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Executive Summary: Community Input Report, 2013

Introduction
This summary presents the major themes generated by an extensive community input process to inform Levy funding priorities for the next five years. Themes that surfaced from input are organized below by Levy-wide topics and by Program Area. Across all sources and topics of input, a few key priorities rise to the top:

- Intensive, longer-duration, relationship-based services that intentionally focus on child and family goals;
- A focus on populations most at-risk for negative outcomes, especially children of color who experience significant disparities in outcomes compared to white children, and a focus on providing services in high poverty areas of the city (especially outer East and North Portland);
- Culturally responsive and culturally specific services that integrate culture in how services are designed and provided; and
- Increased professional development in all program areas.

Methods Used to Collect Community Input
Based on the Community Input Plan adopted by the Levy Allocation Committee in June 2013, Levy staff gathered input in three primary ways over four months: Brief Survey (500 respondents); Stakeholder and Community Group Meetings (39 groups consulted, attended by over 300 people); and Open Public Meetings (3 meetings attended by over 100 people). The majority of survey respondents were community members (e.g. parents, teachers, community advocates), while the majority of those who attended meetings were service providers.

Summary of Findings from Community Input

**Levy-Wide Themes: Equity, Quality, Systems Issues**

**Equity**

- Employ a variety of strategies to prioritize equity in the funding process including setting goals for investments that serve children of color and in culturally specific programming.
- Consider ways in which equity can be prioritized in the funding application including asking whether applicants have an equity policy, track and report data on equity goals, and disaggregate program data by racial/ethnic group.
- Increase accountability for cultural responsiveness and relevance in programming provided by mainstream providers to children of color.
- Focus resources on low-income children of color (including immigrant/refugee children), and in high-poverty areas of the city (East and North Portland); consider how individual program area investments are spread across populations and geographies.
- Change data collection processes for the new Levy cycle to better analyze the race/ethnicity demographics of children served by the Levy and their outcomes.
- Consider best practices in light of a variety of cultural communities, and reflect the importance of cultural identity in outcome measures.
Quality

- Prioritize relationship-based services for children/families that tend toward higher intensity (and less toward drop-in, one-time only, or limited duration services), that emphasize the child/family at the center of the service, and that engage and empower families in shaping their own service experience.
- Assure programs are culturally responsive—that services not only respect clients’ cultural context, but are also able to demonstrate how that context informs the design and provision of the service. Assure programs expect staff to have been trained in key competencies to work with children and families.
- Invest in services that break down barriers to access, especially for low-income families and families of children with disabilities.
- Invest in services that either use or are based on best-practices or quality standards, and that have a track record of producing positive outcomes with any and all populations they seek to serve.

Systems Issues

- Align outcomes with relevant community benchmarks such as those of the local early learning hub (assuming it is funded by the state), child welfare benchmarks used by the state Department of Human Services, and the success indicators used by the All Hands Raised partnership in its Cradle to Career initiative.
- Create a “small grants fund” to build capacity in small, culturally specific organizations to better serve the communities they are currently struggling to serve since these are some of the most vulnerable children/families in the city.
- Encourage or prioritize partnerships where larger organizations propose to sub-contract with smaller organizations.
- Facilitate better communication between various entities operating in the same system.

Allocation of Funds Among the Program Areas

Data gathered through the survey suggest a stronger preference among respondents for funding early childhood, after school and child abuse prevention/intervention programs more than foster care, hunger relief, and mentoring. (Only the survey gathered data on allocation preferences.)

Program Area Themes

Early Childhood

- Invest in high-quality, affordable preschool opportunities for children least likely to arrive at school ready for kindergarten.
- For younger children, focus investments on home visiting services that provide intensive relationships (e.g. such as Early Head Start).
- Support programs that intentionally develop parenting skills, such as parenting classes, and parent-child activities that strengthen parent-child relationships.
- Provide access to mental health consultants that specialize in helping parents and early childhood professionals learn skills and tools to guide and manage child behavior.
Early Childhood (continued)

- Invest in culturally responsive or culturally specific programs; seek out best practices that are culturally specific or that are adapting to become culturally specific or more culturally responsive.
- Make informed investments in the context of other major local/state initiatives; align outcomes and share Levy data with those efforts for continuous system improvement.
- Offer workforce development for early childhood professionals and program technical assistance, including strengthening supervision and use of trauma-informed care.

Child Abuse Prevention & Intervention

- Invest in intensive, comprehensive parenting education and parenting support programs; and assist parents in accessing concrete supports (e.g. financial, housing, childcare) that help them meet their basic needs.
- Invest more heavily in prevention than intervention services.
- Focus services on populations with risk factors for child abuse and neglect, especially families of color who are overrepresented in the child welfare system, those who are low income, those with a history of child abuse, those impacted by domestic violence and those with alcohol and drug issues.
- Assure that all child abuse prevention and intervention programs are either culturally responsive or culturally specific, and assure that parents are supported in developing skills and accessing services and supports that help them protect and care for their children.
- Set expectations around trauma-informed care and provide technical assistance to child abuse prevention programs to assist with implementation.

Foster Care

- Invest in programs that provide intensive and continuous support for youth in foster care and those aging out of foster care; programs that recruit, train and support foster parents; provide educational supports for children in foster care (early childhood through college); and provide services that lead to permanency.
- Focus services on African American and Native American children in foster care and the highest risk populations of children in foster care, including those with APPLA (another planned permanent living arrangement), teen parents in foster care, and LBGTQ youth.
- Assure that all foster care programs are either culturally responsive or culturally specific, and assure that children and youth in foster care are supported and empowered.
- Set expectations around trauma-informed care and provide technical assistance to foster care programs to assist with implementation.
After School
- Invest in programs providing academic support, enrichment programs (including those focused on physical activity; arts; Science /Technology/Engineering/Math; Chess), summer programming, and SUN Community Schools.
- Assure that all after-school programs are either culturally responsive or culturally specific, and assure that families are involved and supported to engage in their child’s education.
- Focus services on populations with risk factors for poor outcomes, especially youth of color, those who are low income, and those learning English as a second language.
- Assure that services are geographically located in areas of high poverty and concentrations of populations of color, and assure that service is equitably distributed east of 82nd Avenue.

Mentoring
- Invest in mentoring services that intentionally focus on youth’s academic achievement as well as supporting them to set and pursue college and career goals.
- Support culturally specific services in which mentoring is designed to help keep youth of color in school, on track to graduate, and focused on post-secondary pursuits.
- Direct resources to support models that feature long-term, more intensive relationships between youth and mentors.
- Focus service on youth “at-risk” of poor academic outcomes – youth in poverty, youth of color, youth in foster care, and academic priority youth.
- Make teens (middle school and high school) the priority population of children served.

Hunger Relief
- Increase access to and utilization of existing hunger relief programs that provide food for children during the school day and outside-of-school times through a variety of methods.
- Increase summer food access by expanding summer feeding sites.
- Increase number of school food pantries, especially at SUN Community schools, and especially in East Portland.
- Invest in programs providing nutrition and cooking education.
- Assure that services are focused on low-income families and children, and are offered in high-poverty schools and parts of Portland (East and North Portland).
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Introduction
This report presents the major themes generated by an extensive community input process to inform Levy funding priorities for the next five years. Themes that surfaced from input are organized below by Levy-wide topics and by Program Area.

Across all sources and topics of input, a few key priorities rise to the top:
- Intensive, longer-duration, relationship-based services that intentionally focus on child and family goals;
- A focus on populations most at-risk for negative outcomes, especially children of color who experience significant disparities in outcomes compared to white children, and a focus on providing services in high poverty areas of the city (especially outer East and North Portland);
- Culturally responsive and culturally specific services that integrate culture in how services are designed and provided; and
- Increased professional development in all program areas.

Methods Used to Collect Community Input
Based on the Community Input Plan adopted by the Levy Allocation Committee in June 2013, Levy staff gathered input in three primary ways over four months: Brief Survey (500 respondents); Stakeholder and Community Group Meetings (39 groups consulted, attended by over 300 people); and Open Public Meetings (3 meetings attended by over 100 people). The majority of survey respondents were community members (e.g. parents, teachers, community advocates), while the majority of those who attended meetings were service providers.

Organization of Report
The report is organized by topics on which input was generated. The first three sections—Equity, Quality and Systems Issues—present input themes that are Levy-wide and crossed several or all program areas. The subsequent sections present the themes of input on each of the Levy’s six program areas. The report includes two appendices. Appendix A describes the methods used to gather and analyze the information collected through each of three strands of input. It includes more specific descriptions of the respondents/participants in each strand of input and provides greater detail on the input they provided. Appendix B contains copies of the surveys used to solicit input.
**Topic: EQUITY**

### Summary of Themes Across Three Strands of Community Input

- Employ a variety of strategies to prioritize equity in the funding process including setting goals for investments that serve children of color and in culturally specific programming.
- Consider ways in which equity can be prioritized in the funding application including asking whether applicants have an equity policy, track and report data on equity goals, and disaggregate program data by racial/ethnic group.
- Increase accountability for cultural responsiveness and relevance in programming provided by mainstream providers to children of color.
- Focus resources on low-income children of color (including immigrant/refugee children), and in high poverty areas of the city (East and North Portland); consider how individual program area investments are spread across populations and geographies.
- Change data collection processes for the new Levy cycle to better analyze the race/ethnicity demographics of children served by the Levy and their outcomes.
- Consider best practices in light of a variety of cultural communities, and reflect the importance of cultural identity in outcome measures.

### Findings from Each Strand of Community Input

For each of the three strands of community input collected, findings are presented below. Common themes in the findings are presented above.

#### Community/Stakeholder Group Input

Staff met with the following groups that focus in significant part on improving outcomes for communities of color, and in improving equity in resource allocation across different populations and geographical areas:

- Coalition of Communities of Color
- City of Portland: Office of Equity and Human Rights and
- City of Portland: Office of Neighborhood Involvement, and its Diversity and Civic Leadership Program
- McKenzie River Gathering Foundation
- Center for Intercultural Organizing
- Portland Indian Leaders Roundtable
- Eastern European Coalition
- Portland African-American Leadership Forum
- East Portland Action Plan Education Committee

In addition, staff met with a wide range of stakeholder and community groups to seek input on a range of topics and some of these groups provided input on issues related to improving
outcomes for children of color, and on equitable resource allocation. (For a full representation of stakeholder and community group input received, see Appendix A, pages 13 - 24.)

Community group input on issues related to racial/ethnic and geographic equity is thematically summarized below.

**Prioritize Equity**
- Adopt an equity policy for PCL and require/encourage its grantees to undertake an equity assessment process if they do not currently have an equity policy.
- Prioritize racial/ethnic equity in making investments by focusing investments on communities most affected by racial/ethnic disparities in outcomes.
- Increase investment in culturally specific services to advance equity.
- Invest in increasing capacity of culturally specific organizations to serve their communities; consider a “small grants program” to achieve this goal.
- Consider adopting targets for percentages served in Levy programs for racial/ethnic groups in excess of the percentage of the general and student populations they represent because these groups have significantly poorer outcomes across all domains.

**Change Data Collection and Reporting Practices**
- Collect demographic data on race/ethnicity using the “alone or in combination” method to provide a better description of who is served with Levy programming, to compare to data collected in a similar manner by others (Multnomah County, School Districts), and to understand to what degree Levy programming is reaching children of color in proportion to the percentage of the general and/or student population they comprise.
- Collect Levy program participation and outcome data in ways that allows the Levy to disaggregate data on participation rates and outcomes by racial/ethnic populations.
- Consider comparing percentage of children of color served in early childhood program area to the percentage of the 0-5 population living in poverty because the poverty rate for children of color is higher than the rate for white children.

**Increase Accountability for Cultural Responsiveness and Relevance**
- Consider track record and monitor progress of mainstream organizations/programs in engaging children of color and providing culturally relevant programming.
- Incorporate standards for cultural responsiveness for mainstream organizations/programs into funding application and grant monitoring process.
- Track and report progress on the degree to which service staff reflects the population they serve.
- Track and report progress on the degree to which services are provided in primary language of child/family served.

**Focus Populations/Geographies**
- Focus investments on populations with the highest needs and who are the most vulnerable, including recent immigrants.
- Focus investments on children of color in early childhood.
• Focus child abuse prevention and foster care investments on African American and Native American children.
• Provide more early childhood programming in East Portland.

**Best Practices and Program Outcomes**

• Consider opportunities to improve or adapt current best practices to a variety of cultural communities.
• Consider other approaches to best practices in the mentoring program area to allow for culturally appropriate mentoring models.
• Support cultural identity in program implementation and measure cultural identification as an outcome.

**Survey Data and Public Meeting Input**

Neither the survey questions nor the questions posed at the public meetings specifically addressed equity as such. However, responses to questions regarding who is most important to serve and where services should be offered bear on the issue of equity. (Appendix A, pages 1-12, features survey methods and additional survey data details. For a full representation of input received from public meetings, see Appendix A, pages 25-30).

Across all program areas, 46.8% of responses in surveys prioritized offering services in high poverty geographic areas (includes responses that specified high poverty geographic areas/schools, East Portland and North Portland). 32.1% of responses prioritized offering services to low-income children and/or children of color, and/or immigrant and refugee children. Survey data suggest significant support for targeting services to geographic areas with high concentrations of poverty and children of color, and for services to be provided to this population.

Similarly, input received at all three public meetings, and in all program areas, regarding who should be served included populations most impacted by disparities in outcomes. In addition, there was consistent input regarding the need for culturally specific and culturally responsive programs in all funding areas. Last, high-poverty geographic areas, East Portland and North Portland were highlighted as target areas for services in early childhood, after-school, mentoring and hunger relief group discussions.
### Topic: PROGRAM QUALITY

#### Summary of Themes Across Three Strands of Community Input

- Prioritize relationship-based services for children/families that tend toward higher intensity (and less toward drop-in, one-time only, or very limited duration services), and that emphasize the child/family at the center of the service, and that families be engaged and empowered in shaping their own service experience.
- Assure programs are culturally responsive—that services not only respect children’s and families’ cultural context, but are also able to understand how that context is an integral part of how services are offered/designed for children/families.
- Assure programs have training expectations of staff that assure they have key competencies to work with children and families.
- Invest in services that break down barriers to access, especially for low-income families and families of children with disabilities.
- Invest in services that either use or are based on best-practices or quality standards, and that have a track record of producing positive outcomes, especially with any and all populations they seek to serve.

#### Findings from Each Strand of Community Input

For each of the three strands of community input collected, findings are presented below. Common themes in the findings are presented above.

### Survey Data

224 people responded to at least one question related to features of high-quality programs for children and families. Slightly fewer than half of the respondents described themselves as community members (e.g. parents, teachers, advocates, funders) and just over half described themselves as service providers. (Appendix A, pages 1-12, features survey methods and additional survey data details.)

**Type of Service**

Answering the question “what are the 3 most important features of high quality services for children and families” respondents most frequently mentioned **features based on focused relationships with the child/family** (27.2%). Themes in those responses included client-centered focus, family/parent empowered and engaged in service delivery, and services that wrap-around the child/family with coordinated/holistic approaches. The second feature most frequently mentioned was **positive outcomes/emphasis on best practices, and strong track record** (18.4%). The next most frequently mentioned feature focused on the **traits of service providers and staff**, including reliable, consistent, timely, trustworthy, respectful (11.6%). Respondents also mentioned **access**, such as low-cost/free and conveniently located (9.1%); **culturally responsive**, such as culturally relevant/appropriate/competent, or
culturally/linguistically specific (8.9%); and **high quality staff**, such as well trained, low turnover, strong supervision (7.6%).

### Public Meetings

**Issues of quality in services**

While participants at public meetings were not asked specifically to identify any issues in program quality, the topic came up in the course of participants discussing service needs/gaps, focus populations and geographies, and system alignments. (For a full representation of input received from public meetings, see Appendix A, pages 25-30). The main theme was around **needs for staff training/workforce development**. Included in this theme were discussions about training for home visitors, early childhood professionals regarding strengthening their skills for working with children at-risk of or affected by abuse and neglect. Another topic discussed was the need for service providers to have higher quality, more frequent translation of materials and/or higher quality interpreters available for children and families. In particular, participants voiced desire for interpreters to have better knowledge of the content area in which they work, such as better understanding of early childhood development, caregiver-child attachment and brain development, including the impact of chronic stress such as abuse/neglect on the brain.

### Community/Stakeholder Group Input

To seek input on program area service needs and gaps and other issues across Levy funding, staff met and consulted with stakeholder groups including advisories and community groups. In many of the conversations with these groups, issues of program quality came up in the discussions. Themes from the input received are summarized below. (For a full representation of input received, see Appendix A, pages 13 - 24.)

**Culturally Responsive**

Across several groups, people mentioned the importance of services being responsive to the cultural context in the life of a child or family. Issues included services being culturally relevant and appropriate to children/families served, such as understanding the dynamics of institutional racism, generational poverty, immigrant/refugee experiences, and the historical trauma suffered by people oppressed by dominant culture. Groups suggested that culturally responsive services work with children and families in ways that avoid further marginalization, empowers people as actively engaged and shaping the services they receive, and in some cases specifically seek to strengthen positive cultural identity in children/families. In addition, groups mentioned the importance of language-specific services for children and families whose primary language may not be English. Groups emphasized that services should be offered in the family’s native language, and that interpretation be offered if program staff do not speak the primary language of children/families served. A few groups pointed out that culturally specific services are well poised to provide culturally responsive services because most of the...
people working in those programs and agencies often share similar cultural backgrounds and histories as the children and families they serve, whereas in mainstream agencies that dynamic is less often present.

