McElroy: So, you all have a draft of the final document that staff is proposing that outlines the funding strategies in each of the Levy's six program areas and our audience has that document, as well. There are a couple of minor changes that staff has made to the document. I will review those in a minute. There are a couple of clarifications and changes that you all requested. We have made those.

We solicited feedback from the community at large between the meeting you all had on May 13th until the 10th of June around these strategies, as well as the request for investment template, as well as the proposed review process. Over the period of four weeks, we had a short survey monkey with four open-ended questions that people could respond to anonymously. People were able to provide input by e-mail or come to the three meetings you have had the past few weeks and also provide testimony. We will talk a little bit about the feedback that came in via that four-week comment period.

In the strategies, the minor changes that have been made by staff are what we are calling the features. In a couple of the program areas. Each program has a set of funding strategies. In the document preceding those strategies, a bullet pointed list of what we are calling features for the program area. Those features again came from community engagement. They really outline priorities, the things we are most interested to see across the strategies in that program area. They are not necessarily requirements.

So, there's some clarification from feedback I will get to in a minute that raised questions about some of the features. I want to say up front the features are the highest priority items across strategies that came through community engagement for that particular program area.

The program areas of after-school and hunger relief, the first iteration of the strategies document didn't have focus populations listed in the features. Those have been added to the copy you have before you. The focus populations are informed by the local data work that staff did last summer. They are also the same priorities in those program areas that have been in place since 2014.

Then, for features in the child abuse prevention intervention area, staff removed one of the features that talked about programs exhibiting open communication between the program and family participants because we felt that was already covered in the feature about being a trauma-informed approach and using family voice in programming. So those are minor changes that staff made because they were oversights in our previous document.

As far as changes that you all requested, during your discussion at the May 13th meeting, you all asked it to be more clear what the goals of each program area are and the outcomes that are typically, commonly tracked by programs funded in those program areas. So, that was added to the document.

The foster care program area specifically, we were asked to consider revising strategy number one in the foster care program area to call out recruiting foster parents as part of that strategy. So, we have added that. That was also something that community engagement had called out. We are happy to add that.

Then finally, in the after-school program area, we revised the first strategy to include the word "intensive" which was requested at the previous meeting.

So those are all sort of smaller changes in general. There haven't been huge changes made to the document otherwise.

Public Feedback in Comment Period

McElroy: Now, I will review the public feedback that we received during the four-week comment period that we had. There were only seven people who weighed in with input around the strategies. Five of them anonymously through the short survey monkey that we had and two grantees. There weren't clear themes that came because there are so few responses that came in. So, we took time to paraphrase the responses that people provided and provide a response. They took the time to weigh in. We wanted them to see we heard their feedback and considered it.

Had there been many more responses we would have tried to theme it and get to higher-level issues that came out but we are taking the few we heard and responding. In some ways I guess I'm not surprised to think we didn't hear more feedback, only because we have done such a huge process to hear from the biggest stakeholders of the work that we do. So, we will do our best to respond to what we have heard so far.

So, one piece of feedback we received and it did influence how we characterized the rationale for a strategy and child abuse prevention and intervention and after-school program area had to do with how we talked about data related to children of color and their outcomes as a result of being involved in the child welfare system and the public education system. The way we characterized rationale for a strategy in each of those program areas implied that children of color were to blame for the outcomes of the system and perpetuates notions of racism in how we characterized that. We apologized for how we characterized that. We regret having made that implication and we removed that citation from rationale.

So, we made changes to the rationale in the two strategies the program areas

Felicia Tripp-Folsom tried to enter the meeting via cell phone, but technical difficulties resulted in her being unable to attend.

McElroy: As Felicia told us, she was most interested in participating in the conversation about the review process. We will see if we can make that happen.

So, I will keep going. The remaining feedback we received did not result in us proposing any changes to the strategies document. It was more issues for our consideration and we wanted to share that with you. So, we did summarize that for you and the audience has it here today. Some of the things people raised are thinking about the workforce supply concerns for programs and trying to find folks who are bilingual or multilingual in some of the languages we need to be serving in our community.

Another person raised concerns about the transportation costs if applicants are to be providing transportation directly, for example, in an after-school program that serves multiple sites, the costs of that are quite great; which means they would be asking for a lot of money and ultimately you would have policy considerations about spending money on transportation for a program versus funding numerous programs and serving more children. We would be supplying information to you about transportation that is proposed in applications.

Another individual raised considerations about our basic needs strategy and child abuse prevention, intervention and suggested it should be a strategy across all program areas. Our response to that was it came up particularly in the child abuse prevention, intervention program area community engagement feedback. And we focused that strategy around that.

Another individual raised concerns about the mentoring strategy and it calling out wanting to prioritize programs that feature paid staff as mentors, as opposed to volunteers. Again, staff felt that we're not requiring the applicants, only proposed programs with paid staff as mentors but prioritizing those because that's what came out of community engagement and community engagement prioritized attention to quality and training of mentors. In PCL's past experience, the ability for quality control around volunteer mentoring can sometimes be more difficult to make sure people attend the training they are being asked to in order to do mentoring and sticking with that relationship over time.

So, those were the big pieces of feedback around the strategies. Those were the proposed few changes that we had.

So, it does some things for seniors that I'm not sure we share very often. What it does is it helps those individuals combat loneliness. It also helps them with their overall health and well-being. When a child has an adult who cares, who's teaching them, whether it is the teacher, the parent or a volunteer, they begin to thrive. Sometimes what we miss out on is that our seniors thrive and our children thrive. The systems for which we are trying to keep people out of do so much better. My reason for being here is I wanted to make sure that you knew that AARP has a number of things that we do across the country in order to support these programs. Let me highlight a few.

