

**Portland Children's Levy  
Allocation Committee Meeting Minutes  
March 21, 2017 3:30 p.m.  
Location: Portland Building Auditorium – 2<sup>nd</sup> floor**

---

*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 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=37T7ZLtpkxg>*

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

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

**Approval of minutes from December 5, 2016 meeting**

**Young:** So moved

**Kafoury:** Second

**Vote:** All in favor

**Public Comment**

none

**Renewal of Current Grants**

**McElroy:** We collect information on performance on all grants. Staff reviewed information on all grants and created grant performance summaries. We provided those summaries to grantees for their review and comment; we then submitted those reviews to the members of the Allocation Committee prior to this meeting.

Staff proposes that the Allocation Committee make decisions on renewal of current grants by program area at this meeting.

**Saltzman:** Okay, we will consider each program area at one time. We will go through the staff recommendations, then we will take testimony. After testimony, we can vote.

*Commissioner Saltzman read the lists of grants aloud. The list of all grants appears as Appendix A to these minutes.*

**Early Childhood**

**Kafoury:** Just to clarify, you did not find any major issues with any of the early childhood grants?

**McElroy:** That is correct. There were no significant performance or data issues in this area.

**Mentoring**

**Kafoury:** I just want to clarify that staff are recommending renewal for all of these grants?

**McElroy:** That is true. Concerns on individual grants were noted on the performance summaries, but the list we provided includes grants we recommend for renewal.

## Foster Care

**Stoudamire-Wesley:** There were some programs in this area with some concerns around meeting their goals.

**Hansell:** Yes, some programs had outcome goals outside of the normal range.

**McElroy:** There were some grants with concerns in almost every program area. It is important to remember that any concerns did not rise to the level of not recommending renewal. We are happy to answer questions on any individual grants. In the interest of time, we were not planning to review all of those concerns.

**Stoudamire-Wesley:** It was not in this program area that I had concerns.

## Child Abuse Prevention and Intervention

**Hansell:** Staff recommends that two of the VOA grants (Gateway Childcare and Miracles Relief Nursery) be combined into one grant. The VOA grant with Miracles Club did not work out. At this point the two grants are providing the same service, with one grant focused on African American children and families.

**Kafoury:** Looking through the performance summaries, it looked like many had struggled with meeting home visiting goals. I wonder if extra evaluation is needed to review the situation. Maybe staff could review what the issues are with the goals and the programs.

**Hansell:** I think that is a great suggestion. With the additional funding we should reduce the expected number of home visits per FTE, that should improve. I think that staff turnover is a huge issue in this area.

**Kafoury:** I am also aware that coordination of care and cultural competency are significant issues here.

**Stoudamire-Wesley:** I would add that we need to consider how services are provided.

**Kafoury:** It looks like SEI was struggling to meet their goals in this area.

**Hansell:** The SEI program in this area was brand new in 2015-16; so they just had one year of operations. Their metrics as a startup program were not a big concern for me. They did have high staff turnover. They did not meet any of the outcomes set for the program. Because of staff turnover, the grantee was not able to reflect on the failure to meet outcomes; there were not people there to be able to ask what happened. I will continue to monitor this program.

**Stoudamire-Wesley:** Was there turnover in the management of the program?

**Hansell:** A representative from the program might best answer those questions.

**Saltzman:** Could we get someone from Self Enhancement to answer these questions.

My name is **Anniko Campbell** and I am with **Self Enhancement, Inc.** Regarding the staff turnover, two staff just left shortly after the program started and the third person went out on medical leave. The manager of the program was also new to that program. So, we started with a big hole. The Nurturing Parenting curriculum, which is a good curriculum, when parents completed the assessment survey, they checked the boxes saying they are great parents. Once they got through the program and realized it is not a judgement, they answered honestly. So, we had to rethink the way we addressed the group of families doing the assessments. Many of the parents felt the need to be cautious in answering those questions. That was part of the problem in this program.

In talking with PCL staff, we had conversation with Nurturing Parenting about cultural relevance and appropriateness. We are now fully staffed.

**Hansell:** A lot of work has gone in on SEI's part to improve systems around reporting.

**Kafoury:** Moving forward, what would closer monitoring look like?

**Hansell:** Being in contact with the program on a frequent basis. Inquiring whether the assessments are being done; If outcomes are not being met, working to understand what that means. To make sure the program understands our expectations around data. Monitoring might include up to 6 or 7 meetings per year.

#### Hunger Relief

No questions or concerns.

#### After School

**Stoudamire-Wesley:** I would like to discuss with SEI. I would like to hear from them about their after school program. In one program, none of the outcomes were met. I would like to know what happened.

