

**Portland Children's Levy  
Allocation Committee Meeting Minutes  
February 4, 2019 2:30 p.m.  
Location: Portland City Hall Council Chambers**

---

*The full record of the meeting may be viewed on the Portland Children's Investment Fund website:  
[www.portlandchildrenslevy.org](http://www.portlandchildrenslevy.org)  
or YouTube at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LzVfo6VAZXg>*

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

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

**Wheeler:** I feel very fortunate to be overseeing the Portland Children's Levy. I am looking forward to my role on this Committee.

Welcome to **Multnomah County Commissioner Jessica Vega Pederson** as the County elected member of the Allocation Committee.

**Vega Pederson:** I am honored to serve on the Allocation Committee.

**Approval of minutes from October 22, 2018 meeting**

**Vega Pederson:** So moved

**Hornecker:** Second

**Vote:** All in favor

**Public Comment**

None

**Portland State University Grantmaking Process Improvement Recommendations**

McElroy:

- Last summer the Allocation Committee authorized the Levy to issue an Intermediate Request for Proposals to hire a consultant to design and implement a qualitative research project that identifies strengths and challenges with PCL grantmaking process and offers recommendations for improvements. This was done preparation for the upcoming grantmaking cycle.
- The project is being done by a team from Portland State University's Center for Improvement of Child & Family Services, led by Thuan Dong, Research Associate at the Center, and Alma Trinidad, Associate Professor in the School of Social Work.
- The report was already disseminated publicly through the Levy contact list.

**Thuan Dong:** It can be easy to miss elements when dealing with as much data as we did. We spoke with 66 individuals, not including Levy staff. We did not emphasize that the Levy and other stakeholders are doing really great, important work, with integrity.

The report can be found here: <http://www.portlandchildrenslevy.org/community-engagement>. The report is appended to these minutes.

Our report was an institutional analysis to review the Children's Levy system. It considers the system as an actor and looks at the processes involved. Our goal was to evaluate the system. That is where we focused our recommendations. It assumes bias or inequities are likely to exist and we are looking for them. We are seeking to make the systems more just. We focused on racial equity in our analysis.

Our methods are qualitative. Our methods were grounded in reviewing the 2015 grantmaking process. We reviewed that process.

We also did literature reviews of best practices and equitable grantmaking. Most of the literature is focused on private foundations; so, we did some translation.

We did interviews and focus groups. We interviewed applicants, both funded and unfunded, Levy staff and Allocation Committee members, and members of the local funding community.

We looked at the whole process in its various parts.

Our data sources included 21 organizations funded or unfunded. We included 5 culturally specific agencies and 6 agencies that were new and funded, and 4 that were new and unfunded.

Our process involved 66 different interviews and hundreds of pages of proposals and other documents.

We get to various confidence elements in our findings. Those elements are saturation, complexity, subtlety, resonance and validity in the stories we heard.

We felt that we did have a lot of confidence in our findings.

The two main categories of our findings were: increasing transparency and strengthening equitable practices. We learned that many times processes were being done with integrity, but communication was not enough. There are places where there are more opportunities for both categories. We did find many instances where both are present.

**Kevin Cherry**, PhD student and instructor at PSU School of Social Work: I will go through the 4 different phases of the grantmaking process.

Pre-Proposal phase  
Bidder's Conference

Strengths:

- Effective information sharing about PCL priorities and mechanics of the proposal
- Positive engagement with PCL staff

Challenges

- Accumulated knowledge/capital presents equity concerns can lead to perceptions of high barrier of entry
- Uncertainty and anxiety about subsequent phases of the grantmaking process

Proposal phase  
RFI (Request for Investment)

### Strengths

- RFI is clear, well-organized and thorough. It rewards good programming
- Applicants are clear on how to complete a proposal – and receive adequate support

### Challenges

- High barrier to entry – detail and organization is high; high level of data and organizational capacity

### Review and Recommendation phase

#### Community-based review/scoring and PCL staff recommendation

### Strengths

- Community reviewers are recruited and valued for their diverse experiences and knowledge
- PCL staff have deep knowledge of applicants – and communicate and utilize this expertise accordingly. This instills confidence in applicants.

### Challenges

- Perceived inequity through possibilities of bias and insufficient information.
- Lack of clarity about the relationship between reviewer scores, staff recommendations and final Allocation decisions
- Lack of clarity on culturally specific bonus points scoring and guidelines.

