Portland Children's Levy
Allocation Committee Meeting Minutes
June 17, 2019 2:00 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 or YouTube at:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=578WFMNhxEk

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 June 3, 2019 meeting

Approved with no objection

Public Comment

None

Program Area Strategies

Meg McElroy: So, I want to kind of take a step back and reflect on how quickly things have moved and how much work has taken place in a short period of time. Also take us back a full year. We have been thinking about how to approach the upcoming round of grant making over the last year. Last summer staff compiled a document that outlined local data on needs of children in Portland and Multnomah county. Then we hired a community engagement consultant who did robust and nine-month-long process speaking with over 500 people in the community about their input around what and how the levy should be going about its business. We also hired a small team at PSU to talk to past applicants, both those who received funding and those who hasn't around ways to improve the grant making process. As staff, who have been doing this work for some time, we are bringing our experience and lessons learned and reflections on how research and studies in the fields that the Children's Levy funds have been evolving over the past several years. This back draft is how we approach the work that brings us to today.

The work that brings us to today includes three big decisions that you have before you to make. The first is adopting the strategies, funding strategies for each of the six program areas. We will talk about those, as the Wheeler said, shortly. And then the template for the request for investment document. That serves as people shorthand that to RFI. Others know it as an RFP. It is guidance and instructions for the grant applications that will be submitted.

You will also be talking about the review process, the process used to recruit volunteer reviewers to score the applications. That's part of the information you will use to make decisions next spring. Those are the three big decision points today. Also, we will review the timeline of the coming year and all of the steps that will occur to get us to providing grants by next spring.

Any questions on the content of today's meeting? If not, I will start with our strategies work.

Funding Strategy Changes

McElroy: So, you all have a draft of the final document that staff is proposing that outlines the funding strategies in each of the Levy's six program areas and our audience has that document, as well. There are a couple of minor changes that staff has made to the document. I will review those in a minute. There are a couple of clarifications and changes that you all requested. We have made those.

We solicited feedback from the community at large between the meeting you all had on May 13th until the 10th of June around these strategies, as well as the request for investment template, as well as the proposed review process. Over the period of four weeks, we had a short survey monkey with four open-ended questions that people could respond to anonymously. People were able to provide input by e-mail or come to the three meetings you have had the past few weeks and also provide testimony. We will talk a little bit about the feedback that came in via that four-week comment period.

In the strategies, the minor changes that have been made by staff are what we are calling the features. In a couple of the program areas. Each program has a set of funding strategies. In the document preceding those strategies, a bullet pointed list of what we are calling features for the program area. Those features again came from community engagement. They really outline priorities, the things we are most interested to see across the strategies in that program area. They are not necessarily requirements.

So, there's some clarification from feedback I will get to in a minute that raised questions about some of the features. I want to say up front the features are the highest priority items across strategies that came through community engagement for that particular program area.

The program areas of after-school and hunger relief, the first iteration of the strategies document didn't have focus populations listed in the features. Those have been added to the copy you have before you. The focus populations are informed by the local data work that staff did last summer. They are also the same priorities in those program areas that have been in place since 2014.

Then, for features in the child abuse prevention intervention area, staff removed one of the features that talked about programs exhibiting open communication between the program and family participants because we felt that was already covered in the feature about being a trauma-informed approach and using family voice in programming. So those are minor changes that staff made because they were oversights in our previous document.

As far as changes that you all requested, during your discussion at the May 13th meeting, you all asked it to be more clear what the goals of each program area are and the outcomes that are typically, commonly tracked by programs funded in those program areas. So, that was added to the document.

The foster care program area specifically, we were asked to consider revising strategy number one in the foster care program area to call out recruiting foster parents as part of that strategy. So, we have added that. That was also something that community engagement had called out. We are happy to add that.

Then finally, in the after-school program area, we revised the first strategy to include the word "intensive" which was requested at the previous meeting.

So those are all sort of smaller changes in general. There haven't been huge changes made to the document otherwise.

Public Feedback in Comment Period

McElroy: Now, I will review the public feedback that we received during the four-week comment period that we had. There were only seven people who weighed in with input around the strategies. Five of them anonymously through the short survey monkey that we had and two grantees. There weren't clear themes that came because there are so few responses that came in. So, we took time to paraphrase the responses that people provided and provide a response. They took the time to weigh in. We wanted them to see we heard their feedback and considered it.

Had there been many more responses we would have tried to theme it and get to higher-level issues that came out but we are taking the few we heard and responding. In some ways I guess I'm not surprised to think we didn't hear more feedback, only because we have done such a huge process to hear from the biggest stakeholders of the work that we do. So, we will do our best to respond to what we have heard so far.

So, one piece of feedback we received and it did influence how we characterized the rationale for a strategy and child abuse prevention and intervention and after-school program area had to do with how we talked about data related to children of color and their outcomes as a result of being involved in the child welfare system and the public education system. The way we characterized rationale for a strategy in each of those program areas implied that children of color were to blame for the outcomes of the system and perpetuates notions of racism in how we characterized that. We apologized for how we characterized that. We regret having made that implication and we removed that citation from rationale.

So, we made changes to the rationale in the two strategies the program areas

Felicia Tripp-Folsom tried to enter the meeting via cell phone, but technical difficulties resulted in her being unable to attend.

McElroy: As Felicia told us, she was most interested in participating in the conversation about the review process. We will see if we can make that happen.

So, I will keep going. The remaining feedback we received did not result in us proposing any changes to the strategies document. It was more issues for our consideration and we wanted to share that with you. So, we did summarize that for you and the audience has it here today. Some of the things people raised are thinking about the workforce supply concerns for programs and trying to find folks who are bilingual or multilingual in some of the languages we need to be serving in our community.

Another person raised concerns about the transportation costs if applicants are to be providing transportation directly, for example, in an after-school program that serves multiple sites, the costs of that are quite great; which means they would be asking for a lot of money and ultimately you would have policy considerations about spending money on transportation for a program versus funding numerous programs and serving more children. We would be supplying information to you about transportation that is proposed in applications.

Another individual raised considerations about our basic needs strategy and child abuse prevention, intervention and suggested it should be a strategy across all program areas. Our response to that was it came up particularly in the child abuse prevention, intervention program area community engagement feedback. And we focused that strategy around that.

Another individual raised concerns about the mentoring strategy and it calling out wanting to prioritize programs that feature paid staff as mentors, as opposed to volunteers. Again, staff felt that we're not requiring the applicants, only proposed programs with paid staff as mentors but prioritizing those because that's what came out of community engagement and community engagement prioritized attention to quality and training of mentors. In PCL's past experience, the ability for quality control around volunteer mentoring can sometimes be more difficult to make sure people attend the training they are being asked to in order to do mentoring and sticking with that relationship over time.

So, those were the big pieces of feedback around the strategies. Those were the proposed few changes that we had.

So, I'm going to open it up for questions from you all and then we have the opportunity for testimony from folks here. Then you all can decide how to proceed with the strategies and we will talk about the request for investment.

Public Comment

I am **Judy Strand** from **Metropolitan Family Service**. We did provide some feedback. We wanted to clarify it a little further. One of the concerns we have is finding a way to support our intergenerational mentoring program, Experience Corps. The after-school strategy is pretty much aligned with what we are doing. However, with older adults they many times do not prefer to work that late in the day. So, we would like to propose consideration of extending the time frame to be flexible to align with the school day if that is helpful to the mentors or tutors who are coming to the program, particularly for older adults who tend to want to work during the school day. We have just found that is powerful and does work, but we cannot get -- the numbers we will need to get the dosage to do after school with older adults. We have tried and failed. I want to say coming off the intergenerational global meeting last week in this community, if we want to bring these elders to our schools and keep them there in the six schools we will need flexibility in the way in which older adults like to work, which might be a little different than younger adults.

The second thing is there's some mention around the volunteerism. We equally are feeling that our mentors, especially those looking for supplemental income are happy to take the stipend that we offer to them and they consider that as a powerful economic resource for them. I don't know if we had adequate older adult input in the focus groups, but we wanted to bring those awarenesses forward, not just for our program but any programs that may want to bring older adults as a resource to the Children's Levy service categories.

My name is **Mei Ling Tirochi**. I am a retired elementary school principal. I got to know Experience Corps in 1995 when it was piloted at my school. I am concerned that the levy as it goes forward is really making a break between after-school programs and the school program. I want you to consider that as you go through. I think it is important to connect the school, its teachers, it's curriculum, all of its employment and value system to what's happening in the after-school program. That doesn't always happen. A lot of times the school is two places. There's after school and hours during school. 3:00 is the breaking point. I want you to remember that mentors in the schools, volunteers in the schools, paid or not paid, can build credibility and trust and acceptance and communication by being part of the school day, too, and the school community. So, they aren't two separate things. So often, it is them and us and it shouldn't be. It should be a partnership. That also allows us to respond culturally to the differences in language and to the credibility and trust that immigrants and people living in poverty need to begin to trust a school community for support.

Wheeler: Thank you.

My name is **Ruby Hatten-Pitz**. I'm a state director for **AARP in Oregon**. I had an opportunity to work with experience Corps which is an AARP program, partially funded through the AARP Foundation. I became a fan when the program was new coming to us and I have stayed a fan for a number of reasons. When AARP took over the experience corps program, I was an executive board council member for AARP here in Portland. I lived here before I moved back. I stayed with that when I moved away and came back to the state of Oregon. I'm sitting here now with Judy, still as a fan.

I want to make you aware of a couple of things. When I looked at the community engagement design that we were just going over, it closely mirrors Experience Corps with some flexibility that these two ladies have been talking about as it relates to time of day. Children need care all day long. It's not one time or another. They need it all day long. When a program is well implemented, like Experience Corps, the focus is for children to learn to read. We know what happens when children can't read and we need to be very direct when we say this. Our prisons are built at the fourth-grade reading levels. The reason why AARP chose this program, Experience Corps, is because it takes in to account what seniors can bring to a school and what children need in a school, learning how to read.

So, it does some things for seniors that I'm not sure we share very often. What it does is it helps those individuals combat loneliness. It also helps them with their overall health and well-being. When a child has an adult who cares, who's teaching them, whether it is the teacher, the parent or a volunteer, they begin to thrive. Sometimes what we miss out on is that our seniors thrive and our children thrive. The systems for which we are trying to keep people out of do so much better. My reason for being here is I wanted to make sure that you knew that AARP has a number of things that we do across the country in order to support these programs. Let me highlight a few.

We are hoping to identify individuals, but especially people of color who are culturally relevant, focused and trauma focused as well which fits into what you are trying to do here. We are partnering with intergenerational organizations and we have come before Ted Wheeler and talked about those, as well in our H-friendly initiative. We are also encouraging continued funding volunteers are receiving a small stipend. They can show up when they are supposed to get there and home safely. That ties in to the transportation offered in the city. We are encouraging that EC staff reflect the populations of people served. AARP is doing these things have so we can combat loneliness in seniors and keep children from entering our penal system where they can do us no good as we age. Thank you for giving me a chance to share with you and to let you know that AARP is always ready to serve. Thank you very much.

Wheeler: Could I ask a couple of questions here? Obviously Experience Corps has been around for a while. It has had successful outcomes and I would be concerned if we did something that would unintentionally derail that success. I want to say that first and foremost. I strongly support the nexus between serving both the youth, who want, as you say, to have a caring adult in their lives, somebody who works with them and brings experience to the table and has a benefit for older adults, as well. We should look for those nexus opportunities as much as possible. Regarding the policy we are about to vote for, number one, what would be the implication of not altering the policy, as it is currently drafted, and number two, what is it you are specifically asking us to amend in this policy?

Strand: The after-school strategy is the one that best fits with the work that Experience Corps is doing in terms of the focus. All of the criteria in terms of the services delivered, the focus on social, emotional all of those things would work for us. What doesn't work is if we have to provide the services just in the after-school space. We are asking for could we expand it to include school day as long as we are aligned with those principles, not just after school. Our mentors don't fit into the mentoring category because they are academically focused around reading. That's the problem.

Wheeler: I'm just thinking out loud. I'm not suggesting a particular policy, literally thinking out loud which for me is a dangerous thing always. If we made that exception in the case where it is difficult otherwise for mentors to be available -- what do you all think about that?

Is that one potential strategy?

Hatten-Pitz: I think so. I think the funding of Experience Corps, and to be more direct, if this funding goes away, we will lose some schools. We don't want to lose schools in this program. We'd rather add schools for children who need reading tutors. I don't want us to lose any schools.

Young: First of all, I think we are going back and forth between a couple of terms, one is mentoring and the other is tutoring. It is my understanding that what experience corps does is more tutoring than mentoring.

Strand: It is. We have historically called it mentoring in the model but in Children's Levy definition it is tutoring.

Young: The other thing is I wasn't here when children's levy -- I voted on it the first time but I wasn't sitting here. I'm not sure the term, after-school, how it was defined. I don't know anywhere does it say -- and maybe Lisa will jump in.

McElroy: I wish Lisa was here and she would have the more legal response to this. It is something I would want to check not only with LIsa but with the City Attorney's Office because the original definition had to do with how the state of Oregon school funding option levies can and can't be used. I think the definition of after-school and summer programming was intentional in order to be in compliance with regulations around how much additional taxation can occur for use of money during the school day. I don't think we have the option to amend the after-school policy to include programming during the school day. My staff advice would be that the mentoring strategy as it is conceived now -- while I appreciate Judy's point of it doesn't call out tutoring, it is really talking about mentoring. I believe what you are describing wanting to do would be a better fit in that program area than it would be in the after-school program area because I don't see us being able to amend how after-school is being defined. I'd want to check with the City Attorney's Office before we issued a final decision.

Strand: I guess we would have to look more closely at the fact we would have volunteers, not paid mentors with Experience Corps if that is an issue or not.

McElroy: There is nothing in the mentoring strategy that precludes anyone from proposing a paid or volunteer mentoring program. Just what the priorities were. That's all.

Strand: I think the definition of paid mentor, again, that's a term that is attached to the program. It's a stipend so that people can get to and from and can buy a meal if they can't afford to do that.

Wheeler: There's a bit of a precedent on the Portland city commissions where we have needed people, particularly people at lower income who are making a true sacrifice by participating. We have found that to be a reduction of barriers to their participation.

Vega-Pederson: I was just wanting clarification. I think the voters voted on after-school programs so I was concerned of the ability to make the change.

McElroy: That is well taken. It says both after-school and summer programming.

Wheeler: Judy, with this information in mind, it sounds like what Meg is telling us there maybe a legal impediment here but the door is also open in another program area. Does that address your issue?

Strand: I think so. We had a number of points about the mentoring program. I'm just making sure we are eligible. Hopefully we will be. We will do our very best and try that category.

Wheeler: Good. I would hate for us to inadvertently create a structural impediment to an intergenerational play here in the schools. I think that would be a huge mistake. It sounds like we are in agreement that they could apply under a different category.