**Anniko Campbell** and **Anthony Deloney** from **Self Enhancement Inc.** appeared before the Committee.

**Campbell:** Our biggest problem was getting the children engaged with the surveys. Getting middle schoolers to complete a survey was a challenge. We worked with Lisa to get better information from the students so they reflect what is actually happening in our great programs.

**Pellegrino:** I feel like it was more an administrative issue rather than a program issue. In the changeover of staff, some of the understanding of the system was lost.

**Deloney:** I will be straightforward and say we dropped the ball on that piece. Everyone knows the programming was excellent. The handoff on the surveys was not there. Working with Lisa, we are now well on target to get those numbers where they need to be and then some.

**Pellegrino:** WE have a new survey design and we will look at the data system. Also, I will meet with the program team to make sure they know how important this survey is. I think that shows what monitoring we will be doing. Outcome data is only collected once per year.

**Campbell:** We collect attendance and demographic information throughout the year.

**Pellegrino:** the only issue was with the outcome data. All of the demographic and attendance data was reported correctly.

**Campbell:** We have a database that we can now check against the records kept on paper.

**Kafoury:** To clarify, outcome data comes from the student surveys?

**Pellegrino:** Yes, that is common in this program area.

#### Public Comment on Grant Renewals

**Jonathan Blasher, Jonathan and Katelin** from **Playworks** spoke to the Committee. Katelin is a coach at West Powellhurst and Jonathan is a junior coach there. WE thank the Levy for previous funding. WE support that staff recommendations for future funding. Also, **Susan Olds**, Principal at **West Powellhurst Elementary** spoke in support of the Playworks program at that school.

#### Continued Discussion of Staff Recommendations for Renewal

**Serena Stoudamire-Wesley** asked to hear from a representative of the **IRCO** mentoring program. No representative was present.

**McElroy**: There is underspending on the mentoring grant. The program had an expansion which rolled out slowly, so they did not spend the whole budget in the first year. They have carried forward some funding from the first year, but did not spend those funds. The grant was underspent by 14% each year. I recommended their renewal level reflect the underspending and current staffing. They are currently spending below budget again this year.

**Stoudamire-Wesley**: I would like to hear about the concerns with the IRCO SUN after school program performance.

**Pellegrino**: They did not meet all outcome goals in year 1; they met them all in year 2. With the positive trend, I am comfortable recommending renewal on this grant.

**Saltzman**: I will recuse myself from voting on any Impact Northwest grants.

#### Vote on Early Childhood Grants

**Kafoury**: I move that we accept staff recommendations on all early childhood grants.

**Stoudamire-Wesley**: Second

**Saltzman**: I recuse myself on Impact NW, but vote in favor of all of the others.

**Vote: All in Favor.**

#### Vote on Mentoring Grants

**Hornecker**: I move that we accept the staff recommendations on all mentoring grants.

**Young**: Second.

**Vote: All in Favor.**

#### Vote on Foster Care Grants

**Hornecker**: I have one proposal. I looked carefully on any grant that received a some or none on outcome goals. On the NAYA grant, it appears they are on track, but I would like to fund the NAYA grant for one year, with the understanding that they would get the second year assuming they stay on track. This would be an added fiduciary oversight. I move that we renew all grants, but that we review the NAYA grant in one year.

**Kafoury**: I second.

**Elise Sanchez** from **NAYA Family Center** addressed the Committee. I oversee the Foster Care and Early Childhood programs. In our current mid-year report, we are already very close to meeting our goals for the full year. We are fully staffed for the first time in about a year and a half. WE have had some staff turnover in the past. WE have 2.75 FTE on the foster care grant. Some of our outcome measures are a bit out of our control. Connection to kin goals are out of our direct control. We provide the only sibling visits that some of our children receive. Many of our outcome measures are self-reported. We feel that our children are very connected to our programs and staff. We are happy to provide additional reporting. WE have a great relationship with the PCL staff. We feel we have done well.

**Vote on NAYA Family Center Grant: All in Favor**

**Pellegrino:** To clarify, are you granting the full amount with the condition of outcome results or half the grant?

**Hornecker:** I am fine with whatever is administratively most efficient.

**Pellegrino:** Then, I recommend you approve the full 2 year amount with the option to review in one year.

**Saltzman:** Then that is the understanding.

**Hornecker:** I recuse myself on New Avenues.

**Saltzman:** I recuse myself on Impact NW.

**Vote on Staff Recommendations of Foster Care Grants: All in Favor**

Vote on Child Abuse Prevention and Intervention Grants

**Kafoury:** I propose we use the same process for the SEI grant. We grant them the full 2-year amount and ask them to report back in one year so we can continue to monitor.

