

Good afternoon, or good evening, depending on which part of the world you are in.

We are expecting a large number of participants this morning so I'm just waiting one second until we get a critical mass of people in the room.

And we will go ahead and get started.

So welcome again everybody and thank you for joining us for today's peer to peer webinar for racial equity.

My name is Talia Gibas, I am a program officer with carrot, the agency that is supporting lever for change, and the WK Kellogg Foundation for this challenge.

This webinar is being recorded and a link to the recording will be posted in the forums, as well as on a peer review resource page that we are developing and adding to the racial equity websites, we will share the URL of that page with you in the coming days.

I want to begin by saying congratulations to all of you. In order to enter this next phase of racial equity, you had to submit a completed eligible proposal that seeks to advance racial equity in our world.

And now you are part of a broader cohort of organizations, large and small from around the world that are united in the value of addressing and apparent repairing racial inequities.

Having taken a look at the number of number of your submissions I can attest to the great range of ideas that have been captured throughout this process and it is truly inspiring.

So we hope that you too will be inspired by participating in this next step. It's no small feat to have taken the time and the care to complete a submission, and thank you again so much for participating.

wanted to let you know how we have allocated our next hour together. First, I will begin with a broad overview of the peer review process, including the rationale behind it and how it fits into the bigger picture of this challenge.

Then, Jenna Schornack of lever for change will provide additional guidance regarding the context of the proposals you'll be reviewing and some key things to keep in mind as you complete your reviews.

She will also share a brief video on implicit bias, which will be very important for you to remain aware of as you go through this process.

Then my colleague, Ethan Matthews will provide a technical demonstration of the platform you will use to complete your reviews, and then we'll open things up for your questions.

So please type your questions into the q amp a tab and we'll answer as many as we can. We'll also be typing responses to your questions throughout our time together.

Please note, if you are joining us via YouTube, you will not have the option to ask questions live, but please email us at [questions@racial equity dot org](mailto:questions@racialequity.org).

If you have outstanding questions after the session.

Okay, so now I will provide a quick overview of how peer to peer review fits into the broader context of racial equity . We all know that too many people's futures are bound by the color of their skin or their family circumstances, or the limits of

opportunity because of systemic inequities in our communities.

As you know, racial equity is a call to answer that challenge. And you all did that by completing and submitting a proposal.

We then completed the first step of review and that is known as Administrative Review.

In order to confirm that your proposals met the eligibility criteria and are broadly aligned with the WK Kellogg Foundation's goals for this challenge so congratulations again for having passed administrative review.

This next step is for all eligible applicants to read and provide feedback on five other submissions using the scoring rubric peer review

is a unique feature of this challenge that aligns with a broader goal of ensuring that the process of applying to racial equity has value to all. We know this is an additional request of your time, and it ensures a number of things. Number one, it ensures that all participants receive feedback on their ideas from diverse perspectives from people who are working towards a similar vision.

Number two, it also exposes each participant to five other organizations who are working to achieve the same goal. We know that participants in past rounds of peer review have gone on to reach out to each other as peer review is complete and after the challenge and found ways to collaborate.

Number three, given the very broad scope of this challenge, it allows participants to learn about different efforts to address racial equity in different contexts.

This challenge has garnered participation from more than countries around the world, which is really an invaluable opportunity for exchange and learning.

So here's how peer to peer works you each have been assigned five other applications, which you will see when you log into the scoring into the platform.

And those assignments were made randomly.

In the event that you have a conflict of interest with one of the applications you were assigned, please email questions at racial equity dot org with the applicant name and number as soon as possible and we will replace that conflicts with a new

application for you to review between now and the peer review deadline, which is Monday, Aprils at pm. Eastern time. you will read and provide feedback on those submissions.

We have given you several weeks to complete them in order to allow you adequate time to review each proposal and full and provide thoughtful feedback.

Now we've already received a number of questions about who should be completing these reviews so I wanted to clarify that. We know that many of you applied as teams.

So, in order to complete this process you have a few options.

The preferred option is to select one team member who has a deep understanding of an experience with your proposed solution, and who can land on the ground perspective and providing feedback.

And this option that person will complete all of the assigned reviews. And to do that, this individual will need the same login credentials, who that were used to submit your application.

However, depending on your team the situation or preferences we understand that it might not be feasible for one person to complete all the reviews, or you may simply prefer to review them as a team, and that is fine.

You will need to coordinate, because the system will not allow multiple logins in the same registration simultaneously. So you'll need to make sure that only one person is logged in at a time.