McElroy: Yes. Experience Corps was funded in the mentoring program in the past. The program area over the last five years shifted toward focusing on older youth, middle school and high school aged youth, which is one of the contributing factors to that program no longer being funded. It wasn't ineligible based on the fact it had intergenerational relationship-based work between older adults and children as its primary delivery.

Strand: Okay. We will go for that category. Thank you for your time.

Wheeler: To be continued. Thank you.

Any discussion or are we just calling for a vote, meg? On the program area strategies.

McElroy: The only clarification I would add is I think Judy's original request to consider amending the after-school area warrants clarification from staff to any applicant so we will be sure to follow up with that because I feel quite confident, we can't. I want to make sure we are clear in communicating that so it is not confusing for any potential applicant of what after school does and doesn't include.

Wheeler: That's good and I appreciate the testimony clarifying that point. I want to make sure we have not throwing down obstacles to those kinds of programs.

Hornecker: On the child abuse prevention, number three, the second bullet point, client assistance funds. Could you talk a little bit about how you would see short term being defined and also what it means to be tied to at least one other proposed service approach?

Hansell: So, short term -- really the intention there is to address avoiding crisis situations. So short term could be a one time or there's a plan in place to be able to continue to provide that support if ongoing support is needed. For example, if housing was an issue, if somebody needed help with a down payment or deposit, with a deposit or a portion of a month's rent but there was a plan in place for the next month.

Wheeler: Could I interrupt for a moment?

Who do we have joining us today in our chamber?

Unknown Speaker: These are children involved in the Social Justice art camp with [inaudible]Portland.

They just left the smart center meeting with some kids going to Washington, D.C. to meet with Senator Wyden and talk about things that are important to them. Learning from the older students how they will petition what they need, they made signs and came to your office. And they signed up to talk to you about the things important to them. Most of them were school based because some of the kids have been involved in bullying at the end of receiving it. Some kids have had to seek advocacy for housing. All kinds of things that they discussed just from listening to the older students. I was telling them as they grow older and they are able to articulate their issues to their peers we hear those things and do what we need to do to resolve those issues but they need to communicate and have their voices heard and so we are teaching them what the process looks like.

Wheeler: Thank you for bringing them here and kids, thank you for being at city hall. Thank you.

Unknown speaker: One thing they did not like was the waving on the way in. They are like we don't want to do this. So, we said we would let you know.

Wheeler: Fair enough. Thank you, kids, for being here. Appreciate it.

Hornecker: With that definition, we have an extremely deep need for the type of coverage that you just mentioned. It's at the epicenter of our homeless crisis, keeping people from falling into homelessness. But we could spend every dollar we have allocated into just this single idea and not make a dent. I'm a little concerned about opening up this. I don't remember this being in the last definition. Is this part of the new one?

Hansell: This is new. This strategy is a new strategy. In the past -- the programs we currently fund many have client assistance funds as part of the budget they have with us. Each of those have their own criteria and ways they manage that. The amounts in the current grants are not huge amounts. Probably typically between two and $6,000 a year. Some have more but that is probably the average. It's a concern that continues to come up in community engagement. It was a concern in 2014 and it's a concern again. In looking at this, there was a way to hopefully prevent some families becoming involved in the child welfare system. We know it will not take care of every issue, but if this is something that could support some families and be of assistance we wanted to include it.

Hornecker: Well, I mean -- I think everybody up here is probably working in some way or another on the bigger issue. We're all proponents and we all know it needs to happen. It's just -- would a client have to already be engaged to obtain the service, or would the first thing they sign up for be this benefit?

Hansell: So, as part of this service approach, I think that addresses your other question of what does it mean to be engaged with one of these other service strategies. So, it wouldn't be a stand-alone client assistance fund that could be access. A family need to be engaged with one of the other strategies, enhanced parenting or response or in case management services. So, it is not a stand-alone fund for anyone in the community to access.

Hornecker: So more targeted. So, they would be already enrolled and have been identified at high risk or at risk or already in case management.

Hansell: They would be working on other aspects of child abuse prevention and family safety.

Young: I had a question also under -- actually I have a couple of things. The first is just following up with the child abuse prevention and intervention. To intervene, to lessen harms and prevent future risk, which, of course, I agree with. But in rationale, the language is providing mental health therapy and counseling for children and their families. Under possible service approach, it says treatment and other healing approaches. I wanted to note that -- this is something that I suppose -- and I'm sure there are always challenges, but people who are participating under the Oregon Health Plan would be receiving therapy. I'm curious -- I have a question around that. Certainly, there may be people who are not enrolled in any kind of insurance program, but really that is a responsibility that I believe the state has for providing mental health treatment.

Hansell: So, with this strategy, it's not intended to replace or take the place of OHP or other insurance coverage. It's meant to cover things that are not covered by insurance. So that's the purpose. It is not meant to take the place.

McElroy: There are times when the mental health treatment needed for an individual may not be fully covered by the OHP plan. So, the cost of the treatment may not be fully reimbursed. So, it provides an opportunity for providers to not only get -- find a way to finance the entire type of treatment they may want to offer to somebody but other services that may or may not be reimbursed by the particular health plan as well like group therapy or certain type of support group.

Young: Okay. Thank you.

The other area, note that I had, is under early childhood. In the information provided to the committee ahead of time, you note -- you talk about childcare. It said that priority will be considered as a strategy on its own crossing program areas and brought to the allocation committee separately.

McElroy: Correct. We were going to wait to do it in the fall. The community childcare initiative that you all have invested in provides childcare subsidy to working families in Portland whose incomes are 200% of the federal poverty level or less and helps augment their state-funded 47.11 employment-related daycare subsidy to pay no more than 10% of their income to childcare. That is run through Mount Hood Community College's referral through Multnomah county. It is a large initiative that has funding through next June. It supports families with children ages 6 weeks to age 12. It is early childhood and before and after-school care. It is not early childhood specific area strategy. Childcare itself is called out separately in the ballot language. Because it's been an initiative we have handled separately from the program area competitive investments, we were going to wait to bring it back to you in the fall and also where we had another year of performance data come in. They have been doing well but we wanted to make sure we had everything before we ask you to consider that investment differently since it hasn't been typically a competitive investment.

Wheeler: All right. Do we need to take a vote on the program area strategies?

McElroy: Yes, please.

Wheeler: All right.

Proposal: To adopt the Program Area Strategies for 2020-2025 as outlined by staff.

Vega-Pederson: So, moved.

Young: Seconded.

Wheeler: Motion and second.

Hornecker: I like all the changes. I've thought about stepping into the recruiting and retention of foster parents and having better trained, higher functioning foster parents is critical. However, they will be operating in a system that according to the secretary of state and a lot of investigative reporting has extremely large challenges.

There's definitely a suggestion the highest functioning foster parents are burned out the fastest because the DHS loads them up. As a result, until we see further progress on DHS's improvement strategies that I think they are a year into now, I can't bring myself to think that our dollars spent on recruitment and retention are going to go as far as dollars directly aimed at foster kids. Of all of the things that's the only thing I can't get comfortable with and I'm not in favor of at this time. As funny as that seems when I call it a critical need, I don't see how we will be able to move the needle on it. If we take it as a block, I didn't know how to deal with that, but the rest of them I'm fine.

Wheeler: So, let me see if I can craft a compromise strategy here. Anything before it is funded has to come back to us. That question would, once again -- I think it is an entirely appropriate line of questioning, as it is with any of these. As to the best use of programming we have to decide how to weigh the different programming areas. I, too, am an optimist that was said earlier and I have high hopes for the foster care system and the work that DHS is doing. But, I don't see forwarding this package in any way today precludes us from making that decision on a program-by-program basis, unless someone disagrees. Is that correct?

McElroy: That's totally correct. You may get only one applicant who proposes to do that and for reasons you may want or may not want to fund it.

Wheeler: I can't disagree with your logic there. All right. So all in favor, vote aye. Opposed. And it passes. Thank you.

Proposal: To adopt the Program Area Strategies for 2020-2025 as outlined by staff.

The draft proposal is attached to these minutes as Appendix A.

Vote: All in Favor

Wheeler: The motion passes.

<u>Template for Request for Investments</u>

Request for Investment Template is Appendix B of these minutes.

McElroy: On to the next topic. The template for the request for investments. So, everybody here with us has a copy of that, as well.

Just as a reminder we as the staff used the same feedback opportunities to hear from folks during the four-week comment period about anything they wanted to raise about the request for investment document. Again, remind you all it will have three sections. When we bring the program area specific RFI's back to you for publication and approval in the fall. Our work this summer will be to take this template and create one of these that is catered to each program area.

The entire application from any given applicant will be worth 100 points. 36 points for the section that focuses on organizational capacity and commitment to racial equity, diversity inclusion, 54 points for program design and effectiveness and 10 points for a budget and budget narrative. We don't have that section yet here for you. We haven't proposed changes to that one from what has been used in the past. You will see that with the program RFI's when we bring them back in the full.

A couple of things that we, as a staff, tweaked in the draft that you have before you from this last time that you saw it. In the organizational section, we added two definitions -- excuse me, three definitions. We added the definition on racial equity and the definition on diversity. We took those from the City Office of Equity and Human Resources definitions. Then we added a definition of inclusion, which the city did not have included in the definition. So, we borrowed from Race Matters Institute. Those are on page one of that section of the RFI.

We took a little time to improve how we characterized language accessibility in item D in that section to talk also about how applicants make sure that their communications are accessible, not just to people who need interpretation or translation, but are using assistive technology devices to make sense of documents coming from -- e-mail communications, website communications and documents. We, ourselves are learning a lot through the city's access work and trying to improve our digital accessibility, as well.

The next part of changes I want to bring to your attention had to do with things you requested from our previous meeting. In our last meeting, we talked about the program section of the RFI. I left with a reflection, realizing I didn't do a great job of explaining and answering a particular question raised around best practice. The thing I wish I had said is that the entire program section is really built around the basic tenets of best practice. It asks applicants to talk about the intentionality of design is part of the best practice. It asks applicants to identify and be clear about who they want to serve and why; which activities they will be doing with that population and why; what attendance is expected in those activities to produce outcomes; which outcomes will result from those activities; and how staff will be trained to deliver a quality program along those lines.

In addition, we added a definition to the program section on best practice that we borrowed from Miriam Webster. We added a definition around evidence-based programs that's from Penn State's Evidence Based Intervention and Support Center. To be clear about the differences between those two things.

Hornecker: How are they different?

McElroy: Best practice can be based on science, but it can also be based on experience. Evidence based programs are programs where there has been robust scientific study of the particular intervention, where the study has been done in a way that looks at comparison populations and produces statistical information around effects of the population that got the intervention and that it is sustained over time. Not every best practice has an evidence-based science behind it.

Hornecker: Evidence-based programming is always best-prectice, because it has large data to support what it is doing.

McElroy: Yes, I hear what you are saying. Evidence-based programs use best practice.

Hornecker: I asked the question. I appreciate you coming back to it. The thing that I thought was confusing is in the first sentence we say we're going to invest in best practices and then we give the definition of best practice. Then we give the definition of evidence-based program but not say we are going to invest in evidence-based programming.

McElroy: We say we are going to invest in best practice because that's what we will do because not everything is evidence-based. We wanted to leave open, in case it was confusing to people that we are not expecting that everything proposed for funding is an evidence-based program.

Hornecker: Okay. So, we should say that then.

McElroy: Okay.

Hornecker: I'm just saying when I read it, what defines best practice and maybe I missed it but then when we give the definition for evidence-based programming, I'm assuming that's important to us. You are right. We don't say that it is anywhere else in the document. That's what I could find.

McElroy: Yes. I hear what you are saying and it sounds to me like you are saying it is confusing how we are characterizing it. The intent was to say to people, we are not suggesting you only propose evidence-based programs. In our experience, people have proposed those, but they haven't always been successful pulling them off. But, they have been successful doing other programming based on best practice. It may not be this trademarked, evidence-based, particular program model that was developed by this university and is now replicated.

The intent of the section to say we recognize not everybody is doing work that falls on that standard of scientific evidence base, but we want to fund effective programs that demonstrate the things that are often times included in best practice. So that's what the bulleted list is supposed to represent.

Hornecker: I would suggest if we had a sentence at the end of the first paragraph of what we are funding, what we will fund I think it would make the paragraph clearer.

You give the definition and then you say, not all programs that are effective have evidence-based backup. But don't we need to say, so we are open to funding or we will consider funding best practice programs that are not evidence based?

McElroy: Sure. I guess I thought the next sentence did that but I guess it does. PCL seeks to fund programs that demonstrate the following. You are saying between that sentence and the previous one I need a better transition?

Hornecker: They seem to be important phrases. That's the only reason I brought it up last time and i'm bringing it up again. I'm thinking of having reviewers that are steeped in this stuff and know the difference in programming and probably knows whether they are or aren't to be clear whether they had an opportunity towards funding and a high score is important.

McElroy: So, something like PCL will consider proposals using evidence-based models, as well as other general best practices?

Hornecker: If that is what we will do, that's what we should say.

Wheeler: I don't object to that. That's helpful.

Vega-Pederson: I think if it helps you to have clarify that's great. For me the first sentence in the paragraph kind of states that we're going to be funding programs that use best practices, and that it achieves positive outcomes and though rest of the paragraph is explaining best practices includes things that are experience and evidence-based and gives more detail about that. But if we need another clarifying sentence that's fine.

Young: I appreciate the point that mitch made, too, that the reviewers -- they may have questions but my sense is you will be working closely with reviewers who will have probably been made aware, more than once, what this is, what our intent is. And those differences in semantics.

McElroy: Yes. You will hear more in a bit and have to decide on that, but the scoring, the proposed scoring criteria and what the reviewers is used is published with this template. It should hopefully help them with those distinctions.

Those were the main pieces of feedback you brought to our attention and then feedback from the comment period through the anonymously through the survey monkey and that people e-mailed to us directly.

A couple of folks brought to our attention they had concerns with how the scoring of demographics of applicant staff is categorized in the organizational section of the RFI. That section provides more points for organizations where a majority of client staff and board identify as a person of color. And the individuals that raised those concerns referenced examples of large organizations that may have difficulty getting those points in the score overall but may have small units within their organization that focus on serving specialized populations.

Staff's response is, yes, we understand that and we hope that the other parts of that section of the RFI give an applicant ample time to talk about those unique features of how their organization is working on racial equity, diversity and inclusion. Only six of the 36 points are looking at the demographics of this particular agency staff, clients and board. So, there's 30 other points that people can, applicants can try to make the points up that they want about the type of work they are doing. Again, we calibrated this entire section based on PSU's findings of our grant making process and how to improve it and also the feedback that we got through community engagement.

