Portland Children's Levy
Allocation Committee Meeting Minutes
June 3, 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=hGbkLzfBjqw

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

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

Approval of minutes from May 13, 2019 meeting

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

Public Comment

None

Video of Lifeworks Children's Relief Nursery, created by PCL staff, shown. Can be seen on Portland Children's Levy website. www.portlandchildrenslevy.org/videos.

Program Area Strategies Update

Wheeler: Staff is going to update us on program area strategies. We will not be voting on this today. We are still seeking input from the public via survey monkey and other sources. We plan to decide on these topics at our June 17 meeting. Links to sources are available on the Children's Levy website.

Pellegrino:
Staff presented draft program area strategies based on community engagement recommendations, local data and best practice at last meeting.

Committee asked for some follow up information on how the strategies differed from those adopted in 2014, and how they relate to outcomes.

As noted by the community engagement consultants when they presented their recommendations to the committee, there was not huge change in what people want the Levy to invest in; instead more feedback on how services are designed, and who delivers them. This feedback was incorporated into features included in the strategies, and then into the RFI questions on program design and demographics of the applicant organizations.

Strategy Differences

- **Early childhood:** reflects community engagement (CE) input to allow broader range of models and removes age group limitations.

Hornecker: Can you please explain the difference around age.

McElroy: Previously, home visiting was exclusively for ages prenatal to 3 and preschool was exclusively for ages 3 to 5. Pre-school included pre-school like experiences. We chose to remove those limitations in response to community engagement.

- **Child abuse preventions and intervention:** focus on child development reflects CE, includes previous strategies and opens to new approaches; adds a strategy focused on supporting families in crisis and preventing neglect which arose out of CE
- **Foster care:** adds strategy to support foster parents which came from CE; broadens strategy focus to include previous strategies and other culturally relevant approaches per CE

Hornecker: I am interested in a strategy that involves training foster parents. Have we thought about whether that strategy compete with direct services to foster children.

Hansell: We do not know what the dollar amount would be yet. I see the training of foster parents as supporting children in foster care. It is similar to parenting support in child abuse prevention. Training and support of foster parents was highlighted in 2014 community input. At that time, it was felt that that was DHS responsibility. This time, we are seeing that there is a role for community-based services training of foster parents. It would need to be coordinated with DHS. The audit of DHS that came out last year highlights the need for support of foster parents. In particular, training of trauma informed care are important.

Hornecker: I understand why we would do it. I am not clear on what the shortage of DHS training is. It is such a broad category, I wonder how we will understand proposals when we receive them.

Hansell: Reviewer panels in foster care will have DHS representatives. They will be able to help with that analysis. I have also heard from DHS management, that the support is needed in helping address behaviors of children in their care. This would be similar to home-visiting. Providing that type of support is more likely to keep children in their placements. That is an example. The other need is respite care and child care for foster parents during training. It will be a balance of which strategies are best for the Levy to invest in.

Pellegrino: This is true across program areas. There will be a balancing based on the applications you receive. It is not only about how much need is there, but also who is coming forward to offer services. Also, did the application convince us that this is a well thought out program that is going to be well delivered. There is always a constellation of factors.

Hornecker: In adding training for foster parents, it makes the calculation more complex.

Pellegrino: It has come through so strongly in the public input both times that we feel compelled to include it.

Hansell: We are not sure what proposals we will get on this strategy.

- **After school:** minor change to emphasize themes from CE on how to support students; new strategy focused on social emotional development which was a CE theme; enrichment strategy is similar and can include SUN programming

Hornecker: In 2014, we had intensive academic support. Intensive has been dropped this time. I recall that was an important word

Pellegrino: In the past, we engaged more policy driven stakeholders, who were more directive. The literature supports intensive academic programs as most likely to show outcomes. The current input was about providing individual support with low ratios. There was also an emphasis on providers, parents and teachers working together. That was included in the past but was highlighted in the input this time.

Hornecker: Why would we not include intensive?

Pellegrino: We could, but it did not come out of the input. Do you think it should be in there?

Hornecker: We really focused on it in the past. Taking it out broadens the field. I thought it was beneficial in the past. I do not object to broadening it.

Young: I agree with Mitch. How you operationalize intensive is important. I think it sets a standard. We want this to be intensive and as beneficial as possible. I think it conveys the message.

