

**Portland Children's Levy  
Allocation Committee Meeting Minutes  
March 18, 2019 3:00 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](http://www.portlandchildrenslevy.org)  
or YouTube at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4G-kpCd1Szs>*

**Attending:** Mitch Hornecker, Jessica Vega Pederson, Ted Wheeler (Chair), Julie S. Young; absent Felicia Tripp-Folsom,

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

**Approval of minutes from February 4, 2019 meeting**

**Vega Pederson:** So, moved

**Young:** Second

**Vote:** All in favor

**Public Comment**

None

**Review of Annual Compliance Audit of the Children's Levy**

**Kelly:** The independent accounting firm **Merina & Company** submitted their final audit report on March 6, 2019. They reviewed our performance for last year fiscal year, July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2018. The report was distributed to the Allocation Committee and will be available on our website after this meeting. The full methods and results are available in that document.

In general, the auditors review our processes – how are we supposed to be doing things - and then look at a sample of transactions in detail to see if we followed our procedures. They also confirm our compliance with authorizing legislation, including spending no more than 5% of fund revenues to administer the fund. They review grant expenditures for compliance with authorizing legislation and Allocation Committee and Portland City Council approvals. They review our administrative expenditures, which include: all Levy staff salaries and benefits; payments to outside vendors for goods and services, including office lease, office supplies, website maintenance, advertising, and similar costs; payments to other City of Portland offices for general fund overhead, printing and copying, technology services, insurance and similar costs.

The audit report was all good news. They found us to be complying in all areas and have no findings or recommendations of changes. Significantly, the auditors confirmed that our spending on administering the fund is below the 5% cap in the ballot measure.

**Wheeler:** Thank you John for your work.

**Grant Renewal**

**Pellegrino:** We are hoping you might vote after each program area.

**McElroy:** I am going to remind you of the process we go through to prepare for renewal decisions. Annual grantee reports are compared to grant obligations and goals, for example, number of kids to serve, number of service activities to offer. Levy staff calculates performance on major metrics for program area and average it over 4 years: early exit, meeting participation goal (staying in to measure/achieve outcome), outcome goals meet, staff turnover. We compare individual grantee to average range of performance in program area over 4 years. We review factors influencing the metrics. Staff take all these factors into account when making recommendations.

Levy staff prepare program summaries; these are sent to grantees for their review and they can include comments. The Allocation Committee receives all that information in binders in advance of this meeting.

Now is not a time to ask for additional funding so renewal amounts calculated using the FY 18/19 grant budget, minus any carryover, plus a 3.9% COLA. The COLA level was based on the COLA level set by the City of Portland in its budget development process.

We will take each Program Area one at a time.

- Staff will give recommendations by program area
- The Allocation Committee can ask questions of staff
- Grantees will be offered time to testify if want, not expected, especially if you agree with staff recommendation.
- After testimony, Allocation Committee will discuss and vote; then, move on to next program area.
- For program areas with recommendations to end a grant or conditional renewal, we recommend you vote on those grants individually and rest of grants as group

**Wheeler:** In the interest of time, if you agree with staff recommendation, we do not need to hear testimony. If you would like to change staff recommendation, you are welcome to testify.

McElroy: The first recommendation is to renew the Child Care Initiative.

#### **Staff recommends an additional year renewal of the Child Care Initiative**

- We will return in fall to consider its funding for remaining Levy term.
- families with financial assistance for childcare, families enrolling in future and have young children want to know whether they'll have that help in future to keep their children in care.
- By fall will have annual report to review performance, plus state legislature decide other funding issues may impact CCI.

**Young:** I understand the state is overhauling its SPARQ quality framework. Can you give us a timetable on that process?

**McElroy:** I cannot give you the timeline now. There have been shifts and it is likely to hinge on decisions of the Oregon legislature in the near future.

