# AGENDA

**GOVERNANCE GROUP**  
June 21, 2019  12:00 – 5:00 pm  
Seattle Foundation, Board Room  
1601 Fifth Avenue, Floor 19 Seattle, WA  
Call-in:  206-263-8114   #6923351

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:15</td>
<td>Welcome &amp; Introductions</td>
<td>Michael Brown, Marguerite Ro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:20</td>
<td>Consent Agenda</td>
<td>Marguerite Ro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:25</td>
<td>Systems &amp; Policy - Agenda</td>
<td>Dionne Foster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15</td>
<td>COO Visioning (part 1)</td>
<td>Andrée Akita, Christina Hulet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15</td>
<td><em>Break</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30</td>
<td>COO Visioning (part 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:45</td>
<td>Adjourn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Next Meeting:**  July 19th, 2019  Chinook Building, Room 121

**Governance Group Members**

Lydia Assefa-Dawson  Michael Brown  Deanna Dawson  Andrea Estes  Ubax Gardheere  
Rod Dembowski  Matelita Jackson  Paola Maranan  Gordon McHenry, Jr.  Jenn Ramirez Robson  
Yordanos Teferi  
Marguerite Ro  Sili Savusa  Nathan Smith  Tony To  AJ McClure
COMMUNITIES OF OPPORTUNITY
GOVERNANCE GROUNDING

RESULTS STATEMENT

Create greater health, social, economic and racial equity in King County so that all people thrive and prosper, regardless of race or place.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

• Consistently demonstrate the values of equity, respect and partnership.
• Ensure low-income communities and communities of color affected by inequities develop and own the solutions.
• Advocate for and change institutional policies and processes to support equity goals.
• Encourage investments (both funding and in-kind resources) in long-term community capacity building and in systems, policy and practice changes that lead to greater racial and economic equity throughout King County.
• Catalyze alignment of funding streams and partner across issues and sectors to seek preventive strategies that address root causes of today’s inequities.
• Be transparent and show how data and community expertise inform initiative strategies.
• Continuously learn, improve and share work publicly.
• Focus on geographic communities with the greatest needs, while simultaneously sharing lessons learned and building relationships across King County – *We are one King County.*

VALUES

*We commit to guide Communities of Opportunity using these values:*

**Equity:** work intentionally to eliminate racial, ethnic, socio-economic and geographic disparities in health and well-being

**Process Equity:** an inclusive, fair and open process

**Community Engagement:** authentic community engagement that involves listening to and understanding the unique histories of communities

**Driven by quantitative and qualitative data:** Data will track and report progress, as well as support given for promising and evidence-based practices

**Innovation:** Recognize that change involves risk and value an adaptive approach that views failure as an important part of the learning process
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Friday, May 17, 2019 2:00 pm – 4:00 pm
Location: Chinook, Room 115

Members Present: Marguerite Ro, Michael Brown, Deanna Dawson, Andrea Estes, Marty Jackson, Yordanos Teferi
On Phone: Ubax Gardheere, Sili Savusa, Lydia Assefa-Dawson

COO Staff: Amanda Kay, Blishda Lacet, Cristina Gonzalez, Kai Domingo, Dan Bernard, Sharon Bogan, Aaron Robertson, Roxana Chen
On Phone: Dionne Foster

Other Attendees: Christina Hulet, Theresa Cruse

Consent Agenda: Governance Group (GG) approved the consent agenda that included meeting minutes from April 19th, 2019.

Commercial Affordability RFQ
The Commercial Affordability Pilot seeks to identify and develop models, tools and services that increase community ownership as part of an anti-displacement and equitable development strategy and slow the displacement of businesses within the Communities of Opportunities region. The goals and objectives for a pilot program include:

- Build upon existing successful models to test or expand approaches that will influence systems/policy change and investment practices to promote micro/small businesses to remain in their community, to benefit from development, revitalization, investment, and contribute to economic stability and resiliency in COO communities.
- Increase access to capital by communities where current lending products/models have not been available or acceptable.
- Create tools that address needs of micro/small businesses to access capital and leverage resources for feasibility studies, tenant improvements/capital improvements.
- Provide technical assistance for small/microbusiness retention.
- Identify barriers and solutions to public investment to support strategies.

Communities of Opportunity (COO) will select an organization or team to create and implement a commercial affordability pilot program that will work within specific COO neighborhoods in King County to achieve a set of desired program goals and objectives.

Update on Reports
- The King County Executive's response to a budget proviso on COO 2018 outcomes for the three original place-based site partnerships will be transmitted to King County Council by June 30, 2019. COO staff are compiling data from partnership 2018 year-end reports. The contents of the report will include:
  - (a) list of services provided through COO, including number of persons served by each site/site's partners, that identifies services by issue areas of housing, economic opportunity, health, or community connections;
  - (b) summary of priority strategies developed by place-based sites for 2018 and outcomes achieved towards those priority areas; and
  - (c) summary of any developed performance measures or performance measures monitoring methodology.

Staff will arrange meetings with Council Members after the report has been submitted. We will be inviting Governance Group members and partners from Rainier Valley, SeaTac/Tukwila, and White Center to join us in briefing meetings to share results from 2018, and describe challenges and successes in these communities.
- BSK Annual Report to is going to council, and COO has a few pages in the report. Staff is close to a final version, and it will be sent around when it is done.
- **Participatory Evaluation Snapshot (draft).** The layout will not change, but the content can be adjusted. Dionne and Sharon will be working on the content around S&P. Please send any feedback to Sharon by May 31st.

**COO Visioning**
Discussion continued on COO's legacy and vision for the future, specifically around how we are honing in and focusing our efforts to achieve our ‘leave-behind’ goals. We have convened three sessions with a small group, since our last Governance Group meeting. The small group is building off of ideas from the GG notes (April 2019 and GG retreat September 2017). We've tested a few hypotheses to hone in on potential strategies. Our team -- Paola Maranan, Jenn Ramirez Robson, Carrie Cihak, Michael Brown, Marguerite Ro— have shared feedback on thoughts, like: reclaiming a community development approach/model, COO's 'big win', engaging anchor institutions, and making the COO model the practice. From the discussion, we will share a proposed framework for COO that could be used to define specific equity outcomes and strategies.

The focus for this GG discussion was **POWER** -- within the “4-P” framework of People, Place, Policy and Power. Breaking into small groups, we discussed how the Power piece would look moving forward.

Some general Governance Group discussions included:
- How do we make COO a replicated model?
- What does the “4-P” framework really mean, and what is the leave behind in the short term and in the long term?
- The change within institutions is exciting and glad to see it being lifted up
- We need more capital to build housing
- Power is really important, and some community members are being drowned out
- We need to be building community based initiatives within philanthropy

Regular Session end 3:50
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Systems & Policy Change Agenda - Presentation

Last year, the 2018 Systems & Policy grantee cohort developed a set of systems and policy change recommendations. They shared their work in March 2019 with governance group members and the full content of policy focused issues is included in your packet. Please read/review the materials for a presentation/discussion:

1. **Systems & Policy Change Agenda**: This document represents the issues COO grantees see as critical to change in order to bring racial equity in our region. COO did not edit out issues or attempt to limit the spectrum of challenges grantees raised as relevant to their communities. Given this approach, the policy agenda is broad in reach and scope. A one-page summary (found on page 3) of this document is the condensed version of the policy agenda, and contains only the issues that the cohort selected for prioritization.