**Well Trained Staff**
Many groups discussed the various training needs for direct service staff and supervisors, and emphasized that quality staffing drives quality programming. Some of the most common training needs identified were communication skills, particularly for difficult conversations between program staff and families. Other commonly mentioned needs are for staff to better understand child behavior and developmentally appropriate expectations (across all ages); trauma-informed approaches/philosophy to working with children/families; youth-voice in services (especially for program serving older youth); parent/family engagement and involvement in services; working with families affected by domestic violence; and disability awareness and approaches to working with children (and their parents) with disabilities. The need for strong supervision was mentioned and some groups suggested that supervisors should also be well-trained. A few groups also said that staff turnover was a concern for them, particularly in the foster care and child abuse prevention and intervention funding areas, and they mentioned that training is critical to maintain program quality when staff turn over. Specific to foster care, groups said foster parents, DHS caseworkers and services providers (e.g. independent living programs) lack knowledge of the resources available to support youth in foster care and therefore miss opportunities to effectively link youth/families to needed resources.

**Emphasis on Best Practices**
Many groups mentioned that they support the use of best practices, and of evidence-based practices. They mentioned the importance of programs having “fidelity” to any best practice or evidence-based practices they use. At the same time, some groups mentioned the importance of having flexibility to adapt best practices models to better fit/serve specific cultural populations. A few early childhood groups suggested that culturally specific and/or more culturally responsive versions of a few best practices ought to be developed, e.g. positive behavior intervention supports, and the state’s new childcare quality standards. A few groups mentioned the importance of using “standards” in practice for services, such as with mentoring programs.

**Focused Relationships with the Child/Family**
Many groups referred to the importance of building and nurturing strong relationships with children and families. Groups emphasized how those strong relationships foster families’ engagement in services, especially with hard-to-reach or hard-to-engage families. Groups suggested that quality engagement includes focused, intentional outreach strategies directed toward children/families that need the service, and that the outreach results in engaging those families into the service. Along those lines, groups emphasized the importance of supporting services with a history of successful outreach and engagement of hard-to-reach families. Some groups said that parent involvement and client-centered services, including wrap-around approaches that coordinate multiple systems in a child/family’s life and include family voice, are crucial elements of quality.
Access
In almost every group, people discussed barriers that limit children’s and families’ access to services. Groups suggested that without overcoming some of the key barriers to access, many children and families cannot experience high-quality programs.

Cost: The most common theme was cost—that high quality programs often cost too much especially for low-income families, and typically the only way for families to attend these programs is through financial assistance, or through programs that set eligibility criteria based on income. Many groups pointed out that services for low-income families such as Head Start are difficult to access because the services are full, or the families fall just outside the income qualifications (e.g. a family’s income is just a few dollars more than the federal poverty level).

Location: Apart from cost, the other most common theme about access focused on where services are located. Many groups said that children and families need transportation in order to access services, or they need the services to be conveniently located. Groups mentioned that services that have their own vans or buses to transport children and families make for easier access to services, but they also suggested that families need help paying for public transportation. In addition, they said that sometimes public transportation does not help families access services because they would need to take several buses or the bus line they need runs infrequently, making travel time too long.

Children with Disabilities: Another critical issue of access mentioned by several groups was the need for programs to more inclusively serve children with disabilities. A few groups suggested that support to childcare providers to better serve children with disabilities is crucial for working parents. A similar theme was echoed in other groups regarding after school settings—that after school programs need staffing and resources to better include and serve children with disabilities in their programs. One group, composed primarily of parents and grandparents, observed that overall the Levy does not appear to have services that specifically support children with behavioral disabilities, and suggested that families of those children need access to the types of services the Levy has traditionally funded. Such access, the group noted, would include staff trained and equipped to serve children with behavioral disabilities and communicate effectively with parents around the children’s needs.
**Topic: SYSTEMS ISSUES**

**Summary of Themes Across Community Input**

Many stakeholder groups provided input on systems issues that crossed all Levy program areas, as well as specific systems issues that relate to a particular program area. Attendees at the open public meetings were asked to input about system-level efforts in each of the program areas that the Levy should be aware of, and with which the Levy should align. Input on program area systems issues received from both the stakeholder groups and public meetings are noted in the input summaries for each program area (see Appendix A, pages 13 – 30). Surveys did not include questions on systems issues.

The most consistent systems level recommendation made by stakeholder groups that crosses all Levy funding areas is **for the Levy to align its outcomes with relevant community benchmarks** such as those of the local early learning hub (assuming it is funded by the state), child welfare benchmarks used by the state Department of Human Services, and the success indicators used by the All Hands Raised partnership in its Cradle to Career initiative. One stakeholder group suggested that the Levy organize funding areas by ages to more easily align with other efforts in the program areas that are organized by age, and with benchmarks that organize outcome tracking by age (e.g. All Hands Raised success indicators). Several groups noted that the Levy has generally not funded grass roots groups, many of which serve smaller ethnic communities that are not served well or at all by larger social service agencies. Some groups **advised that the Levy create a “small grants fund” to build capacity in small, culturally specific organizations** to better serve the communities they are currently struggling to serve since these are some of the most vulnerable children/families in the city. Acknowledging that smaller organizations often lack the capacity to apply for Levy funding, some groups **suggested that the Levy encourage or prioritize partnerships where larger organizations propose to sub-contract with smaller organizations.** This input speaks to the overall system of services and how the Levy can best contribute to assuring that needs are met across all groups living in the city.

In addition, stakeholder groups and public meeting attendees raised a variety of other system related issues. Some of the most frequently mentioned were: (1) the Levy should help **facilitate better communication** between various entities operating in the same system (e.g. school personnel and community based after-school programs); (2) the Levy should **support program quality and professional development** in all program areas; (See Input on Quality section of this report for more detail, pages 4 - 7); and (3) the Levy should modify its **data gathering practices and outcome reporting** (See Input on Equity section of this report, page 1 – 3).
Topic: PERCENTAGE ALLOCATED TO EACH FUNDING AREA

Survey Input on Division of Funds
Of the three strands of community input, only the survey gathered data to inform apportioning funds to the different program areas. (Appendix A, pages 1-12, features survey methods and additional survey data details.) Given that the Levy’s funding must be divided among its six program focus areas (early childhood, after school, mentoring, child abuse prevention & intervention, foster care and hunger relief) one of the survey questions asked respondents how much they would allot to each funding area (with the percentages adding to 100 percent).

Subset of Total Respondents
Of the 500 survey respondents, 463 attempted this question; the other 37 respondents left all focus areas blank and of these, the majority (21) were from non-English surveys. Since allocating 0% or 100% to any one program area is not an actual option under the ballot language, all answers with those values were removed to create a subset of 342 respondents who completed the question, indicating amounts apportioned to each of the six areas: of these, 53% were from various types of community members and 47% from service providers.

Average of Responses per Program Area
Mean response figures were calculated for each program area from completed responses (i.e. allocated funds to each of the six areas). The results were:
- 23% to funding early childhood
- 18% to after school
- 17% to child abuse prevention/intervention
- 15% to foster care
- 14% to hunger
- 13% to mentoring

Responses indicating no funding or significant funding to one program area
Looking more closely at the 121 responses removed for indicating a value of 0 or 100 to at least one program area provides additional perspective on respondents’ preferences. Among respondents that indicated no funds to a specific program area, more than 60 people said that no funds should be allocated for foster care, mentoring, and hunger. Only 3 said no funds should be allocated for early childhood, 35 for child abuse prevention/intervention, and 42 for after school. Conversely, among respondents that indicated allocating significantly higher portions to a specific program area (i.e. more than 50% of funds), 41 respondents said early childhood; 21 respondents favored after school; 15 for hunger relief; 14 for child abuse prevention & intervention, and 8 each for foster care and mentoring.

Conclusion
The preferences conveyed in the mean figures accord with the preferences of respondents that indicated no or significant funds to a given program area. Taken together, these data suggest a stronger preference among respondents for funding early childhood, after school and child abuse prevention/intervention programs more than foster care, hunger relief, and mentoring.
Program Area: EARLY CHILDHOOD

Summary of Themes Across Three Strands of Community Input

- Invest in high-quality, affordable preschool opportunities for children least likely to arrive at school ready for kindergarten.
- For younger children, focus investments on home visiting services that provide intensive relationships (e.g. such as Early Head Start).
- Support programs that intentionally develop parenting skills, such as parenting classes, and parent-child activities that strengthen parent-child relationships.
- Provide access to mental health consultants that specialize in helping parents and early childhood professionals learn skills and tools to guide and manage child behavior.
- Invest in culturally responsive or culturally specific programs; seek out best practices that are culturally specific or that are adapting to become culturally specific or more culturally responsive.
- Make informed investments in the context of other major local/state initiatives; align outcomes and share Levy data with those efforts for continuous system improvement.
- Offer workforce development for early childhood professionals and program technical assistance, including strengthening supervision and use of trauma-informed care.

Findings from Each Strand of Community Input

For each of the three strands of community input collected, findings are presented below. Common themes in the findings are presented above.

Survey Data

287 people responded to at least one question related to the early childhood program area. 61% of respondents were community members (e.g. parents, teachers, advocates, funder) and 39% of respondents described themselves as service providers. Among respondents, 26% completed a survey translated from English into another language. (Appendix A, pages 1-12, features survey methods and additional survey data details.)

Type of Service

When asked “what is the most important thing the Levy can do to help children arrive at school ready for kindergarten” respondents mentioned Preschool/Head Start most frequently (39.4%). Approximately three quarters of the mentions for Preschool/Head Start were made by community members. The second most frequently mentioned response was home visiting services (18.8%), including specific mentions of the Early Head Start model. The third most
frequently mentioned response was services that focus on parenting, (14.4%) including parent-child activities, parenting classes. Respondents also mentioned early literacy (6.7%) and early childhood mental health/child behavior supports (5.3%). Nearly two third of mentions for that service were from community members.

**Who to Serve**
When asked “who is most important to serve”, more than two-thirds of responses (69.4%) mentioned specific populations with risk factors including low-income children and children in poverty; children of color and immigrant/refugee children; and children with risk factors such as teen parents, single parents, or foster children. 4.5% of responses did not mention specific populations and noted all children should be served. Approximately 16% of survey responses specified ages of children to be served, with slightly more responses indicating ages 3 - 5 year compared to ages prenatal/birth – 5 years.

**Where to Serve**
When asked “where is it most important to serve”, nearly two-thirds of responses (65.1%) suggested directing services to specific geographies; 12% of responses said that all geographic areas should be served. The greatest number of survey responses prioritized East Portland (39.1%) including NE and SE Portland, and equal portions suggested high poverty schools or geographic areas (13%), and North Portland (13%). Both East Portland and North Portland have higher poverty rates than the city as a whole, so taken together responses suggest preference for areas with high poverty and associated risk factors. Less than 10% of responses mentioned a preferred setting for services with most preferring home or childcare facilities.

### Public Meetings

**Service Needs/Gaps**
Attendees prioritized the following service needs and gaps, and focus populations/geographies across the three meetings. Numbers in parenthesis refer to the number of people across the three public meetings who prioritized the type of service listed. (For a full representation of input received from public meetings, see Appendix A, pages 25-30.):

- Home Visiting (22)
- Parenting supports- parenting education classes, activities focused on parent-child relationships (15)
- Affordable, quality childcare (7), and Affordable preschool (4)
- Early Head Start slots (3) (both its center-based and home-based models)
- Culturally specific/relevant services (3); and Capacity building around cultural competence/relevance, including language interpretation/translation and building the early childhood knowledge skills of interpreters working with family-serving providers(3)

**Focus Populations/Geographies**
Meeting attendees suggested a variety of specific populations for early childhood services focusing primarily on racial/ethnic groups that experience disproportionately lower
kindergarten readiness, and also on populations with other substantial risk factors for low kindergarten readiness (such as poverty, English language learners, children with special needs, and children in foster care). For geography, participants noted both the importance of serving East of 82nd Avenue and in North Portland.

**Other Community Efforts in the Program Area**

Meeting attendees were asked to provide input on other community-level initiatives with which PCL should align or seek to complement, or which might help inform Levy funding priorities. Across the three meetings, the following community efforts were mentioned:

- Assure the Levy continues tracking the local Early Learning hub developments (a state-led early learning system reform effort launched at the local level), and aligns with the hub’s efforts where relevant (and as the hub’s role and work becomes better defined).
- Continue involvement with Cradle to Career’s Ready for Kindergarten Collaborative, and make early childhood investments in the context of the priority schools/neighborhoods selected by the collaborative (align or complement, depending).
- Consider Levy work in context of United Way’s new focus on child poverty; see where respective efforts can complement each other.
- Align with any service quality and policy priorities developed by the newly formed county-wide leadership network of home visiting services.
- Align with the state’s proposed expansion for the Employment Related Day Care subsidy program, and provide more support for childcare affordability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community/Stakeholder Group Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Staff met with several early childhood stakeholder groups including advisories consisting of service providers and childcare providers, parents, health care professionals, consultants, researchers, school and county administrators. In addition, staff met with a range of other stakeholder and community groups to seek input on service needs and gaps across the Levy funding areas and some of these groups provided input specific to early childhood services. Input received is summarized below. (For a full representation of community & stakeholder group input received, see Appendix A, pages 13 – 24).

**Service Needs/Gaps**

- Early childhood mental health/child behavior consultants that help childcare providers, teachers, parents and home visitors with skills to guide and manage child behavior, and address challenges in classrooms and at home
- Summer programming before kindergarten, especially for children at-risk and those transitioning from Head Start
- Childcare affordability and quality supports, especially for children with disabilities
- Parent-child activity groups
- Access to hunger relief/nutrition, and mental health services for parents/families
Focus Populations/Geographies

- Children of color and English language learners
- Children with disabilities
- Foster children
- East Portland
- Neighborhoods/schools with high rates of child poverty/free-reduced lunch or other risk factors

Other Issues in the Program Area (System Alignments and Program Quality)

- Continue involvement with the local Early Learning Hub effort to improve service coordination across the early childhood system; align outcomes with state’s goals of kindergarten readiness.
- Through the hub or other mechanisms, consider sharing Levy performance data more regularly with other funders and/or administrators of similar service models to see if trends in Levy data mirror trends in their data; engage in joint problem-solving and service quality improvements.
- Continue participation with the Ready for Kindergarten Collaborative—attending meetings, supporting workgroups.
- Program quality issues: increase the use of a trauma-informed care by providers, support more training/development for supervisors overall.
- Prioritize culturally specific and culturally responsive programs. Seek out services that use best practice, but that want to develop more culturally specific adaptations of the practice (e.g. Positive Behavior Intervention Supports). Support services with history of engaging hard-to-reach populations; if services are not provided in child’s/family’s native language, assure families have access to interpretation and that interpreters have training in early childhood content, e.g. child development, brain development in early childhood, attachment.
- Support efforts that develop more capacity in childcare and early education settings to inclusively serve children with disabilities, including children with behavior challenges who may be too young to diagnose.
- Align with Oregon’s quality rating system and standards for childcare providers and its associated training to increase quality.
Program Area: CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION & INTERVENTION

Summary of Themes Across Three Strands of Community Input

- Invest in intensive, comprehensive parenting education and parenting support programs; and assist parents in accessing concrete supports (e.g. financial, housing, childcare) that help them meet their basic needs.
- Invest more heavily in prevention than intervention services.
- Focus services on populations with risk factors for child abuse and neglect, especially families of color who are overrepresented in the child welfare system, those who are low income, those with a history of child abuse, those impacted by domestic violence and those with alcohol and drug issues.
- Assure that all child abuse prevention and intervention programs are either culturally responsive or culturally specific, and assure that parents are supported in developing skills and accessing services and supports that help them protect and care for their children.
- Set expectations around trauma-informed care and provide technical assistance to child abuse prevention programs to assist with implementation.

Survey Data

260 people responded to at least one question related to the child abuse prevention and intervention program area. 62% of respondents were community members (e.g. parents, teachers, advocates, funders) and 38% of respondents described themselves as service providers. 30% of the respondents completed a survey translated from English into another language. (Appendix A, pages 1 -12, features survey methods and additional survey data details.)

Type of Service
When asked which services were most important to provide in the child abuse prevention and intervention program area, parent education (including classes and parent-child activities was mentioned most frequently (26.0%). After parenting education, mental health services (including parent, child and family counseling and therapy) were mentioned second most frequently (15.6%). Almost three quarters of the mentions for mental health services were made by community members. Parenting support and advocacy was mentioned third most frequently (14.7%) and was often paired with parenting education. Case management/linkage to services (8.9%) and home-visiting services (8.0%) were the next most frequently mentioned services.

Who to Serve
When asked to whom it was most important to provide child abuse prevention and intervention services, the majority of responses (61.3%) listed at-risk populations including poor/low income children, children with risk factors such as history of abuse, parent with
substance abuse issues, children of color and immigrants/refugees. 17% of survey responses did not prioritize any specific population for service and noted that all children should be served. Fewer than 10% of survey responses included reference to an age group.

**Where to Serve**
When asked where it was most important to provide services, responses included specific geographies as well as locations where services should be delivered.

**Geography:** Approximately 40% of the survey responses prioritized directing services to **specific geographies;** 25% of responses said that all geographic areas should be served. The greatest number of survey responses prioritized **East Portland** (23.8%), **North Portland** (8.1%) and geographic areas with **high poverty or other risk factors** (7.2%). Both East Portland and North Portland have higher poverty rates than the city as a whole such that it can be inferred that survey respondents are prioritizing high poverty areas of the city for child abuse prevention and intervention service.

