

**Portland Children's Levy  
Allocation Committee Meeting Minutes  
October 31, 2016 1:30 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](http://www.portlandchildrenslevy.org).*

**Attending:** Mitch Hornecker, Deborah Kafoury, Dan Saltzman (Chair), Serena Stoudamire-Wesley, Julie S. Young,

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

**Saltzman:** We are fortunate to have an additional \$4.4 million available to allocate over the next few months.

**Public Comment** – none

**Approval of minutes from March 7, 2016 meeting**

**Young:** So moved

**Hornecker:** Second

**Vote:** All in favor.

**Proposed Renewal Process for Current Grants**

**Hansell:**

Staff proposes to conduct the renewal process using a similar method as was used during the last Levy period. Grantees are not required to submit full proposals for renewal. Instead, grantees are required to request in writing that their current grants be renewed for the remaining two years of the current Levy authorization. PCL staff will then use the following information to recommend whether to renew grants, and at what funding level of funding:

- Performance of grantee on PCL accountability metrics (service goals, client participation data including early exits, minimum dosage and data disaggregated by race/ethnicity, program outcomes, staff turnover);
- Information provided in mid-year and annual written reports, along with information communicated in any meetings between grantees and PCL staff that provides further context for program implementation;
- Financial review including percentage of grant funds spent to date and results of applying analysis tool to annual financial audits submitted by grantees.

This information is compiled in a "Grantee Performance Summary" completed by staff using data on individual grants, and aggregated data on all grants in a program area.

Most of the information included in the summary is based on annual data report provided by grantees for the two completed fiscal years of program delivery. In addition, a mid-year narrative report and invoice due January 31, 2017 provide additional contextual information on implementation, and updated grant spending data. Using annual and mid-year data, staff will complete individual performance summaries for all grants. Staff recommendations for renewal and funding amount will be included in each summary. Summaries with renewal recommendations will be provided to all grantees no later than February 24, 2017. Grantees will have the opportunity to add further comments to the performance summaries and renewal recommendations, and return them to PCL staff no later than March 3, 2017. Staff will send completed summaries to Allocation Committee members on March 7, 2017.

Committee members will have the opportunity discuss renewal recommendations with staff and/or grantees before making renewal decisions at a public meeting scheduled for the third week in March 2017.

Dates are included in the handouts available at the meeting [Appendix A to these minutes].

**Kafoury:** Will summaries include grantee comments?

**Hansell:** Yes.

### **Recommendations for Allocating Additional Accrued Revenues**

**McElroy:** Today we are introducing staff's recommendations for the process of allocating additional revenues. At a future meeting, scheduled for December 5, 2016, we will ask the Allocation Committee to decide about the process and the policy options we recommend today.

In March, we briefed you that, due to higher than projected revenues, the Levy has accrued a fund balance of \$4.4 million. At that time, you decided to wait until the renewal process to decide what to do with those funds; which brings us to today.

Staff looked at the following 7 criteria in developing our recommendations for how to allocate the \$4.4 million in fund balance.

1. Current Allocation of PCL Funds
  - distribution across program areas of total allocations to strategies in programs areas
  - included additional allocations made 2015 from higher than projected rev prior years
2. Past public input and Previous funding process:
  - public input for 2014 funding process;
  - feedback from applicants, reviewers, and Committee members during last process
  - current local data, populations and developing needs, for opportunities to address issues raised in feedback
  - unsuccessful applicants from 2014 funding round; competition in each program area
3. Administrative Capacity:
  - Administrative capacity and workload for grantees, applicants, Allocation Committee members and staff for 2 years of funding
  - future funding dependent on voter reauthorization of Levy (current expires 6/30/2019)
  - If reauthorized, next competitive funding round soon after
4. Timeframe:
  - time frame for executing a process to make allocations for a July 1, 2017 contract
  - sequencing of decisions and work to achieve: renewal of existing grants, potential increase subset of existing grants, and potential applications for new programs.
5. Program quality support:
  - leverage current quality improvement work in all program areas, and whether additional funding would be needed for grantee staffing to improve program quality.
6. Local context:

- Efforts occurring and opportunities raised by partners to address emerging community needs including Early Learning Multnomah, All Hands Raised Partnership governance and collaborative groups, SUN Coordinating Council, United Way Successful Families 2020

7. Allocation Committee member input:

- Talked individually with each Allocation Committee member over the summer to hear his/her perspective on allocation options for additional, accrued revenue.
- Refined recommendations based on each member's feedback.

Timeline and process for these options will be discussed in later Allocation Committee meetings pending committee's decisions regarding pursuing these options.

Assuming Allocation Committee handles renewals of current grants in March, staff anticipates allocation decisions for additional revenue based on whatever policy options the Allocation Committee adopts in April.

**PCL Staff Recommendations for Allocation of Additional Revenue**

1. Reduce Caseloads for Home Visiting Programs/Require Minimum Level of Reflective Supervision for staff in those programs:

Allocate up to \$1.5 million over 2 years for up to 25 grantees.