2. **COO Feedback Document**: Grantees shared their perspective on what it has been like to be a COO grantee. They uplifted the components of our work that have been strong, and they also highlighted challenges and areas where they would like to improve or things done differently. This document is intended for internal use and to help us be accountable and report back to our grantees.

Strategy Discussion: COO Vision

On Friday, we will continue discussion on COO’s legacy and vision for the future, and focusing our efforts to achieve ‘leave-behind’ goals and the strategies that support them.

In large and small group discussions, we will review an emerging strategic framework for COO that builds on the “4-Ps” of People, Place, Policy and Power.
The outline above is the draft summarizing COO goals (or what we want to “leave behind”). We’ll discuss these overarching (proposed) goals and a set of strategy pillars that are holding each of these goals, that have been identified through priorities that are emerging from place-based and systems & policy grantee work.

We’ll review these and discuss how they resonate with Governance Group members, reflect on how we and partners may see ourselves represented in these statements.

**Background/Process.** We have convened three sessions with a small group, since our last Governance Group meeting. The small group is building off of ideas from the GG notes (April 2019 and GG retreat September 2017). We’ve tested a few hypotheses to hone in on potential strategies. A small group met in April and shared feedback on thoughts, like: reclaiming a community development approach/model, COO’s ‘big win’, engaging anchor institutions, and making the COO model the practice. A draft will be developed using feedback from the June GG meeting. Staff will take the draft, add more detail and vet ideas with community partners prior to September retreat with GG.
We are drowning in information but starved for knowledge. *John Naisbitt*

At its genesis, the Systems and Policy Change cohort was convened to produce a coherent, cohesive, and relevant set of systems policy recommendations to rapidly and sustainably close racial and geographic disparities in the areas of community connection, economic opportunity, health and housing. Community and organizational leaders representing over 30 community based organizations already serving in these areas across a wide spectrum of racial, ethnic and geographic communities including organizations serving LGBTQ communities of color within King County served in the cohort by sharing their experience and expertise.

The facilitators convening the cohort focused on three objectives:

1. An equitable and compelling process for cohort members that increases capacity for ongoing inter-organizational relationships and collaboration.
2. A process that is relevant and beneficial for individual grantee organizations as well as the shared goals of the cohort.
3. A process that increases the good standing and work of King County and the Seattle Foundation.

This process began with the acknowledgement that understanding the challenges and envisioning the right solutions had to be built upon the knowledge and wisdom of those communities who are experiencing these disparities. Without authentic connections with these communities, transferring that knowledge and wisdom alone, would not lead to success.

The cohort self-selected into at least one of the four focus areas and formed small working groups to focus on housing, health, community connection and economic opportunity separately. Each group met 3 times for half-day sessions. These half day sessions were bookended by full-day cohort gatherings that brought together the groups across the issue areas in August of 2018 and March of 2019. These result-area-focused meetings followed a process that began with mapping a shared vision for a desired future, then into brainstorming what changes would most effectively bring out that vision, and finally setting priorities and building a cohesive strategy in every result area.

While housing, economic opportunity, health and community connection were established as focus areas, this process has explicitly, from the beginning embraced the inherent intersectionality with these four areas. Each result area small working group had opportunity to observe, add to and edit the other areas throughout the process and all were encouraged to explore beyond the boundaries when they felt appropriate.

What follows is an agenda authored and vetted by the entire cohort. While these insights represent the analysis and creativity of community leaders, it intends to be employed alongside organizations led by and for the communities they serve, and not stand alone and apart from the people who know how to engage in it.
Equitable change is systemic and led by those most impacted.

AN AGENDA FOR CHANGE IN FOUR RESULT AREAS

COMMUNITY CONNECTION
HOUSING
HEALTH
ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY
ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY
The importance of preparing for a vocational vision that generates prosperity and community service continues to be crucial. And, real changes in economic systems to prioritize the values of communities and imagines success as shared, must occur. We need solutions for tomorrow as well as today that open doors for good jobs at living wages and in healthy conditions that allow community members to work and thrive in the places they live.

1. Create public and private investment structure to incentivize creation of worker-owned cooperative businesses.
2. Address upside down tax code through passing capital gains and income taxes.
3. Increase accountability regarding the impact of development between immigrant and people of color small business owners and local government.
4. Modify state benefits to tiered system to support people through changes in income and qualification measures.

COMMUNITY CONNECTION
Building the capacity for disparate communities, organizations and public institutions to understand distinct challenges and shared aspirations is difficult work. Moving forward in solidarity while acknowledging privilege and unequal relationships between partners remains crucial for true systems change. We need structures that simultaneously reinforce self-determination while developing deeper, accountable relationships between communities, government and private partners.

1. Support organizations led by and for the communities they serve with funding, technical support and training to equip leaders and create avenues to influence public policy.
2. Issue funding on multi-year cycles to make systemic and strategic change.
3. Increase direct private and public funding to grantee work on systems and policy change, decrease investment in granting process.
4. Institutions collaborate with impacted communities to codetermine goals and outcomes before strategy and policy are determined.

HOUSING
The strategy to sustainably, and with dignity, house the growing number of housing-insecure people in the region needs to simultaneously be committed to the crisis of the moment and the future needs of historically marginalized people. Ending unjust evictions needs to be prioritized as is planning that creates spaces according to long-term aspiration and not only short-term necessity.

1. Incentivize community land ownership with no-to-low interest rate loans.
2. Pass up-zoning throughout Seattle and County suburbs.
3. Make County-wide commitment to solve Native American homelessness crises centering Native People in policy decision-making and resource allocation.
4. Pass statewide Just Cause laws – including rent increase time-lines and maximums.

HEALTH
Ableism, colonization, and transphobia are as connected as racism and patriarchy to the inequities driven by white supremacy in our health systems and living environments. Fundamental change is necessary for equity in wellness. Sustainable holistic and culturally relevant care designed by and for those most impacted is vital to addressing the determinants of health disparities.

1. Create contracting opportunities for place and ethnic community-based organizations who are led by and for those most impacted to identify priorities and solutions for those communities’ challenges, rather than government-led initiatives.
2. Expand capacities for providers to use integrated care models by mandating partnerships with community organizations led by and for those most impacted and are experienced with systems-based care to meet community needs.
3. Mandate data sovereignty initiatives, where health data is owned and managed by community or community-based organizations who are specifically connected with those most impacted.
4. Create learning partnerships between health care systems and community-based organizations led by and for those most impacted to develop or implement culturally relevant strategies that meet the specific needs of marginalized communities.