Pellegrino: We will add that to the feedback that we will bring back on the 17th.

- **Mentoring:** encompasses previous strategy; emphasizes CE them of supporting youth development.
- **Hunger Relief:** New strategy includes previous strategy of school-based pantries and is broader to include community locations; new strategy on mobile food pantries or home delivery of food reflects CE input; training and education on food related topics for youth and adults was included and funded as part of alternative approaches last time; added explicitly here to reflect CE recommendations.

Hornecker: I would like to go back to child abuse prevention and intervention. We had therapeutic intervention called out. It has been dropped in the current proposal.

Hansell: It is rephrased as to intervene to lessen harms and prevent future risk. It could include therapeutic intervention. I still see it as fitting into the proposed strategies.

Hornecker: Is therapeutic intervention a subset of trauma-informed care?

Hansell: Trauma-informed care is a broader category. Trauma-informed care is a component of any program we fund.

Pellegrino: Trauma-informed care came through in public input for everything.

Feedback on strategies: not much to date. We will make one last push to gather input. The PSU work and the community engagement work involved a high volume of input about the Levy. We propose one last push, report at June 17 meeting and make final decisions then.

Public Testimony

Jorge Nava, who coordinates a youth program at **IRCO,** addressed the Committee. I run the Levy funded program called INSPIRE which is an in-school program for refugee and immigrant education. I want to support the priority of equity, inclusion and diversity. I also support the social emotional priority. IRCO is a culturally specific organization that provides programs throughout Portland. My program provides individualized academic support for youth. It provides advocacy, social emotional learning, and culturally focused academic support. We also provide after school activities. INSPIRE serves Latino, Slavic, African immigrant and Asian and Pacific Islander populations. We provide support for Nepali, Bhutanese as well as Somali populations. We have found that bilingual and bicultural advocates are very important. We thank you for your continued support. We are excited that the Levy is focusing on diversity, inclusion and equity.

Dr. Joseph Tietz, Executive Director of **Pathfinder Network** addressed the Committee. Pathfinder Network receives PCL funding. I am a clinical psychologist. Trauma-informed approaches are a core piece of our work and we take it quite seriously. It is broader than therapeutic intervention. It represents the whole experience of being engaged at a particular agency. It requires training of all staff at a broad level. It has more significance than the word intensive, which can mean many things. Almost all approaches to children have to take that into consideration. We can do more harm than good when we do not take care to see the impact of how we deliver services.

Wheeler: That is a great thing about these meetings. We have so much expertise in the room.

We will not vote on this item until June 17.

Relationship of Draft Strategies to Goals and Outcomes

Pellegrino:

Baseline data: data on outcomes for children in Portland and Multnomah County are included in Local data report and referenced in the strategy documents.

- Levy accountability framework is built on a logic model that links the supports we fund to the positive longitudinal and community level outcomes we are all looking for.
- The framework includes assuring that people are enrolling in the programs funded, understanding the demographics of those using services, understanding the level of participation in services and disaggregating that information to make sure some groups are not consistently dropping off in participation, measuring client level outcomes, and staff turnover which especially impacts relationship-based services.
- The framework does not include longitudinal tracking of outcomes for children and caregivers over longer periods of time because doing this is costly and would require expertise of professional researchers.
- It also does not include as assessment of the Levy's impact on community level results for children/caregivers such as the graduation rate. This type of study also requires professional research design and implementation because all variables other than Levy funded programming that affect community level outcomes need to be statistically controlled. Also have to keep in mind that Levy programs serve 10-12% of the child/youth population in Multnomah county in a given year, that these children are spread throughout the age continuum, and that the funded services range in intensity from 8 hours in a year for a single after-school program, to 400+ for a full day pre-school program. Best information available is for Multnomah County.
- PCL monitors whether funded services work toward reducing racial/ethnic disparities in children's well-being and school success. Over the current Levy, 70% of children served are of color, as compared to a population of children in Portland schools that is 50% children of color. Data collected over the last 5 years has not shown any consistent differences between the race/ethnicity of those enrolling in programs and those who stay long enough to measure program outcomes. In this last levy period 80%-85% of the children in programs meet the program outcomes.
- PCL also monitors and reports annually on overall investment in Culturally Specific services and services provided to children/caregivers who live or go to school in east Portland and has met goals to increase those investments over time.
- In response to community engagement input and recommendations, PCL could begin to track the demographics of grantees' staff and board over time. Provided at time of application but not collected

annually. Could also monitor grantees' implementation of other EDI practices such as level/quality of service user voice, community accountability practice, language accessibility practice.
- We can also monitor and report on Levy staff and board composition and practice over time. We will be doing this as required of all independent bureaus of the city in creating affirmative action and equity plans and reporting progress on goals.