**Hornecker: motion to approve staff recommendation**

**Vega Pederson: Second**

**Vote: All in favor.**

**Wheeler: The recommendation is adopted.**

***Approved grants, including grantee agency, program name and one-year funding amount appear in a document appended to these minutes.***

#### Early Childhood Grants

**McElroy:**

- We recommend renewing 14 grants.
- One grantee opted not to seek renewal.

**Young:** I have a concern related to center-based pre-K programs. I am certainly in favor of renewing all of those. It has to do with attendance data, which is discouraging. What do you think is a good target for these programs?

**McElroy:** I do not think there is yet good research to guide us on that issue. Young children tend to be absent far more than school age children. Most of the data in the field is for school age children. There is some research that suggests we should lower the threshold to 80 to 85%. I am still struggling with that issue as well. There is no clear guidance from the federal level, for Head Start, for example.

The other issue is the lack of transportation being provided by any of the programs in our portfolio. That may influence as well.

**Wheeler:** What do you see as best practice regarding staff turnover?

**McElroy:** It is hard to come to any real conclusions on that topic in this sector. Turnover is influenced by many factors, which make it difficult to see trends. There is very little research on this topic.

**Wheeler:** I see we have a number of programs with particularly low turnover.

**McElroy:** I agree and can see that those programs are doing many things to be places where people feel valued. Without research, it is difficult to draw any conclusions from those successful programs.

**Staff recommendation is to renew 14 grants in the Early Childhood Program Area.**

**Public Comment:** None

**Vega Pederson: motion to approve staff recommendation**

**Young: Second**

**Vote: All in favor.**

**Wheeler: The recommendations are adopted.**

#### Mentoring Grant Renewal

**McElroy:** Staff recommends renewing 6 mentoring grants.

**Wheeler:** I was surprised that College Possible had low levels of participation. Why do you think that is?

**McElroy:** The program described last year as a significant anomaly. The coaches who work with the students are AmeriCorps members. Both of the coaches who were in the program have left the program. New staff have been hired and participation has significantly increased as of the mid-year report.

**Wheeler:** Do we know how many college counselors are at David Douglas High School? The number 2 rings a bell for me.

**McElroy:** I do not know off hand. College Possible staff who are here may know.

*College Possible staff stood and indicated they did not know that information.*

**Wheeler:** I have the idea that it is a low number and that a program like College Possible could really be helpful at that school.

**Staff recommendation is to renew 6 grants in the Mentoring Program Area.**

**Public Comment:** None

**Young: motion to approve staff recommendation**

**Vega Pederson: Second**

**Vote: All in favor.**

**Wheeler: The recommendations are adopted.**

Foster Care Grant Renewal

**Hansell:** Staff recommends all 8 grants in this area be renewed. The amount of the SEI Foster Care Grant will be conditional upon the number of youth in foster care enrolled in the program at June 30, 2019.

The SEI grant amount is conditioned on the number of youth enrolled in the program at June 30, 2019. If 40 or more youth are enrolled, the grant amount will be \$259,965. If fewer than 40 youth are enrolled, the grant amount will be prorated. For example, if 20 youth are enrolled at that time, then the grant would be 50% of that amount, as 20 is 50% of 40.

**Wheeler:** Can you help us understand the relationship between service goals and outcome goals for these grants.

**Hansell:** Service goals related to the number of participants and the service activities. For example, number of home visits or classes. Outcome goals are negotiated for each grant. What percentage of participants who received the minimum dosage of the program will achieve the outcome.

**Wheeler:** it sounds like service goals are gross numbers. Outcomes are how you did with those who participated. You could see a situation where you have concerns about service goals and have good outcomes, what lessons could you draw from that?

**Hansell:** All of the metrics are important to us. The case you mention points to expensive service.

Pellegrino: It is important that there be a balance of the two metrics.

**Wheeler:** Is there a way to put this in terms of ROI?

**Pellegrino:** You would love to have an ROI. It is difficult here because we fund so many interventions.

**Wheeler:** Impact NW and SEI Foster Care, both great organizations, both are low on service goals, but good on outcome goals. How do we weigh those two metrics?

