Portland Children's Levy
Allocation Committee Meeting Minutes
December 16, 2013 1:00 p.m.
Location: Portland City Council Chambers

The full record of the meeting may be viewed on the Portland Children's Investment Fund website: www.portlandchildrenslevy.org.

Attending: Mitch Hornecker, Marissa Madrigal, Dan Saltzman (Chair), Serena Stoudamire-Wesley, Julie S. Young

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

Approval of minutes of November 22, 2013 Meeting

Madrigal: motion to approve
Stoudamire-Wesley: second
Vote: All in favor

Public Comment – none

Proposed Changes to Request for Investment (Funding Application)

Meg McElroy:
Our goal is to have the Allocation Committee revise and approve a template for the funding application – the request for investment or RFI. Once approved, staff will create the six program area RFI's to be ready for publication in mid-January. Many of the things to be reviewed today were presented at the November meeting.

There are six major issues on the agenda today: the overall RFI content, structure and points; minimum point requirements; set goal for percentage of funds invested in culturally specific services; two miscellaneous changes; and a change to the process.

We recommend that the staff brief the committee on all six items and then take public comment.

There is a draft scoring rubric available.

The RFI draft and draft scoring rubric are appended to these minutes.

Revise Content and Adjust Point Values

Program Description and Proven Program/Design Rationale Sections

Staff has combined the Program Description section and Proven Program/Design Rationale sections in the 2009 RFI into one section, Proven Program Design and Effectiveness, worth 55 points.

Rationale:

- **Total point value remains the same**: The program description section was worth 25 points and the proven programs section was worth 30 points so the point value for the two sections has not changed.
- **Eliminates past problem**: In responding to these sections separately, applicants repeated the program description in the section that asked for the design rationale (research, best practice, program data and experience). Combining the two sections into one should make it easier for applicants to discuss each program design element and the design rationale all in the same response without having to repeat information across sections.

Budget Section

Lisa Hansell: The budget section links budget to the proposed program.We ask for a detailed proposed budget for the first year, and total proposed budgets for later years. We ask for detailed justification for five areas of the budget. We request allocation methods for indirect costs. Administrative expenses cannot exceed 15% of the proposed program costs. That is the same as the current rate. Staff streamlined the budget section to focus on the information most relevant at this stage in the process, eliminate requests for information that was not used, and keeping in mind that reviewers often do not have the expertise to confidently assess and score this section.

Also, we recommend that we reduce the point value of this section from 15 to 10 points. This was based on a review of other funding applications from both government and private foundations. Some reviewers did not feel confident in assigning point values to budgets. Staff typically works closely with agencies in contract negotiations.

Hornecker: Budget is only part of the section. Cost effectiveness & budget justification seems like a bigger part of that section. Did scorers have a challenge there too?

Hansell: Yes. We hope the rubric will help people feel more confident scoring that section.

Young: If there are questions about a budget, how could the staff communicate those concerns?

Hansell: Staff reviews each application and writes a summary that includes any concerns.

Pellegrino: Budgets are very commonly revised after grants are awarded based on the grant amount.

Young: Do you review all of the budgets of the applications?

McElroy: In the past, the staff has reviewed every application and its budget. We each read the applciations in our program areas. We communicate reviewer scores, any issues we identify and give our recommendations.

Organizational Capacity Section

Hansell: This section asks the organization to show they have the capacity to successfully implement and maintain a cost effective proven program. We ask about: organization history and structure; turnover in key management positions; and administrative and financial experience.

Staff reviewed applications from other funders (private and government) and revised this section as follows:

- Moved some staffing questions to program section, and changed what is asked about staffing.
- Added a question on administrative and financial capacity that specifically requests information on financial management of grants.
- Added a requirement that applicants that have not received PCL funding in the past three years complete a Statement of Experience that details the five largest funders of the applicant and notifies applicants that PCL staff may contact other funders for references.
- We recommended reducing the point value from 15 to 10.

Rationale:
Levy staff looked at a sample of other funders' applications (private and government) and noted that most asked for less detail that we requested in this section, and asked different types of questions. Some private funders did not have any specific questions regarding organizational capacity at all, and just required submission of the mission, vision, and strategic plan for the organization.

Adding the statement of experience will enable us to check references on organizations we have not worked with recently.

Saltzman: Can you tell me more about the statement of experience.

Pellegrino: The statement of experience is not scored, but is something staff would review and would check references.

In addition, staff assesses the financial health of the organization using a tool developed by PCL's auditors and reports on the results of applying the tool to applicant's audits or financial statements as part of the application evaluation process.

Hornecker: Where is that scored?

Pellegrino: It is not scored. It is a separate report.
John Kelly: It is a series of metrics based on the financial statements. Current ratio, net income and a variety of other ratios are compared to a normal range. If more than four are outside the normal range, I do a deeper look and write up a narrative about the ratios and the financial history of the organization.

Hansell: That report is part of the staff summary.

Hornecker: Not scored as part of this section?

McElroy: Not scored by the reviewers, but is a separate part of staff review that informs our recommendations.

Pellegrino: We feel like a greater level of experience is needed in this area.

Hornecker: Good stuff.

Cultural Responsiveness Section

Pellegrino: Staff reviewed a draft Protocol for Culturally Responsive Services: Literature Review, Philosophy and Standards for Performance authored by PSU's Center to Advance Racial Equity, along with applications from other funders (private and government), and consulted with OEHR, County Managers, and the Coalition of Communities of Color. Using all of these sources of input and seeking to balance higher standards for cultural responsiveness with the fact that organizational capacity levels differ dramatically among service providers, staff has revised the content and language of this section substantially. The major changes proposed are as follows:

- The degree to which the staff, management and board reflect the population served is specifically scored in the application.
- Applicants are asked to describe their organizational commitment to cultural responsiveness and provide examples.
- Applicants are asked to describe how they gather and use input from service users, and how this input influences all aspects of policy and program planning/implementation.
- Applicants are asked to address how they engage with the communities they serve in terms of collaborating with community leaders and other organizations that serve/represent the same communities.
- Language accessibility is more broadly addressed.

Hornecker: This is great work. I am totally supportive of it. I did note some redundancy.

Pellegrino: One section (1B) asks about the population served by the program. This section (4B) is asking about the clients of the entire organization. We are looking at board and management staff and their relationship to the broader population served.

Hornecker: That is one example. It is just a question of redundancy and scoring.

Pellegrino: There are a few things going on. One is service based equity. In your service provision, how are you taking into account cultural responsiveness. We tried to put those questions in the program section. In the cultural responsiveness section, the questions are about the whole organization and are broader.

Stoudamire-Wesley: How are demographics determined? Are you looking at more than head of household?

Pellegrino: We are beholden to how the organization captures the data in the application. In our demographic reports, we are more specific about duplicated or unduplicated counts are required. In this section, we are asking for unduplicated counts.

McElroy: We have asked the applicant to convey the information around the population that makes the most sense. They would choose either parents or children to report on.

Bonus Points

Pellegrino: Similar to the prior system, staff recommends awarding 3 “bonus points” for programs that demonstrate that they are culturally specific. Staff also recommends awarding 3 “bonus points” to programs that demonstrate that more than 50% of the children/families served reside or go to school in the zip codes defined as East Portland EXCEPT FOR APPLICATIONS IN THE FOSTER CARE PROGRAM AREA. We did not receive any input that suggested we change the system.

Rationale:

- Public input favored awarding bonus points for cultural specificity, and culturally specific services were highly prioritized in all forms of public input.
- Public input favored awarding bonus points for programs serving East Portland, except in the foster care program area where input suggested that foster youth should be served wherever they live or go to school.

Hornecker: If we increase cultural responsiveness, is it still necessary to have bonus points?

Pellegrino: They are two different things. Everyone has to answer the culturally responsiveness section. Not all organizations are culturally specific organizations. A culturally specific organization may not score as highly on cultural responsiveness. We are responding to public input that we advantage culturally specific organizations. We expect all applicants to be culturally responsive to the populations they serve.

Young: We did hear public testimony in our last meeting that we consider giving bonus points for North Portland.

