

**Portland Children's Levy  
Allocation Committee Meeting Minutes  
December 5, 2016 2:00 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](http://www.portlandchildrenslevy.org) or YouTube at [www.youtube.com/watch?v=l-cV\\_tBjLw4](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=l-cV_tBjLw4)*

**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.

**Approval of minutes from October 31, 2016 meeting**

**Kafoury:** So moved

**Hornecker:** Second

**Vote:** All in favor

**Public Comment**

**Tracy Oseran** of **Urban Gleaners** described the work of Urban Gleaners and requested that the organization be considered for funding.

**Proposed Renewal Process for Current Grants**

**Lisa Hansell:** The proposed renewal process was presented at the Oct. 31<sup>st</sup> Allocation Committee meeting & was sent to the entire Levy database.

- No feedback was received at AC meeting or since the meeting
- AC members have not had questions or expressed concerns regarding the proposed renewal process

Just as a refresher, I'll review the proposed renewal process. Under this proposal,

- 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 period.

Once we know which programs want to be renewed Levy staff will make renewal recommendations.

Recommendations will be made based on the following information:

- Grantee performance using the established accountability metrics
- Information provided in mid-year and annual written reports, plus any additional relevant information
- Financial review
  - % of grant funds spent to date
  - Analysis of annual financial audits submitted by grantees

For each grantee, Levy staff will prepare a "Grantee Performance Summary".

The information included in the summaries will be based on annual data reported by grantees for the two completed fiscal years (FY 14/15 and FY 15/16).

Additionally, a mid-year narrative report and invoice will provide additional contextual programmatic information as well as updated grant spending data.

Staff recommendations for renewal and funding amount will be included in each summary. Summaries with renewal recommendations will be provided to all grantees by **February 24th**.

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 3rd**.

Staff will send completed summaries, including any grantee comments, to Committee members on **March 7th**.

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

**Public Comment** – none

**Kafoury:** Is this how it has been done in the past?

**Hansell:** Yes

**Proposal to accept the renewal process as recommended by staff**

**Young:** So moved

**Stoudamire-Wesley:** second

**Vote:** all in favor

**Hansell:** Levy staff will contact grantees directly with details of the process

**Recommendations for Allocating Additional Accrued Revenues**

**Summary of Public Input received**

**Pellegrino:** There is a handout available with the summary of input. [It is Appendix A in these minutes]

[Pellegrino read the information in the handout]

**Revised Staff Recommendations**

**McElroy:** There is a handout available with a description of revised staff recommendations [Appendix B]. We are talking about allocating \$4.4 million for the final 2 years of the current levy.

[McElroy read the information in the handout]

**Stoudamire-Wesley:** How many after school programs do we have?

**McElroy:** 16.

**Stoudamire-Wesley:** Would all of those programs receive the funding for summer programming?

**McElroy:** Not all of the 16 offer summer programming.

**Pellegrino:** We do not know who among the current grantees would apply for those funds to expand programming.

**Stoudamire-Wesley:** \$750,000 for expanding existing after-school programs is not much money.

**Hornecker:** Can you explain the parameters for the proposed 3% increase to current grantees?

**McElroy:** Grantees would submit revised budgets and we would see the proposed increases there.

**Hornecker:** So, any category could receive the additional funding?

**Pellegrino:** Yes, and there would be reviewable justification for the increases.

**Young:** The funds for the YPQA (recommendation #4) – are those dollars that we already set aside?

**Pellegrino:** we funded the YPQA program through the training funding. This proposal is extra funding to individual grantees.

**Young:** Would it be appropriate to take this funding from the pool we set aside for training?

**Pellegrino:** It might come from that pool, but we felt the funds should come from the grant side rather than the training or quality improvement pool. There are not enough funds in that pool to cover all the training or quality improvement work we are proposing.

**Kafoury:** I have a question about the childcare initiative. The providers you heard from are not necessarily the ones getting the funding from this program. So, maybe that is why they did not hear from them.

I feel passionately about this topic. I hear from families that child care is a huge issue for families. I would like to see us set aside some of the funds to address this need. I am not sure of the timeline, but I will be suggesting that today.

**Pellegrino:** One thing to keep in mind is that by the end of the fiscal year, we will know if additional funds are available. Currently demand is not outstripping supply for the childcare initiative.