Result Area Summaries and Identified Priorities
Regulatory Change
1. Pass Just Cause laws statewide – including rent increase time-lines and maximums.*
2. Pass up-zoning throughout Seattle and County suburbs.*
3. End single family zoning in Seattle. Incorporate range of multi-unit or clustered housing types compatible in scale with single-family homes that help meet the growing demand for walkable urban living in single-family zones.
4. More zoning to increase duplex, triplex, and more multifamily zoning throughout the County.
5. Organize across the County to create new local AMI definitions to reflect geographic disparities.
6. Make government funding in proportion to the demographic data, prioritize communities who need help the most.
7. Mandate equitable statewide rent control that meets the growing needs of folks that are not eligible or just below or above affordable housing policy.
8. Incentivize and simplify development of public and institutionally owned land to make access to development less dependent on wealth and insider knowledge.
9. Increase bonus size ranges from 1 to 2.5 for Rental housing tax breaks incentivizing developers to build more affordable housing, especially in suburban areas.

Case Management and Coordination
1. Increase the number of mandatory case workers in the County to reflect ratio of 1 case worker to 20 low-income seniors advocating for quality living standards for seniors.
2. Establish public partnership to fund a decentralized online site to clearly and flexibly access up-to-date housing policies.
3. Increase State funding for case management capacity to coordinate multiple resource needs and wrap around support.

People with Disabilities
1. Include seniors who are over the age of 60 and are caring for dependents at home in the King County property tax exemptions and increase the combined income threshold to $75,000.
2. Support worker organization for caregivers.
3. The Washington Administrative Code (WAC) needs to create new and more flexible housing options for supporting people with disabilities and their families, caregivers.
4. Require housing development to designate certain percentage of units for people with disabilities.

Transitions from Institutions
1. Pass regulations to mandate trauma-informed-person-centered case management across each stage of reintegration for those returning to their communities from institutions.
3. Increase allocation of housing for people transitioning back into their communities from being incarcerated.
Develop Community Controlled Housing
1. Annual place-based culturally and linguistically relevant educational and resourcing opportunities for community members to develop housing in their own communities.
2. Incentivize community land ownership with no-to-low interest rate loans.*
3. Land ownership opening strategies towards community driven development.
4. Establish partnerships between community organizations and private funders to create community lending circles.
5. Support housing co-ops and community land trusts.
6. Increase funding for down payment assistance in Seattle and King County.
7. New funding policies for low-income housing development to increase available housing stock.
8. Increase funding for pre-development educational and outreach opportunities to deepen community engagement.
9. Start a housing trust fund for South King County funded by local municipalities, the State and private sources.
10. Require land and housing developers to contribute a percentage of profit to Duwamish Tribe.
12. Make County-wide commitment to solve Native American Homeless crisis, by centering Native people in policy decision making and resource allocation.*

Individual Home Ownership
1. Change current Condominium Act to protect sellers of condominiums to increase condominium inventory, especially the 7th year assessment period and liability issue.
2. Make condominium development conversion easier to expand pathways to ownership.

* Policy agenda pieces the cohort identified as priorities.
Building Bridges Between Community Action and Other Influencers
1. Address upside down tax code through passing capital gains and income tax.*
2. Expand and fund Working Families Tax Credit (WTFC) to fully balance tax code and support people with low-incomes.
3. Support community organizing to pass the estate tax.
4. Support organizations that are creating connection avenues to legislators for community voice to influence program funding and structure.
5. Expand participatory budgeting in King County with technical support from community leadership so people can effectively influence public budget.
6. Prioritize the building of community spaces to community values and wisdom can be mobilized to self-define the meaning of work and societal contribution.
7. Create community-led and operated fund that supports trans and non-binary women of color for gender affirming health work.

Vocational Readiness and Education
1. Fully fund state need grants: tuition and opportunity costs, for example: College Bound.
2. Expand Seattle Promise to King County, by including opportunity costs (e.g. books) and part-time enrollment.
3. Mandate schools receiving Seattle Promise dollars to provide comprehensive reports with feedback from students about what is working well and what gaps remain.
4. Privately and publicly fund organizations that are bridging connections to legislators to hear and learn from community members to influence policy funding and design.
5. Increase vocational training opportunities for 30+ aged adults.
6. Increase support for non-college post-secondary education opportunities by partnering with unions and trades professionals.
7. Create post-secondary skill and job-readiness training to increase employability and pay equity for people with disabilities.
8. Increase suburban and urban small and local agricultural production apprenticeships.
9. Create public and community groups partnership to develop strategy for worker replacement for oncoming turnover in local government departments.

Community Centered Business
1. Increase incentives for women- and minority- owned business contracting.
2. Create public and private investment structure to incentivize creation of worker-owned cooperative business.*
3. Create incentives for private developers to include affordable space for pre-existing small business to stay in place.
4. Increase accountability around the impact of development between immigrant and people of color small business owners and local government.*
5. Create culturally and linguistically appropriate small business incubators with cohorts, for example: Space Works that has public funding structure.
Workplace Support
1. Support unions to build capacity to offer more programs and outreach to underrepresented communities.
2. Increase public resources to effectively enforce Fair Workers Rights ordinances in King County.
3. Organize to replicate Seattle model of workplace rights throughout state.
4. Increase accessible training and support to understand and claim workers’ rights, for example: Know your Rights class.
5. Outreach to employers to provide education, support and accountable relationships regarding workers’ rights.
6. Build emergency notification system with appropriate language for people facing environmental hazards.
7. Create incentive structures for employers to offer equal pay for people with disabilities.
8. Create free management training with a focus on equity.
9. Increase fire and building safety with practices similar to the Bangladesh accord.
10. Increase opportunities for people to work in self-sustainable ways, including cooperative models to avoid barriers for participation.

Safety-Net Programs
1. Extend re-authorization periods for social service programs to twelve months.
2. Modify state benefits to tiered system to support people through changes in income and qualification measures.*
3. Expand eligibility for safety-net and programs to include low-income working people who are above income threshold, but not self-sufficient (i.e. childcare, food stamps).
4. Increase support for accessible child savings account bill.

Accessibility
1. Mandate structural and program design to include Universal Design standards at all public institutions.

Transitioning from Institutions
1. End education-need grant penalty for those involved in legal cases.
2. Promote successful reentry by modifying the process for obtaining certificates of discharge and vacating conviction records, and pass New Hope Act.
3. Expand definition of who is exempt from legal and financial obligations.

Improving Transportation
1. Support community organizing to build support for coordinated regional transportation that supports underserved people in suburbs.
2. Design worker-informed policy that mandate fair scheduling rules for commuters in suburban areas, particularly where there is warehouse work.

* Policy agenda pieces the cohort identified as priorities.
Community Leadership
1. Create city and county contracting opportunities for place-based and ethnic community-based organizations who are led by and for those most impacted, to directly facilitate identifying priorities and solutions for those communities’ particular challenges, rather than using government-run committees or government-decided initiatives.*
2. Increased transparency in County Board of Health member selection.
3. Get representative from the Community Health boards on the Washington Health Alliance.
4. Mandate data sovereignty initiatives, where health data is owned and managed by community or community-based organizations who are specifically connected with those most impacted.*
5. Make policy changes to facilitate WA resident International Medical Graduates to be local practitioners.
6. Increase public and private financial support for birth workers of color and fund birth worker of color scholarships for doulas, midwives, lactation specialists and birth educators.