Pellegrino: In the past, we have heard that service provision is more concentrated in the core of the city, including North Portland. There has been much less service provision in East Portland. The policy priority has helped organizations to focus resources in East Portland.

There is concern that for foster youth, we prioritize the population and not geography.

McElroy: We have now reviewed all sections of the RFI. Are there changes that you would like to see in the content?

Saltzman: Do you think this new RFI will help to get clear and concise responses?

McElroy: That is our hope. We had that lens in mind as we crafted the new RFI. We did debrief the prior process with this committee. Reviewers provided feedback as well.

Pellegrino: We have added more tables to help review information.

Madrigal: I really appreciate the work you did on the culturally responsive and specific organtizations. There are many concrete questions.

Pellegrino: We understand that this information will give us a good baseline for gauging improvement.

A single program needs to submit one application to be considered in all program areas for which it might be eligible. One organization may apply for multiple programs in different program areas.

Hornecker: Item E4 in section 1 looks like a look back in outcomes. Item F2 looks like a forward look at what tools will be used to track outcomes. I did not see why there was no validation information in the E4 section.

Pellegrino: If E4 had not validation information listed, we would ask for those specifics. It sounds like we need to clarify this section. The requirements of F2 should be applicable to past results (E4). We will work on the language in this section to make it clearer.

Hornecker: You are saying that for existing programs, the outcomes from E4 are assumed to be the same as the methods in F2.

Pellegrino: We want the answers to F2 to apply to E4. We will clarify the language in the application. It is helpful to have your perspective.

Add Minimum Points Requirement

McElroy: Staff recommends requiring that applicants earn a minimum of 39 points in the combined Proven Program Design and Effectiveness section, and a minimum of 16 points in the Culturally Responsive Programs section to be considered for funding.

Rationale:

- **Sets clear minimum standards**: Setting this parameter provides clear communication in advance of funding decisions on minimum standards for applications.
- **Assures minimum standards are met**: Setting this parameter would assure that the proven program design and cultural responsiveness of any funded program at least meets a minimum standard of quality.

Madrigal: Have there been situations where the committee had to consider funding applications that were sub-par? Is this a reaction to a problem from the past?

McElroy: This is an effort to be realistic when we come to funding decisions. It can help us screen out those applications that do not meet a certain standard.

Pellegrino: It is more of a formalization than a reaction to past experience.

Set Goal for Percentage of Funds Invested in Culturally Specific Services

Pellegrino: Staff recommends setting a goal in the RFI for each program area to invest at least 30% of the funds allocated to that category in culturally specific programming. The Levy invested 31% of its total resources in culturally specific programming over first three years of the current levy, but the percentage has typically varied considerably depending on the funding area. This would be a goal; reaching the goal will depend on which organizations apply, and the quality of the applications received. The idea is to give organizations incentive to apply.

Rationale:

- **Encourage culturally specific applicants in all categories**: Setting a goal for investment in culturally specific programming for each program area will hopefully encourage culturally specific programs to apply in program areas where investment in these programs is currently low (child abuse and mentoring).
- **Multnomah County SUN Service System**: No groups that staff solicited for public input specified an ideal percentage of investment in culturally specific programming, or were willing to suggest a target percentage. Currently, Multnomah County allocates one third of the funding available for its SUN Service System to culturally specific services.

Young: I agree with the method. I want us to be sure that we are only funding programs with good outcomes and sound organizations.

Pellegrino: We agree. This is a goal, but it is one of many factors considered in funding decisions.

Miscellaneous Changes

Hansell: Staff recommends two small technical changes that affect eligibility to apply for grants as follows:

Narrow Eligible Applicants

Narrow eligible applicants to non-profit corporations, local education agencies, community colleges and universities and eliminate for-profit corporations and other government agencies.

Rationale:

PCL has never funded for-profit corporations and other government agencies because the need for a profit margin for the former, and additional administrative expense for the latter add cost to the services. PCL generally seeks to maximize its funding to directly benefit children and families.

Raise the Minimum Annual Grant Level

Staff recommends that the minimum annual grant amount be increased from $30,000 to $50,000.

Rationale:

This will decrease the number of total grants, and prevent small organizations that do not have the capacity to meet PCL accountability standards from applying.

Saltzman: Why do we want to proscribe a for-profit organization from applying. I could see the possibility of an organization making a good proposal. I am leaning toward eliminating the prohibition.

Pellegrino: In the past, they have not been competitive.

Madrigal: I have a conflict thinking of tax dollars going to pay for profit beyond administrative costs. If a for-profit proposed just covering their costs, I could consider that.

Saltzman: I want to allow for the possibility of for-profits making competitive applications.

Hornecker: I thought this proposal was meant to stop a large number of applications. I am open to the possibility of a competitive application from a for-profit companies.

Hornecker: I think the minimum grant level is a good idea. Will it have a large or modest impact?

Pellegrino: It will have a modest impact. I think it helps us to get organizations that can support the grants.

Process Changes

Hansell: Staff recommends two changes to the funding process as described in the RFI documents. First, we recommend creating a two-step process for funding decisions in which staff recommendations for funding are presented, applicants provide testimony, and the Committee has an opportunity to ask questions of staff and applicants at the first meeting. No funding decisions are made at this meeting, and the funding meeting is scheduled one week later. This will provide a chance for Committee members to clear up any questions they have, consider testimony provided, and allow applicants additional time to advocate if they so choose. This process change addresses repeated complaints that the Committee does not have adequate time to hear and consider testimony from applicants, and to ask questions of staff and/or applicants.

Staff also recommends that we provide our funding recommendations to all affected applicants at least two days prior to the meeting at which they will be presented. In the past, staff recommendations were given to applicants at the same meeting where the recommendations were presented, and the funding decisions were made. Applicants provided feedback that this short timeline made it difficult to digest what staff was recommending and why, and to effectively respond.

The recommendations would go to agencies two business days before first consideration of application.

Public Testimony

Mike L'Oreste with **Portland OIC** testified**.** My question is around residency and eligibility. Can the Levy fund programs for Portland children who are at a site in Gresham?

Mark McKechnie from **Youth, Rights and Justice** testified. It appears that the scoring on cultural responsiveness section is overly focused on race and ethnicity to the exclusion of other forms of culture.

Rebecca Locamp with **First Robotics Competition Team 1432 After School, Mentoring, Tutoring and Workforce Training Program** testified. With the restrictions on grants to no more than 30% of an agency's budget, I am concerned that only cash will be considered. Agencies that rely heavily on in-kind donations will be excluded. We function with a small amount of money, but with materials and equipment donated. I would hate to see a worthy, functional, very successful program not be considered.

Ken Dale with **Peninsula Children's Learning Center** testified. Your deadlines make budgeting difficult for organizations with June 30 deadlines. I urge you to move things along as quickly as possible to give organizations a chance to revise their budgets.

Saltzman: I would like staff to answer the questions raised in public testimony.

McElroy: If the child is a resident of the City of Portland, then the program is eligible to receive funding. Levy funds would only be permitted to benefit the children of the City of Portland by zip code and mailing address.

McElroy: Other variables beyond race and ethnicity are included in the application. Applicants are encouraged to add additional rows to talk about any other demographic elements of the clients they serve, their staffing and their board members.

It is an important element that we are looking at race and ethnicity and language.

Pellegrino: We look at financial statements and last closed fiscal year's revenues. The organization needs to be large enough to meet the revenue requirement and have an audit. Smaller organizations might find a partner to be eligible.

Kelly: Some in-kind services can be counted in revenues. It is a GAAP issue that is somewhat technical.

Pellegrino: The process is very involved. Given our staffing, we cannot promise being done earlier. If we can move up the date, we will try. Much depends on the volume of applications and the schedules of the reviewers.

Votes on Above Items

1. **Request For Investment Template Structure Content, Structure & Point Values**

McElroy: The one change I heard requested was being more clear about the specifics of outcomes in sections F2 and E4.

Hornecker: Have we had many programs fail?

Pellegrino: Very few.

Hornecker: I am focusing on organizational capacity and budget narrative. With the economic stress in the community, I am concerned about having organizations that can carry out the programs. I like the emphasis on cultural responsiveness. It feels like 10 point on organizational capacity is very low.

