

2018 Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Audit Appendix

developed for the Chesapeake Bay Trust
by Skeo Solutions

May 2018

Contents

A1. CBT Diversity and Inclusion Workplan Evaluation	2
A2. CBT DEI Audit Document Review Notes	7
Objective 1. Authorizing Environment.....	7
Objective 2. Hiring, Promotion and Tenure	8
Objective 3. Contracting and Investing.....	10
Objective 4. Training and Internal Culture	10
Objective 5. Grantmaking Program Design	11
Objective 6. Funding Priorities	14
Objective 7. Philanthropic Leadership	16
A3. Agenda and Meeting Notes from Facilitated Conversation with Staff.....	188
Agenda.....	188
Skeo’s Meeting Notes	200
CBT’s Meeting Notes.....	255
A4. Meeting Notes from Interviews with Board Members	344
Midgett Parker – 3/14/2018.....	344
Benjamin Wechsler – 3/14/2018	355
Tom Miller – 4/4/2018.....	377

A1. CBT Diversity and Inclusion Workplan Evaluation

The following evaluation of the D & I Workplan has been provided to the Trust in an expanded electronic format, and is provided here for reference.

Draft DEI Work Plan Audit Guide 1/30/2018				Status of Strategy		Assessment of Strategy			Comments
Internal/ Operational Goals	Date goal created	Strategies	Outcome/ Metrics	Yes	No	1	2	3	
Pre official Diversity Work Plan									
Quantify the # of grants that went to "diverse" communities or served "diverse" communities	pre-2002	Add a "diversity grant" label to each grant that could be queried	"Diversity Grant" field added in Trust's Grant Access Database	✓			◆		
Obtain external guidance for the Trust's diversity and inclusion efforts (then called "Minorities in Environment Initiative"). Big question: Should we develop a new grant program specifically for communities of color, or was there enough overlap in our mission and environmental priorities of communities of color	2007-2008 and 2010	Hold listening sessions with diverse individuals and groups from an age, ethnic, and socio-economic perspective (all from communities of color) in 2008 in Baltimore City and Annapolis and 2010 in Prince Georges County, Montgomery County, and Dorchester County (consultant: Iantha Gant-Wright)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of recommendations (including changing the initiative's name in 2010 from "Minorities in Environment Initiative" to "Diversity Initiative".) A decision on the big question - no separate grant program. Development of a Diversity Work Plan in 2009 	✓				◆	Receiving two rounds of guidance from impacted communities at the outset of the Trust's diversity and inclusion efforts is a model approach. Feedback clearly informed the Trust's decision-making about its approach to building relationships with and providing funding to communities of color.
Emphasize importance of diversity through creation of a board-level committee	2008 created; 2008-current	A diversity committee was created that guides Trust's actions on Diversity and Inclusion		✓				◆	
Obtain external guidance for the Trust's diversity and inclusion efforts	2008-current	Expand Board's Diversity Committee to be a hybrid board/external committee	Meetings have been held regularly (twice per year) since the inception of the DEI Committee	✓				◆	Including non-board members on the committee is a model approach for continuing to receive external guidance for the Trust's diversity and inclusion efforts. May want to consider whether compensating non-board members is warranted and/or would help expand membership of the committee to target groups.
Adopt a non-discrimination policy (sparked by boy scout discussion)	2008	Development of Trust Non-Discrimination Policy	Adopted policy	✓				◆	Demonstrates engagement with national conversation about Diversity, Equity and Inclusion.
Develop a work plan for diversity and inclusion efforts	2009	Create a diversity and inclusion plan for the organization (internal and external practices) that lays out both internal and external goals.	Work plan completed	✓				◆	
Post official Diversity Work Plan									

Obtain a more accurate, quantitative sense of the # of people of color engaged in our grant-making	2009	Revise RFPs (and database) to capture demographic information - To improve upon the "presence/absence" limitations that the previous "diversity grant" label suffered, we added the requirement for applicants to report on the # of people of color engaged in each grant in 3 categories (vols, students, and teachers). The data were then analyzed for each category	Quantification of # of people of color (vols, students, teachers) in every application as self-reported by the applicant	✓			◆	Strong step forward from a "presence/absence" model of evaluation; however, does not yet capture funding organizations led by people of color. Consider updating metrics as described in Recommendation B3 in the DEI Audit Report.
Reach out beyond grant-making to vendors of color through any contractual work the Trust does	2009	Revise RFQs/Vendor agreements to actively promote diversity, and change procurement policy to require outreach to MBE/DBE firms for any procurement over the small procurement threshold		✓			◆	
Increase diversity of individuals associated with the Trust (as an organization - see below for grant-making)	2009	Host a Student Intern from the School of Social Work program at Univ of MD Baltimore	This suggestion was one made by a staff member who was a graduate of the UMB SSW program. We applied, but did not get an intern that year. The staff member subsequently left, and the Trust began its Chesapeake Conservation Corps program, which would have a bigger reach and engage more people of color in intern-like positions, the year after		x		◆	Although the strategy originally envisioned for this goal did not succeed, it launched a broader conversation about other ways to achieve the goal through the Corps program. Diversity of Corps members is increasing.
Increase diversity of individuals associated with the Trust (as an organization - see below for grant-making)	2009	Increase the diversity of CBT's staff members	% of staff of color over time	✓			◆	Consider updating metrics as described in Recommendation C3 in the DEI Audit Report.
Increase diversity of individuals associated with the Trust (as an organization - see below for grant-making)	2009	Increase the diversity of CBT's board members	% of board members of color over time	✓			◆	POC on board has increased from 5% to 20% overtime; Women on board started at 15% and rose to 35% briefly, but has gone back to 15% and seems stuck (2000-2018). Staff have done outstanding work in attempting to influence nominations of diverse, highly qualified individuals to the board.

Provide a more representative review of Trust grant applications (through TRC membership) - a way to include viewpoints from a wide range of demographics, knowing that the Trust makes grants from the Coastal Bays to Western MD in all types of communities, and there is no way for a staff of 10-15 to have a representative of every community	2009	Increase the diversity of CBT's Technical Review Committees. From 2009 on, all program staff have been required to solicit TRC members that include people of color (a minimum of one person of color). In 2018, that policy was modified to include specific targets based on the demographics of the regions in which grants are offered	TRC compositions - 2009-2017 goal to include people of color. 2018 goal to match demographics of applicants	✓		◆		Although representation on TRCs is currently not meeting expectations, the effects of the 2018 representation policy should continue to be measured annually; the policy could become a model for other foundations, if successful. See Recommendation A2 in the DEI Audit Report for additional detail on recommendations.
Promote non-discriminatory policies among applicant/grantee organizations	2009	Placement of CBT's Non-Discrimination Policy on CBT publications	Agreement by applicants not to discriminate by signing grant proposal	✓		◆		
Promote diversity among our various audiences	2009	Placement of CBT's Diversity Statement on CBT publications	A community more aware of diversity issues (as measured by, e.g., adoption of Diversity Goals by other environmental funders, like the bay program?)	✓		◆		CBT's Diversity Statement is prominently located on the website and referred to in other materials. Does the Trust intend to gather quantitative data related to the metric for this goal or should the metric be updated?
External/ Programmatic Goals	Date goal created		Outcome					
Pre official Diversity Work Plan								
Bring attention to the need for more engagement of communities and individuals of color in natural resources issues	pre-2002; outreach strategy revised in 2009	Creation of the Arthur Dorman Scholarship and revision of the outreach strategy for the scholarship: Offer a scholarship (now \$5K) for a student of color who engages in environmental issues. Later changed to engagement in community and/or environment (2009) to expand reach and be sensitive to issues with the non-universal use of the word "environment" (which we heard from diversity listening sessions below)	# Dorman applicants generated; 1 Dorman scholarship awarded per year. ~\$80K since 2002	✓		◆		
Post official Diversity Work Plan								
Share externally the Trust's commitment to diversity and inclusion	2009	Develop culture-specific outreach/promotional materials (strategy adopted 2009)	publications (e.g., annual reports, website photos) that show broad diversity.	✓		◆		Consider updating the "strategy" language, which seems awkwardly worded.

Share externally the Trust's commitment to diversity and inclusion	2009	Participate in/on diversity committees, task forces, panels, etc. (strategy adopted 2009)	# of panels/committees	✓		◆	Staff serve on the Chesapeake Bay Program's Stewardship workgroup and Diversity workgroup. One staff leads CBFNs Capacity Building efforts.
Share externally the Trust's commitment to diversity and inclusion	2009	Share organization diversity data on Guidestar (% people of color, staff and board) the vehicle with which Green 2.0 tracks environmental NGOs diversity data (strategy adopted 2017)	Data entered into Guidestar	✓		◆	
Increase direct grant outreach to communities/organizations of color	2009	Increase the # of grants made that engage communities of color	# of people of color (students, teachers, vols) engaged in Trust grants; % of people of color engaged in Trust grants	✓		◆	Trust is performing well according to existing metrics. However, existing metrics does not yet capture funding organizations led by people of color. Consider updating metrics as described in Recommendation B3 in the DEI Audit Report.
Increase direct grant outreach to communities/organizations of color	2009	Develop culture-specific outreach/promotional materials	publications (e.g., annual reports, website photos) that show broad diversity.	✓		◆	Trust is performing well according to existing metrics. Opportunity to ask target communities what additional culturally-relevant materials may be needed (e.g., materials in languages other than English?). See Recommendation B4 in the DEI Audit Report.
Increase direct grant outreach to communities/organizations of color	2009	Revise Mini Grant RFP for schools to capture participation in the Free and Reduced Lunch Program/encourage applications for Title 1 Schools (which had always not had to meet a match requirement for funding) (strategy adopted 2009)	# title 1 school applicants	✓		◆	The number of title 1 schools served increased between 2013 and 2017, but experienced a drop off in 2018. When percentages are considered, the percentages have increased slightly over time (from 34% in 2013 to 39% in 2018). Consider updating the metric to percentages or including percentages as part of several metrics to give a more complete picture of the Trust's progress.
Increase direct grant outreach to communities/organizations of color	2009	Create an email list for targeted action alerts to diversity grantees (strategy adopted 2009)	list developed, # of groups on list (not completed)		x		Trust did not move forward with this strategy, so outcomes here were not assessed.
Increase direct grant outreach to communities/organizations of color	2009	Created a 'Connector' group component to our smalls grants program (strategy adopted 2015)	# grants brought in by connector groups	✓		◆	10 Connector Grants awarded (based on chart provided). Consider clarifying the metric (e.g. what is the target number of grants brought in by connector groups?).

