Portland Children's Levy
Allocation Committee Meeting Minutes
May 13, 2019 2:00 p.m.
Location: Portland City Hall Council Chambers

The full record of the meeting may be viewed on the Portland Children's Investment Fund website: *www.portlandchildrenslevy.org* *or YouTube at:* https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=45ute-pYcJc&list=PL4m94lCOY10nGzPYKTdl1nyAsgCQSTqTU

Attending: Mitch Hornecker, Felicia Tripp-Folsom, Jessica Vega Pederson; Ted Wheeler (Chair), absent Julie S. Young

Welcome/introduction of Allocation Committee and Children's Levy staff

Approval of minutes from April 8, 2019 meeting

Vega-Pederson: So, moved
Hornecker: Second
Vote: All in favor

Public Comment

None

Small Grants Fund

Pellegrino:

PSU Recommended establishing a small grants fund to:
- Improve equity of access to Levy funding for smaller organizations that cannot successfully compete for larger Levy grants;
- Fund organizations arising out of communities that reflect the communities they serve; possibly focus on some smaller populations who may be missed by currently funded organizations (Pacific Islander, children with disabilities, small immigrant/refugee groups);
- Reach children/families who may not be served by organizations typically funded by the Levy;
- Build capacity in small organizations to improve data collection and reporting so that they can compete for larger PCL grants in the future.

Staff has put together some proposed parameters to move forward with the project.

Proposed Parameters
- **Types of Services to Fund**: PCL must fund services in the 6 program areas authorized in the ballot language.
- **Size of Fund**: $1 – $1.5 million total over three years (estimated 2021-2024).
- **Grant Size and Length**: Grants would be less than $60,000 annually. In addition, PCL funds cannot comprise more than 30% of annual organizational revenues, so very small organizations would need to consider their requests accordingly. Grants would be maximum of 3 years.
- **Target for Total Number of Grants**: To be determined based on minimum grant size and length, but likely a range of 10- 20.
- **Type of Organization and Service Population Focus**: Organizations that have some paid staff, receive some funding from other community sources, need support developing organizational capacity, and have developed out of communities they are serving.

PCL staff sought additional input via a short survey on proposed small grants fund parameters after last meeting. Small response (19 people) and all but one favored creating a small grants fund.

Concerns raised in survey included:
- Need for more funding by agencies currently funded by PCL
- PCL staff capacity
- Are PCL resources adequate to support such a fund?
- Smaller organizations may need a higher administrative rate than is allowed in larger grants

Clarify that PCL is projected to have adequate resources to keep current investment level of approximately $19 million per year, create a small grants fund of the size mentioned, and increase resources available for the regular competitive grants. This is due to increased revenues and distributing fund balance accrued over 2014-2019 levy equally over the years of the next levy period.

We are recommending that we hire an additional staff person to work on creating and carrying forward a small grants fund pilot project.

Vega Pederson: What do you mean by this being a pilot project?

Pellegrino: We are asking that you try it and then review whether it achieved what we hoped. Did it address the concerns mentioned by the PSU report? We expect grants to be made 2 years from now. There are many details to be worked out. We expect the grants would be for 3 years.

Vega Pederson: Do we have any idea how many applicants we would be getting?

Pellegrino: It will depend on the parameters we set. Many very small grants would attract more applicants. There are City of Portland requirements that will always need to be met.

Wheeler: Can you clarify the timeline and is it enough time to evaluate the success of the program?

Pellegrino: We expect 3-year grants and do think it is enough time to evaluate. That would give us 2 years of data and time to build capacity.

Wheeler: It seems likely that there would be a need for technical assistance. Is that worked into the plan?

Pellegrino: Yes. Depending on who you hire, it might be provided by the staff or hired from outside.

Wheeler: The increased administrative workload will be outweighed by attracting providers who have a more direct connections to communities we are not currently reaching. Is that your assumption?

Pellegrino: Yes. And also to help foster organizations in various communities. Communities are broader than any one organization. For instance, we fund only one organization in town that serves Native Americans. There may be others that are smaller and are reaching segments of the community not currently being reached by NAYA. We don't know what we don't know.

Wheeler: I think we should do this, but I think we should go into it with our eyes wide open. We should be transparent. If we go into this and we fund very small organizations for 3 years, we are likely to become large supporters of these organizations, aren't we?

Pellegrino: There is the 30% rule, which limits us to being no more than that amount of their revenues. That rule is in the law. We have to do that.

Wheeler: My concern is that we get to 3 years and then hear that if you withdraw your funding, we will collapse.

Pellegrino: There will be the option to continue the grants. We do not want to promise the continued funding.

Wheeler: Are we clear on the outcomes we will be seeking?

Pellegrino: We have these outcomes from the PSU report. We always ask programs to meet certain outcomes as well. We will be able to give you an assessment of how they have performed on their grants. We do that for every grant.

Improving equity of access and building capacity in organizations that have risen form communities are other goals. Those are different policy goals. I think those outcomes are measurable.

Hornecker: These are great questions. We will want to craft the program carefully. There is some tension between building capacity to allow the organization to grow and stand on their own. That is in tension with funding programs for a short period of time. Every dollar we spend on growing an organization is a dollar we are not spending on direct service. I try to be reflective of that tension.

How we write up the program is important. It will be a participatory process. There are many issues to wrestle with.

Pellegrino: Yes, those questions are not yet answerable. There are funders who decrease funding over time and try to help organizations increase their fundraising capacity. There are other options that we have not explored. You will have the chance to consider a variety of options as we build the program. You will be able to decide how to balance those policy goals.