- Reduces workload for home visitors supporting and serving highly stressed families to an average of 8 home visits per week and assures they have additional supervisory support for their work.
- Rationale: Quality work occurring in EC, CAPI, FC to support programs becoming more trauma-informed in their practices.

2. Mental Health Consultation Services for Home Visiting Programs

Allocate up to \$300,000 over two years to add at least 2 FTE to existing mental health consultation grant in early childhood, and broaden its scope to serve 20 - 25 grantees across child abuse prevention/intervention, foster care, and early childhood program areas. Include requirement that bilingual/bicultural mental health consultants are part of the team or are sub-contracted to provide services.

- Rationale: Builds on quality improvement work started in spring 2016 in EC, CAPI, and FC by providing additional on-site consultation, training to home visitors, supervisors, and clients.

3. Increase Funding for Summer Programming in After School Program Area:

Allocate up to \$1.5 million over 2 years.

- Allow only currently funded after-school programs that provide summer programming to increase the number of youth served, lengthen the weeks of service offered, and/or increase the number of locations at which they offer services to avert summer learning loss, to engage youth in constructive activities, and to help working parents with childcare needs.
- Rationale: Need for more summer programming that supports academics and provides enrichment was noted by stakeholders in the public input gathered prior to the 2014 funding round, and is a national priority in the out-of-school-time field.

4. Increase the Community Childcare Initiative:

Allocate up to \$1.1 million over 2 years.

- Would allow more families to receive subsidy for quality care and education. Keeps childcare costs for families earning up to 200% of the Federal Poverty Level to no more than 10% of income.

**Saltzman:** What is it about home visiting that caused it to rise to the top in your recommendations?

**McElroy:** It was a theme in public input in the past for those programs to be more trauma-informed. It has been a local and national trend to move in this direction. The housing crisis has put additional stress on the programs and families in these programs. This is an effort to reduce the workload of staff in programs to allow them to better support the families with whom they work.

**Kafoury:** Can you talk about where you got the 8 home visits per week figure?

**McElroy:** Early Head Start, a national model of home-based services, aims for 8 visits per week per staff member. There is also Healthy Families America, on which the local programs are based. Depending on the need of the families, home visitors do 8 to 10 visits per week.

We feel like the requirement for reflective supervision and access to consultation caused us to recommend 8 visits per week. Also the movement toward trauma-informed programming moved us that way.

**Kafoury:** Will there be a reduction in families served?

**McElroy:** The 20% increase in funding should allow a reduction in caseloads; so the number of families served would remain the same. More staff would be hired to serve the same families.

**Pellegrino:** This is a good time for the public to give input about how the additional funds should be allocated and about the renewal process.

**Stoudamire-Wesley:** Are any folks being left out in these four recommendations? For example, in after school are we making sure culturally specific groups are being included?

**Pellegrino:** In order to receive the summer program funding in after school, the current grantees would need to offer summer programming. In the childcare programming, that is based on families applying to get the subsidy. It is open to any families who meet the eligibility criteria.

**Young:** I have a question about the reduction of caseloads in home visiting. Would this be optional for grantees to apply? Is this a new expectation or requirement?

**McElroy:** We had not decided, but it should probably be optional. Ideally, you could require it. But, we will probably not require it. Typically, if we offer something like this, programs are unlikely to choose not to make the change.

**Kafoury:** Is there enough funding for every program that we fund could make this change in staffing?

**McElroy:** Yes, that is how we arrived at that funding amount. It would be a 20% increase to all 25 existing programs who offer home visiting programs.

**Hansell:** We were not imaging it as an automatic increase, but rather funded programs would submit proposals to qualify for consideration.

**Stoudamire-Wesley:** Does that increase take into account increases to minimum wage?

**McElroy:** We looked at that effect for all grantees and available funds should cover those increases. So many of the wages in our programs are already above proposed minimum levels.

**Pellegrino:** We also provide COLA's which will likely cover the increases in wages.

## **Public Comment**

**Saltzman:** I invite public comment now on the topics of renewal and allocation of additional funds.

**Seth Truby**, Executive Director of **BRAVO Youth Orchestras** described the BRAVO program. BRAVO has robust partnerships with Portland Public Schools, Oregon Symphony, and social and civic organizations. Revenue from the Portland Children’s Levy could allow us to offer a longer summer program and to serve several hundred more children from the Roosevelt cluster, which serves a high number of children experiencing poverty. This investment would leverage lots of philanthropic investment in the community. Our impact - our students increase their reading scores 50% faster than other students in the same schools. We are doing a much more robust evaluation program this year and expect results in June.