Increase direct grant outreach to communities/organizations of color	2009	Created a 'Mentorship' component to our small grants program (strategy adopted 2015)	# new applicants brought in by mentors	✓				◆	7 Organizations mentored. Consider clarifying the metric (e.g. what is the target number of grants brought in by mentors?).
Explore potential of "non-traditional" projects	2009	Change policy within program staff for how to discuss projects with grantees (reduce "bay" focus)	# of "non-traditional" projects (e.g., not specifically water quality/habitat meant to engage new audiences	✓				◆	Significantly expanded the Trust's funding efforts beyond "traditional" projects.
Explore potential of "non-traditional" projects; work to identify co-benefits	2015	Close our Mini Grant program to traditional and repeat applicants and re-designed the program to serve exclusively new applicants	% of new applicants now vs. before; % of applicants of color now vs. before	✓				◆	This metric is difficult to assess and CBT was not able to provide data on all grant programs readily; consider updating the metric to clarify the assessment process for the future. From Jana's reflections on sample numbers pulled from 2 grant programs: "What I'm noticing is that as we changed the Mini program in 2017 to be eligible ONLY to new applicants, the long-standing applicants are turning their attention to the OR program, so the # and % of new applicants is going down in the Outreach and Restoration grant program. But the net effect is a higher % of new applicants overall."
Encourage other NGOs to adopt DEI plans/strategies that we can support through grant-making	2015	Pilot cultural competency trainings and develop a recommendations document resulting for watershed organization pilots (strategy administered 2015-2017)	3 cultural competency trainings	✓				◆	Skeo performed the services for these actions; this evaluation is based on what was authorized and funded, not the products and services provided.
Encourage other funders to adopt DEI plans/strategies	2017	Lead Chesapeake Bay Funders Network to conduct a DEI readiness assessment for the Chesapeake community and to develop a DEI plan (strategy adopted 2017)	Assessment to be completed, DEI plan completed	✓					In progress, so cannot "assess" at this point in time.
Encourage other funders to adopt DEI plans/strategies	2017	Organize a DEI retreat for CBFN funding partners	DEI retreat and Training	✓				◆	Skeo performed the services for these actions; this evaluation is based on what was authorized and funded, not the products and services provided.
Codify commitment to Diversity into the organization		Ensure diversity initiative recommendations are incorporated into the new strategic planning process	Strategic plan	✓				◆	

A2. CBT DEI Audit Document Review Notes

Objective 1. Authorizing Environment

1.1 Adopt and disseminate a clear DEI statement or policy.

References: 5, 12, 26

- *CBT Non-discrimination Policy (5)* – exists; directly connects non-discrimination to the Trust's effectiveness in achieving its mission; focuses on legal compliance; adopted 2008; included in grant-making materials as a guiding principle.
- *CBT Diversity Statement (5, 12)* – exists; directly connects diversity to the Trust's effectiveness in achieving its mission; directly commits to actions that support diversity and inclusion; published on website, with supporting information about the steps the Trust is taking to enact the statement's commitments; does not directly address equity; uses the term "minority"
- *3 Strategic Plans (26)* – clearly broadening and deepening this commitment over a 15-year time span; integrated throughout Strategic Plan, instead of one section; performance measures, goals and objectives related to grant-making introduced over time.
- *Follow up discussion with CBT* – Updating the Non-discrimination Policy and Diversity Statements and addressing the incorporation of language related to equity is the responsibility of the D&I Committee. Currently, there is no set schedule for reviewing and updating these items.

1.2 Adopt an organizational DEI Plan and assess progress on the plan.

References: 3, 4, 16

- *2008 Diversity Initiatives Objectives and Workplan (3)* – includes recommendations for Internal/Operational, External/Programmatic, and Evaluation Metrics; also includes a workplan for 2009/2010; includes a metric for assessing each objective; assignments are primarily staff assignments with some assignments to the board or D&I committee; the workplan guides work in two ways: 1) CBT reviews the work plan as part of our prep for D&I Committee meetings, and 2) each task is assigned to an individual's work plan, which gets assessed once per year (June of each year as part of performance evaluations).
- *Diversity Committee Materials (4)* – includes a Diversity and Inclusion Advisory Panel 2015-2016 Work Plan; contains an anticipated outcome for each objective; this workplan is not "assessed" in a formal way and is updated as the committee makes a suggestion; additional materials show robust engagement with many topics related to the work plan.
- *Trust Demographics Guidestar (16)* – 2017 or 2018 assessment of Trust demographics

1.3 Include DEI measures in the performance goals for the CEO and other senior and mid-level managers.

References: 26, 27 -Trust work plan (which is the ED work plan) and other example workplans

- *Follow up discussion with CBT* - Tasks from the strategic plan and Diversity Initiative Objectives and Workplan are assigned to an individual's work plan, which gets assessed once per year (June of each year as part of performance evaluations).
- *3 Strategic Plans (26)* – clearly broadening and deepening this commitment over a 15-year time span; integrated throughout Strategic Plan, instead of one section; performance measures, goals and objectives related to grant-making introduced over time.

- *Example Work Programs (27)* – shows integration of performance goals across various levels of programmatic staff; does not show evidence of performance goals for operational staff

1.4 Creation of a Board-level Diversity or DEI Committee or equivalent

References: 4, 30 (board agenda example)

- *Diversity Committee Materials (4)* – Diversity and Inclusion Committee (composed of board members and volunteers) oversees the Trust's Diversity Initiative workplan; some documents refer to this committee as the D&I Committee and others may refer to it as an advisory panel.
- *Sample Board Meeting Agendas (30)* – demonstrates consistent inclusion of discussions led by the D & I Committee in board agendas over the year 2016
- *Follow up discussion with CBT* – The D&I Committee has evolved over time, starting as an official ad hoc committee as described in CBT bylaws (i.e., composed entirely of board members). Soon after forming, they proposed a hybrid structure in which the committee was part board, part external to ensure outside input. It's a model CBT has replicated in other areas as well.

Committee members do not get compensated. Non-board members are recruited by staff and board based on key audiences CBT is trying to reach.

Originally, the committee was composed entirely of people of color. They themselves voted to diversify about 5 years ago to include members of the faith community, boating community, hunting community, veterans community, etc. Currently, the committee is 50% people of color (8 of 16), and 50% representing other audiences with an emphasis on the three under-engaged audiences currently prioritized by CBT: communities of color, the faith community, and the human health community

Objective 2. Hiring, Promotion and Tenure

2.1 Adopt personnel policies and procedures to promote DEI in hiring, promotion and tenure.

References: 3, 9, 16

- *2008 Diversity Initiatives Objectives and Workplan (3)* – includes the following recommendations: "Ensure not only that CBT is a non-discriminatory workplace, but that it actively promotes diversity (e.g. in hiring practices, choice of vendors, etc.) and creates a learning atmosphere that expands the cultural competencies of CBT staff and board"; don't see promotion and tenure-related objectives in the plan (i.e., objectives that go beyond hiring diverse staff).
- *Staff Diversity over Time; Job Descriptions; Recruitment (9)* – demonstrates a process for advertising jobs in locations relevant for people of color, language encouraging applications from people of color and indicating opportunities for advancement, inclusion of junior staff's ideas for the advertising process; demonstrates a steady rate of employment for women and an increasing rate of employment for people of color; do not see evidence of policies and outcomes related to promotion and tenure for staff of color.
- *Trust Demographics GuideStar (16)* – 2017 or 2018 assessment of Trust demographics; demonstrates that 7/20 staff (35%) identify as persons of color and 2/5 managers (40%) identify as persons of color.
- *Follow up discussion with CBT* – Promotion and tenure of staff of color are considered part of staff development and the Trust's overall emphasis on advancement and tenure for current staff.

2.2 Conduct proactive outreach and recruitment to increase representation of people of color and other underrepresented groups across board, management, staff and intern positions.

References: 8, 9, 10, 13

- *Working to increase diversity in the Trust's intern and Corps program (8)* – applications materials for 2 programs demonstrate proactive outreach and recruitment at the intern and Corps level.
- *Follow up discussion with CBT* – The SSW intern application was unsuccessful and has not been pursued again since the staff person leading that effort left. Current efforts are focused on the Corps. The percentage of people of color in the Corps grew from about 16% to about 34% between FY 10 and FY 13.
- *Staff Diversity over Time; Job Descriptions; Recruitment (9)* – demonstrates a process for advertising jobs in locations relevant for people of color, language encouraging applications from people of color and indicating opportunities for advancement, inclusion of junior staff's ideas for the advertising process; demonstrates an increasing rate of employment for people of color between 2008 and 2018.
- *Board Diversity Over Time and Requests for more Board Diversity to the Governor's Appointments Office (10)* – shows dogged, persistent outreach to the governor's appointments office, including identification of candidates through networking events and recommendations and feedback to the GAO; shows growth in the number of persons of color between 2000 and 2018; shows a spike in the number of women around 2010 and a decrease between 2010 and 2018; both women and people of color on the board are currently around 20%.
- *Dorman Award (Annual Award and scholarship given to a Maryland student of color) materials (13)* – shows evolution in language from "embracing diversity" to "minority student" to "student of color"; shows commitment to increasing the pipeline of persons of color engaged in the environmental field.
- *Follow up discussion with CBT* – Dorman Award has always been given to a student of color and is now specifically designated for this population of students.

Additionally, the board is actively engaged in expanding to new recruiting networks and identifying board members of color.

2.3 Include people of color and other underrepresented groups in hiring and promotion committees.

References: 9, 16 (The hiring and promotion committees are the senior team, of which 2 of 5 are people of color)

- *Staff Diversity over Time; Job Descriptions; Recruitment (9)* – Demonstrates a process for advertising jobs in locations relevant for people of color; language encouraging applications from people of color and indicating opportunities for advancement; inclusion of junior staff's ideas for the advertising process.
- *Trust Demographics GuideStar (16)* – 2017 or 2018 assessment of Trust demographics; shows that 2/5 senior team members are people of color.
- *Working to increase diversity in the Trust's intern and Corps program (8)* – applications materials for 2 programs demonstrate proactive outreach and recruitment at the intern level and Corps level.
- *Facilitated discussion with staff* - CBT has hired a Corps graduate.
- *Follow up discussion with CBT* – The SSW intern application was unsuccessful and has not been pursued again since the staff person leading that effort left. Current efforts are focused on the Corps. The percentage of people of color in the Corps grew from about 16% to about 34% between FY 10 and FY 13.
- *Dorman Award (Annual Award and scholarship given to a Maryland student of color) materials (13)* – shows evolution in language from "embracing diversity" to "minority student" to "student of color"; shows commitment to increasing the pipeline of persons of color engaged in the environmental field.
- *Professional Development and Tuition Assistance Policy (28)* – clearly defined policy with funds available to all full and part-time staff on an annual basis.