**Young:** Second

**Vote: All in Favor.**

**Saltzman:** Now we will vote on the remaining Child Abuse Prevention and Intervention Grants with my recusal from Impact NW.

**Vote: All in Favor.**

Vote on Hunger Relief Grants

**Kafoury:** I move we adopt the staff recommendations.

**Stoudamire-Wesley:** Second

**Vote: All in Favor.**

Vote on After School Grants

**Hornecker:** I would like to talk about the SEI after school program. There was no recovery in year 2 for this program. It met no outcome goals in year 1 and year 2. We have heard that our reporting is burdensome, but

every other program in this area reported and met at least some goals. I cannot see a way to continue funding a program that met no outcome goals the first two years we funded it. SEI is a great program, but this one I cannot support.

**Pellegrino:** To clarify, in the first year they did not measure any outcomes. They did not fail to meet them; they did not measure them. It was an administrative failure. In the second year they did not meet the goals, but they measured them on a very small number of children. Again, there was an administrative problem with the survey being done properly. It is less meaningful to me when a small group of kids self report.

I have visited the SEI after school many times over many years. I do not feel there is any decline in the quality of the program. They are delivering the service and children are attending. The children are getting the service. This issue is administrative. They are clear that this needs to be rectified. As you heard, the staff is aware and prepared to improve the administrative situation.

**Stoudamire-Wesley:** I move that we renew SEI, but like previous situations, we review them next year. I would also like to see close monitoring of the grant.

**Kafoury:** I second that motion.

Vote on funding SEI after school program.

**In favor:** Kafoury, Saltzman, Stoudamire-Wesley, Young

**Opposed:** Hornecker.

**Motion passes**

**Saltzman:** I recuse myself on the Impact NW grants in after school.

Vote on Staff Recommendations for After School Grants

**Vote: All in Favor.**

*All Staff Recommendations for funding levels were adopted by the Allocation Committee. Those amounts are included in Appendix A to these minutes.*

Competitive Grant Round for New After-School Programs

**Pellegrino:** We are thinking of piloting a 2 step process for this funding round. We notified the public and sent out a draft letter of interest. We received almost no input. Two folks responded favoring a two step process.

I think it might be helpful to hear public testimony. I am also happy to answer questions.

We are talking about allocating \$500,000 for the final two years of the current Levy.

A two-step process involves a shorter letter of interest followed by full applications from those who are invited to apply.

**Saltzman:** We are open to public testimony on this topic.

Kafoury: I thought we had decided to try this new method.

Saltzman: there is no one wanting to testify, but I see many heads nodding in agreement with going with a two step process.

**Young:** I move that we adopt a two-step process

**Kafoury:** Second.

**Vote: All in Favor.**

**Pellegrino:** Here are the dates we are planning for this process:

April 5: Issue call for Letters of Interest (LOI) that specifies: funding timeline, questions for applicants to answer in LOIs, and any focus for investment selected by Committee.

April 26: LOIs due to PCL; LOI review period begins.

**Pellegrino:** We adopted strategies in the past, based on public input. IN the past, the adopted strategies are as follows:

1. Intensive Academic Support: must provide at least 60 hours of programming per year and include program staffing dedicated to connecting with parents and school staff;
2. Enrichment: programs that support broadening or deepening knowledge and skills;
3. New SUN Community School Programs: funding SUN Community Schools at schools where program is not currently offered; PCL to provide up to 50% of current county funding level per site; priority to sites with highest rank on equity index.

**Kafoury:** I recommend we not focus on any new SUN sites. I would like us to focus on intensive academic support and enrichment programs.

**Stoudamire-Wesley:** Second.

#### Public Testimony on Areas of Focus for New After-School Grants

**Vaune Albanese** of **Friendly House** addressed the Committee. I understand why there has been focus on East and North Portland. I hope the Board will consider funding a program not in East or North Portland in this upcoming round. We want to be able to serve low income families living in the urban core. Funding programs in Northwest Portland allows low-income families to live in the inner west side. We lost funding because our program was considered small and was not on the East side. We are having trouble raising funds from foundations. PCL funding can help make this programming available.

**Joel Cisneros** from **Latino Network** addressed the Committee. I am here to talk about funding programs in East Portland, particularly for the Latino community in that part of the city. We look forward to submitting our letter of intent and applying for new funding. Thank you.

**Vote: All in Favor**

#### Setting Goals for Funding by Strategy

**Pellegrino:** In the past you targeted 60% of funding to go to intensive academic programs, 20% to new SUN and 20% to enrichment programs. I thought you might consider goals for this round of funding.

