

**Portland Children's Levy
Allocation Committee Meeting Minutes
May 1, 2017 1:30 p.m.
Location: Multnomah County Board Room**

*The full record of the meeting may be viewed on the Portland Children's Investment Fund website:
www.portlandchildrenslevy.org
or YouTube at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UZ57OU7xg7I&feature=youtu.be>*

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

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

Approval of minutes from March 21, 2017 meeting

Hornecker: So moved

Young: Second

Vote: All in favor

Public Comment

none

Compliance Examination of Fiscal Year 2016

Matthew Apken, CPA of Merina and Company, LLC reported the results of the compliance examination of the Portland Children's Levy for the year ended June 30, 2016. The report, which contained an unmodified or clean opinion was issued on March 30, 2017. The compliance examination report can be found on the Portland Children's Levy website: <http://www.portlandchildrenslevy.org/about-us/financial>. The examination found that the Levy's internal controls are adequate and provide a sound structure for processing administrative expenses and grant reimbursements. Total administrative expenses are less than 5% of cumulative revenues. All grantee expenses were allowable and within approved budgets. All recommendations of prior years have been implemented and there were no new recommendations based on the examination.

Allocation of Additional Funds to Existing Grantees

Saltzman: We will be making decisions about investments of up to \$3.4 million for the final two years of the Levy.

Additional Funding for Home Visiting Programs

Lisa Hansell: The \$3.4 million was previously set aside by the Allocation Committee for three purposes: home visiting programs; expanding programming for after-school summer programs; and supporting grantees that are planning to implement the Youth Program Quality Assessment (YPQA) program. Grantees interested in the additional funds submitted the following: total amount requested; grant budget for fiscal year 2017-18; narrative justification for the additional funding; and revised scope of work for after school programs.

Staff recommendations for home visiting programs in 3 program areas – child abuse prevention & intervention, early childhood, and foster care. Staff recommendations are shown as Exhibits A, B & C at the end of these minutes. Grantees were notified of staff recommendations prior to the meeting.

Home visiting programs could request an increase of up to 20% of their budgets to increase FTE to reduce caseloads and increasing frequency of reflective supervision. Total funding recommended is about \$975,000 over two years.

Public Comment – none

Young: I have one question. Did you have conversations that chose not to apply for the additional funds.

McElroy: Two organizations in early childhood chose not to pursue this funding. One is new to the Levy and due to start up challenges, we chose to use the existing funding to reduce caseloads. The other program is an early head start model and already has low caseloads, similar to what we are proposing.

Hansell: In child abuse prevention and intervention, some organizations chose not to pursue this funding but did not let me know why. There was one program in foster care that felt they were fine with their current funding. One other program, a relief nursery, did not find these funds to fit as well with their program structure.

Saltzman: I recuse myself from the Impact Northwest decisions in this category.

Vote on Staff Recommendations: All in Favor.

Staff Recommendations as adopted are Exhibit A appended to these minutes.

Additional Funding for Summer Programs for Existing After School Grantees

Pellegrino: We made additional funding available for current programs to offer additional summer programming. We reviewed requests from grantees to be sure they represented expansion of services. We also reviewed proposed budgets. Total recommended was \$360,556. *Exhibit B appended to these minutes shows the staff recommendations.*

Public Comment – none

Hornecker: I move we accept the staff recommendations.

Young: Second

Saltzman: I recuse myself from the Impact Northwest decisions in this category.

Vote: All in Favor

Staff Recommendations as adopted are Exhibit B appended to these minutes.

Additional Funding for Programs Implementing Youth Program Quality Assurance (YPQA)

Pellegrino: Grantees were permitted to request up to 5% of current year budget as additional funds for the next two years to support implementation of YPQA. Total recommended is \$50,672. *Exhibit C appended to these minutes shows the staff recommendations.*

Hornecker: Could you explain your position with Friends of the Children.

Pellegrino: They requested the largest sum. My recommendation was a lower level than was requested because they are funded with an OCF (Oregon Community Foundation) grant specifically to support the implementation of this process. Our funds will supplement that amount in support of the YPQA implementation. OCF will cover 0.25 FTE and we will cover 0.125 FTE. These FTE amounts are comparable to other agencies with similar staff levels.

Public Comment - none

Hornecker: I move to accept staff recommendations.

Young: Second

Saltzman: I recuse myself from the Impact Northwest decisions in this category.

Vote: All in Favor

Staff Recommendations as adopted are Exhibit C appended to these minutes.

Saltzman: Total additional investment was \$1.375 million.

Annual Data Report

McElroy: We provided the full report to the Allocation Committee in late February.