You will also need to review the scores and comments before you submit for consistency, really the key thing is that we want you to keep in mind with this is that the person or people completing the reviews should have an understanding of your own proposed

solution should have an interest in learning about the ideas, put forth by others, and should also have the capacity to complete the reviews thoroughly.

As with the application, the reviews must be completed in English.

So once you've completed your five required reviews, you will see additional reviews pop up into your queue. So, this can cause some confusion so I want to try to be as clear as I can, those additional reviews that pop up after the first five are optional before Monday, April 26th.

If time allows. We encourage you and you are welcome to complete those optional reviews. What completing these optional reviews does is it helps to reduce the number of reviews that we might need to reassign.

On April, , but again it is not required only the first five are required. Between now and April .

Once that deadline has passed on Monday, April , at pm. Eastern time. We will notify you via email. If there are any additional required reviews that you will need to submit.

If there are required review additional reviews assigned to you, they will be due on Thursday April at pm. Eastern time. You will also be notified if there are no additional reviews assigned to you at that time.

Please note that if you do not meet that April deadline to complete the five required initial reviews, or if you do not meet the April deadline to complete.

Additional reviews that may be assigned to you, your application will not be eligible to move forward to future phases of the challenge.

Once peer review is complete all scores will be normalized for fairness and to account for easier and tougher reviewers. There is a page on our website.

The level playing field that has a lot more detail on this normalization process so we encourage you to take a look at that.

In addition, the scores and feedbacks that you provide will be anonymously shared with your fellow applicants after peer review is complete. And we know from surveys of past challenges that the feedback is extremely helpful.

So please help us continue that trend by being thorough and constructive in your feedback, same way that you would hope that others see with comments that they give you, based on the rank order of submissions provided by peer reviews, a subset of applications

will move to the next phase of review which is the expert review panel, and that phase, your application will be reviewed and scored again by five expert reviewers, and you can see the full roster of expert reviewers on our websites.

So that's a quick overview of the process, and I'm now very happy to turn things over to Jenna sure knack of lever for change, who will provide some more guidance for things to keep in mind as you dive into this process.

Thank you. Talia Hi everyone, my name is Jenna Shornack, I am the awards director at lever for change. I am proud to say we are now on our the challenge I love her for change.

So we do have some feedback and learnings about peer review from applicants from all the other challenges and I would like to share more with you today.

I will offer some broad guidance on scoring specific to the racial equity challenge as well. But first, we would like to address implicit biases, our partners at Chicago beyond have created a short video about recognizing biases.

When reviewing applications. We will now hear from Liz Dozier to explain more patience. When it comes to making decisions around who to fund judges should bring their individual perspective with a decision I mean, that's a must.

But the question is, what of our own perspective as judges are we intending to bring, and that serves making a really good decision for investing in work with transformative impact versus what we are unconsciously bringing to the table that might actually cut against making a difference and a significant problem of our time. Let's dig in. Let me give you a few examples.

Beauty bias. This is one I'm sure we can all relate to. It's where we associate beauty with success like physical beauty but also in like writing styles spelling and grammar.

So as a judge, I might subconsciously react to how the first paragraph of an application is written and before I ever really reading through the entire application, make a judgment about how that applicant team might be able to execute or not execute.

I might end up for example giving higher scores for really excellent grammar in the English language, which, at the end of the day, might not be the best proxy for the ability to think and do differently.

For example, standard English language is really shaped by white dominant culture. And so if I'm prioritizing as a judge. Excellent Standard English language.

What does that say about my judgment, what does it say about really understanding our time, and how to bring about solutions. So, let me be very clear.

The point is not that a truly transformative application or a truly community led application will either have exquisite Standard English language, or patchy grammar.

The point is being aware of my assumptions. Being aware of my assumptions, connecting the beauty of an application with the impact and the durability of the actual work affinity bias.

When something reminds us of something we know and like we have a greater warm the greater connection we just pay more attention. For example, we can't understand certain ideas, because we can't relate to them in a cultural context.

So as a judge, I might subconsciously have an affinity for science based applications, or for large scale quantitative evidence. This is a judge may cause me to unintentionally disfavor applicants.

and harder to research populations. The question to ask ourselves as judges is simply this. When I'm assessing the impact of an application is my judgment drawing on how much it reminds me of some concept or some institution or some evidence elsewhere, that I like, or perhaps that I dislike.

This isn't about bad people who are bias and good people who are not biased. We all have bias neural science shows us it's built into our human brains.

We couldn't get out of bed in the morning and function if we were constantly re-evaluating every single decision, every day.

But we're actively trying to invest in worthless truly ambitious and important our biases and whether x investment looks like why investment we've seen before, could actually get in our way of making the right decision.