### **Public Comment**

**Judy Strand** from **Metropolitan Family Service** addressed the Committee. I am happy that Ready, Set, Go will have the chance to be deepened. I am here to thank you for that opportunity. We are excited that we are seeing very positive results with this program. We are currently serving 40 families and by strengthening that we are likely to see even more gains. We are very dedicated to equitable access. We are invested in providing a culturally responsive approach. At Lynchwood, about 77% of the families we serve are coming from quite a variety of backgrounds. It results in a very dynamic environment.

**Joel Cisneros** from **Latino Network** addressed the Committee. I am here to support the revised recommendations, particularly in the early childhood and after school areas. The recommendation to reduce group size for the preschool programs would allow Latino Network to sustain and add our Juntos Aprendemos program in east Portland sites where the need has outpaced what we can serve. We support the recommendation to open a competitive process. Currently PCL does not fund any culturally specific after school program for Latino youth in east Portland, despite the growing disparities our youth face. We want to thank the staff for being responsive to the community feedback.

**Angela Glabach** from **Saturday Academy** addressed the Committee. We are a current grantee in after school. Saturday Academy recruits experts from the community to work with youth in small group settings. We ask that you consider institutional history and past performance in allocating additional revenue. We partner with SUN sites who do not have the funding to make a dent in the summer loss experienced by students. Saturday Academy has the expertise to work with partners to engage students in STEM activities in summer programs.

**Seth Truby** of **BRAVO** addressed the committee. We are delighted to see the revised recommendations with a proposal for new applicants in the after school program area. BRAVO is invited to perform at Governor Brown's inauguration in January. With me are Michelle Chavez-Acosta who has been a participant in BRAVO for three years. Also, with me is Veronica Acosta, who was on our staff, but is now school secretary at Rosa Parks.

**Michelle Chavez-Acosta** spoke to the Committee. BRAVO is a great program. The staff and teachers are very supportive. I am grateful for the opportunity. I hope to continue the program until college. BRAVO is amazing.

**Veronica Costa-Garcia** addressed the Committee. BRAVO is a wonderful organization. I was fortunate to work for the organization and see the hard work of BRAVO staff and volunteers. They go out of their way to build relationships with students. BRAVO has given many opportunities to students. It is an extraordinary organization. Our school is very diverse. BRAVO helps unite our school community through music.

**Grace Thiel** of **Boys & Girls Clubs** of Portland addressed the Committee. She thanked the Committee for investments and supported greater investment in after-school programs. Boys & Girls Clubs provide a safe, nurturing and caring environment. The youth receive a hot meal and have many educational activities, as well as career skills. Summer programs served nearly 2,300 youth last summer. They ran 267 different camps. Clubs serve 2 meals per day. The Clubs have a summer curriculum to address summer learning loss; it has been successful. The Clubs fill a critical need for families and youth.

**Jorge Nava Marin** of **IRCO INSPIRE** addressed the Committee. The INSPIRE program is an in and after school program for immigrants and refugees and it provides culturally specific academic support. I work with Latino youth and families. The program has consistently showed positive results and was the highest ranked applicant. We would like to respond to requests to expand our services, especially in the Parkrose School District. We request you enhance existing after school programming. We also support increasing funds for programs implementing the Youth Program Quality Intervention program. We have participated in these trainings and are interested in continuing this work. We also support the staff recommendation for a 3% COLA for all funded organizations. Please consider allocating additional funds to IRCO's INSPIRE program to help refugee and immigrant youth. An additional \$96,000 would allow us to serve at least three additional schools and support more than 40 students and their families.

#### Committee Deliberation on Allocation of Additional Revenues

**Kafoury:** Are some of the staff proposals connected?

**McElroy:** Ideally, yes.

**Saltzman:** Let's start with the proposal to reduce caseloads in home visiting programs and reduce group size for preschool group programs.

**Young:** I stand in favor of the staff recommendations on this topic. Reducing caseloads really addresses early childhood, foster care and child abuse prevention and intervention. It is a great opportunity for us to have an impact. This focuses on ages zero to 3, which research says is a great place to start.

