Intersecting inequities related to race, age, gender, income, wealth, sexual orientation, and other dimensions of equity.
- The legacy of historical and structural racism.

Discussion includes a broad array of reliable quantitative data and qualitative data.

What should be done? 30 points

To what extent will the proposal deeply impact the racial inequities?

Application clearly describes the collective impact on needs & challenges as well as outcome metrics. Overall, the program(s) or project is driven by community needs and

- Defines a common purpose as well as clearly describes programs (i.e., direct services), their primary outcomes, and how programs work together for the common purpose.
- Consists of mutually reinforcing activities that amplify impact, yielding the most leverage possible.
- Enhances existing partnerships and identifies roles among primary agencies within the partnership.
- Integrates collective impact features.
- Integrates community engagement and communications to promote a shared vision and impact.
- Involves community members in decision-making roles (championing).
- Fosters a movement and takes actions to influence systemic supports to racial equity.

Application clearly describes how the program(s) or project will make a deeper impact on inequities stated and achieve...
Scoring process for panelists

Four main categories broken into smaller tier-specific “components” that correspond to individual application questions or sets of questions

Example, from Large Tier

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Possible Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why Do It? (25 points)</td>
<td>Description of CORE Condition/'Problem' or community need</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community strengths and assets</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inequities/Who is experiencing needs</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Scoring process for panelists

Reviewer displays a matrix with guidelines on how to score each component.

For most questions, inadequate (0 or not scored) + scoring at 5 levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inadequate</th>
<th>Partial</th>
<th>Between Partial and Satisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Between Satisfactory and Exemplary</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does not address the question or component at all. Unable to score this component of the response.</td>
<td>Addresses question or component briefly or indirectly but lacks sufficient detail or clarity.</td>
<td>Answer falls between partial and satisfactory</td>
<td>Presents a clear, well-reasoned response to the question or component.</td>
<td>Answer falls between satisfactory and exemplary</td>
<td>Fully addresses the question or component in a clear, well-reasoned, and thorough response. Demonstrates deep knowledge and experience related to the question or component. Makes an explicit connection between the question or component and the intent of CORE as a results-based, collective impact movement to achieve equitable health and well-being.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More information is needed to determine whether the response is satisfactory.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrates a basic understanding of the question or component but response could be more detailed or thorough.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Scoring process for panelists, an example

**Reviewer will provide component-specific guidance**

**Example, from Large Tier**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why Do It? (RFP 25 points)</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Inadequate (0 pts)</th>
<th>Partial (2 pts)</th>
<th>Between Partial and Satisfactory (4 pts)</th>
<th>Satisfactory (6 pts)</th>
<th>Between Satisfactory and Exemplary (8 pts)</th>
<th>Exemplary (10 pts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1.</strong> Description of CORE Condition(s) &amp; 'Problem' or community need (10 points)</td>
<td>Does not describe a CORE Condition, problem, or community need at all. Unable to score this component of the response.</td>
<td>Names a primary CORE Condition but does not describe it AND/OR only briefly or indirectly discusses the problem or community need but lacks sufficient detail or clarity (e.g., does not elaborate and uses very little or unrelated quantitative or qualitative data)</td>
<td>Answer falls between partial and satisfactory</td>
<td>Presents a clear, well-reasoned description of the CORE Condition selected and the 'problem' or community need AND Uses and cites quantitative data (including community indicators from valid and reliable sources) AND MAY INCLUDE qualitative data to demonstrate a basic understanding of the problem or need. BUT The description of the relationship between the CORE Condition and the problem/need could be more thorough or explicit</td>
<td>Answer falls between satisfactory and exemplary</td>
<td>Presents a clear, well-reasoned, and thorough description of the CORE Condition selected and the ‘problem’ or community need, using strengths-based language AND Uses and cites quantitative data (including community indicators from valid and reliable sources) AND qualitative data to demonstrate deep knowledge and understanding of the problem or need, including the extent of existing inequities and their root causes AND Provides a detailed, explicit description of the level of need in the community and how the problem or need is related to the primary CORE Condition (and other related CORE Conditions if applicable)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note to reviewers:**

**remember to score on how well applicant describes a need – NOT your opinions on the types of needs that are more urgent than others.**
Tips on quantitative / numeric scoring

Focus on application in front on you – don’t compare or ‘rank’ applications

Focus on consistency with scoring guidance

Confirm all aspects satisfied to assign score

Think critically – not too soft or too hard, funders need help to make the best decisions
Scoring process for panelists, comments

Identify strengths and opportunities for improvement in main sections

*Example, from Large Tier*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why Do It? (RFP 25 points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please identify 2-3 strengths of the applicant’s responses to the Why Do It? section. Use brief statements or bullet points to describe specific areas where the applicant’s response was most persuasive, exemplified the intent of CORE, or otherwise stood out as exemplary. (1000 characters)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please identify 2-3 areas where the application could be improved. Use brief statements or bullet points to identify specific areas where the applicant’s response did not fully address the question asked, lacked detail, or could otherwise be improved. (1000 characters)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tips on qualitative / comments scoring

Be constructive, “critical friend”

Comments are shared with applicants and funders

Aim for recommended number of comments / at least one comment in each section

“None identified” is ok, if used sparingly
Examples of qualitative / comments scoring

Strengths

• *Description of need/problem was very clear and precise (e.g., specific quantitative data on abuse & neglect rates, foster care, racial disparities)*

• *Cited real life example to show familiarity with people experiencing this need*

Opportunities for improvement

• *Discussion of community strengths and assets would benefit from quantitative or qualitative data, more detail*

• *Inequities could be fleshed out a bit more, especially regarding age (which is listed by applicant as a dimension of equity). For example, program serves 8-13 year olds, so would be nice to see specific data for that age group.*
Panel follow-up meetings, if needed

Large variances in proposal scores between panelists in group

Ambiguities between applications, clusters of very close scores

Opportunity to share ideas and best thinking about proposals

MAY adjust scores after discussion, but NOT required

Qualitative comments can help illuminate why one panelist may have rated something higher or lower than another