Public Comment

None

Pellegrino: We are proposing that you vote to move forward with the small grants project and authorize us to hire a staff person to work on it.

Vega-Pederson: I move that we direct staff to move forward with creating a small grants fund.

Tripp-Folsom: Second

Vote: All in Favor

Program Area Strategies

Hansell: I will present some background and then each grant manager will present draft strategies for each program area.

Before launching the 2014 competitive funding round, PCL adopted these Levy-wide and program area goals.

Levy-wide goals:

1. Prepare children for school.
2. Support children's success inside and outside of school.
3. Reduce racial and ethnic disparities in children's well-being and school success.

Program area goals are in your materials and in the handout for the audience.

- Prior to new funding rounds, the Levy seeks community input about most needed services in each of the Levy's six funding areas.
- Community engagement for this upcoming funding round differed from previous community engagement in that it had a focus on engaging a more diverse range of community members rather than service providers and stakeholders.

- Community members provided input on
  - Preferred types of service activities in each program area
  - The qualities and features services should have
  - How services are delivered
  - Who delivers services

- At the last Allocation Committee meeting, the Empress Rules team presented the community engagement report (full report is available on the PCL website)

- Recommendations included in the report focus on equity and inclusion and demonstrate a preference for services that:
  - Are culturally relevant, responsive and focused, and trauma informed;
  - Listen and respond to the voice and preferences of youth and families;
  - Pay attention to accessibility and address barriers to access including hours of operation, location and transportation;
  - Employ staff who are of and grounded in the cultural communities they serve.

- In drafting program area strategies, staff relied heavily on these themes along with community input about preferred service activities.

- Staff also considered:
  - local data compiled in 2018
  - relevant research
  - National, state and local frameworks relevant to program

Today, staff will present the first draft of strategies for each program area. The Committee will have the opportunity to ask questions, discuss and hear public input.

The Draft Program Area Strategies document was provided to the Committee prior to this meeting and was emailed to the PCL database.

Hard copies of the draft strategies are in your packets and are available to those attending today's meeting.

The draft strategy document will also be available on the PCL website.

The strategy documents include: features, strategies, possible service approaches, rationale, and citations to the community engagement report, data, research and frameworks.

Staff will present strategies, by program area, in the order they appear in the strategies document.

McElroy:

Early Childhood Strategies and features

- Experience, intentionality, success supporting child development and school readiness of children of color and other historically underserved populations such as children with disabilities, children of immigrant/refugee families, families experiencing housing instability.
- Parent voice/leadership identifying needs/solutions to meet their needs
- Informed by science of brain development, child development
- Connection/community between parents
- Help connect parents and fato resources for basic needs, and for transportation
- Diversity, cultural responsiveness in EC workforce, including speak home language
- Commitment to training, developing staff with current research brain development, child development, parenting

1. **Provide affordable, high quality preschool- programs will small adult: child ratios and focused on quality standards**
   - Early Head Start, Head Start, Oregon Prekindergarten, and early learning programs that meet other quality standards

2. **Enhance parent/family support of child development and nurturing**
   - Family/home visiting, parent/child programs, or parenting programs that support children's development and strengthen their family's skills with information and tools to offer nurturing, developmentally appropriate and culturally relevant/responsive learning opportunities.

3. **Support families, childcare providers, and teachers with guiding child behavior**
   - Infant/early childhood mental health consultation and other research-informed prevention supports for children in their early care and learning settings to support positive behavior

Rationale:

- Community engagement prioritized affordable preschool that meets quality standards; access to early learning and care with staff that have research-based training to offer planned learning activities, create nurturing environments and guide children's behavior; and services that build parents' skills and knowledge for supporting child development and behavior while connecting families to resources and to each other. Priorities included that early childhood staff, particularly home visitors, understand the culture and speak the home language of the families they serve.
- Community engagement also highly prioritized affordable, quality childcare, however not only in early childhood. That priority will be considered as a strategy on its own, crossing program areas, and brought to the Allocation Committee separately from this strategy process.
- Local data in Multnomah County indicate that the young population is becoming more racially/ethnically diverse, poverty disproportionately affects very young children of color and immigrants/refugees, and significant numbers of children in E Portland and with home language other than English enter kindergarten without preschool experience.

- Studies and policy efforts continue to emphasize the importance of quality, affordable preschool for supporting positive child development and school readiness, especially for children with the least opportunity to access preschool.
- National efforts by the Center for the Study of Social Policy call on leaders in early childhood programs and systems to center parent voice and leadership as a strategy for racial equity."
- Harvard's Center for the Developing Child, focused on early brain development research and its impacts over the life span, urges 3 principles to improve outcomes for children and families: support responsive relationships for children and adults, strengthen core life skills (for children and adults), and reduce sources of stress in the lives of children and families. These principles include policy and practice recommendations that support the 3 proposed strategies.
- National policy leaders in early childhood recommend an array of services that build high-quality childcare and early education, strong parents, healthy and economically stable families.

Child Abuse Prevention and Intervention Strategies and Features

Hansell:
Portland Children's Levy seeks to invest in child abuse prevention and intervention programs with the following features:
• Culturally relevant, responsive & focused programming, including staff who speak the language of the children/families they serve
• Listens to, and is responsive to, youth/families served
• Experience serving children and families exposed to toxic stress or trauma, including African American and Native American children and families, immigrant children and families and children with disabilities.
• Offers accessible services - flexible hours & transportation
• open communication between the program and family/participants
• Staff receive on-going training on cultural inclusivity, racial equity and trauma informed practices

1. Enhance parenting skills to promote healthy child development – programs explicitly focused on reducing risks for child abuse and neglect and enhancing protective factors.