We are hoping to identify individuals, but especially people of color who are culturally relevant, focused and trauma focused as well which fits into what you are trying to do here. We are partnering with intergenerational organizations and we have come before Ted Wheeler and talked about those, as well in our H-friendly initiative. We are also encouraging continued funding volunteers are receiving a small stipend. They can show up when they are supposed to get there and home safely. That ties in to the transportation offered in the city. We are encouraging that EC staff reflect the populations of people served. AARP is doing these things have so we can combat loneliness in seniors and keep children from entering our penal system where they can do us no good as we age. Thank you for giving me a chance to share with you and to let you know that AARP is always ready to serve. Thank you very much.

Wheeler: Could I ask a couple of questions here? Obviously Experience Corps has been around for a while. It has had successful outcomes and I would be concerned if we did something that would unintentionally derail that success. I want to say that first and foremost. I strongly support the nexus between serving both the youth, who want, as you say, to have a caring adult in their lives, somebody who works with them and brings experience to the table and has a benefit for older adults, as well. We should look for those nexus opportunities as much as possible. Regarding the policy we are about to vote for, number one, what would be the implication of not altering the policy, as it is currently drafted, and number two, what is it you are specifically asking us to amend in this policy?

Strand: The after-school strategy is the one that best fits with the work that Experience Corps is doing in terms of the focus. All of the criteria in terms of the services delivered, the focus on social, emotional all of those things would work for us. What doesn't work is if we have to provide the services just in the after-school space. We are asking for could we expand it to include school day as long as we are aligned with those principles, not just after school. Our mentors don't fit into the mentoring category because they are academically focused around reading. That's the problem.

Wheeler: I'm just thinking out loud. I'm not suggesting a particular policy, literally thinking out loud which for me is a dangerous thing always. If we made that exception in the case where it is difficult otherwise for mentors to be available -- what do you all think about that?

Is that one potential strategy?

Hatten-Pitz: I think so. I think the funding of Experience Corps, and to be more direct, if this funding goes away, we will lose some schools. We don't want to lose schools in this program. We'd rather add schools for children who need reading tutors. I don't want us to lose any schools.

Young: First of all, I think we are going back and forth between a couple of terms, one is mentoring and the other is tutoring. It is my understanding that what experience corps does is more tutoring than mentoring.

Strand: It is. We have historically called it mentoring in the model but in Children's Levy definition it is tutoring.

Young: The other thing is I wasn't here when children's levy -- I voted on it the first time but I wasn't sitting here. I'm not sure the term, after-school, how it was defined. I don't know anywhere does it say -- and maybe Lisa will jump in.

communicating that so it is not confusing for any potential applicant of what after school does and doesn't include.

Wheeler: That's good and I appreciate the testimony clarifying that point. I want to make sure we have not throwing down obstacles to those kinds of programs.

Hornecker: On the child abuse prevention, number three, the second bullet point, client assistance funds. Could you talk a little bit about how you would see short term being defined and also what it means to be tied to at least one other proposed service approach?

Hansell: So, short term -- really the intention there is to address avoiding crisis situations. So short term could be a one time or there's a plan in place to be able to continue to provide that support if ongoing support is needed. For example, if housing was an issue, if somebody needed help with a down payment or deposit, with a deposit or a portion of a month's rent but there was a plan in place for the next month.

Wheeler: Could I interrupt for a moment?

Who do we have joining us today in our chamber?

Unknown Speaker: These are children involved in the Social Justice art camp with [inaudible]Portland.

They just left the smart center meeting with some kids going to Washington, D.C. to meet with Senator Wyden and talk about things that are important to them. Learning from the older students how they will petition what they need, they made signs and came to your office. And they signed up to talk to you about the things important to them. Most of them were school based because some of the kids have been involved in bullying at the end of receiving it. Some kids have had to seek advocacy for housing. All kinds of things that they discussed just from listening to the older students. I was telling them as they grow older and they are able to articulate their issues to their peers we hear those things and do what we need to do to resolve those issues but they need to communicate and have their voices heard and so we are teaching them what the process looks like.

Wheeler: Thank you for bringing them here and kids, thank you for being at city hall. Thank you.

Unknown speaker: One thing they did not like was the waving on the way in. They are like we don't want to do this. So, we said we would let you know.

Wheeler: Fair enough. Thank you, kids, for being here. Appreciate it.

Hornecker: With that definition, we have an extremely deep need for the type of coverage that you just mentioned. It's at the epicenter of our homeless crisis, keeping people from falling into homelessness. But we could spend every dollar we have allocated into just this single idea and not make a dent. I'm a little concerned about opening up this. I don't remember this being in the last definition. Is this part of the new one?

Hansell: This is new. This strategy is a new strategy. In the past -- the programs we currently fund many have client assistance funds as part of the budget they have with us. Each of those have their own criteria and ways they manage that. The amounts in the current grants are not huge amounts. Probably typically between two and $6,000 a year. Some have more but that is probably the average. It's a concern that continues to come up in community engagement. It was a concern in 2014 and it's a concern again. In looking at this, there was a way to hopefully prevent some families becoming involved in the child welfare system. We know it will not take care of every issue, but if this is something that could support some families and be of assistance we wanted to include it.

Hornecker: Well, I mean -- I think everybody up here is probably working in some way or another on the bigger issue. We're all proponents and we all know it needs to happen. It's just -- would a client have to already be engaged to obtain the service, or would the first thing they sign up for be this benefit?

Hansell: So, as part of this service approach, I think that addresses your other question of what does it mean to be engaged with one of these other service strategies. So, it wouldn't be a stand-alone client assistance fund that could be access. A family need to be engaged with one of the other strategies, enhanced parenting or response or in case management services. So, it is not a stand-alone fund for anyone in the community to access.