- *Follow up discussion with CBT* – According to management, CB does track the funds and has the ability to analyze whether they are differentially used by staff of color vs. other staff. However, management does not suspect there would be any difference in use.

Objective 3. Contracting and Investing

3.1 Adopt policies and practices that promote DEI in contracting and consulting.

Reference: 7

- *Procurement Policy and Contractor RFP (7)* – demonstrates a process and required documentation for soliciting bids from MBE/DBE firms as defined by Maryland for purchases of > \$10K.
- *Follow up discussion with CBT* – The Trust does not have selection criteria or an evaluation process that weights the outcome in favor of MBE/DBE firms; their focus is on the outreach strategy, mirrored on the federal government procurement guidelines in 2 CFR 200. The Trust does not actively track whether outreach results in increased use of MBE/DBE but has records available that could be analyzed for this purpose.

3.2 Adopt practices to ensure socially responsible investments and DEI best practices among investment managers.

Reference: 29 - Brown Advisory policies

- *2016 Investment Policy Statement (29)* - "Ten percent of the total investment portfolio will be invested in socially responsible instruments"

Objective 4. Training and Internal Culture

4.1 Conduct staff and board training on DEI and racial equity issues.

References: Facilitated staff conversation; board interviews

- Staff attend DEI-related sessions at conferences, but agreed that there is a difference between a DEI-related session and direct training in DEI. Some staff attended a DEI training sponsored by the Trust as part of the broader DEI planning effort with CBFN and CCWC; however, staff noted that no staff-wide DEI training has occurred at the Trust. Staff expressed a high level of interest in receiving training as a group.
- Board interviews identified that the board has not received a DEI training although they have received presentations from staff on DEI initiatives at the Trust. There is less interest in a DEI training at the board level.

4.2 Staff and board support the DEI policy as integral to achieving the mission of CBT.

References: Facilitated staff conversation; board interviews

- Staff universally affirmed DEI as necessary for achieving the Trust's mission. The most common theme was "it's going to take everyone to restore water quality." One person noted that because the Trust is a government entity, it needs to be accessible to all citizens. Vernice, any other observations?
- Staff express a high level of comfort that the board is supportive of DEI. Interviews with board members also show a high degree of support for DEI, including that there is time allotted to diversity and inclusion on every agenda. Senior management also reports that the D&I Committee of the board is interested in adding "equity" to their name, but first wants to develop a shared definition of equity.

- One board member noted that while there may be varying levels of agreement on the board around how central DEI is to achieving the mission of the CBT, there is a high level of shared agreement that DEI is central to the *identity* of CBT.

4.3 Regularly include DEI considerations in daily operations and decision-making at the staff and board levels.

References: Facilitated staff conversation; board interviews

- Staff shared a variety of ways DEI impacts their daily work including influencing communications, funding partnerships, hiring, contracting, and a wide variety of aspects of grant-making. Staff demonstrated a high comfort level with raising and discussing the tricky aspects of implementing DEI policies in grant-making.
- Interviews with board members reveal that there is time allotted to diversity and inclusion on every agenda and that a D & I Committee has been created. Further, one board member observed that grant-making decisions are heavily influenced by DEI as evidenced by the following:
 - The DEI program and the Connector group program are evidence that the board puts designated resources towards DEI.
 - In the individual grant programs, the quality of the submittal is the primary factor but DEI issues are discussed at the grant panel meetings. Those reviews are scientifically objective but are not blind in the sense that reviewers know a lot about the organizations submitting. There are efforts when the proposal is of quality to be accepted to promote proposals from the DEI perspective.

4.4 Board, management and staff have the skills and tools needed to advance DEI.

References: Facilitated staff conversation; board interviews

- Staff described a significant number of tools and processes that are currently in place to advance DEI. They also indicated a high level of interest in gaining additional skills and tools, and in having dedicated staff time for exploring the tricky issues of DEI in grantmaking and developing new skills, tools and processes that advance the Trust in these areas.
- In board interviews, board members expressed a high degree of confidence in the staff's skills in the area of DEI. One board member observed that the lengthy process required for replacing board members can leave gaps in DEI skills at the board level when a highly skilled board member moves on.

Objective 5. Grantmaking Program Design

5.1 Seek input from external audiences on role of DEI in grant-making

References: 2, 4

- *2007-2008, 2010-2012 Minorities in Environment/Diversity and Inclusion Listening Session Materials (2)* – demonstrates a commitment to listening communities of color and capturing their recommendations; 2007-2008 sessions convened, while 2010-2012 sessions went to targeted communities.
- *Diversity Committee Materials (4)* – Diversity and Inclusion Committee (composed of board members and volunteers) oversees the Trust's Diversity Initiative workplan; some documents refer to this committee as the D&I Committee and others may refer to it as an advisory panel.
- *Follow up discussion with CBT* – The D&I Committee has evolved over time, starting as an official ad hoc committee as described in CBT bylaws (i.e., composed entirely of board members). Soon after forming, they

proposed a hybrid structure in which the committee was part board, part external to ensure outside input. It's a model CBT has replicated in other areas as well.

Committee members do not get compensated. Non-board members are recruited by staff and board based on key audiences CBT is trying to reach.

Originally, the committee was composed entirely of people of color. They themselves voted to diversify about 5 years ago to include members of the faith community, boating community, hunting community, veterans community, etc. Currently, the committee is 50% people of color (8 of 16), and 50% representing other audiences with an emphasis on the three under-engaged audiences currently prioritized by CBT: communities of color, the faith community, and the human health community

5.2 Explicitly include DEI criteria in grant evaluation and targets.

References: 1, 6a, 6b, 17, 18, 19, 20

- *Follow up discussion with CBT* – In 2008, the board approved the following criteria for internally designating a grant a “diversity grant”:
 1. The grant is for a new project or program whose primary goal is to engage communities of color and other underrepresented groups in the restoration and protection of the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries.
 2. The grant is for a program or project that includes restoration activities and citizen engagement in a community of color.
 3. The grant is for outreach activities that increase an existing project or program's engagement of minority or other underrepresented groups.
 4. The grant is to a school that reports to the Maryland State Department of Education a population with either 50% of students receiving Free and Reduced Lunch or more than a 50% minority population.
- *Historical tracking of diversity in database and examples of reports (1)* – demonstrates database tool, development of early thought around “diversity” criteria, and reporting to board;
- *2007-2008, 2010-2012 Minorities in Environment/Diversity and Inclusion Listening Session Materials (2)* – demonstrates engagement with communities of color in developing the Trust's thinking around DEI in grant-making; does not include discussion of specific selection criteria.
- *Example RFP - online app print screen (6a)* – language encourages serving communities of color and partnering as needed with organizations who are culturally competent in serving your target demographic; application requests information about the anticipated % volunteers, students and teachers of color engaged; language does not directly encourage organizations led by persons of color to apply.
- *Examples of board meeting diversity reports (6b)* – Demonstrates reporting to the board in 2008-2010 about diversity measures tracked in grantmaking (% volunteers, students and teachers of color engaged); reports include charts and case studies. Analysis of the evaluation metrics reveals that grantees routinely underestimate their potential for success in engaging persons of color when applying for grants (i.e., their actual engagement of persons of color is higher than their estimated engagement figures submitted with the grant applications).
- *CBT Diversity Initiative Summary (17)* – Demonstrates a long-history of commitment to advancing DEI practices within the Trust's grantmaking as well as advancing the field overall; demonstrates a commitment to reviewing and changing metrics and processes as needed; indicates that the Trust “reviews the criteria used to identify grants benefitting underserved and/or communities of color” annually.

- *Mini K-12 Environmental Education_DEI (18)* – provides a table capturing the number of Title 1 schools served between 2013-2018 (ranges from 20-40, per year; no clear trend line – the numbers bounce up and down; does not show how many schools served total); demonstrates commitment to providing a higher level of funding (100%) to Title 1 schools when compared to non-Title 1 schools (50%)
- *Connector Group Program Materials (19)* – outstanding connection between the concept of Inclusion and the mission of the Trust; demonstrates the process and pipeline for focusing the Community Engagement Mini Grant Program and Chesapeake Conservation Corps programs on three under-engaged audiences: faith community/ies, communities of color, and the human health sector; difficult to tell who the mentor organizations are and how the \$ were distributed across the three under-engaged audiences and 2 programs, but clearly demonstrates that funding is being held and utilized.
- *Mentorship Program Materials (20)* – outstanding connection between the concept of Inclusion and the mission of the Trust; demonstrates development of an incentivized program for mentoring new potential grantees; encourages relationship-building while steering resources directly to the mentee instead of the mentor; rewards mentor with opportunity to apply for additional funds for their own projects.

5.3 Provide outreach and grant-management training to organizations run by and primarily serving communities of color and/or other underrepresented communities.

References: 19, 20, facilitated discussion with staff

- *Connector Group Program Materials (19)* – outstanding connection between the concept of Inclusion and the mission of the Trust; demonstrates the process and pipeline for focusing the Community Engagement Mini Grant Program and Chesapeake Conservation Corps programs on three under-engaged audiences: faith community/ies, communities of color, and the human health sector; difficult to tell who the mentor organizations are and how the \$ were distributed across the three under-engaged audiences and 2 programs, but clearly demonstrates that funding is being held and utilized.
- *Mentorship Program Materials (20)* – outstanding connection between the concept of Inclusion and the mission of the Trust; demonstrates development of an incentivized program for mentoring new potential grantees; encourages relationship-building while steering resources directly to the mentee instead of the mentor; rewards mentor with opportunity to apply for additional funds for their own projects.
- *Staff Discussion* – indicates strong commitment to providing coaching and technical support at a staff level to these communities and organizations; also identified that there is an ongoing discussion about the best way to do this (proactive vs. available, webinar vs. in-person); staff mentioned that they try to keep the staff-to-participant ratio low (approximately 1:10) when doing in-person trainings

5.4 Ensure grant review committees include people of color and other underrepresented groups.

References: 11a, 11b

- *Data on TRC Membership from 2017-2018 (FY18) and new outreach goals for FY19 (11a)* – demonstrates growth in goals for representation of people of color (from 1 per committee to a % within 10% of the population in the targeted geographic area); demonstrates pro-active outreach to potential reviewers of color; demonstrates pro-active maintenance of a database of potential reviewers of color; demonstrates a robust tracking mechanism; demonstrates that % reviewers of color are consistently lower than % persons of color in the relevant target geographic area and there is room for growth here (i.e., one committee had zero people of color, and all had less than the target of being within 10% of the population of the target geographic area).