Possible service approaches include:
• **Home visiting services** that provide parenting information, caregiver support, training about child health, development and care to families in their homes.
• **Parenting skill and family relationship approaches**, including but not limited to **parenting classes**, that provide support to parents and caregivers to teach positive parenting practices and behavior management to create safe families and protect children from harm.

Providing parenting education and support to families at risk of abuse and neglect was highlighted as a need across all three strands of community input

2. **Intervene to lessen harms and prevent future risk –** treatment for children and families exposed to trauma, toxic stress and/or child abuse and neglect with a **focus on healing** and preventing future risks.

Possible service approaches include:
• **Behavioral parent training programs** designed to teach parents specific skills to build safe, stable and nurturing relationships with their children.
• **Treatment and other healing approaches** for children and families to lessen the harms of trauma, toxic stress and abuse and neglect exposure.
• Treatment and other healing approaches for children and families to prevent problem behavior and later involvement in violence.

Treatment and other healing approaches would be limited to services that are not eligible for coverage by Medicaid/Insurance (because the service is not eligible or because the participant does not have insurance coverage). Applicants could choose to propose to enhance existing services by requesting PCL funds to cover programmatic expenses that are not reimbursable or could propose new or additional services that are not covered by Medicaid Insurance.

Providing mental health therapy and counseling for children, and their families, where there are concerns about abuse and neglect was highlighted as a need across all three strands of community input

3. Connect families to needed resources and supports for stabilization – access to basic need resources explicitly focused on reducing risks for abuse and neglect and enhancing protective factors.

Possible service approaches include:
• **Case management/navigation services designed to connect families to resources** needed to stabilize family unit (e.g. housing, food, medical care, job/skills training, mental health services, substance abuse treatment, crisis intervention services, domestic violence services respite care).

Wheeler: I understand why families would find navigation difficult. From the provider perspective, is there enough capacity even if we had a good navigation model in place?

Hansell: We don't know that there is enough room. One big theme of community input was that folks don't even know about the services that are available. A first step is understanding needs and connecting them to resources. We do know that there are shortages. We can help identify the gaps.

Wheeler: Have we provided a comprehensive list of what those services are? DO we have a comprehensive list?

Hansell: Would that be 211?

Wheeler: Presumably it would be.

McElroy: It is important to remember those things change. Services offered and eligibility change over time. 211 has been the keeper of that information. They have the most accurate information. It is only as accurate as the updates providers furnish.

Wheeler: Could we get a presentation on 211 at a future meeting? I would be interested to hear how the Levy and the County and City work together to provide services. What is our current baseline level of services and how are they coordinated?

McElroy: It might be nice to hear from the providers in the room today.

• **Client assistance funds to meet basic needs of families on a short-term** basis to avoid crisis situations and help stabilize families. The intent is to fill in gaps until long-term solutions are in place. This service approach would **need to be tied to at least one other proposed service approach related to this strategy or other child abuse prevention and intervention strategies**; it is not intended to be a stand-alone fund to be accessed by any program.

Connecting families to needed services and resources (housing, food, jobs, etc.) was identified by community survey respondents as a top service need when child neglect is a concern.
Service provider survey respondents identified a lack of accessible supportive services as the top barrier for families in accessing support needed to prevent child abuse and neglect.

Pellegrino: This speaks to your point. Connecting to services and there being enough resources are both issues. We know we cannot solve the housing crisis with the Children's Levy funds.

Hansell: it is something that keeps families out of the child welfare system. Providing for basic needs is the first need.

Wheeler: The City and County jointly were able to keep 750 people at high-risk in their housing last year. I am not clear how that system integrates with this system.

Pellegrino: It is a bit of a function of how families connect with service providers. It may be through the joint office.

Wheeler: This is a problem we have at the City. We want people to pick the service then need rather than being able to see all services available. We don't have a 311 system. We are one of the last major metropolitan areas to not have one. We have many voicemails that are not service. My suspicion is people are falling through the cracks and resources are being wasted. Without integration of services, the use of resources may be wasted.

Vega-Pederson: I think better information sharing systems would go a long way to get services. At the County, we are working on this topic. It is difficult to integrate the jurisdictions.

Pellegrino: Integrating the jurisdictions is a difficulty. We have heard that it is needed to prevent and emergency from becoming a catastrophe.

Foster Care Strategies and Features

Hansell:

Portland Children's Levy seeks to invest in foster care programs with the following features:

• Culturally relevant, responsive and focused programming
• Listens to, and is responsive to, youth/families served
• Experience serving children and youth in foster care, including African American and Native American youth, youth who identify as LGBTQ+, older youth, youth with disabilities and youth with behavior challenges
• Has an established working relationship with DHS child welfare, understands the child welfare system and successfully supports youth, foster parents and birth parents to navigate the system
• Offers flexible hours of operation including evening and weekend hours
• Provides transportation or can demonstrate transportation provided by another entity for program participants
• Staff receive on-going training on cultural inclusivity, racial equity and trauma informed practices

1. Enhance support and training for foster parents to promote healthy child development – services explicitly focused on providing supportive home environments, maintaining placements and retaining foster parents.