Let me share a few more types of bias to be aware of Halo bias. Here's the simple definition. It's when we identify one great thing and an application and let the Halo, the pure glow of that affect our opinions of everything else in that application,

it can work the opposite way as well. The Halo can actually be worn. For example, as a judge it might see that a particular member of applicant

team attended a certain school, and I might subconsciously conclude with the entire application is stronger and more feasible.

But the real question is whether the knowledge required to do the work is really learned in a classroom to better school set us up to do better work with particular populations.

Does a higher class of education, bring people together in ways necessary for transformative change to happen.

For example, typical education credentials are going to be less able to measure the act of bringing community together. There was no class out there that I know of at least that teaches about the dynamics in a particular community.

The best applicants we have a lot of formal education, or perhaps a little, but we have been trained to associate education credentials, with potential to succeed.

It's part of our bias, as a judge, I might see evidence from a certain University, and subconsciously conclude the application is more evidence based, but only certain types of work have access to university researchers only certain types of work connected data in big administrative databases and vulnerable populations are less likely to be fully counted in data sets, because of how the production of evidence actually works.

Confirmation bias. Now this is when we subconsciously look for evidence to back up our own opinions, these opinions may be coming from a subconscious desire to conform within the opinion of the group were a part of confirmation bias is also called my side bias, because it's a tendency for us as human beings to search out and favorite information that confirms my side. What I already believe to be true.

If you believe women are bad drivers and I see a bad driver who happens to be a woman. This backs up my completely archaic belief it's all women are bad drivers, as a judge, I might also believe a certain narrative about particular communities or populations, and I might subconsciously favor applications, find them to be more feasible, if they confirm my narrative and disfavor application that challenge it.

Contrast bias.

That's when we compare something we see in an application to another organization or context that we're familiar with subconsciously we're defining a comparison point that might not be appropriate.

So as a judge, I might subconsciously be evaluating the impact of smaller groups versus larger groups, I would be pitting one application led by multiple smaller organization against the ability of a larger institution to articulate its impact and entirely different contexts by pausing and bringing that implicit judgment into my conscious focus. I can evaluate whether the comparison is appropriate, whether I'm unintentionally judging things that look different than what I've seen before to be less feasible or less doable.

In the end, recognizing bias is all about noticing. It's about noticing how as a judge, we're evaluating applications, what's the back of our mind, it's so critical that we're deliberate and vigilant, to set aside our bias that we're able to truly see the impact that awaits.

Thanks everyone we will share a link to that video in the applicant portal and in follow up materials, watching this video is required before you start the peer review process.

So if there is a member of your team that will be doing peer reviews but it's not on this webinar, please make sure they have access to this video.

Now, some more about scoring. You have been randomly assigned your applications to review. However, we recognize you might not be a specialist on the specific area of each application you've been assigned.

Please remember this was an intentionally open challenge, and we received applications from all over the world, representing various types of organizations approaches and mindsets for thinking about this work.

We see this as an opportunity to learn from and explore other both solutions to an equitable future.

And as a reminder, by the term racial equity has specific connotations within the United States, in a global context, this challenge seeks to advance equity within hierarchies structures policies systems and practices of dehumanization to perpetuate disparities for racial and ethnic groups in a local context. We believe a racially equitable society is one in which neither race nor ethnicity determined opportunity and life outcomes.

It is a society we're all groups have the ability to participate prosper and reach their full potential.

Depending on the local conditions, named in the application you're reviewing barriers to that vision may be rooted and proceed racial differences and or oppression tied to cat, ethnicity, cast, or economic injustice.

of this challenge applications were required to be submitted in English, and we also ask that your reviews the requests are in English, we acknowledge and understand the barrier this places on those whom English is not their first language.

And we asked you to keep this in mind when reviewing your assigned applications.

English was chosen to provide a consistency across all entries and reduce the risk of translation error or misinterpreting an application. However, we know even within the English language, there are differences and terminology phrasing and perspective.

Next, we ask that you please be professional and kind of giving your feedback. Remember applicants are just like you and have given their best efforts.

So please be generous and constructive.

Applicants will receive your scores and comments. Although your name will not be attached. As I said earlier, we are now on our th challenge lever for change.

And we have observed that the norm and peer review its fellow applicants score honestly and provide constructive fair feedback. Further we survey all applicants after the competition.

And they also say they find their scores were overwhelmingly helpful and constructive. We ask that you help us keep this trend going as a participant in racial equity.

Also in that same line of thinking, feel free to also point out the strength of the application and additions areas of growth.

