

**Portland Children's Levy
Allocation Committee Meeting Minutes
February 26, 2018 1:30 p.m.
Location: Portland City Hall Council Chambers**

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=dH9QQOxcF1A&feature=youtu.be>

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 October 2, 2017 meeting

Hornecker: So moved

Stoudamire-Wesley: Second

Vote: All in favor

Public Comment

None

Saltzman: The Portland City Council recently referred the Portland Children's Levy initiative to the May ballot. It will be measure 26-197.

Annual Data Report

Meg McElroy presented the annual data report. The full report can be found on the Portland Children's Levy website: <http://www.portlandchildrenslevy.org/about-us/performance-and-results>. Slides from the presentation are appended to these minutes.

There is a 43-page report that covers data from the past year of Levy operations and looks at 3 year average performance. It uses data collected from grantees. I will cover the Levy-wide information. Program area information can be found in the report.

Grantees perform significant work to provide this data. We do not have per client or per child level information.

The overall Levy goals were adopted by the Allocation Committee after extensive public input. The three goals are:

- Prepare children for school;
- Support children's success inside and outside of school;
- Reduce racial and ethnic disparities in children's well-being and school success.

You also set access goals to try to reach those who have been historically underserved. Those are:

- To invest at least 30% of funds in culturally-specific services Levy-wide and in each program area
- To increase access to services in East Portland

Both goals were met Levy-wide; 1 program area (hunger relief) did not meet investment goal for culturally specific services.

The Levy increased access to services in East Portland. In the previous levy, an average of 38.1% children served resided in or attended school in East Portland; In grant year 16-17 m that number increased to 45.3%. The boundary is roughly 82nd Avenue. 5 zip codes are used to denote East Portland.

Children Served

- 11,505 children served in 16-17
- Exceeded goals for numbers served by 11.8%
- Majority of children served from families with annual incomes at 185% of Federal Poverty Level or less
- 31.3% from homes with a primary language spoken other than English
- 70.6% of children served identify as children of color; increase over average in previous levy (64.4%)
- Most figures are similar to 5-year average in previous levy

Service Access by Race and Ethnicity

- Comparing school age population in 5 Portland area school districts to population accessing PCL-funded services
- 3-year trends show a more diverse population accessing PCL-funded services than population enrolled in area schools.

Participation in Services

- Early Exit rate lower 1.3% points compared to 5-year average previous levy. Average of 7.5% of participants exited “early”; 8.8% in previous levy
- Increase in % receiving participation “minimum dosage”- 5-year average in previous levy was 66.6%- increase likely due to greater emphasis, change in definition and tracking methods for better accuracy. Average of 80.7% of participants received “minimum dosage”; 66.6% in previous levy
- Near parity between race/ethnicity of population enrolled and participating over time
- New data on race/ethnicity identity participants receiving “minimum dosage” compared to those that enrolled- mostly parity; among children of color, less than % point disparity for only a few populations, e.g. Latino, African American this year. Over 1%-point disparity for white children all 3 years.

Outcome Goals

- Grantees met an average of 81.4% of their outcome goals; decrease over average of 87.8% in previous levy. There were 25 new programs in this period; new programs take time to figure out the appropriate level goals. Also, missing a goal by a small amount is the same as missing the outcome by a large amount.

Goals measured by grantees vary by program model, and include:

- Child development and health
- Parenting practices and family functioning
- Child and family stability
- Social-emotional competencies and indicators of positive youth development such as self-confidence, positive social behaviors, and connection to school
- Indicators of school success including attendance and academic achievement

Staff Turnover

Staff turnover is an important metric for the Levy since so many of our services are relationship based.

- Average of 21.1% of staff supported through PCL turned over during the year

- Range over the last several years is 15% - 20%
- Variations by program area
- Data doesn't track reasons for turnover e.g. promotion, retirement, or returning to school to pursue advanced degrees in field of education, human services or social work. The Levy funds a lot of entry level jobs which are likely to have turnover.
- Political climate may have had an impact
- Child abuse prevention and intervention had the lowest staff turnover level in recent years.

Kafoury: Can you remind us what specific steps we took to improve staff turnover.

McElroy: Yes, we paired mental health consultants with staff in home visiting programs. We offered them training series as well as on-site consultation around workplace wellness. It included encouragement to use trauma informed practice to take care of themselves in work that is highly stressful. It also helped provide more skills for supervisors to help navigate the field. The programs that have improved turnover do happen to be involved in these efforts, but we do not have data that proves the impact of the training and other services. We feel encouraged.

Hunger Relief Programming

Hunger relief area is different from the other program areas. This area is more transactional. We are trying to provide for a basic need. There is likely a great deal of interconnection between this area and the others.