Community and Institutional Partnerships
1. Identify organizations that have successfully developed and implemented anti-racist organizational change strategies and increase their capacity to inspire and lead other organizations and institutions to do similar work.
2. Create partnerships between hospitals and clinics and community-based organizations led by and for those communities most impacted to develop, implement, and expand culturally attuned models of care and well-being strategies to meet the specific needs of marginalized communities.*

Whole Person Healing and Wellness
1. Mandate access to culturally appropriate and trauma informed behavioral health care for people with low-incomes and people of color at clinics in the county.
2. Expand technical, administrative, philosophical and billing capacities for healthcare providers to develop, implement, expand integrated care models where primary, dental, behavioral health, and social services are fully integrated and offered to all patients by mandating partnerships with community-based organizations led by and for those most impacted and have experience with holistic and systems-based care to learn how to best meet community needs.*
3. Change systemic barriers to affirm indigenous medicine and healing and allow for sustainable billing to Health Care Authority.
4. Provide Community Health workers to work holistically in the community and deploy a whole person approach, rather than an approach that is fund driven. Contracting agencies (i.e. Children’s, Group Health, University of Washington, etc.) could pool funds to make a collective contract.
5. Create pathways for agencies (health organizations) to employ holistic health contracts rather than contracts for outreach on specific issues only i.e. dental health example.
6. Incentivize major health institutes to adopt “anchor missions”, and strategies to address social determinants of health structurally and systemically within those institutions.
Gender Affirming Health and Healing
1. Create appropriate and affirming education opportunities for trans people to learn how to take care of themselves and make healthcare decisions with available tools and resources.
2. Create requirements for a history of substantial trans and gender diverse leadership as a requirement of supporting gender affirming health care access work.
3. Invest in organizing and community education efforts that increase trans and gender diverse communities’ access to their healthcare rights and due process when facing discrimination.

Built Environmental Determinants of Health
1. Provide incentive for including Heat and Energy Recovery Systems (ERV/HRV) near major arterials and highways and for affordable housing projects.
2. Develop economic policy and system changes that are focused on carbon reduction, creating sustainable communities, clean energy, energy efficiency, and green economies in King County.
3. Incentivize use of non-toxic materials in affordable housing development.
4. Allow multi-family housing providers to provide multi-family transit passport to their residents in exchange for reduced parking requirements on site, saving the developer and the resident.
5. King County Metro create special passport for affordable multi-family housing at cost of $1.50 per trip.
6. Reduce the threshold for # of households in a building that use a card from 100% to 75%
7. King County Metro to create pooled fund of resources that is available to multi-family housing providers to buy down cost of the multi-family access card.
8. Build community-led and operated network that can provide emergency housing (e.g. Oakland Soul).

Schools
1. Increase capacity for scratch cooking in communities with the highest health disparities by creating culturally affirming cooking demonstrations with affordable access to ingredients in every county and city community center monthly.
2. Pilot universal free lunch program, removing income qualifications to receive free and reduced lunch, at a school with high rates of low-income students and monitor the impact the impact on participation.
3. Make capital investments in public schools kitchens and improve the data schools collect about student demographics and mandate schools offer options for halal.
4. Reproduce CalFresh Program in King County and allow Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) users to purchase hot and prepared foods at participating restaurants.
5. Address systemic problems in the food supply chain by adopting Good Food Purchasing Policy at large institutions like City of Seattle or Hospitals. Example: LA Food Policy Center.
6. Require comprehensive ongoing trauma informed training for teachers, aids, and staff coming into contact with students at schools.
7. Increase non-gendered, non-competitive sports programming offered at schools.
8. Pass state legislation that requires schools to repair unfit drinking water sources in a given period of time.
9. Expand pilot program that brings health care services directly to schools (e.g. Kaiser Permanente Partnership).

Shared Spaces
1. Policy change at Seattle and King County Parks and Recreation to prioritize capital investments in low-income neighborhoods. Use socio-economic equity score to make investment decisions.
2. Reconfigure prioritization for parks capital improvements to incorporate demographics on equity and usage, to insure improvements benefit low-income neighborhoods and neighborhoods with LGBTQ demographics who want to use public space.
3. Require Seattle & King County Parks and Recreation to create a minimum level of service for women, individuals with faith and cultural needs for recreation, people with disabilities, trans people, and communities underserved by recreation facilities. Mandate a minimum level of classes to serve these communities.
4. Increase the number of publicly available bathrooms.
5. Expand protected bike lanes.

* Policy agenda pieces the cohort identified as priorities.
Relationships between Community and Government
1. Public and private partners should recruit and hire policy outreach workers that are identifiably relevant and relatable to the communities they serve in order to develop necessary accountability and trust.
2. Include resources for skills and capacity building when requesting community participation in government- or funder-sponsored committee work.
3. City and County agencies and community organizations partnerships to include co-designing panels and committees meant to provide community insight and access in order to better understand the financial and opportunity cost of participation and accountability for action items that are not implemented.
4. Support goals and metrics to be established in geographic and ethnic communities before any government or institutional facilitation to determine strategy and policy decisions.*

Relationships between Community and Funders
1. Include identifying, connecting with, and resourcing people with insider knowledge of the communities projects are intended to serve to gather and build community understanding, before determining scope and solutions.
2. Change grant structure so relationships between grantor and grantee organizations are more accountable and transparent with bi-directional report back that keeps both grantor and grantee aware of progress and updates.
3. Increase direct private and public funding to grantee work on systems and policy change, decrease the investment required of grantees in application and reporting process.*
4. Issue funding on multi-year cycles to make systemic and strategic change.*
5. Create support systems for non-profit workers, like a 2 year sabbatical opportunities for grassroots and non-profit workers.
6. Identify and center people of color organizations who are led by leaders of color when creating strategy and defining outcomes.
7. Cultivate and promote public policy-makers of color.
8. Build platform to lift up intergenerational slate of elected officials.
9. Apply King County data on demographic representation lens on all levels of grant-making and funding.
10. Require all organizations who partner with, but may not be grantees themselves, be recognized.
11. Build in grant capacity for all partners to be clear about project roles and relationship expectations.
12. Create relationships that enable responsible direct funding from private and public resources to geographic communities (decrease indirect funding through non-location based intermediaries).
13. Streamline reporting or include support models that help organizations incorporate tracking/reporting into their regular activities rather than monthly narratives and financial reporting where we have to backtrack to activities we’ve done.

Relationships between Communities
1. Support the creation of community-driven big cross-cultural coalition of communities to increase voice.
2. Support international collaboration opportunities and coalitions for communities who are connected globally.
3. Create an appropriately accessible and curated resource guide with cultural and geographic distinctions and a funded networker position to create directory of people doing key work and to make connections between organizations and communities.

4. Support community organizations with funding, technical support and training to equip leaders and create avenues to influence public policy.*

5. Create “teach-in” events that focus on History of Voting, the Electoral College, ways to stop gerrymandering and volunteering for “signature” chasing, mobilize political power in community.