- *Grants Policy and Procedures Manual_021918 (11b)* – demonstrates that the manual includes information about the required procedures and targets for engaging people of color on Technical Review Committees.
- *Follow up conversation with CBT* – TRC members are not compensated for their time. TRCs are constituted a new each year; members are not retained year to year.

The board is engaged to some degree in recruiting TRC members, but it is primarily the responsibility of staff. In the theory of the structure, the Grants Policy Committee is responsible for TRC membership, and could (and sometimes does) suggest reviewers in general and reviewers of color. In practice, sometimes it's a bit rushed, and the GPC defers to staff. Most board members do not have technical backgrounds, so they are not always in a position to recommend TRC members.

Objective 6. Funding Priorities

6.1 Promote non-discriminatory policies among applicant/grantee organizations

References: 5, 6a

- *Non-Discrimination & Diversity Statements - adopted by board May 2008 (5)* - CBT Non-discrimination Policy exists; directly connects non-discrimination to the Trust's effectiveness in achieving its mission; focuses on legal compliance; adopted 2008.
- *Follow up discussion with CBT* – the Trust has never had to enforce the non-discrimination policy. However, there was a lot of discussion around the Boys Scouts' anti-LGBTQ stance that led to the development of the policy.
- *Example RFP - online app print screen (6a)* – language encourages serving communities of color and partnering as needed with organizations who are culturally competent in serving your target demographic; application requests information about the anticipated % volunteers, students and teachers of color engaged; language does not directly encourage organizations led by persons of color to apply; additionally, I don't actually see non-discrimination language in the example RFP.

6.2 Fund organizations that serve people of color or other underrepresented groups.

References: 2, 3, 17, 18, 21, 22

- *2007-2008, 2010-2012 Minorities in Environment/Diversity and Inclusion Listening Session Materials (2)* – demonstrates a commitment to listening to communities of color and capturing their recommendations for grant-making; 2007-2008 sessions convened, while 2010-2012 sessions went to targeted communities
- *2008 Diversity Initiatives Objectives and Workplan (3)* – includes recommendations for Internal/Operational, External/Programmatic, and Evaluation Metrics; also includes a workplan for 2009/2010; includes a metric for assessing each objective
- *CBT Diversity Initiative Summary (17)* – Demonstrates a long-history of commitment to advancing DEI practices within the Trust's grantmaking as well as advancing the field overall; demonstrates a commitment to reviewing and changing metrics and processes as needed; indicates that the Trust "reviews the criteria used to identify grants benefitting underserved and/or communities of color" annually.
- *Mini K-12 Environmental Education_DEI (18)* – provides a table capturing the number of Title 1 schools served between 2013-2018 (ranges from 20-40, per year; does not show how many schools served total); demonstrates commitment to providing a higher level of funding (100%) to Title 1 schools when compared to non-Title 1 schools (50%)

- *Example non-traditional (art, sports, theater, health) projects (21)* – demonstrates that the Trust is conducting grant-making for projects that stretch beyond traditional watershed projects; demonstrates an especially strong emphasis on health, including the health of people with disabilities and the health of other “at-risk” populations such as children involved in the Truancy Court Program and children diagnosed with mental health challenges.
- *New Applicants (FY18) to the Mini Community Engagement and Restoration Grant Program (22)* – “list of the new applicants who applied to the Mini Grant program over the last fiscal year. New applicants are defined as organizations who have received less than three successful awards from the Trust in the past”; demonstrates attention to expanding the applicant pool and reaching new audiences.

6.3 Fund organizations led or staffed by people of color or other underrepresented groups.

References: 2, 19, 20

- *Follow up conversation with CBT* – The Trust does not currently collect data that distinguishes between organizations that serve people/communities of color and organizations that are led by people of color.
- *2007-2008, 2010-2012 Minorities in Environment/Diversity and Inclusion Listening Session Materials (2)* – demonstrates a commitment to listening communities of color and capturing their recommendations for grant-making; 2007-2008 sessions convened, while 2010-2012 sessions went to targeted communities
- *Connector Group Program Materials (19)* – outstanding connection between the concept of Inclusion and the mission of the Trust; demonstrates the process and pipeline for focusing the Community Engagement Mini Grant Program and Chesapeake Conservation Corps programs on three under-engaged audiences: faith community/ies, communities of color, and the human health sector; difficult to tell who the mentor organizations are and how the \$ were distributed across the three under-engaged audiences and 2 programs, but clearly demonstrates that funding is being held and utilized.
- *Mentorship Program Materials (20)* – outstanding connection between the concept of Inclusion and the mission of the Trust; demonstrates development of an incentivized program for mentoring new potential grantees; encourages relationship-building while steering resources directly to the mentee instead of the mentor; rewards mentor with opportunity to apply for additional funds for their own projects.

6.4 Incentivize and fund organizations to increase DEI in their organizational practices.

References: 23, 24, 25

- *Expanding the Circle (23)* – demonstrates funding 3 pilot projects that increased DEI in watershed organizations; demonstrates the development of recommendations for how funders can support various approaches to increasing DEI in grantee organizations
- *Draft DEI Assessment Survey (24)* – demonstrates commitment to assessing the baseline commitment to DEI in the CCWC and CBFN grantee communities
- *CBFN DEI Retreat Agenda (25)* – demonstrates funding for Funders and (grantees through the corollary CCWC retreat) to learn about DEI approaches to funding and watershed work
- *Follow up conversation with CBT* – In the capacity building program, applicants know what the Trust considers DEI practices, since the current CBI program is all about engaging under-engaged audiences. In other programs, perhaps not.

The criteria for each grant program are published, and some include DEI criterion (e.g., the CBI). Others (e.g., a program like the nontidal wetlands program) do not.

6.5 Incentivize projects that align watershed investments with community needs.

References: 19

- *Connector Group Program Materials (19)* – outstanding connection between the concept of Inclusion and the mission of the Trust; demonstrates the process and pipeline for focusing the Community Engagement Mini Grant Program and Chesapeake Conservation Corps programs on three under-engaged audiences: faith community/ies, communities of color, and the human health sector; difficult to tell who the mentor organizations are and how the \$ were distributed across the three under-engaged audiences and 2 programs, but clearly demonstrates that funding is being held and utilized.
- *Follow up conversation with CBT* – Incentives or language included in other program areas besides the Connector Group Program includes the Capacity Building Program, the Outreach and Restoration Program, the Mini Grant Community Engagement Program. For example:
 - From the first page of the OR Request for Proposals “aims to engage a diverse range of organizations, both with community-related missions and focused environmental missions, to facilitate projects that enhance communities, involve residents, and improve natural resources. This grant program funds projects in partner areas as well as throughout Maryland”.
 - And “Track 2: Restoration projects should: Engage people in on-the-ground community-based projects that benefit both the community and the quality of one or more natural resources (example: native plants, trees, water).”
 - And “All projects should meet one or both of the following goals: a) Significantly engage members of a specific audience in community and environmental issues through awareness or behavior change efforts.”
 - The RFP uses the word “community” 35 times.

Objective 7. Philanthropic Leadership

7.1 Ensure communication materials are culturally accessible, promote DEI goals and reflect people of color and other underrepresented groups.

References: 12, 14, 19, 20

- *CBT Diversity and Inclusion Statement Webpage (12)* – exists; directly connects diversity and inclusion to the Trust’s effectiveness in achieving its mission; directly commits to actions that support diversity and inclusion; includes supporting information about the steps the Trust is taking to enact the statement’s commitments; does not directly address equity; uses the term “minority”.
- *Example Trust Annual Reports and Example Brochure (14)* – demonstrates inclusion of images of people of color and images of diverse people working together; includes text that highlights the Trust’s commitment to D & I; includes content highlighting “diversity” awards; content makes the connection between community interests and healthy watersheds; not available in languages other than English.
- *Connector Group Program Materials (19)* – marketing materials include of images of people from diverse backgrounds (pictures sparse – resulting in less diversity than annual reports and brochure); outstanding connection between the concept of Inclusion and the mission of the Trust; demonstrates the process and pipeline for focusing the Community Engagement Mini Grant Program and Chesapeake Conservation Corps programs on three under-engaged audiences: faith community/ies, communities of color, and the human health sector; materials available only in English.

- *Mentorship Program Materials (20)* – marketing materials include no images; outstanding connection between the concept of Inclusion and the mission of the Trust; demonstrates development of an incentivized program for mentoring new potential grantees; encourages relationship-building while steering resources directly to the mentee instead of the mentor; rewards mentor with opportunity to apply for additional funds for their own projects; not available in languages other than English

7.2 Collaborate with philanthropy peers to develop and implement standardized DEI indicators for applicant/grantee organizations.

References: 23, 24, 25

- *Expanding the Circle (23)* – demonstrates the development of recommendations for how funders can support various approaches to increasing DEI in grantee organizations; does not provide a full set of recommendations for standardized DEI indicators in the application process
- *Draft DEI Assessment Survey (24)* – demonstrates commitment to assessing the DEI baseline in the CCWC and CBFN grantee communities; does not provide a full set of recommendations for standardized DEI indicators in the application process
- *CBFN DEI Retreat Agenda (25)* – demonstrates leadership with engaging philanthropy peers at CBFN in discussions about the need for standardized DEI indicators for applicant/grantee organizations (corollary discussion with CCWC, demonstrates leadership with engaging potential grantees in a similar discussion)

7.3 Evaluate and disseminate best practices regarding increasing DEI in environmental philanthropy, and support adoption of best practices by peer foundations.

