**Questions and answers**

**from the webinar Centering Lived Experience**

**through Participatory Grantmaking**

1. **I'd love more information on how the People's Panel was recruited and selected. Who participated in that process, and what were the criteria?**

The Tamarack Institute put out the call for People’s Panel members and developed a relevant criterion that would support the overall goal of this project. People’s Panel member applications were limited to those who lived/worked within the Peel Region, as an existing understanding of the Peel context was deemed critical to the project. Additionally, People’s Panel applicants were asked to submit a short application indicating and explaining their interest in the role and their relevant lived experiences. Tamarack assessed these applications and ultimately selected 12 applicants to join the People’s Panel, paying special consideration to ensure the Panel was comprised of diverse perspectives (including and not limited to: age, origin, status, etc).

1. **I am interested in this idea that organizations were in phase 2, so did the stakeholders in phase 1 include some organizations? Or just people with lived experience rather than employees of organizations?**

The People’s Panel was comprised of 12 individuals with varied professional and personal experiences. Many of our People’s Panel members had relevant newcomer lived experiences, and many members also had relevant experience working within the realm of newcomer settlement. The Panel played two primary functions. First, they co-created the funding opportunity and the assessment criteria. Using their knowledge of the sector and their lived experiences as Peel residents they developed the funding opportunity to address needs that they deemed most urgent and pertinent to their community. Secondly, they reviewed all the applications which were submitted and engaged in the grantmaking process. At this stage, they reflected on their assessment criteria and funding priorities/objectives to make funding decisions. Another key stakeholder involved in this process was the Peel Newcomer Strategy Group, which played an intermediary role. They supported our work by providing us with a thorough understanding of the Peel landscape.

1. **Did the panel have lived experience of being refugees themselves?**

Yes, our Panel was comprised of members with varied lived experiences (ranging from refugees, immigrants, international students, etc.)

1. **Was any training provided to the People's panel?**

The People’s Panel was not provided formal training. However, each of the grant-making/design sessions was facilitated by the Tamarack Institute. This facilitation guided and supported the People’s Panel as they developed the funding opportunity and subsequently made their funding decisions. Additionally, members of the People’s Panel were provided with the necessary material and background information to ensure their thorough participation. To monitor their engagement, Panel members were also provided with reflective evaluation questions to reflect on and monitor their work and contributions. Questions included: How would you rate your contribution to these sessions? How much did you learn from these sessions? To what extent did you feel equipped to take part in these sessions? (e.g. information shared before session, support with tools, Q/A, etc). Through this experience, as facilitators, we learned that it is important to assess the needs of your group to ensure there are no barriers to participation. To facilitate productive working groups, sessions need to be adapted to suit each particular group of participants.

1. **Did the panel determine the criteria?**

Yes, the People’s Panel determined and developed the criteria which were used to assess project applications. The Panel developed their criterion using their professional/sector knowledge, lived experiences and their understanding of the Peel Landscape. [More information on the criteria can be found here.](https://www.tamarackcommunity.ca/hubfs/PGP_ApplicationGuidelines_Final.pdf?hsCtaTracking=262a2c8c-12b6-4d90-a129-cb7e2a037c85%7C65f43eeb-1d7b-40ce-b396-d2e511f42a9e&hsLang=en)

1. **How did organizations' participation in coaching calls impact the likelihood of receiving grant funding?**

These coaching calls were not mandatory for applicants to attend. They were drop-in calls attended on a voluntary basis and were offered as a way for organizations to pose any questions/concerns regarding the application process. Additionally, these calls were facilitated by Tamarack and not the People’s Panel.

1. **What was the process to evaluate the proposal submissions?**

Using the criteria, objective and funding priorities the People’s Panel designed in the first stage of their work, they assessed each application based on how the proposed project addressed the funding opportunity’s targeted focus. The People’s Panel deliberated and thoroughly assessed each organization’s complete application. To facilitate this decision-making process, we asked Panel members to rank the applications based on how they addressed the funding opportunity’s primary objective and priorities. Panel members utilized an assessment matrix that allowed them to formulate a score for each application. This scoring (that each individual member completed prior to the group session) served as a starting point for the group dialogue. Panel members discussed and shared their findings with the group and proceeded from there. Ultimately, decisions were made on a consensus basis, as all Panel members agreed on the final selection of grantees.

1. **How many people were involved in total?**

This project was a collaborative effort between WES, Tamarack, Peel Newcomer Strategy Group and the People’s Panel. The People’s Panel was composed of 12 individuals from the Peel Region.

1. **Were members of the People's Panel able to remake grantee recommendations?  How do you handle perceived or actual conflicts of interest?**

This project was grounded in trust, and therefore it was important that we remained fair, equitable and transparent in our process. All People’s Panel members were asked to indicate any perceived or actual conflict of interest. If such a conflict of interest arose, the individual was asked either to step down from their position in the People’s Panel or refrain from partaking in a certain decision. For example, a member of our Panel whose organization decided to apply for the funding opportunity stepped down from their position on the Panel to prevent any potential conflict of interest.

1. **How do you incorporate the intersectionality of the groups you work with?**

The input and perspective put forth by the People’s Panel allowed this funding opportunity to reflect a deep consideration for intersectionality. The People’s Panel reflected on their varied lived experiences and identified the need to support marginalized/vulnerable groups not typically supported through other newcomer-focused projects and efforts. This consideration was reflected and made clear in the application guidelines (which were meant to guide applicants in their project proposals). Additionally, this consideration was incorporated into the assessment criterion, which was utilized by the People’s Panel when making final funding decisions.

1. **I so deeply appreciate this participatory approach, more reflective of our communities. I wonder if you have heard from disabled person’s organizations interested in participating in this process.**

This approach is well-suited to work with any equity-seeking group. Here is one example: [Disability Rights Fund](https://learningforfunders.candid.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2018/12/PGM-DisabilityRight.pdf?_gl=1*q0jrxo*_ga*MTMwMDQ3NDgwNy4xNjUzNTg3NzQ5*_ga_5W8PXYYGBX*MTY1MzU4Nzc0OS4xLjEuMTY1MzU4ODM3Mi42MA..&_ga=2.159756152.456607600.1653587750-1300474807.1653587749) working with participatory grantmaking.

1. **In addition to the funding allocated to communities how much additional resources were needed for the backbone support and facilitation?**

The overall budget Tamarack received from WES was divided in a way that allocated roughly ¾ of the funds for community funding (funding of the grantees’ projects), ¼ of the funds for backbone support and facilitation (this includes: staff, honoraria to People’s Panel, communications, knowledge mobilization, evaluation, etc.).

1. **In our sector, many of the organizations we'd like to involve in something like a People's Panel are already so overstretched and likely don't have the capacity to take this on, even with honoraria. How did you balance having diverse voices with the reality that some people missing didn't have the capacity to participate?**

It was critical to the project that we made sure to honour and recognize the commitment made by our People’s Panel. The People’s Panel members were compensated for their time and commitment to this project at a rate that reflected the cost of living within the Peel Region. Additionally, we made an effort to coordinate and set dates for working sessions in the early evening ahead of time so that we could accommodate our Panel and allow them to make any necessary adjustments (if need be). Above all, we made sure to be very clear in our outreach when describing the amount of work necessary for this project to ensure individuals felt informed when making their decisions about joining the People’s Panel.