**Hansell:** Impact NW have current concerns, but the first two years of the Levy there were not concerns. Staffing issues were the cause. They have a plan and are making progress, which is why they were still recommended for renewal.

Those concerns are the reason for the conditional funding amount for SEI. They have been struggling with meeting the number of youths they are contracted to serve. They are working closely with DHS and I am hopeful they will be able to reach their target of 40 youth by the end of the year. We are monitoring this situation very closely.

**Vega Pederson:** Looking at the number of children served compared to the annual budget. How do you evaluate that ratio, and the value of the dollars?

**Hansell:** Those decisions are made at the grant award time, considering what has been proposed in the application. Ultimately, the Allocation Committee decides how much to award. Staff negotiates service goals directly with the grantee.

There are many types of services with varying intensity, which affect that ratio.

**Vega Pederson:** It sounds like it is done on an individual program level.

**Pellegrino:** Different models require varying degrees of intensity.

**Staff recommendation is to renew 8 grants in the Foster Care Program Area. The amount of the SEI Foster Care grant will be conditional upon the number of youth enrolled in the program as of June 30, 2019.**

**Public Comment:** None

**Young: motion to approve staff recommendation**

**Vega Pederson: Second**

**Vote: All in favor.**

*Hornecker abstained from voting on the New Avenues for Youth grant.*

**Wheeler: The recommendations are adopted.**

Child Abuse Prevention and Intervention Grant Renewals

**Hansell:** In this area staff recommends 13 grants be renewed. Staff recommends that two grants not be renewed.

The two grants not recommended for renewal are Bradley Angle Healing Roots Family Advocacy Project and Metropolitan Family Service Nurturing Parenting Program. For these programs, staff has had concerns about delivering the intended number of home visits. Grantee responses to staff concerns were provided to the Allocation Committee.

**Wheeler:** I propose we consider the grants recommended for funding first.

**Young:** I have a question regarding the relief nurseries. Both are recommended for renewal. Your notes indicate that one of them was challenged to achieve service goals in part because of the tool being used. The other grantee did not have that same concern. I was curious whether they used different tools.

**Hansell:** They use the same tool as required by the Oregon Relief Nursery Association. My impression is that the tool is subjective. Maybe someone is here who could speak to that issue.

**Young:** Yes, I would be interested in hearing from the VOA Family Relief Nursery.

*An audience member from the VOA indicated that they would need to follow up.*

Public Comment: None

**Hornecker: motion to approve staff recommendation**

**Vega Pederson: Second**

**Vote: All in favor.**

**Wheeler: The recommendations are adopted.**

**Wheeler:** Now we can take up the Bradley Angle program.

**Young:** The information from staff is very concerning regarding the infrastructure support not being there to support the success of the program. Can you say more about that Lisa?

**Hansell:** Bradley Angle has had a change of leadership, being without an executive director for 2 years, only interims. Other program staff have turned over as well. It is a very small program that we fund. All of those issues lead to the service goals not being met. The ongoing concerns lead to the recommendation not to renew.

**Rebecca Nichols,** Interim Executive Director of **Bradley Angle House** testified. This program supports Black and African American persons who have experienced domestic violence. This is a culturally specific and culturally responsive program. It is the only program of its kind currently funded by the Portland Children's Levy. The survivor's choices define the strategy of the program. Our job is to offer options and recommendations of services.

We are on track to serve the number of families we are expected to serve with PCL funding. We are committed to meet the service goals in this grant. We ask that you renew the funding of this program.

**Vega Pederson:** Staff indicated the lack of infrastructure support. How do you address that concern?

**Nichols:** I am providing the support that had been provided by our deputy director, who left in January. I have been with the organization since the end of November. After meeting with Lisa, we have spent time looking at the home visits. Our advocate will have an increase in hours with a 100% focus on direct service delivery. The dedication to home visiting will be the top priority.