**Relationships between Funders**

- Foundations and other intermediaries step up to educate peer funders: host community connection meetings that facilitate relationships between other funders and community organizations.

*Policy agenda pieces the cohort identified as priorities.*
As a part of the Systems & Policy Change cohort's creation of the Policy Agenda, the cohort self-selected into the four result areas (Health, Housing, Economic Opportunity, and Community Connections) which met together in three sessions. In the last session, result area groups were asked to briefly provide feedback on their experience with Communities of Opportunity – focused on the Systems & Policy Change grant process and policy agenda convenings by reflecting on What they liked, What about the experience they wanted to be different, and What would they add to the process if they could. Their responses were analyzed and five issues emerged as a clear consensus for opportunities to improve.

The five issues were: 1) **Space to increase connections between cohort members**, 2) **The application and evaluation process**, 3) **Connection with funders**, 4) **Solidarity among partners**, and 5) **Supporting smaller and grassroots organizations**. In our final full-cohort engagement we presented the five issues that were raised back to the cohort, facilitated deeper thinking about each of the five issue areas, and determined what potential solutions to these issues would look like from their perspective.

What follows are the notes and summary of those discussions. They are organized by issue area beginning with a description of the issue and discussion questions (derived from the original feedback and in the form presented back to the cohort), followed by a summary of emergent themes, suggestions for improvement, and finally the transcribed notes from the discussion. The entirety of this content came from facilitated discussions of cohort members. COO staff were present and available upon request, but did not join as participants.

**1) Space to increase connections between cohort members**: There is so much value in building relationships between community leaders and orgs. Use this process to more effectively provide space for connections in a way that understands people's limitations of time and costs.

**Discussion Questions:**
- How can COO be a useful connector for your organizations?
- What does the opportunity to connect look like for a broadly diverse collection of people?

**Themes:**
- Need for coordination and research to identify inter-organizational alignment and natural partnerships.
- COO to transparently play convener role, but not facilitate, set up and step back.

**Big idea!** Organizations can be convened to train each other in various skill and insight development.

**What successful improvement looks like:**
- A systems continuum blueprint that plots and shares outcomes and intersections with the cohort.
• An accessible organizations roster.
• More opportunities for the whole cohort to be together, rather than to be in small groups

**Summary of Discussion:**

**Creating Space: Before the Work**

It’s crucial to acknowledge that grantees are working within and continue to be impacted by the barriers and systems the project intends to address. These barriers and systems drive patterns of behavior that serve the system and are often threaten efforts of systems change.

One of these patterns that we want to highlight is the silo-ing of objectives and activity. We often find that grant processes create activity that ask us to segment our experience into “modes” like survival, learning, organizing, and working in order to produce outcomes that address these aspects individually, but not holistically.

Another pattern is that when we share physical space as part of the process, prescribed tasks take up potential space for connection.

**Creating Space: The Work**

Take care to create a common language. This work involves a diversity of expertise in community work as well as in the levels of interacting with policy change. While the spectrum can set the context for deep systemic understanding, the limitations of our time together makes an accessible way to share ideas across disciplines and experience with policy would be very beneficial.

Partnerships in the fundamentals of strategy and decision making are prerequisites for authentic collaboration. Once grantees are convened, COO staff should step back from primarily directive and embrace a role more as container creation and maintenance and allow outcomes to be developed with grantees. Building in mechanisms for transparency and understanding of what the COO’s activities and influences are in systems change would also be key steps.

**Creating Space: The Process**

Design in mechanisms and pathways to collaborate within and without the scope of the grant. Support from COO in this might look like deliberate matching and helping to identify natural partners within the cohort.

Create a continuum blueprint to plot out social conditions, the narrative that might be leading to those conditions and what outcomes may be expected from policy changes and why. This analysis could include the intersections of grantees and other organizations to highlight potential collaborations and inform funding decisions.

2) **Application and Evaluation Process:** A process that supports grantees and takes into account the time and effort the administration and compliance requirements require. (Alternative Reporting, i.e. art based)

**Discussion Questions:**
- How could COO structure our evaluation process to help support your success? Please consider how a multi-year grant process would factor in.
• How do you measure the success of your work for our organization in moving policy? How do you know you've progressed? Please include both qualitative and quantitative information.
• How do you measure the success of your work in building your organization capacity? How can you tell your organization is better off?

Themes:
• Responsibility to decode organizations’ activity into the funder framework should shift from grantee to funder.
• Personal one-on-one was helpful and generative, written report felt unnecessarily extensive.
• Give grantees more notice and clarity about what was expected to be reported on, earlier.

Big idea! Metrics and review could be co-designed to be helpful for grantees to know and track.

What successful improvement looks like:
• Evaluation report that could be utilized by the organization in other ways, ie communication products.
• Trainings in how to translate organization’s work into the format and perspective that the funder requires.
• Process builds relationships between grantees and grantees and funder and not just policy wins.

Summary of Discussion

Application and Evaluation Process: What worked and what didn’t

There was near consensus that the 1 on 1 sessions for 2018 grant extension and renewal were very necessary, appreciated and relationship-building.

More time and resources to understand the written portion would have been helpful.

The mechanisms of different COO partner (King County, Seattle Foundation) needs that drove the evaluations was not well understood and needed clarification.

Mixed reactions to Survey Monkey’s ease of use.

Application and Evaluation Process: Making designed benefits multi-directional

The evaluation and application process seemed design to benefit the funder and not the grantees as partners or serve to specifically advance the work. Could these processes be redesigned as serving the interests of grantees as well?

Co-create evaluation questions to learn more from grantee’s about communities’ perspective on successful systems change and systemic barriers to change. Create products from the evaluation process that could be used to facilitate community outreach, learning and capacity building. Evaluation deliverables could take the form of communication tools like infographics, fact sheets and other reporting-to-community tools.

Application and Evaluation Process: Developing Strategic benefit

Could the evaluation processes be used to establish a multi-year, multi-focus, and multi-agency longitudinal evaluation and track changes over time?
Could the evaluation process help to develop a focus that goes beyond numbers and be able to curate understanding of community-directed narrative of their needs? Could there be an evaluation of the entire community of practice where the learnings can map grantee's work and allow for informed responses to what grantees are experiencing?

**Application and Evaluation Process: Innovative Reporting**
Can we include means for effective reporting other than the 8 page evaluation? The current model distracts from the work of system change and redirects to a process that meets the communication model of funders and not necessarily for grantees. Storytelling, or other visual reporting increase the available capacity of grantees and can reflect a more accurate measure of the actually and felt change in the communities than a written report can.

**Application and Evaluation Process: Expanding evaluation scope to other key areas of systems change**
The current model for evaluation predetermines definitions of success and misses other significant measure for systems change. Measures like community leadership building, new learning, outreach, collaborating to create collective support and power building, building community trust and understanding in advocacy are all very important and need to be tracked in addition to specific policy wins.

Understanding the dynamic landscape and tracking changes in that landscape and what enabled those changes and what steps shifted power dynamics are key areas to develop questions for.

3) **Connect directly to funders**: Use this process for specific opportunities for funders to see what orgs are doing, why they are important and what it looks like.