**Service Delivery Setting:** Approximately one quarter of survey responses designated a preferred setting for service delivery with 13% choosing community settings (e.g. churches, childcare, social service organizations), 7% in homes and 6% in schools.

**Public Meetings**

**Service Needs/Gaps**
Attendees prioritized the following service needs and gaps, and focus populations/geographies across the three meetings. Numbers in parenthesis refer to the number of people across the three public meetings who prioritized the type of service listed. (For a full representation of input received from public meetings, see Appendix A, pages 25-30.):

- Mentors for children, which indirectly provides respite for parents (10)
- Paid mentors for parents (10)
- On-going family supports (9)
- Workforce development (home visitors, early childhood teachers) (8)
- Child abuse education programs for children (5)
- Programs providing support for schools including school staff training (5)
- Slots in therapeutic classrooms/preschools (5)
- Domestic violence education for families (4)
- Parent empowerment (4)

**Focus Populations/Geographies**
Meeting attendees primarily suggested Levy resources focus on serving families with the greatest risk of child abuse and neglect. Geographic priorities were not identified by participants.
Other Community Efforts in the Program Area

Meeting attendees were asked to provide input on other community efforts with which the Levy should align or seek to complement, or which provide context for investment decisions the Levy Allocation Committee will face. Across the three meetings, the following community efforts and initiatives were raised:

- Follow the implementation of Differential Response by DHS (scheduled to begin in May 2014); an alternative response to how DHS investigates and intervenes in abuse/neglect.
- Look at Washington State’s effort to translate the Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACE) Study into public policy; using study findings to change/improve child welfare practices.
- Be aware of the work being done through the Defending Childhood Initiative on helping systems and communities better recognize, respond to and prevent children’s exposure to violence.
- Stay updated with the work of the Family Violence Coordinating Council regarding the coordination of domestic violence intervention efforts within Multnomah County.

Community/Stakeholder Group Input

Staff met with seven groups with content expertise in the child abuse prevention and intervention program area: the Community Council on Family Preservation, three District 2 Advisory Councils (Child Welfare, Fatherhood, and Portland American Indian/Alaska Native), a District 2 manager, the Family Violence Coordinating Council, the In-home Support and Reunification Services (ISRS) Network, to gather input on child abuse prevention and intervention service needs and gaps as well as other issues related to this funding area. In addition, staff met with a range of stakeholder and community groups to seek input on service needs and gaps across the Levy funding areas and some of these groups provided input relevant to child abuse prevention and intervention services. Input received is summarized below. (For a full representation of community & stakeholder group input received, see Appendix A, pages 13 – 24).

Service Needs/Gaps

- Parenting education and support, especially intensive and comprehensive models that focus on the whole family
- Need a mechanism to connect families to preventive and supportive resources before child welfare is involved
- Access to basic needs (e.g. housing, transportation, child care)
- There is a lack of an adequate level of prevention services to keep children safe and out of child welfare

Focus Populations/Geographies

- Native American and African American families because children from these populations are overrepresented in the child welfare system
• For parent education, several focus populations were mentioned including new parents, fathers, parents of teens, families receiving Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) cash assistance benefits
• High-risk populations (e.g. teen parents, families impacted by domestic violence, families with criminal justice involvement)

Other Issues in the Program Area (System Alignments and Program Quality)
• Programs/organizations need training and support to further develop and implement trauma-informed services. Groups recommended that the Levy formalize trauma-informed training requirements for programs funded in this program area.
• Staff turnover rate in these services is concerning. Families utilizing these services have experienced trauma and stress; high-turnover rates add damage.
• Expand the availability of culturally specific programming. Because smaller, culturally specific organizations often lack the capacity to compete for Levy funding, encourage large organizations to partner/sub-contract with small, culturally specific agencies.
• Provide additional supports and technical assistance to culturally specific organizations interested in competing for Levy funding.
• The DHS child welfare budget has increased for both internal and contracted services. Therefore, DHS District 2 has recommended that Levy resources focus on prevention efforts with families that are not involved with child welfare. Some stakeholder groups also made this recommendation.
Program Area: FOSTER CARE

Summary of Themes Across Three Strands of Community Input

- Invest in programs that provide intensive and continuous support for youth in foster care and those aging out of foster care; programs that recruit, train and support foster parents; provide educational supports for children in foster care (early childhood through college); and provide services that lead to permanency.
- Focus services on African American and Native American children in foster care and the highest risk populations of children in foster care, including those with APPLA (another planned permanent living arrangement), teen parents in foster care, and LBGTQ youth.
- Assure that all foster care programs are either culturally responsive or culturally specific, and assure that children and youth in foster care are supported and empowered.
- Set expectations around trauma-informed care and provide technical assistance to foster care programs to assist with implementation.

Findings from Each Strand of Community Input

For each of the three strands of community input collected, findings are presented below. Common themes in the findings are presented above.

Survey Data

240 people responded to at least one question related to the foster care program area. 65% of respondents were community members (e.g. parents, teachers, advocates, funders) and 35% of respondents described themselves as service providers. 33% of the respondents completed a survey translated from English into another language. (Appendix A, pages 1-12, features survey methods and additional survey data details.)

Type of Service

When asked which services were most important to provide in the foster care program area, foster parent recruitment, training and support was mentioned most frequently (23.7%). After foster parent education and support, intensive support for children in foster care (including advocacy/case management, transition to adulthood, mentoring) were mentioned second most frequently (21.5%). Two-thirds of the mentions for intensive support for children in foster care were made by community members. Academic support for children in foster care, early childhood through college, was mentioned third most frequently (20.2%). More than three-quarters of the mentions for academic support were made by community members. Stable connections for children (including reunification, permanency & Family Find) was the fourth most frequently mentioned type of service (12.8%). Over two-thirds of the mentions for stable connections for children were made by service providers.
**Who to Serve**
When asked to whom it was most important to provide foster care services, the most frequent response (30.2%) was all children in foster care. 18.9% of respondents listed at-risk populations including children of color, highest risk children (e.g. LBGQT, runaways), poor/low income children and immigrants/refugees. Fewer than 25% of survey responses included reference to an age group; of those that did most listed teens and young adults as the priority.

**Where to Serve**
When asked where it was most important to provide services, responses included specific geographies as well as locations where services should be delivered.

**Geography:** Approximately 30% of the survey responses said that all geographic areas should be served; 28% prioritized directing services to specific geographies. The greatest number of survey responses prioritized East Portland (18.8%), North Portland (6.3%) and geographic areas with high concentrations of children in foster care (3.1%).

**Service Delivery Setting:** Approximately one-quarter of survey responses designated a preferred setting for service delivery with 11.5% choosing community settings (e.g. social service organizations), 9.9% in homes and 5.7% in schools.

---

**Public Meetings**

**Service Needs/Gaps**
Attendees prioritized the following service needs and gaps, and focus populations/geographies across the three meetings. Numbers in parenthesis refer to the number of people across the three public meetings who prioritized the type of service listed. (For a full representation of input received from public meetings, see Appendix A, pages 25-30.):

- Services to support youth “aging out” of foster care/transitioning to adulthood (13)
- Recruit culturally specific foster parents (11)
- Tutoring/academic support (9)
- Training and support (including mentoring) for foster parents (9)
- Mental health services (5)
- Multi-disciplinary approach to supporting children in foster care (e.g. Court team model) (5)
- Services leading to permanency (4)

**Focus Populations/Geographies**
Meeting attendees primarily suggested Levy resources focus on serving children in foster care most impacted by disparities in outcomes. Geographic priorities were not identified by participants.

**Other Community Efforts in the Program Area**
Meeting attendees were asked to provide input on other community efforts with which PCL should align or seek to complement, or which provide context for investment decisions the
Committee will face. Across the three meetings, no community efforts or initiatives were identified in this funding area.

**Community/Stakeholder Group Input**

Staff met with nine groups with content expertise in the foster care program area: Community Council on Family Preservation, five District 2 Advisory Councils (Child Welfare, Fatherhood, Foster Parent, Foster Youth and Portland American Indian/Alaska Native), a District 2 manager, Oregon Foster Youth Connection, and the Portland Leadership Foundation to gather input on foster care service needs and gaps as well as other issues related to this funding area. In addition, staff met with a range of stakeholder and community groups to seek input on service needs and gaps across the Levy funding areas and some of these groups provided input relevant to foster care services. Input received is summarized below. (For a full representation of community & stakeholder group input received, see Appendix A, pages 13 – 24).

**Service Needs/Gaps**
- Services to support youth “aging out” of foster care/transitioning to adulthood
- Long-term mentors or other consistent person that will help the child navigate school, placement transitions, and life
- Foster parent recruitment, training and support
- Reunification support and services for birth parents; including quality family time (visitation) that includes facilitated activities that help move families toward reunification
- Educational support for children and youth, early childhood through college
- Access to summer, after school and enrichment activities
- Cost of child care of young foster children is a significant barrier to recruiting and retaining foster parents

**Focus Populations/Geographies**
- Native American and African American children as these populations are overrepresented in the child welfare system
- Latino children, the population of Latino children in foster care continues to increase
- Older youth in foster care
- Highest risk populations in foster care (e.g. teens in foster care with children, LBGTQ)

**Other Issues in the Program Area (System Alignments and Program Quality)**
- Programs/organizations need training and support to further develop and implement trauma-informed services. Formalize trauma-informed training requirements for programs funded in this program area.
- Staff turnover rate in this funding area is concerning. Children served by these programs have experienced trauma and stress; high staff turnover rates add more damage.
• Expand the availability of culturally specific programming. Because smaller, culturally specific organizations often lack the capacity to compete for Levy funding, encourage large organizations to partner/sub-contract with small, culturally specific agencies.
• Provide additional supports and technical assistance to culturally specific organizations interested in competing for Levy funding.
• A youth-adult partnership approach needs to be employed by all professionals working with youth in foster care: foster parents, case workers, and service providers.
• Communication improvements are needed on all levels: between DHS and youth, between DHS and service providers, and with the community regarding the needs of children in foster care and what it means to experience being in foster care.
• Align the outcomes that are tracked in the foster care program area with benchmarks that DHS is tracking.
• Look for opportunities to align with Positive Youth Transitions, a local effort to change collaborative systems so that no young person transitions out of foster care into homelessness. The focus of the effort is on youth in foster care with an APPLA (another permanent planned living arrangement) who are not living with kith or kin (n=233).
Program Area: AFTER SCHOOL

Summary of Themes Across Three Strands of Community Input

- Invest in programs providing academic support, enrichment programs (including those focused on physical activity; arts; Science/Technology/Engineering/Math; Chess), summer programming, and SUN Community Schools.
- Assure that all after-school programs are either culturally responsive or culturally specific, and assure that families are involved and supported to engage in their child’s education.
- Focus services on populations with risk factors for poor outcomes, especially youth of color, those who are low income, and those learning English as a second language.
- Assure that services are geographically located in areas of high poverty and concentrations of populations of color, and assure that service is equitably distributed east of 82nd Avenue.

Findings from Each Strand of Community Input

For each of the three strands of community input collected, findings are presented below. Common themes in the findings are presented above.

Survey Data

271 people responded to at least one question related to the After School program area. 63% of respondents were community members (e.g. parents, teachers, advocates, funder) and 37% of respondents described themselves as service providers. Among respondents, 29% completed a survey translated from English into another language. (Appendix A, pages 1-12, features survey methods and additional survey data details.)

Type of Service

When asked which services were most important to provide in the after-school program area, academic support (including tutoring and/or homework support) was mentioned most frequently (31.1%). After academic support, all types of enrichment programming (including arts, sports/movement/recreation, STEM) were mentioned second most frequently (24.3%) with sports/recreation/movement the most mentioned category of enrichment programming (10.2%). SUN Community School programs were mentioned third most frequently (16.1%).

Who to Serve

When asked to whom it was most important to provide after-school program services, the majority of responses (55.3%) listed at-risk populations including poor/low income children, children with risk factors such as disability, or academic failure, children of color and immigrants/refugees who are English language learners. Approximately 20% of survey responses did not prioritize any specific population for service and noted that all children...
should be served. Less than 20% of survey responses included reference to an age group, and of those that did, most listed elementary and middle school aged children as the priority.

**Where to Serve**
When asked where it was most important to provide services, responses included specific geographies as well as locations where services should be delivered.

**Geography:** More than half of the survey responses prioritized directing services to specific geographies; 12% of responses said that all geographic areas should be served. The greatest number of survey responses prioritized **East Portland** (24%), high poverty schools or geographic areas (17.3%), and **North Portland** (12.3%). Both East Portland and North Portland have higher poverty rates than the city as a whole such that it can be inferred that survey respondents are prioritizing high poverty areas of the city for after-school service.

**Service Delivery Setting:** Approximately one third of survey responses designated a preferred setting for service delivery with nearly 20% choosing **schools**, 5% specifying community settings, and 9.4% specifying that services should be offered at multiple locations (school and community).

### Public Meetings

**Service Needs/Gaps**
Attendees prioritized the following service needs and gaps, and focus populations/geographies across the three meetings. Numbers in parenthesis refer to the number of people across the three public meetings who prioritized the type of service listed. (For a full representation of input received from public meetings, see Appendix A, pages 25-30.):

- Programs that support parents’ engagement in their child’s education (25)
- Summer programming that includes academic support and recreational activities (20)
- Culturally specific and responsive programming (17)
- School year academic support that is tied to both teachers and parents/caregivers (i.e. communication/coordination between teachers, after-school academic support staff and families) (7)
- Programs that support students’ empowerment, confidence, and leadership development (7)

**Focus Populations/Geographies**
Meeting attendees listed a variety of focus populations for after-school services primarily organized around risk factors (such as poverty, academic failure, English language learners, children with special needs, teen parents, gang affected youth), and racial/ethnic groups that experience disproportionately poor outcomes. In terms of geography, attendees noted both the importance of serving East of 82nd Avenue and in reaching children living in poverty regardless of where they live. Taken together, the most consistent input was to direct services to at-risk populations who are most affected by disparities in outcomes.
**Other Community Efforts in the Program Area**

Meeting attendees were asked to provide input on other community efforts with which the Levy should align or seek to complement, or which provide context for investment decisions the Levy Allocation Committee will face. Across the three meetings, the following community efforts and initiatives were raised:

- Align with Portland Public Schools Milestones for academic achievement across the K-12 system. The Cradle to Career initiative selected similar milestones for students K-12.
- Be aware of school district equity initiatives such as Courageous Conversations about Race which is being used in Portland Public Schools.
- Assure that hunger relief efforts are aligned with after-school programming.
- Align with SUN system.
- Be aware of/complement other local funding streams such as the Metro STEM Partnership, Oregon Community Fund’s investments in after-school programs for middle school aged youth, and the Kaiser Permanente Fund’s investments in changing social determinants of health (through Northwest Health Foundation).
- Align with attendance goals of Cradle to Career’s Communities Supporting Youth Collaborative (goal is to increase the percentage of children in Multnomah County schools who attend 90% of schools days by 5.1% between the 2012-13 and 2013-14 school years).
- Align with Governor’s 40-40-20 goals and framework (40% of adult Oregonians hold a bachelor’s or higher degree, 40% hold an associates or other post-secondary certificate, and all have a high school diploma).
- Align with state Prosperity Initiative (goals are to reduce poverty, raise income levels and reduce income inequality in Oregon).

**Community/Stakeholder Group Input**

Staff met with the SUN Coordinating Council, Multnomah County mangers of the SUN system, and staff for the statewide after-school network called Oregon ASK to gather specific input on after-school service needs and gaps, and policy issues related to investing in SUN. In addition, staff met with a range of stakeholder and community groups to seek input on service needs and gaps across the Levy funding areas and some of these groups provided input relevant to after-school services. Input received is summarized below. (For a full representation of community & stakeholder group input received, see Appendix A, pages 13 – 24).

**Service Needs/Gaps**

- Academic support focused on basic skill acquisition (e.g. reading and math at 8th grade level)
- Enrichment programming (music, arts, Science/Technology/Engineering/Math and chess mentioned) including assuring that PCL funds enrichment programs to offer programming at SUN
- Culturally specific and responsive programming; assure programming is culturally relevant for English language learner populations
• Increase number of SUN Community schools using Equity Index to prioritize expansion sites
• Parent education directed at helping parents navigate the school system
• Better support for disabled and behaviorally challenged children to participate in after-school programming, including funding inclusion specialists where needed.

Focus Populations/Geographies
• African-American and Native youth because they are not achieving outcomes at the same rates as Latino and immigrant youth participating in the system which suggests that additional supports may be needed
• Schools/geographic areas with high rates of poverty and a high concentration of children of color (SUN Equity Index of schools)
• English language learners

Other Policy Issues
The SUN Coordinating Council specifically provided input recommending that PCL take applications to expand SUN Community School programs to additional sites that do not currently have the program, and that it prioritize any investments using the SUN Equity Index (considers poverty and race/ethnicity of school populations to rank need). The Council was neutral on whether PCL should require matching dollars either from lead agencies or school districts/sites for any proposal for a new SUN site.
Summary of Themes Across Three Strands of Community Input

- Invest in mentoring services that intentionally focus on youth’s academic achievement, including their performance in school as well as supporting them to set and pursue career and college goals.
- Support culturally specific services in which mentoring is designed to help keep youth of color in school, on track to graduate, and focused on post-secondary pursuits.
- Direct resources to support models that feature longer-term, more intensive relationships between youth and mentors.
- Aim to serve mainly youth “at-risk” of poor academic outcomes- youth in poverty, youth of color, youth in foster care, and academic priority youth.
- Make teens (middle school and high school) the priority population of children served.