**Young:** I recommend invest 60% in intensive academic support and 40% in enrichment programs. And I am concerned that our academic programs serve children grades 4 and older. We have few programs that serve

younger children. But, I think we are missing an opportunity to invest in children grades K to 3. Research tells us that being able to read at grade 3 is an important indicator of high school graduation rates. I see this as an important opportunity. Enrichment programs are equally valuable for developmental improvement. I am not saying we should only invest in children in that age group, but I do think splitting the funds to 60% academic and 40% enrichment would be valuable.

That is likely to fund about 2 programs in each area.

I propose a goal of funding 60% intensive academic support and 40% enrichment programming.

**Hornecker:** Is there enough funding for 2 in each area?

**Pellegrino:** Possibly. We need to see what the applications are.

**Kafoury:** We have flexibility. This decision is guidance for the community as they apply. WE are not bound to this exact ratio.

**Young:** Having received information from staff that in the after-school area only 19% of the children are grades K to 3. So, I think we have room to increase the younger ages.

**Pellegrino:** Keeping in mind that younger children tend to attend less after-school programming.

**Hornecker:** I second the motion to target 60% academic and 40% enrichment.

**Vote: all in Favor.**

#### Further Focus of New After School Funding

**Pellegrino:** This is an opportunity to further define the focus of the funding.

**Hornecker:** I have a proposal. In our after-school programs, we have done a good job of serving African Americans and Native Americans. We have not done as well serving Latinos. This seemed an opportunity to make some headway there. I would like to see us dedicate funding for Latino children in east Portland.

**Young:** If we vote to specify in this way, I am concerned that we will receive proposals from that community, perhaps even more than one. If there is only one and it does not meet what we want, then we are in a difficult spot.

**Kafoury:** I appreciate you looking at the data to inform our decisions. I think we may be doing better with some populations, I think there are still significant concerns with those communities. I would be more interested in focusing on children of color, rather than one population.

**Stoudamire-Wesley:** I agree with Chair Kafoury that we should be open to children of color and low income children.

**Pellegrino:** You can limit in the call for letters or you can indicate priorities.

**Stoudamire-Wesley:** I do not think we should leave any kids out. We should serve our underserved populations.

Public Testimony on focus or priority of populations



**Claire Roshall** from **VOA of Oregon**. We run drug and alcohol programs with Home Forward. I encourage you to focus on underserved communities. We serve a diverse population in North and East Portland. I encourage you not to limit to a population.

**Patricia Rojas** from **El Programa Hispano Catolico**. I encourage you to think about culturally specific services have the capacity to serve all children. There is value in providing culturally specific services in such a way that is particularly effective and meaningful to a population. I appreciate calling out the lack of movement in serving Latino youth. Instead of limiting, make your call wide to serve diverse populations. I encourage you to look at the importance of culturally specific organizations.

**Julia Mitchell** from **POIC**. We work with all youth throughout the City of Portland and into Gresham. We work with African American and Latino youth. I encourage you to fund programs who serve all marginalized populations.

**Tamara Henderson** of **Native American Youth and Family Center**. I want to echo the comments that culturally specific organizations serve more than their targeted population. Many of our youth are multi-racial.

**Vaune Albanese** of **Friendly House**. I believe choice is important to families. I believe culturally responsive services and culturally specific services are important. Those organizations cannot serve all the need. I would like you to spread the money to all parts of the city.

**Matt Ailer** from **Boys and Girls Clubs of Portland**. I work in program evaluation. There is a recent All Hands Raised report indicating the difficulty of applying categories in demographics. Some of the populations can be dramatically undercounted. Hispanic is an oddball racial category that is not a race. That leads to some confusion. I caution against using data that is split out by race as its validity is questionable.

**Young**: I move that we will prioritize intensive academic support and enrichment programs that are serving children in elementary schools.

**Stoudamire-Wesley**: I second.

**Hornecker**: We are going to fund 4 programs. The reason for the conversation is to narrow the field of applicants. The low barrier first step will likely yield a wide array of proposals. I am not in favor of prioritizing younger kids, because I am shaken by the horrendous graduation rates from our schools for kids of color. I do not want to prioritize younger kids. I would like to see a spread of the money between those who have been bypassed making it to grade level 3 reading.

**Young**: The upper limit would be grade 5. We cannot ignore older children. I really feel that this half million dollars is a chance to go upstream and improve graduation rates for when those kids are ready to graduate. I would prefer to put it all into early childhood, but am fine with this situation.

Vote on Prioritizing After-School programs that are serving children in elementary schools.