- 15,644 children and 13,470 parents/caregivers served
- 12,023 of children served through school food pantries
- 3,612 children served with other emergency food resources
- Programs served a higher percentage of Latino and Asian children, and a lower percentage of African-American children than are enrolled in Portland schools, or were served in other PCL funded programs
- Likely due to concentration of hunger relief programming in East Portland and concentration of African American population West of 82nd Ave.
- 70% of children served in Hunger Relief programs resided or went to school in E PDX; 45% across all other program areas.
- Bulk of children served getting food through school food pantries which were substantially expanded with PCL funding
- Examples of other emergency food resources provided include home delivered meals, summer lunch program, produce and prepared food donations from partner orgs, food produced in community gardens.
- Consider lack of reach into African American population with Hunger Relief programs in planning for next Levy

Hunger Relief Implementation Highlights

- Grantees provided additional emergency food resources at schools without pantries
- Higher percentage of families using school pantries more frequently
- Strong demand for delivered meals for families with barriers to accessing other sources of emergency food
- Strong demand for food discounts at Village Market/New Columbia

Areas for Improvement and Looking Ahead

- Public engagement/input on levy funding priorities

- Use service access data to inform public engagement/input focus, particularly for disparities by program areas
 - e.g. hunger relief needs and services strategies for African American population
 - Other specific populations that data suggest are underserved, e.g. children with disabilities. Only 5% of children served were reported to have disabilities, compared to 13% from CDC. We do not collect that data from all grantees.

Kafoury: The childcare initiative has really good results – more children served than we had anticipated. I would like us to have more conversation about that project. It seems to be addressing a clear need.

McElroy: In a future meeting I would like to bring more data back on that particular project. In the full report, there is a section there about the community childcare initiative. It should soon be serving close to 200 children annually. I plan to present more data for a future meeting.

Saltzman: Thank you for a good report.

Conditional Grant Renewal of SEI and NAYA Grants

Saltzman: Now we will hear from staff regarding their recommendation to renew grants that were conditionally approved last year. Members of the Allocation Committee wanted to hear back from staff before renewing these grants for FY18-19.

Pellegrino: We sent the Committee the information on these grants. We recommend renewing these three grants since in all cases the programs met all or some of their outcomes.

When the Committee voted to renew current grants in March 2017, renewal of two SEI grants (After-school and Child Abuse Prevention), and one NAYA grant (foster care) was conditioned on program performance in 2016-17. Grantees report data on service levels, participation, outcomes and staff turnover annually. Committee members wanted to review this data before deciding whether to continue these grants in 2018-19.

In addition, all the rest of the data on these grants looked fine. They are serving the amount of people we would expect. There are no other performance concerns.

Kafoury: Are you recommending further monitoring?

Pellegrino: Yes. All of the service monitoring will continue quarterly. The SEI after school program was a data collection issue. I have checked in with them and they indicate that the system is set up correctly.

Public Testimony: None

Stoudamire-Wesley: Is the goal that all of the program goals should be met?

Pellegrino: The outcomes are only reported annually. So we will get that information to you when it is available.

Saltzman: It sounds like we are ready to vote to continue these contracts.

Hornecker: So moved.

Stoudamire-Wesley: Second

Vote: All in Favor

Public Involvement and Planning for the Next Levy

Lisa Hansell:

To frame this discussion

- I'd like to start with a brief overview of public involvement,
- then I'll recap the October 2nd discussion on this topic,
- move on to describing additional information gathered since the October meeting,
- share staff recommendations
- and then open it up for discussion.

Overview of Public Involvement

Public involvement is a process in which members of the public who are most impacted by planned government action participate in the decision-making about it.

The City believes that government works best when it partners with the community. Effective public involvement is essential to achieve and sustain this partnership.

Some of the benefits of public involvement include:

- decisions respond to the needs and priorities of the community
- provides opportunity for community members to be part of the solution
- community members feel heard and valued
- Increases public understanding of and support for public policies and programs.
- Builds trust and increases accountability of government actions

I've reviewed these principles to assure there is a shared understanding of what public involvement is and why it is important.

At the October 2nd meeting, we shared with you the goals of the Levy's 2013 public involvement plan. Since not everyone was able to attend that meeting, I'll review them now:

- Promote community understanding of Portland Children's Levy funding process, services funded and demographics of children and families served.
- Understand perspectives from diverse stakeholders about the most effective and most needed services for children, especially children most affected by historical inequities.
- Cultivate positive relationships with traditionally marginalized populations.

With those goals in mind, we sought input on the following topics:

- Overall goals for Levy funding, division of levy funds among program areas, and policy goals/recommendations for funding areas
- Needs/Gaps (i.e. in services, for populations or geography, in service coordination)

- Equity issues
- Request For Investment issues (i.e. questions asked/information sought)
- Evaluation/feedback on community input process

In addition to providing information about the goals of the last public involvement process, staff:

- provided background on how public involvement was done in 2013,
- the major themes of the public input received,
- and feedback on the 2013 funding process used.

The 2013 public involvement process was developed and implemented entirely by PCL staff.