Findings from Each Strand of Community Input
For each of the three strands of community input collected, findings are presented below. Common themes in the findings are presented above.

Survey Data

230 people responded to at least one question related to the mentoring program area. 64% of respondents were community members (e.g. parents, teachers, advocates, funder) and 36% of respondents described themselves as service providers. Among respondents, 33% completed a survey translated from English into another language. (Appendix A, pages 1 -12, features survey methods and additional survey data details.)

Type of Service
When asked “what is the most important thing the Levy can do to connect youth with caring adult role models and promote academic achievement” respondents most frequently mentioned focus the relationship on support specifically for achievement (30%). Among the types of achievement supports mentioned, responses called out academic support such advocacy, tutoring (19.6%); and career/post-secondary support such as going to college, job training/internships (11.4%). Apart from focus of the relationship, responses frequently mentioned structure of the relationship (e.g. one-to one-mentoring, or group mentoring), (11.8%). A similar portion mentioned duration/intensity of the relationship, including long-term/intensive, and weekly contact (11.4%). A significant portion of the responses (17%) in the section were not usable because they said things such as “more mentors”, “caring adults”, “mentoring” and did not indicate any preference for type of mentoring.
**Who to Serve**
When asked “who is most important to serve”, nearly half of responses (48.7%) mentioned **specific populations with risk factors** including children with risk factors such as academic priority or foster children; low-income children and children in poverty; children of color and immigrant/refugee children. Suggestions to serve all children regardless of risk factors were 17.3% of responses. 26% of responses **specified ages of children** to be served, with middle school age being the most frequently mentioned age (11.7%) followed closely by high school (10.2%) and only a few mentioned elementary age (4.6%).

**Where to Serve**
When asked “where is it most important to serve”, half of responses (49.5%) suggested directing services to **specific geographies**; 20.6% of responses said that all geographic areas should be served. The greatest number of survey responses prioritized **East Portland** (25.3%), followed by suggestions for **high poverty** schools or geographic areas (13%), and **North Portland** (10.3%). Both East Portland and North Portland have higher poverty rates than the city as a whole, so taken together responses suggest preference for areas with high poverty and associated risks. A preferred setting for service delivery was mentioned in 17.5% of responses, with most preferring school (10.3%) and fewer preferring community (7.2%).

**Public Meetings**

**Service Needs/Gaps**
Attendees prioritized the following service needs and gaps, and focus populations/geographies across the three meetings. Numbers in parenthesis refer to the number of people across the three public meetings who prioritized the type of service listed. (For a full representation of input received from public meetings, see Appendix A, pages 25-30.):
- Culturally Specific mentoring services (20)
- Mentoring through transitions, e.g. from middle to high school, out of foster care (17)
- Achievement-focused, on teens for career/internships and going to college (8), and academic/behavior support (7)
- Anti-bullying programs for middle school students (9)
- Models that include family outreach and engagement (7)

**Focus Populations/Geographies**
Participants suggested a variety of specific populations for mentoring services focusing primarily on populations most affected by disparities in outcomes, such as youth of color, youth in poverty, academic priority youth, youth with special needs, youth in foster care, adjudicated and/or gang-involved youth, and teen parents. For geography, participants noted both the importance of serving East of 82nd Avenue, especially in outer SE Portland, and also in North Portland. Altogether, the input consistently suggested the Levy direct services to at-risk populations who are most disproportionately affected by negative outcomes putting them at risk of later challenges in life. Participants also noted the challenges of recruiting mentors that live in East Portland or who are willing to serve children that live in East Portland.
Other Community Efforts in the Program Area
Participants were asked to provide input on other community-level initiatives with which PCL should align or seek to complement, or which might help inform Levy funding priorities. Across the three meetings, the following community efforts were mentioned:

- Align with Oregon Mentors’ Quality-based Mentoring initiative to assess, evaluate and improve the quality of mentoring programs.
- Align with success indicators used by Cradle to Career initiative, including the Communities Supporting Youth Collaborative’s focus on school attendance goals
- Align and coordinate with SUN system where applicable.
- Connect with mentoring research fellow at Portland State University for the latest research on effective mentoring practice.

Community/Stakeholder Group Input

Staff met with Oregon Mentors staff, researchers and consultants in mentoring practices, and advocates for mentoring. In addition, staff met with a range of other stakeholder and community groups to seek input on service needs and gaps across the Levy funding areas and some of these groups provided input specific to mentoring services. Input received is summarized below. (For a full representation of community & stakeholder group input received, see Appendix A, pages 13 – 24).

Service Needs/Gaps

- Academically-focused mentoring that provides support for youth to achieve in school, graduate, and pursue college/careers
- Culturally specific mentoring services, including those that help children of color with college and career pursuits. Be flexible on design of culturally specific mentoring models because the traditional mentoring model of one-to-one relationships is not appropriate in many cultures that are more communally oriented.
- Focusing on youth in middle and high school
- Transition supports between 8th and 9th grade when risk of drop-out increases
- Opportunities for group mentoring
- Models that use/demonstrate longer-term, intensive relationships (over multiple years)
- Models that help foster positive racial identity development
- More male mentors for boys and mentors of color for children of color

Focus Populations/Geographies

- Children of color and English language learners
- Children with disabilities
- Teens, especially those struggling academically

Other Issues in the Program Area (System Alignments and Program Quality)
Only a few groups weighed in on issues related to mentoring services. The group focused on mentoring indicated that Oregon Mentor’s Quality Based Mentoring initiative would be an
opportunity for alignment; requiring funded programs to participate in the effort or funding only programs that have successfully completed the effort, or both. Other systems issues in mentoring focused on the need for the mentoring field to include a broader range of culturally specific models that focus on building positive relationships between caring adults and youth.
Program Area: HUNGER RELIEF

Summary of Themes Across Three Strands of Community Input

- Increase access to and utilization of existing hunger relief programs that provide food for children during the school day and outside-of-school times through a variety of methods.
- Increase summer food access by expanding summer feeding sites.
- Increase number of school food pantries, especially at SUN Community schools, and especially in East Portland.
- Invest in programs providing nutrition and cooking education.
- Assure that services are focused on low income families and children, and are offered in high poverty schools and parts of Portland (East and North Portland).

Findings from Each Strand of Community Input

For each of the three strands of community input collected, findings are presented below. Common themes in the findings are presented above.

Survey Data

238 people responded to at least one question related to the mentoring program area. 63% of respondents were community members (e.g. parents, teachers, advocates, funder) and 37% of respondents described themselves as service providers. Among respondents, 29% completed a survey translated from English into another language. (Appendix A, pages 1-12, features survey methods and additional survey data details.)

Type of Service

When asked which services were most important to provide in the hunger relief program area, nutrition and cooking education programs was mentioned most frequently (17%). School-based food pantries were mentioned second most frequently (14.1%). Provision of meals during out-of-school times such as suppers (when not provided in an after-school program setting), weekends, vacations and summer was mentioned third most frequently (13.4%). Increasing access to existing hunger relief programs such as SNAP, WIC and the free/reduced price breakfast/lunch/supper programs was fourth most frequently mentioned (8.7%).

Who to Serve

When asked to whom it was most important to provide hunger relief, 38.6% of responses listed at-risk populations including poor/low-income children, children of color and immigrants/refugees. Approximately 25% of survey responses did not prioritize any specific population for service and said that all children should be served. A significant number of responses (23.3%) specifically noted that families of children should also be served.
**Where to Serve**
When asked where it was most important to provide services, responses included specific geographies as well as locations where services should be delivered.

**Geography:** 42.5% of the survey responses prioritized directing services to specific geographies; 31.1% of responses said that all geographic areas should be served. The greatest number of survey responses prioritized *East Portland* (19.1%), *high poverty* schools or geographic areas (16.2%), and *North Portland* (7.2%). Both East Portland and North Portland have higher poverty rates than the city as a whole such that it can be inferred that survey respondents are prioritizing high poverty areas of the city for hunger relief services.

**Service Delivery Setting:** Approximately 22% of survey responses mentioned the setting for service delivery; however, results were fairly evenly divided with 8.4% saying services should be located in both school and community settings, 7.8% saying services should be located in schools, and 5.4% saying services should be community based.

---

### Public Meetings

**Service Needs/Gaps**
Attendees prioritized the following service needs and gaps, and focus populations/geographies across the three meetings. Numbers in parenthesis refer to the number of people across the three public meetings who prioritized the type of service listed. (For a full representation of input received from public meetings, see Appendix A, pages 25-30.):

- Fund food support through programs funded in other categories (19)
- Provide nutritious, healthy, organic foods (14)
- Increase availability of food for children/families over the summer (9)
- Expand participation in the after-school supper program (7)
- School food pantries (4)
- Nutrition Education (3)

**Focus Populations/Geographies**
Meeting attendees listed a variety of focus populations for hunger relief including children who are not yet in school, teens, families of hungry children, immigrants/refugees and other racial/ethnic groups that experience disproportionately poor outcomes. In terms of geography, attendees noted both the importance of serving East and North Portland (higher poverty parts of Portland), and areas designated “food deserts” (refers to areas where there is little access to stores selling fresh fruits and vegetables).

**Other Community Efforts in the Program Area**
Meeting attendees were asked to provide input on other community efforts with which PCL should align or seek to complement, or which provide context for investment decisions the Committee will face. Across the three meetings, the following community efforts and initiatives were raised:
• Coordinate with Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC), the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) and the Federal Free/Reduced Price school food program that provides breakfast, lunch, afternoon snacks and suppers at schools and other qualifying sites.
• Align with the Hunger Relief Task Force/Partners for a Hunger Free Oregon plan (Ending Hunger Before it Begins).
• Align with SUN system efforts to provide food assistance.
• Align with Multnomah County Food Action Plan (goals of plan are to increase local food options, make healthier food choices easier for all, build systemic justice, health and food security, and promote a thriving local economy).

Community/Stakeholder Group Input

Staff met with the Partners for a Hunger Free Oregon, Urban Gleaners, the Oregon Food Bank, Meals on Wheels, the Palau Foundation, SUN System managers at the County who help coordinate hunger relief efforts through that system, and the manager at Portland Parks and Recreation in charge of the City’s summer “food in the parks” efforts to gather specific input on current hunger relief efforts, service needs and gaps, and policy issues. In addition, staff met with a range of stakeholder and community groups to seek input on service needs and gaps across the Levy funding areas and some of these groups provided input relevant to hunger relief services. Input received is summarized below. (For a full representation of community & stakeholder group input received, see Appendix A, pages 13 – 24).

Service Needs/Gaps
• Increase utilization of existing hunger relief programs (SNAP, WIC, school meals, summer food and school based emergency food programs) through improved outreach, provision of additional staffing, and provision of volunteer coordination staff.
• Use a multi-pronged approach to providing hunger relief (multiple types of locations, multiple programs, and multiple types of providers).
• Increase school based food pantries, especially at SUN Community School sites, and especially in East Portland.
• Increase summer feeding sites, particularly in East Portland. Consider using community and/or school libraries as summer feeding sites.

Focus Populations/Geographies
• East Portland was mentioned most frequently, and North Portland was also mentioned.
DATA LIMITATIONS

In preparing this report, the sources of data used and the ways in which data were analyzed include several limitations, as described below:

- **Demographics of individuals providing input**
  While surveys were translated into 4 other languages and respondents were described by the language of the survey they completed, we did not collect any data on the race/ethnicity, gender, or income-level of the survey respondents. Similarly, we did not collect data on the demographics of participants in the stakeholder groups or in the public meetings. In all, we are unable to describe the relationship between individuals’ input and demographic variables that describe their racial/ethnic identity. We are also unable to describe the population of respondents overall by their demographics, so we cannot determine whether input was collected from a representative sample of the population.

- **Analysis of survey responses: services for specific populations**
  The survey featured open-ended questions, asking respondents to indicate which services were a priority in a given program area and for which populations of children specifically. Several respondents indicated more than one service and/or more than one population in their answers. These multi-part answers made it impossible to determine which population was specified as a priority for any particular service priority listed. Staff chose to analyze priority services and priority populations separately rather than in one-to-one relationship with each other.

- **Sources of input: design and time limitations**
  The public input process was designed and run by Levy staff, none of whom are professional researchers. Respondents/participants in the input process may not have understood all or part of questions they were asked. Confusion about the questions may have resulted in respondents/participants providing different input than if they had understood the questions better. This dynamic may have been exacerbated with surveys that were translated from English and where questions may not have made sense in the cultural context of the respondent. In addition, the entire input process was limited to four months; additional time may have yielded other input and different results.

- **Interpretation of responses**
  Levy staff had to create methods of grouping open-ended survey responses by topics. While staff tried to be as objective as possible in understanding what the responses indicated, it is possible that staff misinterpreted answers in categorizing and counting responses. Similarly, as staff sought to summarize topics raised by community and stakeholder groups, staff grouped the input by categories and concepts. It is possible that staff’s interpretation of the input may not reflect the intent of the respondent/participant.
Methods: SURVEY

Survey Design
In an effort to provide multiple formats for community input on Levy priorities, a brief survey was created that asked about funding allocations between all six program areas, service priorities in each program area (i.e. what types of services, who to serve, where to serve), and features of high-quality services for children and families. The survey also included a few questions to describe the respondents, including their familiarity with the Levy and their perspective (e.g. parent, service provider, community leader) in answering the survey.

The survey was offered in two formats: 1) for English-speaking audience, featured open-ended, qualitative questions pertaining to service priorities in each program area; 2) translated version in four languages: Spanish, Russian, Vietnamese and Somali, featured only multiple choice answers for service priority questions and fewer questions overall regarding priorities per program area. Costs of translation necessitated that the version for non-English audiences be kept to multiple choice for ease of tabulation and analysis. Both versions featured only multiple choice answers for the questions asking respondents to describe their familiarity with the Levy and connection with/perspective on the Levy.

Copies of the surveys are provided in Appendix B of this document for reference.

Distribution
English and translated survey links were posted online on the Levy website and numerous times on the PCL Facebook page. The links were sent to the Levy database; all grantees; and included in the July, August and September Levy e-newsletter, as well as two Allocation Committee recap e-newsletters. Other outreach included working with the city’s Office of Neighborhood Involvement’s Diversity and Civic Leadership Program; providing links and hard copies of the survey to many community and culturally specific organizations for distribution to clients and staff members; working with school districts and SUN coordinators for dissemination of information via websites and newsletters; and publishing links on local newspaper websites and blogs. Levy staff also attended school-sponsored events such as Back to School nights and other parent meetings to personally gather surveys from parents. Levy staff, grantee staff and others assisted in gathering input from the following school communities: Gilbert Heights Elementary in the David Douglas School District; James John, Lents, Vestal, Scott and Bridger K-5 and K-8 schools in Portland Public Schools; and Parklane Elementary in the Centennial School District.

Tabulation Methods
A master dataset was created from all on-line responses and hard-copy responses. Excel was used to generate counts/frequencies of respondents’ answers to describe them as a group (e.g. their familiarity with the Levy and how they describe themselves with respect to their connection to/perspective on the Levy).

In reviewing the answers to the program area questions, Levy staff created a master list in Excel of the different responses that were given for each question; response categories were organized by column in the sheet. Respondents’ answers to the questions included discrete
pieces of information. For example, in response to a question about the most important services to fund in early childhood, a respondent might have mentioned pre-school and also home visiting. In this case, staff then marked both the pre-school and home visiting column on the Excel spreadsheet. Staff then used Excel to count the number of times a response was mentioned, and the total “mentions” of any/all responses per question, per program area. Across all respondents for each of the three questions in each program area, there is a total number of “mentions”. Total “mentions” indicates the number of times each response was counted from the answers provided. The total number of times each response was mentioned was used to generate the summary data featured in pages 5 – 12 of this appendix.

In order to best summarize the data on service priorities, (see tables on pages 5 – 12 of this appendix), staff combined some types of responses into larger over-arching themes. For example, respondents mentioned “at risk” as well as specific risk factors such as “incarcerated parent” or “teen parent” in answering the “who to serve” question. In nearly all program areas, there were many mentions of “at risk” generally, but fewer mentions of each specific risk factor. In this situation, staff elected to add all mentions of specific risk factors into the count for the general “at risk” response and this is reflected in the total of “at risk” responses. Other instances of combining of topics into larger themes occurred at various points in the data summarizing process.

For tabulating the responses for the survey question regarding “features of high quality services”, the same approach – sorting responses mentioned to topics, and counting “mentions” of a response – was used. This open-ended question was also included on the translated surveys; however, a smaller number of written responses in each of the languages, combined with both the cost and length of time needed to translate the responses, prompted Levy staff to not include those findings at this time.

**Survey Respondents**

There were a total of 500 respondents to the surveys (both versions, all language groups). The bulk of respondents were English-speaking. More people who identified as some type of community member (e.g. parents, teachers, advocates) responded to the survey, as compared to the portion that identified as a service provider. Last, a slightly higher portion of respondents described themselves as “somewhat familiar” or “unfamiliar” with the Levy. The tables and narrative below describe the respondents in greater detail. Nearly all respondents to the translated versions of the surveys described themselves as a community member, rather than a service provider.
Table 1. **Total Respondents by Language Version/Format of Survey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Language, format</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percent of Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English version, online</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English version, hard copy</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal- Respondents, English version</strong></td>
<td><strong>417</strong></td>
<td><strong>83.4%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish version, hard copy</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish version, on line</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese version, hard copy</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese version, on line</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian version, hard copy</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian version, on line</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal- Respondents, Translated version</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The online survey was accessed via Survey Monkey. As shown in Table 1, the preponderance of respondents to the online English survey vs. the online non-English survey brings up various challenges for these culturally-specific communities: computer access; comfort/trust level with government-sponsored surveys; familiarity with survey topics. In general, Levy staff found that working in small group settings with a trusted advocate from each specific cultural community who could answer questions and help interpret survey language increased the response rate. Also, while Somali language surveys were published and distributed, the high rate of illiteracy among Somali parents/community members in their native language hindered these outreach efforts.