References: 16, 17, 23, 24, 25, website

- *Trust Demographics GuideStar (16)* – 2017 or 2018 assessment of Trust demographics; demonstrates collaboration with philanthropy peers in self-evaluation of staffing demographics and board demographics
- *CBT Diversity Initiative Summary (17)* – Demonstrates commitment to training other peer foundations (as requested); demonstrates that the Trust has engaged 8 CBFN-affiliated Foundations to engage in a DEI effort.
- *Expanding the Circle (23)* – demonstrates funding 3 pilot projects that increased DEI in watershed organizations; demonstrates the development of recommendations for how funders can support various approaches to increasing DEI in grantee organizations
- *Draft DEI Assessment Survey (24)* – demonstrates commitment to assessing the baseline commitment to DEI in the CCWC and CBFN grantee communities
- *CBFN DEI Retreat Agenda (25)* – demonstrates funding for Funders and (grantees through the corollary CCWC retreat) to learn about DEI best practices in grant-making and watershed work

A3. Agenda and Meeting Notes from Facilitated Conversation with Staff

Agenda

Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Audit Discussion with Chesapeake Bay Trust Staff

Purpose:

- Understand staff perceptions of the current status of diversity, equity and inclusion at the CBT.
- Gather information for evaluating the audit criteria on Training and Internal Culture (section 4 of the audit).
- Identify how staff think CBT could continue to grow and strengthen its practice of DEI.

Agenda

1:00 Welcoming Remarks (Jana Davis, CBT)

1:05 Meeting Purpose and Introductions (facilitated by Vernice Miller-Travis, Skeo)

- Review meeting purpose and agenda
- Brief introductions – name, role at CBT, part time or full time, how long you have been here

1:20 What is your Internal Culture around Diversity, Equity and Inclusion like? (Vernice Miller-Travis, Skeo)

- Do you see the DEI policy as integral to achieving the mission of CBT? Why or why not?
- To what extent do you and your colleagues include DEI considerations in daily operations and decision-making?
- Do the Trust's board, management and staff have the skills and tools needed to advance DEI?
- What training and/or resources have staff received on DEI and racial equity issues? Any gaps?
- How do you think CBT has responded to recent accusations of unfair grant-making?

2:15 Where might CBT go from here to advance DEI?

- In what areas would you like to see continued growth in DEI?
- Can you think of any new areas for expansion? (e.g., donor solicitation)
- What barriers to and/or opportunities for continued growth in DEI stand out to you?
- What resources do staff need to support continued growth in DEI?

2:45 Discussion Recap (Vernice Miller-Travis)

- Discussion summary, and acknowledgement that there's a lot more to discuss.
- Is there anything else you would add to the insights from either discussion?

2:55 Closing Remarks (Jana Davis, CBT)

3:00 Adjourn (Vernice Miller Travis)

DEI Audit Objective 4 – Training and Internal Culture

- 4.1 Conduct staff and board training on DEI and racial equity issues.
- 4.2 Staff support the DEI policy as integral to achieving the mission of CBT.
- 4.3 Regularly include DEI considerations in daily operations and decision-making.
- 4.4 Board, management and staff have the skills and tools needed to advance DEI.

CBT Mission Statement

The mission of the Chesapeake Bay Trust is to promote public awareness and participation in the restoration and protection of the water quality and aquatic and land resources of the Chesapeake Bay region and other aquatic and land resources of the State. The Trust will engage residents of the region in programs that lead to actions that measurably improve local communities and increase resource stewardship.

Trust's Diversity and Inclusion Statement

The Chesapeake Bay Trust has a mission to promote the public awareness and participation of all local residents in the restoration and protection of our region's natural resources through its grant making. In order to achieve its mission and fully perform as an organization, the Trust commits to:

- Fostering the inclusion of individuals and groups from diverse backgrounds including, but not limited to, age, gender, race, creed, ethnicity, national origin, religious beliefs, physical abilities, sexual orientation, military service, citizenship, and socioeconomic status in all of the endeavors of the Trust.
- Expanding the dialogue between diverse communities that lead to new collaborations and identify co-benefits of environmental and community projects.
- Partnering with grantees, donors, vendors, and others who also recognize the importance of increasing diversity in efforts to restore and protect our natural resources and seek new ways to promote inclusion.
- Learning and sharing best practices that increase the inclusion of all local residents in the ongoing effort to restore our natural resources and our communities.

Skeo's Meeting Notes

Part I. What is your Internal Culture around Diversity, Equity and Inclusion like?

1. Do you see the DEI policy as integral to achieving the mission of CBT? Why or why not?

- Yes – our primary goal is to engage all citizens of MD in restoring and protecting the CB and its tributary. If we don't reach everyone we can't achieve these goals.
- Water is a regional issue, if you just pick one area you can't fix the issue.
- The fact that we were created through legislation means we should be accessible to everyone.
- I agree we are always trying to be helpful to the underdog, answering the phones, answering emails, making sure everyone knows.
- Among other funders like us, there is a lot of confusion about why it is integral to what CBFN says is a very similar mission to the Trust's mission; it's been interesting to understand that there are other organizations that don't see it as integral and it makes me appreciate that our organization does.
- It probably wasn't explicit in the very beginning (early 2000's) but once Midgett [Parker] raised it, it was like "of course" and then we had to articulate why it's important. And it's because its going to take everyone to restore water quality.

2. To what extent do you and your colleagues include DEI considerations in daily operations and decision-making?

- For me, I have to think about it frequently because I am communicating our story publicly – newsletter content and pictures we choose and how that communicates what we are doing internally and making them match.
- From a funding perspective, a lot of our funding partners have that in their goals as well (working in diverse communities) so we have to make sure we are doing that.
- When we hire contractors or use the website, we think about this when we are hiring people. When Heather sends the job announcements out, she is always sending them out to diverse outlets and makes sure to track them and the results. We make sure to reach out to HBCUs; we've recently made a partnership with the NAACP.
- One thing I struggle with, especially in grant-making ... typically we want to give funding to highest rated scorers and ensure the grantee is able to properly manage the funds. You want to make sure the grants are going to diverse communities but need to ensure management. In the mini-grant program, we have more flexibility. We ask for Title I data.
- We train people [grantees] on project management – how do you make sure your contract with your contractor is sound and you're not getting taken for a ride. We also train people on grant writing. Making sure they have an EIN number to accept funding. Making sure they have a DUNS number.
- Capacity building model allows grantees to play a capacity building role on the ground. We've also expanded internally how much time we spend with the applicants. We can only help people who reach out to ask us for help – is this a barrier to the process?
- We provide an opportunity to talk to program officers if their proposals don't get selected. Most of the time people do take advantage of this and resubmit. Sometimes they'll submit 3 times before they get awarded – we encourage them that they never know who they're competing against, so don't give up and keep submitting. Sometimes we call them directly, if they don't call us.
- I know we have the capacity building program, but another option might be a diversity grant-making program.

- We provide expectations up front, spend a lot more time with our grantees with their financials, and help them get it all in order. Because we are project-specific funders, we don't ask for the last year's budget, a list of the board of directors, etc. We do still try to consider capacity, but our watershed grant program was originally giving out hundreds of thousands of dollars, and as we learn more about a particular grantee we try to modify and put it in the RFP so they understand what they're going to have to provide and can make a decision about whether they can do it.
- We created a timesheet template and walk through financials with them.
- Grants policy manual helps us update staff on changes in the process.
- Grantees do tend to think that the doors are closed for one reason or another – don't always understand the grantmaking process. You have to talk with them and have open communication if they have gotten a grant before and then don't get another the next year.
- We have a web version of the [applicant training] workshop ... had a large workshop, but noticed we were getting the same grantees at the workshop over and over
- Mini-Grant program is eligible only to new applicants. If your organization has received 4 or more grants from the Trust in the past, you are not eligible. More experienced organizations can participate in the mentorship program and if their mentee wins, they can also apply to the Mini-Grant program.
- Connector group program – conducts outreach through organizations that have a mission that is similar to organizations that we want to reach. We have hired three organizations that can reach our target audiences. We've had some results and downfalls, but we're learning from that. We are pushing funding towards this when we can because it's high value.
- We understand that other people find other things important and this program helps us connect their interests to cleaning the bay.
- We also try to keep the grant-making staff to audience ratio really low ... if there will be more than 10 participants in a training, we reach out to staff to see if anyone else is available to help present.
- Our typical grantees actually like these DEI programs and have embraced them as an effective way to expand the conversation.

3. Do the Trust's board, management and staff have the skills and tools needed to advance DEI?

- Can't speak about board or management, but as staff we could have more skills. Would like more resources to expand into new spaces.
- We all individually have gone to conferences and workshops, but this conversation is the first time that we've had a CBT-focused conversation.
- Loved the training at the Karen Noonan center – resonated with cultural humility.
- It would even be great for the staff to be on the same page about definitions of DEI and other related terms.
- We have a box that we check on whether a grant is a diversity grant, and with how we are changing the groups that we focus on it would be nice to have a conversation about that to ensure consistency across staff.
- It's intimidating to have these conversations sometimes, it's more comfortable to look at a project on its technical merits; I'm glad we're starting to have these conversations as a group. Agree that conferences have EJ components, but whether or not I know how to apply it is different.
- We always want to have our external review committees to be diverse as well, but in order to do that we're trying to figure out whether that person is a person of color – you can't ask, but you don't want to make a call based on a photo online; sometimes with our technical programs, we are looking for engineers or specific skills like organizational development – some of these fields are not diverse themselves, so I feel like we are hitting walls. We have great goals and its very difficult to reach them within the timeframe we have. And some of these areas are very gray.

- Also, just because someone is a person of color, doesn't mean they bring the perspective you are looking for. It's tricky. If they are a person of color but you are looking to expand projects in downtown Baltimore and they have never been to Baltimore, they are not the perspective you need.
- With board composition– we're at a handicap because of the nature of our organization; the governor appoints our board; our board does not have full autonomy to appoint its membership, which is unusual for most nonprofits. The governor's appointment office changes frequently; different priorities and timelines than CBT. We can put suggestions before the office.
- The board acknowledges that they need to be more diverse and are supportive of DEI goals; personally, have never felt that they are anything but 100% behind DEI in our work. Probably like most of us they could use as many tools as we could give them.

4. What training and/or resources have staff received on DEI and racial equity issues? Any gaps?

- Most staff have attended conference sessions and read articles. For example, at the CB watershed conference – there has been a lot of focus on DEI there. But general agreement that a conference session is not the same thing as a training workshop.