### Decision and Allocation

#### Public Allocation Committee hearings

### Strengths

- Applicants have opportunities to share their work and their agencies with the Allocation Committee
- A level of transparency is guaranteed because of the public decision-making

### Challenges

- Applicants just don't like this phase of the process. It can feel intimidating and shaming, and it is highly uncomfortable to be competing against one's peers
- Perceived disparities in who can fully access and benefit from testimony and advocacy
- Final allocation decisions can appear unpredictable and unrelated to community reviews, staff recommendations and public testimony

**Wheeler:** This is very compelling and I appreciate it. The perceived disparities in access to private advocacy, can you confirm that happens?

**Thuan Dong:** Private advocacy does occur, both as policy and based on our interviews.

**Wheeler:** When we have an RFP out for the City, we do not meet privately with people who are applying.

**McElroy:** Because this is a grant process, our process is structured differently from a typical city RFP. Emails of Committee members are public. Levy staff does not manage access.

**Wheeler:** Interesting. I look forward to your recommendation on that point. I do not have time to meet with everyone, so will likely develop my own policy.

**Vega Pederson:** We sometimes have regular County business with people who might be applying for a grant. It can get murky in terms of how you manage those meetings.

**Dr. Alma Trinidad:** These are our findings that are perceptions of those we interviewed.

**Cherry:** We did hear from stakeholders that this is happening. We cannot say whether the advocacy influences decisions.

**Wheeler:** The City uses procurement policy to keep the playing field level. City policy states that we are not to discuss the RFP with an applicant, even if meeting for another purpose. It is an interesting point.

**Trinidad:** There were examples of providers meeting with members to share information about their work. That is totally open, even off-cycle, when an RFI is not happening.

**Thuan Dong:** The playing field is never level. We hope to increase the levelling of it.

**Wheeler:** I want to make sure as much as possible we eliminate the perception that the playing field is not level. It undercuts the process.

#### Recommendations

**Thuan Dong:** The full report has 30 recommendations. The executive summary has 7.

1. Development of a fund dedicated to small grants to support small, emerging organizations, not previously funded by Portland Children's Levy. This fund would have a different minimum and maximum grant amounts than PCL uses for its typical grants.
2. Redesign Section IV of the RFI to include more explicit definition of culture; separate out the culturally specific bonus points to a newly created Section V and increase the number of bonus points from 3 to 12 as indication of the importance of culturally specific work
3. Reconsider the public testimony process, including increasing time allotted for testimony and making the testimony private (following public meeting law, noting that this is a testimony, not a deliberation or decision-making event) . Something similar to this is done by the City of Beaverton

**Wheeler:** Are those Beaverton meetings still public?

**Thuan Dong:** I am not sure. I believe they are.

**McElroy:** We are contacting the City Attorney's Office to learn more about how changes to the process would be affected by public meeting law.

**Tripp Folsom:** I can comment on the City of Beaverton process, having gone through it. As an applicant, you are given an assigned time. You meet with the entire allocation committee. The meeting is not a public meeting. It is only with the applicant and the allocation committee. No decisions are made in those meetings. The list of organizations and times are public records. Decisions are made in public.

4. Reconceptualize the testimony/advocacy process altogether, including allowing multiple opportunities for agencies to meet with Allocation Committee members, including in “off cycle” years
5. Offer multiple opportunities for more transparent processes:
  - a. Adopt a policy or process that AC members must follow should they diverge from PCL staff recommendations
  - b. Adopt an appeals process
  - c. Use the PCL website to upload questions/answers from applicants, FAQs, etc.
6. Consider increasing PCL staffing capacity. In order for our recommendations to be implemented, we believe there needs to be more available FTE. This increase can be accomplished by two different means:
  - a. When PCL is due for reauthorization, change ballot language to raise the administrative cap above 5%
  - b. In the meantime, reconsider how PCL staff work is classified – whether as administrative or programmatic duties. Increased capacity for programmatic work attends to developing and maintaining grantee relationships, building capacity, and providing technical assistance that so many programs desire and appreciate
7. Review the efforts in achieving these recommendations in one year’s time. This process could include developing, as allowed by AC by-laws, a sub-committee to monitor

**Trinidad:** We hope that subcommittee might include community members and other stakeholders.

**Lisha Shrestha,** Research Assistant at PSU: I want to talk about high barrier to entry for smaller organizations. We understand this is common to other similar levies in Oakland and Seattle. These smaller organizations often are trusted by their communities, but lack support to compete for funds like the Children’s Levy. The Portland Children’s Levy might help support smaller organizations.