Madrigal: The justification was that other organizations were weighting that topic less. What type of organizations were they?

Pellegrino: Those were foundations and some government organizations. Very few asked these kinds of questions. Those who ask did not score them.

Saltzman: Are you suggesting we add points to the organizational capacity?

Hornecker: I would add there and reduce the program area by 5 points.

Young: I support it the way it is. I agree with staff that we fund organizations that are stable. The real questions that will separate applications lie in the program itself.

Stoudamire-Wesley: I agree with that.

Saltzman: I believe there is a consensus to stay with the staff recommendation.

Proposal: Accept the draft RFI template proposed by staff (appended to this memo) with staff to create clarifying language around the relationship in 1E4 to 1F2.

Young: So moved.

Madrigal: Second.

Vote: All in Favor.

2. Minimum Points Requirement

Young: I move that we accept the staff recommendation of minimum points for program section of RFI is 36 out of 55 points and minimum points for cultural responsiveness section is 16 out of 25 points.

Madrigal: Second.

Vote: All in Favor.

3. Goal for Percentage of Funds Invested in Culturally Specific Services

McElroy: The next proposal is the goal of investing at least 30% of funds in culturally specific services in each of the six program areas.

Saltzman: We have the option not to meet this goal if sufficient quality applications are not available.

Madrigal: So moved.

Stoudamire-Wesley: Second

Vote: All in Favor.

4. Define Eligible Applicants

McElroy: It sounds like you would like to include for-profit corporations as eligible and may want to clarify whether universities need to be public or private or both.

Madrigal: If we consider for-profit corporations, could we specify that they only recoup costs. I do have trouble with the idea of someone profiting from the levy. If they wanted to come in as a partner, that would be one thing. If we consider an application from a for-profit, I can go into those considerations at that time.

Pellegrino: I am not sure we will be able to separate out profit in an application.

Saltzman: I do not think we will get many of these applications. I just do not want to overly proscribe something that may not even happen. I would like to allow the possibility of it happening.

Young: I do not see this as different from other contracts that the City or County have with private businesses. It is taxpayer money involved in those contracts as well. I don't think this will threaten nonprofits competing for our funds. If anything, we need more public private partnerships for people to come together with a common mission. Perhaps there is a strategy out there that we can be open to.

McElroy: So, we would add for-profit corporations to the list of eligible applicants?

Young: I think we should allow public or private universities.

Hornecker: I believe it should be for-profit entities rather than corporations.

Saltzman: I will make that motion – adding for-profit entities to the list of eligible applicants and not restricting universities to any particular group.

Stoudamire-Wesley: Second.

<u>Vote:</u>

In favor: Hornecker, Saltzman, Stoudamire-Wesley, Young

Opposed: Madrigal

Motion approved.

5. Minimum Annual Grant Level

McElroy: Proposal is to set minimum grant size at $50,000 per year.

Young: So moved.

Madrigal: Second.

Vote: All in favor.

6. Process Change

McElroy: Accept staff recommendation for process as outlined in the draft template (appended to these minutes).

Stoudamire-Wesley: So moved.

Madrigal: Second

Vote: All in Favor.

Saltzman: WE now have a Request for Investment template.

Pellegrino: Next time, we will have six RFI's for your review.

Saltzman: Our next meeting will be at 2:00 p.m. on Friday, January 10, 2014 here at City Council Chambers.

Adjourned 2:45 p.m.

Investing in our future
portland children's levy

Invitation to Submit a Request for Investment in ____________________Program Services to be Delivered in the City of Portland

Publication Date: January 16, 2014

Summary of RFI

Available Funding:	**Approximately $__________will be available for a 36-month period through the Portland Children's Levy. Individual grants will be capped at $550,000 peryear, per proposal. Total investment by the Children's Levy in an organization will be limited to 30% of annual organization revenue.**
Due Date, Time & Place:	**March 3, 2014 by 5 PM** **The application and all attachments must be submitted in electronic format. No paper submissions will be accepted. Submit applications and all attachments via email to** **OR submit on a flash drive to** **319 SW Washington St., Ste. 415, Portland, OR 97204.**
Bidder's Conference:	**Applicants are strongly encouraged to attend one of two Bidders' Conferences which will be held on _, 2014 from ______, and _, 2014 from ____ at ___________________________.**
Period of Award:	**36 months (7/1/14 – 6/30/17)**
Eligible Applicants:	**Not for Profit Corporations – 501(c)(3), Local Education Agencies, Community Colleges and Universities. These groups may also apply as a consortium of organizations through an identified lead agency/fiscal agent.**
Requested Services:	
Goal of Services:	
Questions or Comments	**Questions or comments about this Request for Investment may be addressed to _______________, at @portlandoregon.gov, 503._______________or 503._______________.**

Request for Investment in ________________________

Introduction

In November 2002, Portland voters passed Measure 26-33, known as the Portland Children's Levy (PCL). PCL invested an average of $9.5 million per year over five years in proven programs located in the City of Portland to help prepare young children for school, prevent child abuse and neglect, provide safe and constructive before and after-school alternatives and mentoring relationships for children. In November 2008, Portland voters renewed the Portland Children's Levy for an additional five years beginning July 1, 2009. PCL invested an average of $11.5 million per year in proven programs in early childhood, child abuse prevention/intervention, foster care, after school and mentoring.

In May 2013, Portland voters again renewed the Portland Children's Levy for five additional years beginning July 1, 2014. Depending upon annual tax receipts, PCL will invest approximately $___ million per year in proven programs in early childhood, child abuse prevention/intervention, foster care, after school, mentoring and hunger relief.

All investment recommendations are made by a five-member Allocation Committee that is composed of one City of Portland Commissioner, one Multnomah County Commissioner, one representative of the business community, and two citizens with expertise in children's issues.

PCL seeks to increase the capacity for selected programs to deliver services and to implement proven programs, thereby improving outcomes for young people and for the community.

PCLGoalsandStrategies

After discussion and public input during the summer and early fall of 2013, the Levy Allocation Committee adopted overall goals for the Levy and goals for each of the program areas specified in the 2013 ballot measure. Concurrently, PCL conducted an extensive four month public input process to inform Levy funding priorities for the next five years. The input process included a written survey (500 respondents), meetings with key stakeholder, policy and community groups (39 groups, over 300 people), and open public meetings (100 people). Using the results of this public input process, the Allocation Committee adopted funding strategies and priorities in each program area that contribute toward achievement of PCL's program area and overall goals. The adopted goals and strategies are outlined in the following table. The Allocation Committee also set a goal of investing at least 30% of resources allocated for each program area in culturally specific programs.

Overall Goals of the Levy • Prepare children for school. • Support children's success inside and outside of school. • Reduce racial and ethnic disparities in children's well-being and school success.
Early Childhood: Support children's early development and readiness for kindergarten.
Strategy 1: Intensive Home-Visiting for children prenatal – 3 years old
Strategy 2: Preschool, Head Start, or structured preschool-like experiences for children 3 – 5 years old
Strategy 3: Early Childhood Mental Health Consultation
Child Abuse Prevention and Intervention: Prevent child abuse and neglect and support vulnerable families.
Strategy 1: Strengthen parenting skills and resilience
Strategy 2: Address trauma through therapeutic intervention
Foster Care: Support the well-being and development of children and youth in foster care
Strategy 1: Academic Support (early childhood – college)
Strategy 2: Support for youth in the transition to adulthood (ages 14-24)
Strategy 3: Permanency for Youth
After-School: Provide safe and constructive after-school and summer programming that supports children's well-being and school success.
Strategy 1: Intensive Academic Support
Strategy 2: Enrichment Programming
Strategy 3: New SUN Community Schools
Mentoring: Connect children and youth with caring adult role models that support their well-being.
Strategy 1: Supports for students' academic achievement and/or post-secondary pursuits
Hunger Relief: Expand access to healthy, nutritious food for hungry children.
Strategy 1: Increase Access/Utilization of Existing Programs
Strategy 2: School-Based Food Pantries
Strategy 3: Increase Access to Food During Summer and Out of School Time
Strategy 4: Alternative Approaches

SubmittinganApplication

PCL expects that most applicants will select one program area and one strategy in that program area to address in a single application. However, PCL recognizes that some programs may be eligible to receive funding in more than one program area (e.g. a child abuse prevention program that serves children aged 0-5 may qualify for early childhood and child abuse prevention funding under the RFIs for both program areas). Applicants may request that a single proposal be considered for funding in more than one program area by checking the applicable boxes on the Application Cover Sheet (Exhibit A) and providing the information requested in Section 1.A. of the application. Proposed programs must meet the requirements specified in all of the RFIs under which funding is sought (e.g. eligible population, age range, applicable program area strategy). The application will be scored by one review committee, and if the program is funded in one category, it will be removed from consideration for funding in the second category in which it was eligible to request funding. If the application is considered, but not funded in one category, it will be considered for funding in the second category in which it was eligible to apply.