**Scott Showalter** President of the **Oregon Symphony** spoke in support of **BRAVO Youth Orchestras**. All of our 76 musicians teach or perform with the students of BRAVO. They are a high quality partner. The organization is worthy of every one’s support. It is a social movement from the “El Sistema” program from Venezuela. I have visited Caracas and seen people of all ages working together to create community through music. El Sistema is the best export of that country. The BRAVO program teaches teamwork and problem solving; it empowers them spiritually and helps them intellectually. BRAVO kids have a total change in their lives – in what they do and don’t do on the streets. This program creates an additional family for the students. Music is a fundamental human right. This program saves lives. We need to grow BRAVO here in Portland. We can change the lives of many of Portland’s at-risk youth.

**Jim Quackenbush** from the **Portland Police** spoke to the committee in support of **BRAVO Youth Orchestras**. Music has helped me to grow as a person. Arts spur our highest level of thinking and help us to grow in many ways. I am concerned about the development of our future leaders. BRAVO provides leadership training to our youth. Let us continue to support our youth.

**Principal Tamela Newsome** of **Rosa Parks School** spoke in support of **BRAVO Youth Orchestras**. We are the home and birthplace of BRAVO. Our kids need this program. We had no music program at our school before BRAVO. BRAVO is a powerful program. It is nothing short of miraculous. Many of our students have moved to George Middle School were BRAVO continues for them. BRAVO provides for families as well as children. BRAVO is a program where students immediately give back to the community. They have performed here at City Hall and Multnomah. Please make a way for us to grow this program.

**Libra Ford, Chief Operating Officer**, from **Self Enhancement, Inc.** I support the staff recommendations and would like to add one more. These programs require a lot of data on performance to be reported. We need more support on hiring data people to facilitate our reporting. We need funding to give accurate data. We want program staff to focus on services, not data. I ask you to consider some of the funding going to infrastructure needs, which includes data reporting.

**Tracy Osborne**, Executive Director of **Urban Gleaners**; we collect edible food and get it to kids and families. We have been doing this for the past 10 years. WE get 60,000 pounds of food per month from Grocery Stores and event sites. We distribute the food to families through school pantry sites with over 75% free and reduced lunch populations. We also have mobile markets that go to low income housing. We are feeding around 4,100 people every week. Kids need food; they are not getting it at home. I would like to know how and when I apply for funding.

**Saltzman:** We are considering whether to open up for additional investments. The current recommendation is not to do so. Your testimony is in the right place.

**Grace Seale** with the **Boys and Girls Clubs of Portland** addressed the Committee to advocate for funding after-school programs at their organization. Families who access programming face many challenges, and Boys and Girls Clubs provides a range of services to address these challenges (services described). We have an opportunity to increase the impact of our programs. While PCL is not currently funding club based programming, we feel strongly that this is an opportunity for the Portland Children's Levy to invest in our work, and to increase the capacity to provide services to kids and families.

**Lizzy Martinez** from **Latino Network** addressed the Committee. We have concerns about the proposed staff recommendations. We want to call attention to programming in early childhood. Staff recommendations do not include any increased funding for pre-school like programs – like Juntos Aprendemos at Latino Network and Head Start and similar programs. We know there is huge need for these programs and data continues to show that these programs increase kindergarten readiness and ultimately college readiness and career readiness. The staff recommendation means no Latino programs would be eligible for additional funds. We urge you to expand the increase to early childhood programs across the board. We also suggest you expand the after school funding to include grantees not currently funded in that program area. Latino Network is currently funded in early childhood. When we applied for funding, we were not yet a SUN School provider. Today we oversee SUN programming in more than 15 schools. We provide programming at 33 schools overall. By not accepting new grantees, we feel you are disadvantaging Latino youth and families who participate in our programs. From time to time, staff recommendations have missed the mark for children and families of color. We urge you to rectify this mistake. Latino children are the largest and fastest growing segment of our population and to allow this huge disparity to move forward would harm our community. We respectfully ask you to expand your priority areas to include these recommendations so all of our children have access to quality programs.

**Megan Lewis**, Executive Director of **Friends of the Children Portland**, addressed the Committee. We are honored to be partners with the Children's Levy. We appreciate the emphasis on quality. Staff turnover is a big concern for youth service programs. There is pressure on wages in youth service. Health care costs are increasing. Salaried staff going to hourly and eligible for overtime wages will also put pressure on us. I request some of the funds go to a larger COLA for all grantee programs.

**Saltzman:** As was said earlier, we will be making these decisions in future meetings. That completes our testimony for today.

**Pellegrino:** We will be summarizing this testimony and will distribute it to the public and the Allocation Committee. We will continue this conversation at future meetings this winter.

**Saltzman:** People can give us feedback and testimony through email – addresses are on our website.

**Kafoury:** In Multnomah County, we are seeing providers tell us that staff turnover is very high. Are there ways we can look more deeply into that topic. I am concerned about inequities within organizations by lightening loads of staff in some programs, but not others.

**McElroy:** The proposal on decreasing caseloads is driven by a desire to better support staff in programs we fund and improve staff turnover. Turnover has numerous factors beyond wages. Our effort in home visiting should be a part of improving this situation. Overall wage structure in the sector is a concern that exceeds our ability to change. There are potential impacts on organizations around uneven caseloads. These impacts will need to be addressed case by case.