#### Challenges

- Relatively fewer sources of revenue than established organizations
- They are under resourced – both technical and human resource

#### We recommend

- Development of small funds dedicated to small grants
- Provide more technical assistance
- Applies to agencies that have never received PCL funding
- Shorter length of time, for example 1-3 years

Small grants was an overwhelming finding from all stakeholders we contacted, funded and unfunded.

**Tripp Folsom:** Given that our staff is already stretched thin, how would we be able to do that?

**Pellegrino:** We will need to do some research on what capacity we have, what resources we have, and what timetable we are looking at. I am sure we would need additional help.

**Tripp Folsom:** I love the idea of having a small grants funds, but I see staff capacity is an issue.

**Cherry:** This recommendation goes hand in hand with reconsidering the 5% cap and reviewing how staff time is considered in regard to the cap. We see this as a long term vision for PCL.

**Thuan Dong:** There are limitations to our study.

- Missing voices
  - Reviewer experiences
  - Fewer unfunded applicants
  - No interview with those who never applied
- Oakland and San Francisco levies were reviewed but not others (Seattle & Florida)

Thank you to all who participated in this process.

**Trinidad:** We think the understanding of equity has improved since 2014. We look forward to what is next.

**Public Testimony:** None

**McElroy:** We as a staff are very appreciative of this process. We have ideas of what our next steps might be.

- We see the work taking place over the next 5 months. We plan to work with the Allocation Committee to sequence consideration of the recommendations.
- Staff will meet individually with each Committee member before March 18<sup>th</sup> meeting to identify priorities and feedback or concerns on individual recommendations. We want your input to frame and stage decision making on recommendations.
- That timeline allows the committee to deliberate over time, opportunities for public comment, and staff create iterations of the process based on input

Concerning the 30 recommendations, staff groups them as follows:

Seven of them are relatively easy to implement, unlikely to require Committee deliberation:

- mainly practice improvements for how staff communicates with applicants about process
- Examples of these include creating FAQ document for applicants; developing written materials that describe the entire review process to applicants, including recruitment methods and reviewer roles.

There are several recommendations that are more complex.

- They have greater implications: staff time, Allocation Committee workload/time commitments, hinge on findings yet to come from PCL's current community engagement efforts, require Levy financial resources.
- 2 recommendations: establish a small grants fund for emerging organizations and consider whether to have a two-step application process—have substantial impact on options for operationalizing other recommendations.
- Others: modifying the RFI particularly around the questions, scoring, definitions and bonus points allocation for culturally specific programs and organizations; fine tuning the application review process; and reconsidering how applicants provide testimony and advocacy to the Allocation Committee for funding.

**Vega Pederson:** The role of the review committee and the experience of reviewers is an area of concern. I would love to get more information on that if possible.

**McElroy:** We did do a survey with all of our reviewers. I am happy to provide that information to you. There were good ideas in their thinking about how to improve the process.

## Community Engagement Process Update

**Hansell:** The community engagement process is ongoing. It will help to set priorities and strategies for the next round of investments. Every five years, the Levy undertakes community engagement work. In the past, the staff has designed and undertaken that work. This time, we have contracted with an outside consultant, Empress Rules, to design and implement that work. Kheoshi Owens is the principal of Empress Rules.

The Allocation Committee approved the plan in October 2018. The full plan is available on the Children's Levy website.

### Goals of the Community Engagement Process:

- Understand perspectives from diverse stakeholders about the most effective and most needed services for children, especially children most affected by historical inequities.
- Identify community solutions to improve outcomes for children and families.
- Cultivate positive relationships with traditionally marginalized populations.
- Promote community understanding of Portland Children's Levy

### Community Engagement Activities

- Outreach using an interest questionnaire to identify representative sample of community members to survey
- Surveys to gather input on most effective & most needed services for children
- Focus Groups to identify community solutions to improve outcomes for children and families

### Status Update on Community Engagement Process

#### Outreach (Interest Questionnaires)

- Interest questionnaires were distributed and collected in November and December.
- The Empress Rules team and Levy communications staff partnered in messaging and outreach.
- The interest questionnaire was available in English, Spanish, Vietnamese, Russian, Chinese, and Somali.
- 455 completed questionnaires were received, 66 questionnaires were "screened out"
- 389 survey eligible participants:
  - 164 parents, including foster parents;
  - 139 service providers;
  - 78 youth;
  - and 8 other community members