**Hornecker:** Where do you expect to end up at the end of the year?

**Nichols:** We will not meet the goal of 470 visits, but we will be aiming to provide 8 visits per week.

**Young:** Bradley Angle notes that the home visiting model may not be the best model for the families to be served.

**Nichols:** We are prioritizing that service within the options provided to survivors.

**Young:** I appreciate that you have a model that centers on the people you serve. What other methods do you have of working with people.

**Nichols:** We meet participants in many sites; they just may not be happening in the home.

**Young:** Is there the possibility of changing how the services are provided?

**Hansell:** A home visit can be in settings other than homes. It would be up to the Allocation Committee to decide to change the model. You would need to give me the authority to negotiate a new program model.

**Young:** I understand there is some complexity in that type of arrangement.

**Vega Pederson:** Can you clarify the demographics of persons served by this program.

**Hansell:** In the first years of the program, the demographic data included their full program, which included a part not focused on African Americans. Over the past 2 years, focusing only on the PCL program, the average is 65% African American in full or part, participants.

**Young:** This fiscal year the number is 100% families who identified in full or in part as African American.

**Wheeler:** Staff indicated concerns about the data and the financial reporting in this grant. Can you clarify what those concerns are?

**Hansell:** I met with Bradley Angle staff and there was not a lot of confidence in terms of the participation data. Tracking methods were unclear due to staff turnover. The financial concerns were related to 40% of staff budget being spent, but only 28% of home visits having been completed. There was talk of the staff person supporting and working with other programs within Bradley Angle. This contradicted information in the mid-year report. Rebecca has indicated that she is looking into the time spent on the PCL project.

**Nichols:** Our program coordinator had been doing other work that is not in the contract with PCL. I will be verifying that we are only charging PCL for time spent on this project.

**Hansell:** I do not think anyone is doing anything intentional. I think the turnover and transition in the organization has been the problem.

**Young:** What is the stability of the organization in the next six months?

**Nichols:** within the program, we plan to increase the hours of the advocate to focus on the program. There is an active executive director search. We hope to have someone hired in the near future. I will be staying on as deputy director to help bring on the new ED.

**Wheeler:** I am very conflicted on this. I am cheering for you. The organization is lucky to have you. Bradley Angle has done great work in this community historically.

**Hornecker: Motion to accept the staff recommendation to discontinue funding of Bradley Angle house as of July 1, 2019.**

**Vega Pederson: Second**

**Vote: All in favor.**

**Wheeler: Staff recommendation carries.**

**Wheeler:** Now we can take up the Metropolitan Family Service program.

**Amy Corbett**, Chief Program Officer at **Metropolitan Family Service**; **Maria Perdomo**, Senior Manager for early learning and parenting education at MFS; **Laura Heller**, senior manager of the parent coaching service at MFS addressed the committee.

**Corbett:** We respectfully request that you reconsider funding the MFS Nurturing Parenting Program for the following year. MFS has met all goals outlined in the funded proposal we submitted. After our proposal was accepted, we learned that PCL had service goals around home visiting. MFS has exceeded the number of parents served for the last 4 years and are on track to meet that number this year. WE have done this despite some staff turnover. We have also served a larger number of children from east county than any other program. 87.5% of parents we have served have completed at least 12 coaching sessions, and in the past 3 years have demonstrated significant improvement in nurturing, attachment and parental empathy. MFS has stable, highly qualified staff in place, including certified parent educators with expertise in this area. MFS has not met home visiting goals because of the high degree of trauma and distress experienced by the families in the program. Connecting families to other services have been powerful tools to achieving outcomes. Families' needs are often met through other programs in addition to the home visiting and coaching. Our qualitative evaluations are very positive. WE have met all or most of our enrollment goals and all or most of our outcome goals. We have a commitment to increasing our caseloads next year.

**Perdomo:** In my experience, families with stress with trauma are hard to engage in the beginning. Home visiting is a new concept for some of our families. We need to be flexible around how to support the families. Families often cancel appointments for home visits. Sometimes phone calls are used instead. We are flexible, persistent and committed to serving the families as they need.