Hornecker: Some of the data on staffing is in the RFI questions.

Pellegrino: Yes, but we have not followed up and tracked that information. Please keep in mind that everything we ask the organizations to provide is additional work for them.

Public Testimony and Advocacy

Pellegrino: Last meeting, staff provided a range of options to improve transparency and address issues raised in PSU report. Committee members offered feedback at the meeting. No one offered public testimony on the options discussed at the last meeting.

Staff has taken Committee feedback and made a recommendation on how to proceed:

1. Written testimony: provide a chance for applicants to respond in writing to staff funding recommendations in a similar format to the one we use in the renewal process. We recommend doing this to give all applicants a chance to respond to staff recommendations and address the committee in writing. Applicant comments would be similar to grantee response on renewal information.

2. Oral Testimony:

PSU Recommendation: Committee expressed reluctance to adopt PSU's recommendation of 10-minute interviews of applicants due to time commitment (20 hours of interviews if similar level of applicants as in 2014) and the difficulty of paying attention to testimony given in 2-hour blocks of time.
Subgroups hear testimony: No opinion was expressed on option of spreading testimony among members so that not all members listened to the same testimony. Staff saw potential issues in still requiring a substantial time commitment from committee members, and there is no easy way to communicate what is learned through testimony among members.
Subgroups provide testimony: No opinion expressed on option of allowing oral testimony for subsets of applicants – e.g. only for those not recommended by staff for funding, or lower scoring applications. Staff saw potential issues with limiting testimony to only some applicants who then may end up receiving funding at the expense of applicants who did not have a chance to testify.

Video Testimony: Committee member recommended allowing video testimony. If the Committee allows for video testimony 2-3 minutes in length that AC members can view on their own time, this would at least allow committee members to spread out listening and maintain attention.
Staff recommends allowing option for video testimony; PCL staff would set up multiple locations/dates/times available for shooting testimony; would be optional for applicants, and PCL staff would provide the video to AC members in advance of decision meetings. Likely to be the same time commitment and potentially less for applicants compared with providing testimony at a meeting. PCL would provide interpreters for non-English speakers and allow additional time for those requesting interpretation.

3. Advocacy: Staff recommends against allowing advocacy by applicants during the funding process in light of perceptions of unfair access to Committee members, and assuming that Allocation Committee agrees to allowing written video testimony options. During funding process, applicants could not discuss their application with committee members.

Vega-Pederson: I am fine with the written testimony. Prohibiting advocacy, knowing that we might need to meet, but could not discuss the application, would be fine with me. I am not sure what the difference is with the videos versus in person testimony.

Pellegrino: The biggest advantage is that you would not have to hear all the testimony at one time. Also, we could control that everyone has the same amount of time. Might also be more convenient for those who testify. Folks would not need to come downtown. It does not address the desire for a 10 minute interview. In order to allow interviews, we would need to redesign the whole process.

Vega-Pederson: Would the video process add costs?

Pellegrino: We could make it work. It would not add burden to the agencies. It would cost some money – staff time and other costs.

Young: It is a loss not to have people in the room testifying. It has been difficult, but I have liked having folks come here in person. I support the video model. We do lose the ability for other folks to hear the testimony. Could the videos be available on the Levy website?

Pellegrino: Yes, we could put the videos on the Levy website. I agree that something is lost in not having face-to-face contact.

Young: I agree that we could be better listeners by breaking up the viewing of the testimony.

Public Testimony

Dr. Joseph Tietz, Executive Director of **Pathfinder Network** addressed the Committee. It I much more trauma-informed to allow video testimony. Testifying in this space could feel like a court. Not everyone feels comfortable testifying in this setting.

