ATTENDEES:
Richard Roche, Jeff Dennerline, Jacquenette McIntire, Rana DeBey, Elisabeth Perez Cinthia Diaz Calvo.

Welcome:
Roche welcomed everyone for being here to discuss about the grant’s eligibility criteria, equity indicators, pre application draft and final app and the program updates. DeBey thanked all for making the time to review the documents and take part in this meeting. She introduced herself.

AGENDA:

- Review proposed revisions to definitions of stated public benefit areas for Community Technology Grant Program

  DeBey went over the changes in Eligibility Criteria document and explained the changes. Dennerline asks if we are limiting ourselves as using the word video instead of media. Is vcr video? These changes are to take us to the end of this cycle which can be revised in the future. The wording could be “production and video related”. Jacquenette suggests a regular cycle to review the language and purpose to apply to the needs and changes in society. Jacquenette asked about the barriers and if we captured all categories, the answer was yes.

  DeBey said staff reached out to legal counsel to see about these changes and the original document doesn’t include. Legal council was unsure there was a need for a resolution. If this committee needed to formalize it and take it to the MHCRC for formal resolution it would need to be reviewed by jurisdictions and then go to council. The only concern or risk about this is if we have a candidate that is willing to challenge the outcome and want to prove that they would qualify before but not after the changes. Jeff said the risks are slim and unlikely since the new changes are more inclusive.

- Review proposed equity indicators

- Brief Q&A regarding pre-application and application revisions

  DeBey said the purpose of a pre-application is to reduce the amount of work from the applicant and this is very equitable already.

  DeBey suggests removing the evaluation plan from the pre application process. Jeff had comments about the pre application – he suggests request for applicants to be more concise about the narrative. Jeff suggests 500 characters. Jacquenette agrees with jeff on limiting the characters so the applicant refines their message and focus.
It has been clear that if an application is accepted there is no guarantee. Jacquenette asked if in the past, the applications have identified other source of funding, can this be added. On the final application, DeBey confirmed that applicants are asked to identify partners. Elevate Oregon will be different from other bigger non-profits.

There have been discussions with Open Signal and Metro East about being coaches/mentors to the community to teach how to make great production videos. The media orgs could say they don’t have capacity and we can give them the money to hire someone to send and teach others.

Application:

DeBey went over the final application and significant changes.

1. Is partner list and letters – this creates barrier. What is now asked to list their partners and say if they are confirmed or not and ask for their contact information for staff to confirm that. We ask applicants to list their main partners. Most apps have 2-4 partners. There is no anticipated problem with this.
2. An executive summary – this takes a lot of support and staff time to coach each applicant struggling with this section.
3. Evaluation criteria will shift to reflect what was discussed today. DeBey’s goal is to open the application period in mid-October.

Dennerline asked DeBey to consider that usually the commissioners get reading materials 3 days in advance. Streamlining the timeline is highly appreciated.

DeBey welcomes input on the process and work.

• Community Media Center Compliance Input

DeBey asked how often they would like an update from the community media centers. Perez asked, more than frequency, what would commissioners like to know from community media centers. McIntire agrees and suggests that maybe commissioners can write up an outline with questions they want to know. Dennerline likes having both EDs in the same meeting. He also would like to know what they did with the $50,000 they got earlier this year. DeBey agrees that the ask is appropriate. Dennerline asked what they present at city council. Perez says they do a presentation and the highlights of the year past, they keep it high level and provide overview and impacts of their biggest programs. Perez also mentioned that a standardized format that is 15 minutes or less and if it’s possible in a video! Roche agrees. Jacquenette suggests 4-5 things in the format that we always want to know.

7 different films at different stages – Dennerline would like to know what happened to that. $200,000 for the Black Films Initiative?

• Additional Comments

DeBey mentions that this committee might want to meet again to talk about scope of work for that project.
At sept 21 Perez will share changes in operations that we are implementing. Dennerline suggests meeting again in person at Edgefield. They have plenty of space to meet.