Possible service approaches include:
• In-home visits to provide service to children and support foster parents with skills and education training to address the individual needs of the children in their care
• Facilitate and support partnering relationships between foster parents and birth parents
• Respite care, specialized supports for relative foster parents and grief support for foster families when children leave their homes

Providing support and training for foster parents was identified as a critically needed service by community and service provider survey respondents and focus group participants

Staff met with DHS Child Welfare District 2 branch management teams for their input on needs and priorities for children and youth in foster care and to assure that strategies and possible service approaches were appropriate for children in DHS custody. They too identified supporting and training foster parents as a critical need

2. Individualized support to promote child and youth well-being – services and supports for children, youth and birth families with a focus on healing and healthy development.

Possible service approaches include:
• **Mentoring** that provides children and youth with consistent, caring support and model important life skills
• Support and guidance for youth in the transition from foster care to adulthood
• **Reunification support** including visitation between parent and child, visitation between siblings (if separated), parent skill building and intensive in-home support when the child returns home, connection to concrete services (e.g. transportation, job training, housing, respite care, day care, mental health and substance abuse services), and assistance developing social support networks.
• Advocacy/case management for children and youth in foster care and those who have aged out of foster care to assure their needs are met

Providing individualized support – mentoring, support in the transition from foster care to adulthood, reunification services – to children and youth in foster care was identified as key to supporting the well-being of children and youth in foster care by community and service provider survey respondents, focus group participants and DHS Child Welfare Branch management teams.

- Counseling/Therapy/Support was ranked highly by community and provider respondents.
- Last time around, we stayed away from a therapy strategy for youth in foster care because these services should be provided by OHP for youth in foster care.
- Staff discussed this with DHS management to get their perspective on this.

- They don't feel the Levy should invest in this because there is a system in place to provide counseling/mental health services and they plan to work with that system to better address the needs of children and youth in foster care.

Tripp-Folsom: I am wondering why recruitment of foster parents is not included, given the shortage of foster parents, especially families of color.

Hansell: It could be added. Recruitment is primarily a DHS responsibility. It could be added here.

After School Strategies and Features

Pellegrino:

Features:
- Culturally relevant, culturally responsive and culturally focused programming
- Staff to student ratios that allow for individual attention and support for youth
- Provides transportation or can demonstrate transportation provided by another entity for program participants
- Staff receive training on cultural responsiveness, trauma informed practices and youth development principles

1. Academic support and tutoring that includes individual attention and staff who act as liaison between school, student, caregivers.
Possible service approaches include academic goal setting, homework support academic skill building, credit recovery, advocating for students with school personnel, assisting and supporting parents to advocate for their children with school personnel.
Rationale: need for academic support and tutoring was a theme across all strands of public input. Need for staffing to support communication and understanding between students, schools and families to support student success was a theme in community and provider survey input.

2. Support healthy relationship building, positive behavior and social emotional skill development.
Possible service approaches include curriculum and activities that embed or are focused on social emotional skill building (cultural identity, belonging, interpersonal skills, goal setting, growth mindset, self-management, perseverance, engagement, self-efficacy), mindfulness, healthy relationships in families and with peers, bullying awareness and prevention.
Rationale: Need for programming that supports development of a range of social emotional skills was a theme in all strands of input. These skills are important for academic and life success, and after-school programs can be effective in building these skills.

3. Provide engaging enrichment opportunities attractive to children and youth including recreation, sports, physical activities, arts (fine, performing, music, expressive writing), STEM (science, technology, engineering, math) and culturally focused programs.
Service approaches include stand-alone enrichment activities and classes, and enrichment opportunities embedded in summer and after-school programs offering a range of activities.
Rationale: These enrichments rated highly among choices for AS program focus in community survey; focus on STEM programming was a theme in focus group input.

Tripp-Folsom: In the past, you had new SUN schools. Why now are the offerings different this time?

Pellegrino: I am not sure why that did not come up this time. It may be because the County has expanded the SUN system in the past few years.

Vega-Pederson: Recently the County added a SUN program to the last high poverty school.

Pellegrino: A SUN program could be included under these strategies. As you mention, this set of strategies is broader than in the past. We talked to different people this time. We heard from more community members.

Mentoring Strategies and Features

McElroy:
- Experience, intentionality, and success in serving youth populations marginalized by public education systems and who need support staying connected to and successful in that system, including youth of color, and/or youth who identify as immigrant/refugee, as having a disability, as LGTBQ+
- Family and youth's voice, engagement, and leadership in identifying their needs and solutions to meet their needs
- Rely primarily on paid staff whose job focuses on and emphasizes mentoring- who are experienced, trained and share an identity with the youth they serve, and/or speak their home language
- Low youth/adult ratios that assure individualized support for youth and give youth/adults the opportunity to build meaningful relationships over time
- Commitment to ongoing staff training and development on the role and importance of culture in mentoring relationships

Support youth's academic success and positive development
Possible service approaches include:
- Individualized and/or group mentoring of youth to support school success where mentor serves as a liaison between child/family and school/teacher(s)
- Individualized and/or group mentoring of youth to support positive youth development and youth's goals for careers, health relationships/behavior, or interests (e.g. art, math, science)

Rationale
- Need for mentors to support academic success, positive youth behavior, healthy relationships and/or provide opportunities for new experiences related to youth's interests, especially in arts, sciences, math, careers were strong themes across all community engagement related to mentoring needs and priorities.
- Paid staff in youth development/mentoring/youth-focused programs act as mentors in PCL's experience and in order to support community priorities for quality, especially the supply of available mentors that share an identity with youth, PCL wants to support mentoring programs that rely on paid, experienced, well-trained staff that serve as mentors, rather than rely exclusively or primarily on volunteer mentors.
- Mirrors national movement toward "Critical Mentoring" practice, advanced by the Center for Critical Mentoring and Youth Work, which centers culture as the primary driver of a mentee's learning and of the mentor/mentee relationships
- Research on best practices in mentoring supports these features and studies indicate that quality mentoring programs are associated with positive youth outcomes in social emotional development, academic success, and reduced risky behaviors.
- Local data on youth of color, who identify as an immigrant/refugee, as having a disability, as LGTBQ each experience disproportionate barriers to school success such as homelessness, bullying, poverty, and lower rates of academic achievement and positive youth development.