Hornecker: So more targeted. So, they would be already enrolled and have been identified at high risk or at risk or already in case management.

Hansell: They would be working on other aspects of child abuse prevention and family safety.

Young: I had a question also under -- actually I have a couple of things. The first is just following up with the child abuse prevention and intervention. To intervene, to lessen harms and prevent future risk, which, of course, I agree with. But in rationale, the language is providing mental health therapy and counseling for children and their families. Under possible service approach, it says treatment and other healing approaches. I wanted to note that -- this is something that I suppose -- and I'm sure there are always challenges, but people who are participating under the Oregon Health Plan would be receiving therapy. I'm curious -- I have a question around that. Certainly, there may be people who are not enrolled in any kind of insurance program, but really that is a responsibility that I believe the state has for providing mental health treatment.

Hansell: So, with this strategy, it's not intended to replace or take the place of OHP or other insurance coverage. It's meant to cover things that are not covered by insurance. So that's the purpose. It is not meant to take the place.

McElroy: There are times when the mental health treatment needed for an individual may not be fully covered by the OHP plan. So, the cost of the treatment may not be fully reimbursed. So, it provides an opportunity for providers to not only get -- find a way to finance the entire type of treatment they may want to offer to somebody but other services that may or may not be reimbursed by the particular health plan as well like group therapy or certain type of support group.

Young: Okay. Thank you.

The other area, note that I had, is under early childhood. In the information provided to the committee ahead of time, you note -- you talk about childcare. It said that priority will be considered as a strategy on its own crossing program areas and brought to the allocation committee separately.

McElroy: Correct. We were going to wait to do it in the fall. The community childcare initiative that you all have invested in provides childcare subsidy to working families in Portland whose incomes are 200% of the federal poverty level or less and helps augment their state-funded 47.11 employment-related daycare subsidy to pay no more than 10% of their income to childcare. That is run through Mount Hood Community College's referral through Multnomah county. It is a large initiative that has funding through next June. It supports families with children ages 6 weeks to age 12. It is early childhood and before and after-school care. It is not early childhood specific area strategy. Childcare itself is called out separately in the ballot language. Because it's been an initiative we have handled separately from the program area competitive investments, we were going to wait to bring it back to you in the fall and also where we had another year of performance data come in. They have been doing well but we wanted to make sure we had everything before we ask you to consider that investment differently since it hasn't been typically a competitive investment.

Wheeler: All right. Do we need to take a vote on the program area strategies?

McElroy: Yes, please.

Wheeler: All right.

Proposal: To adopt the Program Area Strategies for 2020-2025 as outlined by staff.

Vega-Pederson: So, moved.

Young: Seconded.

Wheeler: Motion and second.

Hornecker: I like all the changes. I've thought about stepping into the recruiting and retention of foster parents and having better trained, higher functioning foster parents is critical. However, they will be operating in a system that according to the secretary of state and a lot of investigative reporting has extremely large challenges.

There's definitely a suggestion the highest functioning foster parents are burned out the fastest because the DHS loads them up. As a result, until we see further progress on DHS's improvement strategies that I think they are a year into now, I can't bring myself to think that our dollars spent on recruitment and retention are going to go as far as dollars directly aimed at foster kids. Of all of the things that's the only thing I can't get comfortable with and I'm not in favor of at this time. As funny as that seems when I call it a critical need, I don't see how we will be able to move the needle on it. If we take it as a block, I didn't know how to deal with that, but the rest of them I'm fine.

Wheeler: So, let me see if I can craft a compromise strategy here. Anything before it is funded has to come back to us. That question would, once again -- I think it is an entirely appropriate line of questioning, as it is with any of these. As to the best use of programming we have to decide how to weigh the different programming areas. I, too, am an optimist that was said earlier and I have high hopes for the foster care system and the work that DHS is doing. But, I don't see forwarding this package in any way today precludes us from making that decision on a program-by-program basis, unless someone disagrees. Is that correct?

McElroy: That's totally correct. You may get only one applicant who proposes to do that and for reasons you may want or may not want to fund it.

raised around best practice. The thing I wish I had said is that the entire program section is really built around the basic tenets of best practice. It asks applicants to talk about the intentionality of design is part of the best practice. It asks applicants to identify and be clear about who they want to serve and why; which activities they will be doing with that population and why; what attendance is expected in those activities to produce outcomes; which outcomes will result from those activities; and how staff will be trained to deliver a quality program along those lines.

In addition, we added a definition to the program section on best practice that we borrowed from Miriam Webster. We added a definition around evidence-based programs that's from Penn State's Evidence Based Intervention and Support Center. To be clear about the differences between those two things.

Hornecker: How are they different?

McElroy: Best practice can be based on science, but it can also be based on experience. Evidence based programs are programs where there has been robust scientific study of the particular intervention, where the study has been done in a way that looks at comparison populations and produces statistical information around effects of the population that got the intervention and that it is sustained over time. Not every best practice has an evidence-based science behind it.

Hornecker: Evidence-based programming is always best-prectice, because it has large data to support what it is doing.

McElroy: Yes, I hear what you are saying. Evidence-based programs use best practice.

Hornecker: I asked the question. I appreciate you coming back to it. The thing that I thought was confusing is in the first sentence we say we're going to invest in best practices and then we give the definition of best practice. Then we give the definition of evidence-based program but not say we are going to invest in evidence-based programming.

McElroy: We say we are going to invest in best practice because that's what we will do because not everything is evidence-based. We wanted to leave open, in case it was confusing to people that we are not expecting that everything proposed for funding is an evidence-based program.

Hornecker: Okay. So, we should say that then.

McElroy: Okay.