Identity of Respondent

Table 2. **Total Respondents by Type of Identity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type/Identity</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percent of Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Advocate</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Leader</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Member</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funder</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/Guardian (or Foster Parent)</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Maker/Policy Advisor</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher/Program Consultant</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Teacher/School Administrator</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Types of Community Members</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Provider</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>500</strong></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levy staff’s outreach included working with the Office of Neighborhood Involvement, City of Portland school districts, current grantees such as IRCO, as well as SUN coordinators, to help...
identify outlets and venues for both online and hard-copy survey distribution to English and non-English speaking parents. This effort helped increase the number of parents that completed the survey. The high response rate by service providers is not surprising given high interest in the Levy’s upcoming funding round. Both current Levy grantees and other service providers are listed in the Levy communications database and have received numerous reminders about the survey in emails, e-newsletters, Facebook postings and through the PCL website.

Apart from the data contained in the table, it is noteworthy that among the 105 respondents who described themselves parents/guardians/foster parents, approximately half responded to the English survey and the other half responded to the translated surveys. In addition, nearly all service provider respondents filled-out the English version of the survey.

Familiarity with Levy

Table 3. **Total Respondents by Familiarity with Levy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Familiarity with Levy</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percent of Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Familiar</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Familiar</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Familiar</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In contrast to the figures here showing that a majority of respondents described themselves has having little to no familiarity with the Levy, 65.1% service providers responding to the survey described themselves as “very familiar” with the Levy, compared to 23.1% of all types of Community Members. Among all respondents, “Parent/Guardian/Foster Parent” was the largest single group that indicated being “unfamiliar” with the Levy at 38.8%, which could mean that while some may receive services from a Levy-supported grantee, they may not realize that program funding comes from the Levy. This presents an opportunity for education and outreach in the future.

It is important to keep in mind that not all 500 respondents completed every question in the entire survey. The number of respondents to each question varies, particularly for answers to the questions regarding service priorities for each of the program areas. The specific number of respondents to each question is provided in the following program area summaries of the survey data.
Summary of Data by Program Area
The following pages contain a summary or survey data gathered on each program area. The list below reviews some of the data points in the summaries and how they are to be read/understood:

- **Number of respondents per question, per program area**: The number of respondents listed next to each of these survey questions refers to the number of survey respondents that answered each question in that program area.

- **Total “Mentions”**: As previously noted in the tabulation methods section, staff counted the “mentions” of each response. Those counts, in total across all responses and for each topic, are provided in the summary. The number of total “mentions” is greater than the number of respondents because one respondent may list more than one response of a service, population or location as important (e.g. academic support and enrichment activities; children of color and teen parents; North Portland and East Portland).

- **Number and Percent of “Mentions” per question**: For each of the three service priority questions—“what service”, “for whom”, “where to serve”—the number of total mentions of all responses is listed. In addition, the table indicates the number of “mentions” of responses per topic, and the percent of total mentions that fell under each topic. **Example**: if there are 418 total mentions of types of early childhood services, and pre-school was mentioned 165 times, then pre-school comprises 39.4% of the total mentions of types of early childhood services.

- **Topics and Sub-topics of Responses**: In some of the tables a general topic category of response is listed with bulleted sub-topics listed below. In these cases, the number in bold reflects the total for the whole topic of responses (e.g. all those responses that mentioned any type of home visiting), and the italicized numbers below it correspond to the bulleted sub-topics reflect the mentions of the specific sub-topic (e.g. Early Head Start home visiting).
### Features of High Quality Services: SURVEY Input Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Topic</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Three most important features of High Quality Services for children &amp; families</strong></td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Most important features of High Quality Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses (most mentions)</th>
<th>Number of Mentions</th>
<th>Percent of Total Mentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship-based/focus on relationship with child/family</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Client-centered, expecting growth in the client(s)</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Family/parent engaged and empowered in how services provided</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Wrap-around child/family, holistic/coordinated approach to serving child</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Relationship as focus of service</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Outreach engages child/family in services</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Intensive, long-term services</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strengths-based approach to serving child/family</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes, Track Record, Best Practice/Evidence-based</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Focuses on outcomes for children, uses best practice/evidence-based</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Has track record of results for organization or service (inc. financial)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Characteristics of Service Providers or Staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reliable, consistent, timely</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Safe, earns trust</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Respecting, compassionate</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ability to listen</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to services (e.g. low cost/free, located where people can easily get to)</strong></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Culturally Responsive services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Culturally responsive, relevant, appropriate, competent</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Culturally specific/Language specific</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Quality Staff (well trained, knowledgeable, low turn-over, strong supervision)</strong></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Early Childhood: SURVEY Input Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Topic</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What: Most important services to provide</strong></td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Who: Most important populations to serve</strong></td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Where: Most important locations/areas to serve</strong></td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WHAT: Most important services to provide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Description</th>
<th>Number of Mentions</th>
<th>Percent of Total Mentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre school/Head Start</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting (parent-child activities, parent classes)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Visiting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified or various models</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Head Start</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Literacy</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early mental health/child behavior supports</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WHO: Most important populations to serve

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Description</th>
<th>Number of Mentions</th>
<th>Percent of Total Mentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific Populations</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low income/children in poverty</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children of color</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children “at risk” (e.g. teen parent, foster children)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant/Refugee/English Lang. Learner</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Children</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages of Children</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – 5 years old</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prenatal/birth – 5 years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not currently in EC services/Head Start waitlists</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WHERE: Most important locations/areas to serve

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Description</th>
<th>Number of Mentions</th>
<th>Percent of Total Mentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific Geography</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Portland</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Portland</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas with high poverty, populations of color</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Areas</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settings</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In homes or in childcare facilities</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Schools</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Child Abuse Prevention & Intervention: SURVEY Input Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Topic</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What: Most important services to provide</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who: Most important populations to serve</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where: Most important locations/areas to serve</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### WHAT: Most important services to provide

Total Mentions: 327

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses (most mentions)</th>
<th>Number of Mentions</th>
<th>Percent of Total Mentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parent Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classes &amp; parent-child groups</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mental Health/Therapy/Counseling</strong></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(parent, child, family)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parent Support/Advocacy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case Management/Linkage to services</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Home-visiting/home-based services</strong></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### WHO: Most important populations to serve

Total Mentions: 243

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses (most mentions)</th>
<th>Number of Mentions</th>
<th>Percent of Total Mentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific Populations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children “at risk” (e.g. history of abuse, teen parent)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low income/children in poverty</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children of color</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant/Refugee/English Lang. Learner</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Children</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ages of Children</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-age</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young children (0-5)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teens</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### WHERE: Most important locations/areas to serve

Total Mentions: 223

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses (most mentions)</th>
<th>Number of Mentions</th>
<th>Percent of Total Mentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific Geography</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Portland/NE/SE</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Portland</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas with high poverty, populations of color</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Areas</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community settings (e.g. social service agencies, churches, child care)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In homes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Foster Care: SURVEY Input Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Topic</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What:</strong> Most important services to provide</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Who:</strong> Most important populations to serve</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Where:</strong> Most important locations/areas to serve</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WHAT: Most important services to provide

Total Mentions: 367

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses (most mentions)</th>
<th>Number of Mentions</th>
<th>Percent of Total Mentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foster Parent Recruitment, Training &amp; Support</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive support for children in foster care</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advocacy/Case management</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transition to adulthood</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mentoring</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic support for children in foster care (e.g. – college)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable Connections for children (e.g. permanency)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WHO: Most important populations to serve

Total Mentions: 222

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses (most mentions)</th>
<th>Number of Mentions</th>
<th>Percent of Total Mentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific Populations</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Children of color</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Highest risk Children (e.g. LBGQT, runaways)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Low income/children in poverty</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Immigrant/Refugee/English Lang. Learner</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Children</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages of Children</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• High-school and young adults</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Elementary and middle school-age</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Young children (0-5)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Parents</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WHERE: Most important locations/areas to serve

Total Mentions: 192

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses (most mentions)</th>
<th>Number of Mentions</th>
<th>Percent of Total Mentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific Geography</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• East Portland/NE/SE</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• North Portland</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Areas with high concentrations of children in care</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Areas</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settings</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community settings (e.g. social service agencies)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In homes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Schools</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### After School: SURVEY Input Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Topic</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What: Most important services to provide</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who: Most important populations to serve</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where: Most important locations/areas to serve</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WHAT: Most important services to provide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses (most mentions)</th>
<th>Number of Mentions</th>
<th>Percent of Total Mentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Support</strong> (including tutoring and homework help)</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrichment Programs</strong> (All Types)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recreation/Sports Movement</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enrichment (General)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Arts Enrichment</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• STEM/Chess</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUN Community Schools</strong></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Mentions:</strong> 354</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WHO: Most important populations to serve

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses (most mentions)</th>
<th>Number of Mentions</th>
<th>Percent of Total Mentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific Populations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Low income/children in poverty</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Children “at risk” (e.g. academic priority, disability)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Children of color</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Immigrant/Refugee/English Lang. Learner</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Children (regardless of risk)</strong></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ages of Children</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Elementary/Middle School</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• High School</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Mentions:</strong> 235</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WHERE: Most important locations/areas to serve

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses (most mentions)</th>
<th>Number of Mentions</th>
<th>Percent of Total Mentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific Geography</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• East Portland/NE/SE</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• High Poverty Schools/Areas or schools with ach. gap</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• North Portland</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Geographic Areas</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School Based</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community Based</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use Multiple Locations</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Mentions:</strong> 243</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Mentoring: SURVEY Input Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Topic</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What: Most important services to provide</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who: Most important populations to serve</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where: Most important locations/areas to serve</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WHAT: Most important services to provide

Total Mentions: 271

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of Relationship</th>
<th>Number of Mentions</th>
<th>Percent of Total Mentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Academic (e.g. advocacy, tutoring, achievement)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Career/post-secondary (e.g. college, job training)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure of Relationship</th>
<th>Number of Mentions</th>
<th>Percent of Total Mentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• One to One</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Group</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration/Intensity of Relationship</th>
<th>Number of Mentions</th>
<th>Percent of Total Mentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Long-term/intensive</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Weekly</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WHO: Most important populations to serve

Total Mentions: 197

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Populations</th>
<th>Number of Mentions</th>
<th>Percent of Total Mentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Children “at risk” (e.g. academic priority, in foster care)</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Low income/children in poverty</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Children of color</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Immigrant/Refugean/English Lang. Learner</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All Children</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ages of Children</th>
<th>Number of Mentions</th>
<th>Percent of Total Mentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• middle school age</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• high school age</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• elementary school age</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WHERE: Most important locations/areas to serve

Total Mentions: 194

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Geography</th>
<th>Number of Mentions</th>
<th>Percent of Total Mentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• East Portland/NE/SE</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• North Portland</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Areas with high poverty, high drop-out rate</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Areas</th>
<th>Number of Mentions</th>
<th>Percent of Total Mentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• All Areas</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settings</th>
<th>Number of Mentions</th>
<th>Percent of Total Mentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• In schools</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In community</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Hunger Relief: SURVEY Input Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Topic</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What: Most important services to provide</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who: Most important populations to serve</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where: Most important locations/areas to serve</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## WHAT: Most important services to provide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses (most mentions)</th>
<th>Number of Mentions</th>
<th>Percent of Total Mentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition and Cooking Education Programs</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-Based Food Pantries</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside-of-School Time Meals (supper, weekends, vacation, summer)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Access to Existing Hunger Relief Programs (SNAP, WIC, FRL)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## WHO: Most important populations to serve

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes (most mentions)</th>
<th>Number of Mentions</th>
<th>Percent of Total Mentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific Populations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low income/children in poverty</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children of color/Immigrant/Refugee</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children &quot;at risk&quot;</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Children, All Ages</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include Families</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## WHERE: Most important locations/areas to serve

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses (most mentions)</th>
<th>Number of Mentions</th>
<th>Percent of Total Mentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific Geography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Portland/NE/SE</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi Poverty Geographic Areas</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Portland</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Geographic Areas</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both School and Community Locations</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Locations</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
METHODS: Meetings with Community & Stakeholder Groups

Meeting Structure and Input Process
PCL staff spent four months doing intensive outreach to a wide-range of community groups, and met with stakeholder groups consisting of policy makers, service providers, parents and youth (including foster parents and youth formerly in the foster system), health care professionals, consultants, school administrators, researchers, funders, advocates, and county administrators of public health and human services. From June through September, staff consulted with nearly 300 individuals from 39 groups around the city.

Staff offered to meet with groups during their regularly scheduled meetings, or to set a separate meeting, depending on which the group preferred. Specific discussion questions were developed for each group centering around six main topics. Questions generally fell within the following topics; a sample of some of the questions asked is listed below:

- **Overall Goals for Levy Funding**
  Questions included: Should the Levy develop more specific goals to guide its investments in the priority services identified? For example, specific portions of Levy [e.g. after school, early childhood] funding toward certain types of service?

- **Needs/Gaps Input**
  Questions included: Within the Levy’s specific program areas, what types of service are highest priority and for which populations?

- **Equity Issues**
  Questions included: What should the Levy do to ensure that grants lead to more equitable outcomes for children in Portland? Should the Levy develop specific goals to investing in East Portland or in culturally specific services?

- **System Efforts in Connection to the Levy**
  Questions included: In light of current system-level efforts in [e.g. child welfare, domestic violence, early childhood], how should the Levy consider aligning its investments with those efforts?

Tabulation Methods
Two Levy staff attended most meetings. One staff facilitated the feedback process while the other took notes on the discussion. In other cases, Levy staff relied on the group’s staff person for notes or took their own notes. All notes from the discussion were transcribed and saved on the Levy’s shared drive (as Word documents). Levy staff analyzed the notes for themes in the discussion. Staff recorded themes in a matrix (using Excel), grouped by topics such as program area needs/gaps, equity, program quality, and system alignments. A summary of notes grouped by theme/topic are found on pages 15 – 24 of this appendix.
The groups consulted include:

**Community**
- All Hands Raised/Cradle to Career Collaborative
- Center for Intercultural Organizing
- City Diversity and Civic Leadership Program/ Mutual Assistance Associations
- City Office of Equity (including New Portlander Advisory Council, Commission on Disability)
- City Office of Neighborhood Involvement-Community and Neighborhood Involvement Center
- Coalition of Communities of Color
- East Portland Action Committee- Education Subcommittee
- Sample of Funder colleagues in Portland area
- Hispanic Metropolitan Chamber
- Portland African American Leadership Forum
- Portland Indian Leaders Roundtable
- Portland Parent Union
- Worksystems

**Early Childhood**
- Childcare Resource & Referral of Mult. Co. Advisory Council
- Early Childhood Council of Multnomah County
- KairosPDX Childcare Provider Network
- Linkage Steering Committee
- Project LAUNCH Young Child Wellness Council

**Hunger Relief**
- Meals on Wheels
- Oregon Food Bank
- Oregon Hunger Relief Task Force
- Portland Parks & Recreation (summer food)
- Partners for a Hunger Free Oregon
- SUN Service System (summer food and food pantries)

**After-School**
- SUN Coordinating Council
- SUN Service System Managers
- Oregon ASK

**Child Abuse Prevention/Intervention & Foster Care**
- Community Council on Family Preservation
- District 2 Child Welfare Advisory Council
- District 2 Fatherhood Advisory Group
- District 2 Foster Parent Advisory Council
- District 2 Foster Youth Advisory Council
- District 2 Managers
- Family Violence Coordinating Council
- ISRS Network
- Oregon Foster Youth Connection
- Portland American Indian/Alaska Native Advisory committee (PAIANAC)
- Positive Youth Transitions Group

**Mentoring**
- Oregon Mentors
Summary of Input from Community and Stakeholder Groups

The following is a summary of the input received from community and stakeholder groups and includes input related to all Levy funded programming, specific program areas, equity, quality, and the funding process. In the cases where input did not fall into any of these categories, it is grouped in the section labeled “Other.” Numbers in parenthesis after any of the input noted refers to the number of groups that provided that particular piece of input.

### All Program Areas

**Quality**
- Improve staff competency especially on communication and partnership with families
- "Cultural comfort" by client in all services; client feels their culture is understood by program/staff

**Access**
- Language creates a barrier to access (3)
- Transportation limits access; school-based delivery better
- Needs of smaller immigrant groups are often not met by larger social service agencies; fund grassroots groups serving these populations that lack access.