AdoptedStrategies:[Insertprogramareaname]
The Allocation Committee has adopted the strategies listed below to fund ____________programs through this RFI. **Only programs that propose to employ at least one of these strategies should apply for funding under this RFI.**

[Insertprogramareastrategies]

GuidelinesandProcessforProgramsthatUseMultiple(enterprogramarea)Strategies

[Insert specific instructions for program area]

FundingRequirements
The applicant's response to the RFI and the required attachments described below will be used to determine whether the applicant meets these funding requirements.

A. Available Funding and Funding Limitations
Approximately $____________ will be available for a 36-month period. Individual investments will be capped at $550,000 per year, per application. All applicants must request at least $50,000 per year. Proposed programs must directly serve children and families.

Applicants must demonstrate that PCL funding will comprise **no more than** 30% of the applicant's revenues for its last closed fiscal year. Applicants must include all funding they are requesting from PCL in all program areas in calculating this amount.

B. City of Portland Residency
All beneficiaries of PCL investments (i.e. children served) must be residents of the City of Portland.

C. City of Portland Rules and Guidelines
Funded organizations will be required to follow City of Portland EEO hiring guidelines and contracting rules[1], provide proof of liability, automobile and workers compensation insurance and provide additional assurances as required by PCL staff.

D. Duration of Investment
PCL funding is available for 36 months of service provision beginning July 1, 2014 and ending June 30, 2017.

[1] PCC 3.100.005 provides in part: It is unlawful to discriminate on the basis of race, religion, color, sex, marital status, familial status, national origin, age, mental or physical disability, sexual orientation or source of income in programs, activities, services, benefits, and employment whether carried out by the City of Portland, directly or through a contractor or any other entity with whom the City of Portland arranges to carry out its programs and activities except as allowed by federal law, rules and regulations.

E. Eligible Applicants
Non-profit corporations (501(c)(3), local education agencies, community colleges and universities are eligible to apply for PCL funding.

F. Eligible Service Population
Children aged ____and their parents or guardians.

G. *Additional Requirements specific to the program area*

[Insertspecificprogramarearequirementsasapplicable]

ApplicationComponents

A. Application Cover Sheet
Applicants must include a completed application coversheet using the form attached in ExhibitA.

B. Narrative Response and Formatting Requirements
Applicants must respond to each of the four sections of the funding application. Each section is worth a portion of 100 possible points. Applicants may be eligible to receive 6 possible bonus points as described in the application. Please be clear and specific in your responses and assure that you have responded to all parts of the question. Applicants who fail to address a portion of the question will receive fewer points.

Narrative responses must be formatted as follows:

- Separate page(s) for responses to each of the four sections; label response to each section and the lettered and numbered subparts
- One-inch margins on each page
- No less than 12-point type
- Page number and program name listed at the bottom of each page
- Comply with page limits for each section; pages that exceed the limit will not be scored

C. Required Enclosures
All applicants must submit the Checklist of Required Enclosures (ExhibitB) with the following documents:

- Detailed FY14/15 proposed program budgets including sources and uses for all funds using the attached budget form in Exhibit C, and total annual proposed budgets for FY15/16 and FY16/17 using the attached budget form in Exhibit D
- Table IV.B. Demographics of Organization's Clients, Staff and Board (Exhibit E)
- Statement of Experience (Exhibit F) for applicants that have not received PCL funding between July 1, 2010 and the publication date of this RFI
- Proof of 501(c)(3) status (where applicable)

- Annual organization-wide budgets for the current operating fiscal year, and the most recent closed fiscal year that include sources and uses of all funds. Please clearly state the starting and ending months of the organization's fiscal year
- If the applicant has revenues of at least $1 million for the last closed fiscal year, applicant must submit a recent audited financial statement
- If the applicant has annual revenues of less than $1 million for the last closed fiscal year, the applicant is not required to submit an audited financial statement with the application, but will be required to obtain an audit prior to receiving any funding from PCL
- Client intake or enrollment form used by program
- Additional attachments required for the program area where applicable

Failure to submit required enclosures may disqualify the application from consideration.

ApplicationProcess

A. Bidders' Conference

PCL will hold two Bidders' Conferences on ____________, 2014 from______, and_________, 2014 fromC______,at C________________. The bidders' conference is not mandatory, but it is highly recommended that all potential applicants attend. The purpose of the Bidders' Conference is to review the requirements and necessary forms for the RFI, and answer any questions from potential applicants regarding the application components and/or process. Questions and answers from the bidders' conference will be available at www.portlandchildrenslevy.org within 2 business days of each conference.

B. Application Submission

Applications will be due by 5 pm on March 3, 2014. Applicants may submit their completed application electronically to ________________at the following email address: ____________________. All attachments to the application must also be submitted electronically.

Alternatively, applicants may submit completed applications on a flash drive by delivering the flash drive to 319 SW Washington Ave., Ste. 415, Portland, OR 97204. All attachments to the application must be included on the flash drive.
Please do **not** submit a PDF of the entire application so that staff can separate attachments as necessary. No paper applications will be accepted and all applications must be received in person or electronically by 5 pm. Staff will acknowledge receipt of all applications via email within 5 working days of receipt.

C. Review and Scoring

Each proposal will be scored by review committees composed of volunteers from the academic community, the business community, private foundation staff, government agency staff, non- profit staff and the community. These individuals will read, review, and score each proposal based on the criteria defined in the following Application Directions and Scoring Rubric in Exhibit H [or download at ________________]. Application scores for each section are averaged between all reviewers, and then the averaged section scores are added to reach a total score for the application. Staff will award bonus points based on the criteria specified in the RFI. Applicants must score at least 39 points in Section I. Proven Program Design and Effectiveness, and at least 16 points in Section IV. Culturally Responsive Programs and Organizations to be considered for funding.

D. Staff Funding Recommendations

After applications have been scored, staff will make funding recommendations to the Allocation Committee based on balancing the following: application scores, target allocation percentages for each strategy, percentage of funding for culturally specific programming, geographic distribution of services, priorities identified within each strategy, past performance if the program has been funded previously, financial health of the applicant organizations and other policy considerations. Staff will provide recommendations to the Allocation Committee in advance of the first funding meeting, and will make recommendations available to applicants and the public at least two business days prior to the public meeting at which the recommendations will be presented.

E. Allocation Committee Funding Decisions

The Allocation Committee will make funding decisions for each program area in a series of public meetings beginning in mid-May and ending by mid-June. PCL anticipates setting meetings approximately once per week during this period. By April 1, 2014, PCL staff will notify all applicants of the time, date, and place of Allocation Committee meetings in which the Committee will make funding decisions affecting the applicant. Meetings will be structured as follows:

- Meeting 1: Hear staff funding recommendations and rationale, and public testimony for two program areas. Time allotted for Allocation Committee to ask questions of staff and applicants.
- Meeting 2: Make funding decisions in the two program areas discussed at Meeting 1. Hear staff recommendations and rationale, and public testimony for two additional program areas. Time allotted for Allocation Committee to ask questions of staff and applicants.
- Meeting 3: Make funding decisions in the two program areas discussed at Meeting 2. Hear staff recommendations and rationale, and public testimony for remaining two program areas. Time allotted for Allocation Committee to ask questions of staff and applicants.
- Meeting 4: Make funding decisions in final two program areas.

The Allocation Committee will make funding decisions based on scores and other community conditions in order to foster a balanced and integrated citywide system of services.