Hunger Relief Strategies and Features

Portland Children's Levy is seeking to invest in hunger relief programs that include the following features:
- Conducts significant outreach to improve awareness of resources
- Employs strategies to reduce stigmatization for people accessing services
- Is demonstrably responsive to community needs and preferences on location for access, hours of operation and culturally appropriate foods
- Has and uses nutrition and/or quality standards to screen food distributed to children and their families.
- Provides fresh, perishable foods including fruits, vegetables, dairy, eggs and meats.

1. Provide food for pickup by families at a variety of community locations including schools.
Possible service approaches include food distribution at community-based locations such as churches, schools, parks and organizations serving children/families, and distribution methods such as food pantries and fresh food "markets" that allow people to select needed foods, pre-prepared food boxes, and backpacks filled with non-perishable foods for weekends.
Rationale: Community and school-based food distributions were prioritized across all strands of input as best way to provide healthy, nutritious food to children and caregivers.

2. Provide mobile food banks or pantries and/or home delivery of food to children and families experiencing food insecurity.
Rationale: Transportation to no-cost food resources and grocery stores was noted as significant barrier in all strands of input, need for mobile services was a theme in focus group input. Transportation is most frequently cited reason for accessing only mobile HR service PCL currently funds.
Can address barriers around limited hours of operation and location convenience, both of which were noted in input.

3. Provide training and education on nutrition, cooking, food budgeting, smart shopping, accessing local food resources, gardening for food production and community gardening resources to children and their caregivers.
Rationale
- The need for training and education on these topics was a theme in focus group and provider input.
- Food insecure families eat less nutritious diets because low cost foods are often calorie dense but nutrient poor.
- Education on food selection, nutrition and budgeting can decrease food insecurity and improve health outcomes.

Wheeler: To what degree do we think about intergenerational support? Thinking about pairing the needs of older adults with the needs of children. I am aware of the difficulties of transportation. I wonder about volunteers being linked with families in need. To what degree do we think about connecting those dots?

Pellegrino: Meals on Wheels, which we currently fund, does use volunteers, some of whom are retirees and older adults. That is not necessarily intentional. Would you be looking to call that out specifically?

Wheeler: Yes, that would be worthwhile. There may be opportunities in calling that out. There might be partnership opportunities in linking with the City of Portland. I will think about those connections.

McElroy: I would be curious to hear from providers about those options. I think about the training of volunteers being an issue. I also think about the cultural issues – older persons who can volunteer tend to be white and more affluent, while the children are younger and of color. The cultural difference can be problematic. I would want us to look to programs for insight about that.

Pellegrino: The use of volunteers varies between program area. I think the role matters.

Public Testimony

Brie Condon, new Executive Director at **Bradley Angle House** addressed the Committee. I want to add information about trauma. Trauma can affect accessibility to resources. The resource listing is available. Someone's experience with trauma can make a resource in a booklet completely inaccessible. Trauma also has an intergenerational effect. It is important to understand what trauma does to access to services. The City of Portland continuing to fund services that help address intergenerational trauma is critical.

Hornecker: Thank you for your work. We are on the right track.

I have a couple of suggestions. On page 3, you have a chart, I would like to see the prior strategies lined up with the proposed strategies in that chart. I would like to understand the differences – are the proposed strategies significantly different from prior ones. I think we need to include the key elements of the features – both prior and proposed.

Pellegrino: We did not have key features in the past. As Kheoshi Owens told us, the what has not changed much from the past; the how has changed.

Hornecker: That is a tough distinction. We are trying to broaden. It will be harder to grade. I am concerned that we will receive many more proposals. Do we have a broader range of delivery options? It would be helpful to have it all on the page to make it clear where we have shifted.

We will be engaging the current grantees and the broader community for input. It would be helpful for us to see that input. I suspect our current grantees will be interested in responding.

Pellegrino: I do not expect much input. Our recent experience was that we engaged the community. We will organize the input.

Tripp-Folsom: I see strategies but would like to see outcomes. For example, at All Hands Raised, we wanted to raise the completion of FAFSA's. I want to be sure that we can see if we are moving the dials. Are there outcomes that we can affect? The strategies are great. I do not know what the outcomes were from the prior funding rounds.

Pellegrino: That gets tricky. We fund services of many types across many age ranges. Our programs do not have the capacity to measure outcomes over time. Once someone leaves a program, they are not tracked. We can provide outcome data that relates to the strategies.

Tripp-Folsom: Another example would be the number of culturally specific providers in various areas. Can we track the numbers of providers from the various communities? I am looking for ways we can hold ourselves accountable for what the community asked for. I want to honor the input. Not so much the effects on the youth, but more the changes to the sector and who is working in it.