**Heller:** Summarizing a letter from a parent in the program about the benefits of the MFS program. Parent coaching was provided by phone when home visits were cancelled. These calls do not count as home visits. The parent indicated that the program has been very helpful for the family.

**Young:** I know this challenging work. We see this across child abuse prevention and intervention. This is a part of the work. I am wondering whether the home visiting model is working for those families.

**Corbett:** I do not think it is the wrong model. I think 8 visits per week per FTE is challenging. Our coaches are still working when folks cancel appointments. We are getting the outcomes and serving more than we were contracted to serve. We had a high rate of completion. We are getting good outcomes. We are trying to meet parents where they are. It is very challenging. We also had some staff turnover as well.

**Heller:** When we have had turnover, no family has been left in a lurch. We have been able to cover. WE have always offered services in the transition.

**Vega Pederson:** There has been an issue with referrals. Is that ongoing?

**Heller:** It has been a challenge. Our parent coaches have full caseloads. We are keeping the outreach going. It can take time to build trust after a referral.

Vega Pederson: I have a question for staff. Is it correct that the home visit service goal has not been met?

Hansell: That is correct.

**Wheeler: I move that we accept the staff recommendation to discontinue funding to the Metropolitan Family Service Nurturing Parenting program as of July 1, 2019.**

**Hornecker: Second.**

**Vote:**

**In favor: Hornecker, Vega Pederson, Wheeler**

**Opposed: Young**

**Wheeler: the motion passes.**

#### After-School Grant Renewal

**Pellegrino:** Staff recommends renewing 21 after school grants without condition.

**Staff recommendation is to renew 21 grants in the After-School Program Area.**

**Hornecker:** Glad to see second step doing well. That looks promising.

**Public Comment:** None

**Vega POederson: motion to approve staff recommendation**

**Young: Second**

**Vote: All in favor.**

**Wheeler: The recommendations are adopted.**

**Pellegrino:** There are two grants up for conditional renewal – **Human Solutions** and **Pathfinders**.

The first is **Human Solutions**. I recommend we renew the grant if they are successful in getting a permanent site for the shelter as of July 1, 2019. In winter 2018, the program lost its site. The County is in the process of finding a new site for the program.

**Wheeler:** Do they have to have the space by July 1?

**Pellegrino:** That would be ideal. It is difficult to run the program if it goes much beyond that date. It is important to have the program history. You could make the grant dependent on them signing a lease. They do run summer programming.

**Vega Pederson:** Things are moving forward in terms of the program finding a home.

**Young:** I am in favor of supporting the program.

**Wheeler:** I feel the same. I want to see this program succeed. I am not sure I want to hold them to a deadline of July 1. So long as they are negotiating in good faith. We can check in on the progress at future meetings. I am fine with the recommendation. I would be very reluctant.

I am fine with the staff recommendation seeing that we have opportunities to get updates on this program.

**Public Comment: None**

**Wheeler: I move that we accept the staff recommendation on the conditional funding of the Human Solutions program.**

**Young: Second**

**Vote: All in favor.**

**Wheeler: The motion carries.**

**Pellegrino:** The program at **Pathfinders** was funded in 2017. It had very slow startup due to staff turnover. Very few people were served in the first year. They are on track to meet their goals in the second year. I recommend you renew the grant with the condition that they meet the deliverables for the current school year. They would need to meet their service goals.

**Hornecker:** I would like to leave discretion to staff to allow us flexibility if the program is very close to its service goals.