**Stoudamire-Wesley:** I am in favor of the \$150,000 for the two preschool groups. But, I am not yet sold on the home visiting. I would rather see some of that money moved to after school and summer programs.

**Kafoury:** I am unsure of the reduction of caseloads. This is a lot of money to put into it. I am not clear that there are outcomes that we could see as a result of this spending. I would like to see the outcomes from this spending. I do not know what the goals and objectives would be over time.

**McElroy:** The goals and objectives of the individual programs will not change. We would expect to see program staff turnover rates reduced, although other factors can contribute to turnover. The outcome we expect is that staff would feel more equipped and less stressed in their work and would build stronger relationships with the families they serve. When we surveyed grantee staff about 2 years ago, the leading source of dissatisfaction and staff turnover is the high stress of the job itself. There are other programs where lower caseloads is helping mitigate that stress. In the current political climate, helping staff who are making home visits is something we can do to help them. There are 25 programs that will be enhanced by this funding.

**Young:** Previously we had some information about gold standard of ratios of staff to clients.

**McElroy:** We have some families that are seeing families about every other week, and they are carrying caseloads of about 25 families. There are other programs with caseloads of 10 to 12 families and seeing those families weekly. The idea is that the frequency of home visits would remain the same, but there would be additional staff to reduce caseloads. The figures we included offer up to a 20% increase to fund additional staff and supervision. The other element is providing time for reflective supervision for home visitors. This supervision model gives support to the staff.

**Stoudamire-Wesley:** Is there a coalition where these folks gather?

**McElroy:** The Multnomah County Health Department has been using federal and local funds to convene that group. It serves as an umbrella for many parts of the system – supervisors, funders, home visitors and parent advisory groups. I participate in that group regularly.

**Kafoury:** Will other funders use these same caseload levels?

**McElroy:** That may be a challenge. The programs we fund may have different levels than other programs within an agency. Funding requirements may require different service levels or caseloads requirements. That is already true in many of these programs and agencies. We are already in that position.

The Levy could signal the sector that we support a different standard in these programs.

**Stoudamire-Wesley:** I am not hearing a parent voice in here. At some meetings, I hear parents say that they get too many home visits. I want to hear from parents what is best for them.

**McElroy:** I appreciate what you are saying. Under these recommendations, we are not increasing the number of home visits.

**Kafoury:** I wonder if we can discuss all of them before we vote on them.

**Saltzman:** Okay. Any comment on the recommendation for mental health consultation services for home visiting programs? Hearing none, let's move on to alternative recommendations for summer and after school programming. Staff recommends investing \$1.5 million to existing programs for summer programming. An alternative is to split that amount and open a round of new investments in after school programming.

**Kafoury:** If we split the amount, could existing programs ask for some of the funds?

**Pellegrino:** That is a decision to be made by the Committee. The idea was to fund new programs in the after school program area. An existing grantee running more than one program, could apply for funds for a new program.

**Hornecker:** I am trying to understand the timing of these funds getting to grantees. I heard you say that new programs would be unlikely to be running their programs prior to the summer of 2017. It seems like we need to consider this balance of getting funding to existing programs fairly quickly versus the delay of a process for funding new programs.

**Pellegrino:** There are time considerations in all the decisions we are making. Renewals involve reporting on performance to grantees and to the Committee. Other changes to existing programs require changes in scope and budgets, also to be reviewed by the Committee. If we also need to run an RFI for a new round of funding in after school, that will take some time; it is likely that funding will begin to flow in September. We are only funding summer programming for programs that also provide after school programming. The new round might fund programs that do not provide summer programming. So, the September timeline might not impact funding. The delay would only impact new programs.

**Kafoury:** I am open to more conversation about whether to split the funds and allow new grantees. I would prefer to see more funding for the summer programming.

**Young:** I would prefer to see all the funding go to summer programming and not have a new round of funding. The need for additional summer programming is that great.

**Pellegrino:** We will be asking for proposals from the agencies and you will make those decisions after reviewing them. Most of the programs do serve significant numbers of children in the eastern part of the county.

**Saltzman:** The fourth recommendation is increasing funding for all current grantees by 3%, in addition to the 2% COLA.