The Annual Report: Investment Expectations, Results and Implications 2015 – 2016 is available on the Children's Levy website at <http://www.portlandchildrenslevy.org/about-us/performance-and-results>.

Summary of Data Report slides are included at the end of these minutes.

Hornecker: What was the number of new programs at this stage of the last levy?

McElroy: That is a good question, and I don't know the answer.

Hornecker: We may need to dig deeper on some of the outcome data, to explain why fewer outcomes are being met.

McElroy: We have changed the number of outcomes we are tracking.

Hornecker: We are not slicing the pie exactly the same way, but we do not have all the information to compare levy periods.

Pellegrino: We could get more information on this topic.

Additional After School Funding Round

Pellegrino: We are doing a two-step process. We have received 23 letters of interest (LOI) for funding. We have given you each a binder with all of the LOI's in them. We will provide you with brief descriptions.

We have a review committee of 6 people to review and score the LOI's, who have been oriented and provided with materials. They will meet later this month and create a list of prioritized recommendations for our next meeting. At that meeting, you will decide who to invite to submit full applications.

We will get you scores the week of May 15 in preparation for the meeting on May 22.

You will also review and approve the final RFI at our next meeting.

Full proposals will be due at the end of June. Final decisions will be made at the end of July or beginning of August. That will allow programs to start early in the school year.

Kafoury: We had set aside much more than we spent on the previous areas at this meeting. We have about \$2 million more available to spend now. There seem to be many great programs submitting LOI's. I think we should consider using more of those funds to fund more programs who have submitted LOI's in the next two-year cycle.

Pellegrino: The only caution is that it is only 2 years of funding. There is a big uptake on getting grantees set up for data. You will have only one year of data before renewing these grants for the next levy cycle. Also, you will increase the number of grants substantially if you give many small grants. There is a disadvantage to changing the amount of funding after putting out the call for applications. You all set limitations for this round based on the small amount available.

Kafoury: I understand there are a myriad of reasons not to do it. I just thought we should discuss potentially going ahead. Maybe not the whole \$2 million, but maybe \$1.5 million. Many of the applicants are tried and true partners of ours in the community. I prefer not to be sitting on money when it could be better spent out in the community. I would love to hear what other folks think of that idea.

Saltzman: I am definitely open to it. I have not looked at the submissions yet. I would like a chance to review the proposals.

Hornecker: If we don't do that, we need to figure out how we are going to spend the money. We can't sit on it.

Kafoury: We could have geared it many other ways. I thought we did a good job of narrowing it down. The requests are substantial.

Pellegrino: Do you want to provide any instructions to the review committee in that regard? The amount of money you want to spend might influence how many they recommend you invite back for a full application.

Hornecker: Why wouldn't they be ranking them regardless of our intentions or funds available?

Pellegrino: You will see a set of ranked scores regardless. Typically, staff makes a list of recommendations. WE were planning to have the review committee create the list of recommended applicants. The amount of funding available might influence how many programs the reviewers recommend you invite to submit full applications.

Young: You are suggesting it would be helpful for us to decide the total amount available?

Pellegrino: Yes, it would be helpful to know the total amount to provide guidance to the reviewers.

Young: I heard you say that applicants may have responded differently if we were offering more money.

Pellegrino: Yes, but we cannot fix that issue now. We likely would have gotten different requests.

Young: I agree that is a downside. It seems like we should go ahead and allocate more money for more services.

Hornecker: The ranking will be influenced by clustering of scores. I am not going to be in favor of funding any low scoring applications. How much money we make available will be influenced by the scores of the letters. If all of these programs score on the high end, I would be in favor of funding them. I was the one advocating that we spread the money differently. That is water under the bridge. We have got the money now. I am not comfortable deciding how much we will spend until I see the rankings.

Kafoury: It looks like there is about \$3 million of asks in this book.

Pellegrino: I hope you will keep in mind that there are administrative considerations in adding that many grants.

Saltzman: This round is open to new organizations.

Hornecker: I see that as another reason not to decide the amount today.

Pellegrino: We can just have the review committee score the applications and not recommend who to invite back.

Saltzman: That sounds good. Also, at our next meeting on May 22, we can decide how many to invite to do a full proposal. We can also decide how much we want to invest at that time.

Pellegrino: You can decide about the amount at the next meeting, or wait until the next meeting after that when you have the full applications.

Hornecker: WE will have more information at the next meeting.

Saltzman: Our next meeting is Monday, May 22 at 1 pm in City Hall Council Chambers.

There will be a reception in the atrium in City Hall on May 22

Hornecker: I want to commend staff for the clean audit report.

Adjourned 2:30 pm