F. City Council Approval

The Allocation Committee's funding decisions will then be submitted for final approval by the Portland City Council. Final funding decisions shall be made at the sole discretion of the Portland City Council. The offering of this RFI does not constitute a commitment to fund by the City of Portland or PCL.

G. Notification

PCL intends to notify all applicants of the results of the selection process promptly upon the decision of the City Council. It is anticipated that notification will occur no later than June 30, 2014, with contracts to begin on July 1, 2014.

Applicants selected for funding will receive written confirmation of selection. Funds will be available for use by selected projects after grant agreements with the City of Portland have been executed.

H. Questions or Comments

Questions or comments about this Request for Investment may be addressed to _______________, at ____________@portlandoregon.gov, 503._______________or 503._______________.

I. Proven Program Design and Effectiveness (55 points)

PCL will invest in proven programs and programs employing best practices shown to be effective in improving the lives of children and/or families. Proven and effective programs and practices have the following features:

- They have a clear focus on whom they serve and why, how the program is designed, and why the program is best suited to serve the focus population.
- They are based on best practice standards, including cultural responsiveness.
- They have processes in place to assess and monitor client participation in services and intended client outcomes and they achieve intended client outcomes.
- They use some or all of these processes and data for continuous quality improvement. They compare fidelity of implementation to best practice standards and make relevant program improvements.

Please answer all subparts and label your responses to correspond to the appropriate subpart. All applicants must score at least 39 points in this section to be eligible to receive funding. [12 page maximum]

A. Program Summary and Identification of Strategy. Provide a two paragraph summary of the program for which you are requesting funding; include a general description of the program you intend to offer. Identify the PCL program area strategy or strategies that the proposed program will address. If the proposed program will address more than one of the program area strategies, estimate the percentage of the budget (in Year 1) that will be used to support each strategy. If you are submitting this application for consideration in more than one program area, specify the applicable strategies in each program area.

B. Population to be Served. Please refer to the definitions in Exhibit G to complete the tables in this section.

1. Number of Clients (Children, Primary Caregivers, or both) to be Served Annually. Complete Table I.B1, indicating the total unduplicated number of children, and, if applicable, primary caregivers to be served each year.

Table I.B1. Total Unduplicated Clients to be Served Each Year			
	YEAR 1	**YEAR 2**	**YEAR 3**
	July 1, 2014- June 30, 2015	**July 1, 2015- June 30, 2016**	**July 1, 2016- June 30, 2017**
Total Unduplicated Children to be Served			
Total Unduplicated Primary Caregivers to be Served (if applicable)			

2. Explanation of Projected Children/Primary Caregivers to be Served. What is the basis for these projections?

3. Estimated Demographics of Population to be Served. Complete Table I.B3 below estimating the demographics of the population to be served by the proposed program for Year 1. Complete the table for EITHER children or primary caregivers, but not both.

Table I.B3. Estimates of Demographics of Population to be Served by Proposed Program, Year 1	% of Children or Primary Caregivers
1. Gender	
Male	
Female	
2. Race/ Ethnicity	
Latino/Hispanic	
African American	
African Immigrant/Refugee	
Native American/ Alaska Native	
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	
Asian	
White	
Eastern European Immigrant/Refugee	
Multiracial/Multiethnic	
3. Primary Language in Home	
English	
Spanish	
Vietnamese	
Russian	
Chinese (Mandarin, Cantonese, etc)	
Other languages	
4. Geographic Area	
East Portland	
North Portland	
Other areas of Portland	
Homeless	
5. Age	
prenatal - 2	
3 - 5	
6 - 11 (Elementary School)	
12-14 (Middle School)	
15-18 (High School)	
19 - 24	
Over age 25	
6. Socioeconomic Status	
At or Below Federal Poverty Level	
Between 101% - 185% of FPL	
185%- 200% of FPL	
over 200% of FPL	
7. Disability	
Client with Disability	

4. Rationale for Selected Population. What is the basis for the demographic estimates provided in Table I.B3? Why do you intend to focus on this population?

BONUSPOINTS: Applicants who predominantly serve children residing in the eastern part of Portland (roughly east of 82nd Avenue: zip codes 97216, 97220, 97230, 97233, 97236, 97266), or offer services at a site located in this area, will receive three bonus points.

C. Outreach, Engagement, and Enrollment of Clients to be Served

1. Outreach & Engagement. What outreach methods will you use to recruit participants for the proposed program? Why do you believe these methods will be effective with the population? What barriers to engagement do you anticipate encountering, and what will you do to address them (to the extent possible)?
2. Enrollment. Describe the child/client intake and/or enrollment process including how you verify that children/families meet any eligibility requirements. Include the intake or enrollment form for the program as part of the Required Enclosures with this application.

D. Program Design

1. Main Program Activities. Complete Table I.D1 to show the main activities of the proposed program. Specify up to three service components most fundamental to the program. Amount of service offered refers to the total services offered by the program. Reference hours per day, days per week, weeks per year that the service will be offered, as applicable.

Table I.D1. Program Activities in Year 1		
Program Component	**Number of Clients to be served (specify if children, or primary caregivers) in Year 1**	**Amount of Service to be Offered in Year 1**
Other Program Design Details		
Curriculum: If the program will use a curriculum or curricula, please list the name of it here:		
Sites: List the name(s) and address(es) of all sites at which services will be offered:		
Multiyear Service: If the service is designed to serve the same client for multiple years, specify the range of years a client could participate:		

2. Minimum Service Dosage and Program Participation Goals. Complete Table I.D2 indicating the minimum amount of service per child per year you believe is necessary to achieve client outcomes (minimum dosage). Provide this information by program component or as a total amount of service regardless of component, whichever is most applicable.

Table I.D2. Minimum Service Dosage and Participation Goals			
	Program Component 1 OR Total for All Program Activities	**Program Component 2**	**Program Component 3**
What is the minimum level of service (i.e. minimum dosage) necessary for the client to achieve the intended outcome?			
Percent of total clients to be served that you project will complete minimum service dosage in Year 1.			

3. Staffing for Proposed Program. Complete Table I.D3 indicating the staffing for the proposed program; include direct service positions and program management positions. Direct service positions are defined as staff that works face-to-face with children/clients; program management positions are defined as staff supervising direct service positions. Do not list names of staff. Insert rows as needed.

Table I.D3. Staffing for Proposed Program			
Staff Position/Title	**Job Responsibilities**	**Education Level and Years of Experience**	**Expected Competencies and Training Requirements**
Caseload or Adult to Child Ratio: Indicate the caseload for 1FTE if the proposed program includes individualized services. Indicate the Adult to Child Ratio if the proposed program includes classes for children/youth.			

4. Program Outcomes. Complete Table I.D4 listing up to 4 outcomes you anticipate clients will achieve as a result of participating in the proposed program. Project the percentage of clients served that will meet each of the outcomes listed.

Table I.D4. Program Outcomes	
Client Outcomes	**Percent of Clients Projected to Meet Outcome (Year 1)**

E. Rationale for Proposed Program, Participation Goals and Outcome Goals

1. Appropriate and Relevant Design. How is this proposed program appropriate for and relevant to the population(s) you intend to serve?

2. Relationship Between Activities and Outcomes. How are the specified outcomes related to the program activities? How did you determine or estimate the minimum service dosage needed to achieve the outcomes?

3. Participation Data. If the proposed program was offered in the past, provide participation data from the previous year of program delivery. If available, provide and describe participation trend data from the past three years. How did these participation data, and any other factors, inform your projection of the portion of clients that will receive the minimum service dosage in Table I.D2? If you are proposing a new program, what is the basis for your projection of the portion of clients that will receive the minimum service dosage in Table I.D2?

4. Outcome Data. If the proposed program was offered in the past, provide outcome data from the previous year of program delivery. If available, provide and describe outcome trend data from the past three years. How did these outcome data, and any other factors, inform your projections of the portion of clients that will achieve the outcomes in Table I.D4? If you are proposing a new program, what is the basis for your projection of the portion of clients that will achieve the outcomes in Table I.D4?