A couple of other respondents noted concerns about how accurate demographic data will be in applications that come forward. They raised questions because demographic data collected from clients and staff is optional and some people may have fear around providing certain information about themselves to the organization that's serving them or employing them.

Yes, as staff, we hear that concern. We provided in the application opportunity for people to talk about how they arrived at the numbers they will be supplying in their application so reviewers can make sense of it using the narrative description of how applicants gathered that information and if they had to estimate it, on what basis.

Another piece of feedback we heard at a previous meeting was that there are other special populations that the levy should consider. One of those is the justice involved population and that our current application doesn't necessarily call out that population. That's true. However, we have left that section of the RFI open so that if there are populations we haven't called out or overlooked that we hope an applicant can talk about it in their responses to that section. And they can insert rows on the table that will be provided to describe the demographic characteristics of their clients, staff and board to talk about those additional populations.

Hornecker: I was just wondering about why we did that. It seems such an easy thing to say yes to in light that it is a dramatic marker for kids having problems. When you say we have a place where you can identify others, are there a lot of other markers as significant as criminal justice system that we would expect to see there?

McElroy: I personally don't know. As a person who positions myself as learning in this field every day, I think there are possibilities of populations that we haven't considered or have overlooked where we want to give people the opportunity to include that information.

We focused on racial equity, diversity and inclusion. Because that's in part where the city's goals have led us, where community engagement and PSU's recommendation led us. But, we wanted to hold some space for other populations that we hadn't considered or overlooked. If you introduce a racial equity lens, that really matters. The justice-affected population. There could be others we haven't thought about but wanted to leave it open.

So, it is dissatisfying answer to some extent.

We also heard feedback from a fellow funder to make our application use more plain language. That's a movement that both state and federal are trying to make everything easier to read and understand. We tried to make sentences shorter; used words familiar to more and fewer clauses and more active voice. We had a couple of requests for clarifications on particular questions in the

RFI. We were already planning to provide guidance to applicants around examples of how to respond to certain questions; frequently asked questions and providing tips and information to help them.

Finally, we had a question raised about how we, as a staff, considered the consequences of the RFI's priorities for racial equity, diversity and inclusion. In particular, it was raised -- this person raised questions about how those priorities may shift funding from what the levy has been currently funding to other organizations or other types of services. And had we anticipated or thought what that transition would look like?

Our response is yes, somewhat, but every time the levy runs a funding process the possibility of funding new things is a possibility. We manage those each time they come up. At the same time, we recognize that the priorities that have been put into this particular RFI are borne out of the history institutional policy and practices that have resulted in unequal access for children and families in our community. We are asking how organizations are working to make better by those past inequities. So, we may see shifts and we will be prepared to support organizations and programs going forward. With that, happy to answer more questions on the RFI, take any input and that's the next piece of decision making.

Hornecker: One last question. On the scoring sheet for proven program section e. I was looking at the first and fourth bullet and wondered if you could explain how those are different.

The fourth bullet uses best practice and it seems like it was the definition without saying that. Is the first bullet where you would see the newer innovative program proposal?

McElroy: I think it's a little bit of both. The difficulty with best practice sometimes is there may be best practices that somebody needs to explain that are particular to the type of service model they are doing - home visiting or preschool. Versus the overall - we have chosen to do this particular service with this population because these are the things that we know that produce the results we want; and we're going to only hire this type of staff with this type of training and make sure our service is provided only this frequently. I think there are two ways that people can get into the details of the service delivery there. One at a higher rationale in general for what they plan to do with the population they plan to serve and why that population and one that is a more fine grain about best practices relative to that type of service they are proposing.

Wheeler: All right. Is there any public testimony on this item? Yes, sir. Come on up.

<u>Public Comment on RFI Template</u>

My name is **Joseph Tietz**. I'm the executive director of **Pathfinder Network** and we serve the criminal justice population. I would respectfully argue the demographic does stand out, to your question, Mitch, what predominant co-existing - poverty, marginalization -- the plethora of those criteria. I can't think of another population that does meet it. I think it represents a statement from the Portland Children's Levy to identify that and call it out.

Wheeler: Thank you. Anybody else? All right.

Anyone want to propose any changes before we call for a vote? Mitch?

Hornecker: Does anybody -- how do you feel about the criminal justice issue? I would be interested in hearing how you see that. I feel like I'm not -- I don't have a deep enough understanding but it seems something that is so obvious with kids.

Young: I guess I need a little more information about how it would be reported because are we talking about - we're looking for data regarding the parents and their participation in the criminal justice system. What data are we looking for? Or the children. Certainly, we have teens who are sadly in the criminal justice seem. I need clarification on what are we looking for?

McElroy: That's a good question.

Hornecker: I mean, I took it to understand we are telling the public what our priorities are for funding, right? Those include race and the question is do we want to add criminal justice as a priority, meaning that if the program is -- this is how I'm thinking about it. This is why I'm glad we are talking through it. That a program serving that client base would, all things being equal, be scored higher than a program not serving that base or some other priority population of ours. It's a way to elevate proposals.

Vega-Pederson: I have a question. So, is the area where you said there's a space to put additional demographic information the table X?

McElroy: Yes. It is an excel document that applicants can insert rows for other characteristics, demographic variables, identifying types of information for populations that they would want to share and be able to talk about throughout that entire section of their application.

Vega-Pederson: So just looking at the table X, least the part that is in the packet, I don't see where they would put other demographic information that might be important.

McElroy: Yes, the way it is formatted now is to print on one page for ease of reading this group and this decision making but because it is an excel document, it won't be protected or anything and people can download it and insert rows. When it is submitted as an application it may have another page.

Vega-Pederson: So would it be helpful if we had -- maybe this is on the version that I can't see but we have two, two, three, four, five, if we had six, other and this is the space to include other information that you think is relevant. That way, because I think that people that have contact with the criminal justice system, like an organization may want to highlight but there may be others, as well. Maybe just opening it up that way would meet some of the needs that have been brought up.

McElroy: Can I ask the person that testified to clarify a question? Is your intent to ask us to call out that population in the demographics that we request or is it to ask that applicants as a priority serve that population?

Tietz: I don't want to be -- [inaudible]

McElroy: You want to talk about it in the application as a called out population.

Tietz: As a statement from the Children's Levy that states this is a population -- [inaudible]

Young: To me, what is helpful about this table, table X, is being able to take a look and sort of map out the demographics of the clients and then how it matches or doesn't match with the program or the organization, who they are working with. I think that is part of our intent, or maybe the whole intent. So, if you have identified that you have clients who are participating in the criminal justice system but the people providing service to them may have history, I would think that is true, but I'd say the likelihood of -- is going to be lower. I could be wrong on that in terms of management staff, board of director and all of that. In other words, could it be a negative for us to call this out? Am I making any sense, or am I clueless in terms of how the organizations are operating?

McElroy: I think your questions is a good one. The thing I don't know is organizations that may be providing services, particularly to this population as part of its intentionality and design probably have a lot more information to supply about those demographics and how they work with that population. When I think of the average after-school program the Levy funds they may not know a lot about the justice involved life experience of the children they are serving. It doesn't mean they shouldn't, but at this point it is not necessarily something they are asked to provide or track. I think what I want to try to figure out is a balance between sending the message we care about this population so we are asking about it in this table and we expect you to start asking this information of children and families. So, I want to be careful about how what we put in the table influences what people think they need to track and ask about. I guess because you work with the population, I would defer to your expertise how to handle the tension we are surfacing.

Tietz: I'm not sure I completely understand the question. [inaudible] **In conversations about diversity, equity and inclusion, criminal justice history is a know component.** I think we are missing an opportunity. I just feel my obligation is to say it but I may be wrong. My understanding -- [inaudible]

Young: So, I guess where I am is that I would like to have that information around what are the lives like for the children and families we are serving? I'm not sure having -- I'm not sure this table is the place to be -- of how we are -- of how it would best help us or reviewers in the decision making.

McElroy: I agree. This is only one piece of information and we are asking a lot of other parts of the story in hopes that people will use other parts of the application to tell that part of the story.

Young: I want that story but I'm not sure this is the place for it.

Hornecker: It is an interesting question. I don't know the answer.

McElroy: We could certainly ask. When I think of the other types -- because this is a template, we have to use for each program area and think of the other type of questions applicants have to answer, I'd want to figure out how to characterize the information that we ask for -- and if you don't have it is the okay. The hard part is much of the information we are asking has points and other values that influence their ultimate score. I'm concerned about the expectation that applicants who don't work with that population knowingly are being expected to start tracking information they can't easily ask or may not be pertinent to the particular service they are doing. It may be pertinent in how their staff are trained to do trauma informed approaches in their after-school program but maybe not whether children at school A or B should be provided this after-school program. I hope I'm doing a good job of characterizing what information we ask and why. I'm willing to add it and I think we have to be careful about it. We can also add it --

Hornecker: Let's see if we can ask the question differently. A program that is providing services to children or families who have had contact with the criminal justice system would invariably dealing with a clientele that is overrepresented in the communities that we care about. Therefore, they should be in a great position to score well on our questions about DEI and as a result should be able to compete just the way we have it set up now. No matter what section you chose, if your program was mentoring or whatever, you could -- or foster care, whatever, our particular population is children and families -- it seems like you ought to be able to score well. By the population you are serving you are able to tell us, hey, I'm working with your priority population. That's what will get them funded.

Assuming, it is a well-run program. So, there is really no obstacle to a program submitting for funding. We might not be able to track it or some programs may not know how much or how little their clients have criminal justice but a program specifically focused on that would be able to tell us that and that would score well. I guess answering my own question, it feels like we're in a position to fund programs like that.

McElroy: Right. I think the only feedback, push back was by putting it as a discreet called out population that we as a Levy are sending a different message.

Hornecker: Which is a good point.

McElroy: We can build it in there also for now as part of our draft program area rfis that you have to approve in September and come back with a final recommendation about this is going to work this program area perhaps but maybe not as -- it feels a little more difficult to figure out how to proceed with it in this program area, like hunger relief.

Vega-Pederson: I'd say I would feel more comfortable being an other column or more open ended. I feel like if you have something called out on the table or where you have it and it is not matched with the point system it will be confusing.

If we have it open ended people can put down other demographic that is important for their programs and organization and that, overall, kind of -- more generic. A question about if they have -- if the staff reflects diversity of the client that's serve it is apples to apples comparison, versus something not reflected in the points system.

Wheeler: Good. Any further discussion?

Should we take a vote on the RFI template?

Proposal: To adopt the RFI template as presented by the staff.

Hornecker: So, moved

Vega-Pederson: Second

Vote: All in Favor.

Wheeler: So, I have to be the bearer of bad news. It is 20 after. You have two more items and I have a hard out at 4:00.

McElroy: We can do it. The next is a decision point and the following is a review of timeline. So, you are doing great.

Grant Review Process

Hansell: I will take you through this and it will be much quicker than the discussion last time, than the presentation about the grant review process. I will review the proposed changes to the review process quickly, summarize the concerns at the last meeting and present a summary of the public feedback we received. And then you will have an opportunity to discuss, call for more testimony and decide on this issue.

For your consideration there are several proposed changes to the grant review process and two options for structuring the review. Both of these include changes that were raised and recommendations made by the 2014 reviewers, PCL staff and PSU.

These changes include:

- conducting extensive outreach to recruit reviewers,
- implementing the reviewer application and screening process,
- providing more training for reviewers,
- allowing more time for reviewers to read and score applications,
- discontinuing the review panel meetings where the reviewers discussed applications and that he option to change scores,
- offering stipends to volunteer reviewer
- sending score forms to all applicants.

I want to reiterate that both of these options that I will present next will include all of those things I just mentioned and will likely result in overall increase in quality opposed to the 2014. And to let you know the 2014 process, there weren't issues with that. In fact, the reviewer evaluations we got back when we asked what would be improved, a majority of people responded everything was great. This is a really good process. So, I don't want you to think it was a bad process last time.

Option 1 Review Process

With Option 1, each set of reviewers scores the full application.

The advantage to option one, advantages are:

- it is simpler to explain and implement
- the reviewers would score everything they are reading and reviewing.

The disadvantages to this approach are:

- staff would need to do their best to balance the knowledge and experience of the reviewers for each of the groups of reviewers
- all reviewers would have to score on topics where they have may have less knowledge or experience.

Option 2 Review Process

Option two splits the review between two sets of reviewers. One set would review and score the organizational capacity and racial equity, diversity inclusion section and the other set scores the program and budget sections.

The advantage of this approach is:

- it creates the opportunity to really match the reviewer experience and knowledge with the relevant application sections. So, the reviewers with strong experience and knowledge of organizational management and EDI would review that section of the application. And those that have the content area and program service delivery experience and knowledge would be reviewing the program and budget sections.

The disadvantage of this approach include:

- greater complexity to explain and implement,
- total hours of reviewer time are estimated to be more for this option, compared to option one
- a heavy her administrative burden for PCL staff to coordinate the various elements of the review process with ten reviewers per application versus five.

So, that's an overview. At the June 3rd meeting, the committee raised three concerns with the review process proposal.

First there was a concern raised that it would be unfair for applicants to only see part of an application and staff wants to clarify with both options the reviewers would receive the whole application. The difference would be for option one reviewers would read and score the whole application. Option two, readers and reviewers would only score parts of the application.

Whichever option the committee chooses, we will be sure to clearly explain to applicants what process is being used and explain it through the bidders' conferences in the RFI materials and on the FAQ's posted on the PCL website.

The second concern raised was related to option two. The committee expressed concern that splitting he view created redundancies because they want to review the whole application. Splitting the review eliminates the staff to average scores in cases where multiple sets of reviewers are reviewing applications from organizations that submit multiple applications.

Then the third concern had to do with the timing of the score sheet distribution. This would pertain to either option chosen. One committee member advocated for sending score sheets before the end of the funding process to increase transparency. In response, staff has built into the proposed timeline, which I will cover next, time to assemble and send score sheets to the applicants before they provide their written and video testimony to the committee.

Staff does have some concern that providing the score sheets to applicants before the committee makes funding decisions will require members to review individual score sheets, as well, especially if applicants raise issues related to their scores or comments that the reviewers may have made on the score sheets.

So, for those who have made funding decisions in the past for the levy, I think you will recall the volume of the applications that you received and the materials to review. So, just would ask that you please consider whether or not it is manageable to add review of score sheets to your workload, as well.

Public Comment on the Review Process (received prior to the meeting)

Hansell: With public comment, we received two pieces of public comment regarding the review process. The first person was seeking information regarding the information used to score the applications. As a clarification, staff instruct reviewers to score only on the application information and not use any outside information about the programs or organizations in their score. They are just to use the score sheets and the information that was presented.

The other person weighed in on their choice for option one or option two and they chose option one stating it will provide the best outcome. Since there are advantages and disadvantages to each of the options to have to defer to your preference. So, time for discussion.