**Pellegrino:** The renewal and the 2% COLA are to be funded by revenues that we anticipate receiving in the future. The proposals we are bringing today are for the use of funds already accrued, funds that are sitting in a bank account right now. The 3% would come from the already accrued funds.

**Kafoury:** My concern is that, between this 3% increase and the reduced caseloads, that close to half of these funds would be going toward not increasing services for children in our community. If we have \$4.4 million, we should be increasing services to kids. This strikes me as funds to providers, not to services.

**Pellegrino:** Any increase in funds would require the providers to provide a budget and a narrative justification. They would have the option to expand programming using the additional 5%.

**McElroy:** With the new budgets and scope changes, there may be some moderate increases in programming. We do not know what providers will propose. Most of our home visiting providers already meet the new, higher minimum wage requirements. Most already pay at least \$15 per hour.

**Young:** I appreciate the concern about adding services. Part of the appeal in reducing caseloads, is that it ideally improves quality of services. Reducing turnover and improving quality of the service received.

**Kafoury:** I agree and if we could measure the quality of service, I would be more inclined to get behind that proposal. IN two years, I would like to see the reduction in turnover and if not, I would like to revisit whether

that is the best use of those dollars. There is so much need out there. Families are feeling the pinch. We really want to really know that our money is making a difference.

**Saltzman:** Number five is increase funding to grantees implementing Youth Program Quality Intervention. No concerns on that one. The final recommendation is to eliminate the recommendation to increase funding to the childcare initiative.

**Kafoury:** I appreciate what the staff said that there may be more funding available in six months and we will know then whether there is more need.

**Pellegrino:** We will let you know if there are waiting lists.

**Saltzman:** I feel that reductions in caseloads is in effect providing more services to those families and children. It is my understanding that home visiting is one of the best ways to reach families in need. Given that our revenue picture does look good and will look better. I am inclined to support the \$1.6 million for home visiting and preschool.

**Wesley-Stoudamire:** Is the mental health consulting related to the home visiting changes?

**McElroy:** The mental health consulting is in addition to the home visiting changes. This funding would sustain the program staff having access to the support.

**Saltzman:** I agree with Julie that this is not the time to add new programs. I prefer to wait until the Levy is renewed. I am open to increasing the funding for the existing programming. I struggle with the increase of 3% on top of the 2% COLA, but it will be based on a demonstration by each program. Providers will need to show us how they are serving children and families. I am fine with the other recommendations. I am also fine with the other staff recommendations.

**Wesley-Stoudamire:** I am all for increasing after school programs. I would like to see \$2 million for increasing summer programs. I prefer not to add new programs. I would take \$500,000 from one of the other proposals. Maybe not increase other grants by 3%. Maybe we take the \$500,000 from the 3% general increase.

**Saltzman:** I am comfortable with that suggestion.

**Pellegrino:** Summer programs are costly.

**Kafoury:** I would be supportive opening up to new grantees. We have a long time until the next levy. We have heard from BRAVO and others that they are providing great services to kids.

**Young:** I move to allocate

- \$1.65 million for the staff recommendation to reduce caseloads for home visiting programs and group size for preschool group programs;
- \$385,000 for mental health consultation services for home visiting programs;
- \$2 million for afterschool summer programming for current grantees;
- To increase the COLA's for existing grants to 2% plus \$388,000;
- To increase funding for current programs implementing the Youth Program Quality Intervention in accordance with the staff recommendation

**Saltzman:** I second the motion.

**Kafoury:** Because of the way this is being discussed, we are leaving out an important partner of ours that is now being funded by Multnomah County to be a SUN provider; that is Latino Network. They will not be allowed to apply for the summer programming because they are not a PCL after school grantee. Which is why it is important that we are coordinating with other funders of these types of programs.

**Pellegrino:** The only way to address that issue is to open up funding for new after school programs. We do not fund summer only grants because they outcomes are not demonstrable. That was a policy decision made in the early days of the Children's Levy. SUN programs are required to provide 4 weeks of summer programming. That is funded by the base level of funding. Some provide more summer programming with other funds.

**Hornecker:** I am concerned about the timing of getting funding for summer programs. What summers would be covered by the funding of new proposals?