Wheeler: I share the conflict. We want to respect the organizations and their services. Not only do we all benefit from the in-person testimony. You lose the opportunity to ask questions. The practical reality is that the evaluation is that other means need to be used. I like the idea of using the video method. We may need a way to ask specific questions of the organizations after viewing the videos.

Pellegrino: I had not thought of that. We can add time to cover that.

Tripp-Folsom: You level the playing field for all applicants. It is also less traumatic. It will give people the time to tell their story. The Levy helping is great.

Wheeler: You are asking us for a vote to work on these processes?

Pellegrino: Yes, you are setting policy now. We will communicate the process in the request for investment, etc.

Wheeler: I would like us to present this as something we are doing on a trial basis. We want to see how it works.

Proposal: to set staff recommendations for public testimony as the policy to be integrated into the request for investment process.

Vega-Pederson: So, moved

Tripp-Folsom: Second.

Vote: All in Favor

<u>Proposed Changes to Request for Investment (RFI) Document</u>

McElroy:

Reminder of Timeline and Plan

- preparing template for the Request for Investment (RFI)
- present a draft section for consideration, discussion and public testimony
- Continue solicit public comment on draft between this meeting and June 17 meeting: anon Survey Monkey, email address, and AC meetings
- incorporate feedback, back to committee for further discussion and/or approval on June 17.
- Publication of RFIs planned for September 2019.

At the previous meeting, we outlined proposed changes to one section of RFI – diversity, equity and inclusion. This meeting looks at second section- proven program design & effectiveness - worth the largest amount of points

Review: major factors influencing changes to RFI

- align PCL's RFI with city equity goals, major equity themes from community engagement and from PSU's review of PCL's grantmaking process,
- efforts undertaken by local private and public funders
- ask questions that address applicants' practices in assuring children and families served experience racially just, safe, and inclusive programs and organizations
- point spread previous applications- more points where more differentiation

Comparing Proposed changes to past RFI

- **4 sections, 100 points, bonus points**
- **This time: 3 sections, 100 points, no bonus points**

2014 RFI: Scored Sections of the Application	**Point Value per Section**
I. Proven Program Design and Effectiveness	55 points (min 39)
II. Program Budget, Budget Narrative, and Cost Effectiveness	10 points
III. Organizational Capacity	10 points
IV. Culturally Responsive Programs and Organizations	25 points (min 16)
Bonus Points: Serving children/families East of 82nd Ave.	3 points
Bonus Points: Culturally specific services	3 points
PROPOSED Draft 2019 RFI: Scored Sections of the Application	
I. Org Capacity and Commitment to Racial Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion	36 points (min 23)
II. Proven Program Design & Effectiveness	54 points (min 38)
III. Program Budget and Budget Narrative	10 points
No bonus points	

Same factors inform the changes proposed to the RFI's Proven Program Design & Effectiveness section.

Changes proposed to RFI last time

- streamlining questions about overall organizational capacity and cultural responsiveness
- retooling to emphasize organizational commitment to advancing racial equity, diversity, and inclusion.

Changes this time:

- Streamlined questions, especially to assure that RFI asks applicants to address features called out by community engagement and proposed in program area strategies.
- Features woven into RFI questions include:
  - past success/experience in serving the program's population
  - evidence of service user voice or family desire for the program
  - diversity and reflectiveness of program staffing and assuring staff training/development related to issues of program quality.
  - Other program area features will be included in the program area RFIs once this basic template adopted by Allocation Committee
  - Staff will draft program area RFIs over summer and present to AC in early September with goal publish in September.
- Simplified language to make it easier for applicants to understand the RFI and prepare an application.
  - Emphasized racial equity, diversity, and inclusion in questions such as population to be served, outreach, barriers to reaching population,
  - explanation of program design- why this program, for this population and how do you know they want and that it will produce outcomes stated?
  - program quality around attendance, outcomes, and staff development and training
- Removed bonus points entirely and instead wove racial equity, diversity, and inclusion into RFI questions/scoring criteria.
- Included question on serving East Portland in section on population to be served.