Wheeler: I just have a question. The information is noncommittal. Which puts in a precarious place and given the strong case for a new process it would be my inclination to stick with what works. That being said, I don't see why we couldn't do a pilot on a smaller basis have some applications, maybe in one program area or maybe -- you are laughing. You thought about it.

McElroy: Only because we will have to communicate to the program area that we will handle your program differently.

Wheeler: Paradigm shifts are never easy. That's the question before us.

Young: I'd speak in favor of having two reviewers, have it split. The reason for that is I had the opportunity to sit on an organization that was making much smaller grants than this and it is one area not cross areas. So, I was a grant reviewer. It was interesting that I felt very comfortable in certain areas being able to score and understand and believe that I knew what was happening.

When it came to all of the budget areas, I was glad that I didn't have to work on that area because that wasn't something where I felt adequately trained to really understand how organizations manage their operating budgets and so on. I think being able to focus on what the program area itself really allowed me to go deeper into that and really consider what I was doing.

I think for our reviewers to have an opportunity to really use their area of expertise is I think valuable for them. I think it is more fair for the organizations that the grants are reviewed by people that have those areas of expertise. Certainly, there are people in the community who could probably do both adequately. But I think this has great potential, especially because we are so focused after the feedback that we got from PSU, Empress Rules and from the community of really wanting us to pay attention to the DEI work. I think that this is a way to say, yes, we are and we are scoring it separately. That's my vote.

Vega-Pederson: This is a tricky one. It is talking about a change and you never know if it will be a good or bad change. Sometimes you just have to do it.

I appreciate your words very much. I feel like they reflected what I was thinking. If we know we are going to have experts in DEI or programs or whatever looking at it, it seems like that's a strength that we are adding to the process. I appreciate Felicia's comments last week when she was talking about how it may be a harder process for the reviewers. I think if it was my job I would read the whole application and it is mandatory even if you are scoring only one part because I would imagine an applicant would want to continue the story they are telling about how they are going to do the work they are doing, especially around DEI, both in the one section but also the other section. Even if you are not grading it, you want to get the full story they are presenting to you. I appreciate that is part of the requirements that they would look at the full application. So, I think that was my big concern.

I have a question about the score sheet distribution. From the perspective of what position does that put reviewers in? If somebody is getting their score sheet back, is it anonymous or is that --

Hansell: It is anonymous. They just get the scores. Reviewers are asked to provide any comments constructive comments back to the applicants that will help them to understand the score that was awarded. So that's the information they will get but there aren't any names attached to the score sheets.

Vega-Pederson: All right. I know that is -- I also think -- I'm concerned about the impact on the process if they are getting some feedback before the entire has gone through where there's been the chance for the reviewers to be sent to staff. The staff hasn't had a chance to make their recommendations yet and we haven't had our chance yet. So I'm a little concerned what that would do to the system. Okay. Those are my comments. It's not really come to any decision. Just thinking out loud a little bit.

Hornecker: Well, I guess I worry this is a solution in search of a problem. Since we haven't had any feedback that we have had reviewers that have done poor jobs on areas they weren't experienced in. And on the other side of the ledger is Julie's well-taken point of it is a demonstration to the community that we are doing something.

I would be inclined to support the Mayor's idea of a pilot project. We don't need to change thinking because what I would propose is we simply do it for our own information. We will have experts grade a couple and see if there is any difference between what we are getting from two people reviewing one application versus one person reviewing one application. It doesn't have to be every application. Just a couple. They can report to us. It doesn't influence who gets what because everybody is under the same program. If it comes back and says our two expert reviewer and one expert reviewer came within statistical similarities of each other that would be informative. If we have very different answers when we have two versus one that would be good to know and lead in a different direction.

I think of the staff time and the recruitment increase. It's not a small undertaking to double the number of reviewers. I guess I'm looking for a toe in the water step before we jump in?

Hansell: Can I make a clarification. It is not doubling the reviewers. It doubles the number of applications, reviewers per application. Just a clarification.

McElroy: I want to clarify, Mitch, I understand what you are saying. You are saying internally look at the information and the scores not based on the idea of separate processes, not actually do a separate one?

Hornecker: Just thinking out loud. If we proceed with option one. At the same time, we pull out some number of programs -- proposals and have them graded by two people and those scores are not factored in awards until after the full grading and made our decisions. And then go back and look and see if it is something we want to change going forward. I don't know, Mr. Mayor if your project would like different than that but it seems like it would be pretty low impact on staff to do it that way.

Hansell: I'm going to think out loud, too and it may not make sense. I'm wondering if we went with option one and then reviewed scores where we will know which reviewers had more experience and knowledge in EDI, for example, and pull out those scores and see how they differ from folks who had more experience with program area and content and see if there was a difference in how -- if we were to have grouped them differently if there would have been a difference in score. Does that make sense?

Hornecker: Anything like that. Anything to where we -- as I said, putting our toe in the water before we commit to a functioning well-received process that we have now.

McElroy: We will have that information. We are planning to do recruitment of reviewers in ways that allow us to track information on how they identified what their experience and knowledge is that they are bringing to the process. So, we would have a way to look at these ten reviewers said they had this experience and knowledge, their average score is here with this.

Vega-Pederson I guess my question is what if we do notice a difference?

Hansell: That would inform the next time we do funding.

Vega-Pederson: It would just push that to the next round then.

Wheeler: Who would like to provide public testimony on this issue?

No Public Comment

Wheeler: Very good. I will entertain a motion, or not.

Hornecker: I guess I move for option one with a proviso that staff would devise a mechanism that would allow us to evaluate whether or not we could get higher quality reviews done by choosing option B. So, the next time we have a funding round, we will be able to be base a decision on that information.

Young: I will second Mitch's motion. Was there anything specific from Empress Rules or PSU regarding this part of the scoring?

McElroy: Great question. Not from Empress Rules and PSU's input on review was more about you all did a pretty good job last time. You weren't transparent what you did. So, do that better and be more intentional on recruitment. So here we are.

Hansell: Option two came out of the comments you made, Julie, reflecting the thinking behind option two.

Wheeler: So, I feel like I'm steering in the dark here. I'm going to support the motion currently on the table, but I think it does raise some interesting and provocative questions. I think Julie's question around budgets is one excellent example. The DEI issue is another interesting example. Was anybody else surprised how little testimony and feedback we got on this? I was. It struck me as a fairly major change in the way we do things. I think people are equally grasping at straws. It would be helpful to have -- I do support the idea of a pilot. I agree it is more work and we will have to work with you and find a way to make that work for you. I'm not trying to pile on extra work on your shoulders because you do a lot of work and I appreciate it but if we had a pilot we would have a more robust situation and people would have more to comment on. It is hard to comment on something that we don't understand the full dynamics of what is being proposed. I'm prepared to stick with what ain't broke.

Any further discussion?

Vega-Pederson: I would just say that -- this is a tough one. I'm going to support the motion because I take to heart what Felicia said last week and she seemed to have the most experience being the reviewer. I take that since I haven't had that much experience to heart. I want us to go forward with a pilot of some type and we will look at what option two is trying to get at and the easiest way to administrate possible but that is tipping the scales for me.

Proposal to adopt Option 1 Reviewer Process with some analysis to test whether option 2 might have produced different results.

Vote

In Favor: Hornecker, Vega-Pederson, Wheeler

Opposed: Young

Wheeler: Motion carries 3-1.

Hansell: Can I ask for a clarification regarding the timing of the districts of the score sheets to applicants, either before the process ends or at the conclusion?

Hornecker: To me, we have built in, as I read this, two opportunities for comment. One is video and one is written and they are not mutually exclusive.

Did we decide last time we were going to do both? It seems like we ought to offer one or the other but to get a video presentation and the same written presentation seems redundant and wasteful of their time and our time.

Hansell: I don't know that the information, the written -- I wouldn't assume applicants would provide the same information in the written versus the video. I would think the video -- well, I don't know.

McElroy: You did vote last time to take them both.

Hornecker: I continue to be in favor of the transparency of delivering the score sheets anonymously, of course, to the applicants.

Vega-Pederson: Can I ask a clarifying question? In the past did they receive score sheets?

Hansell: If they requested them after the conclusion of the funding process.

McElroy: So not in advance of funding decisions. Great.

Young: Yeah. So, my understanding on this, then is that if applicants receive those scores before we have made our decision, we may receive written information from them, explaining something and saying this was not -- the score was given but this is accurate or blah, blah, blah and I haven't seen the score either. So, the committee also needs to see the score sheets earlier than in the past.

Hansell: Exactly. You received the average score, the average total score but you did not receive each individual score sheet. This would mean you would get these to look at, as well. And so then an applicant could say one reviewer scored me 15 and another scored me 47. When I look at the scoring criteria, I think I should have gotten a 48. Then you would need to look at the individual scores and figure out what you do with that information and how it influences your decision.

Young: Right. That's the extra part. It's not just an aggregate score. We're talking every single score.

McElroy: Typically, we are provided the aggregate score because you haven't typically received the score sheet from each application but this time you would have to get both.

Hansell: So, five score sheets per application going with option one.

Wheeler: Great.

Hansell: So, yes to that, you want them sent at the time we send the staff recommendations?

Young: So, is this a decision we are making or a given?

Hansell: It needs to be decided so we know when to send them. We need to put it -- we will need to go on the RFI so folks know when they will be receiving the score sheets.

Young: Well, I certainly agree it's important for the applicants to have that information before they choose to do video testimony. I would say that we would need -- we would need the information they are receiving also.

Wheeler: Let me ask, does anyone here have strong feelings on this? Come up, I want to hear what you had to say. You gave good testimony before. Let's hear it. Since we are going to take a vote see if anybody has thoughts on it. Go ahead and have a seat.

Joseph Tietz: You will get advocacy. If I score 42 and thought it should have been 48 you will all get contact or information and so be prepared for that. I like the idea of transparency and see how you are evaluated. It is helpful for me as an executive director because I learn how we present ourselves and it is always a good idea. In this situation, I've never had that opportunity from a foundation to get the points before the decision. A lot of other places don't do this. It is an interesting idea. I see value in it but if I was on your side of the dais, I would be like that's a lot of paperwork to look at. Because a lot of people will refute their scores if they feel they are underscored.

Wheeler: I see a lot of head shaking going on behind you

Can I ask you a question and I always appreciate your public testimony? It is helpful and it's completely relevant being a provider. Does it steer your narrative at all? If you get that information does it steer the discussion in terms of what you focus on, versus maybe how you ordinarily present your organization?

Tietz: Yes, I used to be a program officer for an international program and in that context we would coach the people applying for funding. If you get feedback from a funder, you are obviously being cued that the way you are communicating isn't clear or doesn't meet criteria. Sometimes it doesn't meet criteria. I would hope that most people understand that I don't service this population or don't meet this criterion; but generally speaking it gives that person -- it will steer them in a sense I of I would reword it to use different words or address the feedback I might receive from the scorers. Now, I don't remember because I haven't been in the job long enough to know what or if we requested, is it just points or are they comments?

McElroy: It is the whole reviewer score sheet. They are usually five pages per reviewer. It is whether you have three out of the five points available and sometimes people write a comment and sometimes they won't. It would be a pdf copy of every point by point that was on the application and any comments written.

Tietz: I don't know how helpful that would be if it is just points.

Wheeler: Would it help from an organizational learning perspective for future applications? Would that be a value or no?

Tietz: Oh, yeah. But I don't know if the timing of it makes sense.

McElroy: I think to your point if I understood your question, will how an applicant presents -- I think you will hear from people about how the process of the review may have been flawed opposed to other parts of how they might have constructed that argument and/or both.

Proposal: To send score sheets to applicants before funding decisions are made

Vega-Pederson: I will make a motion that we send those score sheets to the applicants earlier in the process.

Hornecker: Second.

Wheeler: We have a motion and a second. Any further discussion?

Vote: All in favor

Wheeler: All right. We're going to try it and see how it goes. So, thank you to our team. Appreciate that very much. And our last item and thank you -- we have caught up and I appreciate.

<u>**Timeline for Funding Process**</u>

Funding Process Timeline is Appendix C to these minutes

Hansell: This will be very quick. In your packet and also as a handout for the audience is a tentative funding process timeline. You notice the first thing on the timeline is the next Allocation Committee Meeting which will be held between September 9th and the 23rd where you will meet to make final decisions necessary to begin the funding process and publish the FRI's.

So, at the September meeting, you will be:

- approving a request for investments in the program areas as mentioned earlier.
- Allocating the available funds by program area,
- setting minimum maximum amounts and
- approving the criteria staff will use in making funding recommendations.

Staff is proposing one committee meeting to consider these decisions. In advance of the meeting, staff will provide the recommendations and rationale to the public via the e-mail distribution list, social media and website posts. We will also solicit written feedback and invite people to come and testify before you all make decisions in September.

I'm not going to walk you through the whole timeline but as a general summary. In the fall we publish the RFI with the bidders' conference with applications due just before Thanksgiving. The winter, the reviewers will be reviewing and scoring the application and staff will be preparing the materials for the Allocation Committee for your review and decision making. And then in the spring you will receive those material and hopefully make funding decisions in May.

Just want to reiterate this is a tentative timeline. Things may come up that call for adjustments, but this is our best estimate at this point. You don't need to vote on this item. If you have questions or want to discuss the timeline.

Wheeler: Looks like we are good.

Thank you. Thank you to the incredible PCL staff and all of my colleagues here and thanks to everybody who provided feedback and testimony. Have a great summer. We stand adjourned until September.

Adjourned 4:00 pm

Appendix A

DRAFT Program Area Strategies for 2020- 2025

Background: Goals and Program Area Strategies, 2014-2019

Before launching the previous, large competitive funding round in 2014, PCL adopted the Levy-wide goals shown below, and the program area goals shown throughout this document.

- 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.

PCL staff conducted a 4-month community input process to inform development of service strategies aligned with these goals. PCL solicited input from community members and service providers via surveys and public meetings, and from over 30 existing stakeholder groups such as All Hands Raised, Oregon Foster Youth Connection, Young Child Wellness Council, Portland African American Leaders Forum, and the East Portland Action Plan. Requests for input were framed to elicit prioritization of specific types of services for specific populations in the 6 programs areas. This input led to adoption of strategies which were incorporated into the Requests for Investment (funding application) in each program area.

Preparation for 2019-20 Funding Round

The community engagement designed to inform the 2019-20 funding round and led by Empress Rules Equity Consulting was intentionally planned and carried out differently than in the past. Consultants focused on engaging a more diverse range of community members. They asked questions to elicit more input on how services are delivered, what qualities and features the services should have, and who delivers services in addition to preferred types of service activities in each program area. Empress Rules engaged over 500 people engaged in the process, analyzed their input, and reported the results. The report recommendations focus on equity and inclusion and demonstrate a preference for services that:

- Are culturally relevant, responsive and focused, and trauma informed;
- Listen and respond to the voice and preferences of youth and families;
- Pay attention to accessibility and address barriers to access including hours of operation, location and transportation;
- Employ staff who are of and grounded in the cultural communities they serve.