5. Alignment with Strategies. How do the proposed program and selected outcomes align with the program area strategy (or strategies, if applicable) indicated in I.A of your application?

6. Logic Model. If you have a logic model for program inputs, outputs, and outcomes, please include it with your response to this question. The logic model does not count toward the page length in this section.

F. Continuous Quality Improvement

1. **Tracking Program Participation**. Describe the processes the proposed program uses or will use to track client participation in service activities. How does or will the program calculate participation rates of children/clients in the program? Does the program disaggregate participation data by race/ethnicity, or have the capacity to do so?

2. **Outcome Measurement Methods.** What surveys, screening tools, assessment tools, interview protocols, and/or case note forms does the proposed program use or plan to use to measure client outcomes? Why did the program select the specified tool(s) to assess client outcomes? How are the tools appropriate for and relevant to the focus population to be served? Describe how you use or plan to use the assessment results to determine whether an individual meets the outcomes specified above? Does the program disaggregate outcome data by race/ethnicity, or have the capacity to do so?

3. **Program Quality and Effectiveness.** Describe how the proposed program reviews or plans to review the quality and effectiveness of program services, including on-going monitoring of program participation and outcomes. How does the program determine, or plan to determine which elements of the program are working well and which are not? If you have offered the proposed program in the past, provide examples that demonstrate how the processes used resulted in program changes and improvements.

4. **Staff Support and Supervision.** Describe how you assure program staff and supervisors are equipped and supported to do quality work. Describe how you identify and respond to training and professional development needs for both supervisory and program staff. If the proposed program is new, describe what you plan to do. If you have offered the proposed program in the past, provide examples that demonstrate how the processes used resulted in program changes and improvements.

II. Program Budget, Budget Narrative and Cost Effectiveness (10 points)
This section links the funding requested with specific elements of the proposed program. The proposed budget should be an appropriate and accurate projection of the program expenses for FY 2014-2015.

A. Budget

All applicants must submit:
1) A detailed proposed budget for FY 14/15 including sources and uses for all funds using the budget form in Exhibit C and;

2) Total annual proposed budgets amounts for FY 15/16 & FY 16/17, without line items, using the budget form in Exhibit D. If the total amount requested in FY 15/16 and/or FY 16/17 differs substantially (more than 20%) from the FY 14/15 proposed budget, provide a brief explanation in the space provided on the form.

The following expenses will **not** be reimbursed by PCL:

- Out of town travel (unless training is required for a proposed program)
- Phone systems or other significant office equipment
- Fundraising expenses
- Fees or dues to a statewide, national or international organization (unless required for usage of a curriculum for the proposed program)
- Depreciation
- Interest
- Expenses categorized as “other” or otherwise not delineated

B. Cost Effectiveness and Budget Justification
Please answer all subparts and label your responses to correspond to the appropriate subpart. [4 page maximum]

Provide a complete justification for each line item in the budget per the instructions below.

1. Salaried and Hourly Personnel. List the job title, staff member name, (if known), part time or full time status, and percentage of that time working on the proposed program for which PCL funding is requested. All positions (direct service and management) listed in Section I, Table I.D3 should be included in the budget. List the salary or the hourly rate of pay for each position. List the total other costs associated with each employee such as taxes and benefits.

2. Contracted Programmatic Services. Identify any organization(s) that are proposed to receive funds as subcontractors under this proposal and briefly describe the services they will provide. Please break down how subcontractor funds will be spent. For any staff positions that will be funded through the sub-contract, include the position titles, percentage full-time equivalent that will be paid for with PCL funds, and the hourly pay rate for each position.

3. Program Expenses. All expenses listed in this budget category must directly benefit and support the operation of the proposed program and each line item must be justified. These expenses may be direct (e.g. client assistance fund, participation incentives, volunteer recognition, local travel/mileage), or indirect (e.g. rent for space in which program activities are conducted, utility expenses for program space or program staff offices, equipment leases for equipment used to create program materials, phone expenses for program staff). **Program expenses cannot include administrative expenses.**

For indirect expenses included in this budget category, explain the allocation method used to arrive at the amount budgeted for each line item. Any reasonable method is acceptable including allocation of expenses per employee, allocation using time records or time studies, or allocation using square footage. If different methods are used for different types of indirect other program expenses, please specify.

Example(allocationmethodforindirectprogramexpenses):
Telephone expenses are allocated by the FTE associated with the program. The proposed program will use 2.5 FTE. The organization employs 10 FTE so we are allocating 25% of telephone costs to the proposed program. Typical annual phone costs are $3,600 so we have budgeted $900 for this line item.

4. Data Management and Evaluation Expenses. Identify data management and/or evaluation expenses for which PCL funding is requested. Explain how expenses listed in the budget are related to the data gathering and analysis tasks you described in your response in Section I.F. If staff and or subcontractors are listed, describe their duties and explain why their time is necessary for data collection, management and/or evaluation.

5. Administrative Expenses. Indicate the administrative rate; the rate cannot exceed 15% of the proposed program costs. Administrative expenses are defined as those that are incurred in the general operation and management of the agency and are listed on the IRS Form 990 as "Management and General Expenses." Administrative costs can include, but are not limited to, the following: salaries and expense of the chief officer of the organization and that officer's staff; general legal services; accounting; general liability insurance; office management; auditing; bookkeeping, accounting services, payroll, prorated administrative postage, janitorial services.

III. Organizational Capacity (10 points)
PCL is interested in investing in organizations that have sufficient capacity to successfully implement and maintain a cost effective, proven program.

Please answer all subparts and label your responses to correspond to the appropriate subpart. [2 page maximum]

A. Organization History and Structure. Provide a brief summary of the organization's mission, history and organizational structure. Provide an organizational chart (not included in the page count for this section), identifying where the proposed program belongs within the structure.

B. Strategic Plans. Describe how the proposed program fits into the organization's short and long-term strategic plans.

C. Key Management Staff Turnover. Complete Table III.C below for the key management positions referenced in Table IV.B. Key management personnel are those having authority and responsibility for planning, directing and supervising the activities of the organization (e.g. executive director, chief financial officer, division directors). Add rows to the table as needed.

Table III.C Staff Turnover in Key Management Positions

Job Title of Key Management Position	How many times did position turn over between 1/1/11 and 12/31/13?	How many total weeks did position remain empty between 1/1/11 and 12/31/13?

D. Financial and Administrative Experience. Describe the organization's financial and administrative experience and capabilities. Include experience in managing and accounting for federal, state or local funding sources in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP).

E. Statement of Experience (if applicable). For organizations that have not received funding from PCL within the past three years (between July 1, 2010 and the publication date of this RFI), please submit a completed Statement of Experience (Exhibit F); list the five largest contracts and limit to one page. This document will not be scored but may be considered in making funding decisions.

IV. Culturally Responsive Programs and Organizations (25 points)
PCL values equity, diversity and access to opportunity among the children served by the programs it funds. In order to support its values and assure that all programs supported through the Levy are culturally responsive, PCL will fund:

- Culturally specific programs offered by culturally specific organizations
- Culturally specific programs offered by culturally responsive mainstream organizations
- Culturally responsive programs offered by culturally responsive mainstream organizations.

Definition of Culturally Responsive Program and/or Organization:[2]
An organization or program that has a defined set of values and principles, demonstrates behaviors, attitudes, policies and structures that enable them to work effectively cross-culturally, and has the capacity to:

- value diversity;
- conduct self-assessment;
- manage the dynamics of difference;
- acquire and institutionalize cultural knowledge; and
- adapt to diversity and the cultural contexts of the communities they serve.

A culturally responsive organization or program incorporates all of the elements listed above into all aspects of policy making, administration, practice, service delivery, and systematically involves consumers, key stakeholders and communities.

Definition of Culturally Specific Program and/or Organization:[3]

- The majority of clients served are from a particular community of color (e.g. African American, African, Asian and Pacific Islander, Native American/Alaska Native, Latino/Hispanic, Slavic).
- The staff, management and board reflects the community that is served.
- The organizational or program environment is culturally focused and identifiable by community members as such.
- The organization has a track record of successful community engagement and involvement with the community being served.
- The community being served recognizes the organization as a culturally specific organization.