Subsection, 2014 RFI Template	Points	**Proposed Subsection, 2019 RFI**	Points	**Explanation of Proposed Changes**
A. Program Summary and Identification of Strategy	2	A. Program Summary and Connection to Applicant Org	3	Retains program connection to PCL strategy; focuses on program's relationship to Organization, including commitment to racial equity, diversity, inclusion.
B. Population to be Served	8	B. Population to be Served	8	Retains questions on methods for estimating population, numbers to serve. Moves rationale for population to serve to section E with other questions on rationale for program activities and meeting population's needs. Adds points for serving program area priority populations.
C. Outreach, Engagement, & Enrollment of Clients to be Served	5	C. Outreach and Recruitment of Population to be Served	3	Retains questions on outreach, recruitment, barriers to engaging in program. Removes questions on enrollment procedures.
D. Program Design	10	D. Program Design	6	Reduces points for completing simple tables, moves points to amplify other quality issues.
E. Rationale for	18	E. Explanation of	12	Narrows focus on asking applicant to explain why

Proposed Program, Participation Goals, and Outcome Goals		Program Design		program is appropriate for the population, and how program activities will lead to projected outcomes with the population. Asks how program furthers PCL goals in program area. Scoring criteria emphasize features called out in community engagement such as: success and experience with population; service user voice; and considerations of racial equity, diversity, and inclusion. Moved some past questions into next section to focus on ongoing program quality issues.
F. Continuous Quality Improvement	12	F. Program Results, Quality, and Improvement	18	Focuses questions on program quality related to program attendance, outcomes, and staff development/supervision. Asks how program measures, monitors, and acts to make improvements in these issues. Considers racial equity, diversity, and inclusion for attendance, outcomes, and staff development/supervision. Staff training questions could also be further refined to focus on specific training content issue per program area, such as brain development (EC), youth development (After School), Trauma Informed Care (Foster Care), etc.
		TBD to program area considerations	4	Points to spread to address program area issues, e.g.: Foster Care: program's working relationship with DHS Hunger relief: access-related features Other program areas: other quality features in strategies, such as staff training on specific content
Total Points	55	Total Points	54	

Tripp-Folsom: Who will explain this process to the applicants?

McElroy: In the past, the information was in the RFI document, and we held bidders' conferences and were available to answer questions. We have looked at what other funders are doing along these lines. We plan to develop a Frequently Asked Questions document.

Tripp-Folsom: I was just about to recommend that.

McElroy: We also will find a way to share questions that arise in the process.

Hornecker: On page 1, under proven program design and effectiveness, we seem to be distinguishing best practice and evidence based. Can you explain the difference?

McElroy: Not every best practice has robust evidence base behind it. There may be good evidence, but it may not have risen to the high standard of evidence-based practice.

Hornecker: Did we apply evidence-based or best practice last time?

McElroy: We used both. We have been flexible about providers adapting an evidence-based model to include best practices based on experience.

Hornecker: How does the scorer determine whether something is a best practice.

McElroy: Criteria for scoring are well outlined in the materials. The reviewers will need to apply the criteria defined here to evaluate responses. Lisa Hansell will talk about who the reviewers are soon.

Hornecker: It does seem to be a judgment call. Why did we not include a specific request for evidence that a program is a best practice. In other parts of the application, you ask for evidence. Maybe we should ask for that evidence.

McElroy: I hear you asking for a request for evidence that proposed model is best practice.

Hornecker: We would include a definition of best practice. We would add a question that requests evidence that the program has met the standard. We should also define evidence-based as well.

Wheeler: This is an ongoing question about what best practice is and who gets to decide. I am concerned that we not penalize a program that gets good results but may not use a best practice method.

McElroy: That is the intent behind that section. Applicants could point to best practice but could also point to experience and success. Other rationales could be provided.

Wheeler: I don't care if it is best practice as long as it gets results. Help me to reconcile those two things.

McElroy: I think that section is designed to reconcile those things. The scoring guidelines include multiple options for explanation. Best practices, evidence-based methods, and experience and results could all be valid responses. Also, there is the option to value responses around cultural value of methods.

Wheeler: I am concerned that we are getting too complex. Is there a way to simplify?

McElroy: There are the questions we ask the applicants and there are separate, more detailed, criteria for the reviewer to use. Providing detailed criteria for reviewers is a typical approach in a process like this.

Wheeler: I want to make sure we honor the intention of the Levy and get results. I want to be sure that diligence in getting fairness in the application design does not get in the way of getting the outcomes we want. I want to make sure the outcomes don't get overwhelmed by some of these other considerations. I want to make sure the dollars we are investing are getting good solid outcomes, first and foremost.