**Stoudamire-Wesley:** Has there been any discussion about how some of these home visiting programs can work together. Some families say they get 7 or 8 visits from different folks per month. Portland State talked about addressing that problem a couple of years ago.

**McElroy:** Good question. Multnomah Health Department has convened the home visiting community of practice using federal funding. We have been an active partner in that group. There are regular meetings to address the issues you mention.

**Pellegrino:** I hear in some meetings that program parameters & eligibility criteria can contribute to that problem.

**Stoudamire-Wesley:** I am concerned about how this problem can be addressed.

**McElroy:** There is a workgroup looking at that issue as well. Trying to create seamless referral systems to connect families into services.

### **System Partners Projects – Center on Equity and Inclusion**

**Pellegrino:** I will give a brief summary and Hanif Fazal will also present.

As you may recall, in spring 2015 when the Committee decided how to allocate additional revenues, it allocated \$200,000 toward supporting system partners and improving the systems that affect both children and the organizations that serve them. Staff is proposing that PCL invest \$25,000 for one year in an initiative of the Center for Equity and Inclusion.

#### **Proposal Description**

The Center for Equity and Inclusion (CEI), a recently formed non-profit dedicated to developing systemic approaches to closing disparities faced by under-represented communities in Oregon, has recently piloted a cohort learning model for community-based organizations and funders designed to embed equity and inclusion within organizational practices and procedures. The model is designed to inform the broader funding community on how to best advance equity both organizationally and systemically. With initial investments from foundations (Collins, Meyer, Miller, MRG, Oregon Community, Trailblazers), CEI began providing ongoing consultation and training to all levels of several community-based organizations in early 2016. Training and support is focused on operationalizing equity and inclusion policy and procedure at all levels of the organization, including board leadership. Organizations participating in the 2016 cohort included several PCL grantees (Friends of the Children, New Avenues for Youth and Boys and Girls Clubs). Each organization pays \$10,000 to participate in the cohort.

CEI is currently securing commitments to begin the process with a second cohort of community-based organizations, and is seeking to form a learning community of funders to move through a parallel process. The learning community will meet quarterly with a focus on the following objectives:

- Understanding the process, a community-based organization goes through to advance equity and build a culturally responsive organization;
- Learning how to best support this process as a funder;
- Developing a shared standard for assessing grantees' capacity to use grant funding in an equitable and inclusive manner;
- Building a shared commitment to and competence in advancing issues of equity, diversity and inclusion in the funding community.

CEI has asked PCL to participate in the second cohort which will begin shortly. Meyer, Oregon Community Foundation, United Way, Collins and the Trailblazer foundations have all committed to participating in this cohort. CEI is soliciting 6 non-profit organizations to participate in the second cohort. Saturday Academy's board has recently approved their participation, and others are in the works.

#### **Project Details**

**Timeline:** January 2017 – February 2018

Estimated Project Cost: \$295,000

Proposed PCL Contribution: \$25,000

Deliverables: Mid-Year Progress report focused on outputs (e.g. progress on training, policy development, and funder cohort meetings); Cohort Completion Report that includes an impact and learnings report, as well as individual project reports prepared by the participating community-based organizations.

**Staff proposes to commit \$25,000 over the project timeline to support both community-based organizations' participation in the cohort (including PCL grantee, Saturday Academy), and PCL staff's participation in the funder learning cohort with the goals of assisting community-based organizations' improving equity and inclusion policies and practices, and building PCL competence in advancing equity, diversity and inclusion in its funding practices.**

**Hanif Fazal** from the **Center for Equity and Inclusion** addressed the committee. **I would like to give more background. I was associate director at Open Meadow.** I worked on issues of equity and inclusion for eight years at Open Meadow. It was a transformative experience for the organization. There was no roadmap of how to do that work in an entire organization – fundraising, board work, human resources, etcetera. Meyer Memorial Trust inquired about our work and asked for more work on helping other organizations do this work. Eventually, we created the process and founded the Center for Equity and Inclusion.

My fear is that nonprofits would not have the resources to figure out how to do this work or would check the box without meaningful change. It is a hard process. I received funding to launch this process. Ten organizations took part in our first year.

I am excited about a basic roadmap of taking a mainstream organization into competence and operationalizing these issues. Up to this point, sporadic training to raise consciousness was available and assessments were available. Our process seeks to raise consciousness and operationalize. PSU is doing an outside evaluation of our process. I am excited about exploring the funders' role in this process. We see ourselves as reporting to funders about the commitment of nonprofits to this process. We can also inform funders about their own role in the process.