Hornecker: I'm just saying when I read it, what defines best practice and maybe I missed it but then when we give the definition for evidence-based programming, I'm assuming that's important to us. You are right. We don't say that it is anywhere else in the document. That's what I could find.

McElroy: Yes. I hear what you are saying and it sounds to me like you are saying it is confusing how we are characterizing it. The intent was to say to people, we are not suggesting you only propose evidence-based programs. In our experience, people have proposed those, but they haven't always been successful pulling them off. But, they have been successful doing other programming based on best practice. It may not be this trademarked, evidence-based, particular program model that was developed by this university and is now replicated.

The intent of the section to say we recognize not everybody is doing work that falls on that standard of scientific evidence base, but we want to fund effective programs that demonstrate the things that are often times included in best practice. So that's what the bulleted list is supposed to represent.

Hornecker: I would suggest if we had a sentence at the end of the first paragraph of what we are funding, what we will fund I think it would make the paragraph clearer.

You give the definition and then you say, not all programs that are effective have evidence-based backup. But don't we need to say, so we are open to funding or we will consider funding best practice programs that are not evidence based?

McElroy: Sure. I guess I thought the next sentence did that but I guess it does. PCL seeks to fund programs that demonstrate the following. You are saying between that sentence and the previous one I need a better transition?

Hornecker: They seem to be important phrases. That's the only reason I brought it up last time and i'm bringing it up again. I'm thinking of having reviewers that are steeped in this stuff and know the difference in programming and probably knows whether they are or aren't to be clear whether they had an opportunity towards funding and a high score is important.

McElroy: So, something like PCL will consider proposals using evidence-based models, as well as other general best practices?

Hornecker: If that is what we will do, that's what we should say.

Wheeler: I don't object to that. That's helpful.

Vega-Pederson: I think if it helps you to have clarify that's great. For me the first sentence in the paragraph kind of states that we're going to be funding programs that use best practices, and that it achieves positive outcomes and though rest of the paragraph is explaining best practices includes things that are experience and evidence-based and gives more detail about that. But if we need another clarifying sentence that's fine.

Young: I appreciate the point that mitch made, too, that the reviewers -- they may have questions but my sense is you will be working closely with reviewers who will have probably been made aware, more than once, what this is, what our intent is. And those differences in semantics.

McElroy: Yes. You will hear more in a bit and have to decide on that, but the scoring, the proposed scoring criteria and what the reviewers is used is published with this template. It should hopefully help them with those distinctions.

Those were the main pieces of feedback you brought to our attention and then feedback from the comment period through the anonymously through the survey monkey and that people e-mailed to us directly.

A couple of folks brought to our attention they had concerns with how the scoring of demographics of applicant staff is categorized in the organizational section of the RFI. That section provides more points for organizations where a majority of client staff and board identify as a person of color. And the individuals that raised those concerns referenced examples of large organizations that may have difficulty getting those points in the score overall but may have small units within their organization that focus on serving specialized populations.

Staff's response is, yes, we understand that and we hope that the other parts of that section of the RFI give an applicant ample time to talk about those unique features of how their organization is working on racial equity, diversity and inclusion. Only six of the 36 points are looking at the demographics of this particular agency staff, clients and board. So, there's 30 other points that people can, applicants can try to make the points up that they want about the type of work they are doing. Again, we calibrated this entire section based on PSU’s findings of our grant making process and how to improve it and also the feedback that we got through community engagement.

A couple of other respondents noted concerns about how accurate demographic data will be in applications that come forward. They raised questions because demographic data collected from clients and staff is optional and some people may have fear around providing certain information about themselves to the organization that's serving them or employing them.

Yes, as staff, we hear that concern. We provided in the application opportunity for people to talk about how they arrived at the numbers they will be supplying in their application so reviewers can make sense of it using the narrative description of how applicants gathered that information and if they had to estimate it, on what basis.

Another piece of feedback we heard at a previous meeting was that there are other special populations that the levy should consider. One of those is the justice involved population and that our current application doesn't necessarily call out that population. That's true. However, we have left that section of the RFI open so that if there are populations we haven't called out or overlooked that we hope an applicant can talk about it in their responses to that section. And they can insert rows on the table that will be provided to describe the demographic characteristics of their clients, staff and board to talk about those additional populations.

Hornecker: I was just wondering about why we did that. It seems such an easy thing to say yes to in light that it is a dramatic marker for kids having problems. When you say we have a place where you can identify others, are there a lot of other markers as significant as criminal justice system that we would expect to see there?

McElroy: I personally don't know. As a person who positions myself as learning in this field every day, I think there are possibilities of populations that we haven't considered or have overlooked where we want to give people the opportunity to include that information.

We focused on racial equity, diversity and inclusion. Because that's in part where the city's goals have led us, where community engagement and PSU’s recommendation led us. But, we wanted to hold some space for other populations that we hadn't considered or overlooked. If you introduce a racial equity lens, that really matters. The justice-affected population. There could be others we haven't thought about but wanted to leave it open.

So, it is dissatisfying answer to some extent.

We also heard feedback from a fellow funder to make our application use more plain language. That's a movement that both state and federal are trying to make everything easier to read and understand. We tried to make sentences shorter; used words familiar to more and fewer clauses and more active voice. We had a couple of requests for clarifications on particular questions in the

RFI. We were already planning to provide guidance to applicants around examples of how to respond to certain questions; frequently asked questions and providing tips and information to help them.

Finally, we had a question raised about how we, as a staff, considered the consequences of the RFI's priorities for racial equity, diversity and inclusion. In particular, it was raised -- this person raised questions about how those priorities may shift funding from what the levy has been currently funding to other organizations or other types of services. And had we anticipated or thought what that transition would look like?