**Pellegrino:** That would likely fund one full summer and one month of another summer.

**Hornecker:** I am very supportive of increasing our summer programming. Because increasing summer programming for current grantees will fund summer 2017 programming, I would like to use \$1.5 million for expanding current programs into summer and set aside \$500,000 to fund new after school programs. That would address Chair Kafoury's concern about getting some new entrants into Levy funding.

**Saltzman:** I like this new idea of using \$500,000 for new funding.

**Hornecker:** Can we change what the COLA is. I would like to see it be up to 5%, based on whatever is available.

**Kafoury:** We could revisit that at a later time. There is likely to be other funds available.

**Young:** I would amend my motion to allocate \$1.5 million for summer programming at existing after school programs. And we would allocate \$500,000 to open up a process to fund new after school programs.

**Kafoury:** I would like to cap the additional funding for current grants to 2% COLA and up to 2% additional increases.

**Young:** I amend my motion and move to allocate

- \$1.65 million for the staff recommendation to reduce caseloads for home visiting programs and group size for preschool group programs;
- \$385,000 for mental health consultation services for home visiting programs;
- \$1.5 million for afterschool summer programming for current after school grantees;
- \$500,000 for new after school programs.
- To increase the COLA's for existing grants to up to 4% based on the availability of funds;
- To increase funding for current programs implementing the Youth Program Quality Intervention in accordance with the staff recommendation; these programs would receive a 2% increase in addition to the COLA increase mentioned above. This would result in these programs receiving a total increase of up to 6%.

**Wesley-Stoudamire:** I second the motion.

**Vote:** All in Favor.

**Saltzman:** We have one remaining item – the systems partners project which we previously discussed.



**Pellegrino:** Because of City of Portland contracting requirements, we need a formal vote. This proposal is to fund a joint investment with the early childhood learning circle. This is the joint investment in improving professional development system for childcare providers.

The Early Childhood Funders' Learning Circle (ECFLC), of which the Levy is a part, has been working for the past year to develop a joint funding initiative to support system improvements in early childhood. The ECFLC is a group of funders (private, community, corporate and family foundations, Social Venture Partners), that have been meeting for the past nine years to develop their collective knowledge base on important issues in early childhood care and education, to stay abreast of early childhood system developments in the state, and to network with each other on early childhood investment priorities. After research on other early childhood funding collaboratives, consultation with member organizations, early childhood experts, researchers, and staff of Oregon's Early Learning Division, the ECFLC has proposed a joint investment opportunity for members to collectively fill a particular gap in the professional development system for childcare providers.

Oregon recently implemented a Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) for childcare providers. Among other things, the rating system includes a domain for qualifications of personnel providing care, and uses the state system (Oregon Registry) for documenting and recognizing professional development "steps" as the means for evaluating the level of quality in this domain. In order for childcare providers to move up the "steps" in the Oregon Registry, they must complete specified types of training. Culturally and linguistically diverse providers, and those providers located in rural areas lack access to these trainings which prevents providers from improving their quality rating, and, in turn, becoming eligible for a higher rate of reimbursement under the state's Employment Related Day Care reimbursement system. The proposed project seeks to assist in remedying this situation by undertaking the following:

- Develop more master trainers (trainers who train cadres of other trainers) from under-represented communities and language groups, and who live in rural areas to increase the number of people who can provide professional development to childcare providers serving communities of color, English language learners and rural areas.
- Increase the pool of culturally and linguistically diverse trainers and trainers living in rural areas who can provide culturally and linguistically specific trainings to childcare providers serving communities of color, English language learners and rural areas.
- Identify and develop culturally responsive training curricula improvements in partnership with trainers and the communities they serve.

The **Oregon Community Foundation** will be the fiscal agent for this project. That is where the money will flow.

Staff recommends the Allocation Committee invest \$100,000 in this project through June 30, 2019.

**Wesley-Stoudamire:** Do the agency's get to choose who they are working with? I want to be sure the folks at the agencies will be interested in participating.

**Pellegrino:** Yes. There is a group at PSU that coordinates this work. The idea is that trainers and master trainers are identified and trained. So, funding will be available to pay organizations who are participating in receiving training and improving cultural responsiveness in curriculum.

**Hornecker:** So moved.

**Young:** Second

**Vote:** All in favor.

**Saltzman:** We do not have a meeting scheduled. We hope to have it in March.

Adjourned at 4 pm.