Keep in mind that the application had word count. So answers may be brief, budgets were meant to be overviews, and we also asked applicants to avoid using jargon.

As you dive into your views We urge you to pay close attention to the scoring rubric and criteria outlined on racial equity website. I will share some key considerations for each category now.

The first criteria is game changing some considerations for how to assess if a proposal is game changing could be, what is the overall impact of the solution proposed.

Please note there's no expectation that a proposed solution have global impact, but rather think about what the impact or shift is for the specific community system institution or group of people.

You might want to consider, while the impact of the solution be transformational or will it reinforce or continue the status quo.

We know systems can take many years to fully transform or rebuild the solution should be on a pathway towards transformational change an outcome should not be incremental.

And finally, does the solution reflect a deep understanding of current conditions and systems, and have the applicant identified key leverage points and changing those systems.

The next category is equitable.

We really want to emphasize that equity, does not mean the solution will benefit all types of people everywhere.

Some key questions ask are is the proposed is the proposal addressing the root causes of racialized outcome or is the solution, only tackling the impacts of racialized system and upholding the status quo is the impacted community part of decision making

and defining success is the project led by people with lived experience related to that solution.

And does the solution take an asset based approach our definition of asset based as it pertains to racial equity is a solution that is focused

on string solutions are defined and driven by the community and beneficiaries are valued for what they contribute

versus what they lack. And finally does the applicant the proposed solution embrace and reflect commitment to racial equity ratio healing community engagement and leadership.

The next category is bold, some considerations for this are does the solution feature ideas approaches structures or outcomes that are imaginative, or catalytic.

Please keep in mind, imaginative, does not necessarily mean inventing a new technology tool or brand new concepts, imaginative, or catalytic ideas could be something to do with how to maintain a sustainable organization for could be that testing or experimenting,

taking risks, a revolutionary new vision, or it can be a novel partnership or expands that expansion of tried and true ideas that catalyze better and bolder outcomes.

It does not need to be all of these things.

We are looking for outcomes are bold aspirational and can be sustained over time.

And finally, the last category is actionable.

We are calling for bold ideas, but we are also trying to understand if the ideas are attainable. This is where we want you to look at the plan. The team, the activities and ask yourself.

Does this make sense. Is this realistic.

We want to emphasize that early stage ideas and newly formed team can still score high on the actionable criteria experience can come in many forms, it could be lived experience, it could look like someone who has done this work for many years, or could

be someone who has skills from prior experiences that they're transferring to a new project project.

You may also consider if the team is thinking about strategic partnerships to fill any gaps or skills and capacities.

You might also be looking to see if applicant provides evidence that the solution will be successful. Again, we want to emphasize that we are asking applicants impacted community, how they define success.

And we also want to emphasize there could be all different types of evidence that can support the solution being successful.

These can be formal or informal studies observations and other indicators have changed, as defined by the community, oftentimes in grant making one type of evidence is preferred over others, and we encourage you to be open to all these various types of

evidence. Please also remember that each finalists will receive \$ million planning grant and many months of support for revising their plans and preparing to implement the solution.

One final point for each scoring criteria, we encourage you to assess the entire application. In other words, there's not one question or one section of the application that perfectly aligned to the floor, scoring criteria.

I will now hand it off to Ethan Matthews, and look forward to answering any questions you have, at the end of the webinar.

Thank you, Jenna, I'm going to go ahead and take this into the back end of the system where you guys have put your applications and and submitted.

Normally you'd be on the website here and click on login.

And this is a test environment so please now to look a little bit different than than what you've seen in your peer review but you'll click on peer review there.

And then I'm going to go here this is a queue of reviews. You know there's a video tutorial right here that you can go ahead and watch it's about two minutes or so, gives an overview of what I'm going through right now.

You can always email us questions at questions@racialequity2030.ORG, if you have any issues completing your reviews.

So there's two tabs here one is the open reviews and one is completed reviews. When you complete a review it will go to this tab, and you can edit that review up until the reviewing deadline.

So, if you need to get back in and change something or you have a second thought about something you can get back in there and edit before that initial peer review period deadline.

I'm going to go ahead here and open a new review completely full stop. I'm going to click Start review.

And once I'm in here. I'm going to have a registration form that I'm going to click on, and also the application form, exactly what you all submitted when you submitted your proposals, hold these open as you're going to use them as you go through the reviewing process.

Next time in the rubric and this is the same scoring rubric that we just visited with Jenna on the front front end at the website. But this version of it allows you to actually enter answers and score a proposal that has the four different traits along the top here in changing equitable bold and actionable.