Conversation moves on to things they would like to see improved ...

- I feel really strongly about those communities in low-lying areas ... we need to really reach these folks. But you don't necessarily have an organization in the community you're trying to reach (though we can help municipalities, churches etc.), so that is something we struggle with.
- Conservation Corps highlighted as a great program – Green 2.0 tells us that the environmental movement is not diverse, generally speaking. We are the only philanthropic organization that has a program to try to fix that. The Corps program suffers trying to engage persons of color and low-income persons – hard when it's a stipend program, for kids who don't have support from parents. It's hard to get someone to commit to a year of below minimum wage work. We're up to \$18K and trying to get it up to \$20K. How will repeal of the healthcare act affect this ... we offered healthcare until Obamacare happened, and we would probably try to go back to offering it. Many of these students are in the position of giving money to their parents to help pay the bills.
- Can we improve this by placing them in locations with low cost of living and/or have host sites offer housing and/or other types of supplementary funding. Vernice suggests having a focus group to help develop ideas about how to advance the program and participation of people of color. Programs like these can be a main entry point into the environmental field.

5. How do you think CBT has responded to recent accusations of unfair grant-making?

[this question skipped due to time]

Part II. Where might CBT go from here to advance DEI?

6. In what areas would you like to see continued growth in DEI?

- *Expand the corps program* - Corps program opened doors for me; my host site hired me after the program ended; have been at Trust one month. Really would like to see it grow – wonderful experience and clear opportunity. Could we do a 20 hour instead of a 40 hour, so they have the option to work?
- *Internal training/board training*
- *Webinars* for pre-application stuff in lieu of the meeting of grantees, so folks feel like they have a resource to learn more about what we can expect; other grantee resources.

- *Integrating lessons learned from Community Engagement Mini Grant program* – wonder if there's anything in that program that we can model on a larger scale for our larger grant programs? Know there might be some barriers to scaling up, but would like to see thought put into this.
- *In person training and outreach* - Workshops that bring together – 3 perspectives; need to be in the same room. In person outreach can be risky on our end – I remember when you walked up to me in the CB Forum cafeteria and said I want to do a project with you.
- *Recognize the external costs of applying for and managing grants* – have a theory that the cost from project to project goes down once you work with a neighborhood/group; need better metrics that get at community education and true level of effort. There's a lot of work that gets done (e.g., relationship building) that doesn't get measured or valued.
- *Build fun, cool projects* – e.g. veteran outdoor rehabilitation – takes a long time to educate them on the value of who we are and what we could do with them; difficult to put time towards these expanding the circle when there are so many grantees coming already and we are not able to fund them all.

7. Can you think of any new areas for expansion? (e.g., donor solicitation)

- *Finding populations that are not the usual grantee suspects* - People who are exclusively Vietnamese speaking on the eastern shore that are working as migrant farmworkers. We ended up mostly funding translations costs for documents and for a translator to help speak about some of the water quality issues on the floor. Then nothing since then. Sometimes I think – oh there are so many groups like that that we are not talking with. We try to do that in a targeted way through our Connector group work.
- *When do you move on?* The Trust was at the forefront of engaging houses of worship and now there are organizations solely dedicated to this; probably won't dissipate if we move on to a new focus area; but there are also so many places of worship who haven't engaged with us. It's a gray area.
- *Investigate how we can raise more money that is restricted for DEI purposes* (e.g., education and diversity; human health) – use those monies to reach people working in this area and bring more people into the fold; leverage corporate resources?
- *Decision makers* – board and corporate owners in those organizations may be good to build funding relationship with.
- *Baltimore meet and greet* - Fair to kick off with for-profits engineering and design services and non-profits that we have built the capacity of. Instead of forcing a marriage between groups, allows low-capacity groups to select their partners.

8. What barriers to and/or opportunities for continued growth in DEI stand out to you?

- *How we determine who is getting a grant* – we have a lot of partnerships, but that makes us have to do what our partners want; can create a barrier to distributing funds to target groups; need to work on finding ways around this to ensure we are making grants in an equitable way.
- *Telling our Story* - We could use our social media more to brag about our projects more, so people can see it and replicate projects. We have been doing more storytelling than before; some grantees coordinate pushouts of messages; leverages social media because those formulas are designed to pick up things that are being pushed by a lot of people; we need to take advantage of this.
- *Get the message out of who we are* – distinguish from other Chesapeake Bay groups (e.g. Chesapeake Bay Foundation); don't know how to solve for that.
- *Storytelling* - Delicate balance for us in not trying to step on our grantees toes, though we provide the funding and technical support to help them get there; how much credit can we take for funding it if we are not doing implementation; we beg our grantees to involve us with photos, videos, volunteers days; often they forget to keep us in the loop and engage us in the process about storytelling. The point is not tooting your own horn, but developing partnerships and bringing others in this space.

9. **What resources do staff need to support continued growth in DEI?**

- *Increase the marketing budget* - Its expensive to do video for advertising and marketing.
- *Building a working committee (volunteer) to actually help with implementation* – how to navigate that sensitively and have asks of them that are discrete and tangible so we can use their input and contributions
- *Research success stories* - Have some additional examples of success stories of people who have taken environmental issues and joined them with community goals – stories from around the country would be helpful. [Vernice reminds them about the Expanding the Circle report, and there is agreement that it could be more broadly circulated.]
- *Training* - Would like a longer conversation around training – develop what types of things we could learn that would help us shape the things we talked about
- *Staff time for DEI development and problem-solving* – time to address sensitive questions that we need time and energy and space to deal with. For example, diversifying our Technical Review Committees – it's uncomfortable to be in the position of looking a person's Facebook picture and trying to determine their race or ethnicity; what is the social structure that provides an appropriate way to ask that conversation and structure it in a way that wouldn't be offensive to someone? We need staff time for a conversation to develop: Here's our value, here's our process.

Vernice, Sarah Steff Jeff, BreAnna, Sadie,
Abbi, Heather, Kacey,
Elin, Hannah, Tava,
3/20/18 - DEI Audit facilitated mtg Zack, Emily,
Nguyen
Kelly

Stee - intro → EPA is ^{or of} their biggest clients (mathe or phone)
do community parts of revitalization, eg superfund sites
Vernice - ^{this effort} not related to the recent "bumps" in the road

1:20 - Introductions

1:25 Internal Culture at Trust DEI

① is Diversity policy integral to achieving mission?

Heather - yes. Goal to engage all citizens. All-employee.

If we don't interact w/ everyone, can't achieve goals

Emily - we - can't just fix in one place

Tava - impact - everyone must be engaged. B/c
leg created, we should be reaching everyone

Sadie - reach new audiences, try new things

Kacey - ^{at} DEI at funder network level; there is confusion
about why it's important. There are some people
who don't think it's integral. Trust is on the
other hand open about the fact that it's integral

Vernice - was this always the case at the beginning
of the Trust?

Jana - prob not but an easy addition that makes sense

② Vernice - Day to Day DEI inclusion ^{DEI in Daily operations}

Zack - has to think about it frequently b/c public
face. which stories + pictures

Jeff - lot of finding partners have ^{similar} goals so yes.
Goals to work in diverse communities

Vernice - what about day to day, not just
grant-making

Kelly - yes thru contracting MBE/DBE

② DEI 3/20/19

Sadie - ups, Heather when recruiting
Breanna - Corps outreach, HBCUs, NAACP
partnership - always looking for new partnerships
Emily - struggle - scoring proposals - balancing
new applicants vs. federal \$ risk. more
flexibility in EEMini. Larger programs can
be harder

Venice - Ford Foundation - hard at threadbar age.
her colleagues made 40 grants/yr; she did
30 big grassroots goals. Giving \$ away
is hard. Have to say no to people. Capacity
Bdy partnership

Venice - Do we train people?

Abbi - we have run
project mgmt training. Areas that
need the projects the most can be EJ
communities. But hard to find the people
to do the projects sometimes. But need
things like EIN#. Lots of lapses when
"ups it's a good project" and "yes it's feasible"

Kacey - we build the capacity of the capacity
builders. eg BWB.

We used to hold grantee meetings

We have expanded how much time we spend
w/ applicants. We review drafts. We
handhold thru microedp. How to get
a DUNS # + EIN. Sometimes we can
only help people who reach out

Venice - if people get turned down, can they talk
to us? Lots of head ~~shaking~~ nodding

(3) DET 3/20/19

Heather - yes + they will often resubmit. we encourage. Sometimes 3X. B/c you never know the next round of competition

Tara - sometimes we'll call them.

Sadie - agreed

Vernice → ^{perception -} reason that EJ groups is b/c there was racial overtones. But capacity issue. Need staff, board, audited financial statements

Perception vs. what was really going on.

ⓐ We can help people understand what really is going - find accountability.

People don't understand that - think it's just a vault of \$. Like a black box.

Recent incident - obv that there was misinformation + lack of understanding of what it takes to make grants

Martha - sees from both sides - low capacity groups vs. racial stigmatization

Vernice - do some of the smaller groups have probs?

Martha - analogy: Wont someone w/ great credit but someone new has no credit. Or wont to hire w/ experience but recent grad.
Diversity - grant-making thing?

Heather - we don't ask for typical stringent stuff that other funds do (like board of directors list, budgets)

Gave the Targeted WS shoebox receipts story. we try to also train + give expectations up front

Sadie - we spend a lot of time going through documentation w/ grantees. We spoon feed. We help people get receipts together. To help build capacity. Have policies clearly laid out.

Sadie - sees the perception vs. reality problem. People see funds as closed off even though we are not.

④ DEJ 3/20/18

Venice - EPA - biggest funder of EJ work. Took a long time to get to that place. Federal \$, created EJ small grants progr \$15-30k. Would do trainings on how to compete & manage. Took that conversation all over the country. Might take more outreach.

BreAnna - explained the mini Connector + mentor Program Δ. See new people coming thru the door. Meet people on what they are interested in. "Typical" grantees embraced this

Kacey - we generally do respond to grant training requests. BreAnna does a lot of that

Venice - EJ groups recommendations lined up - reach new audiences,

③ Does trust board mgmt staff have the skills ^{resources}
BreAnna - at staff level could have more skills.
Hispanic communities - could reach more. Could have more

Tara - This is the first training at CBT on this level
all gone to indiv trainings

Emily - would love to learn more. "Cultural humility" would love to learn more. Be on same page w/ defin of "diversity." Revisit that defn.