**Stoudamire-Wesley:** I was opposed to this proposal. There have been many programs that have talked about operationalizing as well as training in this area. In my community in Northeast Portland we have been talking about these issues for a long time. For me, nothing is standing out that is going to be different. When I look at the proposal, I think, how about you go to the culturally specific organizations and ask them how they are doing it. I might be asking too much. For me, equity, diversity and inclusion is not a process; it is a value and a goal. If I don't have the empathy in it, then no I am not going to push it forward. So, then I have to push back on the organization and ask why you have not operationalized them, because you have not valued it.

Organizations have come to us and we have funded them and they have let us know they are already doing this. So, we need to look at this a little bit closer to see if they are doing this. When I look at these organizations who are serving kids and families in all these different communities, some of them are doing excellent work and are succeeding. So, I would rather hear from them what they feel is missing.

What is it that you are doing that tops what others have done?

Fazal: Being at a nonprofit for 13 years, there were not a lot of resources out there that could help us put it all together. We had "Courageous Conversations" which created a great set of protocols and agreements and raised some consciousness for us. But, it did not do anything more. It did not help us figure out how to create a staff that reflected the people we served. It did not help us figure out the culture building we needed to do within our organization so white folks won't say, I don't have a job here, or folks of color feel tokenized. That is just one avenue of driving this work. There are many organizations doing parts of this work, but it was onerous to consult



with many organizations on many topics within this work. There was not one place to go to get the roadmap to comprehensively address these issues in your nonprofit.

I agree with you. Part of the reason we are doing this is that a lot of nonprofits have been saying they have been doing the work and I don't believe they are really doing it. Part of what I think is different about us is, I agree there is a set of goals. How do you work yourself through a process to get that foundation to build collective will and passion across our organization? What does that actually mean and how do we do that well? Everybody speaking the same language, having the same framework, and being deeply invested, how do we build an equity lens that we are using across decision-making in the organization. How do we create a plan that is really holding us accountable to this goal? Who is responsible for that and who is training our board to hold us accountable to that? At Open Meadow, if it was out there, we did not know who could come in and work with us.

Another big part of it is working with funders. Working with board members is also a unique challenge. There is not much out there to guide that work. The difference is the comprehensive nature of the work. It is a minimum of a year to get going. We have executive directors who are leading this movement. We are doing comprehensive training. If you ask the executive directors who are involved, they will tell you it is unique.

Another difference is that it is my job not to make you look good, but to look at you and report back to funders. We are talking about wholesale cultural change.

I am a huge believer in engaging specific communities and asking them what works best for them. That is best practice in this work. Someone who can guide organizations to put it all together is valuable. It is a process to build will in organizations to do this work.

I get the suspicion or trepidation about, here is another one of these programs. Being a person of color who was in an all-white organization and watching that transformation, I have understood what it means to be one in a white-dominant organization that has not done this work. And what it means to go through that process. For me it has been important to help hold other organizations accountable in this work as well. And I am excited to get some real clarity around what is the process from mainstream to culturally responsive. What should we expect?

**Saltzman:** For year two how many new organizations will you work with?

**Fazal:** We are finishing up an 18-month process with 5 organizations and are starting the process with 5 new organizations. We will also begin working with a cohort of funders. We will work with funders to identify what is their work in their own organizations and how do they best support these efforts.

**Saltzman:** Will the five organizations be Levy grantees?

**Pellegrino:** Not all five; but 3 of the previous 5 were Levy grantees. Saturday Academy's board has voted to do the process. There may be others.

**Young:** Will PCL staff be part of the funders cohort?

**Fazal:** Yes. The first meeting of that cohort is in January.

**Stoudamire-Wesley:** Will we be putting this out so that other folks can apply to do this work? Or are you just choosing this one organization?

**Pellegrino:** No we will not RFP this work. We learned about this work through other funding networks. Other organizations could ask us to support their work. This is not exclusive in any way.

**Young:** Who at PSU is doing your evaluation?

**Fazal:** Billy Samberg at PSU. They worked with a healthcare system doing similar transition.

**Hornecker:** Thanks to Serena for your thoughtful comments. This process feels very different to me from other programs with these goals. I share your questions, but it is very different from anything I have been through. I am an enthusiastic supporter because of that. I have experience with this program through New Avenues for Youth.

**Stoudamire-Wesley:** Thank you Mitch. As an African American woman, I have been at many organizations where I was the only person of color. I have been through many programs and I did not hear anything that is any different here. That is my opinion.

**Kafoury:** What does the \$25,000 pay for?

**Pellegrino:** It pays a portion of the cost of \$295,000 to run the program. Different funders pay different amounts. It does not cover the \$10,000 for the nonprofit fees. It is not specific to Saturday Academy or any other nonprofit.

**Fazal:** Each nonprofit partner pays \$10,000 and funders subsidize the rest of the cost.

**Pellegrino:** I think it is an opportunity for white-lead organizations to change.

**Stoudamire-Wesley:** Why are people not listening?

**Fazal:** I think people are listening and are hearing. When the Coalition for Communities of Color brings out an assessment, the ability of an organization to operationalize the recommendations is nuanced and complex. I think this is honoring the work of the Coalition. These organizations are investing significant resources in this process to reshape their culture.