Our response is yes, somewhat, but every time the levy runs a funding process the possibility of funding new things is a possibility. We manage those each time they come up. At the same time, we recognize that the priorities that have been put into this particular RFI are borne out of the history institutional policy and practices that have resulted in unequal access for children and families in our community. We are asking how organizations are working to make better by those past inequities. So, we may see shifts and we will be prepared to support organizations and programs going forward. With that, happy to answer more questions on the RFI, take any input and that's the next piece of decision making.

Hornecker: One last question. On the scoring sheet for proven program section e. I was looking at the first and fourth bullet and wondered if you could explain how those are different.

The fourth bullet uses best practice and it seems like it was the definition without saying that. Is the first bullet where you would see the newer innovative program proposal?

McElroy: I think it's a little bit of both. The difficulty with best practice sometimes is there may be best practices that somebody needs to explain that are particular to the type of service model they are doing - home visiting or preschool. Versus the overall - we have chosen to do this particular service with this population because these are the things that we know that produce the results we want; and we're going to only hire this type of staff with this type of training and make sure our service is provided only this frequently. I think there are two ways that people can get into the details of the service delivery there. One at a higher rationale in general for what they plan to do with the population they plan to serve and why that population and one that is a more fine grain about best practices relative to that type of service they are proposing.

Wheeler: All right. Is there any public testimony on this item? Yes, sir. Come on up.

<u>Public Comment on RFI Template</u>

My name is **Joseph Tietz**. I'm the executive director of **Pathfinder Network** and we serve the criminal justice population. I would respectfully argue the demographic does stand out, to your question, Mitch, what predominant co-existing - poverty, marginalization -- the plethora of those criteria. I can't think of another population that does meet it. I think it represents a statement from the Portland Children's Levy to identify that and call it out.

Wheeler: Thank you. Anybody else? All right.

Anyone want to propose any changes before we call for a vote? Mitch?

Hornecker: Does anybody -- how do you feel about the criminal justice issue? I would be interested in hearing how you see that. I feel like I'm not -- I don't have a deep enough understanding but it seems something that is so obvious with kids.

Young: I guess I need a little more information about how it would be reported because are we talking about - we're looking for data regarding the parents and their participation in the criminal justice system. What data are we looking for? Or the children. Certainly, we have teens who are sadly in the criminal justice seem. I need clarification on what are we looking for?

McElroy: That's a good question.

Hornecker: I mean, I took it to understand we are telling the public what our priorities are for funding, right? Those include race and the question is do we want to add criminal justice as a priority, meaning that if the program is -- this is how I'm thinking about it. This is why I'm glad we are talking through it. That a program serving that client base would, all things being equal, be scored higher than a program not serving that base or some other priority population of ours. It's a way to elevate proposals.

Vega-Pederson: I have a question. So, is the area where you said there's a space to put additional demographic information the table X?

McElroy: Yes. It is an excel document that applicants can insert rows for other characteristics, demographic variables, identifying types of information for populations that they would want to share and be able to talk about throughout that entire section of their application.

Vega-Pederson: So just looking at the table X, least the part that is in the packet, I don't see where they would put other demographic information that might be important.

McElroy: Yes, the way it is formatted now is to print on one page for ease of reading this group and this decision making but because it is an excel document, it won't be protected or anything and people can download it and insert rows. When it is submitted as an application it may have another page.

Vega-Pederson: So would it be helpful if we had -- maybe this is on the version that I can't see but we have two, two, three, four, five, if we had six, other and this is the space to include other information that you think is relevant. That way, because I think that people that have contact with the criminal justice system, like an organization may want to highlight but there may be others, as well. Maybe just opening it up that way would meet some of the needs that have been brought up.

McElroy: Can I ask the person that testified to clarify a question? Is your intent to ask us to call out that population in the demographics that we request or is it to ask that applicants as a priority serve that population?

Tietz: I don't want to be -- [inaudible]

McElroy: You want to talk about it in the application as a called out population.

Tietz: As a statement from the Children's Levy that states this is a population -- [inaudible]

Young: To me, what is helpful about this table, table X, is being able to take a look and sort of map out the demographics of the clients and then how it matches or doesn't match with the program or the organization, who they are working with. I think that is part of our intent, or maybe the whole intent. So, if you have identified that you have clients who are participating in the criminal justice system but the people providing service to them may have history, I would think that is true, but I'd say the likelihood of -- is going to be lower. I could be wrong on that in terms of management staff, board of director and all of that. In other words, could it be a negative for us to call this out? Am I making any sense, or am I clueless in terms of how the organizations are operating?

McElroy: I think your questions is a good one. The thing I don't know is organizations that may be providing services, particularly to this population as part of its intentionality and design probably have a lot more information to supply about those demographics and how they work with that population. When I think of the average after-school program the Levy funds they may not know a lot about the justice involved life experience of the children they are serving. It doesn't mean they shouldn't, but at this point it is not necessarily something they are asked to provide or track. I think what I want to try to figure out is a balance between sending the message we care about this population so we are asking about it in this table and we expect you to start asking this information of children and families. So, I want to be careful about how what we put in the table influences what people think they need to track and ask about. I guess because you work with the population, I would defer to your expertise how to handle the tension we are surfacing.

Tietz: I'm not sure I completely understand the question. [inaudible] **In conversations about diversity, equity and inclusion, criminal justice history is a know component.** I think we are missing an opportunity. I just feel my obligation is to say it but I may be wrong. My understanding -- [inaudible]

Young: So, I guess where I am is that I would like to have that information around what are the lives like for the children and families we are serving? I'm not sure having -- I'm not sure this table is the place to be -- of how we are -- of how it would best help us or reviewers in the decision making.