Levy staff reviewed the data collected through the interest questionnaires and found the following populations & groups well represented:

- African Americans; Native Americans; LGBTQ; people who have experienced homelessness; people who have experienced the foster care system
- Reached more parents than the Levy did in 2013

Levy staff identified gaps in perspectives/underrepresentation for the following populations & groups:

- Latinx; Slavic; African Immigrant; Middle Eastern; Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander; immigrants/refugees; non-English speakers.

The Levy requested Empress Rules do additional outreach to the populations underrepresented in the questionnaire responses.

### Surveys and Combined Interest Questionnaires/Surveys

- All 389 interest questionnaire respondents invited to complete a survey.
- Two surveys were developed: one for community (parents and youth) and one for service providers.
- Community survey - 25 multiple choice questions; available in English, Spanish, Vietnamese, Russian and Somali
- Provider survey includes 4 multiple choice and 27 open-ended questions.

The Empress Rules team has been conducting “survey gatherings” to reach the missing perspectives identified through the review of the interest questionnaire data.

- They have reached out to several groups and offered to attend events to talk with folks about the Levy and distribute a combined interest questionnaire & survey.
- 7 survey gatherings held as of 1/27/19 - 67 completed interest questionnaires & surveys.
- 33 additional completed interest questionnaires & surveys submitted through other efforts.

In total - 489 interest questionnaires have been completed:

- 243 parents, including foster parents
- 142 service providers
- 96 youth

227 surveys have been completed:

- 178 community surveys
- 49 provider surveys

The Empress Rules team will hold additional survey gatherings and is following up with those invited to complete the survey who have not yet submitted responses.

Surveys will be accepted until 500 surveys are received or until the end of February, whichever comes first.

### Focus Groups

The Empress Rules team has held eight focus groups:

- 2 Youth groups
- 2 Spanish-speaking parent groups
- 1 Foster Care Impacted parent/foster parent group
- 1 Parents with Children with Disabilities & Parents with Disabilities group
- 1 Immigrant/Refugee parent group
- 1 Direct Service Providers with children group

Within each group, as appropriate, Empress Rules was asked to select a balance of participants from historically marginalized communities.

8 focus groups have been held with a total of 84 participants:

- 51 parents
- 22 youth
- 11 service providers



## Analysis and Report

After collecting and analyzing the data from these activities, Empress Rules will produce a community engagement report that describes

- methods used to engage the community;
- a summary of findings and recommendations related to program service needs and proposed programming solutions for each of the Levy's six program areas;
- any other key findings from the community engagement process.

The community engagement report is scheduled to be presented to the Allocation Committee by April 15, 2019.

### **2017-18 Annual Data Report**

*Data Report is available on the Levy website: <http://www.portlandchildrenslevy.org/about-us/performance-and-results>*

**Meg McElroy** presented a summary of the report.

**McElroy:** I want to thank grantees for putting together this data. We aggregate the data from the grantees to create this report.

**Hornecker:** Having talked about a small grant fund and streamlining the application process, it does not address two big issues. One is data; we have strict outcomes that we require. It seems like we may need to include data and outcome reporting if we decide to begin a small grants program.

**McElroy:** I agree that we need to consider outcomes and reporting as well. We would need to decide about many issues, including reporting requirements, funding size and time period of grants. Our typical grants now are about \$150,000 per year for 3 years, with the option to renew for 2 more years. Those grantees have large organizational revenues. We need to take those factors into consideration if we have a small grants fund. That will be the work of staff to think about how to structure that process.

Report covers expectations, results, implications for investment goals and grant performance metrics across all Levy grants, and by program area

This summary covers Levy-wide highlights from report.

*Slides from this report are included as an addendum to these minutes.*

#### Overall Levy Goals

- 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.

