



Equity Framework Report Feedback From ESAC Members

This document contains the feedback regarding the Equity Framework Report that was submitted by ESAC members:

From Phil Wu:

What are the parts of the report that you like or agree with the most? Please tell us why.

Overall, an excellent report! Best parts from my perspective:

- 1) Supplemental definitions of Metro's Outcomes including further defining "vibrant communities"
- 2) "Equity + 5" framework (with a further modification described later)
- 3) The graphic highlighting data – social determinants of health – justice – equity – Metro Outcomes is a great description of the conceptual process
- 4) Well thought out indicators (except one) and their descriptions, how they connect to Metro's outcomes and Metro's sphere of influence
- 5) Thoughtful summary of history

What are the parts of the report that you do not like or disagree with? Please tell us why.

No real disagreements. Some suggested changes:

- 1) Change Equity + 5 framework to: TO MAKE A GREAT PLACE arrow to EQUITY arrow to VIBRANT COMMUNITIES + LEADERSHIP ON CLIMATE CHANGE + TRANSPORTATION CHOICES + ECONOMIC PROSPERITY + CLEAN AIR AND WATER
- 2) In the data graphic, I would change "parks and environmental burdens" to "parks and nature." The social determinants of health are neutral, and "environmental burdens" suggests a negative factor. Including "environmental justice," along with "racial and economic justice," acknowledges the disparity in environmental burdens experienced across communities.
- 3) Definition of "restorative justice" is convoluted and hard (for me) to understand., even after reading is multiple times. Doesn't adequately capture the excellent commentary that goes into further detail.

What recommendations set forth by the report's authors do you agree with? Please tell us why.

Wholeheartedly support the recommendations of the report. Important to recognize the difficulty in identifying data sources and the quality of the data. The criteria that have been recommended in selecting data seem very appropriate. Originally, I believe, the baseline

committee intended to define the indicators and identify the data points, and the conclusion that this process should entail a more extended, careful analysis using the recommended criteria is laudable.

What recommendations set forth by the report's authors would you change? Please tell us why.

What recommendations would you add?

Please include any additional comments or questions about the report that you may have.

From Irene Koney:

What are the parts of the report that you like or agree with the most? Please tell us why.

This report is clearly written, and gives clear guidance on some important next steps for Metro.

I agree with all the recommendations of this report.

The best part of this report is:

- Reframing of Outcomes "Equity+5"
- The structure of the report clearly outlines Metro Authority and Influence in each section, and makes the report recommendations easy to apply and reference.
- The section on the historical background and context is very important and well written. When we know our history, we can make informed decisions about our

future.

- Metro's desired outcomes and the equity efforts required are clearly outlined in the 10 equity indicators section of the report. Metro's roles, responsibility and influence are outlined in a way that Metro leadership may begin to ask deeper questions about their role in the past, and how they need to shape the future decisions and reduce/eliminate disparities on ALL Metro residents.
- An estimated 130 to 150 thousand Slavic/East European community members live in the Metro area, it is great to see this community was included in this report.
- Appreciate the empowerment language used in the report, for example words like survivor instead of victim.

What are the parts of the report that you do not like or disagree with? Please tell us why.

I agree with all the recommendations of this report. Great work!!

What recommendations set forth by the report's authors do you agree with? Please tell us why.

Agree with all sections of the report.

What recommendations set forth by the report's authors would you change? Please tell us why.

What recommendations would you add?

Meaningful Engagement and Empowered Communities section pages 69 to 71:

To promote meaningful engagement of the community they serve, Metro leadership which is primarily made up of white males could greatly benefit from a training put on by White Men as Full Diversity Partners <http://wmfdp.com/>

To promote understanding of our history, Metro staff could benefit from professional development sessions on understanding disparity and the historical background of racism in Oregon. Speakers such as Walidah Imarisha and others should be invited to speak at lunch and learn sessions.

Economic Equity: Fair Employment and Economic Prosperity pages 55 to 57:

For each bureau/division of Metro, an equity budget assessment tool could be filled out and reviewed so that any money Metro spends is through an equity lens. Specific questions to ask:

- Who benefits from this budget decision?
- Does it reduce/eliminate disparity?
- Does it exclude service or move resources from existing programs/neighborhoods and how does it specifically impact communities that experience discrimination due to race, ethnicity, gender, economic status, national origin or a historically marginalized group?
- What are the intended and unintended consequences of existing and future disparities of this budget decision?

Agree: Metro should collaborate with community organizations to establish agency-specific performance and accountability measures for each equity indicator. I would *add* that it should be placed in the Metro Auditor Office.