PCL relied heavily on these themes and input results on preferred service activities in drafting program area strategies. In the foster care program area, PCL staff also met with Oregon Department of Human Services, District 2 staff (approximately 50 people) for their input on needs and priorities for children and youth in foster care and to assure that strategies and possible service approaches are relevant for children in DHS custody. Staff also relied on local data compiled in 2018 and focusing on children's needs. Last, staff has considered national, state and other local best practice and policy frameworks related to Levy program areas such as Center for Disease Control's framework for prevention child abuse and neglect, Oregon Early Learning Division's "Raise Up Oregon" policy framework, Oregon Youth Development Commission policy focus, All Hands Raised collective impact framework and indicators.

Features outlined in each program area emphasize PCL's priorities, not requirements, for strategies.

Early Childhood Strategy and Rationale

Program Area Goal: Support children's early development and readiness for kindergarten.

Common Outcome Goals: Children meeting developmental milestones, parents improving and/or demonstrating positive parenting practices, children up-to-date on immunizations.

PCL seeks to invest in early childhood programs with the following features:

- Experience, intentionality, and success in supporting child development and school readiness of children of color and other historically underserved populations such as children with disabilities, children of immigrant/refugee families, and families experiencing housing instability
- Parent voice and leadership in identifying their needs and solutions to meet their needs
- Built on current and emerging science of brain development and child development
- Foster community and connection among and between parents and families
- Offer connection to resources that meet families' basic needs and reduce transportation barriers to participating in services
- Diversity and cultural responsiveness in their early childhood workforce, including people speaking the home language of the children/families they serve
- Commitment to training/developing staff with current research in brain development, child development, and/or parenting

1. **Provide affordable, high quality preschool- programs will small adult: child ratios and focused on quality standards**

   Possible service approaches include:

   - Early Head Start, Head Start, Oregon Prekindergarten, and early learning programs that meet other quality standards

2. **Enhance parent/family support of child development and nurturing**

   Possible service approaches include:

   - Family/home visiting, parent/child programs, or parenting programs that support children's development and strengthen their family's skills with information and tools to offer nurturing, developmentally appropriate and culturally relevant/responsive learning opportunities.

3. **Support families, childcare providers, and teachers with guiding child behavior**

   Possible service approaches include:

   - Infant/early childhood mental health consultation and other research-informed prevention supports for children in their early care and learning settings to support positive behavior

Rationale

- Community engagement prioritized affordable preschool that meets quality standards; access to early learning and care with staff that have research-based training to offer planned learning activities, create nurturing environments and guide children's behavior; and services that build parents' skills and knowledge for supporting child development and behavior while connecting families to resources and to each other. Priorities included that early childhood staff, particularly home visitors, understand the culture and speak the home language of the families they serve.[1]

- Community engagement also highly prioritized affordable, quality childcare, however not only in early childhood. That priority will be considered as a strategy on its own, crossing program areas, and brought to the Allocation Committee separately from this strategy process.
- Local data in Multnomah County indicate that the young population is becoming more racially/ethnically diverse, poverty disproportionately affects very young children of color and immigrants/refugees, and significant numbers of children in E Portland and with home language other than English enter kindergarten without preschool experience.[2]
- Studies and policy efforts continue to emphasize the importance of quality, affordable preschool for supporting positive child development and school readiness, especially for children with the least opportunity to access preschool.[3]
- National efforts by the Center for the Study of Social Policy call on leaders in early childhood programs and systems to center parent voice and leadership as a strategy for racial equity."[4]
- Harvard's Center for the Developing Child, focused on early brain development research and its impacts over the life span, urges 3 principles to improve outcomes for children and families: support responsive relationships for children and adults, strengthen core life skills (for children and adults), and reduce sources of stress in the lives of children and families.[5] These principles include policy and practice recommendations that support the 3 proposed strategies.
- National policy leaders in early childhood recommend an array of services that build high-quality childcare and early education, strong parents, healthy and economically stable families.[6]

Child Abuse Prevention and Intervention Strategy and Rationale

Program Area Goal: Prevent child abuse and neglect and support vulnerable families.

Common Outcome Goals: Parents improving and/or demonstrating positive parent-child interaction, parents connecting with and/or utilizing community supports, children meeting developmental milestones.

PCL seeks to invest in child abuse prevention and intervention programs with the following features:

- Culturally relevant, culturally responsive and culturally focused programming, including staff who speak the language of the children/families they serve
- Listens to, and is responsive to, the voices of the youth/families served
- Experience, intentionality, and success in serving children and families exposed to toxic stress or trauma, including African American and Native American children and families, immigrant children and families and children with disabilities.
- Offers accessible services - flexible hours of operation and provides transportation
- Staff receive on-going training on cultural inclusivity, racial equity and trauma informed practices

1. **Enhance parenting skills to promote healthy child development –** programs explicitly focused on reducing risks for child abuse and neglect and enhancing protective factors.

   Possible service approaches include:
   - Home visiting services that provide parenting information, caregiver support, training about child health, development and care to families in their homes.
   - Parenting skill and family relationship approaches, including but not limited to parenting classes, that provide support to parents and caregivers to teach positive parenting practices and behavior management to create safe families and protect children from harm.

   Rationale
   - Providing parenting education and support to families at risk of abuse and neglect was highlighted as a need across all three strands of community input[7] and by DHS District 2 Child Welfare Management teams.
   - Local data on the number of child abuse reports and confirmed incidents of child abuse and neglect point to the need for additional support for children and families.[8]
   - This strategy and service approaches are included in the Center for Disease Control's core set of strategies for preventing child abuse and neglect,[9] align with the Strengthening Families framework,[10] and other current research on improving outcomes for children and families and avoiding entry into the child welfare system. [11] [12]

2. **Intervene to lessen harms and prevent future risk –** treatment for children and families exposed to trauma, toxic stress and/or child abuse and neglect with a focus on healing and preventing future risks.

   Possible service approaches include:

- Behavioral parent training programs designed to teach parents specific skills to build safe, stable and nurturing relationships with their children.
- Treatment and other healing approaches[13] for children and families to lessen the harms of trauma, toxic stress and abuse and neglect exposure.
- Treatment and other healing approaches for children and families to prevent problem behavior and later involvement in violence.

Rationale

- Providing mental health therapy and counseling for children, and their families, where there are concerns about abuse and neglect was highlighted as a need across all three strands of community input[14] and by DHS District 2 Child Welfare Management teams.
- Local data shows there is a demonstrated need for this service. In 2017, there were 16,652 reports of suspected child abuse or neglect and 1,741 victims of child abuse and/or neglect in Multnomah County.[15]
- Strong evidence has emerged in the past few decades demonstrating that a child's exposure to violence, among other adverse childhood events (ACEs), can lead to lifelong health, behavioral, and social problems, including substance use.[16]
- The Center for Disease Control includes this strategy and services approaches in their core set of strategies for preventing child abuse and neglect.[17]

3. **Connect families to needed resources and supports for stabilization** – access to basic need resources explicitly focused on reducing risks for abuse and neglect and enhancing protective factors.

Possible service approaches include:

- Case management/navigation services designed to connect families to resources needed to stabilize family unit (e.g. housing, food, medical care, job/skills training, mental health services, substance abuse treatment, crisis intervention services, domestic violence services respite care).
- Client assistance funds to meet basic needs of families on a short-term basis to avoid crisis situations and help stabilize families. The intent is to fill in gaps until long-term solutions are in place. This service approach would need to be tied to at least one other proposed service approach related to this strategy or other child abuse prevention and intervention strategies; it is not intended to be a stand-alone fund to be accessed by any program.

Rationale

- Connecting families to needed services and resources (housing, food, jobs, etc.) was identified by community survey respondents[18] as a top service need when child neglect is a concern. Service provider survey respondents identified a lack of accessible supportive services as the top barrier for families in accessing support needed to prevent child abuse and neglect.
- In 2016 the child poverty rate in Multnomah County was 18.7%. Child poverty rates are higher for children of color than for white children and higher than the county-wide child poverty rate.[19]
- Strengthening economic supports to families is included in the Center for Disease Control's core set of strategies for preventing child abuse and neglect. Strengthening economic supports at the individual family level reduces risk and increases protective factors for families.

Foster Care Strategy and Rationale

<u>Program Area Goal:</u> Support the well-being and development of children and youth in foster care.

<u>Common Outcome Goals:</u> Children and youth actively engaged in/attending school, youth increasing life skills, placement stability, children and youth improving permanency status.

PCL seeks to invest in foster care programs with the following features:

- Culturally relevant, culturally responsive and culturally focused programming
- Listens to, and is responsive to, the voices of the youth/families served
- Experience, intentionality, and success in serving children and youth in foster care, including African American and Native American youth, youth who identify as LGBTQ+, older youth, youth with disabilities and youth with behavior challenges
- Has an established working relationship with DHS child welfare, understands the child welfare system and successfully supports youth, foster parents and birth parents to navigate the system
- Offers flexible hours of operation including evening and weekend hours
- Provides transportation or can demonstrate transportation provided by another entity for program participants
- Staff receive on-going training on cultural inclusivity, racial equity and trauma informed practices

1. **Enhance support and training for foster parents to promote healthy child development** – services explicitly focused on providing supportive home environments, maintaining placements, recruiting and retaining foster parents.

   Possible service approaches include:

   - Engage with the community, especially communities of color, to recruit people interested in becoming DHS-certified foster parents
   - In-home visits to provide service to children and support foster parents with skills and education training to address the individual needs of the children in their care
   - Facilitate and support partnering relationships between foster parents and birth parents
   - Respite care, specialized supports for relative foster parents and grief support for foster families when children leave their homes

   Rationale

   - Providing support and training for foster parents was identified as a critically needed service by community and service provider survey respondents, focus group participants[20] and DHS Child Welfare Branch management teams.
   - There is a shortage of family foster care homes in Multnomah County and throughout Oregon.[21] Part of the reason for this shortage is that foster parents are not well supported in the role.
   - In FY 17/18, 2,083 children and youth in Multnomah County spent at least one day in foster care indicating a substantial population in need. The median length of time in care for a child in Multnomah County is 28.2 months.[22]
   - Research shows that loving, supportive families – whether birth, kin or foster- are critical to the healthy development of all children and the importance of supporting all important adults, including foster parents, on whom vulnerable children rely.[23] [24]

2. **Individualized support to promote child and youth well-being –** services and supports for children, youth and birth families with a focus on healing and healthy development.

   Possible service approaches include:

   - Mentoring that provides children and youth with consistent, caring support and model important life skills
   - Support and guidance for youth in the transition from foster care to adulthood
   - Reunification support including visitation between parent and child, visitation between siblings (if separated), parent skill building and intensive in-home support when the child returns home, connection to concrete services (e.g. transportation, job training, housing, respite care, day care, mental health and substance abuse services), and assistance developing social support networks.
   - Advocacy/case management for children and youth in foster care and those who have aged out of foster care to assure their needs are met

   Rationale

   - Providing individualized support – mentoring, support in the transition from foster care to adulthood, reunification services – to children and youth in foster care was identified as key to supporting the well-being of children and youth in foster care by community and service provider survey respondents, focus group participants[25] and DHS Child Welfare Branch management teams.
   - In 2017, 88 youth aged out of foster care in Multnomah County. Aging out refers to the point in time when youth leave the foster care system because they were not reunified with their birth parent(s) or adopted and are too old to stay in care.[26]
   - Safe and timely family reunification is the preferred permanency option for most children who are removed from their parents. Statewide, 56.5% of children who left foster care in 2017 were reunified with their families.[27]
   - Child-adult relationships that are responsive and attentive have a double benefit: stimulating children's brain development and providing buffering protection against toxic stress effects.[28]

After-School Strategy and Rationale

Program Area Goal: Provide safe and constructive after-school and summer programing that supports children's well-being and school success.

Common Outcome Goals: Attending 90% of school days, no suspensions/expulsions from school, demonstrate or increase positive social behaviors, self-confidence, positive attitude toward school, school engagement, skill in content area of program.

PCL seeks to invest in after-school programs with the following features:

- Culturally relevant, culturally responsive and culturally focused programming
- Staff to student ratios that allow for individual attention and support for youth
- Provides transportation or can demonstrate transportation provided by another entity for program participants
- Staff receive training on cultural responsiveness, trauma informed practices and youth development principles

1. Provide intensive academic support and tutoring that includes attention to individual student needs, and staff who act as a liaison between schools, students and caregivers.

Possible service approaches include academic goal setting, homework support, tutoring, academic skill building, credit recovery, advocating for students with school personnel, assisting and supporting parents to advocate for their children with school personnel.

Rationale

- The need for academic support and tutoring was a theme across all strands of input.
- The need for staffing to support communication and understanding between students, schools and families in order to support student success was a theme in both the community and provider survey responses.
- Local data on academic disparities and current graduation rate for students of color all point to the need for additional academic support, particularly for students of color.[29]
- Multiple studies and meta-studies have found that after-school programs help improve academic performance, particularly for students at risk for failure in math and reading, and narrow the achievement gap, particularly for low income students.[30] Studies have also found that participants in after school programs demonstrate improved school attendance, decreased likelihood of dropout, and improved school behavior.[31]

2. Support healthy relationship building, positive behavior and social emotional skill development.

Possible service approaches include curriculum and activities that embed or are focused on social emotional skill building (cultural identity, belonging, interpersonal skills, goal setting, growth mindset, self-management, perseverance, engagement, self-efficacy), mindfulness, healthy relationships in families and with peers, bullying awareness and prevention.

Rationale

- The need for programming that supports development of a range of social emotional skills was a theme in all strands of input.

- Local data on youth meeting the state benchmark for positive youth development show less than half of 8th graders meeting the benchmark, and 11th graders of color meeting the benchmark at lower rates than white youth.[32]
- Research supports the importance of social emotional skill development for academic and career success and provides evidence that after school programs impact development of these skills.[33]

3. Provide engaging enrichment opportunities attractive to children and youth including recreation, sports, physical activities, arts (fine, performing, music, expressive writing), STEM (science, technology, engineering, math) and culturally focused programs.

Service approaches include stand-alone enrichment activities and classes, and enrichment opportunities embedded in summer and after-school programs offering a range of activities.

Rationale

- Community survey respondents rated all these activities highly among choices for after-school program focus. The need for STEM programming was a theme in focus group input.
- Research confirms that after school and summer programs should allow students to choose from a variety of high- quality activities and experiences that they find engaging and interesting.[34]

Mentoring Strategy and Rationale

Program Area Goal: Connect children and youth with caring adult role models that support their well-being.