**Discussion Questions:**
- What roles would need to change and what would be need to be different to accomplish this?
- What would grantees need to do to maximize the benefit?

**Themes:** Funders need to know more about what CBOs do, and vice versa. Effective partnerships depend on relationship and a process that builds meaningful relationships between funders and CBOs are essential. Systems change commitment should be longer (20 years, and include 5-8 years of knowledge gathering).

**Big Idea!** How do we position our work as “market worthy”? i.e. how to CBO’s position their work as valuable and demonstrate the value of the impact as it relates to investment

**What successful improvement looks like:**
- Flowchart that makes roles and their expectations explicit be shared at the onset.
- More attention to community voice and less focus on innovation.
- Language that is more flexible to meet grantees where they are (ie. Clarity in renewal vs. extension).

**Summary of Discussion**
Participants offered concrete examples of how improved relationships between grantees and funders can unlock the maximum value in the portfolio of work funded. Community groups benefit greatly from direct collaboration with one another. Frequent opportunities to interact and consensus build act as catalysts for future work and serve a dual purpose of peer training and capacity building. From the grantee perspective, there is a universal need for streamlined communication across all topics. Many organizations, at some
point, struggled to distinguish between grant requirements and training opportunities. Clarity on organizational roles and responsibilities should be revisited more frequently, with handy reference tools for new staff.

Long-term organizational investment was identified as the primary and most critical systems change. Broadly, the current funding mechanism does not reflect long-term investment while acknowledging the considerable structural and institutional factors that shape individual or community health. Organizations are tackling these structures with short-term funding, in the form of 2-5 years generally. A broader vision of funding support that incorporates both administrative and project-based growth could be piloted with CBOs. An ideal program would fund cohorts in 10 year cycles, with renewal paths that are attainable. This type of investment allows for CBOs to retain critical personnel and thought leaders - foundational to the works impact.

4) **Solidarity**: Shared development of vision, strategy, decision making, and evaluation between COO elements like the gov. board, grantee groups, community members, Seattle Foundation, other funders and King Co throughout the entire process. Transformative rather than transactional relationships

**Discussion Questions:**
- What would a process that exemplifies solidarity look like? How would you design the interface and relationship roles of the parties of this grant including but not limited COO staff, governance, and your organization?
- What will be the signs that it is working and how do we build in the necessary buy-in?

**Themes:**
- Simplify and make process and organizational structure more transparent (COO org chart).
- Space and resources that allows community participation from the beginning at the goal setting phase is needed.
- Bring community into review process, i.e. ensure community members are on

**Big idea!** Allow for a post-grant grantee role to extend through cycles to support accountability and mentorship for next grantees.

**What successful improvement looks like:**
- Engage cohort earlier to collaborate on what values should be measured.
- Increase process milestone clarity.
- Accommodate for varying levels of current policy fluency.

**Summary of Discussion**

**Clarify roles and partnership structure from the beginning to build trust.**
Introduce roles and responsibilities of SF, KC, consultants, Governance Group at the beginning. A visual organizational chart of the structure and timelines of process deliverables would be helpful.

**Evolve quality of relationships for greater impact.**
COO can be a catalyst to redefine funder-grantee relationships for the sake of more effective and sustainable systems change. Bringing in grantees as partners from the conceptualizing of goals and outcomes and continuing on past when grants have ended can create the context for shared goals of systems change and not the focus on specifically administering resources for change.
More fundamental and deeper connections between grantees and the COO, including the governance group, to increase trust, accountability and impact can produce more identification of prioritized needs, capacity for community buy-in, targeting the right values and feedback loops that keep improving processes.

**Acknowledge and build upon existing systems change efforts.**
It's so important to honor work that has already been done. Concentrating on point-in-time and project-based partnerships can underappreciate or ignore all together, change and policy work already being done and the relationships and overlapping strategies, the understanding of which can be essential to long-term success.

Without the basis for a high-level of trust, it's very difficult to expect strategy to be freely handed over funders. Grantees may filter their participation to just meet requirements of agreement and not full-hearted efforts for change.

**Include funding decision making power in collaborations.**
Funding models that share decision responsibilities with community members exist and can better allow strategies that are more responsive to where communities are at, exist (Social Justice Fund) and should be researched. This kind of powering sharing can get us to a point where we actually begin to share experiential understanding required to fuel meaningful systems change.

**Communities have varying capacities and face different barriers to fully participate**
A developmental phase to support capacity building to fully participate as partners may be helpful for some communities like the refugee and immigrant communities. Communities who face unique barriers represent essential insights in understanding systemic challenges.

5) **Supporting smaller and grassroots orgs:** Improve experience for groups with less staff or that rely on volunteers, and whose participation requires disproportional costs.

**Discussion Questions:**
- What best practices from other partnerships or programs successfully meet the needs of and benefit from the participation of smaller organizations?
- Who are the right people to learn more from and can review changes?

**Themes:**
- Policy Agenda purpose needs more translation for organizations who aren't used to Systems and Policy Change work through that lens.
- Smaller organizations need more money and time relative to other grantees to support this work.
- Smaller organizations can benefit from more opportunities to sub contract or partner with other organizations to expand capacity.

**Big idea!** How can smaller organizations' service-based understanding of systems change be specifically facilitated to benefit the Systems and Policy Change project?

**What successful improvement looks like:**
- Address gray area between Capacity and Project level grants.
- More opportunities for mentoring by other organizations.
Application process that recognizes different writing standards due to diversity in education and English fluency.

**Summary of Discussion**

**Smaller organizations may have a different way of thinking about policy and systems change**

Smaller organizations may offer distinct ways of offering services and connecting with communities. These distinctions can result in unique strategies for system change and dedicated support to pay attention and learn from those unique strategies are important.

Administrative support that can pay special attention to the limitations and recognize the strengths smaller organizations bring can make big difference. Practices like reimbursement models and restrictions on subcontracting and partnerships can have a disproportional and negative effect on smaller organizations.

Not every small and grassroots organization has growth as a goal. Capacity building models may force organizations to add the endeavor of growth regardless of whether or not that may be in their best interests.

**Smaller organizations rely on a limited number individuals to get the work done**

Leadership development strategies and building capacity to avoid burn out are incredibly important for organizations who are relying on a small number of people to handle a large amount of task and responsibilities. Mentoring relationships for newer or small organizations may be a significant step.

Navigating grants and partnership processes are often done by the same people who are doing the majority of the groundwork and whose expertise and experience is in practice and not in administration. Easy and simple processes that are aware of language and cultural barriers are important throughout the entire life span of grants.

