

02.07.2024 Meeting Notes:

- Timestamp: 6:05PM – PM calls meeting to order and reviews preliminary agenda. HA calls roll. Attendance is as follows:
 - Meg Evans
 - Jasmene Miranda
 - Pecolia Manigo
 - Jorge Vela
 - Hassan Ahmed
 - Selina Xue
 - Jessica Arline
 - (Anokhi Mehta – Excused)
- PM asks for motion to adopt Agenda. ME motions, JV seconds the motion. Motion passes with no nays.
- Timestamp: 6:07PM – PM asks Commission to review previous meeting minutes. ME motions to approve meeting minutes for 1/17/2024 meeting, JA seconds. Motion passes with no nays.
- Timestamp: 6:09PM – PM opens to public forum. No members of the public requested time to speak (three members of the public were present, see below).
- Timestamp: 6:10PM – HA opens floor to OYC presentation by Sara Tiras. Slides attached. Presentation is related to voting item to fund Youth Participatory Action Research project (YPAR) and youth stipends.
- Timestamp: 6:27PM – ST opens presentation to questions. JV asks to clarify Fiscal years included in vote and memo. RL responds that the memo for funding covers FY23-24 and FY24-25 and explains that some of the project is funded via an award from former Mayor Libby Schaaf (\$100,000 towards YPAR). This vote would also authorize stipends to youth participating in YPAR, OYC and other research or commission activities.
- Timestamp: 6:36PM – JM motions to pass the OYC budget item. JV seconds the motion. The motion passes without nays.
- Timestamp: 6:37PM – HA and RL initiate conversation around subcommittees and planning processes. RL states that she is awaiting legal feedback on subcommittee planning and noticing, including the levels of formality of the subcommittees and if the second meeting of the month could focus on that work, absent other needs. PM and JV are asked for input due to past experience and expertise. (See attached document at the end of these notes for the transcribed document.)
 - PM notes that of the three noted subcommittees (strategic planning, evaluation, and RFP), strategic planning is likely a higher priority over evaluations, pending charter confirmation. RL highlights two potential evaluators from the December 2022 RFQ process. In a previous cycle, the POC also established a list of topics to evaluate, as set by the POC, the public, and Council. The evaluation subcommittee will predominately be responsible for managing the evaluator's process, based on previous works. A goal of April 2024 was set to send out an evaluation survey to programs.

- RL lays out an ideal plan for evaluation, clarifying the depth of our ability to evaluate. RL also notes that FY22-23 will be extremely challenging to evaluate due to the point in time. PM and RL brainstorm about ways to evaluate FY22-23, including seeking internal program evaluations and data from Cityspan. PM states that this subcommittee's priority should be to select an evaluation partner and circulate a previous version of the OFCY survey to organizations by April 2024. RL highlights the robust nature of program data across agencies and CBOs and suggests that the evaluation subcommittee work with the evaluator to leverage that. PM names not to shame, but to highlight, that thus far, the current strategic plan has not undergone evaluation. JV and ME volunteer to staff the Evaluations Subcommittee.
- RL reminds the Commission that DRE will return during the month of March to discuss the race and equity impact assessment process for evaluations and strategic planning.
- Discussion moves onto the Strategic Planning Subcommittee, including the community needs assessment, the impact of the evaluations on the work of this subcommittee and the youth involvement in the participatory research projects by OYC. JA shares relevant subject matter expertise in community needs assessment. PM shared the historical role of strategic plan subcommittee, including project management and close collaboration with the Children and Youth Services Director (RL).
- RFP timeline of Summer 2025 deadline for award announcements. Rules surrounding readers are discussed:
 - POC and Staff cannot serve as readers
 - Readers will need to be recruited (do not necessarily need to be Oakland residents)
 - Readers cannot be grantees
 - PM shares out the timeline from previous years, as well as historical context of challenges, including new challenge of equity focus.
 - Readers are defined as volunteers/individuals who will read grant applications and score proposals based on rubric, as well as provide questions based on applications.
- JM asks about reader vetting process. RL states that one is not established but will be created. JM volunteers to collaborate on process. JA reminds of other SMEs in Darlene Flynn and other members of DRE team.
- PM shares historical context of OFCY RFP process. JA poses standardized rubric and pre- application webinars to mitigate historical reactions during the upcoming process. The commission determines that this will be incorporated into the 2025-2028 RFP. PM noted that part of the difficulty during the previous RFP process was that programs that had traditionally been funded were not, based on the new standards, and that programs struggled with the equity focus requirement. Commission members also discuss how updated geographic indicators also impacted program funding decisions, especially with the goal of systems change.
- PM and POC members remind public that OFCY's grants are a fraction of the General-Purpose Fund, which is determined by our tax revenue. Going out to eat and spending dollars in Oakland

are ways to ensure that OFCY can provide larger grants to CBOs serving Oakland's youth.

- Timestamp: 7:51PM – PM and RL highlight that POC is missing Adult members from D2, D6 and D7; and Youth members from D3, D5, D6, and D7. The Mayor also has one seat to appoint. Members of the public from those districts are encouraged to apply for the POC to help shape this work.
- Timestamp: 7:55PM – HA adjourns the meeting.