Common Outcome Goals: Youth demonstrating positive engagement in school, youth attending 90% of school days, no expulsions or suspensions, making progress toward graduation, and those classified as seniors graduate from high school.

PCL seeks to invest in mentoring programs with the following features:

- Experience, intentionality, and success in serving youth populations marginalized by public education systems and who need support staying connected to and successful in that system, including youth of color, and/or youth who identify as immigrant/refugee, as having a disability, as LGTBQ+
- Family and youth's voice, engagement, and leadership in identifying their needs and solutions to meet their needs
- Rely primarily on paid staff whose job focuses on and emphasizes mentoring- who are experienced, trained and share an identity with the youth they serve, and/or speak their home language
- Low youth/adult ratios that assure individualized support for youth and give youth/adults the opportunity to build meaningful relationships over time
- Commitment to ongoing staff training and development on the role and importance of culture in mentoring relationships

Support youth's academic success and positive development

Possible service approaches include:

- Individualized and/or group mentoring of youth to support school success where mentor serves as a liaison between child/family and school/teacher(s)
- Individualized and/or group mentoring of youth to support positive youth development and youth's goals for careers, health relationships/behavior, or interests (e.g. art, math, science)

Rationale

- Need for mentors to support academic success, positive youth behavior, healthy relationships and/or provide opportunities for new experiences related to youth's interests, especially in arts, sciences, math, careers were strong themes across all community engagement related to mentoring needs and priorities.[35]
- Paid staff in youth development/mentoring/youth-focused programs act as mentors in PCL's experience and in order to support community priorities for quality, especially the supply of available mentors that share an identity with youth, PCL wants to support mentoring programs that rely on paid, experienced, well-trained staff that serve as mentors, rather than rely exclusively or primarily on volunteer mentors.
- Mirrors national movement toward "Critical Mentoring" practice[36], advanced by the Center for Critical Mentoring and Youth Work, which centers culture as the primary driver of a mentee's learning and of the mentor/mentee relationships

- Research on best practices in mentoring supports these features[37] and studies indicate that quality mentoring programs are associated with positive youth outcomes in social emotional development, academic success, and reduced risky behaviors. [38]
- Local data on youth of color, who identify as an immigrant/refugee, as having a disability, as LGTBQ each experience disproportionate barriers to school success such as homelessness, bullying, poverty, and lower rates of academic achievement and positive youth development.[39]

Hunger Relief Strategy and Rationale

Program Area Goal: Expand access to healthy, nutritious food for hunger children.

PCL is seeking to invest in hunger relief programs that include the following features:
- Conducts significant outreach to improve awareness of resources
- Employs strategies to reduce stigmatization for people accessing services
- Is demonstrably responsive to community needs and preferences on location for access, hours of operation and culturally appropriate foods
- Has and uses nutrition and/or quality standards to screen food distributed to children and their families.
- Provides fresh, perishable foods including fruits, vegetables, dairy, eggs and meats.

1. Provide food for pickup by families at a variety of community locations including schools.

Possible service approaches include food distribution at community-based locations such as churches, schools, parks and organizations serving children/families, and distribution methods such as food pantries and fresh food “markets” that allow people to select needed foods, pre-prepared food boxes, and backpacks filled with non-perishable foods for weekends.

Rationale
- Community and school-based food distributions were prioritized across all strands of input as a best way to provide healthy nutritious food to children and their caregivers.
- Schools are geographically dispersed and reasonably convenient locations for many families with children to access.
- Lack of grocery stores in some neighborhoods create food deserts that make it difficult for many low-income families to access quality, nutritious foods.[40]
- Food insecurity and child poverty affect a significant portion of children and families in Portland, and both disproportionately impact children and families of color.[41]
- Food insecurity influences health and life outcomes for children and families.[42]

2. Provide mobile food banks or pantries and/or home delivery of food to children and families experiencing food insecurity.

Rationale
- Transportation to no-cost food resources and grocery stores was noted as a significant access barrier in all strands of public input, and the need for these services was a theme in focus group input.
- Mobile food resources can address the issue of limited hours of operation at food distribution sites.
- Transportation barriers are the most frequently cited reasons for seeking to access the food delivery program currently funded by PCL.[43]
- Some caregivers with disabilities and/or chronic health conditions, and caregivers whose children have disabilities or chronic health conditions disproportionately experience transportation barriers in accessing other community food resources.

3. Provide training and education on nutrition, cooking, food budgeting, smart shopping, accessing local food resources, gardening for food production and community gardening resources to children and their caregivers.

Rationale

- The need for training and education on these topics was a theme in focus group and provider input.
- Food insecure families eat less nutritious diets because low cost foods are often calorie dense but nutrient poor.[44]
- Education on food selection, nutrition and budgeting can decrease food insecurity and improve health outcomes.[45]

---

[1] Owens, K, Empress Rules (2019), Portland Children's Levy Community Engagement Report, http://www.portlandchildrenslevy.org/sites/default/files/documents/Portland%20Children%27s%20Levy%20Report.pdf

[2] Portland's Children: Overview of Key Local Data, 2018, pp 14-16. http://www.portlandchildrenslevy.org/sites/default/files/Local%20Data%20Profile.FINAL_.09.11.18.pdf

[3] Meloy, Gardner, and Darling-Hammond. Untangling the Evidence on Preschool Effectiveness: Insights for Policymakers. January 2019. Learning Policy Institute. https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/untangling-evidence-preschool-effectiveness-brief

[4] Manifesto for Race Equity & Parent Leadership in Early Childhood Systems. Jan 2019. Center for the Study of Social Policy. https://cssp.org/resource/parent-leader-manifesto/

[5] Center on the Developing Child at Harvard University (2017). Three Principles to Improve Outcomes for Children and Families. https://developingchild.harvard.edu/resources/three-early-childhood-development-principles-improve-child-family-outcomes/

[6] From the Ground Up: Establishing Strong Core Policies for Infants, Toddlers, and Families. 2017. CLASP and Zero to Three. https://www.zerotothree.org/resources/2053-from-the-ground-up-establishing-strong-core-policies-for-infants-toddlers-and-families

[7] Ibid. Owens, K, pp. 33-35

[8] Ibid. Portland's Children: Overview of Key Local Data, 2018, pp. 17-21

[9] Fortson, B.L., Klevens, J., Merrick, M.T., Gilbert, L.K., & Alexander, S.P. (2016). *Preventing Child Abuse and Neglect: A Technical Package for Policy, Norm, and Programmatic Activities.* Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/can-prevention-technical-package.pdf

[10] Center for the Study of Social Policy's Strengthening Families website https://cssp.org/our-work/project/strengthening-families/

[11] Ibid. Center on the Developing Child at Harvard University (2017). Three Principles to Improve Outcomes for Children and Families. [12] Center on the Developing Child at Harvard University (2016). *Applying the Science of Child Development in Child Welfare Systems.* https://developingchild.harvard.edu/resources/inbrief-applying-the-science-of-child-development-in-child-welfare-systems/

[13] Treatment and other healing approaches would be limited to services that are not eligible for coverage by Medicaid/Insurance (because the service is not eligible or because the participant does not have insurance coverage). Applicants could choose to propose to enhance existing services by requesting PCL funds to cover programmatic expenses that are not reimbursable or could propose new or additional services that are not covered by Medicaid Insurance.

[14] Ibid. Owens, K.
[15] Ibid. Portland's Children: Overview of Key Local Data
[16] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Violence Prevention website https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/childabuseandneglect/acestudy/index.html
[17] Ibid. *Preventing Child Abuse and Neglect: A Technical Package for Policy, Norm, and Programmatic Activities.*
[18] Ibid. Owens, K. p. 34
[19] Ibid. Portland's Children: Overview of Key Local Data p. 9-18
[20] Ibid. Owens, K. pp.39-42
[21] Department of Human Services, Child Welfare System, *Foster Care in Oregon: Chronic management failures and high caseloads jeopardize the safety of some of the state's most vulnerable children*. Secretary of State Performance Audit. January 2018; pp. 24-38 http://sos.oregon.gov/audits/Documents/2018-05.pdf.
[22] Ibid. Portland's Children: Overview of Key Local Data, 2018, pp. 17-21.
[23] CHAMPS, Children Need Amazing Parents (2019), Policy Playbook, 2nd Edition http://fosteringchamps.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/CHAMPS-Playbook-2nd-Edition.pdf
[24] Ibid. Center on the Developing Child at Harvard University (2016). *Applying the Science of Child Development in Child Welfare Systems.*
[25] Ibid. Owens, K.
[26] Ibid. Portland's Children: Overview of Key Local Data
[27] Ibid.
[28] Ibid. Center on the Developing Child at Harvard University
[29] Ibid. *Portland's Children: Overview of Key Local Data,* 2018, pp. 21-23
[30] Lauer, P. A., Akiba, M., Wilkerson, S. B., Apthorp, H. S., Snow, D., & Martin-Glenn, M. L. (2006). *Out-of-School-Time Programs: A Meta-Analysis of Effects for At-Risk Students. Review of Educational Research,* Vol. 76, No. 2 (Summer, 2006), pp. 275-313. American Educational Research Association, http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.836.238&rep=rep1&type=pdf.
Vinson, M., Sniegowski, S., & Liu, F. (2015). *New Jersey 21st Century Community Learning Centers Year 2 Report: 2013-14 Program Year*. American Institutes for Research, https://www.state.nj.us/education/students/safety/afterschool/eval/1314Report.pdf.
[31] Huang, D., Sung Kim, K., Marshall, A., & Perez, P. (2005). *Keeping Kids in School: An LA's BEST Example A Study Examining the Long-Term Impact of LA's BEST on Students' Dropout Rates.* National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing. University of California, Los Angeles, https://journals.library.ualberta.ca/jcie/index.php/JCIE/article/viewFile/11745/8977.
[32] Ibid, pp. 11-12, 23-24.
[33] See multiple citations referenced in the American Institutes for Research brief, *Supporting Social and Emotional Development Through Quality Afterschool Programs*, https://www.air.org/sites/default/files/downloads/report/Social-and-Emotional-Development-Afterschool-Programs.pdf.
Hirsch, B. J., Hedges, L. V., Stawicki, J., & Mekinda, M. A. (2011). *After-School Programs for High School Students: An Evaluation of After School Matters,* https://www.sesp.northwestern.edu/docs/publications/1070224029553e7f678c09f.pdf.
Durlak, J. A., Weissberg, R. P., & Pachan, M. (2010). *A Meta-Analysis of After-School Programs That Seek to Promote Personal and Social Skills in Children and Adolescents.* American Journal of Community Psychology. 45:294-309. http://www.flume.com.br/pdf/Durlak_A_meta-analysisof_after_school.pdf.
[34] See multiple citations in National Institute on Out-of-School Time, 2009 Fact Sheet on Children and Youth in Out-of-School Time, https://www.niost.org/pdf/factsheet2009.pdf.
[35] Ibid. Owens, K.
[36] For more on Critical Mentoring, see the work of Dr. Torie Weisten-Serdan (https://www.criticalmentoring.org/ and https://criticalperspective.org/2015/06/20/critical-mentoring-a-definition-and-agenda/)
[37] From Successful Relationships & Programs resource for mentoring, on Youth.gov https://www.youth.gov/youth-topics/mentoring/best-practices-mentoring-relationships-and-programs
[38] Snapshot: Youth Mentoring Research and Outcomes. From Mentor: the National Mentoring Partnership. https://www.mentoring.org/new-site/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/Snapshot-on-Mentoring-2016.pdf
[39] Ibid. Portland's Children: Overview of Key Local Data, 2018. Pp 9-13, 21-23

[40] 30% of Portlanders live within a half mile of a grocery store; 70% of Portlanders in the Central City live within a half mile of a grocery store. The Portland Plan, 2012, p. 130. http://www.portlandonline.com/portlandplan/index.cfm?c=58776.
[41] 22% of ***children i***n Multnomah County were food insecure in 2015; approximately 30% of African American, Native American and Latino ***individuals*** were food insecure in Multnomah County (2014-2016). 50% of children in Portland schools are enrolled in the federal school lunch program; 70% of children attending school in the 4 East Portland school districts were enrolled (David Douglas, Parkrose, Centennial, Reynolds). Portland's Children, Overview of Key Local Data, 2018, p 24.
[42] Review of multiple studies on the relationship between food insecurity and health in children in the United States. Craig Gunderson and James P. Ziliak, *Food Insecurity and Health Outcomes,* Health Affairs, Vol.34, No.11, 2015. https://www.healthaffairs.org/doi/full/10.1377/hlthaff.2015.0645. Food insufficiency associated with negative academic and psychosocial outcomes for children, Alaimo, Olson and Frongillo, Food insufficiency and American School-Aged Children's cognitive, Academic and Psychosocial Development, Pediatrics, Vol.108, 2001. https://pediatrics.aappublications.org/content/108/1/44.short.
[43] Portland Children's Levy: Investment Expectation, Results and Implications, 2017-18, p. 39. http://www.portlandchildrenslevy.org/about-us/performance-and-results.
[44] Drewnowski, Adam, The Cost of US Foods as Related to their Nutritive Value, American Journal of Clinical Nutrition, 92(5): 1181-1188, 2010. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2954450/
[45] The Importance of Nutrition Education in the 2015 Child Nutrition Reauthorization, Center for Food, Education and Policy, Columbia University; see article and accompanying citations to multiple studies. https://www.tc.columbia.edu/media/media-library-2014/centers/tisch-center/Nutrition-Ed-White-Paper-09.14.pdf.

Appendix B

Draft Request for Investment (RFI)

Introduction
Staff have prepared a draft template for the Request for Investment (RFI) for consideration, discussion and public testimony. The Allocation Committee will make final decisions on the template at their June 17, 2019 meeting. Publication of the RFIs is planned for September 2019.

The proposed revisions to the Organizational Capacity and Racial Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) section of the RFI combine two formerly separate sections on organizational capacity and cultural responsiveness into one section focused on the *applicant organization* and the extent and depth of its policies, practices and results related to racial equity, diversity and inclusion. This section is proposed to be worth 36/100 points.

The proposed revisions to the Proven Program Design and Effectiveness section of the RFI focus on streamlining and retooling questions to reflect input from community engagement on desired program features, particularly those related to advancing racial equity, diversity, and inclusion. The proposed changes would align PCL's RFI with equity themes raised in community engagement, and best practices in assuring children and families experience racially just, safe, and inclusive programs. Desired features unique to particular program areas will be included in the program area RFIs once the basic template is adopted by the Committee. This section is proposed to be worth 54/100 points.

Staff will provide a draft of Program Budget/Budget Narrative/Cost Effectiveness section with the draft program area RFIs this coming fall. This section will be worth 10/100 points.

