

## Metro | *Meeting minutes*

Meeting: Equity Strategy Advisory Committee  
Date: Monday, April 18, 2016  
Time: 3 to 5 p.m.  
Place: Metro Regional Center | 600 NE Grand Ave., Portland, OR 97232 |  
Conference Rooms 370 A&B

---

### **Attendees**

Equity Strategy Advisory Committee: Carl Talton, Rey España, Phil Wu, Julia Meier, Andrew Singelakis, Betty Dominguez, Irene Konev, Desiree Williams-Rajee, Janet LaBar (via phone)

Absent: Kirsten Kilchenstein, Pam Treece, Alejandro Vidales, Camilo Sánchez, Israel Johnson, Amanda Whalen

Metro: Scott Robinson, Juan Carlos Ocaña-Chú, Scotty Ellis, Patty Unfred

### **Welcome and Agenda Review**

Carl Talton, ESAC Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

### **Approval of Minutes**

The minutes from the two previous ESAC meetings needed to be approved:

- Minutes from Feb. 22, 2016 meeting: Betty Dominguez moved to approve the minutes, and Phil Wu seconded. The minutes were approved by all present members.
- Minutes from Apr. 6, 2016 meeting: Desiree Williams-Rajee moved to approve the minutes, and Phil Wu seconded. The minutes were approved by all present members, except Ben Duncan, who abstained.

### **Assignment of Strategic Plan sections review for completion and inclusion in the final draft**

Juan Carlos Ocaña-Chú, Equity Strategy Program Manager, reviewed the timeline and process to review and sign off on sections of the plan that are completed. Staff is suggesting to divide the ESAC members in four teams who will meet or share information online to provide recommendations. Juan Carlos explained the sections for the four teams to review, which should be roughly the same number of pages for each team. A sign-up sheet was provided, and it will be sent to those absent.

Staff is still exploring how to strengthen intersectionality language. Staff is working with Dr. Roberta Hunte from PSU and Keith Jones, an consultant expert on disability rights, to review the current language and get suggestions for how to enhance it.

The committee asked a question about budget process as it relates to the adoption of the Strategic Plan. Some items included in the plan are already budgeted for Fiscal Year 2016-17 and ready to begin implementation. Other items that will require additional resources

## Metro | Meeting minutes

will go back to Metro Council as part of a budget amendment after adoption of the Strategic Plan.

Rey España suggested to include existing ESAC members in the conversation about budget requests, since ESAC will sunset after the Strategic Plan is adopted. Ben Duncan asked if there is any analysis being done on current budget, either when adding new program areas or shifting existing resources. Irene Konev mentioned that, at the City of Portland, for every budget item staff has to answer questions about how it relates to racial equity; and each item is reviewed by the Office of Equity and Human Rights. Desiree Williams-Rajee remarked that a budget tool is only as good as the values of the organization because it can be used as just a justification tool or used to change investments. Carl suggested that staff consider using a budget tool and information developed by the Community Investment Initiative's Equity Committee.

### **Review and discussion of the implementation and evaluation framework for the Strategic Plan**

Juan Carlos explained the staff developed and refined the implementation and evaluation framework for the Strategic Plan. The evaluation aspect needs to include significant community participation. The goal is to make the process realistic and not cumbersome; simple, but effective.

Scotty Ellis, Equity Program Analyst, explained the implementation/evaluation draft process graphic. The graphic shows teams identified for setting goal evaluation measures, and teams having the authority to implement actions. There is emphasis in utilizing existing bodies for the implementation/evaluation work. The graphic contained several steps:

Step 1A – The goal evaluation team establishes metrics for each goal. Community members, perhaps some from the recommended committee that would succeed ESAC, will have expertise in each of the five goal areas. The metrics will be established within the first six months. This will be an iterative process: it will continue to evaluate actions and future adjustments.

Step 1B – The DEI steering committee, comprised mostly by SLT members, will be repurposed to play a strategic role in determining and refining actions, and assigning their implementation to specific teams and groups.

Step 2 – Each implementation team will have the authority to implement the assigned actions. Policy level actions will go to DEI Steering Committee. Prior to beginning implementation, a disparities assessment will be conducted to determine who will be impacted by action. If action did not support all communities, the implementation team will recommend steps to address needs of other communities.