## Appendix A

### Summary of Input Received on Staff Recommendations for Allocating Additional Revenues

This summarizes input received from organizations that testified at the October 31, 2016 Allocation Committee meeting, written input received by PCL staff after the meeting between 10/31/16 and 11/18/16, and input received via a written survey completed by grantees that implemented the Youth Program Quality Intervention in 2016.

After the October 31, 2016 meeting, PCL solicited written input via the PCL contact database which includes (among others), grantees, organizations that applied for funding in the past but are not current grantees, and organizations that have not applied for funding in the past but have requested to receive PCL communications.

#### **1. Provide After-school Funding for Programs Not Currently Funded**

Four organizations requested that PCL allow programs that are not currently funded to apply for after-school program funding with the additional revenues.

#### **2. Provide More Funding for Current Grantees**

Five organizations requested that PCL provide increased funding to existing grantees (over and above the 2% COLA) for a variety of purposes including covering increased health care and space rental costs, capacity building for data reporting, and expansion of existing programming.

#### **3. Increase Funding for Preschool Group Programs**

Two organizations funded to provide preschool group programs advocated for increased funding for these programs.

#### **4. Remedy Calculation Error in Mental Health Consultation Recommendation**

Morrison Child and Family Services advocated for increasing the additional funding for mental health consultants for home visiting programs to cover the cost of 2 full time employees. Original calculation by PCL staff was mistakenly based on less than full time employees.

#### **5. Provide Funding for Hunger Relief Programs Not Currently Funded**

One organization advocated for allowing hunger relief programs not currently funded to apply for funding with the additional revenues.

#### **6. Increase Funding for Currently Funded Hunger Relief Programs**

One organization advocated for increased funding to current hunger relief programs to expand availability of translation services at school pantry sites, and to better support parent and student involvement in pantry operations.

#### **7. Support for Staff Recommendations**

Seven organizations expressed support for one or more of the following specific staff recommendations:

- Funding for current grantees to expand summer programming
- Funding for reduction in caseloads of home visiting staff

- Expanding mental health consultation services to home visitors and including hiring of bilingual/bicultural staff

<b>8. Increase Funding for Current Grantees Implementing Youth Program Quality Intervention</b>
---

This feedback came from a survey of after-school and mentoring grantees who implemented the Youth Program Quality intervention in 2016. When asked what was needed to support their ongoing implementation of the Youth Program Quality Intervention, they advocated for increased funding to support staff capacity for ongoing implementation (e.g. compensation for substitutes to accommodate staff program observation, assistance in handling implementation logistics, assigning management of process to one staff, compensation for time spent training).

## **Appendix B**

### **Revised Staff Recommendations for Allocation of Additional Revenues**

In light of input received at and since the October 31, 2016 Allocation Committee meeting, staff has revised its recommendations for allocating additional accrued revenues as discussed below.

#### **Total 2 Year Cost of Revised Recommendations: \$4,498,000**

The total funding recommendations described below slightly exceeds the \$4.4 million in additional revenues that have accrued to date. Funding for this excess can be covered by a combination of the following:

- It is possible that not all of the options specified below will actually cost as much as has been recommended for allocation (e.g. decreasing caseloads for some home visiting program may not cost as much as estimated).
- At the end of the 2016-17 fiscal year, there will likely be some unspent funds which can also be used to cover the \$100,000 gap.
- Reserves can be used to cover any portion of the \$100,000 gap not covered by the above options.

<b>1. Reduce Caseloads for Home Visiting Programs and Group Size for Preschool Group Programs</b>
---

Keep recommendation to reduce caseloads for home visiting programs and require a minimum level of reflective supervision (25 programs in early childhood, foster care and child abuse prevention). In addition, increase funding for 2 early childhood preschool group programs that provide neither home visiting nor preschool classroom services to decrease group sizes from 25+ to 18 children (and their parents).

Rationale: Rationale for decreasing caseloads for home visiting programs is the same as stated in the original staff recommendations: 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.

Rationale for increasing funding for preschool group programs is to allow a decrease in preschool group sizes which will help staff to better support participating families, and bring adult to child ratios closer to ratios of staff to children in preschool classrooms.