**Program Area Priorities**
- Prioritize early childhood, after-school and hunger relief
- Prioritize SUN Community schools; hunger relief services; mentoring services

**Who to Serve**
- Education is a huge concern across all communities of color; need to reach children of color at an earlier age
- Bhutanese, Nepalese, Karan, Somali, Iraqi, and Eastern European communities are a priority and are not getting served in larger organizations
- Populations with least opportunity for education and enriching activities (low-income, immigrants)
- Eastern European youth (middle school and high school) and parents
- Populations with greatest needs in program area (e.g. American Indian/Alaska Native) should be focus of investment

**Where to Serve**
- Increase programming in East Portland (4)

### Early Childhood

**Access**
- Transportation limits access (2)
- Access to quality childcare is limited for working poor
- Programs that best engage hard-to-reach families should be priority

**Service Needs/Gaps**
- Prioritize programs that build a supportive bridge to kindergarten (e.g. summer before kindergarten and stay with family through kindergarten year) (3)
- Mental health (2)
- Food insecurity (especially summer & weekends) (2)
• Educational activities
• Early childhood program that serves stay-at-home mom/her children
• Childcare subsidy especially for working poor
• Programs that use a culturally specific or culturally competent peer for parent/child early education
• Parents with developmental delay/ disability don't get support from existing parenting services
• Childcare subsidy and options for better quality care for children with disabilities;
• More positive behavior interventions supports (3)/ early childhood mental health consultation services for childcare providers; especially those caring for children who are too young to diagnose
• Skill building groups for children aged 3-5
• Parent groups for parents of children aged 0-2 to reduce isolation

Who to Serve
• Highest need children
• Children with disabilities
• Children of color
• Low-income and immigrant children/families

Where to Serve
• East Portland (4)

Outcomes
• Align with state's kindergarten readiness goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>After-School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Access
• Include funding for inclusion options for children with disabilities so they can participate in after-school activities
• Lack of transportation inhibits access to after-school programs in some contexts

Service Needs/Gaps
• Parent education directed at helping parents navigate school system (especially for immigrant populations) (2)
• Any programming that addresses lack of basic skills (e.g. reading and math at 8th grade level)
• Culturally relevant after-school programming; community schools are lacking this
• Mental health supports
• Housing supports
• Culturally specific programming
• Enrichment programming for SUN sites that's free to sites
• Academic support and social/emotional support equally important for immigrant/refugee youth; don't fund one without the other
• Better supports for families with children that have behavior challenges and other disabilities; consider funding specific inclusion options for these populations using the model that Portland Parks and Recreation uses.
• Increase number of SUN sites; prioritize using the equity index to choose new sites;
• Align with All Hands Raised Communities Supporting Youth Collaborative action plan objectives on reducing chronic absenteeism
• Music, arts and chess enrichment programming
• Fund strands of enrichment services across schools e.g. Science/Technology/Engineering/Math, or that and arts, or target additional services to a high school strand

Who to Serve
• Consider more supports for African American and Native youth; outcomes of these populations that participation in SUN programming are poorer than those for Latino, immigrant and white youth
• Use Equity index for expansion sites; assure foster youth served
• Focus on English language learners and assure culturally relevant programming

Where to Serve
• Use Equity Index for funding additional SUN sites (2)

Mentoring

Quality
• Focus on quality for mentoring programs
• Oregon Mentors’ Quality Based Mentoring model could be used; model emphasizes continuous improvement
• Consider requiring applicants to demonstrate elements of model and/or grantees to begin process of demonstrating that they meet the elements of the model

Service Area Needs/Gaps
• Mentoring for career/college pursuits (start in middle school; ongoing relationship until post-high school)
• Culturally specific mentoring with a focus on helping with school and talking with youth and parents about college & jobs
• Career-based mentoring for older youth
• 8th-9th grade transition services are important for immigrant refuge populations because of dropout risk at this juncture. Need consistent, ongoing supports especially group mentorship
• Mentoring programs that foster racial identity development
• Foster natural mentoring relationships
• Consider youth initiated mentoring (some models exist)
• Consider “near peer” mentoring where older youth with the same characteristics as the service population mentor younger youth (e.g. foster youth who have aged out of the system mentoring current foster youth); College Possible is currently funded by school districts in Multnomah County and uses this model

Hunger Relief

Access
• Use multipronged approach to hunger relief
• Increase outreach to improve utilization of hunger relief programs at existing sites
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• Increase access to school pantries; transportation is a barrier for many families and they are already coming to the school
• Consider using school and community libraries to distribute food in summers

Service Area Needs/Gaps
• Expand school-based food pantries (3), especially at SUN Community school sites, and particularly in East Portland where pantry sites are less common and transportation more difficult
• Increase utilization of supper program and summer feeding program through staffing increases
• Increase coordination capacity at schools to make use of faith-based volunteers to assist with hunger relief programming that is already operating at school sites
• Increase summer feeding sites, particularly in East Portland
• Expand harvest share program to distribute excess produce
• Expand capacity of existing gleaning programs to make better use of food that would otherwise go to waste
• Strengthen existing programs for hunger relief e.g. including SNAP outreach, WIC participation, school meals, summer feeding and school-based emergency food programs
• Consider delivering prepared meals to congregate feeding sites and possibly individual homes to reach children at times of day and school year when there are few other options

Where to Serve
• East Portland (3)
• North Portland (1)

Foster Care

Quality
• Trauma-informed services (4)
• Establish service eligibility criteria through a community conversation
• Need a youth-adult partnership approach; assure youth voice in all things that impact youth
• Foster parents need to understand the youth in their care and how to best support them
• Service providers need to be well trained and experienced in serving the population
• Reduce staff turnover rates (DHS caseworkers and community service providers)

Access
• Cost of childcare is a huge barrier for foster parents (2)
• Summer and enrichment activities too costly (2)
• Supervised visitation can be very expensive and there is limited availability
• Financial assistance is needed for families reuniting with children
• Transportation
• Staff and foster parents need to be knowledgeable regarding available resources and help youth access the resources
• Long-standing pain between child welfare department and communities of color; fear of DHS is a significant barrier
Service Area Needs/Gaps

- Comprehensive supports for youth “aging out” of foster care/transitions to adulthood (e.g. enhance Independent Living programs, basic living skills, housing, college preparation and transition support) (7)
- Youth need a consistent, supportive adult that can help navigate school & life (e.g. long-term/therapeutic mentors, coaches/facilitators, interdisciplinary team, maintain connections with family and friends) (7)
- Training for foster parents (e.g. early childhood, parenting teens, LGBTQ youth, positive youth development) (5)
- Reunification services (e.g. facilitated visitation focused on reunification, mentoring, family stabilization) (5)
- Supports for foster parents (e.g. respite, in-home support, mentors) (3)
- Long-term mentoring/therapeutic mentoring for children/youth (3)
- Quality, subsidized child care (2)
- After-school & enrichment programs (2)
- Recruitment of new foster families, including specialized recruitment for families willing to take older youth (2)
- Need a safe "time-out/retreat" space to help youth cope
- Continuation of early childhood supports that are lost when children enter foster care
- Therapeutic supports
- Services to facilitate adoption
- Youth found these programs helpful: Independent Living Programs, Youth, Rights and Justice, Start Making a Reader Today, Alternative High School, Mentoring (Friends of the Children, Powerhouse & Big Brothers Big Sisters), Oregon Foster Youth Connection, SUN, Court Appointed Special Advocate, therapeutic services (art therapy)

Who to Serve

- Native American and African American youth who are overrepresented in foster care (all groups)
- Specialized services for LBGTQ youth in foster care (2)
- Youth in foster care with APPLA (another planned permanent living arrangement)
- Bi-lingual services for Hispanic youth
- Gang affected youth and youth with substance abuse issues
- Children affected by domestic violence and parental abuse of drug and alcohol
- Teens in permanent foster care
- Teens in foster care who have children
- Expand PCL eligibility criteria to include any youth that has ever been in foster care

Outcomes

- Focus on preventing homelessness
- Have a common thread or expectations regarding outcomes; DHS is beginning to work on this, consider aligning with what they end up doing

Child Abuse Prevention & Intervention

Quality

- Trauma-informed services (3)
• Implement program models with fidelity
• Recruit and retain staff appropriate for the communities served
• Implement specific domestic violence training standards
• Services need to focus on the whole family

Access
• Families need access to services before child welfare involvement (2)
• Gaps between "on verge" of needing services and "getting in" program
• Transportation is a significant barrier

Service Area Needs/Gaps
• Parent education and support (7); especially intensive, comprehensive models (4); focus populations include new dads at the hospital (2), for parents of teenagers, and new parents, immigrant parents
• Comprehensive services to support families who are receiving assistance from self-sufficiency in an effort to keep families out of child welfare (housing, domestic violence services, mental health, and drug & alcohol) (3)
• Commit more funds to prevention; DHS resources to purchase community services for families with open cases have increased) (2)
• Subsidized child care (2)
• Supports and services for children/families impacted by domestic violence (e.g. wrap-around services at shelters, advocates at shelters, support for children when police called to respond to domestic violence situation) (4)
• Respite care
• Mechanism for connecting families to services
• Financial stabilization services
• Low-income housing
• Affordable, quality visitation services in child-centered facilities (for non-custodial parents)
• Trauma-specific services for parents (e.g. Trauma Recovery and Empowerment Model) (2)
• Support in schools for children with mental health and addiction issues
• Intensive (2-3 x per week) case management and care coordination for families with children in juvenile justice system
• Parent-Child Therapeutic services
• Prevention programs in schools teaching children and youth about safe and healthy relationships
• Primary prevention (community education)

Who to Serve
• Native American and African American families (3)
• Families not eligible for services funded by DHS (e.g. In-home Safety & Reunification Services or SB 964 Strengthening, Preserving and Reunifying Families) (3)
• African American families (2)
• Programs for youth involved in the criminal justice system (many are African American and Latino (2)
• Native American teen parents are a priority group in need of support
• Service priority for poly victims
• Need more parenting & resource information translated into Russian
• Fathers are underserved, need programs specifically designed to serve men
• Services for youth suspended or expelled from school, and for their families
• Focus prevention services on most vulnerable families

Outcomes
• Focus services so that common outcomes can be measured; organizations need to collaborate to achieve common goals

---

**EQUITY**

Commitment to Equity – Racial/Ethnic

• Prioritize equity in making investments; use Multnomah County’s Equity and Empowerment Lens for reference
• Increase funding to culturally specific organizations (3) (one group suggested 35%)
• Expand the number of culturally specific programs funded
• Levy should have a goal that focuses on equity to demonstrate an commitment to more equitable outcomes for all children (2)
• Establish a racial equity policy for the Levy that includes expectations for serving and working with communities of color; include communities of color in developing policy; there must be higher expectations of mainstream organizations to be culturally responsive and culturally relevant; providers should assess family satisfaction with services (5)
• Require/encourage grantees to have a racial equity policy, or to begin process of organizational assessment with the goal of adopting and implementing a policy. (2)
• Consider establishing goals for serving racial/ethnic groups that are experiencing significant disparities in outcomes across all domains that exceed the percentage of the general and/or student population that each group comprises. For early childhood services, compare population percentage served in Levy programs to population percentage for 0-5 year olds living in poverty.
• Consider establishing a small grants fund to provide funding for small, culturally specific organizations serving communities that may not be receiving services elsewhere; build capacity of organizations to serve their communities. (3)

Commitment to Equity – Geographic

• Commit to serving a minimum percentage of children who live or go to school in East Portland; minimum should be at least the current percentage served (PCL FY 11/12 children served = 37%)
• Commit to serving a minimum percentage of children aged 0-5 who live in East Portland with early childhood services (PCL FY 11/12 children served in EC = 25%); consult census data to find percentage of children living in East Portland aged 0-5 to establish goal. (4)
• Assure that Levy funded services are geographically spread for access by people in need

Who we serve
• Consult cultural groups for services they most need/want(2)
• Focus on populations with highest need for the outcomes we are seeking to produce
• Recent immigrants, struggling communities; children of color aged 0-5
• Use data to see if some groups are underserved
• Children most affected by historical inequities
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- Consider needs of Eastern European population; population is often difficult to reach; providers need to work with youth/parents; families need to know and respect person offering service; networking with churches is one way to connect, need to educate pastors;

Data Collection and Reporting
- Collect racial/ethnic demographic data “alone and in combination” to provide the full picture of who is served
- Use “alone and in combination” demographic data to compare percentages served in Levy programming to percentages of each racial/ethnic group in the student population using the “alone or in combination” method of data collection.
- Disaggregate participation rate and outcome data by racial/ethnic variables (5)

Best Practices
- Consider opportunities to improve/adapt current best practices to more culturally responsive or culturally specific versions (e.g. Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports curriculum used in pre-school and school settings; Tiered Quality Rating and Improvement System for childcare)
- Consider practices of programs that do a good job of engaging hard-to-reach families
- Assure programs are “culturally safe”; culturally specific services provide an alternative to mainstream services that are unlikely to re-traumatize members of cultural groups that have been subject to a history of trauma; culturally specific programs know how to best reach out, and engage vulnerable populations
- Refer to Tribal Best Practices
- People providing the service should reflect the communities being served
- Services should be made available in the primary language of the family
- Consider other approaches to best practices in mentoring programs that allow for different models that are more culturally based and appropriate
- Allow for flexibility in scheduling guidelines for mentoring programs serving Eastern European youth/families

Outcomes
- Keep families intact, reduce cultural isolation, and support cultural identity including spirituality
- All third graders read at grade level.
- Include culturally specific outcomes such as cultural identity and connection to culture

Funding Process

Request for Investment (Funding Application)
- In the cultural competency section, request information regarding how programs will engage the populations they intend to serve, and whether their workforce reflects the population they intend to serve
- Assure that mainstream services using interpreters are required to find interpreters with skills and competency in the content area of the service (2)
- Ask all applicants to describe their approach to working with people on cultural trauma, historical trauma, intergenerational trauma and present trauma
- Ask for evidence that programs are “proven” for all populations intended to be served; ask for evidence of a track record that shows improvement in cultural competency objectives over time; monitor this to see if progress is made after grant is made
• Encourage/require partnerships and sub-contracting between smaller organizations and larger organizations with greater capacity
• Include expectations around sustainability in the RFI
• In mentoring, consider using Quality Based Mentoring Standards as the standard for programs to meet
• Three bonus points is not enough for culturally specific services (2)
• Develop an equity section in the application that is worth 25% of the total possible points

Application Review
• Have an panel with expertise in equity review and score that section of the RFI
• Recruit a more diverse reviewer pool and think more carefully how to compose review panels to combine different perspectives (2)
• Gather community input on scoring criteria
• Highlight success indicators used by the All Hands Raised partnership and Cradle to Career initiative.
• Create a community committee that would also develop a slate of funding recommendations to give to Allocation Committee; don't rule out putting providers on such a committee; they can rise above self interest

Outcomes
• Structure Levy outcomes to match community benchmarks (e.g. Success Indicators used by All Hands Raised)
• Use 3rd grade reading benchmark as an outcome measurement

Quality

General
• Providers should use family satisfaction surveys to assess clients’ perceptions of quality
• Assure that staff are trained in 1) communication, especially with parents regarding difficult issues such as child behavior, 2) behavior science, 3) child development at different ages, 4) disability awareness; 5) working with parents with cognitive delay

Early Childhood
• Technical assistance to help programs develop along trauma-informed continuum
• Feedback loops between clients and major systems regarding challenges families face in navigating systems
• Ask parents what helps them attend group services, what they want from groups services
• Funders (including Levy) should meet regularly within service streams to compare data and see what lessons can be learned across different service streams
• Consider tracking child-level data rather than just aggregate data
• Provide professional development for supervisors, especially in home visiting programs
• Establish core competencies for staff working across disciplines with children aged 0-3

Foster Care
• Assure grantees are doing trauma-informed work; formalize training requirements (2)
• Cross-training between child welfare and domestic violence on how to better engage abusive parents
• Bring service providers to the collective input table
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• Communication improvements are needed on all levels:
  between Department of Human Services (DHS) and youth; between DHS and Independent
  Living Programs (and other service providers); with community regarding needs of foster
  youth and what it means to be in foster care

Child Abuse Prevention and Intervention
• Assure grantees are doing trauma-informed work; formalize training requirements (2)

Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Do outreach and offer technical grant writing assistance to culturally specific providers  
  (organizations serving Native Americans named specifically) (2) |
| • Explore partnering with colleges, United Way or Oregon Native American Business and  
  Entrepreneurial Network offer grant writing support |
| • Concern expressed regarding the level of understanding that the Allocation Committee  
  members have of needs, gaps and systems alignment issues |
| • Consider organizing funding areas by ages; align with the Early Learning Hub and Oregon  
  Youth Development Council |
| • Increase focus of investments for more impact |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>After School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Don't provide all funding for new SUN Community School sites; require at least a 50% match  
  for applications. Consider limiting the total number of new SUN sites PCL will fund in this  
  round (2) |
| • Require that schools/districts provide sign off on applications for new SUN Community  
  School sites. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hunger Relief</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Look to Beach Elementary for hunger relief model for children and families</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foster Care</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Department of Human Services has shifted focus to preventing foster care placement which  
  results in resources and supports shifting away from children in foster care |
Methods: Public Input Meetings

Structure of Meetings
Levy efforts to strive for inclusivity and openness in gathering public input from a wide range of community voices included holding three, two-hour public meetings in geographically divergent locales in July, August and September 2013: Midland Library, 805 SE 122nd Ave.; North Portland Library, 512 N. Killingsworth St.; and downtown Central Library, 801 SW 10th Ave.

Attendees were asked to select a smaller group discussion focused on one of PCL’s six program funding areas: early childhood, after school, mentoring, child abuse prevention/intervention, foster care and hunger prevention. Each group first identified, and then prioritized, what it saw as the top three service needs/gaps in these areas. Input was also gathered on the populations who were most in need of the prioritized services (e.g. children of specific ages, race/ethnicity, neighborhood, etc), as well as how the Levy should consider aligning with and/or complementing other system-level efforts. In addition, Levy staff disseminated a written survey seeking input on the grant application process and inviting any additional comments/input from participants.

Notice of Meetings
Invitation and notice of the meetings were widely publicized months in advance through the PCL database; on social media such as the PCL Facebook page and website; Levy monthly e-newsletters; and other community and social service outlets, including requests to grantees to distribute information through their networks.