And then you can move the slider to go ahead and particularly in and select your selection for this particular trade.

Once you've done that, you can go ahead and enter your feedback in the bottom, and remember that, you know, there's a minimum of words for feedback but please, you know be judicious and give as much feedback as you can per, per trade.

Once I'm done with that I can go ahead and click Next and it's going to take me to equitable.

I can go ahead and create my selection again and then leave feedback.

And I can hit next.

And this is constantly saving my collections as I go through. So, and now I'm on actionable, the final trade.

I'm going to hit next and this will take me to an overall impression score.

Go ahead and leave your overall impression for the overall proposal, and click next and then you get a summary screen and you can get back to any of the trades right here.

If you need to reduce something.

And note that you can click save an exit at any time, and you can, it'll say where you are in this particular review and you can get back to it.

So once I get to the end here I click save an exit.

And I just say complete.

And now that particular review is moved to the completed reviews tab.

So that's a good little short tutorial again you can do this one up here and it's video tutorial if you need to and please if you have any questions at all, email us at questions@racialequity2030.org.

I do want to mention too that if you have any kind of technical difficulties. One of the best things to do. If you're not already using it, it's the switch to Google Chrome.

The platform works best on Chrome, it will work on other web browsers.

Just fine but if you do have initial difficulties at all, you might consider switching to Chrome.

And with that, I'm going to hand it over back over to Talia and lover for change team. We're going to answer some questions.

Thank you so much, Ethan, very much appreciate it and now I'm pleased to introduce my colleague Jenny Adams, who will help get your questions answered.

Thank you. Talia and Hello everyone. We are now in the q&a portion of the webinar, I will read questions allowed and my colleagues will answer

verbally, we will get there as many as we can in the next half an hour or so, and we will go ahead and jump in.

First question.

There were several team members involved in developing our application, who all have deep understanding of an experience with our proposed solution.

Is it possible to assign more than one person to support with reviews? This is Talia. So it talked a little bit about this at the beginning but the preferred option is to have one person complete all reviews, but we completely recognize this is not always possible.

So if you do have several people completing, you will just need to do a few things. First and foremost, you need to coordinate your logins because the platform will only allow one person to be logged in at a time.

And then also, please review the Final Fours and feedback in aggregate before submitting for consistency.

Next question. Is it possible to know how many applications you received, and how many are moving forward to the next stage of peer review this agenda, I can take this one.

The number of applications that did not meet eligibility was quite small. So, we do not share the additional details on application numbers but as you might imagine, given the nature and relative openness of the challenge.

The response was quite robust.

So we hope you consider yourself in good company with many other peers working towards similar goals.

Next question. My team found WKKS, step by step evaluation guide, very helpful in putting together the proposal, should we be referring to it during peer review.

This is Talia. We're very happy that you found that resource helpful. However, it is not meant to be referred to during peer review. So please just focus your comments and feedback on the extent to which the

application meets the criteria in the scoring rubric, keeping in mind all of the considerations that Jenna mentioned earlier.

Next question. One of my assigned applications appears to be from an organization that is very small. A lot of the terms in the scoring rubric refer to transformational change.

How should I reconcile the bold terms of the scoring rubric, with the fact that this organization appears to only have two or three people, great question.

So organizations of all types and sizes were eligible to participate and racial equity, the scoring rubric is focused on boldness and potential for transformation within the proposed solution, not necessarily the organization organizations putting the idea forward. So if you feel like the idea itself is game changing bold etc Then please say so.

The actionable criteria gets more into the team's capacity to implement the solution. So hopefully the application makes the case that the team has the skills capacity plans knowledge or lived experience to implement the proposed strategy with a \$ million investment or talks about their plans for doing so.

If it does not make that case, or if you have questions about their overall plan you should take that into account in your score and feedback comments.

Remember that this proposal is not a fully fleshed out plan. So you should not expect all details to be fully explained.

However, you should get a broad sense of what is being proposed and why the team thinks they will work, but an organization size or relative youth, does not necessarily count against it.

Next question. How do you know people are not going to try and rig the system by giving low scores to other applications. Isn't there an incentive to score others harshly to try and get ahead.

This is Talia. No, there is not an incentive. This is an opportunity to provide respectful feedback to other people who are working toward a similar goal as you are.

So a few things here, as we mentioned previously, we know from surveys of past participants that the feedback they received from colleagues during

peer review is very helpful, and the norm is for all people to be participating in this process in the face and and really providing respectful and constructive feedback to others.

So, we ask that you continue that trend by being thoughtful and thorough. And also, as I mentioned earlier as a reminder all sports or are normalized.