Step 3 – After an action has been implemented for a 2-3 years, the members of the goal evaluation team (from Step 1) will populate the evaluation review teams to conduct the evaluation of the actions implemented.

## Metro | *Meeting minutes*

Step 4 – Assess and recommend adjustments and improvements to the implemented actions.

Carl commented that this is similar to process developed by the Community Investment Initiative. Rey mentioned that the process and graphic are not easy to understand, and it will be important to keep it simple for the community to understand and participate. Also, one year to develop metrics seems too long. It is also hard to reconcile this process with the expectation that departments develop specific action plans. When will measurement actually happen? It is not clear who decides.

Scotty responded that the departments will use metrics created by the goal evaluation team to develop their department-specific plans. Juan Carlos added that the development of action plans will happen concurrently with the goal evaluation metrics. Many actions are already planned and will start right away. And in that case, the metrics will be applied after implementation has begun. Rey responded that the departments will need to use measures to align their plans with the budget. Scotty indicated that there is no existing data to evaluate these specific goals from a racial equity perspective. It is important to use a thoughtful process to set up the foundation to measure success.

Andrew Singelakis asked if Metro has the resources to complete this process. What are the FTE and dollar costs of this plan? Staff have put together an estimate of both items. Julia had additional questions about the goal evaluation team. Scotty specified that the team will develop metrics to measure goals and objectives, but not action items.

Desiree mentioned that there is a language challenge: evaluation and metrics happen at different scales. The City of Portland is using success indicators for evaluation metrics. How do you also measure success at action level? Scotty responded that this model is looking at the success indicator level. Julia asked if we have not already established those.

Scott Robinson, Metro Deputy Chief Operating Officer, asked the committee to consider Goal A: what does success look like at this goal level? Desiree mentioned that the challenge is to move away from transactional to transformational change. Phil added that the measure of success is not a summation of action measures.

Juan Carlos explained that ultimately staff wants to move from evaluating outputs and outcomes to evaluating impact on people. Developing measurements and methodologies will take time. If we only evaluated at the action items level, we would be missing the big picture.

Phil mentioned that the graphic should lay out transformational goals. Irene asked if Metro staff are encouraged to become engaged in this effort. If staff do not own this plan, it will not work. Patty Unfred, Metro DEI Program Director, indicated that the implementation proposal offers opportunities to engage more staff.

Scott indicated that the equity strategy arose from desire to measure the six desired regional outcomes. The Framework Report, prepared by the six community-based

## Metro | *Meeting minutes*

organizations, was intended to establish a baseline. We consistently struggle to establish success measures, as opposed to programmatic outcomes. We are still seeking to establish transformational measures. Can we be more impactful by being more strategic? And how do we measure that?

Julia Meier asked if the next version of ESAC could be the body to develop transformational measures. Juan Carlos mentioned that we need to revise the graphic to show the transformational aspects of this process. Phil suggested to review the Framework Report and look for language around transformational measurement, which should happen in the goal evaluation team.

Desiree asked staff what they want people to understand when they look at the graphic. She suggested to make sure staff communicate the logic model well.

Rey emphasized that the community wants to see accountability for Metro to take action. Desiree mentioned that changes in the behavior of staff and consistency in applying the equity lens are important outcomes. Show what staff are doing differently in decision-making and prioritizing. Ben and Julia asked for Metro to take action now, and report back to community as soon as possible.

Ben also mentioned that Metro will be way ahead of other jurisdictions in terms of the level of depth and detail included in the Strategic Plan. Janet LaBar acknowledged that this was a great conversation, and similar to the challenges that her organization, Greater Portland, Inc., has faced in the development of the GPI 2020 Plan.

### **Agreement on the process to create recommendations on the Strategic Plan from ESAC to the COO and scheduling next steps**

Juan Carlos asked ESAC members to volunteers for working with Metro staff to develop the recommendation memo from ESAC to the Metro COO, regarding the Strategic Plan. Rey, Ben, Desiree and Janet volunteered. Juan Carlos will follow up with them to set up a process to create the draft recommendations memo, which will be then reviewed and presented to ESAC for approval at the May 16 meeting.

Metro staff left at 4:55 p.m. so ESAC could have its staff-less meeting time.

The ESAC meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

The next regular ESAC meeting will take place on May 16, 2016.

Meeting minutes prepared by Patty Unfred and Juan Carlos Ocaña-Chú