**Partnering for smaller organizations brings specific risks to them**

Smaller organizations operate within the same dynamic systems that larger organizations do, with less resources to protect and promote their own interests when partnering with larger organizations. Taking care to have all contributions properly recognized in all stages of collaborations are important for everyone and special attention may have to be given to make sure this is true for smaller organizations.
Appendix A
Transcribed Notes

Conversation 1: Space to Increase Connection

Before the work
People are impacted by the barriers and systems
● Survival mode
● Learning mode
● Organizing mode
● Working in silos
Prescribed tasks from COO, took away possibilities for connection

The Work
● Creating common language
● A list of orgs. And their priorities that everyone has access to (resource list)

The Process
● A way to invite others to participate in the work with you
● Deliberate matchmaking
● Intentional collaboration

● COO has specific role in connecting funders and orgs. (less middle man)
● Inviting funders to be part of the process and the work
● The goal is finding the intersections between the orgs. (shared vision)
● Creating a shared outcome to establish a more organic and lasting investment
● COO playing a role in convening the groups but allowing the groups to create and focus on the outcome.
● COO convenes and steps back
● COO funds the orgs. Simplify the process
● COO creates a continuum blueprint to plot out the systems and policy change outcome.
● Small groups that discuss the social conditions yearly
● What in the narrative led to those conditions? Why?
● How we move forward in the work? (strategies)
● COO acts as a funder container (reserving time and space)
● No prescribed outcome
● Community based evaluations
● Comm. based collaborations and outcomes
● COO asks what the community wants and does only that.
● COO has transparency with their process and outcomes
● COO has to be transparent with themselves
● COO does not prescribe partnerships and collaborations
● COO currently doesn’t have a master list for comm. Orgs. to reference
● Map policy ideas and create an overlay for possible collaborations
● Time set aside to convene on specific topics
● Broadly and smaller individual orgs. Work presented
● Connection ways in which our work intersects
  EX: Collaborative events in tangibles deeper understanding and shared analysis movement building
● COOs role to providing funding on policy, is based on common needs that the community identifies. That are made by the community orgs.
● Grantees can choose partners to receive funding.(optional)
● Funding current and potential collaborations
● There should be 1 cohort (with different meeting rooms)
● All the groups meet at once, in same room with a recognition of the intersections between focus areas
● Time made to see connections between groups
● Stipend for org. Volunteers
● COO pays orgs. to train each other
● COO pays for orgs. To network
● Organizations brainstorm the trainings internally
● Headwater continues in process.
● We request that headwater continues to facilitate
● When the government is not connected to the community they cannot effectively facilitate.
● There is time to share our successes
● Time to share our stories (ground and build community)
● The cohort’s goal should be visual

Conversation 2: Application and Evaluation Process

● More transparency needed/ why is more required now?
● Questions were very extensive, do all these questions actually need to be asked?
● Can grantees help shape these?
● Use these groups to establish a longitudinal evaluation. Where over the years (baseline 1 year established) and look at changes over this time
● Decentralize and make it a collective effort
● Be part of deciding what the evaluation is
● Make sure the grantees know what they are being evaluated on
● Rather than the 8-page evaluation what if they created communication products like fact sheets, blog post, info graphic, etc. that could be used as the reporting.
● Questions as is are the prescribed in order to do this?
● COO should be translators of our work. They should be the ones doing the code switching. We should be community building.
● Trainings on how to translate what we do into what they want
● Innovative evaluation ideas, photos, dance, videos...
● Success not just policy win. It’s also community leadership building
● Ethical needs, funders meeting community, Bi-directional communication
● Transparency of what is compliance is to the county?
- Liked the follow up interview (built comm. And highlighted where grantees actually did more)
- Innovated Evaluation: Storytelling, can share more than just fulfilling basic requirements. Meetings to gather what is needed for the report. Helps collect what is needed for the reporting.
- Co-create the funding requirements so the evaluation and report benefit both.
- Offer alternative eval. Models methods that can be shared.
- Initially did not know what was required.
- Can the Eval. / report be more storytelling in a variety of ways?
- Approaching evaluation based on what's good for the community. Don't obsess over the numbers. Be able to shift to react to those needs.
- Enjoyed the eval. Being shown, felt the visual made sense and the info was being used.
- Liked combining reporting and new grant application.
- Needed more notice on the reporting requirements, more transparency.
- 1 ON 1 sessions worked well.
- Questions were very dense, need things like call in sessions, maybe webinar recorded to settle info.
- Didn't know what we were expected to collect until questions came out.
- Wish they had reporting chart in advance.
- Need a question that asks; 'What else have you done that is relevant and you think we need to know?'
- Innovative ideas, video.
- COO come to events build relationship.
- Looking at individual capacity and adapting to that.
- Took a lot of time, but info was only meant to go one way, to funder.
- Can we do a process that benefits the grantee and funder?
- Define terms used in report, clarity is needed.
- Liked being able to identify what/how we influenced policy.
- But did not feel they had the opportunity of how we shifted power dynamics, can we create that question together?
- Who gets to define what policy change means?
- Supporting other communities in their efforts, outreach, collective support, collective power building, defending yourself from policies that have been created (specific group). These ALL are policy work.
- Eval. questions should be Co-created with transparency of what is required from county from COO, then from COO from grantees.
- Survey/report was fairly easy.
- Survey monkey was hard to use. Had to do a lot of copy and pasting because of the branching logic used.
- Would like to reflect on the goals of the original grant application.
- 1on1 was very helpful.
- Why do this for policy change work? (BEAN COUNTING?)
- Need more transparency of expectations process.
- Questions were repetitive why? If needed, need explanation.
- Innovative evaluation and reporting.
- Should also be something that can also go back to the community.
COO should also be thinking and assisting how did grantees report back to community
Questions did not ask what the systematic barriers that grantees experienced in implementing projects
Building collective community power and trust to understand advocate and more power, hard to incorporate this in evaluation questions.
Survey monkey was difficult, it assumes capacity to sit and do it without interruptions
Was hard because was unsure what we were being measured on
Get evaluation earlier
1ON1 was critical and needed
Innovative evaluation, video, ways that really show what is important and what grantee achieved
Questions like: when you started what did success look like? And how did that change and stay the same?
“ I trust you to do the work.” What does an evaluation look like that is rooted in trust?
Reporting tool could have multiple uses, to be used by grantees also fact sheets, infographics
Could there be an evaluation/reporting for Community of practice? To share challenges/solutions. To help grantees map and respond to what they are seeing/experiencing.
For multiyear. Need to know the milestones we are expected to achieve?
Report out that allows for funders to learn
Orientation with COO to ensure we know what to expect.

Conversation 3: Connecting to Funders

Flow chart that describes roles at the outset
The model needs clarity to ok orientation
Multi-cohorts with different focus (systems and policy/place based)
Funding types/different activities -unclear how to report
Need clarity on who needs representation in the room
How can we safely expose our weakness and what types of relationships are we building?
Unity VS. Competition
How do we relate to funders, we need a training to start the work, what are we committing to?
Streamlined roles please
Knowing who to contact -project officer. We need one point contact
General lack of clarity about who is who and what our connected work can look like.
Benefits for funders to have a direct connection to community
Deeper understanding for the funders making connections between individuals and our places.
HUMANITY
How are they getting their money and who is being sacrificed?
Need clarity of expectations: 1 pager states clearly the expectations for grantees and funders.
Accessibility needs improvement
We need less restrictions
COO reporting is not too complicated
● Funders need a longer attention span
● We need to think of our work a “Market Worthy”
● Systems change efforts take longer than 1 year. We can't do it for the money they give.
● 20-year commitment: 5-8 years knowledge gathering, solidarity needs to be at the center of this work.
● Solidarity VS. Competition
● Practical changes: Funders themselves 1: listen to community, 2: less concerned with innovation 3: know who you are
● We don't want or need a close relationship to our funders
● No one size fits ALL, learn how we do our work, shift your language to meet us where we are, clarity on renewal VS. extension
● COOs role is valuable because they can,
● Evaluation piece was not that valuable for the community, couldn't really use it.