Meeting Participants
Attendance at each meeting ranged from 25 to 60 participants who identified their reason for attending and/or connection to children as parent, service provider, volunteer and advocate. More than 100 people attended the meetings, with 60 percent of those who signed in representing service provider agencies currently receiving Levy grant funds.

Tabulation of Meeting Input
Staff from the Levy and from Commissioner Saltzman’s office transcribed verbal input gathered at the meetings on chart pack paper as attendees were talking. After the initial brainstorming on important service needs and gaps, attendees in each program area group were asked to prioritize the three most important service needs/gaps using dot stickers. Each attendee was given three dot stickers and was instructed to put only one dot sticker next to any individual service need/gap listed.

The results of the prioritization exercise from each of the program areas and each of the meetings was combined and the number of people who prioritized any particular service need/gap in a program area was computed (e.g. number of attendees who prioritized after-school programs that engaged parents in their child’s education was counted for all three meetings). The results are summarized in the table on pages 27—30 of this appendix. The numbers that appear in parenthesis after each listed priority refer to the number of meeting attendees who prioritized the referenced service need/gap.
Attendees were not asked to prioritize particular populations for services; all input received is recorded on the table in the “Who/Where” column. Similarly, all input received on other community efforts with which the Levy may align or complement is listed in the “Align/Complement Other Community Efforts” column.
## Summary of Public Meeting Input

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Area</th>
<th>Priorities</th>
<th>Who/Where</th>
<th>Align/ Complement Other Community Efforts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Early Childhood</strong></td>
<td>• Home visiting (22)</td>
<td>• Low income families</td>
<td>• United Way has a new strategic plan for early childhood – align</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Parent education and programs focused on parent/child relationships (15)</td>
<td>• ELL populations</td>
<td>• Employment Related Day Care expansion – align</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Affordable, quality childcare (7)</td>
<td>• Pacific Islanders</td>
<td>• Earned Income Tax Credit – align</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Culturally specific/relevant (3)</td>
<td>• Burmese</td>
<td>• State early childhood hub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Early Head Start slots (3) Affordable pre-school (4)</td>
<td>• Bhutanese</td>
<td>• Health reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Capacity building around cultural competence/relevance and language</td>
<td>• Culturally specific/response noted for all</td>
<td>• OR Association of Relief Nurseries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>interpretation/translation (3)</td>
<td>program areas</td>
<td>• Cradle to Career – Ready for Kindergarten Collaborative Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Serve populations impacted by disparities</td>
<td>• County home visiting programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in outcomes (all program areas)</td>
<td>• Child Welfare Advisory Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Latino</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Native American</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Parents and children with special needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• African American</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Involved with child welfare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Somali</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Birth to 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• East PDX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• North PDX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Area</td>
<td>Priorities</td>
<td>Who/Where</td>
<td>Align/ Complement Other Community Efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child Abuse Prevention &amp; Intervention</strong></td>
<td>• Mentors for children; respite for parents (10)</td>
<td>• Other priorities listed were focused on teens as a population to serve.</td>
<td>• Differential response – align</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Paid parent mentors (10)</td>
<td>• Culturally specific/responsive noted for all program areas</td>
<td>• Adverse Child Experiences – align</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ongoing family supports (9)</td>
<td>• Serve populations impacted by disparities in outcomes (all program areas)</td>
<td>• Defending Childhood Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Education programs for children to educate them about Child Abuse (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Family Violence Coordination Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Programs providing support for schools including school staff training (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Domestic violence education for families (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Workforce development (home visitors, Early Childhood teachers) (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Slots in therapeutic classrooms/preschools (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Parent empowerment (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foster Care</strong></td>
<td>• Services to assist transition out of foster care for older youth (Family Find Services) (13)</td>
<td>• Culturally specific/responsive noted for all program areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recruiting culturally specific foster parents (11)</td>
<td>• Serve populations impacted by disparities in outcomes (all program areas)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Tutoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Training for foster parents including mentoring (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mental health services (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Court team model (multi-disciplinary (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Services leading to permanency (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Area</td>
<td>Priorities</td>
<td>Who/Where</td>
<td>Align/ Complement Other Community Efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After-School</td>
<td>• Summer Programming (academic support and recreational activities) (20)</td>
<td>• Culturally specific/responsive noted for all program areas</td>
<td>• Align after-school services with hunger relief services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Parent engagement in child’s education (25)</td>
<td>• Serve populations impacted by disparities in outcomes (all program areas)</td>
<td>• Align with Portland Public Schools milestones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Culturally specific and appropriate programs (17)</td>
<td>• Low income pops</td>
<td>• Align with Portland Public Schools milestones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Academic support tied to teachers/families (7)</td>
<td>• Academic priority</td>
<td>• Align with attendance goals of Cradle to Career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Programs supporting empowerment, confidence and leadership development (7)</td>
<td>• High risk, adjudicated and gang affected youth</td>
<td>• Align with SUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Teen parents</td>
<td>• Academic priority designations used by districts – align</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Special needs students</td>
<td>• Courageous conversations about race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• East of 82nd Ave</td>
<td>• Oregon Community Fund investments in middle school after school programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Pockets of poverty</td>
<td>• Governor’s 40-40-20 framework (align)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Schools with greater than 80% Free/Reduced Price Lunch program participation</td>
<td>• Prosperity Initiative (State)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Immigrants</td>
<td>• Metro STEM Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Kaiser Fund for social determinants of health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Area</td>
<td>Priorities</td>
<td>Who/Where</td>
<td>Align/ Complement Other Community Efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Mentoring    | • Culturally specific mentoring services (20)  
               • Mentoring through transitions (school transitions and out of foster care) (17)  
               • Teens (career/college, internships) (8)  
               • Family outreach and engagement (7)  
               • Academic and behavior support (7)  
               • Anti-Bullying programs for middle school aged youth (9)  
               • Mentors need in outer SE (6) | • Culturally specific/responsive noted for all program areas  
                                               • Serve populations impacted by disparities in outcomes (all program areas)  
                                               • Low income pops  
                                               • Academic priority  
                                               • High risk, adjudicated and gang affected youth  
                                               • Teen parents  
                                               • Special needs students  
                                               • East PDX especially outer SE  
                                               • N PDX  
                                               • Youth in foster care | • OR Mentors Quality Based Mentoring – align  
                                               • Cradle to Career  
                                               • SUN  
                                               • PSU Mentoring research division |
| Hunger       | • Fund food supports provided through programs funded in other categories (19)  
               • Nutritious, healthy, organic foods (14)  
               • Summer meals (9)  
               • Expand participation in AS supper program (7)  
               • Integrate asset building with hunger programs (6)  
               • Food pantries located at schools (4)  
               • Nutrition Education (3) | • Culturally specific/responsive noted for all program areas  
                                               • Serve populations impacted by disparities in outcomes (all program areas)  
                                               • Food deserts  
                                               • East PDX (Lents)  
                                               • North PDX  
                                               • Immigrants/Refugees  
                                               • Children under 5  
                                               • Teens  
                                               • Families | • Coordinate with Supplemental Nutrition for Women, Infants and Children (WIC), Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) and Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Programs (SNAP)  
                                               • Hunger Relief Task Force  
                                               • SUN  
                                               • Multnomah County Food Action Plan |
Introduction: The Portland Children’s Levy, a five-year local-option property levy, was renewed by voters in May 2013. It is projected to generate an average of $10 million annually starting in July 2014. Funds are granted to local children’s programs focused on: early childhood, child abuse prevention & intervention, foster care, after school, mentoring, and hunger relief.

This survey seeks your input on the work of the Portland Children’s Levy. Results will inform Levy priorities. Results of this survey will be available in late fall 2013, available at www.portlandchildrenslevy.org, and at www.facebook.com/PDX.PCL

1. How familiar are you with the work of the Portland Children’s Levy? (Check one)
   - Very familiar
   - Somewhat familiar
   - Not familiar
   - Unsure

2. Which of the following best describes you? (Choose up to two).
   - Community member
   - Service provider
   - Parent/Guardian (or Foster Parent)
   - School Teacher/School Administrator
   - Community Advocate
   - Community Leader
   - Policy Maker/Policy Advisor
   - Funder
   - Researcher/Program Consultant
   - Other: (fill in)____________________

3. The Levy’s total annual funding must be divided up among the 6 program focus areas. What percentage of the total would you allot to each area? (Percentages must add to 100%)
   - ___ % Early Childhood
   - ___ % Child Abuse Prevention/Intervention
   - ___ % Foster Care
   - ___ % After School
   - ___ % Mentoring
   - ___ % Hunger Relief

4. What is the single most important priority to you in each of the Levy’s funding areas? Please answer the question addressing each of the following topics.
   • WHAT type of service is most important to achieving the goal in each funding area
   • WHO is most important to serve (specific populations, age groups, etc)
   • WHERE is it more important to serve (specific areas of Portland)

   Early Childhood Goal: To help children arrive at school ready for kindergarten.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHAT service</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WHO to serve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHERE to serve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Child Abuse Prevention & Intervention Goal:** To help prevent child abuse and neglect and support vulnerable families.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHAT service</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WHO to serve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHERE to serve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Foster Care Goal:** To help children and youth in foster care succeed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHAT service</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WHO to serve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHERE to serve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**After School Goal:** To provide safe and constructive after-school alternatives for children and promote academic achievement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHAT service</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WHO to serve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHERE to serve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mentoring Goal:** To connect youth with caring adult role models and promote academic achievement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHAT service</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WHO to serve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHERE to serve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hunger Relief Goal:** To provide healthy, nutritious food to hungry children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHAT service</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WHO to serve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHERE to serve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. In your opinion, what are the 3 most important features of high quality services for children and families?
Encuesta de Opinión de la Comunidad

Introducción: La Recaudación del Impuesto para Niños de Portland, un impuesto sobre la propiedad de opción local de cinco años, fue renovada por los electores de la ciudad en mayo del 2013. Se proyecta que generará un promedio anual de $9 millones comenzando en julio del 2014. Los fondos se otorgan a programas locales para niños que se enfocan en: la infancia temprana, prevención e intervención de abuso de menores, niños en cuidado temporal, programas después de la escuela, mentoría y ayuda alimenticia.

Esta encuesta le pide sus opiniones sobre el trabajo de la Recaudación del Impuesto para Niños de Portland. Los resultados nos informarán sobre las prioridades de la Recaudación del Impuesto. Los resultados de esta encuesta estarán disponibles a finales del otoño del 2013 en www.portlandchildrenslevy.org y en www.facebook.com/PDX.PCL

1. ¿Está familiarizado con el trabajo de la Recaudación del Impuesto para Niños de Portland? (Elija solo una respuesta)
   - Muy familiarizado
   - Algo familiarizado
   - No estoy familiarizado
   - No estoy seguro

2. ¿Qué de lo siguiente le describe mejor? (Elija solo una respuesta)
   - Miembro de la comunidad
   - Proveedor de servicios
   - Padre/tutor (o padre de cuidado temporal)
   - Maestro escolar/Administrador escolar
   - Abogador de la comunidad
   - Líder de la comunidad
   - Legislador/Asesor de políticas
   - Fundador
   - Investigador/Consultor de programas
   - Otro: ________________________________

3. La financiación anual total de la Recaudación del Impuesto debe dividirse entre 6 áreas de enfoque de programas. ¿Qué porcentaje del total asignaría a cada área? (Los porcentajes deben sumar 100%)
   - % Infancia temprana
   - % Prevención/Intervención de abuso de menores
   - % Cuidado temporal
   - % Programas después de la escuela
   - % Mentoría
   - % Ayuda alimenticia

4. ¿Qué es lo más importante que cree que puede hacer la Recaudación del Impuesto para ayudar a los niños a llegar a la escuela listos para el kinder? (Elija solo una respuesta)
   - Acceso a programas gratuitos preescolares y/o Head Start
   - Visitas a casa para proporcionar apoyo y educación para la familia
   - Grupos de juego a los que puedan asistir las familias en su comunidad
   - Acceso a clases de educación sobre la crianza
   - Ayuda para las familias para pagar la guardería
   - Apoyo y recursos para ayudar a los niños a desarrollar habilidades de la lectura temprana
   - Preparación para las familias, proveedores de guardería y maestros para guiar la conducta del niño
5. ¿Qué cree que es lo más importante que puede hacer la Recaudación del Impuesto para ayudar a prevenir el abuso y abandono de menores y apoyar a las familias vulnerables? (Elija solo una respuesta)

☐ Terapia de salud mental/asesoramiento para los niños, padres y familias
☐ Conectar a las familias a servicios y recursos necesarios (vivienda, comida, cuidado médico, trabajos, etc.)
☐ Visitas a la casa para proporcionar apoyo y educación para la familia

☐ Servicios preescolares especializados para niños que corren el riesgo de sufrir abuso y/o abandono
☐ Apoyo para los padres incluidos grupos de apoyo de iguales y preparación individualizada
☐ Acceso a clases de educación sobre la crianza

6. ¿Qué cree que es lo más importante que puede hacer la Recaudación del Impuesto para ayudar a que los niños y los jóvenes en cuidado temporal tengan éxito? (Elija solo una respuesta)

☐ Ayudar a los jóvenes en cuidado temporal a que tengan éxito en la escuela (desde la primera infancia hasta la universidad)
☐ Conectar a los jóvenes en cuidado temporal con adultos que les sirvan de apoyo y que no sean parientes, como los mentores
☐ Guía y preparación para los jóvenes que estén haciendo la transición entre el cuidado temporal y la vida independiente
☐ Ayudar a los jóvenes en cuidado temporal a desarrollar relaciones con los miembros de la familia (abuelos, tíos, tíos, etc.)

☐ Educación y apoyo especializados sobre la crianza para los padres de cuidado temporal
☐ Terapia de salud mental/asesoramiento para los jóvenes en cuidado temporal, sus padres biológicos y sus familias de cuidado temporal
☐ Apoyo y educación sobre la crianza para los padres biológicos que se van a reunificar con sus hijos que han estado en cuidado temporal

7. ¿Qué cree que es lo más importante que puede hacer la Recaudación del Impuesto para proporcionar alternativas para después de la escuela que sean seguras y constructivas para los niños y promuevan el logro académico? (Elija solo una respuesta)

☐ Ayudar a los jóvenes a tener éxito en la escuela incluyendo tutoría y ayuda con las tareas escolares.
☐ Programas Escolares de la Comunidad SUN (variedad de programas que ofrecen las escuelas en las horas de después de la escuela)
☐ Programas recreativos/deportivos/de ejercicio

☐ Programas de arte (teatro y bellas artes)
☐ Otras actividades y clases (ajedrez, jardinería, robótica Lego)
☐ Organizaciones de la comunidad que ofrezcan actividades para los jóvenes sin necesidad de registrarse

8. ¿Qué cree que es lo más importante que puede hacer la Recaudación del Impuesto para conectar a los jóvenes con adultos solidarios que puedan ser un modelo a imitar? (Elija solo una respuesta)

☐ Emparejar un mentor adulto con un niño
☐ Asignar un mentor adulto con un grupo de jóvenes
☐ Requerir que el mentor adulto y el niño se reúnan semanalmente
☐ Asegurarse de que la relación de mentoría dure varios años

☐ Enfocar el apoyo de mentoría en el logro académico y en el éxito escolar
☐ Enfocar el apoyo de mentoría en los jóvenes que están haciendo la transición de la preparatoria al trabajo, carrera profesional o educación superior
☐ Enfocar los servicios de mentoría en los jóvenes que se encuentran en cuidado temporal
9. ¿Qué cree que es lo más importante que puede hacer la Recaudación del Impuesto para proporcionar comida nutritiva y sana a los niños que pasan hambre? (Elija solo una respuesta)

☐ Despensas de comida o cajas de comida disponibles en iglesias o lugares de la comunidad
☐ Despensas de comida o cajas de comida disponibles en las escuelas
☐ Comidas preparadas entregadas al vecindario o a lugares de la comunidad
☐ Comidas preparadas entregadas a las casas
☐ Programas educativos sobre nutrición y cocina
☐ Jardines y educación sobre jardinería en la comunidad y/o en las escuelas
☐ Ampliar el acceso al programa de cenas de la escuela

10. En su opinión, ¿cuáles son las 3 características más importantes de los servicios de alta calidad para niños y familias?
Опрос мнения местного сообщества

Вступление: Портлендский налог в поддержку детей — налог на имущество, подконтрольный жителям города и взимаемый на протяжении пяти лет — был возобновлен налогоплательщиками города в мае 2013 года. Прогнозируется, что с 2014 года налог ежегодно будет приносить в городскую казну в среднем 9 миллионов долларов. Собранные средства передаются местным программам по улучшению жизни детей, включая улучшение дошкольного образования, предупреждение и борьбу с насилием в отношении детей, воспитание приемных детей, внеклассные занятия, наставничество (менторство) и борьбу с недоеданием.