2-year Cost: \$1,650,000 (\$150,000 more than original recommendation)

<b>2. Mental Health Consultation Services for Home Visiting Programs</b>
--

Increase funding for Mental Health Consultation grant to cover cost of 2 additional full time mental health consultants.

Rationale: Correct calculation of cost for addition of 2 FTE to mental health consultation grant to cover consultation needs for 25 home visiting programs in 3 programs areas. Rationale for increasing availability of mental health consultation services to home visiting programs is to build 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. Consultants provide onsite coaching and training that improves use of trauma-informed service approaches, and supports and strengthens program supervisors' reflective supervision practice to better address staff wellness, burnout and vicarious trauma. Would expand mental health consultation services to home visiting programs funded by PCL, including those for families with children older than age five. Addresses strategies identified in early childhood and child abuse prevention/intervention RFIs.

2-Year Cost: \$385,000 (\$85,000 more than original recommendation)

### **3. Alternative Recommendation for Summer and After-School Programming**

Staff originally recommended providing up to \$1.5 million in additional funding to existing after-school grantees to expand summer programming to avert summer learning loss, engage youth in constructive activities and assist working parents with childcare needs. If the Committee is interested in funding additional after-school programming as some providers and grantees advocate, staff recommends that the amount devoted to increasing funding for summer programming for existing after-school grantees be reduced to \$750,000 over two years, and the remaining \$750,000 be allocated to new after-school programs in a competitive funding round. Staff recommends against funding new after-school programs without a competitive process. Grants would likely need to start September 1, 2017 in order to allow enough time to run a competitive round for the funding. Allocating \$750,000 of funding over 2 years to new after-school programs would likely result in 2-4 additional grants in the after-school program area.

Rationale for Funding Additional After-School Programs: Significant feedback was directed at increasing funding for new after-school programming. After-school is the most competitive PCL funding category with 5-6 times the funds requested as available in most competitive funding rounds.

2-Year Cost: \$1.5 million (either all for increased summer programming or split between increasing summer programming of existing grantees, and additional after-school programming provided by new grantees).

### **4. Increase Funding to All Current Grantees by 3%**

Provide all grantees with a 3% funding increase (in addition to 2% COLA<sup>1</sup>) and allow grantees flexibility in using funds to address increased health care costs, increased space rental costs, increased data capacity or other needs unique to particular grants.

Rationale: Grantees advocated for increased funding to help with covering costs that are increasing faster than inflation. Additional funding could also help with increased costs for some grantees in complying with new minimum wage laws, support other wage increases that may help decrease turnover, or fund small program expansions.

2-Year Cost: \$888,000

### **5. Increase Funding to Grantees Implementing Youth Program Quality Intervention**

---

<sup>1</sup> To be clear, funding for renewing current grants and providing a 2% COLA for all renewed grants will come from revenues projected to accrue in 2017-19. The \$4.5 million funding increase proposed here would come from revenues that have accrued to date due to past revenues exceeding existing grant commitments.

Provide additional 3% -6% funding increase to after-school and mentoring programs that are implementing the Youth Program Quality Intervention. Amount of funding increase would depend on whether Committee decides to provide a 3% increase to all grantees per recommendation above. If across the board 3% increase is approved, recommendation is for an additional 3% increase to support ongoing YPQA implementation.

Rationale: In feedback gathered at conclusion of first year of implementation of the Youth Program Quality Assessment process (November 2016), all grantees identified a need for some additional staff capacity/time. Identified needs included compensation for substitutes to accommodate staff observing each other in program delivery, assistance in handling scheduling and logistics for the observations and subsequent meetings, additional capacity for one consistent person to manage the process, and compensation for time spent attending training.

2-Year Cost: \$75,000 - \$150,000

<b>6. Eliminate Recommendation to Increase Funding for Childcare Initiative</b>
---

The original staff recommendations included a 2-year increase of \$1.1 million in funding for this initiative. In light of feedback requesting additional funding for various purposes (increasing health care costs, increasing space rental costs, need for additional data staff, minimum wage/overtime requirements, modest program expansion), staff has eliminated the recommendation to increase funding for the Childcare Initiative. If demand exceeds supply for this service during the remaining years of the current Levy, staff recommends that the Committee consider providing additional funding, if available, at that juncture.