2020
● Build out a clearer role and purpose for the evaluation. That document should be digestible for existing communication channels.
● What we are being evaluated could be clearer
● If you don't have people from the community reading the report, then it becomes that much harder to prioritize it.

Helpful activities for 2020
● Report talk back with PO.
● Access leads to understanding
● context/greater understanding
● Meet together in person KEY
● Partner show case, COO should first receive training from CBOs about who we are and what we accomplish.
● The communities are the content experts! The COO is the content learners

ROLES: FUNDERS
● Set agenda
● Define how that takes place
● Accountability should shift
● Seeing that the money is used in certain way

ROLES: CBOs
● Activities
● Framework alignment
● Layout what we want to do and how to make that feasible (this leads to mission drift)

2020 Grant Cycle
● We need transparency
● What are they going to evaluate us on? CBOs need to establish these metrics case by case
● Shift to recognize community centeredness as a huge benefit
● Impact model takes into consideration systems that work against our mission and incorporate that into evaluation.
● Connection is partnership that's why we want more direct relationship. We need more than a superficial relationship. Connection creates sustainability
● Leadership development and building community voice and integrate that into our service.
Participatory democracy-embedded within service programs

- Draw upon the expertise and lived experience within the community to inform our service design.

2020 grant

- Submit written proposal (brief) and come in for a meeting (panel of decision makers) to explain what you want to do. (idea)
- Will help build real relationship accountability

Conversation 4: Solidarity

- Bring the community into the process, panel for review, peer grant review, what deeper levels
- Freedom of flexible funding to reflect community input and focus directed or redirected, mechanisms for shift
- Post grant cycle feedback forum to debrief with COO and governance
- Roles that extend through cycles
- Simplify process, roles, partners, streams
- Clarifying accountability, “who answers what?”
- Access to gov. Board unfiltered
- Honor work already being done, knowledge, strategy isn't handed over to funders
- Investigate resource generation, social justice fund, generative somatics
- Revision, define together what solidarity means and operates together
- Space to acknowledge together distinct community experience
- Not think in scarcity frame work, always ok to ask for more not just own needs (challenge)
- Space to come together and strategize before speaking to people in power
- What is the most critical need?
- Shared humanity
- Organizational chart at the beginning
- Community reps. In the room at the table. Neutral space
- Other ways to show data: engage with different modes, data can have real inequities due to how its gathered and managed
- Define together about what value is measured. At the beginning
- Define progress
- Process (deliverables) need to be clear, milestones, check cutting
- Rethink definitions of systems and policy change
- What counts? As strategies or priorities
- Biggest impact: what community buys into most
- Support with actual COO resources, political, human, financial, capital
- Flexible in strategies to be responsive to where communities are at.
- Social justice fund model
- Community driven
- Build relationships, connection between funders and communities
- Accommodate for familiarity with laws and policy
- Development phase for immigrant and refugee's leadership development
- Who is doing the training support their own agenda?
CONVERSATION 5: SMALLER AND GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS

- System and policy definition not the way we think of S and P, change
- Services, community connection, doing system policy change different way
- Learning from folks being impacted
- Communities can choose to delegate a representative because the impacted parties aren't able to be at the table
- All at the table making decisions
- Funding for orgs. Mission
- Discernment between who's invited to the table
- Funders paying people from impacted communities
- Authenticity neutral true equality table meetings
- Wealth of knowledge
- People volunteering using valuable resources, time, out of pocket costs,
- Connection to conversation about sustainability
- Intensive stress on community doing the work especially small orgs.
- Floor wage
- Sustainable average wage
- Accessibility for ALL people
- Service oriented
- Policy orgs., redefine policy and systems
- SF code switching VS. service-based thinking about policy
- Look to honor the work and successes of neighbor to neighbor
- Work size caucus
- Continuing equitable backbone funding
- SF taking policy stance while funding grass roots orgs
- What's the purpose of foundation having policy agenda?
- Partnering with other organizations that have same scope of work
  - Built into grants language around partnerships
  - Funding resources in projects
  - Shared data, align outcomes
  - Flexible funding
- Smaller organizations impacted negatively by re-imbursement model
- Project VS. capacity, there is a capacity gray area (between capacity and project size grants)
- More sub-contracting (smaller orgs want the power and option within their grant to subcontract some of their work to other orgs that have more person power. Within the same scope of work)
- Pro partnerships
- The system is not set up for partnerships
- Small orgs partnerships using grant money?
- Power dynamics
- Ground work recognition
- Recognition for work, contributions and longevity
- Equitable grant funding
- Not being forced to grow
- Empowering small organizations to hold their own
• Equity VS Equality
• Smaller orgs should get more funding and larger grants
• Easier reporting
• Amount of experience of folks when showing up
• Smaller orgs. Need more money for their work
• Having resources to build community connections for smaller orgs
• More opportunities for capacity orgs, guided workshop, mentor, options.
• Training partnerships between small orgs with larger orgs.
• Paid person to support smaller and newer orgs. With policy work knowledge
• Intentional peer learning and connecting
• The grant process serves the foundation and funders
• Smaller orgs have more issues with larger orgs. Getting more funding and therefore pulling further ahead and taking smaller orgs. Work.
• Speaking with people who have experienced it
• Application process open to folks' voices( writing standards) COO accepting and funding.
• Small orgs. Feel more pressure to accomplish more than they need to.
• Big scope work can lead to losing sight of actual capacity for ourselves.
• Opportunities funded by the COO for small orgs to take part in policy change trainings
• Small orgs. Need more admin support
• Maybe mentor guidance in the beginning for smaller orgs. Or newer orgs.
• Capacity level grants should be with capacity building and work
• Lots of pressure to achieve outcome from grant expectations
• Small orgs have more burnout and fatigue
• When working towards the grant expectations small orgs can forget to build staff up to be able to have the capacity for policy change work
• More clarity around capacity grants
• Strategic solidarity
• What will the next cohort session scope be? Strategies? To address what we have already created?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POWER</th>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>PEOPLE + PLACE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COO is building a movement of community power.</td>
<td>COO is a model for equity, community solutions and community power.</td>
<td>Community leaders influence systems and policies that are more equitable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen the network of community leaders, across COO communities</td>
<td>Anchor institutions and community have shared power in decision making</td>
<td>Our work is ensuring that people are healthier and are prospering in their community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase collaboration in priority public investment areas where greatest disparities exist</td>
<td>Increased use of participatory evaluation and ownership by communities of their own data (&quot;data sovereignty&quot;)</td>
<td>Increase in community leaders who are influencing and making policy decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehensive, community development approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community ownership and wealth building opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase in public contracting opportunities for community organizations / businesses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>