I ask if this level of detail is truly necessary to get at the results?

McElroy: The reviewers need information to score applications. That information, along with other factors, help you to decide what programs to fund. The score is one thing that helps you make that determination.

Then there is what gets funded. Sometimes, a program meets criteria, but misses the mark in implementation. We as staff need to be able to help them do what was requested. And sometimes, those programs lose funding.

This process does pretty well at identifying the programs that get results. There are those outliers that lose funding because they don't engage the population, or the program needs to be adjusted.

This part of the process is one step in getting to the results.

We ask about how the provider intends to measure the outcomes.

Wheeler: Defining and measuring success is a priority for me.

Young: Did these questions come up in the community engagement work?

McElroy: Community engagement did not address evidence based versus best practice. Community input was more about how services are delivered. Their responses included desire to see representation of the community being served in the provider community. They want people who are well-equipped and trained to be successful in the work they do.

The respondents talked about quality and wanting to be included and seen in the service experience.

Public Testimony – None

Wheeler: There is still opportunity to provide written feedback through the PCL website.

Grant Review Process Proposed Changes

Hansell:

You've heard from Meg about the RFI application, now it's time to think about the RFI review process.

Staff has proposed two options for your consideration. Both options respond to 2014 volunteer reviewer and PCL staff feedback and PSU's recent recommendations. Staff will solicit public comment on the review process between now and the next Allocation Committee meeting, incorporate feedback, and bring it back to the committee for further discussion and approval on June 17.

Prior to this meeting, you received:

- A summary of the PSU recommendations and 2014 reviewer and staff feedback; and
- A chart that summarizes features of the 2014 review process, Option 1 and Option 2

That information is also available for the audience.

The main difference between the proposed options is that

- Option 1 continues the practice of having one set of reviewers score all sections of the application, and
- Option 2 proposes splitting the scoring of a single application between two sets of reviewers.

Both options include the following changes to the 2014 review process:

- There will be extensive outreach to recruit reviewers
- There will be a reviewer application and screening process
- Reviewers will receive more training, including practice scoring applications
- Reviewers will have more time to read and score applications
- There will not be review panel meetings where reviewers discuss applications and have option to change their scores
- Stipends will be offered to volunteer reviewers who review and score applications outside of their regular work hours
- Score forms will be sent to applicants after funding process concludes

I'll walk you through the chart and provide an overview of the changes, unique features of the options and rationale.

1. Number of Actual or Estimated Volunteer Reviewers:
    - 2014: 79
    - Option 1: 75 Option 2: 80

2. Number of Actual or estimated applications:
    - 2014: 115
    - Options 1 & 2; projecting a maximum of 150 applications from 75 organizations

3. Reviewer recruitment:
    - 2014: Recruitment primarily done by personal invitation from PCL staff to people they knew with program area content expertise and/or racial equity, diversity and inclusion expertise.
    - Options 1 & 2: staff propose a more formalized and structured reviewer recruitment and screening process to address PSU, reviewer and staff recommendations.

    Conducting extensive outreach will make the process more inclusive and is expected to result in a larger pool of potential volunteer reviewers representing a broad cross-section of community with a balance of expertise and experience working in, participating in and navigating services that support children/families.

    As part of the recruitment, a description of reviewers' roles and responsibilities will be distributed.
    - This will provide potential reviewers with a clear understanding of expectations and time commitments, something highlighted in 2014 reviewer feedback and will
    - Increase transparency & equity in this part of PCL's process, as recommended by PSU

4. Reviewer application and screening process:
    - 2014: No application or screening process
    - Options 1 & 2: Implement an application and screening process

    Using a reviewer and application screening process will make it possible for PCL to select reviewers with expertise and experience in PCL's program areas and in racial equity, diversity, and inclusion.

5. Reviewer Training & Support:
    - 2014: training provided but it did not include practice scoring applications
    - For Options 1 & 2: training will include guidance and time to practice scoring applications. Mid-way through the review process staff will check in with each reviewer, answer questions and assess progress.
    - The difference in training between Option 1 and Option 2 is that for Option 2 there would be two distinct training sessions: one for Org/Equity Diversity & Inclusion section reviewers and one for Program & Budget reviewers

    Enhanced training and support for volunteer reviewers responds to recommendations made by 2014 reviewers and PCL staff.