**Public Comment: none**

**Hornecker: I move we accept the staff recommendation on the conditional funding of the Pathfinders after school program.**

**Vega Pederson: Second.**

**Vote: All in favor.**

**Wheeler: The motion carries.**

Hunger Relief Grant Renewal

**Pellegrino:** Staff recommends renewing 5 hunger relief grants.

**Staff recommendation is to renew 5 grants in the Hunger Relief Program Area.**

**Public Comment:** None

**Vega Pederson: motion to approve staff recommendation**

**Hornecker: Second**

**Public Comment: none**

**Vote: All in favor.**

**Wheeler: The recommendations are adopted.**

Grantmaking Process Design

Pellegrino: There are 30 recommendations that were in the report from PSU. Staff has discussed the PSU report and recommendations for grantmaking process improvements with Committee members individually and provided a summary of those discussions to Committee members on March 6. Committee members' preferences and input were used to create the agenda for items to consider at the March 18 meeting, and to stage consideration of other recommendations in the PSU report.

We would like you to consider these recommendations first:

- **Small Grants:** Create a small grants fund to increase access to Levy funding for smaller organizations; support capacity building at these organizations.
- **Two-Step Process:** Consider a 2-step funding process to provide feedback on proposals before preparation of a longer application, and/or to eliminate a subset of applicants at an earlier stage to allow for more in-depth engagement of a smaller subset of applicants at the final application stage.
- **Additional Advisory Group:** Consider establishing a sub-committee(s) or advisory group to increase community voice and representation in the Committee's work.
- **Appeals:** Consider implementing an appeal process for unsuccessful applicants.

These all require additional staffing or extra time in the process, so we feel the need to consider these first.

**Based on input from Committee members, staff recommends that the Committee consider moving forward on a small grants fund and reject the remaining recommendations.**

Reasons to pursue a small grants fund include: improve equity of access to Levy funding for smaller organizations that cannot successfully compete for larger Levy grants, fund organizations arising out of communities that

reflect the communities they serve, reach children/families who may not be served by organizations typically funded by the Levy, and build capacity in small and emerging organizations to improve data collection and reporting so that they can compete for larger PCL grants in the future.

Committee members expressed reservations in pursuing this recommendation due to requirements that the Levy fund proven programs, the appropriate role for the Levy and the level of data collection and reporting required by funded programs. If Committee members are interested in exploring starting a small grants fund further in spite of these reservations, staff proposes coming back to the Committee at the April meeting with a proposal that includes some basic parameters for such a fund and addresses these concerns.

Staff recommends against pursuing a two-step proposal process in the next funding round due to experience with the pilot two-step process in 2017, it does not seem likely to truly lower access barriers for smaller organizations to receive Levy funding, and it seems unlikely to lower the number of full applications to a level that would allow more personal engagement between Committee members and applicants.

If the applicant pool cannot be substantially reduced after the LOI stage, workload for applicants, staff and Committee is not reduced, and it's unlikely that there would be any more time for engagement with individual applicants in the review and decision-making process than there is in a one-step process.

Staff recommends against pursuing an additional advisory committee for several reasons. If the point of such a group is to increase community voice and representation in the Committee's work/decision making, it may be easier to do so by addressing how the application review process is conducted, and how testimony is given/received.

Creating an additional advisory group or subcommittee(s) would require clarifying role and purpose of the group, recruiting members through the City process for advisory boards, and bringing the group up to speed on the Levy and its funding process so that it could advise the Committee and/or carry out any other assigned activities. Substantial training and support, including relationship-building among subcommittee members, would be needed for people to meaningfully participate. Additional staffing would be required to carry out this work. This work would need to begin as soon as possible so that the group(s) would be prepared to advise and contribute in the upcoming funding process. In staff's opinion, there isn't enough time to complete these steps while also designing and running the funding process.

Staff recommends against creating an appeal process because unlike the funding processes in the Oakland and San Francisco children's levies, referenced in PSU's recommendations, the PCL process includes a chance for applicants to offer testimony, and funding decisions are made at public meetings. Oakland and San Francisco use typical government RFP processes in which decisions are made solely on written submissions with no public testimony or public decision-making. Allowing for appeals would require that funding be set aside at the beginning of the process to assure funds were available for any appeal that merited funding. It would also require additional time be set aside at the end of the process before final recommendations can proceed to City Council which means time has to be cut from some other part of the process. We do not see the added value of an appeals process.