---

[2] This is a definition of cultural competence taken from Cross, T., Bazron, B., Dennis, K., & Isaacs,M., (1989). *Towards A Culturally Competent System of Care Volume I.;* Washington, DC: Georgetown University, Child Development Center, CASSP Technical Assistance Center. Since the elements of the definition also apply to the elements of cultural responsiveness in the questions below, PCL has referenced it here.

[3] PCL has slightly adapted the definition of a culturally specific organization for clarity in this RFI. Curry-Stevens, A., Cross-Hemmer, A., & Coalition of Communities of Color (2010). *Communities of Color in Multnomah County: An Unsettling Profile*. Portland, OR: Portland State University.

Please answer all subparts and label your responses to correspond to the appropriate subpart. All applicants must score at least 16 points in this section to be eligible to receive funding. [5 page maximum not including Table IV.B]

A. Program Designation. State whether the proposed program is a culturally specific program offered by a culturally specific organization, a culturally specific program offered by culturally responsive mainstream organization or a culturally responsive program offered by a culturally responsive mainstream organization. Your responses to the questions below will be used to determine whether the designation is adequately supported. Applicants who successfully demonstrate that they are a culturally specific program offered by either a culturally specific agency or a mainstream agency will receive 3 bonus points.

B. Demographics Characteristics of Organization's Clients, Staff and Board Members. Complete Table IV.B, Exhibit E per the instructions below. Please refer to the definitions in Exhibit G prior to completing the table.

- **Clients served by the Organization**: enter the actual number, as of January 1, 2014, of ALL unduplicated clients (i.e. children, adults, or both) served by the organization and the corresponding demographic data.
- **Staff of Proposed Program:** enter the actual number of direct service staff and management staff of proposed program, as of January 1, 2014. If the proposed program is new, enter the estimated numbers. Enter the corresponding demographic data for the staff. (Note: Numbers of staff listed should reflect the number of staff positions listed in Table I.D3)
- **Leadership of Applicant Organization:** enter the actual number, as of January 1, 2014, of the organization’s key management staff and board members and the corresponding demographic data. For a definition of “key management staff”, see Section III.C.
- **Note:** You may add additional demographic variables as additional rows if you choose, but please do not add additional columns. Additional demographic variables may include any other uniquely identifiable population.

C. Organizational Commitment to Cultural Responsiveness. Describe the organization’s commitment to cultural responsiveness. Describe how the organization builds a culture of inclusion and equity.

D. Service User Voice and Influence. Describe how service user input is incorporated into program planning, service delivery, evaluation, quality improvement, hiring practices and performance evaluation. Include at least two examples of how service user input resulted in changes to agency and/or programmatic policies or practices that improved cultural responsiveness.

E. Community Engagement and Collaboration

1. Describe how the program/organization engages and collaborates with community leaders of the population(s) it serves.

2. Describe any established collaborations or partnerships the program/organization has with community-based organizations that represent or serve the interests of the population the program/organization serves.

F. Staff Recruitment, Retention, Promotion and Training; Board Training

1. Describe the organization's efforts to recruit, retain and promote staff who reflect the population served by the program/organization.
2. Describe how the organization trains staff to deliver culturally responsive services to the cultural groups it serves.
3. Describe any cultural responsiveness training the organization provides for the board of directors.

G. Language Accessibility. Describe the organization's efforts to provide effective language accessibility to the populations it serves. Include policies and practices on translation of written materials, interpretation services, and staff hiring.

H. Culturally Specific Program Applicants ONLY. Complete Table IV.H below by referencing where evidence can be found in your response to this RFI that supports each element of the definition of a culturally specific program or organization. Reference the RFI section, question number, and any applicable subparts (e.g. I. B3, Table IV.B).

Table IV.H. Evidence of Meeting Definition for Culturally Specific Program/Organization

Element of Definition of Culturally Specific Program/Organization	Location in Application
Majority of clients served are from a particular community of color.	
Staff, management and board reflect community served.	
Organization/Program environment is culturally focused and identifiable by community members as such.	
Organization has track record of successful community engagement and involvement with community being served.	
Community being served recognizes organization/program as culturally specific.	

DRAFT: Proposal Review and Scoring Form

Proposal #: ___ **Reviewer #:** ___

Read Reviewers' Instructions before scoring applications.

I. Proven Program Design and Effectiveness — Possible Points: 55

For Maximum Points for each subsection, responses include the following elements:	Score per Subsection
A. Program Summary and Identification of Strategy: up to 2 points	
• Clear overview of proposed program model and population to be served. • Identifies PCL strategy/strategies that program will address. • If multiple strategies identified, then indicates estimated percentage of budget in Year 1 that will be used to support each strategy.	___ points
Reviewer Notes:	
B. Population to be Served: up to 8 points	
B1. Number Served (1 points) • Number served is provided in Table I.B1.	___Points
B2. Explanation of Projected Number Served (2 points) • Basis for projection is clear and understandable.	
B3. Demographics of Population (2 points) • Estimates of population demographics complete in Table I.B3.	
B4. Rationale for Selected Population (3 points) • Clearly explains basis for demographic estimates by referencing program experience and data. • Clearly demonstrates knowledge of the population and its needs by referencing at least two of the following as part of rationale for the selected population: local data, research, program experience and data, or equity considerations.	
Reviewer Notes:	
C. Outreach, Engagement, and Enrollment of Clients to be Served: up to 5 points	
C1. Outreach & Engagement (3 points) • Clearly specifies outreach methods. • Demonstrates how outreach methods are effective with population. • Demonstrates knowledge of population's barriers to engagement. • Demonstrates how program will seek to reduce barriers to engagement. • Convincingly references at least two of the following in explanation of selected outreach methods and barriers to engagement: cultural considerations, program experience and data, or research.	___Points
C2.Client Enrollment/Intake (2 points) • Demonstrates clear process for client enrollment, and, if applicable, assessing eligibility. • Intake form is provided, and has clear relationship with demographic variables used to describe population in Table I.B3.	
Reviewer Notes:	

D. Program Design: up to 10 points	
D1. Activities (2 points) • All applicable sections of Table I.D1 are complete and are understandable. **D2. Minimum Service Dosage & Participation Goals (2 points)** • All applicable sections of Table I.D2 are complete and understandable. **D3. Staffing (2 points)** • All applicable sections of Table I.D3 are complete and understandable. **D4. Outcomes (2 points)** • All applicable sections of Table I.D4 are complete and understandable. **Overall (2 points)** • Taken together, tables demonstrate a clear outline of the proposed program.	___Points
Reviewer Notes:	

E. Rationale for Proposed Program, Participation Goals, and Outcome Goals: up to 18 points	
E1. Appropriate and Relevant Design (2 points) • Demonstrates how program activities are relevant and appropriate for the population by convincingly referencing at least three or more of the following: local data, research, program experience and/or data, equity goals, or cultural considerations. **E2. Relationship Between Activities and Outcomes (2 points)** • Demonstrates that outcomes selected are clearly appropriate to the service(s). • References two or more of the following in explaining the basis for the level of participation needed to produce outcomes: local data, research, program experience and/or data, or cultural considerations. **E3. Participation Data (5 points)** • Provides requested data on program participation from previous year and trend data from past three years. • Demonstrates how data were used to develop projection of clients that would meet minimum service dosage. If program is new and data are not provided, applicant demonstrates well-developed basis for projection of clients that would meet minimum service dosage. • Data provided show that at least 65% of clients served have met the minimum service dosage in the past. **E4. Outcome Data (5 points)** • Provides requested data on outcomes from previous year and trend data from past three years. • Demonstrates how data were used to develop projection of clients that would meet selected outcomes. If program is new and data are not provided, applicant demonstrates well-developed basis for projection of clients that would meet selected outcomes. • Data provided shows that at least 60% of participants have met outcome goals in the past. **E5. Alignment with Strategies (2 points)** • Well-developed and clear explanation of how program model and selected outcomes align with selected PCL strategy/strategies. **E6. Logic Model (2 points)** • Includes a Logic Model that clearly shows the relationship between program design (inputs), amount of services to be offered and participation goals (outputs), and outcomes for children or families.	___Points
Reviewer Notes:	