McElroy: I agree. This is only one piece of information and we are asking a lot of other parts of the story in hopes that people will use other parts of the application to tell that part of the story.

Young: I want that story but I'm not sure this is the place for it.

Hornecker: It is an interesting question. I don't know the answer.

McElroy: We could certainly ask. When I think of the other types -- because this is a template, we have to use for each program area and think of the other type of questions applicants have to answer, I'd want to figure out how to characterize the information that we ask for -- and if you don't have it is the okay. The hard part is much of the information we are asking has points and other values that influence their ultimate score. I'm concerned about the expectation that applicants who don't work with that population knowingly are being expected to start tracking information they can't easily ask or may not be pertinent to the particular service they are doing. It may be pertinent in how their staff are trained to do trauma informed approaches in their after-school program but maybe not whether children at school A or B should be provided this after-school program. I hope I'm doing a good job of characterizing what information we ask and why. I'm willing to add it and I think we have to be careful about it. We can also add it --

Hornecker: Let's see if we can ask the question differently. A program that is providing services to children or families who have had contact with the criminal justice system would invariably dealing with a clientele that is overrepresented in the communities that we care about. Therefore, they should be in a great position to score well on our questions about DEI and as a result should be able to compete just the way we have it set up now. No matter what section you chose, if your program was mentoring or whatever, you could -- or foster care, whatever, our particular population is children and families -- it seems like you ought to be able to score well. By the population you are serving you are able to tell us, hey, I'm working with your priority population. That's what will get them funded.

Assuming, it is a well-run program. So, there is really no obstacle to a program submitting for funding. We might not be able to track it or some programs may not know how much or how little their clients have criminal justice but a program specifically focused on that would be able to tell us that and that would score well. I guess answering my own question, it feels like we're in a position to fund programs like that.

McElroy: Right. I think the only feedback, push back was by putting it as a discreet called out population that we as a Levy are sending a different message.

Hornecker: Which is a good point.

McElroy: We can build it in there also for now as part of our draft program area rfis that you have to approve in September and come back with a final recommendation about this is going to work this program area perhaps but maybe not as -- it feels a little more difficult to figure out how to proceed with it in this program area, like hunger relief.

Vega-Pederson: I'd say I would feel more comfortable being an other column or more open ended. I feel like if you have something called out on the table or where you have it and it is not matched with the point system it will be confusing.

If we have it open ended people can put down other demographic that is important for their programs and organization and that, overall, kind of -- more generic. A question about if they have -- if the staff reflects diversity of the client that's serve it is apples to apples comparison, versus something not reflected in the points system.

Wheeler: Good. Any further discussion?

Should we take a vote on the RFI template?

Proposal: To adopt the RFI template as presented by the staff.

Hornecker: So, moved

Vega-Pederson: Second

Vote: All in Favor.

Wheeler: So, I have to be the bearer of bad news. It is 20 after. You have two more items and I have a hard out at 4:00.

Option 2 Review Process

Option two splits the review between two sets of reviewers. One set would review and score the organizational capacity and racial equity, diversity inclusion section and the other set scores the program and budget sections.

The advantage of this approach is:

- it creates the opportunity to really match the reviewer experience and knowledge with the relevant application sections. So, the reviewers with strong experience and knowledge of organizational management and EDI would review that section of the application. And those that have the content area and program service delivery experience and knowledge would be reviewing the program and budget sections.

The disadvantage of this approach include:

- greater complexity to explain and implement,
- total hours of reviewer time are estimated to be more for this option, compared to option one
- a heavy her administrative burden for PCL staff to coordinate the various elements of the review process with ten reviewers per application versus five.

So, that's an overview. At the June 3rd meeting, the committee raised three concerns with the review process proposal.

First there was a concern raised that it would be unfair for applicants to only see part of an application and staff wants to clarify with both options the reviewers would receive the whole application. The difference would be for option one reviewers would read and score the whole application. Option two, readers and reviewers would only score parts of the application.

Whichever option the committee chooses, we will be sure to clearly explain to applicants what process is being used and explain it through the bidders' conferences in the RFI materials and on the FAQ's posted on the PCL website.

The second concern raised was related to option two. The committee expressed concern that splitting he view created redundancies because they want to review the whole application. Splitting the review eliminates the staff to average scores in cases where multiple sets of reviewers are reviewing applications from organizations that submit multiple applications.

Then the third concern had to do with the timing of the score sheet distribution. This would pertain to either option chosen. One committee member advocated for sending score sheets before the end of the funding process to increase transparency. In response, staff has built into the proposed timeline, which I will cover next, time to assemble and send score sheets to the applicants before they provide their written and video testimony to the committee.

Staff does have some concern that providing the score sheets to applicants before the committee makes funding decisions will require members to review individual score sheets, as well, especially if applicants raise issues related to their scores or comments that the reviewers may have made on the score sheets.

So, for those who have made funding decisions in the past for the levy, I think you will recall the volume of the applications that you received and the materials to review. So, just would ask that you please consider whether or not it is manageable to add review of score sheets to your workload, as well.

Public Comment on the Review Process (received prior to the meeting)

Hansell: With public comment, we received two pieces of public comment regarding the review process. The first person was seeking information regarding the information used to score the applications. As a clarification, staff instruct reviewers to score only on the application information and not use any outside information about the programs or organizations in their score. They are just to use the score sheets and the information that was presented.

The other person weighed in on their choice for option one or option two and they chose option one stating it will provide the best outcome. Since there are advantages and disadvantages to each of the options to have to defer to your preference. So, time for discussion.

Wheeler: I just have a question. The information is noncommittal. Which puts in a precarious place and given the strong case for a new process it would be my inclination to stick with what works. That being said, I don't see why we couldn't do a pilot on a smaller basis have some applications, maybe in one program area or maybe -- you are laughing. You thought about it.