**Stoudamire-Wesley:** There are some who have done it but not gotten the recognition. I look at Dr. Cook at Warner Pacific. She has a whole university and she took her staff through this. I am going to agree to disagree.

**Hornecker:** This keeps our staff at the table. This is a significant project and is a good thing for the Levy.

**Kafoury:** Was there an earlier cohort of funders?

**Fazal:** Only in a limited sense. We are looking at January to convene the funders cohort.

**Kafoury:** Do the funders and organizations work together?

**Fazal:** A little bit. Their processes are separate, but there will be some overlap. It is my job to report back to funders. Funders' process is much less intensive, but still comprehensive. It gives them a good picture of where and when to support nonprofits. For example, should funders be setting expectations on nonprofits? It is that kind of conversation that we are facilitating. What is a meaningful commitment to this work?

**Kafoury:** It seems like for our team, are we coming in late?

**Fazal:** No, many smaller funders are interested, but have not fully engaged. Meyer and Collins have been doing this work for a while. We will be helping funders to develop common language. In Portland, funders have not yet come together for these conversations. Funders hope for deep and meaningful conversations.

**Pellegrino:** We have come to this as a funder by having many conversations about this topic. In consulting with other funders, researchers and culturally specific organizations, I did not see much agreement in how we should be evaluating whether organizations are making progress in improving cultural responsiveness. We are interested in figuring out how to do this work. To date, we have spent \$100,000 of the \$200,000 allocated for system partners work. This would be an additional \$25,000, and would leave \$75,000 for funding other system partners/system change efforts.

**Young:** Move to approve the staff recommendation.

**Hornecker:** Second.

**Vote**

**In favor:** Hornecker, Kafoury, Saltzman, Young.

**Opposed:** Stoudamire-Wesley

**Saltzman: The motion passes.**

Our next meeting is here on December 5 at 2 pm.

**Adjourned 2:50 pm**

**Appendix A**  
**PCL Staff Recommendations for Grant Renewal Process**  
**and Allocation Options for Additional Revenue**  
**2016- 2017**

**Background:** PCL Staff considered the following parameters in developing the renewal process and allocation options for the additional accrued revenue:

- Current Allocation of PCL Funds: Staff initially analyzed all current investments, including the additional investments made in 2015 to re-evaluate the percentage of overall Levy resources invested in each program area, and in the strategies selected for funding in each program area to understand the current relative allocation of resources.
- Past public input and Previous funding process: Staff reviewed the public input gathered and documented in the last competitive funding round; feedback received from applicants, reviewers, and Committee members during the last process; and current local data on relevant populations to look for opportunities to address issues raised in feedback, and information on developing needs in the community. Staff also reviewed unsuccessful applicants from the 2014 funding round to gauge level and type of competition in each program area.
- Administrative Capacity: Staff weighed approaches that would keep the administrative burden for grantees, applicants, Allocation Committee members and staff reasonable considering that grants will be for 2 years with future funding dependent on voter reauthorization of the Levy (current levy expires 6/30/2019), and if authorized, another round of competition for funding.
- Timeframe: Staff recognized the short time frame for approving and executing a process to make allocations for a July 1, 2017 contract start including sequencing of decisions on renewal of existing grants, potentially increasing some subset of existing grants, and potentially allowing applications for new programs.
- Program quality support: Staff considered ways to leverage current quality improvement work in all program areas, and whether additional funding would be needed for grantee staffing to improve program quality.
- Local context: Staff considered information it collectively gathers from other funders and from participating in a variety of policy and practitioner groups that operate in the children's policy arena. These groups and partners raise, discuss, and seek to address emerging community needs, present new reports and data on current efforts, and bring to light state and national priorities and issues that have local dimensions. These groups and partners include: Early Learning Multnomah, Multnomah County Home Visiting Community of Practice, All Hands Raised Partnership governance and collaborative groups, SUN Coordinating Council, United Way Successful Families 2020, Oregon ASK and regional STEM hubs, Institute for Youth Success, Grantmakers of Oregon and Southwest Washington, Grantmakers for Education, and Prevent Child Abuse America – Oregon Chapter.
- Allocation Committee member input: Staff talked individually with each Allocation Committee member over the summer to hear his/her perspective on allocation options for additional, accrued revenue. Staff refined its recommendations based on each member's feedback.

### **PCL Staff Recommendations for Current Grant Renewal Process**

1. Consider renewal of all current grants plus a 2% COLA (compounded) pending review of program and financial performance
2. Provide grantees with staff's renewal recommendations, including grant and financial performance summary, by February 24, 2017. Grantees have one week, until March 3, 2017 to review and to add comments to the performance summary and return to PCL staff.
3. Final versions of staff recommendations, including any additional grantee comments, sent to Allocation Committee members no later than Tuesday, March 7.
4. Renewal decisions to be made by the Allocation Committee the third week of March, date TBD.