Abbi - sometimes to have these conversations sometimes. Easier to eval on tech merit. Sometimes can be uncomfortable or intimidating. May not know how to take EJ info & use it

Kacey - We want TRC committees to be diverse. Then you have to make a call on someone's ethnicities. In restoration, eg, need engineers

⑤ DEI 3/20/18

Kacey cont'd
some of those fields are not diverse. Merging
techn. + diversity TRC goals.

Abbi - just bc someone is of color, doesn't mean
they are bringing the specific field/input/experience
Vernice - what about the board?

Heather - Governor appoints the board, unusual for
a nonprofit. They have their own priorities + timeline

Jana - board has always been supportive

Vernice - understands. EJ Commission board appointed

the same way.
Beibara - does board have tools + resources? Could be more ^{training} _{and}
Sadie - Remember these board members sometimes do
this in their own jobs

Vernice - Midget - points out that started talking
diversity + now "DEI". Everyone has a different
interpretation. Needs common language + common
understanding. We assume people know.

④ What training + resources have staff gotten + are
there gaps? ^{Lots of hands raised, but all diff.}
_{Some formal; some informal}

Heather - diff for every person

Kelly - eg, going to spokesperson training. More for
her dept to do

Jana - diff btwn learning + having tools

Vernice - session diff than workshop. would training
be good thing? Lots of nods

Vernice - Does the Q come up that this is core
to advancing our work? How does DEI serve
bigger mission? Advance our own work? Or
just extra work?

⑥ DEI 3/20/18

Sadie - low-lying area. Sees it from socio-economic. Grew up in TN mostly white but very poor + uneducated. They need some

Heather - can't find individuals. Communities sometimes don't have indiv who can apply

Kacey - Tara's programs → youth dev program.

We are actively hiring # of people of color employed b/c of Tara's program

Heather - corps program - trying to get people to apply from low-income communities to apply (b/c of small stipend)

Kacey - trying to ↑ stipend

Vernice - would have killed for an \$18k stipend!

Tara - if the Affordable Care Act went away we'd offer health care again.

BreAnna - Heard from connector groups. Some young people have to help pay for their parents

Vernice - could the host pay some portion?

Tara - ^{some groups} have hosts that offer housing or extra help?

Vernice - small focus group to help us think thru how to reach audiences we want to reach?

Mathis - board is supportive

↳ training for staff is ^{prob} necessary

Nguyen - Corps program opened doors was great

Heather - use alumni? explore 1/2-time?

⑦ Where might CBT go from here? What areas could we do more?

Vernice - we mentioned internal framing, maybe board as well

Emily - webinar for pre-application on what we expect. More grantee resources

⑤ DEI 3/20/15

Bo'Anna - Mini CER: Could we model it on a larger scale? Like the connector group?

Heather - we've tried it larger programs. Prince Georges

Sadie - TMI community grants

Abbi - in person workshops can be helpful. Eg her Charles Co in person workshop. Can bring together Tech Ass't w/ applicants

Vernice - in person trainings + workshops combined w/ webinars

Relationship bldg takes time!

Quantify costs of relationship building

Abbi - what it really costs to do a rest project. Starts at the time you start talking to landowner

Once you start working w/ a neighborhood, gets easier + cheaper

Quantify connection bldg eg MUEE then when the kid grows up + puts a rain garden at his own

house

Jana - costs time + \$ to attract new, like the veterans kayakers, but worth it

⑥ New Areas for Expansion? Eg Donor Solicitation?

Kacey - 4 Sys app; EShare Vietnamese-speaking pops as migrant workers. We find translation costs. But then nothing else. So many groups like that.

Vernice - finding unusual suspect groups to apply

Kacey - only so much budget. Don't want to spread yourself too thin. Trust was at forefront of houses of worship work. That wave is moving. We could continue focusing or walk away + let the wave move. When do we move on to something new?

⑧ DEI 3/20/18

Kelly - lot of foundations / corporations have D+I pieces. How can we raise \$ for those purposes? Attracted restricted \$

Venice - liked this idea

Kacey - LID Competition event - for profit engineering firm matchmaking event. (with nonprofits who needed their services)

Getting people those relationships

Fair-type atmosphere

Venice - could be a good conversation in for Geo country. Homeowners not on board w/ LID

⑨ Barriers / opps for DEI growth

Emily - how we determine how we get a grant finding partners have their own criteria - ways around that

Jeff - social media to brag about neighborhood work

Kacey - thunderslap

Abbi - getting msg out about who we are?

Venice - "good work that no one knows about"
 "we're doing great"
 "is not work."

Kacey - remembers Venice didn't know the trust was behind a lot of the work she's seen until this DEI audit

Heather - but we've tried not to step on grantees' toes. Also, sometimes hard to get the grantees to engage us

Kelly - high 4-star Charity Navigator rating, so GuideStar page for testimonials

⑨ DEI 3/20/18

Venice: more of a strategy to advance the knowledge about the work. Better way to tell/amplify this story. Own + occupy this space. CBST has done a lot. We have more to do too + want more partners.

⑩ What other resources do we need?

Kelley - resources (\$). Esp, video is expensive

Venice - marketing budget, perhaps?

Karey - needs a working DEI Committee. Have them do/help more. Discrete asks of them. "Use" them

Emily - more examples of success stories. Esp of community groups where we've met them in the middle. Even from around the country.

Venice - Are we all familiar w/ "Expanding the Circle" document?

Venice - ex. W Va communities who don't even believe they are entitled to clean water + air

Jana - space to have a really sensitive conversation about when + where we're going to have ^{people provide} ethnic info

Venice - ^(rec members, grantees) Ford find - grid about ethnicities + gender to any grant application. If you have all zeros, you're not going probably to get \$. Ford find had to make that decision.

WRAP UP

Sarah - where we are going next. (Jana outlined) report, board report out, depends on next steps

A4. Meeting Notes from Interviews with Board Members

Interview notes from the interviews with three board members can be found on the following pages of this appendix. Interview notes are not verbatim transcripts of the conversation.

Midgett Parker – 3/14/2018

What was your role in shaping CBT's DEI work? How engaged have you been in developing or advancing CBT's DEI mission?

First appointed to the board of the Chesapeake Bay Trust by Governor Glendening. Early on I recognized the lack of diversity on the board as well as in the grant-making (this was over 16 years ago). I started asking the questions concerning the geographic distribution of grants and the CBT staff started tracking the data of grants to communities-of-color by county.

I was re-appointed to the board of the Chesapeake Bay Trust by Governor Ehrlich. It was during this tenure as a board member that I became the Chair of the Trust and started a committee to focus on diversity. My service on the board of the Chesapeake Bay Trust ended after 8 years.

Currently, I'm on the Trustee Council of the Chesapeake Bay Trust. The Trustee Council, started by Jana Davis is composed of past chairs of the Chesapeake Bay Trust, provides the organization institutional knowledge of past practices as well as guidance toward the future. The Trustee Council addresses Trust issues including diversity. Overall, the Trustee Council endorses the work of the current executive director and applauds her work – particularly in the area of diversity to include equity and inclusion.

My law partner, Ben Wechsler, is the current Chair of the Trust board. He has actively engaged me and others to continue to assist the Trust expand its diversity effort.

For the past 10 years, I serve on the advisory board of the Smithsonian Environmental Research Center (SERC). On that board, I've asked the same questions regarding inclusion and diversity.

How do you think that work has advanced? (steadily, episodic, facing challenges, needs to be ramped up, just right)

Moving at an excellent pace and in the right direction. The credit to this movement belongs to the current director of the Chesapeake Bay Trust, Dr. Jana Davis. Dr. Davis has done a phenomenal job in making DEI a part of the standard agenda. Not just talk – but commitment to “make it happen.” The staff, the grantees, the outreach, and more are part of her “walk” throughout the environmental movement. When I look across the landscape of other organizations involved in the restoration of the Chesapeake Bay Watershed, Dr. Davis has made the most progress. Could always be more, but she has done the most.

What major challenges or prime opportunities do you see to moving this work forward?

Opportunity – grant programs that have come about as part of the stormwater management fee that was initiated a few years ago for all the counties in Maryland that touch the Chesapeake Bay. The Chesapeake Bay Trust's work with Prince George's County has made DEI real to underserved communities. By reaching even further into Prince George's County and encouraging more environment “green” organizations and businesses be created, it's a prime opportunity. Out reach into the faith community within communities of color presents opportunities for the Trust to expand the scope of the environmental movement.

What DEI accomplishment has been most meaningful for CBT to date?

Another significant move forward – obtaining the support of Governor Hogan (current governor) and appointing new members to the Trust's board that help expand the board's diversity. You'll hear more about that from Ben Wechsler. He has been instrumental in pushing that forward.

Opportunity – hopefully we can move this whole effort forward. [Shares an extended story from a movie ... "Enemy At The Gates" – a World War II movie – at height of battle of Stalingrad, Khrushchev asked what do we need to reverse the situation of the German advance across Russia. A young political officer in the Russian Army says something like "We need a hero to rally the citizens behind the cause of protecting mother Russia."] That's what we need in this environmental movement – a hero to promote DEI in the public eye and rally others to do the same.

Mr. Parker forwarded a news article distributed among the SERC board telling a success story on the recovery of submerged aquatic vegetation in the Bay. This success story is now being picked up by the mainstream press. The story of success in reversing the decline of the Bay's environment. Can the Chesapeake Bay Trust do the same with what it is doing to promote DEI into the environmental movement? Put it out there; launch a hero?

Years ago, we were looking at where we were distributing our grants – across counties. In those days Prince George's County was a receiving a very small amount of the grant dollars for Bay restoration. The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission received a sizeable grant for an effort to expand its environmental restoration efforts within Prince George's County Parks. As a result of this grant and its announcement, I believe that more organizations from Prince George's County began to apply.

Additionally, I have to applaud Dr. Davis for making the grant committees diverse and more professional.

Organizations in minority communities still need to look at the environmental movement as an opportunity to grow – businesses, jobs, grow individually. More work can be done in this area. In the African American community, we tend to look at standard type of jobs as teacher, lawyer, doctor, accountant, banker and not think of the number of opportunities in the environmental "green & sustainable" industries that are open. Our meager participation within these industries is not for lack of ability, but lack of knowledge that these are viable career fields. How do we get the word out there to the younger generation? The Chesapeake Bay Trust is poised to spread the word to communities of color of the opportunities to become a marine biologist, a principal investigator, a grant-maker, and more.