#### Investment Goals and Results

##### Goals

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

##### Results

- Met both goals Levy-wide; 2 program areas didn't meet investment goal for culturally specific services

- Total of \$17m invested in 17-18 (increase from \$11m in 14-15 and avg of \$11.2m in previous levy period).
- Invested 33% of funds in CS services compared to avg of 31.4% in previous levy (avg annual invest in previous levy was \$11.2 m, so more \$ and increased % in 17-18).
- Increased access to services in East Portland- previous levy average of 38.1% children served residing in/attending school in E Portland; 17-18 figure of 46.2%.
- Didn't meet goals for 30% of funds invested in Culturally Specific services in Hunger Relief for past 4 years.
- Didn't meet culturally specific goal in CAPI b/c one grant voluntarily ended and other grantee merged two grants and no longer met culturally specific definition

#### Children Served and Service Access

- 12,220 children served
- Exceeded goals for numbers served by 9.6%
- Majority of children served from families with annual incomes at 185% of Federal Poverty Level or less
- 31% from homes with primary language other than English
- 68.9% of children served identify as children of color; increase over average in previous levy (64.4%)
- 46.2% children served reside/attend school in East Portland
- 2.5% children were homeless; 5.4% parents/caregivers
- Does not include hunger relief programs- covered in other slides
- Similar figure of children served to previous year
- Typically, exceeding goals due to turnover, large programs hard to project; 15.6% was 5-yr average for exceed goals in previous levy
- % figures similar to previous levy:
- Language- 20% Spanish, 11% other languages
- Homeless- avg 2.7% children, 3.7% parents/caregiver
- Homelessness rates among students in Portland schools is 3.74% so PCL may be underserving homeless students.

#### Service Access by Race and Ethnicity

- Comparing school age population in 5 Portland area school districts to population accessing PCL-funded services
- 4-year trends show a more diverse population accessing PCL-funded services than population enrolled in area schools.
- PCL has shown a slight disparity the past 4 years in service access for children identifying as Asian, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander. Range 2% - 3% points for Asian children and less than 1% point for Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander.
- Larger report on PCL website looks at disparities by program area- mostly a few % points and will be important to consider in funding cycle.
- No disparity trends in program areas.
- Altogether, data shows reaching populations disproportionately experiencing barriers to access and historically underserved.

#### Participation in Services

- Average of 7.6% of participants exited "early"; 8.8% in previous levy
- Average of 79.3% of participants received "minimum dosage"; 66.6% in previous levy
- Near parity between race/ethnicity of population enrolled and participating over time

- Early Exit rate lower 1.3% points compared to 5-year average previous levy.
- Increase in % receiving participation “minimum dosage” - 5 yr average in previous levy was 66.6%- increase because working on it, change definition and tracking methods for better accuracy
- New data on race/ethnicity identity participants receiving “minimum dosage” compared to those that enrolled- mostly parity
- Among children of color, less than % point disparity for only a few populations, e.g. Latino, Multiracial, Native American, this year. Small (1% point or less) disparity for white children all 4 years.

## Outcome Goals

- Grantees met an average of 81.2% of their outcome goals; decrease over average of 87.8% in previous levy

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

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

Lower % of goals met this year likely due to

- changes in which grants were funded between the previous levy and current levy- 32 new programs
- start-up programs— often takes some time to set appropriate goals and measurement methods.
- New grantees met 65.9% in 14-15 and 82.2% in 17-18.
- EC alone reduced outcomes tracked by 39 goals; number goals missed may be similar 8- 10 annually, but greater impact on % when denominator is smaller. Count as met if % in goal reach outcome; if only a few % points off then don’t count it. Ex in EC, with child development outcome or immunization outcome— goal 90% of children, but 88% reach goal. Considered “not met.”

## Staff Turnover

- Average of 21.1% of staff supported through PCL turned over during the year
- Range over the last several years is 15% - 20%
- Variations by program area
- Data doesn’t track reasons for turnover e.g. promotion, retirement, or returning to school to pursue advanced degrees in field of education, human services or social work
- PCL trends mirror sector trends

Literature on sector trends: 30% in child welfare nationally, 16 – 29% for EC in OR

AS national study showed 25% of FT and 40% of PT have t/o after one-year; AS this yr 21% and M at 18%.

Current investment in training, on-site consultation with grantees to support staff through reflective supervision and use of trauma informed practices to manage stress from intensity of their jobs.

- CAPI program area had all-time low turnover rate in the several years PCL has tracked these data - 14.7% in FY16-17 compared to range of 23.3% - 30%;
- FC lower this year by 10% points (15.4% this yr)
- EC lower by 6% than last year (17%).