McElroy: Only because we will have to communicate to the program area that we will handle your program differently.

Wheeler: Paradigm shifts are never easy. That's the question before us.

Young: I'd speak in favor of having two reviewers, have it split. The reason for that is I had the opportunity to sit on an organization that was making much smaller grants than this and it is one area not cross areas. So, I was a grant reviewer. It was interesting that I felt very comfortable in certain areas being able to score and understand and believe that I knew what was happening.

When it came to all of the budget areas, I was glad that I didn't have to work on that area because that wasn't something where I felt adequately trained to really understand how organizations manage their operating budgets and so on. I think being able to focus on what the program area itself really allowed me to go deeper into that and really consider what I was doing.

I think for our reviewers to have an opportunity to really use their area of expertise is I think valuable for them. I think it is more fair for the organizations that the grants are reviewed by people that have those areas of expertise. Certainly, there are people in the community who could probably do both adequately. But I think this has great potential, especially because we are so focused after the feedback that we got from PSU, Empress Rules and from the community of really wanting us to pay attention to the DEI work. I think that this is a way to say, yes, we are and we are scoring it separately. That's my vote.

Vega-Pederson: This is a tricky one. It is talking about a change and you never know if it will be a good or bad change. Sometimes you just have to do it.

I appreciate your words very much. I feel like they reflected what I was thinking. If we know we are going to have experts in DEI or programs or whatever looking at it, it seems like that's a strength that we are adding to the process. I appreciate Felicia's comments last week when she was talking about how it may be a harder process for the reviewers. I think if it was my job I would read the whole application and it is mandatory even if you are scoring only one part because I would imagine an applicant would want to continue the story they are telling about how they are going to do the work they are doing, especially around DEI, both in the one section but also the other section. Even if you are not grading it, you want to get the full story they are presenting to you. I appreciate that is part of the requirements that they would look at the full application. So, I think that was my big concern.

I have a question about the score sheet distribution. From the perspective of what position does that put reviewers in? If somebody is getting their score sheet back, is it anonymous or is that --

Hansell: It is anonymous. They just get the scores. Reviewers are asked to provide any comments constructive comments back to the applicants that will help them to understand the score that was awarded. So that's the information they will get but there aren't any names attached to the score sheets.

Vega-Pederson: All right. I know that is -- I also think -- I'm concerned about the impact on the process if they are getting some feedback before the entire has gone through where there's been the chance for the reviewers to be sent to staff. The staff hasn't had a chance to make their recommendations yet and we haven't had our chance yet. So I'm a little concerned what that would do to the system. Okay. Those are my comments. It's not really come to any decision. Just thinking out loud a little bit.

Hornecker: Well, I guess I worry this is a solution in search of a problem. Since we haven't had any feedback that we have had reviewers that have done poor jobs on areas they weren't experienced in. And on the other side of the ledger is Julie's well-taken point of it is a demonstration to the community that we are doing something.

I would be inclined to support the Mayor's idea of a pilot project. We don't need to change thinking because what I would propose is we simply do it for our own information. We will have experts grade a couple and see if there is any difference between what we are getting from two people reviewing one application versus one person reviewing one application. It doesn't have to be every application. Just a couple. They can report to us. It doesn't influence who gets what because everybody is under the same program. If it comes back and says our two expert reviewer and one expert reviewer came within statistical similarities of each other that would be informative. If we have very different answers when we have two versus one that would be good to know and lead in a different direction.

I think of the staff time and the recruitment increase. It's not a small undertaking to double the number of reviewers. I guess I'm looking for a toe in the water step before we jump in?

Hansell: Can I make a clarification. It is not doubling the reviewers. It doubles the number of applications, reviewers per application. Just a clarification.

McElroy: I want to clarify, Mitch, I understand what you are saying. You are saying internally look at the information and the scores not based on the idea of separate processes, not actually do a separate one?

Hornecker: Just thinking out loud. If we proceed with option one. At the same time, we pull out some number of programs -- proposals and have them graded by two people and those scores are not factored in awards until after the full grading and made our decisions. And then go back and look and see if it is something we want to change going forward. I don't know, Mr. Mayor if your project would like different than that but it seems like it would be pretty low impact on staff to do it that way.

Hansell: I'm going to think out loud, too and it may not make sense. I'm wondering if we went with option one and then reviewed scores where we will know which reviewers had more experience and knowledge in EDI, for example, and pull out those scores and see how they differ from folks who had more experience with program area and content and see if there was a difference in how -- if we were to have grouped them differently if there would have been a difference in score. Does that make sense?

Hornecker: Anything like that. Anything to where we -- as I said, putting our toe in the water before we commit to a functioning well-received process that we have now.

McElroy: We will have that information. We are planning to do recruitment of reviewers in ways that allow us to track information on how they identified what their experience and knowledge is that they are bringing to the process. So, we would have a way to look at these ten reviewers said they had this experience and knowledge, their average score is here with this.

Vega-Pederson I guess my question is what if we do notice a difference?

Hansell: That would inform the next time we do funding.

Vega-Pederson: It would just push that to the next round then.

Wheeler: Who would like to provide public testimony on this issue?

No Public Comment

Wheeler: Very good. I will entertain a motion, or not.

Hornecker: I guess I move for option one with a proviso that staff would devise a mechanism that would allow us to evaluate whether or not we could get higher quality reviews done by choosing option B. So, the next time we have a funding round, we will be able to be base a decision on that information.

Young: I will second Mitch's motion. Was there anything specific from Empress Rules or PSU regarding this part of the scoring?

McElroy: Great question. Not from Empress Rules and PSU's input on review was more about you all did a pretty good job last time. You weren't transparent what you did. So, do that better and be more intentional on recruitment. So here we are.