So we have no evidence to show that people are purposely breaking the system to bring other scores down the norm is very much that applicants are generous and fair in that, in their scoring and again that normalization process helps to ensure that as well.

Next question. One of the proposals I have read focuses on a specific region that is fairly racially homogenous. It does not work with individuals of all races.

Does that mean I should score lower on the equitable criterion.

Know the equitable criterion about whether the proposal addresses the root causes of racialized outcomes, and an equitable systems within that specific context.

So depending on that context, not all races or ethnicities may be focused on in their solution. So equitable in this context means that the proposal compiles compellingly addresses the root causes of racialized outcomes and an equitable system.

It has an asset based approach and acknowledges the historical inequities that sets a path forward towards the future, and they've included impacted communities in decision making positions, and they're taking the lead and defining what success looks like. So all of this is laid out in the scoring range definitions on the rubric itself. I encourage you to to look at those key questions as you get the equitable score.

Next question. How much time do you calculate for one review.

This is Talia. So on average past surveys indicate that each review takes between minutes and one hour to complete sometimes a little bit more sometimes a little bit less.

So you should expect roughly to allocate between four and five hours total during the peer review period.

Next question. We, as applicants, don't appreciate as much as you the funder what you are truly looking for in a finalist, even though we have all reviewed the criteria.

If the applicant pool peers, get it wrong. Is there a corrective mechanism built into this approach.

Great question. A couple of points here so one is that an important part of this challenge is its openness and transparency about what the challenge sponsored with WK Kellogg Foundation is looking for.

This is why we share the scoring rubric and criteria, ahead of time. And it's the same rubric used by all the reviewers, and it does not change throughout the challenge.

It's also going back to the openness, part of this competition is that we are open to lots of different ideas and open to hearing your perspective on those ideas, so there's not one specific project, the type of projects that the WK Kellogg Foundation is looking for beyond what's provided on the website and through the scoring criteria.

However, we know that there is still some subjective is built into applying that criteria, which is why your proposal will be reviewed by at least five other applicants and your scores are normalized and the process that Talia just talked about.

And then there is another layer of review where top scoring proposals will go through later by a panel of expert reviewer is where the proposals will be reviewed again by at least five reviewers.

So we are hopeful that this multi-step process helps give us a lot of information about which proposals rise to the top.

Next question. Can you adjust your proposal in any way, if there are questions that needs to be clarified.

This is Talia, you are not able to adjust your proposal at this time.

However, if you do move on to further stages of a challenge underneath the finalists, you will have about eight months to revise and submit the more comprehensive proposal and bear in mind that you will have also received peer review feedback by that

point so you can take that into account. As you're making any necessary adjustments.

Next question. How many people or organizations are evaluating each proposal.

Each proposal will be reviewed by at least five reviewers. And then if your application is on to the expert review panel phase, then that proposal will then receive five additional reviews.

Next question. Is there a definition for conflict of interest.

Yes. So a conflict of interest would mean that you or your team members have an association with the proposed solution. There are pre existing relationships that render you unable to evaluate the proposal objectively.

So if you have a conflict of interest, please email questions at racial equity dot org and let us know the applicants name and number of the proposals that you have a conflict with and we will replace that with a new application for you to review it does help us if you let us know as soon as possible. So if you have not already logged in and taken a look at the applications that are in your queue please do that, and then reach out if anything needs to be swapped out.

Next question. Will we be assigned applications that share common features such as public populations or approaches.

No, the assignments are made randomly.

Next question. How will intellectual property, be protected as part of this process.

This is general so neither pure nor expert reviewers are bound by a nondisclosure or confidential confidentiality agreement and this process so all the information in your application will move through several rounds that review.

And we advise during the application process that you do not put any information in the application that you would not feel comfortable sharing in that manner.

Next question.

quotes the statement review scores and comments before submission for consistency and quote. Does this mean all team members would review each other's comments and scores.

So this is Talia so yes it can mean that other teams have also assigned one individual who's a member of that team to go through and take a look at the scores and comments together.

Either it's fine. Again, you're just looking to make sure that there's consistency between the reviews if you have different different people who have been participating.

Next question. How many team members need to log in to conduct the reviews. Can one member login and the rest of the team weigh in on the review instead of everyone logging in.

This is probably again. Yes, absolutely. So to reiterate the platform will only allow one login at a time.

So if you have one person completing overviews of your be working as a team. There can only be one login at a time. If you don't do that as a platform will actually take you out if you have more than one person often.

So, yes, absolutely you want one person to log in and.