McElroy: That makes sense. It is difficult to represent outcomes given the diversity of programs providers offer that we fund.

Tripp-Folsom: We asked for recommendations from the community. I would like for us to respond to their requests and be able to report on the specific requests. I think we can track information about the organizations we are funding. Let's be sure to measure those numbers.

McElroy: I hope you will see some of that on the proposed revisions to the RFI (request for investment). That will be new to us.

Pellegrino: We will put these strategies and features out widely for feedback.

Proposed Revisions to the Request for Investment Document

McElroy:

Timeline and Plan
- preparing template for the Request for Investment (RFI)
- present a draft section for consideration, discussion and public testimony
- Plan solicit public comment on draft between this meeting and June 3 meeting
- incorporate feedback, back to committee for further discussion and/or approval on June 3.
- Publication of RFIs planned for September 2019.

revised to respond to and reflect; how approached revisions
- application-related recommendations from PSU
- Levy-wide themes from the community engagement process

more intentionally and specifically focus organizational practices and results related to racial equity, diversity and inclusion.

consulted directly with other funders who have changed grantmaking practices to more intentionally focus on equity, diversity and inclusion
- Meyer Memorial Trust, Collins Foundation, Metro (Parks and Nature grant team), United Way/Early Learning Multnomah, and the Oakland Fund for Children and Youth.

reviewed funding applications or RFPs issued
- Multnomah County Healthy Families, Northwest Health Foundation, and the San Francisco Foundation

Both cases: looked both at grant application questions and how responses were evaluated by either outside reviewers or funder staff.

met with staff of the City's Office of Equity and Human Rights; have agreed to review and provide feedback on draft RFI sections as they are completed.

BACKGROUND: 2014 RFI Overview- 4 sections
- Proven Program Design/Effectiveness (55 points, minimum of 39 required)
- Program Budget, Budget Narrative, Cost Effectiveness (10 points)
- Organization Capacity (10 points)
- Culturally Responsive Programs/Organization (25 points, minimum of 16 required)

3 bonus points
- Serve East Portland zip codes: 97216, 97220, 97230, 97233, 97236, 97266
- programs/organization that demonstrated they were culturally specific.

Previously, Organizational capacity section itself didn't ask questions related to racial equity, diversity and inclusion. It focused on Mission, strategic plans, leadership

Culturally Responsive Programs section focused in part on the definition of culturally specific programs and organizations, asked for the demographics of clients, staff and board of the applicant, and included questions on:

- Organizational commitment to cultural responsiveness
- Service user voice and influence
- Community engagement and collaboration
- Staff recruitment, retention, promotion and training; board training
- Language accessibility

Draft Revised RFI Section Overview

- collapsed the formerly separate sections on organizational capacity and cultural responsiveness into one section
- focused on applicant organization and extent/depth of policies, practices and results related to racial equity, diversity and inclusion.
- new, one section proposed 36 points, minimum of 23 required to be considered for funding
- both draft RFI section/questions for applicants AND scoring criteria/form reviewers to use revised and presented for public input
- RFI sections on Proven Program Design/Effectiveness and Program Budget/Budget Narrative/Cost Effectiveness will remain as separate RFI sections and will bring re-drafts of these section to the Committee for consideration at the June 3 meeting.

NEW: Org Capacity and Commitment to Racial Equity, Diversity and Inclusion

- topic areas similar to 2014 RFI
- questions asked about each topic and scoring criteria changed, refined
- award higher scores to organizations with deep, ongoing commitment to and success in advancing racial equity, diversity and inclusion
- proposed revised section moves away from defining cultural specificity and awarding bonus points for meeting that definition.

Rationale for Proposed Changes

1. **Alignment with City-wide equity goals.**
- 3 equity goals in 2015 (after last PCL competitive funding round)
- assure advancing goals in grantmaking process, community engagement practices and internal operations
- staff acknowledge our lack of diversity, striving toward cultural humility and responsiveness. In addition to changes to grantmaking process for the next funding round, PCL has created and Affirmative Action Plan, and is in the process of creating and Equity Plan using OEHR tools and resources.

2. **PSU Recommendations**
- honor intent of PSU's recommendations more points to **applicant *organizationss*** with greater commitment, experience and results in racial equity, diversity and inclusion, and whose clients, staff and board majority of color.
- PCL eliminate the focus on cultural specificity, staff did not incorporate PSU's bonus point recommendations.
- Instead, more racial equity, diversity, and inclusion related questions asked, additional points highest quality responses to these questions
- standard for reflectiveness of staff and board is articulated as majority of color as PSU recommended.

3. **Community Engagement Recommendations**
- community preference for services delivered in ways that prioritize racial equity, diversity, inclusion, cultural responsiveness
- service providers reflect the culture and language of service users

4. **Other Funders' Focus on Organizational Commitment to racial equity, diversity and inclusion**
- Conversations and review of funders' applications demonstrated a focus on organizational commitment to racial equity, diversity, and inclusion
    - reflectiveness of staff and board (judged differently by diff funders),
    - how service providers truly involve communities served in service design/improvement, and whether/how service providers are accountable to communities served
- Most funders consulted did not focus on cultural specificity or whether organizations/programs met a definition for cultural specificity

5. **Point Spread in 2014 Scores**
- In 2014 funding process, 91% of applications had a score of 8 or more (out of a total of 10 points) on the former organizational capacity section.
- Among the few organizations with a score of 7 or less, six were from organizations that were already grantees of the Levy in 2014.
- organizational capacity section had little impact on funding decisions.
- Conversely, the score range was far greater Culturally Responsive Programs/Organizations section:
    - 70% of applications scored 19 or more, while 12 applications were eliminated for scoring 15 or less.
- proposed revisions increase types of questions that offered reviewers more options for discernment in scores, and more likely affect which applications are eventually funded

Vega-Pederson: I appreciate the changes. Are the goals set by statute?