Benjamin Wechsler – 3/14/2018

What was your role in shaping CBT's DEI work? How engaged have you been in developing or advancing CBT's DEI mission?

First few years, not particularly involved. But DEI has figured prominently in both strategic planning processes that I have been through. The current plan, I participated in that heavily. I was an officer at that point. It was a conversation that we discussed at length at the trustee and staff levels. To address the issue of how do we raise our DEI work and how do we reach beyond the choir and reach audiences that have traditionally not been part of the environmental movement. We have very candid discussions about the difficulties faced by the environmental community in getting traction beyond white suburban audiences.

It's my role as an officer to push the conversation regarding DEI and make people have open and honest conversations about how we are doing. Not congratulating ourselves too much – certainly we are doing better than most – but we are not doing enough. The trust needs to be a thought leader and a leader in building a bigger tent.

How do you think that work has advanced? (steadily, episodic, facing challenges, needs to be ramped up, just right)

Too episodic. The trust is going through a relatively aggressive growth cycle for the better part of a few years. We have the great good fortune of growing our grantmaking. We've doubled our grant making in the last few years. As we manage that growth, there's a lot of staffing and operational issues that come with that and demand a lot of time

DEI is a conversation that the Trust has on a regular basis, but the board's attention has been drawn in so many directions that it hasn't been as steady as it ought to be. Need to spend time at every board meeting and at the staff level to make sure it has a steady and sustained level of interest.

What major challenges or prime opportunities do you see to moving this work forward?

One and the same.

Trust is in a wonderful position in the work it has done in the DEI world for many years. The trust has a sterling reputation as far as the grantmaking and the transparency of the grantmaking we are doing.

The biggest challenge is that the penetration rate in to communities of color in particular is very low. The mission that the trust is advancing is not necessarily shared across the board in other communities. It's a messaging issue – how do you get the message out? Why is the work the Trust is doing important in very communities?

DEI also becomes a challenge in hiring and on the board. Right now we have 4 women of color on the board, no men of color. Of the 19 persons, we have 6 women including 2 ex-officio. This is not reflective of the population at large. So we have challenges in promoting a diverse staff and a diverse board of directors. The lack of diversity is not for a lack of effort. Jana and I have this conversation regularly, as does the Executive Committee.

The trust values diversity of ethnicity, gender, political affiliation and having robust discussions about all of these issues.

What DEI accomplishment has been most meaningful for CBT to date?

One of the things I want to accomplish is to re-balance the board of trustees to be more reflective of the state-wide and watershed-wide mission of the trust

Two weeks ago we got confirmation from the Governor's office that we have added two board members, significantly increasing our gender and ethnic diversity Both of these board members are so fantastic and bring a great skillset to the board. Really honored that they are taking the time to provide us with their professional and life experience.

Thomasina Poirot – attorney

Corretta Bennett – operating officer of a renewable energy company in Baltimore, civil engineer; having someone with a technical background who is also an operations person is so critical as we are expanding and probably buying a building and expanding offices.

Trust picks no board members. Appointed by governor and other statewide officer

I think there's such a risk for any organization to give itself too much credit for what it's doing. I really value having an outside audit on DEI issues. As countless studies have shown we all self-aggregate in our own "bubbles." Until we affirmatively ask for competing perspectives we often don't get them. I'm really happy that the executive staff at the trust takes these issues as seriously as I do. Really looking for critical feedback in order to identify what we're not doing right and how to do better. It takes a lot of trust to ask "what are we doing wrong?"

Tom Miller – 4/4/2018

What was your role in shaping CBT's DEI work? How engaged have you been in developing or advancing CBT's DEI mission?

Been a CBT board member now for 4 years. Each allowed to become engaged in an area of board operations that is of personal interest – I chose grant making and DEI. From a personal point of view and professional, issues of culture and inclusion are really critical to our society and environmental issues in general. They are also something essential to the Trust achieving its mission. I was co-chair with Angela and have been a fairly active member of the D & I Committee in terms of shaping objectives and goals. Have been less involved in the on-the-ground implementation.

How do you think that work has advanced? (steadily, episodic, facing challenges, needs to be ramped up, just right)

Steady ... the Trust has made advances but it has not been easy. Challenge is to find the best and most appropriate way to engage underserved communities – whether it's done through faith-based community, social communities of shared cultural heritage, after school programs – however it's done, it's not easy work to do. If it were, everyone would have already done it. We have faced significant challenges in connecting with communities that have not been a significant part of environmental restoration efforts.

I would love to see the Trust be able to invest more capital in what they've done, but the human capital they've invested has been significant, comprehensive and ongoing.

What major challenges or prime opportunities do you see to moving this work forward?

I think we are at a tipping point in many ways. The major opportunity is to really highlight those areas of success that we've had – like the Connector groups, which was a really inspired idea to move DEI forward. We need to promote what we've achieved to other groups to say, "If you work with us, this is what you can achieve." There is a PR opportunity that is emerging slowly that can strengthen the Trust's connection to underserved communities and communities of color.

One of the Trust's goals is reaching beyond the choir (committed environmental people who the Trust is good at reaching out to). When we see more of our funding going beyond the choir and that the projects those groups do are highly impactful, then we will have been successful.

What DEI accomplishment has been most meaningful for CBT to date?

People sometimes make as much impact as the programs. Jana and Kacey have been really leading in this area. I think their leadership should be recognized. We will really miss Angela Shepherd's involvement – my board member colleague. The commitment that they have shown is what's led to the Connector groups themselves. They really should be recognized – those three people – for the strong leadership they have given.

Does the board see the DEI policy as integral to achieving the mission of CBT? Why or why not?

I don't know how widely my view of the importance of DEI is held on the board. Don't know that we've ever had a full and frank discussion on the topic. The Trust does have a commitment to reaching beyond the choir – to me that implicitly brings in communities you've not connected with before. And in large part, that's underserved communities, inner cities, urban areas, faith-based communities. We've been very successful on connections to faith-based communities, and I think the board is very appreciative of that. Don't know that they really appreciate the potential for growth in underserved communities – that's a feeling.

[returned the question later in the interview to offer this updated reflection/counterpoint] I think there was pretty unanimous concern over the allegations that came out of Prince Georges County over the potential for bias on behalf

of the Trust. As far as I was aware, there was universal concern because they [the board] are all aware of the efforts toward a more inclusive grant funding program. And I don't think that anyone on the board thought that there was any effort on the part of the Trust to exclude any part of the community. Certainly, DEI is central to the identity of the trust. The mission is landscape-based, so if you are not in the watershed it is hard for us to fund you regardless of what other merit you might have. But the board was genuinely worried that someone might think that underserved communities are not a priority.

To what extent does the board include DEI considerations in decision-making?

What they do in their back-office function I don't know. In grant-making decisions – they have this DEI program and the Connector group program – both are evidence that the board does recognize this is an issue and certainly has put resources toward it.

In the individual grant programs, the quality of the submittal is the primary factor but certainly DEI issues are discussed at the grant panel meetings. Those reviews are scientifically objective but are not blind in the sense that we know a lot about the organizations submitting. There are certainly efforts when the proposal is of quality to be accepted to promote proposals from the DEI perspective.

To the extent the Trust has been able to do so they have been very, very responsive to that concern.

Do the Trust's board, management and staff have the skills and tools needed to advance DEI?

This is one area I do worry about. Angela was chair. Jana has asked me to take over that chairmanship. I am happy to do so, but on another level, I feel completely ill-equipped to do so. If you are going to promote grassroots involvement from segments of society who feel unwelcome, I think you need someone who themselves is a grassroots leader. I think in the short-term we have a challenge to know how to replace Angela's role and expertise – a board composition issue. I am willing to stand there and pitch for a while. Angela was a really important person in that process. I can certainly promote my beliefs, but because I am not a community organizer in the way that a minister is, it's hard for me to see how I can be as effective as her.

I have very few concerns about the commitment and quality of the staff. I think they do very well. They are highly professional, highly committed, and highly engaged and enthusiastic. Don't think they have deficiencies there. The staff is relatively diverse for an environmental organization.

One of the constraints staff have is that, understandably, Jana and the staff are really proud of the low overhead cost they carry – 97-98% of funding goes out in grants. That means you're less flexible and adaptive than you might otherwise be. Hard to fund and support initiatives that are additional to their grant-making programs. If you think about taking it to the next level and what you need to do, there is a constraint there.

Is having the Connector group and a few high-profile successes there going to be sufficient to serve as role models and serve other communities we have yet to reach? Or do we have to be more interventionist? If the latter, there are some genuine questions about resources given the laser-like focus on administrative efficiency. The internal budget is so constrained that there is very little money left over that if you said, "I want to hire a diversity officer" – even though I'm not sure that's the right thing to do – the question of where the funds come from for that becomes a challenge. If we conclude that this Connector program is not fully effective, then what else do we need to do and how do we pay for it?

[Skeo asks if the overhead targets come from the state.]

On the Trust's independent side, I think there has been a fairly consistent view that we should be a very, very good steward of the money that the state, foundations and other clients invest in us and ensure that as much of every

dollar they give us goes out. I wish other charitable organizations were as committed to this goal. But it does cause some heartburn every now and then when they have to make a decision about new staff or investing in staff. And I think in Jana's mind, the 5% threshold – as long as we are well below that, no one will every question the efficacy of the Trust as a vehicle for investing in the environment. And I think the board fully support her in that. But then you have a real soul-searching issue come up every time you want to invest in staff.

What training and/or resources has the board received on DEI and racial equity issues? Any gaps?

We've had presentations on the DEI program. We've had fairly extended discussions on reaching beyond the choir (subset of this reach is the DEI issue – but also things like healthcare facilities). The board has also talked about concerns about funding becoming channelized in a small number of highly effective community-based NGOs.

But I don't recall any specific training on DEI. I suppose I'm not sure that I see that as a significant issue. I think that the board is very, very supportive of the Trust's engagement in these issues. The board recognizes and supports that the Trust is a leader in these issues.

Where we may need additional conversation is – if the Connector Group isn't enough to do it, what now?

I see board composition following Angela's departure as a significant challenge, but I know that Jana and the staff recognize that. Replacing board members can be a slower process than you would like. Concern is primarily in finding the person and ensuring that they have the patience to wait through the appointments process, rather than there being any issue with the appointments process coming out of the Governor's office itself.