    The additional training and support will likely result in increased inter-rater reliability and overall quality of scoring.

6. Application Sections Scored:
   2014 & Option 1: reviewers read and score all sections of the application
   The Advantage to this Option is it assures that reviewers gain a full understanding of both the organization and the proposed program.

   Disadvantages: multiple sets of reviewers score the Organizational Capacity and Equity Diversity & Inclusion section of the RFI for organizations that submit multiple applications.

   In 2014, 24 organizations submitted more than one application and accounted for 77 (67%) of the 115 applications received. This duplicates reviewer effort and requires staff to average results from the multiple review panels.

   Option 2: one set of reviewers would score the Organizational Capacity and Equity Diversity & Inclusion section of the RFI; and a different set would score the Program & Budget section of the RFI.

   Program & Budget reviewers would read the full application, but only score the program and budget sections. Reading the full proposal will allow these reviewers to gain an understanding of each organization's commitment, policies and practices related to equity, diversity and inclusion, and use this information as they assess the feasibility of the proposed programming.

   Hornecker: Having the reviewer read the whole application but only score program and budget is redundant. We were trying to solve a redundancy problem with redundancy.

   Advantages:
   Splitting the review offers the opportunity to match reviewer expertise, experience, and interests with the appropriate application sections.

   This method eliminates duplication of reviewer effort to score the same organizational section included in multiple applications by one organization.

   Disadvantages:
   Will require somewhat more staff time to support more reviewers and offer different training sessions

   Hornecker: Did we find deficiency in DEI understanding or qualification in our last reviewers?

   Hansell: I would not say deficient. We did have a balance on each of the review panels. With option 2, all 5 people on the panel would have that interest and experience.

   Hornecker: It seems unlikely that any expert in any of our program areas would have a lack of understanding of DEI.

   Tripp-Folsom: As someone who has done both methods of review, I feel that I don't give the fairness an organization deserves when I only see part of an application. When I have the whole application, I feel like I am doing the best justice for the organization. I see how we are trying to be as fair as possible. Reviewing only one section makes it harder to review it. I think the grant-writers assume that they are writing to someone who will see the whole application.

   Vega-Pederson: In option 2, the reviewer gets to see the whole application, but not score the whole application?

Hansell: Our vision was that the reviewers who are scoring the organization would not see the program and budget section. But, we could offer the whole application to all reviewers.

Wheeler: What problem are you trying to solve here?

Hansell: We were trying to solve the problem of up to 10 different reviewers scoring the same organization. Also, we saw an opportunity to build relationships with individuals who may want to continue working with the Levy on issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion. We see this as an opportunity to meet folks who might serve on an advisory council, which was recommended by PSU.

Wheeler: I don't see option 2 as the best way to solve those issues. It is hard without the context. Is much time or energy really being saved?

Hansell: Maybe 30 minutes saved, but it is difficult to estimate.

Tripp-Folsom: I have been a reviewer for the Children's Levy. I read applications and researched the organizations through their websites and annual reports. I asked Levy staff when I had questions.

I was given 5 or 7 applications. I took 60 to 90 minutes per application. I did not think rushing the process was acceptable. A lot of money was involved. I was able to explain why I scored. I am not a fan of option 2. It is difficult to be fair with that process.

I have reviewed many processes. I find it much harder not to have the whole application.

Young: Scoring of the organization and its DEI work looks at the whole organization. Does that part influence the score of the whole application?

Pellegrino: The organization score would apply to all of their applications in any program area. In the past, sometimes there were differences in the organization scores.

Wheeler: I am mindful of the time.

Hansell:

7. # of reviewers per application
    - 2014 and Option 1: 5
    - Option 2: 10; 5 for Org/Equity, Diversity & Inclusion section and 5 for Program & Budget section

8. # of applications per reviewer
    - 2014: 6-11; avg 7 (avg 160 pages of narrative)
    - Option 1: 8-10 (160-200 pages of narrative)
    - Option 2: **Org/Equity, Diversity & inclusion reviewers**: 20-25 (100-125 pages of narrative)
      Program & Budget reviewers: 10-12 (150-180 pages of narrative)

9. Estimated hours per reviewer
    - 2014: 15-25 (2 hrs/app)
    - Option 1: 30-35 (3 hrs/app)
    - Option 2: **Org/Equity, Diversity & Inclusion reviewers**: 35-40 hours (1.5 hrs/app)
      Program & Budget reviewers: 30-35 hours (2.5 hrs/app)

10. Length of time to review and score applications
    - 2014: 4-6+ weeks
    - Options 1 & 2: 5-9 weeks

Allowing more time for the review and scoring process responds to feedback received from reviewers and will hopefully increase quality.