### **PCL Staff Recommendations for Allocation of Additional Revenue**

Timeline and process for these options will be discussed in later Allocation Committee meetings pending committee's decisions regarding pursuing these options. Staff's recommendations focus on allocating funding to current grantees using the following policy options:

#### **5. Reduce Caseloads for Home Visiting Programs/Require Minimum Level of Reflective Supervision:**

Allocate up to \$1.5 million over 2 years for up to 25 grantees. Builds on quality improvement work undertaken in early childhood, child abuse prevention/intervention and foster care program areas to support programs becoming more trauma-informed in their practices. Improves quality of services by reducing workload for home visitors to an average of 8 home visits per week and assures they have additional supervisory support for their work.

#### **6. Mental Health Consultation Services for Home Visiting Programs**

Allocate up to \$300,000 to add at least 2 FTE to existing mental health consultation grant in early childhood, and broaden its scope to serve 20 - 25 grantees across child abuse prevention/intervention, foster care, and early childhood program areas. Include requirement that bilingual/bicultural mental health consultants are part of the team or are sub-contracted to provide services. Builds on quality improvement work started in spring 2016 in early childhood, child abuse prevention/intervention and foster care by providing additional supports to home visitors, their supervisors, and their clients.

#### **7. Increase Funding for Summer Programming in After School Program Area:**

Allocate up to \$1.5 million over 2 years. Allow only currently funded after-school programs that provide summer programming to increase the number of youth served, lengthen the weeks of service offered, and/or increase the number of locations at which they offer services to avert summer learning loss, to engage youth in constructive activities, and to assist working parents with childcare needs. The specific need for more summer programming that supports academics and provides enrichment was noted by stakeholders in the public input gathered prior to the 2014 funding round, and is a national priority in the out-of-school-time field.

#### **8. Increase the Community Childcare Initiative:**

Allocate up to \$1.1 million over 2 years. Would allow more families to receive subsidy for quality care and education. Keeps childcare costs for families earning up to 200% of the Federal Poverty Level to no more than 10% of income.

# Exhibit A

## Center for Equity & Inclusion Cohort Learning Model- A Brief

---

**Essential Question:** What if foundations could alter the fundamental way predominately white led organizations worked with and supported under-represented communities so that persistent, systemic disparities were closed?

**The following is a proposal for the first step in this process.**

The Center for Equity & Inclusion (CE&I) is dedicated to developing systemic approaches to closing disparities faced by under-represented communities in Oregon and the broader NorthWest Region. It approaches this challenge at a systems, organizational and individual level in three different sectors: public, nonprofit and philanthropic.

CE&I's mission is to be a local, regional, and potentially national resource committed to eliminating disparities, advancing equity, and creating inclusive workplace cultures. The Center takes a holistic approach to organizational development and training; focusing on developing equitable and inclusive organizational culture, policies & operations, and programs -advancing equity and inclusion throughout an organization.

For the past three years, CE&I has assisted education institutions, individual nonprofit organizations and Oregon foundations in integrating and advancing their equity and inclusion efforts. Feedback from this work has been positive and the learning has been instrumental in refining processes that supports organizations in advancing equity.

### The Cohort Model

Beginning in the winter of 2016 CE&I will pilot a two-year cohort learning model for community-based organizations and foundations. The cohort learning model is an effort designed to accelerate organizational transformation and embed equity and inclusion within organizational practices and procedures. The cohort learning model is designed to support and inform the broader foundation community on how to best advance equity both organizationally and eventually systemically.

### Expected Outcomes of the Center for Equity and Inclusion pilot:

Nonprofit Organizations will:	Founding Funders will:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Build the requisite passion and commitment to equity and inclusion needed to advance these efforts throughout the organization.</li><li>• Establish an equity-based shared language, belief system, and framework to address equity and inclusion productively.</li><li>• Develop culturally competent staff who are ready to integrate equitable and inclusive practices in every part of their job responsibilities.</li><li>• Develop an equity lens that supports equitable decision making and ensures the organization is operating in a manner that is equitable and not creating unintentional disparities.</li><li>• Ensure lasting learning through participation in a cohort that will persist beyond intensive work with the Center.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Understand the process a CBO goes through to Advance equity and build a culturally responsive organization.</li><li>• Develop a shared standard for grantees regarding their readiness to use grant dollars in an equitable and inclusive manner.</li><li>• Participate in a foundation cohort where members will be co-learners in a focused effort to advance equity that will endure beyond the life of the initiative.</li><li>• Streamline a process for funders and organizations to distribute and access equity advancement funds in a strategic and cost-effective manner.</li><li>• Have a cadre of organizations that they can rely upon to provide culturally responsive services and be partners in on-going equity advancement endeavors.</li></ul>

The CE&I pilot will consist of ten nonprofit organizations (four in year one, six in year two) and participating foundations who will help CE&I test ideas and develop a cohort experience that allows organizations to learn from their individual processes focused on advancing equity in all aspects of their respective organizations and to learn from each organization's learning and experiences.