- Received lots of information from service providers and stakeholder groups,
- Engagement and responses from community members was limited.
- Some Allocation Committee members and other stakeholders expressed concern about the missing voices
- In response to that feedback, staff recommended the Committee consider contracting with a consultant to lead the next public involvement process.

Additional Information Gathered since the October 2nd Meeting

Per your direction at the October meeting, Levy staff consulted with

- a variety of government entities regarding public involvement projects that were completed in partnership with consultants.
- We reviewed the purpose of each project, the scope of work completed by contractors, timelines and costs.
- A summary of those public involvement projects was provided to each of the Allocation Committee members last week.
- Those projects included City projects through Mt Hood Cable Regulatory Commission; Portland Housing Bureau; Portland Parks & Recreation. We looked at one Multnomah County project through the Health Department. We looked at Metro and the Oakland Fund for Children and Youth, which is similar to the Portland Children's Levy. These projects all had similar purposes to what we are proposing.

Staff Recommendations

After consulting with representatives from the other government entities, staff continues to recommend the Levy engage a consultant to lead the design and implementation of the upcoming public involvement process.

There are three primary reasons for this recommendation:

- To reach and engage youth, parents, and community advocates from diverse communities, we need to work through entities that have established relationships in these communities.
- A contractor can provide expertise and additional capacity to implement more time-intensive community engagement activities like focus groups and interviews.
- A consultant brings neutrality which may result in more direct and honest feedback.

If the Committee chooses to engage the services of a contractor, staff recommends starting the Request for Proposal process now so work can begin as soon as possible after election results are known.

Staff recommends the Committee allocate up to \$100,000 for the services of a public involvement consultant (including any sub-consultants). Staff estimates the public involvement process will take 4-6 months.

Hornecker: I am in favor of this. Thanks to staff for doing a thorough job. I think it is an opportunity to think more broadly. I would like to see public and grantee comment on at least 3 specific areas.

- I would like to engage in a broader deep discussion on grantee staff turnover. It is a problem that plagues social services. There may be things we can do to help, as shown by our investment in child abuse prevention.
- As I look at our after school and mentoring programs and the graduation rates that are extremely underwhelming when compared to all PPS, which are also poor. I wonder if our grantees and the public would have any ideas that would work toward bringing up the graduation rates.
- We are having 2 out of every 10 of our goals not met. So, I would like to see a discussion of that topic to understand whether that number is good, bad or indifferent.
- Finally, this is an opportunity for the public and grantees to provide feedback on us and on staff. So, I would like to be able to utilize an outside group to include those topics, even if it means spending a little more money. I think it would be worth it to try to improve our outcomes.

Saltzman: I wonder if this is the same type of consultant to explore all of these questions.

Hornecker: I think so. The questions seem broad enough to include these topics. I do not have any baseline to know what \$100,000 will buy. I think it would be worth spending a bit more to get familiar with our existing programs, to get more information back from the consultant. It would be a valuable use of our resources.

Saltzman: I am not sure what the consulting market looks like in terms of public involvement. I know we need an estimate for the request for proposal. I do not want consultants to pass us by because we are not offering enough funds.

Stoudamire-Wesley: Could we increase the amount available to \$150,000 to \$200,000 to include all that Mitch has mentioned. I would like us to increase our accountability and be good stewards.

Pellegrino: We would include a not to exceed amount and would require detailed budgets to insure value for money. There is incentive for consultants to propose a good deal and to be sure to get all the work done using a robust set of methods. The other key piece is having relationships in communities. There is a likelihood of subcontractors needed. We do not see this process as including the feedback on the Allocation Committee process, so much as a focus on what are the needs in the various communities.

Kafoury: Multnomah County hired consultants and subcontractors to do the time intensive processes like focus groups and trusted community members. It was really effective and was a community building exercise. Everyone I heard from felt really good about the process. We spent \$200,000 a year. We may want to say \$150,000 for this project.

Young: I stand in favor of being willing to budget the amount needed to get a good product. From the information we were given, \$100,000 - \$150,000 is likely a good amount. I am very much in favor of using an outside consultant. I think it could yield great results.

Public Comment

Joseph Tietz from **Pathfinders of Oregon** spoke in support of engaging a consultant to provide these services.

Saltzman: I am comfortable going up to \$150,000.

Pellegrino: You can extend the ceiling, but are not committed to spending the full amount.

Kafoury: Use of subcontractors would increase the amount.

Pellegrino: **The proposal is for staff to issue a request for proposal to engage an outside consultant to design a process for gathering community input.**

Hornecker: Could we see the draft of the request for proposal.

Pellegrino: Yes, we will provide that to you.

Young: So moved.

Stoudamire-Wesley: To include Mitch's recommendations. Second.

Vote: All in favor.

Saltzman: That concludes our business for today. We do not have our next meeting scheduled yet. It will be posted.

Adjourned 2:25 pm