For previous RFIs, see http://www.portlandchildrenslevy.org/grants/grant-application-archive

Proposed Changes
Organizational Capacity/EDI Section
1. Alignment with City-wide equity goals. The city adopted three equity goals in 2015 (after the last PCL competitive funding round), and PCL seeks to assure we are advancing these goals in our grantmaking process, community engagement practices and internal operations. PCL staff acknowledge our lack of diversity (all PCL staff identify as white) and are striving toward cultural humility and responsiveness. In addition to changes to grantmaking process for the next funding round, PCL has created an Affirmative Action Plan, and is in the process of creating an Equity Plan.

2. PSU Recommendations. Proposed changes to the RFI aim to honor the intent of PSU's recommendations (from process improvement review they conducted) to award more points to applicant *organizations* with greater commitment, experience and results in racial equity, diversity and inclusion, and to those whose clients, staff and board are majority of color. The changes eliminate the focus on cultural specificity, and do not incorporate PSU's bonus point recommendations. The standard for demographic reflectiveness of staff and board as majority people of color is as PSU recommended.

3. Community Engagement Recommendations. These recommendations aim to reflect community preference for services delivered in ways that prioritize racial equity, diversity, inclusion, cultural responsiveness and that service providers reflect the culture and language of service users.

4. Other Funders' Focus on Organizational Commitment to Racial Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion. Conversations with other funders, and review of other funders' applications demonstrated a focus on organizational commitment to EDI, reflectiveness of staff and board (judged differently by different funders), if/how service providers truly involve communities served in service design/improvement, and whether/how service providers are accountable to communities served.

5. Point Spread in 2014 Scores. In 2014 funding process, 91% of applications scored 8 or more (out of 10 points) on the former organizational capacity section. Conversely, the score range was far greater on the Culturally Responsive Programs/Organizations section: 70% of applications scored 19 or more, while 12 applications were eliminated for scoring 15 or less. The proposed revisions seek to increase the types of questions that offered reviewers more options for discernment in scores, and therefore more likely affect which applications are eventually funded.

Proven Program Design and Effectiveness Section

1. Community Engagement Recommendations. Include program features highlighted in community engagement in program design questions including: past success/experience in serving the population, evidence of service user desire for the program, diversity and reflectiveness of program staffing, and assuring staff training/development related to issues of program quality.

2. Focus on Racial Equity, Diversity and Inclusion. Emphasize racial equity, diversity, and inclusion in questions such as population to be served, outreach, barriers to reaching population, explanation of program design, and program attendance, outcomes, and staffing.

3. Reduce and Simplify: Assure all information requested will be used and simplify language to make it easier for applicants to understand the RFI and prepare an application.

4. Eliminate Bonus Points. Weave racial equity, diversity, and inclusion into RFI questions/scoring criteria. Included question on serving East Portland in section on population to be served.

I. Organizational Capacity and Commitment to Racial Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (36 points)

The City of Portland has adopted 3 goals focused on advancing racial equity:

- We will end racial disparities within city government, so there is fairness in hiring and promotions, greater opportunities in contracting, and equitable services to all residents.

- We will strengthen outreach, public engagement, and access to City services for communities of color and immigrant and refugee communities, and support or change existing services using racial equity best practices.

- We will collaborate with communities and institutions to eliminate racial inequity in all areas of government, including education, criminal justice, environmental justice, health, housing, transportation, and economic success.

PCL uses the city's definitions of Equity, Racial Equity, and Diversity.

- Equity is achieved when one's identity cannot predict the outcome. Racial Equity is when race does not determine or predict the distribution of resources, opportunities, and burdens for group members in society.
- Diversity includes all the ways in which people are different, and it encompasses all the different characteristics that make one individual or group different from one another.

Inclusion, as defined by Race Matters Institute: "…is a feature of a setting when voice is valued form the diverse people present and they have organizational power. Inclusion is a core feature of a respectful organizational culture; it is manifested in the setting itself and the dynamics of that setting."

PCL values racial equity, diversity and inclusion of children and families in Portland. One of PCL's goals is to reduce racial disparities in children's outcomes and advance racial equity in children's well-being and success. PCL recognizes that organizations founded with the purpose of racial equity and social justice, with extensive experience and deep commitment to racial equity, are best positioned to help the City and PCL meet its goals.

PCL will fund organizations with demonstrated success and experience, grounded in racial equity, diversity, and inclusion, serving children and families most affected by racial inequities and injustice. PCL understands that organizations are on a continuum of development in their work on racial equity, diversity, and inclusion. Organizations with greater evidence of their commitment and experience with racial equity, diversity, and inclusion, including highly culturally responsive service delivery, will earn more points in this section of the application.

Please answer all parts, A – H, and label your responses to match the letter and heading. Do not include the text of the RFI questions. x- page maximum narrative; xx-point font; Exhibit X, Table X separate from narrative. Applications must score at least 23 of 36 points in this section to be considered for funding. PCL has provided the scoring criteria, following the RFI questions, to help you prepare your application.

A. Organization History and Purpose

Provide a brief summary of the organization's purpose based on its vision, mission, values and history. Describe how those features of the organization reflect its commitment to racial equity, diversity, and inclusion.

B. Leadership and Strategic Direction

Briefly summarize the organization's current strategic plan and its relationship to serving children and families, including the time-period of the strategic plan. Explain how the organization's strategic plan advances the organization's commitment to racial equity, diversity, and inclusion. Describe the roles and responsibilities of organizational leadership in advancing racial equity, diversity and inclusion.

C. Staff Recruitment, Retention, Promotion and Training; Board Training

- Describe the organization's efforts to recruit, train, retain and promote staff to work successfully within the organization.
- Describe how the organization attracts and retains staff who reflect the population served by the organization. Explain how the organization builds its workforce from the populations that it serves.
- Describe how the organization trains staff around issues of racial equity, diversity, and inclusion, including how staff are trained to deliver culturally responsive services to the cultural groups it serves. Describe the impact of that training on service delivery.
- Describe any cultural responsiveness and racial equity, diversity, and inclusion training the organization provides for the board of directors. Describe the impact of the training on the organization.

You may reference Table x in your narrative explanation as needed.

D. Language Accessibility

Describe the organization's approach to language accessibility with the populations it serves, including translation, interpretation, accommodations or assistive technology practices. Describe how the organization evaluates the quality and effectiveness of the language accessibility it offers to clients. You may reference Table x in your narrative explanation as needed.

E. Service User Voice and Influence

Describe how the organization includes service users in identifying the services they want to meet their needs. Describe how service user voice informs the organization's understanding of racial equity, diversity, and inclusion. Describe the organization's greatest accomplishment in the past two years integrating service user voice into its work.

F. Community Engagement and Collaboration

Describe how the organization engages authentically and collaborates with community leaders and community-based organizations that represent the interests of the population(s) it serves.

Describe how these relationships advance the organization's commitment to racial equity, diversity, and inclusion.

G. Achievements and Accountability

Describe how the organization holds itself accountable for racial equity, diversity, and inclusion with the populations it serves. Describe the organization's most significant achievement in advancing racial equity, diversity, and inclusion within the organization, and for children and families in Portland.

H. Demographics Characteristics of Organization's Clients, Staff and Board Members

Complete Table x, Exhibit x per the instructions below. Please refer to the definitions in Exhibit x prior to completing the table.

- **Clients served by the Organization**: enter the actual number for an annual period of ALL unduplicated clients served (i.e. children, adults, or both) served by the organization and their corresponding demographic data. Please use an annual period ending on or as close to June 30, 2019 as possible.
- **Direct Service Staff:** enter the actual number of direct service staff (those that work directly with clients) in the organization and their corresponding demographic data as of June 30, 2019.
- **Management Staff:** enter the actual number of management staff (those that supervise direct service staff and all other executive management) in the organization and their corresponding demographic data as of June 30, 2019.
- **Board of Directors:** enter the actual number of board members and their corresponding demographic data as of June 30, 2019.
- **Note:** You may add additional demographic variables as additional rows if you choose, but please do not add additional columns. Additional demographic variables may include any other uniquely identifiable population.

Describe methods the organization used to arrive at the numbers provided in Table X.

DRAFT (Table X to RFI exerpt): Demographics of Organization's Clients, Staff and Board Members

Name of Applicant Organization: **Name of Program:**

	# of Total Clients served by Organization	% of Total Clients served by Organization	# of Organization Direct Service Staff	% of Direct Service Staff	# Organization Managem't Staff	% Managem't Staff	# of Organization Board of Directors	% of Board of Directors	PROPOSED PROGRAM: Total Number of Children to serve	Total Number of Parents or Caregivers to serve
Total Unduplicated Numbers										
									Percent of Total	**Percent of Total**
1. Gender	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Male										
Female										
Transgender										
Genderqueer										
Did Not Specify										
2. Race/ Ethnicity	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Latino/Hispanic										
African American										
African Immigrant/Refugee										
Native American/ Alaska Native										
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander										
Asian										
Eastern European Immigrant/Refugee										
Multiracial/Multiethnic										
White										
Did Not Specify										
3. Primary Language in Home	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
English										
Spanish										
Vietnamese										
Russian										
Chinese (Mandarin, Catonese, etc)										
Other (specify)										
Other languages										
Did Not Specify										
4. Disability	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Has Disability										
Did Not Specify										
5. Immigrant/Refugee	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0%	0%
Identifies as Immigrant/Refugee										
Did Not Specify										

I. Organizational Capacity and Commitment to Racial Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion   Possible Points: 36

For Maximum Points for each subsection, responses include the following elements:	Score per Subsection
A. Organization History and Purpose: up to 4 points	
• Organization history, mission, vision, and values show dedication and experience serving children and families, an indicate the organization working toward racial equity, diversity, and inclusion. (2 points)	___ Points
• Organization history, mission, vision and values all show strong commitment to racial equity, diversity, and inclusion for children and families. (2 points)	___ Points
Reviewer Notes:	
B. Leadership and Strategic Direction: up to 3 points	
• Organization has a current strategic plan that includes its services for children and families. (1 points)	___ Points
• Organization’s current strategic plan has clear objectives that advance the organization’s commitment to racial equity, diversity and inclusion. (1 point)	___ Points
• Organizational leadership, including Board of Directors, have clear roles and responsibilities for the racial equity, diversity, and inclusion objectives in the plan. (1 point)	___ Points
Reviewer Notes:	
C. Staff Recruitment, Retention, Promotion and Training; Board Training: up to 8 points	
• Has clear practices for recruiting, preparing/training, retaining, and promoting staff to work successfully in the organization. (2 points)	___ Points
• Has successful strategies to recruit, retain and promote staff that reflects the diversity of clients served by the organization. Has developed and sustained efforts to build its workforce from the populations it serves. (2 points)	___ Points
• Staff, including Management, receive ongoing training on cultural responsiveness, racial equity, diversity and inclusion; organization describes how the training has clearly had a meaningful impact the cultural responsiveness of service delivery. (2 points)	___ Points
• Organization provides training on cultural responsiveness, racial equity, diversity and inclusion to Board of Directors; describes how the training has had a meaningful impact on the organization and its work. (2 points)	___ Points
Reviewer Notes:	
D. Language Accessibility: up to 4 points	
• Describes multiple practices to make communication accessible to service users. Examples may include offering services in the population’s native language(s), translation of written materials, interpretation during service delivery, or other tools such as assistive technology and materials compatible with assistive technology, and accessible or plain language approach in materials. • Evaluates the quality and effectiveness of the interpretation, translation, or accessible communication services provided and demonstrates effective interpretation services or high quality language accessibility. (2 points)	___ Points
• Has strategies for hiring and retaining staff that speak the language(s) of clients served by the organization. Direct service staff speak many of the languages spoken by clients served. (2 points)	___ Points
Reviewer Notes:	
E. Service User Voice and Influence: up to 4 points	
• Uses multiple methods on a regular basis across the organization to solicit service user feedback, such as focus groups, surveys, interviews, and/or community advisory groups. (1 point)	___ Points

• Demonstrates how the organization has shaped its service offerings and priorities based on clients' stated needs and solutions to meeting their needs. (1 point)	___ Points
• Greatest accomplishment clearly demonstrates deep, ongoing involvement of service user voice in the organization's work, and advancing racial equity, diversity and inclusion. (2 points)	___ Points
Reviewer Notes:	
F. Community Engagement and Collaboration: up to 4 points	
• Has established, ongoing collaborations or partnerships with community leaders and/or community-based organizations that represent or serve the interests of the population served. • Evidence provided includes partnerships that have been in place for at least 2 years or longer, and may include responsibility for shared outcomes between partners, shared budget and funding for service delivery, mutually beneficial advisory or advocacy roles. (2 points)	___ Points
• Collaborations and partnerships with community leaders and community-based organizations clearly advance the organization's commitment to racial equity, diversity, and inclusion. (2 points)	___ Points
Reviewer Notes:	
G. Achievements and Accountability: up to 3 points	
• Describes robust approaches for holding itself accountable for racial equity, diversity, and inclusion such as annual reporting and analysis of demographic data of clients served and staff/board composition, annual reporting and analysis of program outcome data, maintaining ongoing community advisory committees, and organizational leadership acting in response to these sources. • Demonstrates significant achievement in meeting its own organizational goals for racial equity, diversity, and inclusion, and meaningfully advancing racial equity, diversity, and inclusion. • Most significant achievement in advancing racial equity, diversity, and inclusion in Portland has made a substantial difference in the lives of children and families. (3 points)	___ Points
Reviewer Notes:	
H. Demographics of Organization's Clients, Staff and Board Members: up to 6 points	
• The demographics of the clients served by the organization indicate the organization prioritizes racial equity, diversity and inclusion. (1 point)	___ Points
• 51% or more of clients served by the organization last year identify as a person of color. (1 point)	___ Points
• 51% or more of direct service staff identify as a person of color. (1 point)	___ Points
• 51% or more of management service staff identify as a person of color. (1 point)	___ Points
• 51% or more of board of directors identify as a person of color. (1 point)	___ Points
• Organization's methods for collecting the demographic data in Table X indicate the data are gathered directly from clients, staff, and board members, rather than estimated by organization staff. (1 point)	___ Points
Reviewer Notes:	

Organizational Capacity and Commitment to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion
TOTAL Score: ____ out of 36 Points Possible

II. Proven Program Design and Effectiveness (54 points)

PCL will invest in programs that use best practices and achieve positive outcomes with children and/or families. Merriam-Webster defines best practices as those shown by research and experience to produce optimal results and are established or proposed as a standard suitable for widespread adoption. Penn State's Evidence-based Prevention & Intervention Support Center defines "evidence-based programs" as those that have demonstrated effectiveness through: rigorous scientific evaluation, large studies with either diverse populations or multiple replications, sustained and significant effects over time. PCL recognizes that not all programs have been studied and deemed "evidence-based", and that some "evidence-based" programs may not achieve positive results for all populations.