11. Review panel meetings
    - 2014: Yes
    - Options 1 & 2: No

There were several challenges with the review panel meetings: difficult to schedule, limited meeting time to sufficiently discuss each application, and minimal score adjustments after discussion.

Oakland Fund for Children & Youth also asks reviewers to score a subset of applications in a funding category and does not hold review panel meetings.

PSU recommended that only scores from reviewer panel meeting attendees be included in the final averaging of reviewer scores. If reviewer panel meetings are not part of the process, all scores will be included in the score average.

12. Reviewer Feedback
    - 2014: Yes, survey completed after review panel meeting
    - Option 1 & 2: Yes, staff will meet with reviewers individually to collect and check scoresheets and ask reviewers to complete survey.

Additionally, for Option 2, staff proposes convening the Organizational/Equity Diversity & Inclusion reviewers to discuss their experience with the review process and advise on best ways for PCL to support organizations in their equity, diversity and inclusion work.

Staff proposes hiring an external facilitator for these meetings as recommended by PSU.

Convening reviewers with Equity, Diversity & Inclusion expertise and experience could help PCL connect and build relationships with people who might want to continue working with PCL on racial equity, diversity and inclusion, possibly by joining an ongoing advisory council as PSU advised considering.

13. Stipends
    - 2014: No
    - Options 1 & 2: Yes, just structured differently; **Option 1** $25 per application; **Option 2** flat rate of $250/reviewer

Stipends are a way to honor the contribution of volunteer reviewers.

Offering a stipend may incentivize community members to participate as volunteer grant reviewers.

Metro Parks and Nature and OFCY both offer stipends to their volunteer reviewers.

Stipends only available for volunteer reviewers who do the work outside of paid work time

The maximum cost for stipends would be $18,750 for Option 1 & $20,000 for Option 2

14. Score Sheets
    - 2014: Made available to anyone who requested their score sheets
    - Options 1 & 2: All applicants would receive their score sheets after the funding process concludes

Sending score sheets to each applicant will increase the transparency of the scoring process as PSU recommended.

Hornecker: Will we provide scores at the end of the funding process or sooner?

Hansell: Staff thought that applicants would be provided staff recommendations, not score sheets.

McElroy: With the likely quantity of reviews and applications, it seems unlikely to be feasible to provide scores during the process. It may not be doable.

Also, it can be difficult to see the range of scores. In the past, you have not had the individual scores.

Hornecker: It is a tough call. I like the transparency of providing the scores. There are three steps: applications get scored; staff makes its recommendations; we make a recommendation to City Hall. The question is what information are we going to provide to programs to allow them to provide valuable feedback to us before we make our decisions? The more transparent we can make it, the better for me. It may be too cumbersome.

McElroy: Is having each of the 5 scores of high value versus having the final single score. It is something to mull over.

Pellegrino: We can mock up the timeline for you. That will help you make your decisions. There is always balancing of time versus process detail.

Hornecker: We will be in the market for someone to help with the small grants program. That person will have a very high DEI IQ. It might be great to have that person review the DEI sections of the applications.

Pellegrino: Staff typically do not score applications.

Public Testimony

Dr. Joseph Tietz, Executive Director of **Pathfinder Network** addressed the Committee. I would like to comment on criteria of diversity, equity and inclusion. We add J for justice to that list. I represent 25,000 children of incarcerated parents. There is disproportionality in terms of race and economic status in that group. There are a whole lot of white folks and invisible children, potentially the most marginalized population. You can't see it you can't know it and it is all self-referred. I commend you for including refugee status, immigration status and disability status. As the DEIJ field is emerging, those of us in the criminal justice field advocate for a lens that takes that into consideration as well. I would advocate for that as well.

Wheeler: We will vote on this on June 17 at our next meeting.

Adjourned 4:00 pm