## **Cohort Process**

### **I. Non-profit Organizations**

A. Individual organizations commit to:

- Initial multi-day Equity foundational training for an Equity Team (E-team) consisting of leadership and targeted staff members (2 Days).
- Monthly E-Team session focused on, on-going cultural competence and operationalizing equity organization wide-CE&I facilitated meetings take place for 8-12 months (.5 days)
- Equity foundational trainings throughout the year for All Staff (3 days)
- Board of Director training (1-2 days)
- Organization Leadership Team (2 days)
- Regular consulting with CE&I.
- cohort sessions (3 sessions)

### **II. Foundations/Funder**

A. Foundation partners include: Collins Foundation, Meyer Memorial Trust, Oregon Community Foundation, Portland Children's Levy, Trail Blazers Foundation, United Way.

B. Foundation cohort commits to 3-4 cohort meetings a year in which Foundation leaders work with CE&I to:

\* Understand the process a CBO goes through to advance equity and inclusion efforts and build a culturally responsive organization.

-Identify what is the make-up of a culturally responsive organization.

-Identify what is the pathway to building a culturally responsive organization.

\*Develop a clear understanding of how best to support CBO's in building a culturally responsive organization.

\*Develop a shared standard for grantees regarding their readiness to use grant dollars in an equitable and inclusive manner.

\*Build a shared passion, commitment, and competence in regard to advancing issues of equity, diversity, and inclusion in our own organizations and throughout our region.

## **Exhibit B**

### **CE&I: Equity Advancement Initiative**

*Cohort Learning Model*

#### **Reporting Framework**

**Overview:** The following describes a draft reporting framework for the Equity Advancement Initiative, collaboratively funded by participating CBO's and the following foundations: Meyer Memorial Trust, Collins Foundation, Trailblazers Foundation Oregon Community Foundation.

United Way has agreed to move forward as the fiscal sponsor provided the reporting requirements are within reason given the collaborative nature of this initiative. The following framework includes the documentation of both programmatic outcomes and budget reporting.

### **Reporting Framework:**

#### **Mid-year report:**

Timeline: Sept 30, 2016 (cohort 1), Sept 29<sup>th</sup>, 2017 (cohort 2)

Mid-Year Report will include:

Progress Report: Summary of work done to date, forecasting future work in the second half of the cohort experience, and documentation of key learnings and challenges.

Outputs Report: Reporting on the participation in all elements of this initiative. This includes for each CBO:

- Completion of initial 2.5 day, Equity Foundations training (launch of E-Team)
- Number All Staff trainings completed (3 required)
- Number of monthly E-Team trainings completed (10 required)
- Completion of day long leadership training
- Completion of Board of Directors Training
- Number of cohort Sessions completed (3 required)

2<sup>nd</sup> Cohort Update: Provide a progress report on the development of the second year cohort that includes organizations that have formally committed and/or prospective cohort participants.

#### **Cohort Completion Report:**

Timeline: February, 28<sup>th</sup>, 2017 (cohort 1), February, 2018 (cohort 2)

Impact and Learning Report: Narrative that describes key learnings and challenges from the cohorts' work. Impact report will span across all aspects of the initiative which include:

- Board Development
- Organization Leadership
- All Staff Development
- Operations
- Programming

The Impact and Learning report will include a “*Key Actions and Accomplishments*” section. This will document key steps taken across the cohort that assisted each CBO in advancing and operationalizing equity and inclusion efforts. These actions include and may not be limited to:

- Tools that assist in the advancement of equity
- Policies that assist in the advancement of equity
- New protocols that assist in the advancement of equity and inclusion
- Key decisions or actions that assisted in the advancement of equity and inclusion
- Development of an Equity Plan
- Specific training that assisted in advancing equity and inclusion

Finally, the impact and Learning report will include a “*CE&I Learnings*” section. This section will document the CE&I staff learning through this process. This will include but not be limited to:

- Key learnings from participation in this process regarding how best to advance equity and inclusion efforts
- Reflection on the personal impact experienced by this level of engagement
- Adjustments that are being made to the curriculum or process as a result of our learning

Individual Organization Impact Report: We will be asking each participating organization to write a two-page narrative that documents the individual process and impact that this initiative brought to their



organization. This report will include key learnings, challenges, and their assessment on the impact to their own organization.

Organization Development Report: Report on the status of the emerging Center for Equity and Inclusion, including advisory board development, financial status, budget changes or development, key changes in personnel and/or collaborators.

Funding Report: Provide a brief account of any new prospects/commitments for the second year.

Expense Report: A year-end report documenting that all funding was expended or an explanation of any funding not expended and intended use of that funding. Specifically, expense reporting will include:

- Operating Budget for the Center (with YTD actuals)
- Project budget, with specific foundation funding and expenses to date clearly indicated
- United Way will provide reporting on the same project budget form for all foundations.