**In Favor: Kafoury, Saltzman, Stoudamire-Wesley, Young**

**Opposed: Hornecker**

**Saltzman**: The motion passes.

**Pellegrino**: I want to confirm that you intended that as a limitation, rather than a priority.

**Pellegrino:** That give us the information we need to create the LOI (letter of interest). You will have a chance to see the draft and comment on it in case it does not reflect what you decided before we publish it.

#### Possible Partnership with Momentum Alliance

**Pellegrino:** In the past, folks involved with **Momentum Alliance (MA)** have served as reviewers for us. We have opened a conversation with Momentum Alliance regarding a possible partnership with them to serve in a reviewing/recommending role in this funding round in order to better include youth voice in Levy decisions. MA is a youth-led nonprofit, with experienced coaches, whose mission is to inspire young people to realize their power individually and collectively and to mentor future social justice leaders. Staff has continued discussion with the Program Director, Emily Lai, at MA to explore whether the organization would be interested in supporting youth who participate in MA programming, or otherwise serve in the organization, to serve in a reviewing/recommending role as the Committee makes new after-school program investments this spring. They are interested in pursuing this project as an opportunity to better understand funding for youth programming in the community, develop their own leadership capabilities, provide youth perspective to PCL and to reflect on and advise PCL on its funding process. I thought it would be helpful to hear from Emily and ask her questions.

They would likely be interested in reviewing letters of interest.

**Emily Lai** from **Momentum Alliance** spoke. We are a youth led social justice nonprofit based in North Portland, but we serve youth in the entire Portland Metro Region. WE are youth led in that 75% of our board are 25 and under and 80% are people of color. Our executive director, Vanessa Dominguez, became ED at the age of 21. One of our former executive directors, Diego Hernandez, is now the youngest house representative in Salem. The majority of our staff is 24 and under. WE work on providing a variety of free or paid leadership opportunities to underrepresented youth ages 14 to 30. We have a variety of free camps and paid internships. We are undocumented; refugee; queer and trans; teen parents; youth of color; low income youth and so much more. We also convene a youth equity collaborative, which is a collaborative of youth programs in Oregon who also work on social justice youth organizing. This includes OPAL's youth organizing program; Multnomah Youth Commission; and a variety of youth programs based inside and outside Portland. We would draw from this network in forming this panel to partner with the Levy. We also have formal partnerships with Metro and the City of Portland through their diversity and leadership program. This opportunity would be meaningful for us because we believe that youth experiencing inequities are best equipped to design and lead the solutions to address these inequities. This would be a wonderful opportunity for us to be at a table that we historically are not at. It would give young people who are very interested in designing or administering programs like the programs you fund a behind the scenes look at what an effective powerful program to address barriers looks like, and how these decisions are made. This would be an incredibly meaningful leadership development opportunity for young people.

**Saltzman:** It sounds great.

**Young:** Have you or others in your organization done grant application review?

**Pellegrino:** Folks involved in Momentum were on our review panels in the past. This is different, we would work with Momentum to get youth to be on our review panel.

**Lai:** I cannot speak for who would be on the panel. I know some of our youth are on boards and have written grants. I would say for the most part, probably not this level of experience.

**Young:** Lisa, you or others would be part of the process. It would be an opportunity to mentor them through this step?

**Pellegrino:** Yes, I would view it as a partnership. They would also have something to teach us about how we do our process and what we could do differently. This is a chance in a small round to learn something about how we do and how we might change it.

**Stoudamire-Wesley:** Lisa, are you open to doing it half and half? Having some folks with experience doing the reviews and some youth doing them. I would be open to that arrangement. Since it is a learning process.

**Pellegrino:** Keeping in mind that we do not require grant review experience to be our reviewers in general. Is it just age that you would want me to include?

**Stoudamire-Wesley:** Not just age. I just like to have a balance. It depends how you are going to set it up. Will it be groups of 4 or 5.

**Lai:** We had discussed one group of 5 or 6.

**Kafoury:** It would be nice to see a proposal. I am supportive. I think it is great. I have been very energized and impressed with Momentum Alliance. It is hard for me to decide without a proposal that we could discuss over email. I did not know we were going to take a vote today.

**Saltzman:** It was listed as information.

**Pellegrino:** We did not know whether you would choose an LOI process. I would be happy to get a proposal to you if that is a fine next step for you?

**Saltzman:** Yes.

**Young:** Thank you for coming (Emily). It is very helpful to have you speak to us.

**Saltzman:** WE are done. Our next meeting will be May 1 at 1:30 in City Council Chambers.

Adjourned 5:30 pm