Though turnover fluctuates, programs report high value from the training and consultation support, particularly during 2018 with the national climate creating intense anxiety and fear for many families (and staff) in PCL-funded programs.

**Vega Pederson:** Are you able to see whether there is a difference between new programs versus established programs.

**McElroy:** I did not, but I could.

**Pellegrino:** Just because a program is new, it may only be new to the Levy.

**Hornecker:** This has been a concern for a while. Can we tell whether we have been able to impact this situation?

**McElroy:** Mitch is referring to the Levy investing in reflective supervision training and trauma informed workplace wellness training for staff of working in early childhood funded programs, child abuse prevention and intervention and foster care. Those were the areas with the highest turnover and the greatest stress on staff. In FY 16-17, the CAPI saw its lowest turnover rate of 14.7%; it went back up this year to over 30%. Rates fluctuate in different areas. It is hard to know what impacts these rates.

I can tell you that those investments in training are valued by the agencies. They feel it is really positively impacting the culture of the workplace and the support that staff feel.

We feel good about the investments that we have made in those areas.

#### Hunger Relief Service Access

- 14,126 children and 4,325 parents/caregivers served
- School food pantries served 64% of total (n=9,093)
- Other emergency food resources served 36% of total (n=5,033)
- 65.9% of children served in HR programs resided or went to school in E PDX; 46.2% across all other program areas.
- Programs served a higher percentage of Latino and Asian children, and a lower percentage of African-American children than are enrolled in Portland schools, or were served in other PCL funded programs
- Nearly one third of children served did not report race/ethnicity
- Bulk of children served getting food through school food pantries which were substantially expanded with PCL funding
- Examples of other emergency food resources provided include home delivered meals, summer lunch program, produce and prepared food donations from partner orgs, food produced in community gardens.
- Number of children served that did not report R/E increased substantially this year; need to view access data with caution. Current political climate could be related to this trend.

#### Hunger Relief Implementation Highlights

- Grantees provided additional emergency food resources at schools without pantries
- Percentage of families using school pantries 6 or more times per year has grown each year and now is 49%
- Strong demand for delivered meals for families with barriers to accessing other sources of emergency food
- Strong demand for food discounts at Village Market/New Columbia
- 2 grantees provided key resources at schools where no pantries by engaging partners to regularly provide fresh produce and prepared foods at these sites.
- Most common barriers experienced by those getting home meal delivery are
- chronic illnesses (children or caregivers)

- lack of transportation to emergency food resources available in the community.
- Discount program for fresh produce and pantry staples at the Village Market in the New Columbia Housing development enrolled more than 700 families last year and will focus in the coming year on outreach to resident speaking a primary language other than English.

#### Community Childcare Initiative Highlights

- Served 332 children last year
- 41% identify as children of color, 33% as white, 26% no info
- 58% speak English as primary language, 20% speak Spanish, 6% other primary language
- 30% were infants/toddlers, 41% ages 3-5 years, 29% 6+
- 45% reside East Portland, 52% providers in East Portland
- Median monthly CCI benefit/family= \$338
- 58 providers: 27 centers, 24 larger family providers, 7 small family providers
- Augments state Employment Related Day Care subsidy- working families up to 185% FPL
- CCI also helps families up to 200% FPL
- Pay no more than 10% of income for childcare
- Median monthly income/family= \$2,253
- Median monthly cost childcare = \$1,030
- Median monthly state subsidy= \$583
- Providers participating in state's Early Learning Division quality initiative- SPARK
- 16 providers "star-rated" and other 42 working on quality portfolios, improvements, planning/coaching
- 98 children (29%) were in care with "star-rated" provider

#### Implications and Looking Ahead

- Public engagement/input on levy funding priorities
- Use service access data to inform public engagement/input focus, particularly for disparities by program areas
  - e.g. hunger relief needs and services strategies for African American population
  - Other specific populations that data suggest are underserved, e.g. children with disabilities, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders population and Asian populations

#### Looking ahead to March Allocation Committee Meeting

**Pellegrino:** We will meet again in March. We will be looking at renewals of existing grants. We are taking two years to run the next funding process. We will get you information and recommendations from the staff. Grantees are able to review and comment on the summaries from the staff. Decisions are fairly swift. We do not require grantee testimony.

Staff will meet with committee members to discuss PSU recommendations. We plan to begin the process at the March meeting.

**Meeting is 3 to 5 pm on Monday, March 18.**

Adjourned 4:30 pm