Hansell: Option two came out of the comments you made, Julie, reflecting the thinking behind option two.

Wheeler: So, I feel like I'm steering in the dark here. I'm going to support the motion currently on the table, but I think it does raise some interesting and provocative questions. I think Julie's question around budgets is one excellent example. The DEI issue is another interesting example. Was anybody else surprised how little testimony and feedback we got on this? I was. It struck me as a fairly major change in the way we do things. I think people are equally grasping at straws. It would be helpful to have -- I do support the idea of a pilot. I agree it is more work and we will have to work with you and find a way to make that work for you. I'm not trying to pile on extra work on your shoulders because you do a lot of work and I appreciate it but if we had a pilot we would have a more robust situation and people would have more to comment on. It is hard to comment on something that we don't understand the full dynamics of what is being proposed. I'm prepared to stick with what ain't broke.

Any further discussion?

Vega-Pederson: I would just say that -- this is a tough one. I'm going to support the motion because I take to heart what Felicia said last week and she seemed to have the most experience being the reviewer. I take that since I haven't had that much experience to heart. I want us to go forward with a pilot of some type and we will look at what option two is trying to get at and the easiest way to administrate possible but that is tipping the scales for me.

Proposal to adopt Option 1 Reviewer Process with some analysis to test whether option 2 might have produced different results.

Vote

In Favor: Hornecker, Vega-Pederson, Wheeler

Opposed: Young

Wheeler: Motion carries 3-1.

Hansell: Can I ask for a clarification regarding the timing of the districts of the score sheets to applicants, either before the process ends or at the conclusion?

Hornecker: To me, we have built in, as I read this, two opportunities for comment. One is video and one is written and they are not mutually exclusive.

Did we decide last time we were going to do both? It seems like we ought to offer one or the other but to get a video presentation and the same written presentation seems redundant and wasteful of their time and our time.

Hansell: I don't know that the information, the written -- I wouldn't assume applicants would provide the same information in the written versus the video. I would think the video -- well, I don't know.

McElroy: You did vote last time to take them both.

Hornecker: I continue to be in favor of the transparency of delivering the score sheets anonymously, of course, to the applicants.

Vega-Pederson: Can I ask a clarifying question? In the past did they receive score sheets?

Hansell: If they requested them after the conclusion of the funding process.

McElroy: So not in advance of funding decisions. Great.

Young: Yeah. So, my understanding on this, then is that if applicants receive those scores before we have made our decision, we may receive written information from them, explaining something

being cued that the way you are communicating isn't clear or doesn't meet criteria. Sometimes it doesn't meet criteria. I would hope that most people understand that I don't service this population or don't meet this criterion; but generally speaking it gives that person -- it will steer them in a sense I of I would reword it to use different words or address the feedback I might receive from the scorers. Now, I don't remember because I haven't been in the job long enough to know what or if we requested, is it just points or are they comments?

McElroy: It is the whole reviewer score sheet. They are usually five pages per reviewer. It is whether you have three out of the five points available and sometimes people write a comment and sometimes they won't. It would be a pdf copy of every point by point that was on the application and any comments written.

Tietz: I don't know how helpful that would be if it is just points.

Wheeler: Would it help from an organizational learning perspective for future applications? Would that be a value or no?

Tietz: Oh, yeah. But I don't know if the timing of it makes sense.

McElroy: I think to your point if I understood your question, will how an applicant presents -- I think you will hear from people about how the process of the review may have been flawed opposed to other parts of how they might have constructed that argument and/or both.

Proposal: To send score sheets to applicants before funding decisions are made

Vega-Pederson: I will make a motion that we send those score sheets to the applicants earlier in the process.

Hornecker: Second.

Wheeler: We have a motion and a second. Any further discussion?

Vote: All in favor

Wheeler: All right. We're going to try it and see how it goes. So, thank you to our team. Appreciate that very much. And our last item and thank you -- we have caught up and I appreciate.

<u>Timeline for Funding Process</u>

Funding Process Timeline is Appendix C to these minutes

Hansell: This will be very quick. In your packet and also as a handout for the audience is a tentative funding process timeline. You notice the first thing on the timeline is the next Allocation Committee Meeting which will be held between September 9th and the 23rd where you will meet to make final decisions necessary to begin the funding process and publish the FRI's.

So, at the September meeting, you will be:

Tentative Schedule for PCL Funding Process, 2019-20

Action	Dates	Notes/Time Period
AC Meeting September	Between 9/9 - 9/23	Finalize program area RFIs including guidelines
Publish RFI	9/25	
Bidders' Conferences	9/30 - 10/11	
Application Due Date	11/20	8 weeks for applicants to respond
Applications to Reviewers	12/4 – 12/6	Host 2 reviewer trainings Dec. 4-6
Review Period	12/4 – 1/21	Nearly 7 weeks to review
Individual Meetings with Reviewers	1/21 – 1/31	About two weeks to collect, review score sheets
Staff enter scores and develop funding recommendations	1/31 – 2/26	Four weeks to create final scores for all applicants, prepare application data spreadsheets by program area, prepare reviewer score forms for applicants, develop and communicate funding recommendations to applicants
Applicant Written Testimony Due	3/18	1.5 weeks to respond to staff recommendation; due before spring break
Materials to AC	3/20	Before spring break; includes spreadsheets, summaries, staff recommendations, written testimony
Video Testimony Taped	3/30 – 4/3	3-4 dates/locations
Video sent to AC	4/8	
Funding Decision Meetings (3 program areas per meeting)	4/20 4/27	AC has materials for 4 weeks; 2.5 weeks to listen to watch video testimony plus week between meetings