A group of volunteers like the ESAC should have official authority (with official bylaws) approved by Metro Council to advise Metro Auditor on the equity performance and ensure that an equity lens is applied to all levels of Metro's work with specific emphasis on budget decisions.

Please include any additional comments or questions about the report that you may have.

I appreciate the Metro staff and the Equity Baseline Workgroup for all their work on this report.

From Ben Duncan:

What are the parts of the report that you like or agree with the most? Please tell us why.

1. Historical context and relation to trauma and to the data. Equity requires an understanding of reparative/restorative justice. Important for Metro to acknowledge that history in the context of *why* Metro has an obligation to do this work
2. The legal and economic framing (page 29, first column, 2nd paragraph)

3. Equity +5. Strongly believe this should be a paradigm and framing shift for Metro—that equity is built into everything it does AND is a standing value in and of itself.
4. Call out to internal analysis necessary, and appreciated the sidebars that reflected an assessment of Metro influence

What are the parts of the report that you do not like or disagree with? Please tell us why.

1. Need to change language around “audit”
2. Lack of specific measures
3. Lack of prioritization, criteria or practicality (political, organizational, budgetary)
4. Lack of internal theory of change/strategy

What recommendations set forth by the report’s authors do you agree with? Please tell us why.

1. Commit to internal and institutional changes as quickly as possible. What is doable right now?
2. Prioritization as next step-relates to above. (lead and facilitate)....based on influence over each equity indicator and urgency of community need
3. Agency specific performance....
4. Expanding data

What recommendations set forth by the report’s authors would you change? Please tell us why.

What recommendations would you add?

Internal development of an equity and empowerment lens/framework tool for equity analysis for everyday decision-making

Please include any additional comments or questions about the report that you may have.

From Daniel Vázquez:

What are the parts of the report that you like or agree with the most? Please tell us why.
The report makes good points and outlines great history and background to the reason of why we have the challenges we have now. It sets a good list and agenda for things and issues that can be easily fixed, such as “eliminating the box”, setting an internal minimum wage, and other low hanging fruit. As long as these items can be addressed and fixed, it will have been a good report.
What are the parts of the report that you do not like or disagree with? Please tell us why.
I don’t like the fact that when it comes to Hispanic/Latino history and background, that it is very limited, but I also understand that unfortunately there is in general a lack of significant Hispanic/Latino documented history available – I discussed this with Jared and Scotty, and they too expressed their challenge in searching and obtaining this information.
What recommendations set forth by the report’s authors do you agree with? Please tell us why.
Definitely first the low hanging fruit items. These are the items that can quickly be resolved and show some progress from. The other is just the general notion that equity work is not valued as much as it should be, like Jared mentioned. So making the recommendation that building and making the value of equity work on an organizational and institutionalized level – a challenging task – is essential to the ‘culture change’ that must happen at Metro.
What recommendations set forth by the report’s authors would you change? Please tell us why.
I don’t know exactly if I would change anything now, the recommendations are all good, but emphasizing the need to get them all accomplished is what is imperative.
What recommendations would you add?
I wouldn’t add anything for now, once we see some significant progress and completion of the existing recommendations, we can review any additions.
Please include any additional comments or questions about the report that you may have.
I would just ask the council and senior management team of Metro to provide us with a solid commitment completion timeline of the recommendations items to us. So, in other words, we have provided them with the recommendations, now have them provide us with a timeline of when they will be completed. (“Them’ meaning Metro council and senior staff).

I want to see some solid commitment and results from the council and senior management as to when these recommendation items will be completed. I want to see real results.

From Kirsten Kilchenstein:

What are the parts of the report that you like or agree with the most? Please tell us why.

- Historical background and context.
- Racial/economic justice lens
- Equity + 5, clarification that equity can't be isolated from Metro's desired outcomes
- 1- indicator framework

What are the parts of the report that you do not like or disagree with? Please tell us why.

I don't disagree with any segments of the report.

What recommendations set forth by the report's authors do you agree with? Please tell us why.

- Need for Metro to conduct an equity audit, this is an important step for any organization striving to advance equity
- Swift action on the part of Metro to make internal and institutional changes to reduce disparities (Metro is already on its way with the ban the box decision)
- Metro to take the lead on improving and streamlining data collection in the region
- Need to continue to invest in existing data providers, while improving its own efforts

What recommendations set forth by the report's authors would you change? Please tell us why.

What recommendations would you add?

Please include any additional comments or questions about the report that you may have.

There is a huge effort in the region to improve and streamline data collection in order to understand the disparities and improve services to underserved communities. Metro can be a leader in this effort by joining forces (and leading where appropriate) with other community organizations and governmental institutions.