**Wheeler:** The two-step process and additional advisory committees are both appeals to get broader voices and perspectives at this table. I think there are ways to do that without creating an entire bureaucracy or parallel process. In the City budget process, the Equity Officer is at the table to comment on every single proposal with an equity perspective. We are also increasingly interested in youth voices; there are ways to bring those voices to the table. I am mindful of time constraints and limitations on staff time.

I appreciate the work of PSU, but there may be other ways to get those voices to the table.

We already have an appeals process. Applicants can make the case to staff and the Committee. I am not sure what more we could do short of handing it to another committee.

I like the small grants fund. I was initially cold on it. I am a huge fan of scale. The levy is meant to make a big impact. However, the increasing importance of culturally specific services, I am interested to learn more.

Do you have a set of parameters for a small grants fund yet?

**Pellegrino:** That is what we want to come back to you with. We want to know if you are interested enough for the staff to create an outline of what a small grants fund might look like.

**Vega Pederson:** There would be the same parameters in terms of program areas?

**Pellegrino:** Yes. We must consider the law in the design of the process.

**Hornecker:** I agree we need to be sure that it can be done within the parameters of our charge.

**McElroy:** The decision point is whether you want us to spend the next month putting something together for you to consider.

**Young:** I am lukewarm on the idea of small grants. I take seriously the recommendations of PSU. This would be the time to do it. I support the staff bringing back some ideas.

**Vega Pederson:** I am interested in the small grants fund. It seems like a good way to get at some of the recommendations of the PSU report. Having learned about the history of the 2-step process, I agree that we can set that aside. I agree that the appeals process is not needed. We are making budget decisions; you don't really have an appeal process in budgeting.

Public Comment:

**Susy Kristin**, Executive Director of the Linton Community Center. We are a small community child care center, with programs for preschool and after-school. We have experience with low-income parents. We do not turn away any child who cannot pay. We would be interested to apply for a small grant. We have experience with youth who have dropped out of school. We have been working for 10 years with young people. We have grown gradually and do need.

**Pat Wagner** from the Linton Community Center. We would like to support the small grants fund. The Linton Community Center serves the outer northwest region of Portland. This is an underserved area. It has a big variety of communities. It is quite diverse. We serve many of the working poor for preschool and childcare. We used to be a Head Start, but that was moved to the Pearl. About a quarter of our parents pay nothing for our services. We offer full day preschool and childcare. We hope you will consider the small grants.

**Vega Pederson:** I move that we direct staff to investigate the small grants fund proposal.

**Young:** Second

**Vote:** all in favor.

**Wheeler:** The motion carries.

**Wheeler: I move that, for now, we do not move forward on the two-step process, the additional advisory group, or the appeals process.**

**Hornecker: Second.**

**Vote: All in favor.**

**Wheeler: The motion passes.**

**We all want to thank Portland State University for its report.**

**April 8, 2019 Allocation Committee meeting preview**

**McElroy:** You will hear from the community engagement process team. Kheoshi Owens, the principal of Empress Rules will present their report.

We will likely be coming back to you with other recommendations that came from the PSU report. Staff have grouped them into 4 areas:

- Proposed revisions to the request for investment document, particularly around racial equity
- The application review process
- The testimony process
- The Allocation Committee decision-making process

Over the next 3 or 4 meetings, we hope that you will decide how to make the funding decisions as well as what to fund, based on the community engagement process.

*Video of Listos para Aprender program from Morrison Child and Family Services was shown.*

**Wheeler:** Thank you.

We will meet again on Monday, April 8 from 2 to 4 pm. Agendas will be posted on the Children's Levy website and distributed to the Children's Levy contact list via email.

Adjourned 5:00 pm

*Appendix – Children's Levy FY20 Grant Renewal Amounts Approved by PCL Allocation Committee.pdf*