And then weigh in on the reviews, or you can have different people walking in at different times.

You just can't have more than one person logged in at the same time.

Next question.

We aren't part of consortium, but our other members of our internal team allowed to review, or is it meant to be the project lead.

Yes, you are welcome to include members of your team but we I think our first preference is that one person, the lead, lead the process and submit their reviews but you are certainly allowed to include members of your team in the review process.

Next question is, is similar, can we engage members from the communities we are collaborating with global youth leaders, for example, to review the proposals as part of a team process.

That's a great idea. We really appreciate engaging, members of your community, or use leaders in your case, I think for the peer review process we prefer that you keep it within your team that submitted the application just because there's some standardized thinking and understanding about the challenge and the criteria and scoring rubric but we can certainly see a scenario where you share some of the great ideas that you found in peer review with with community or team members.

And we are hopeful that you engage them in the development of your proposal to.

Next question, clarifying question. So there are five required reviews, but there may be more that become required that would be assigned- So maybe tell you can walk through that process one more time.

Yes, no problem. I understand this can be a little bit confusing. So yes, between now and the April deadline you are required to submit five reviews.

Once you complete those five reviews you will see additional reviews pop into your queue, if you have the capacity, the interest, and the inclination to complete, more than five.

We welcome and encourage you to do that because that will help to cut down on the number of submissions that might need to be reassigned after the April deadline.

After the April deadline. If there are applications that have been reassigned to you that needed to be redistributed you will be notified via email, and then you will have until Thursday, the th at pm Eastern to complete them.

And we will also let you know if there are no additional assignments for you to complete, you will receive that notification, as well. That's really the key thing to keep in mind is you must complete five between now and April, and on April you will be notified in the event that there are more that you need to complete.

Next question. How many applications, go on to the expert panel is it dependent on the peer review, and if so, what are the criteria. Will we get the comments on our proposals regardless of whether we move forward or not.

I can take this one so yes, everyone will get if you participate in peer review, you will receive the comments from the your fellow applicants that reviewed your application, their names will not be part of those reviews but you will get the scores and all the comments at a later date.

In deciding how many applications, go on to back for review panel, we look at the scores, we look at the distribution of scores and where there is a natural cutoff point in the quality of applications.

And so, top scoring applications we do not have an exact number at this time, we really look at the distribution of scores will move on to the expert interview panel.

Next question on similar topic.

How does peer review factor into overall submission scoring the selection committee section of the website indicates considerations including rank from expert review panel, but does not mention the peer review process.

Great question. So the ranking from the peer review process, as I said before we look at the distribution of scores in the ranking, and that will determine.

As you move on to the expert review panel. The expert review panel. Do you not see your peer review score so everyone starts back even again. However, the selection committee will look at the top right scores from expert review panel and also take into

into account the peer review scores and ranking, and the commentary from and feedback from your peer reviews is really helpful in the selection committee consideration of finalize.

So all of that information is taken into account in the collection of finalists.

Next question is, in the course of reviewing another proposal, we find that another applicant would make an amazing partner, because their proposal is so aligned with ours.

Is there any way to ask WK Kellogg consider funding us jointly as an asking that WK Kellogg asked us for a joint proposal.

That's a great question. So a couple of things here. At this point, we will just be considering your proposal.

Odds written there's not an opportunity to address, and how you might be named a finalist. I think if you are named a finalist, one of the key strategic questions will be, we will be working with you on is if there are other partners that you should be joining forces with our people, you should be engaging in your book. And so that would be a really great opportunity to bring a partner that you discovered your peer review on board.

With all that said, we are hopeful that you might find a partner just generally to connect with and if that's the case, you should feel free to reach out to them directly or contact us let us know that you want to connect with them and we would be happy to provide some contact information so you can connect.

We thought in the past reports from applicants, discovered great partners doing similar work or something someone that they want to connect with and learn more from, and they do so we can get a lot of really great benefit of participating in this process.

Next question. Are we required or encouraged to touch base with organization whose proposals we are reviewing.

This is Talia. No, you are not in required or encouraged to reach out to the organization.

The intention is to really focus your review on the information that is provided on the application. So you should not be reaching out to the organization.

There is no need to visit their website, or click on any links that they may have a new or URLs that they might have provided to really be request is that you focus, the scores on the feedback, just on the information that is provided in the application.

Next question regarding reaching out to potential collaborators. Is there a certain amount of time that should pass before doing so is it appropriate to identify ourselves as a peer reviewer if the feedback is meant to be anonymous.

So this is Talia again, you definitely want to wait until after the peer review process is complete, and you can actually email us once that is, is over if you want to reach out and we can provide further guidance on how to do that.