<table>
<tr><th colspan="2">F. Continuous Quality Improvement: up to 12 points</th></tr>
<tr><td>F1. Tracking Program Participation (3 points)
• Demonstrates clear process for tracking attendance for all program components. Includes procedures for tracking attendance and staff responsible for steps in the process.
• Clear explanation of how attendance data is, or will be, used to calculate participation rates for minimum dosage of service needed to meet outcomes.
• Identifies whether or not program disaggregates participation data by race/ethnicity or other demographic variables, or has the capacity to do so.</td><td rowspan="4">___Points</td></tr>
<tr><td>F2. Outcome Measurement Methods (3 points)
• Clearly identifies assessment tools (e.g. surveys, case note protocol) used to measure client outcomes.
• Clearly explains why tools were selected to measure the outcomes specified.
• Demonstrates that tools are appropriate for the population to be served.
• Clearly demonstrates how assessments are scored to determine whether client achieved outcomes. Indicates which staff are responsible for the steps in the outcome measurement process.
• Identifies whether or not program disaggregates outcome data by race/ethnicity or other demographic variables, or has the capacity to do so.</td></tr>
<tr><td>F3. Program Quality and Effectiveness Processes (3 points)
• Demonstrates clear process in place (or planned) to review quality and effectiveness of services to address continuous quality improvement.
• Provides extensive and meaningful examples of how processes used resulted in quality improvement changes in the past.</td></tr>
<tr><td>F4. Staff Support and Supervision (3 points)
• Demonstrates clear processes are in place (or planned) to assure program staff and supervisors are supported in doing quality work.
• Clear and convincing explanation of how the program identifies and responds to training and professional development needs. Includes how staff are supported to work well with the proposed population.
• Provides extensive and meaningful examples of how processes result in ongoing quality improvement of staff support and supervision for program in the past.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Reviewer Notes:</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Proven Program Design and Effectiveness; TOTAL Score: _____out of 55 Points Possible</td></tr>
</table>

II. Program Budget, Budget Narrative and Cost Effectiveness: Possible Points: 10

For Maximum Points for each subsection, responses include the following elements:	Score per Subsection
A. Budget Forms: up to 3 points	
• FY 14/15 budget form (Exhibit C) is complete. • FY 15/16 and FY 16/17 budget form (Exhibit D) is complete. • The FY 14/15 does not include any disallowed costs (see list on page 15 of the RFI). • If the amount requested in FY 15/16 and/or FY 16/17 is more than 20% of the amount requested in FY 14/15, a clear and reasonable explanation is provided.	___Points
Reviewer Notes:	
B. Cost Effectiveness and Budget Justification: up to 7 points	
All budget categories are addressed, calculations are accurate, each line-item is well justified and proposed costs appear reasonable: • **Salaried and Hourly Personnel:** each of the staff positions listed in Table I.D3 of the RFI is included; budget includes percent FTE, salary, and taxes & benefits. • **Contracted Programmatic Services:** if applicant proposes to use contracted services, a line-item breakdown is included and the narrative clearly defines the work of the sub-contractor including staff positions, percent FTE, salary, and taxes & benefits. • **Program:** line-items are limited to those that directly benefit and support the operation of the proposed program; does not include any administrative expenses; allocation methods are clearly explained for all indirect costs; allocations methods used seem reasonable. • **Data Management & Evaluation:** clearly explains how the expenses tie to the data gathering and analysis tasks described in section I.F of the application narrative; the need for and duties of staff and/or subcontractors are clearly explained. • **Administrative:** the budgeted amount is equal to or less than 15% of the program budget sub-total.	___Points
Reviewer Notes:	
Program Budget, Budget Narrative, and Cost Effectiveness; TOTAL Score: _____out of 10 Points Possible	

III. Organizational Capacity — Possible Points: 10

For Maximum Points for each subsection, responses include the following elements:	Score per Subsection
A. Organization History and Structure: up to 2 points	
• Clear description of the organization's mission, history and organizational structure. • Organizational chart is included. • Clear explanation of where the proposed program fits within the structure of the organization.	____ Points
Reviewer Notes:	
B. Strategic Plans: up to 2 points	
• Clearly articulates the organization's short-term and long-term strategic plans. • Demonstrates that the proposed program aligns with the organization's short-term and long-term strategic plans.	___Points
Reviewer Notes:	
C. Key Management Staff Turnover: up to 3 points	
• Table III.C: Staff Turnover in Key Management Positions is complete. • The number of positions listed in Table III.C matches the total number of key management positions identified in Table IV.B. • Low turnover (no more than once for each key management position). • Length of vacancies in key management positions were kept to a minimum (less than 12 weeks).	___Points
Reviewer Notes:	
D. Financial and Administrative Experience: up to 3 points	
• Clearly articulates financial and administrative experience. • Evidence that the organization has substantial financial and administrative experience. • Extensive experience managing and accounting for federal, state and/or local funding sources in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP).	____ Points
Reviewer Notes:	
Organizational Capacity; TOTAL Score: ____out of 10 Points Possible	

IV. Culturally Responsive Programs and Organizations — Possible Points: 25

For Maximum Points for each subsection, responses include the following elements:	Score per Subsection
A. Program Designation: up to 1 point	

• Chooses one of the following three designations:
  • Culturally specific program offered by a culturally specific organization.
  • Culturally specific program offered by a culturally responsive mainstream organization.
  • Culturally responsive program offered by culturally responsive mainstream organization.
	___Points

Reviewer Notes:	
B. Demographics Characteristics of Organization's Clients, Staff and Board Members: up to 4 points	
• Table IV.B: Demographics of Client Population to be Served, Program Staff, and Organization Leadership is complete. • Race/ethnicity and language spoken by direct service staff reflect race/ethnicity of and language spoken by population program proposes to serve (see RFI Section I, Table I.B3 for demographics of population served). • Racial/ethnic makeup of management staff reflects population organization serves. • Racial/ethnic makeup of board of directors reflects population organization serves.	___Points
Reviewer Notes:	
C. Organizational Commitment to Cultural Responsiveness: up to 4 points	
• Organization has policies that articulate a commitment to cultural responsiveness in service delivery and racial equity in outcomes and has procedures in place to monitor progress toward goals. • Organization allocates resources to monitoring and improving cultural responsiveness and equitable results. • Organization has begun, or has completed a racial equity assessment. If completed, articulates what was learned in the assessment.	___Points
Reviewer Notes:	
D. Service User Voice and Influence: up to 4 points	
• Service user input on planning, improvement and review of programs is regularly gathered using multiple methods that might include surveys, focus groups, and/or community advisory groups. • Provides at least two examples that show how service user voice has been used to improve cultural responsiveness in organizational policy, program planning, service delivery, evaluation, quality improvement, hiring practices and/or performance evaluation.	___Points
Reviewer Notes:	
E. Community Engagement and Collaboration: up to 4 points	
• Provides examples of how the organization/program engages and collaborates with community leaders of the population(s) it serves. • Provides evidence of established and ongoing collaborations or partnerships with community-based organizations that represent or serve the interests of the population served. • Provides examples of how the engagement and collaboration influences cultural responsiveness in organizational policy, program planning, service delivery, evaluation, quality improvement, hiring practices and/or performance evaluation.	___Points
Reviewer Notes:	

F. Staff Recruitment, Retention, Promotion and Training; Board Training: up to 4 points	
• Provides evidence of efforts to recruit, retain and promote staff that reflects the population served by program/organization. • Provides evidence that staff receives ongoing training on cultural responsiveness; organization evaluates the effectiveness of training and can describe how the training has impacted service delivery. • Organization provides training on cultural responsiveness to Board of Directors; describes impacts of the training on the organization and its work.	___Points
Reviewer Notes:	
G. Language Accessibility: up to 4 points	
• Has policies and practices to make services accessible to service users in their native language that include translation of written materials, interpretation and hiring staff that speak the language(s) of the communities served. • Evaluates the quality and effectiveness of the interpretation and translation services provided and demonstrate high quality and effective interpretation services.	___Points
Reviewer Notes:	
Culturally Responsive Programs and Organizations; TOTAL Score: ____out of 25 Points Possible	

Total Application Score: ______