PCL seeks to fund effective programs that demonstrate:

- Clear focus on whom they serve, how the program is designed, and why the program is best suited to serve the needs of the focus population. Service users and/or their families have a strong voice in how the program serves their needs.
- Based on best practices, including cultural responsiveness, racial equity, diversity, and inclusion.
- Assess and monitor participants attendance in program activities and achieve intended child or caregiver outcomes.
- Reviews results and works to improve quality using regular feedback from service users. They reflect on how their program is working compared to best practices and program goals, and they make program improvements, including in cultural responsiveness, racial equity, diversity, and inclusion.

Please answer all parts A – F, and label your responses to match the letter and heading. Do not include the text of the RFI questions. x- page maximum narrative; xx-point font. Applications must score at least 38 of 54 to be considered for funding. PCL has provided the scoring criteria, following the RFI questions, to help you prepare your application.

A. Program Summary and Connection to Application Organization

Provide a brief paragraph summary of the program service that you want PCL to fund. Indicate and explain which the PCL service strategy your program addresses. Provide a second brief paragraph describing how the program fits into the organization's current mission, its strategic plan, and its other services. Provide a third brief paragraph explaining how the program advances the organization's commitment to racial equity, diversity, and inclusion.

B. Population to be Served

Be sure you have completed Table X in Section I of your application, indicating demographics of the population to be served by the program in FY2020-21.

In addition, complete the next table for the first year of this grant (July 1, 2020- June 30, 2021). The number of total children (or parents or caregivers) to be served in the next table should match the total number to be served shown in Table X from Section I of the application.

Use the numbered questions after the table to describe the population to be served.

Estimates of Population to be Served	**Year 1, 2020-21**
CHILDREN: Number of Total Unduplicated Children to Be Served	
PARENTS: Number of Total parents/caregivers to be served (if applicable)	
Estimated Population to be Served by Program, Year 1, 2020-21	**% of Children or Parents/caregivers**
Geographic Area	
East Portland (reside or attend school in zip codes: 97216, 97220, 97230, 97233, 97236, 97266)	
North Portland	
Other areas of Portland	
Homeless	
Not given	
Age	
prenatal - 2	
3 - 5	
6 - 11 (Elementary School)	
12-14 (Middle School)	
15-18 (High School)	
Age 19 and older	
Not given	
Socioeconomic Status	
185% of Federal Poverty Level or less	
186% of FPL or more	
Not given	

1. Explanation of Number of Children/Youth, or Caregivers Projected to be Served

How have you calculated the total number of children/youth or caregivers to be served by the program in 2020-21? You may refer to factors such as group size, case load, adult: child ratio, program model standards or similar factors. Do you plan to serve the same number of children/caregivers in the second and third grant years? If not, discuss whether you plan to increase or decrease and why.

2. Estimated Demographics of Population to be Served

How did you estimate the demographics of the population to be served? PCL wants families residing or attending school in East Portland to have access to PCL-funded services. In addition, PCL priority populations in the program area are: *[note: will vary by program area and examples include children of color, immigrants & refugees, children with disabilities, youth who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and/or other gender identities]* Please indicate which, if any, of these populations will comprise 51% or more of the program population.

C. Outreach and Recruitment of Population to be Served

What outreach methods will you use to recruit children or caregivers for the program? How are these methods culturally responsive and likely to be effective with the population? What barriers to recruitment do you anticipate encountering, and what will you do to address them (to the extent possible)?

D. Program Design

1. Main Program Activities

Complete the table to show the main activities of the program. Specify up to three service activities most fundamental to the program. Amount of service offered refers to how much service will be offered to the child or caregiver. You may reference hours per day, days per week, weeks per year and/or total numbers of visits, classes, groups or other service activities that will be offered.

Table: Program Activities in Year 1, 2020-21		
Program Activity	**Number of people to be served (specify if children, or primary caregivers) in Year 1, 2020-21**	**Amount of Service to be Offered in Year 1, 2020-21**
Other Program Design Details		
Sites, if applicable: List the name(s) and address(es) of all sites, such as schools, at which services will be offered:		
Multiyear Service: If the service is designed to serve the same person for multiple years, specify the range of years a person could participate:		
Curricula or Model/Standards Used (if applicable): If the program uses curricula or program model standards and practices to guide its activities, please list those here and provide a 1-2 sentence explanation of each one.		

2. Program Attendance Goals

PCL expects, and best practices across many types of programs indicate, that people are more likely to achieve program outcomes when they attend the program consistently. Describe how much program attendance is needed for a child or caregiver to experience the program's outcomes. You may refer to hours, days, classes, sessions or other ways to count attendance. What percentage of children or caregivers served in the program will reach that level of attendance annually during the grant?

3. Program Outcomes

Using the table, list up to 4 outcomes you anticipate children or caregivers will achieve. Project the percentage of children or caregivers served that will meet each outcome listed. Outcomes refer generally to changes in participants' skills, knowledge, attitudes or behavior.

Table: Program Outcomes	
Child or Caregiver Outcomes	**Percent of Children or Caregivers Projected to Meet Outcome (2020-21)**

4. Staffing for Program

List direct service and supervisory staff positions for the program. Direct service positions are defined as staff that works face-to-face with children/caregivers. Do not list names of staff. Insert rows as needed.

Table: Staffing for Program		
Staff Position or Job Title	**Key Job Responsibilities**	**Key Minimum Qualifications**
Caseload or Adult: Child Ratio Indicate the child/adult ratio or "caseload" for 1 FTE in the proposed program.		
Supervisor to Staff Ratio: Indicate the amount or ratio of supervision FTE designated for each direct service staff 1 FTE in the proposed program.		
Demographics of Program Staff: How will the demographics of program direct service staff, including language spoken, reflect the demographics of the population to be served? You may refer to Table X in your response.		

E. Explanation of the Program Design

In responding to the questions below, please include any racial equity, diversity, and inclusion considerations in your explanations.

1. How is this program appropriate for and relevant to the needs of the population(s) you intend to serve?

2. How do you know that the population to be served wants this program?

3. How do the program activities reflect best practices for the program model? How will the program's activities lead to the proposed outcomes?

F. Program Results, Quality, and Improvement

1. Program Attendance

In section D2 you indicated how much of the program children or caregivers should attend to achieve outcomes. You also projected the percentage of total children or caregivers served who would meet that attendance level. How did you determine the percentage?

Describe how the program staff will track and monitor child or caregiver attendance in the program. How will the program use attendance data to reflect on program quality? How will the program monitor racial equity, diversity, and inclusion in program attendance?

2. Program Outcomes

In section D3 you projected the percentage of total children or caregivers served that will achieve the outcomes. How did you determine the percentages for each outcome?

What tools, such as surveys, screenings, assessments, interview protocols, and/or case note forms, will the program use to collect and report the outcome data described in section D3? Why did the program select the specified tool(s) to assess child or caregivers outcomes? How are the tools appropriate for and culturally responsive to the population to be served?

How does the program use, or plan to use, its outcomes to reflect on program quality? How will the program monitor racial equity, diversity, and inclusion in program outcomes?

3. Staff Development and Supervision

Describe the types of training that direct service staff and supervisors complete to deliver the program activities.

Describe how you will identify and respond to the ongoing training and professional development needs for both supervisory and direct service staff in the program.

Describe the frequency, length, and nature of supervision for direct service staff and for the program supervisor. Please reference the ratio of direct service staff FTE to supervisor FTE in your response.

Describe how direct service staff and supervisors are trained and supported in advancing racial equity, diversity, and inclusion in the proposed program.

DRAFT: Excerpt of Review and Scoring Form

II. Proven Program Design and Effectiveness **Possible Points: 54**

For Maximum Points for each subsection, responses include the following elements:	Score per Subsection
A. Program Summary and Connection to Applicant Organization: up to 3 points	
• Summary paragraph clearly outlines the program and explains how program addresses PCL service strategy. • Program clearly fits organization's mission, strategic plan, and its other services. (2 points)	___ points
• Program clearly advances organization's commitment to racial equity, diversity, and inclusion. (1 point)	___ points
Reviewer Notes:	
B. Population to be Served: up to 8 points	
Number Served and Demographics of Population in Tables (1 point) • Numbers of children or caregivers to serve are shown in both tables and match each other. • Demographics of population to be served are complete in both tables.	___ Points
B1. Explanation of Projected Number to be Served (2 points) • Calculation for numbers to serve is clear and refers to factors such as caseloads, group sizes, adult to child ratio, or other factors affecting number of children or caregivers to serve. • Indicates whether program will serve more, fewer, or same number of children or caregivers in second and third year of grant, and explanation is clear.	___ Points
B2. Estimated Demographics of Population to be Served (5 points)	
• Explains methods for demographic estimates in tables such as program experience, organization experience, or other data sources related to recruitment of population to be served. (2 points)	___ Points
• Indicates 51% or more of population to be served will identify as one or more of the following priority populations: *[note: will vary by program area and examples include children of color, children with disabilities, youth who identify as LGTBQ+, youth who identify as immigrants/refugees]* (2 points)	___ Points
• Indicates 51% or more of population to be served lives in or attends school in East Portland. (1 point)	___ Points
Reviewer Notes:	
C. Outreach and Recruitment of Population to be served: up to 3 points	
• Demonstrates how outreach methods are effective with the population to be served. • Demonstrates knowledge of population's barriers to engagement and describes how program will seek to reduce barriers to engagement. (2 points)	___ Points
• Explains racial equity, diversity, and inclusion considerations in its outreach methods and strategies to help address barriers. Addresses how its outreach methods and engagement efforts are culturally responsive to the population to be served by the program. (1 point)	___ Points
Reviewer Notes:	
D. Program Design: up to 6 points	
D1. Main Program Activities (1 points) • The program activity table is complete and are understandable.	___ Points
D2. Program Attendance Goals (2 points) • Explains how much of the program children or caregivers should attend to achieve outcomes. Specifies the percentage of children or caregivers that will reach attendance level needed for outcomes.	___ Points

D3. Program Outcomes (1 points) • The outcomes table is complete and understandable. Outcomes specified are a change in knowledge, skills, behaviors, attitudes.	___ Points
D4. Staffing for Program (3 points) • The staffing table is complete and understandable. • Explains how demographics of direct service staff will reflect population to be served. Explains whether direct services staff will speak home language of population to be served. Overall, evidence in the organizational section of the application, including Table X, supports these explanations.	___ Points
Reviewer Notes:	
E. Explanation of Program Design: up to 12 points	
• Demonstrates evidence that proposed program design is intentional, based on experience, and has success working with the population to be served. Evidence includes examples of success and experience working with the population to be served. (4 points)	___ Points
• Organization's demographics in Table X further supports these explanations. (1 point)	___ Points
• Describes how population to be served has had a leading voice in deciding that it wants this program. (2 points)	___ Points
• Demonstrates how proposed program activities reflect best practices for the program model. Describes how program activities will lead to proposed outcomes. (3 points)	___ Points
• Convincingly demonstrates racial equity, diversity, inclusion considerations in its explanations for the population to be served, program activities, and specified outcome goals. (2 points)	___ Points
Reviewer Notes:	
F. Program Results, Quality, and Improvement: up to 18 points	
F1. Program Attendance (5 points) • Explains method for determining the percent of children or caregivers projected to meet attendance level for outcomes. Percentages seem reasonable to produce outcomes. (1 point)	___ Points
• Demonstrates clear process program staff will use to track child or caregiver attendance in the program. • Demonstrates clear process for using attendance data to reflect on program quality, such as identifying what is considered low and high attendance by children or caregivers, reviewing data with program staff and service users to identify areas for program improvement. (2 points)	___ Points
• Demonstrates how program monitors racial equity, diversity, and inclusion in program attendance by offering examples such as: analyzing attendance data disaggregated by race/ethnicity or home language; accommodations made to assure program accessibility; culturally responsive approaches to re-engage children or caregivers with low attendance and to celebrate children or caregivers with high attendance; or other relevant examples. (2 points)	___ Points
F2. Program Outcomes (7 points) • Explains method for determining the percent of children or caregivers projected to achieve each outcome. Percentages seem reasonable as goals for program. (1 point)	___ Points
• Clearly identifies assessment tools (e.g. surveys, assessments) used to measure child or caregiver outcomes. • Clearly explains why tools were selected to measure the outcomes specified. (2 points)	___ Points
• Demonstrates how selected outcome measurement tools are culturally responsive to the population to be served, such as describing strengths and challenges of the outcome measurement tools for the population. (1 point)	___ Points
• Demonstrates clear process for using outcome data to reflect on program quality, such as sharing data with program staff and service users to identify areas for program improvement. (2 points)	___ Points

• Demonstrates how program monitors racial equity, diversity, and inclusion in program outcomes by offering examples such as disaggregating outcome data by race/ethnicity, using outcomes to identify and improve program practices that advance racial equity, diversity and inclusion. (2 points)	___ Points
F3. Staff Development and Supervision (6 points) • Explains clear process for assuring direct service staff and supervisors are trained in relevant content, topics, and best practices to deliver the program. • Demonstrates clear methods to identify and support direct service and supervisory staff's ongoing training and professional development needs. (2 points)	___ Points
• Explains the frequency, length, and nature of supervision of direct service staff and program supervisory staff. References the ratio of direct service FTE to supervisor FTE to explain the supervision structure and approach with direct services staff. (2 points)	___ Points
• Demonstrates how program staff and supervisors are trained and receive ongoing development and support in racial equity, diversity, inclusion and cultural responsiveness specific to the program. (2 points)	___ Points
Reviewer Notes:	

Proven Program Design and Effectiveness
TOTAL Score: ____ out of 54 Points Possible

Appendix C

Tentative Schedule for PCL Funding Process, 2019-20

Action	Dates	Notes/Time Period
AC Meeting September	Between 9/9 - 9/23	Finalize program area RFIs including guidelines
Publish RFI	9/25	
Bidders' Conferences	9/30 - 10/11	
Application Due Date	11/20	8 weeks for applicants to respond
Applications to Reviewers	12/4 – 12/6	Host 2 reviewer trainings Dec. 4-6
Review Period	12/4 – 1/21	Nearly 7 weeks to review
Individual Meetings with Reviewers	1/21 – 1/31	About two weeks to collect, review score sheets
Staff enter scores and develop funding recommendations	1/31 – 2/26	Four weeks to create final scores for all applicants, prepare application data spreadsheets by program area, prepare reviewer score forms for applicants, develop and communicate funding recommendations to applicants
Applicant Written Testimony Due	3/18	1.5 weeks to respond to staff recommendation; due before spring break
Materials to AC	3/20	Before spring break; includes spreadsheets, summaries, staff recommendations, written testimony
Video Testimony Taped	3/30 – 4/3	3-4 dates/locations
Video sent to AC	4/8	
Funding Decision Meetings (3 program areas per meeting)	4/20 4/27	AC has materials for 4 weeks; 2.5 weeks to listen to watch video testimony plus week between meetings