Pellegrino: The overall goals are in the statute. The program area goals are not.

Vega-Pederson: I would like to see us call out the diversity, equity and inclusion goals in the program areas.

Tripp-Folsom: I would like to see us use frameworks already developed by other funders, such as OCF.

Vega-Pederson: Even just a snapshot setting the baseline of where we are would be helpful.

Pellegrino: That information is in the local data report. WE have chosen not to present it publicly, but we have sent it to you.

Hornecker: I thought this was excellent work. I have a couple minor points. In section F, I would drop the word "authentic". The authenticity is what is going to be scored. Part H, the word served is twice in the first bullet. I think we want the demographic data in each section; we should ask for it in all of the parts of that section.

I like the scoring. I did not see where parts C,D & E were incorporated. Were those sections removed.

McElroy: We are talking about moving the financial capacity section into the budget section. The key management section did not tell us much and reviewers did little with that information. We thought other questions would be more valuable. The statement of experience was similarly not of much value. Most successful applicants were already known to reviewers, etc. We are trying to limit the size of the applications.

Hornecker: What is the difference between the first 2 bullet point in section H?

Pellegrino: there is an opportunity to include diversity other than racial.

Hornecker: In terms of the percentages, bigger organizations will have a harder time to get over 51% in some of these diversity categories. That is not necessarily a bad thing. Did you consider adding program specific, rather than overall diversity numbers?

McElroy: We had that in the past, but often the staff was a projection, since the program may not have started. The new method prioritizes evidence that the organization is already committed to diversity and inclusion.

Public Testimony: None

Wheeler: Please provide written testimony if you are so inclined.

Discussion of Public Testimony in Grantmaking Process

McElroy: We are not asking for decision today- present background and current options/ideas staff exploring. We are offering time for you to discuss and take public comment.

Background: PCL funding process
It is a hybrid of an annual government budgeting process and typical request for proposal (RFP) process

Annual government process:
- budget proposed- exec proposed, legislative approved/adopted
- multiple public meetings and work sessions
- options for public comment, especially by groups lobbying officials for certain budget outcomes.
- Lobbying regulated by jurisdiction, e.g. disclosure rules for public officials

RFP process: public employees using specific procurement procedures, including
- RFP with detailed specification for goods/services want to buy,
- committee of evaluators scores proposal based on criteria published in RFP
- may interview top scoring proposers,
- top scoring proposer from process is awarded.
- Eval committee can't communicate with proposers, no conflict of interest
- proposers attempting to communicate with eval committee or elected officials/their staff during process to influence process disqualifies proposer from consideration.

PCL uses responsive grantmaking procedure, exempt from procurement, but uses many similar processes to procurement:
- publishes application like RFP with clear scoring criteria for applications,
- community reviewers score applications using published criteria,
- reviewers can't have conflict of interest
- applicants can't contact reviewers to influence outcome of scoring.
- All of that used by Allocation Committee (AC) to make funding decisions.

AC part of Levy act passed by voters. AC subject to OR public meeting law-
- meeting must be publicly noticed
- occur in location that public can attend.
- Law mainly to assure public can be informed and aware of decisions by public bodies and know info upon which decisions made.
- Not require public be allowed to testify/comment—is a public attendance law, not public participation law.

- Presiding officer of public body empowered to decide whether to allow public participation, structure and time allotted for it.

PCL has **competitive grant process** approx. every 5 years after levy renewed.
- AC meets to decide process it will use and to make funding decisions.
- AC selects grant portfolio using policy considerations, like annual gov't budgeting process; application score part of those considerations but not exclusively.

Part of past process included **testimony from applicants.**
- Amount of time/structure of testimony in past based on number of applicants and time available for meetings.
- In 2014 had 2 testimony-only meeting (no decisions).
- Meetings occurred after applications scored and PCL staff had issued its recommendations to AC for which applicants to fund.
- Testimony was mainly in response to staff recommendations
- each meeting for 3 program areas, approx. 50 applicants.
- 2 Funding decision meetings occurred separately from testimony meetings and no testimony taken during decision meetings.
- 2 decision meetings also covering 3 program areas.

In past PCL allowed **applicants to advocate to AC members** for funding/their applications-
- informed those attending Bidders' conf,
- staff referred applicants to PCL website for AC member email addresses.
- Didn't publish guidelines on this in RFI.

PSU Recommendations
- Clarify requirements of public meeting law as apply to testimony at public meetings
- Better communicate that info to applicants
- Modify testimony/advocacy process such as: ways AC members get to know applications prior to funding decisions, allow 10-min interviews of applicants, staff repeatedly notify applicants about what advocacy permissible.