So if you have folks that you want to reach out to just please wait until after peer review and then send us an email and we will be happy to direct you regarding next steps.

Next question, which aspects of the proposal are subjected to the peer review process.

So this is Talia again. So, almost the entire application that you submitted has moved on to peer review, so your remote remember on the application itself, there were specific fields that were marked as being visible to peer an expert reviewers and others that were marked as not visible.

The vast majority were marked as visible.

And so, again, the vast majority of the application is parts of the process including things like the video, and most of the narrative sections.

If you also add that if you are unsure of which, of which of those fields are not included in peer review you could go to the application page of the website and racial ethnic dot org, and you will see that each section has more appropriately.

We have about five minutes left in the webinars will do a couple more questions.

Will how we evaluate other projects impact our own application. So the quality of reviews of other applications impact whether one's own application moves to the next stage

for your reviews or independent of your received reviews and if you move on to the next stage of the challenge.

With the exception of completing the reviews so we ask that you fully complete all of your reviews with thorough and fair commentary and

scores. If you fail to do so you will not move on to the next stage of the challenge.

Next question. Do you recommend reading all five proposals first and then starting scoring, or to score. Each proposal without considering the other four.

I can take this one.

So we encourage you to read your five proposals and tour them independently of each other's sometimes comparing the proposals is an unfair.

proposals. So we really want you to apply the scoring rubric independently to each proposal. There are different approaches for going about doing your reviews and some people do read them all and then go back and score, but I think our key takeaway is that you should review them all independently of each other, and not in a competitive nature.

Next question. I know you can only be logged in on one screen, but is there a way to open the scoring in a new window so you can toggle back and forth between the application and where you score.

This is Talia Yes. So when you log in, the application, and the registration form will actually open in a new tab.

So you will be able to switch back and forth between the tabs with one tab being the actual rubric, and the other being the actual application so that you can read in one screen and then enter your comments as Ethan demonstrated that during his portion of the demonstration of the platform.

And again, if you're just having technical trouble or have questions about this, you can always email us at [questions@racialequity2030 dot org](mailto:questions@racialequity2030.org).

Next question. In our review, should we consider whether or not an application needs the financial support, for example, is an applicant mentioned having access to a lot of outside funding should that be considered in our review.

Great question.

That consideration is not part of the scoring rubric.

So I would not consider whether or not they have access to financial support as part of your score.

Next question.

Have the proposals been assigned already.

This is tell you, yes, they have, if you log into your into the portal, you will see the five submissions that are assigned to you. If you have not done so already, we really encourage you to do that as soon as possible to check for any potential conflicts of interest and also to make sure that everything seems to be working properly.

And that you don't have any technical questions.

Great. And I think final question here.

Is there a word count limit for the feedback.

This is Talia, I know that there is a minimum number of words that needs to be entered, I actually don't know off the top of my head, what the far end limit is.

So we can follow up via email about that one. You are encouraged to be thorough and and constructive in your feedback. Oh actually just see a message right here there is no limits.

Thank you for clarifying there is no limits.

No top end limits on the word counts in the platform, but there is a minimum limit of words, so please be thorough. And again, please be constructive as you enter in that information.

And with that we have reached the end of our time for your questions. So thank you to everyone for submitting such thoughtful.

For somebody puts this thoughtful questions. Thanks to the team for helping get them answered.

Thanks to the team for helping get them answered. We did get to as many as we could. So just a few quick reminders as we close out, we will be sharing a recording of this webinar, as well as the URL as a peer review resource page that will include a list of frequently asked questions as well as a link to the implicit bias video that we shared earlier that will be coming to you in the coming days. As Jenna mentioned that implicit bias video is required, watching for whoever is competing with us in the team and your team so you can either send them the link directly or just have watched the training video and they look at it that way.

The deadline to complete your five required reviews, is Monday April at pm. Eastern time please please please budget your time appropriately so that you can complete your reviews of care.

And again, you'll be notified on Tuesday April if there are additional reviews that are assigned to you or if, for if you're all done at that point you will be notified either way.

If you have questions you can always reach us at questions@racialequity2030 dot org.

And with that, packed agenda for some closing remarks.

Thank you. Talia on behalf of the WK Kellogg Foundation parrot and lover for change, thank you so much for joining us today and for participating in this challenge, as we said we are just thrilled with the response and the applications you submitted and

we are so excited for you now to all engage with each other's applications. And these bold ideas, so please continue to reach out if you have questions, and we really look forward to hearing your feedback.

Thank you and have a great day.