

Governor's Committee on Disability Issues and Employment (GCDE)

Awards subcommittee meeting

September 7 2022

11 am to 12 noon

Minutes

1. **Welcome** – meeting was called to order by Janet at 11:02am, welcomed everyone, thanked them for coming. Amy let us know that she would need to hop off early due to another meeting offsite.
2. **Roll Call** – Staff: Ryan, Emily; Subcommittee: Matt, Kevin, Amy, Clarence, Mike, Tammy, Janet, Kristin, Daniel (others added as they joined after roll)
3. **Housekeeping Rules** – State your name before speaking for the interpreters, speak one at a time, use the reactions and raise your hand for comments or questions as needed
4. **Approval of August 31 meeting minutes** – this item was inadvertently skipped originally, but once revisited, Amy moved and Kevin and Mike both seconded, Janet thanks everyone for reading what was captured on a weekly basis
5. **Venue Update** – Ryan is back, shared an update, stated that he spent some time yesterday to address and work to resolve or clarify any issues between the ESD contracts office and the venue (Lynwood Embassy Suites). Confirmed that we are able to pay via a check or credit card. We are awaiting word from Ryon (the hotel event planner) for a final response regarding the proposed edits from the contracts office. They still need to come to an agreement regarding a method of payment and some minor edits to the contract language.

Ryan has not been able to get in touch with Ryon so far this morning despite repeated calls, but will step away if needed, and is making it a priority to push this forward. Ryan is not yet fully trained on our contracting process, so Elizabeth will sign off on the contract as needed. We hope to have everything together soon. Though it has been a difficult process, Ryan believes we are on the same page with the hotel as of his in-person

meeting with them in August and that they have been fairly responsive and are onboard with our goals so is unsure of the reason for the delay.

We would like to get this process concluded soon so that we can begin sending invites with the registration information. Ryan shared that the contracts manager at ESD will be out of the office on vacation starting next week, so he hopes to have it wrapped up before then, as we do not know who will be stepping in as a backup while they are out of the office. Ryan will keep us informed.

6. Social Media and Nomination Application Update – a robust discussion was had on this subject which is summarized below.

Janet started off by sharing that while the initial extended nomination deadline was Thursday Sept. 1, we kept it open another day. We ended with 16 complete nominations, despite having 75 in the system total. While this is frustrating, we have since realized where some of the hang-ups could have occurred. There is a button at the end that asks what nominators would like to do next, with one of the options being to “go to the end of the survey,” but people may not have realized that you must push “next” after that point in order to submit your nomination, then you will receive a message alerting you that your nomination has been submitted. Otherwise, we are unsure where the obstacles could have been, aside from that people may have thought they submitted a nomination when they in fact did not. Unfortunately, the way the survey is currently setup, we do not collect enough information to be able to know who started but did not complete a nomination. We did send out a general message on Friday reminding people to assure they hit submit, to no avail.

It was mentioned that the message was also sent out to DVR, DDA, and CEA. It was suggested that in the future, a list of completed nominations received be included in that message, so that if people do not see their nomination on the list they are prompted to go back into the system and check. This was noted for next year.

Emily shared that we will be changing the process next year to collect the nominator information up front so that we have the necessary contacts to

follow up with in the event that people start a nomination but do not submit it.

It was noted that only 7 people spent any significant amount of time in the system but didn't complete a nomination, however, it is still hard to estimate the number of complete nominations we could have had based upon that measure because people could have opted to fill out the information on a Word document and simply copy and paste (which would not have taken much time).

It was suggested that we acknowledge those who started a nomination, but was reiterated that we don't currently collect enough information to know that (only the amount of time that individuals spent in the system), but it was still recommended that we send out a general acknowledgement so as not to discourage folks who may have started a nomination from participating again next year.

It was asked whether the supporting documents could be posing a barrier to people's participation, such as encountering issues collecting that information from a third party. It was shared that we have always had that requirement, and have removed some items such as the requirement of the nominator to collect photos and releases, but it was still suggested to examine that portion (for example if you are submitting a nomination on behalf of an organization versus having them self-nominate and may not have all of the pertinent information). It was decided that perhaps this information can be separated out from the nomination questions next year so that if that is what is holding nominators up, we will at least have the other nomination information with which to move forward (and in case people interpreted the directions differently and simply did not submit because they felt that they did not have all of the necessary pieces when in fact they could have submitted what they have and simply not received points for the additional information).

It was asked whether we could consider extending the nomination deadline further for another few days and making the necessary edits to the survey formatting now instead of next year. After much discussion, it was decided that the timeline unfortunately does not allow for this at this juncture and

we would have to move forward with what we have and take these points as learning lessons for next year.

It was suggested that we reach out to subject matter experts if possible to further analyze the data. While we can try to reach out to Survey Monkey, it may not make that much of a difference for this year since we have decided to move forward with what we have, and we are hoping that changes to the nomination form next year will render the issues moot at that time.

It was suggested that we loop the Governor's office in now regarding the low nominations numbers so they are aware.

It was reiterated that we did already make some changes to the form this year as a result of feedback we received and will continue to do so. We did run into the same problem last year of a gap in the number of completed versus incomplete nominations, this year's was just larger, and it is hard to know as we near the deadline if people will just submit them at the last minute.

We will do our best to analyze the data we have from this year and solicit feedback, but have not received any from people thus far.

- 7. Sponsorship Update** – we are still at \$4,500, no additional sponsorships have been received, the latest update was that T-Mobile was not able to sponsor. Clarence shared that he reached out to his contact there and it may have been due to the fact that their budget for the year had already been established, and that we should likely reach out by November or December if we wish to make another ask for next year.
- 8. Marketing Work Group discussion/Update** – the marketing workgroup remains available to assist with the email teasers.
- 9. Email teasers Discussion** – Kristin has volunteered to help with this and we have a calendar of when and how often to send the messages.
- 10. Selection Process Update** – the conflicts of interest have been received from the judges, the info for the judging panel in each category has been decided, we received nominations across a variety of categories for representation despite the low number overall, and we have enough judges to cover the workload. The materials will go out today, the teams will

coordinate a meeting to discuss their comparative scores, and Janet will handle the mailing of any hardcopy forms. The information will go out to judges in an email, to include timelines, but we are aiming for a deadline of the weekend for folks to have reviewed the materials, and early next week to schedule a meeting, to have the results and recipients back from the lead of each group by next Wednesday Sept. 14 so we can move on with other processes as needed (such as ordering trophies).

11. Other Tasks and Projects – Yvonne was thanked for her work in contacting the nominees to solicit photos and release forms.

12. Next steps - we will collect all of this feedback, thank you everyone for meeting today.

13. Next meeting date: Wednesday, September 14 from 11 am to 12 noon