Found service **providers dissatisfied w/ testimony** process b/c
- people testifying with interpretation did not receive more speaking time,
- some applicants had multiple people testify on behalf of application (so more total time for some applicants over others),
- too little time allocated to applicants to speak,
- perceived AC members had already made up minds on what to fund so testimony not useful,
- access for advocacy seemed unfairly distributed

Again- not yet at stage of recommendations but staff's current thinking about options to improve process

Clarification of Public Meeting Law and AC:
Include outline of public meeting law obligations of AC in next RFI, at Bidders' Conference, in an FAQ communication on PCL website, and in emails to applicants throughout process.
Outline would include info such as:
- all meetings of quorum of committee be public, including decision meetings;

- law doesn't require testimony BUT
- policy AC adopts about testimony related to funding decisions will be communicated clearly in RFI, at Bidders' Conf, on FAQ/website, in emails to applicants throughout

Options for Testimony and Advocacy

Opportunity to all <u>applicants to provide written testimony</u>
- Similar to recent renewal process- applicant gets specific recommendation details from staff and has opportunity respond in writing by deadline. All responses given to AC.
- In past, after applications scored, staff provides specific funding recommendations, rationale to AC.
- Staff has not sent detailed recommendations to each applicant- provided more general info.
- Allows all applicants same opportunity to address staff recommendations, and allow applicants not recommended better understand staff's detail rationale

<u>Modify Oral Testimony</u>

Background: PSU recommend more time for testimony (e.g. 10 min interviews).
- Put in context 2014 process: 115 applicants. 2 minutes of testimony over 2 meetings- 4 hours of meetings.

Vega Pederson: Did all applicants testify?

McElroy: Not all, but most did.

Overall increase meetings for AC
- Assume similar number applicants this time, give 10 min per applicant, 20 hours of meeting time (ten 2-hour meetings).
- Difficulty of scheduling meetings - increase time for overall decision-making process part of meeting.
- Dissatisfaction in past w/ testimony and applicants felt not meaningful.
- staff hesitations on increasing testimony in this way

AC members individual/groups of 2 at multiple testimony meetings
- Each member individual or groups of 2, at 1 -2 longer testimony meetings by program area
- Applicants get 10 min slot
- AC member listen 2 program areas of testimony
- Each member then has to communicate info to other members in some form
- Seems hard to accomplish in **transparent, efficient way** and may not help with concerns from applicants about perception that AC not transparent in its decision making.

Focused Testimony meetings
Similar to recent renewal meeting, limit testimony to only particular groups of applicants.
- give time to applicants not recommended, similar to recent renewal meeting process.
- Assume similar number of applicants as 2104, then just under half were recommended for funding, a little over half weren't recommended by staff.
- About 55 applicants to testify, given 10 min each would be about 10 hours, or 5 min per applicant would be 5 hours (two 2.5-hour meetings).
- OR set other criteria in advance to invite testimony only from particular applicants not recommended for funding (e.g. those scoring in bottom half of applicant pool).

- Challenge: if only certain applicants testify, AC finds testimony compelling and opts to fund that applicant but it makes another applicant that had been recommended for funding be removed from consideration, and that one doesn't get a chance to testify. Still get applicant that feels process unfair.

Advocacy to AC members from Applicants
Two options:
- continue allow applicants to reach out to individual AC members throughout funding process and staff does better job communicating to applicants how they can do that- e.g. in RFI, at Bidders' Conference, email notifications, on PCL website
- restrict during funding round: do not allow applicants to contact AC members individually regarding their application(s) during funding process. Committee could adopt policy to not discuss applicants with anyone from applicant org(s) once RFI issue and until AC makes final decisions. Addresses complaints about unequal access and reduces calls/emails to members.

Tripp-Folsom: Clearly, 20 hours of testimony will not work. I recently did a process for a national scholarship and we did videos. Each young person sent a 5-minute video. We each had 250 videos to watch. We had to rank them. We had 3 weeks to get through all of them. I would recommend using videos produced by applicants.

Vega-Pederson: I appreciate the work you did. One piece that would be easy would be to limit the number of people per organization who can testify. I think we should expand the time to allow for interpretation services.

I have to think more about limiting access to us during the process. Something about that does not sit right with me.

I like the idea of written testimony.

I agree that only allowing oral testimony from those not recommended is tricky.

Hornecker: I am strongly in favor of restricting access to the committee during the process. Getting through the emails is a challenge. The only way to fix the equity of access is to eliminate it entirely.

I second the comments about written testimony from the applicants.

I think the oral testimony is not about length of time. I think it is about the structure that is the frustration. I do not think more time will improve the frustration level.

Wheeler: There are two sides. The access side and the attention span. You can only absorb so much testimony. Early testimony is more engaging than later testimony. I have always felt that testifying early is advantageous.

I like the idea of seeking to level the playing field. I like the idea of uniform access. Creating an alternative platform – web based, video or written.

I rely heavily on the staff to give us direction. Most of the time I would take your recommendations. You would do your work based on your standards.

Regarding folks getting to know us better. I hope that I have the opportunity to meet staff and visit the organizations.

Pellegrino: In know many of you meet many of the folks at these organizations.

Wheeler: Did PSU mention appeals?

McElroy: You voted against having one.

Pellegrino: appeals are more useful in standard RFP processes.

Wheeler: I would like to receive written feedback after the fact.

Hornecker: City Council approves or decisions, so there is another opportunity for testimony.

Pellegrino: City Council has to take the whole slate or reject the whole slate. They cannot accept only some of the recommendations. It is a bit different from an appeal process.

Wheeler: It is an all or nothing. The recommendations come as a package.

Public Testimony: None

Pellegrino: WE will craft recommendations for the June 3 meeting. We will solicit written public comment before then.

Wheeler: We welcome written comment.

I want to thank the staff for your work. I appreciate the organization of the material.

Our next meeting is **2 to 4 pm on Monday, June 3.**

Adjourned 4:00 pm