Этот опрос ставит себе цель узнать Ваше мнение о функционировании Портлендского налога в поддержку детей. По результатам опроса мы узнаем о приоритетах в отношении этого налога.

www.portlandchildrenslevy.org и www.facebook.com/PDX.PCL

1. Насколько Вы осведомлены о принципах работы Портлендского налога в поддержку детей? (Выберите только один вариант)
   □ Хорошо осведомлен □ Частично осведомлен □ Не осведомлен □ Не уверен

2. Что из нижеперечисленного характеризует Вас наилучшим образом? (Выберите только один вариант)
   □ Член местного сообщества □ Местный общественный лидер
   □ Поставщик услуг □ Политик
   □ Родитель/опекун (или приемный родитель) □ Спонсор
   □ Школьный ученый/администратор □ Исследователь/научный работник
   □ Защитник прав/представитель местного сообщества □ Прочее: ____________________________

3. Общий итоговый ежегодный налоговый сбор может быть разделен между 6 основными направлениями программы. Какой процент от общей суммы Вы выделили бы на каждое направление? (В сумме должно получиться 100%)
   _____ % Ранее детство (до школы)
   _____ % Предупреждение/борьба с насилием
   _____ % Воспитание приемных детей
   _____ % Внешкольные занятия (после школы)
   _____ % Наставничество/менторство
   _____ % Борьба с недоеданием

4. На что, по Вашему мнению, должны быть направлены средства от сбора этого налога, чтобы помочь детям быть лучше подготовленными к школе (киндергардену)? (Выберите только один вариант)
   □ Бесплатные дошкольные учреждения и/или участие в программах Head Start
   □ Визиты на дом специалистов, оказывающих образовательные услуги и услуги по поддержке семьи
   □ Детские сады на общественных началах
   □ Помощь семьям в оплате услуг по уходу за ребенком
   □ Поддержка и предоставление ресурсов для обучения чтению
   □ Семинары по воспитания ребенка для родителей, воспитателей и учителей
Семинары для родителей

5. На что, по Вашему мнению, должны быть направлены средства от сбора этого налога, чтобы помочь предотвратить жестокое обращение с детьми и для поддержки неблагополучных семей? (Выберите только один вариант)

- Услуги психолога/психотерапевта для детей, родителей и семей
- Предоставление информации о получении необходимых услуг (жилье, питание, охрана здоровья, трудоустройство и т.д.)
- Визиты на дом специалистов, оказывающих образовательные услуги и услуги по поддержке семьи

6. На что, по Вашему мнению, должны быть направлены средства от сбора этого налога, чтобы помочь детям и молодежи, воспитывающимся в приемных семьях? (Выберите только один вариант)

- Помощь детям в обучении (от начальной школы до колледжа)
- Общение ребенка со взрослым, не являющимся членом семьи, напр., с наставником/ментором
- Консультирование молодежи по вопросам перехода от жизни в приемной семье к самостоятельному проживанию.
- Помощь детям в налаживании и поддержании отношений с членами семьи (бабушками, дедушками, тетями, дядями и т.д.)

7. На что, по Вашему мнению, должны быть направлены средства от сбора этого налога для предоставления безопасных и творческих альтернатив внеурочного образования (после учебного дня) для повышения успеваемости? (Выберите один вариант)

- Помощь детям в обучении, включая репетиторов и помощь с выполнением домашней работы
- Программы SUN Community School (разнообразные программы, предлагаемые в школах во внеурочное время)
- Программы по организации отдыха/спортивные кружки

8. На что, по Вашему мнению, должны быть направлены средства от сбора этого налога для налаживания связи детей с положительными ролями моделями? (Выберите только один вариант)

- Предоставление наставника/ролевой модели для каждого ребенка
- Предоставление наставника/ролевой модели для группы детей
- Еженедельные встречи ребенка и взрослого наставника
- Наставничество/менторство, длившееся несколько лет

- Специализированные услуги дошкольного образования для детей, подвергенных риску жестокого обхождения и/или безнадзорности
- Поддержка родителей, включая группы взаимопомощи и индивидуальные консультации

APPENDIX B: Surveys for Community Input, 2013
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9. На что, по Вашему мнению, должны быть направлены средства от сбора этого налога, чтобы обеспечить голодающих детей здоровой, питательной пищей? (Выберите только один вариант)

☐ Пункты раздачи продуктов питания в церквях или общественных центрах
☐ Пункты раздачи продуктов питания в школах
☐ Доставка готовой еды в микрорайон или в общественные центры
☐ Доставка готовой еды на дом

☐ Обучающие программы питания и уроки приготовления пищи
☐ Общественные и/или школьные огороды/сады и обучение садоводству/огородничеству
☐ Расширение доступа к программе школьных ужинов

10. Какие, по Вашему мнению, 3" самых важных характеристики высококачественных услуг, предоставляемых детям и семьям?

APPENDIX B: Surveys for Community Input, 2013
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Khảo Sát Ý Kiến Công Đồng


1. Quy vị có quen thuộc với các hoạt động của Portland Children’s Levy không? (Vui lòng chỉ chọn một)
□ Rất quen thuộc □ Quen thuộc □ Không quen thuộc □ Không chắc

2. Lựa chọn nào miễn tả đúng nhất về quy vị? (Vui lòng chỉ chọn một)
□ Thành viên công dong □ Lãnh đạo công đồng
□ Nhà cung cấp dịch vụ □ Nhà hoạt động chính sách/Có 관한 chính sách
□ Cha mẹ/Giáo viên (hoặc Cha mẹ/Cha chú) □ Nhà tài trợ
□ Giáo viên/Quản lý trường học □ Nhà nghiên cứu/Có vấn chương trình
□ Người ứng hộ trong công đồng □ Khác: (ghi rõ)____________________

3. Tổng nguồn vốn hàng năm của chương trình Levy phải được chia cho 6 lĩnh vực trong tầm chương trình. Quy vị sẽ đồng góp bao nhiêu phần trăm cho mỗi lĩnh vực? (Tổng phần trăm cộng lại phải bằng 100%)

____% Mầm non
____% Phòng tránh/Can thiệp ngược đãi trẻ em
____% Nuôi dưỡng tạm thời
____% Ngoại khóa
____% Kẹm cắp
____% Cứu đời

4. Theo quy vị, điều gì là quan trọng nhất mà chương trình Levy có thể làm để giúp trẻ em đến tuổi đến trường sẵn sàng đi mẫu giáo (Vui lòng chỉ chọn một)
□ Tiếp cận miễn phí trường mầm non và/hoặc các chương trình Tiền Mẫu Giáo (Head Start)
□ Hỗ trợ gia đình trang trải chi phí chăm sóc trẻ
□ Khách viếng thăm tới nhà để hỗ trợ gia đình và trang bị kiến thức
□ Hỗ trợ và nguồn lực giúp trẻ em phát triển kỹ năng đọc sớm
□ Hỗ trợ các gia đình trang trải chi phí chăm sóc trẻ
□ Khắc phục di dân sẽ nhập vào cộng đồng
□ Hỗ trợ và nguồn lực giúp trẻ em phát triển kỹ năng đọc sớm
□ Tiếp cận các lớp học dạy làm cha mẹ
□ Học th proceso giúp trẻ em và gia đình hướng dẫn hành vi của trẻ

□ Hỗ trợ và nguồn lực giúp trẻ em phát triển kỹ năng đọc sớm
□ Khắc phục di dân sẽ nhập vào cộng đồng
□ Hỗ trợ các gia đình trang trải chi phí chăm sóc trẻ
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5. Theo quý vị, điều gì quan trọng nhất mà chương trình Levy có thể làm để hỗ trợ phòng tránh ngược đãi và bạo lực trẻ em cũng như hỗ trợ các gia đình để bảo tồn tương? (Vui lòng chỉ chọn một)
   - Trị liệu/ưu văn sức khỏe tâm thần cho trẻ em, cha mẹ và gia đình
   - Kết nối gia đình với các dịch vụ và nguồn lực cần thiết (nha ô, thực phẩm, chăm sóc sức khỏe, việc làm, v.v...)
   - Khách viếng thăm tối nhà để hỗ trợ gia đình và trang bị kiến thức
   - Các dịch vụ mà không chuyên biệt dành cho trẻ có nguy cơ ngược đãi và/hoặc bị bạo lực
   - Hỗ trợ cha mẹ bao gồm các nhóm hỗ trợ ngang hàng và huấn luyện cả nhân hóa
   - Tiếp cận các lớp học dạy làm cha mẹ

6. Theo quý vị, điều gì quan trọng nhất mà chương trình Levy có thể làm để giúp trẻ em và thanh thiếu niên được nuôi dưỡng tam thời thành công? (Vui lòng chỉ chọn một)
   - Giáo dục làm cha mẹ và hỗ trợ chuyên biệt dành cho đối tượng cha mẹ nuôi
   - Trị liệu/ưu văn sức khỏe tâm thần cho thanh thiếu niên được nuôi dưỡng tam thời, cha mẹ và gia đình nuôi của chúng
   - Hỗ trợ và giáo dục làm cha mẹ cho cha mẹ để chuẩn bị đôi tuồi với trẻ hiện đang được nuôi dưỡng tam thời
   - Giảng dạy thanh thiếu niên được nuôi dưỡng tam thời phải triển quan hệ với các thành viên trong gia đình (ông bà, cô dì, chú bác, v.v...)
   - Kế hoạch thanh thiếu niên được nuôi dưỡng tam thời duy trì hay phát triển quan hệ với các thành viên trong gia đình (ông bà, cô dì, chú bác, v.v...)
   - Hướng dẫn và huấn luyện thanh thiếu niên chuyên tiếp từ giai đoạn nuôi dưỡng tam thời sang giai đoạn sống độc lập

7. Theo quý vị, điều gì quan trọng nhất mà chương trình Levy có thể làm để cung cấp các hoạt động thay thế ngoài khóa an toàn và có định xây dựng dành cho trẻ em và thúc đẩy thành tích học tập? (Vui lòng chỉ chọn một)
   - Các chương trình nghệ thuật (nghệ thuật trình diễn và mỹ thuật)
   - Các hoạt động và lớp học khác (cờ vua, làm vườn, xếp hình Lego)
   - Các tổ chức cộng đồng cung cấp các hoạt động ngoại khóa dành cho thanh thiếu niên
   - Các chương trình giúp đỡ/trợ thao/th pseudo
   - Chương Trình Trường Học Công Đồng SUN (nhiều chương trình ngoại khóa đa dạng tại trường học)
   - Hỗ trợ thanh thiếu niên học tập tốt ở trường bao gồm dạy kèm và trợ giúp làm bài tập.

8. Theo quý vị, điều gì là quan trọng nhất mà chương trình Levy có thể làm để kết nối thanh thiếu niên với các hình thức của một người trưởng thành tận tâm? (Vui lòng chỉ chọn một)
   - Tạp trung hỗ trợ kém cấp vào thành tích học tập và thành công trong học tập
   - Tạp trung hỗ trợ kém cấp vào quá trình chuyển tiếp thành thiếu niên từ cấp trung học sang làm việc, nghề nghiệp hay đại học
   - Các chương trình ngoại khóa cung cấp các hoạt động ngoài khóa dành cho thanh thiếu niên
   - Ứng cấp mỗi trẻ với một người kèm cấp/hình
   - Các chương trình giúp đỡ/trợ thao/th pseudo
   - Ứng cấp mỗi trẻ với một người kèm cấp/hình mới với một nhóm thanh thiếu niên
   - Yêu cầu người kèm cấp và trẻ em gặp mặt nhau hàng tuần
   - Đảm bảo quản hệ kém cấp kéo dài và nám
9. Theo quý vị, điều gì là quan trọng nhất Levy có thể làm để cung cấp thực phẩm dinh dưỡng và có lợi cho sức khỏe cho đối tượng trẻ em đối ăn? (Vui lòng chỉ chọn một)

- Điểm phát thức ăn hoặc hợp thức ăn đặt tại nhà hoặc các địa điểm công cộng
- Điểm phát thức ăn hoặc hợp thức ăn đặt tại trường học
- Thực phẩm chế biến sẵn được chuyển tới các địa điểm công cộng hay lành giếng
- Thực phẩm chế biến sẵn được chuyển tới nhà

10. Theo quý vị, đâu là 3 đặc điểm quan trọng nhất đối với dịch vụ chất lượng cao dành cho trẻ em và gia đình?

[Blank space for answers]


**Tirakoobka Aрагtidaa Bulshada**


1. **Sidee ayaad ugu caantahay la shaqaynta Portland Children’s Levy?** (Dooro kaliyaatamida)
   - [ ] Aad ugu caan ah
   - [ ] Waxoogaa ku caan ah
   - [ ] Aan caan ku ahayn
   - [ ] Aan hubin

2. **kuwan soo socda keebaa sida ufiican ku sharaxaya?** (Dooro mid kaliya)
   - [ ] Xubin bulsho
   - [ ] Bixiye adeeg
   - [ ] Waalid/Wakii (ama Waalid Xanaaneeeye ah)
   - [ ] Macalin Dugsi/ Mamule Dugsi
   - [ ] Taageere Bulsho
   - [ ] Hogaamiye Bulsho
   - [ ] Sameeye siyaasadeed/ La taliye siyaasadeed
   - [ ] Maalgiyaa
   - [ ] Cilmi baadhe/ La taliye Barnaamij
   - [ ] Wax kale: (buuxi) ____________

3. **Wadarta lacagaynta sannadlaha ee Levy waa in loo qaybiyaa 6 barnaamij ee diirada saaran. Boqolkiiba immisa ayaad u qoondayn lahayd wadarta goob kasta?** (boqolaydu waa in ay isu gayn noqdaan 100%)
   - [ ] ___% Ciyaalnimada hore
   - [ ] ___% Ka hortaga Gaboodfalka ilmaha/Faragalinta
   - [ ] ___% Daryeelka xanaanaynta
   - [ ] ___% Dugsiga kadiib
   - [ ] ___% La talinta
   - [ ] ___% Joojinta Gaajada

4. **Maxaad u malaynaysaa inay tahay waxa ugu muhiimsan ee Levy ay qaban karto si ay u caawiso soo galidda carruurta ee dugsiga una diyaarka ah barbaarinta (Dooro mid kaliya)**
   - [ ] Galaan gal kuleh bilaashka dugsiga hahor iyo/ ama Madaxa Bilawga barnaamijyada
   - [ ] Boqoqdayaa falka waxa ay yimaadaan guriga si ay u bixiso taageerada qoyska iyo waxbarashada
   - [ ] Barbaarinta qoysaska si ay ugu yimaadaan bulshadooda
   - [ ] Galaan galka heerarka waxbarashada waalidnimo
   - [ ] Ka caawiya qoyska inay bixiyaan daryeelka ilmaha
   - [ ] Taageerada iyo khayradda si ay uga caawiyaa carruurta inay horumariyaan xirfadaha wax akhriska ee hore
   - [ ] Casharada qoysaska, bixiyaasha daryeelka caafimaad iyo macalimiinta si ay u hagaan dhaqanka ilmaha
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5. maxaad u malaynaysaa inay tahay waxa ugu muhiimsan ee ay Levy qaban karto si ay uga caawiso kahortaga gabood falka ilmaha iyo dhaleecaynta iyo taageerada quosaska danyarta ah ? (Dooro mid kaliya)
   □ Dawada caafimaadka maskaxda/ la talinta carruurta, waalidiinta iyo quosaska
   □ Ku xidka quosaska adeegyada loo baahday iyo khayraadka (guryaynta, cuntada, daryeelka caafimaad, shaqooyinka, iwm.)
   □ Booqdayaasha imanaya guriga si ay u siiyaan taageerada quoska iyo waxbarashada
   □ Adeegyada gaarka ah ee dugsiiga kahor ee carruurta halista u ah gaboodfalka iyo/dhaleecaynta
   □ Taageerada waaliidiinta ay kujiiran kooxaha taageerada fada iyo waxbarashada shakhsi
   □ Galaan gal uleh waxbarashada heerka waalidnimo

6. maxaad u malaynaysaa inuu yahay waxa ugu muhiimsan ee Levy ay qaban karto si ay carruurta iyo dhalinyarta uga caawiso guusha daryeelka xanaanaynta? (Dooro mid kaliya)
   □ Caaawinta dhalinyarta guusha daryeelka xanaanaynta dugsiiga ( ciyaalmimada hore ilmama kooleejka)
   □ Ku xidka dhalinyarta daryeelka xanaanaynta dadka waaweyn ee taageero xidhiidh lalahayn, sida la taliyayasha
   □ Hagiida iyo ku tababarida dhalinyarta ka wareegida daryeelka xanaanaynta ilaa noolol madax banaan
   □ Caaawinta dhalinyarta daryeelka xanaanaynta inay helaan ama ay horumariyaan xidhiidhka xubnaha quoska (ayeeyooyinka, abtiyaasha, adeerada, iwm.)
   □ Waxbarashada waalidnimo waxa ay kujiiran kooxaha taageerada dhalintyarta dayeelka xanaanaynta, waalidiintooda dhalay iyo quosaskooda xanaanaynta
   □ Taageerada waxbarashada waalidnimo ee waaliidiinta dhalay kuwaasi oo dib ula midoobaya carruurta kuwaasi oo kujiiray daryeel xanaanayn

7. maxaad u malaynaysaa inuu yahay waxa ugu muhiimsan ee Levy ay qaban karto sii ay u bixiso waxyaal kale oo badbaado ah ee dugsiiga kadib ee carruurta ayna sare u qaado hirgalinta aqoonta? (Dooro mid kaliya)
   □ Caaawinta dhalinyarta guusha dugsiiga ay kujiiran baridda iyo ka caawinta shaqo guuriga.
   □ Barnaamijyada Dugsiga Bulshada ee SUN( barnaamijyo kala duwan oo lagu bixiyo dugsiyada saacadaha dugsiiga kadib)
   □ Firaaqada/ ciyaaraha/barnaamijyada jimicsiga
   □ Barnaamijyada sawirada ( Samaynta iyo qurxinta sawirada)
   □ Shaqooyin kale iyo fasalo (jesta, beeridda, Lego robotiks)
   □ Ururada bulshadu waxa ay siinayaan dhalinyarta hawlo booqasho

8. maxaad u malaynaysaa inay tahay waxa ugu muhiimsan ee Levy ay qaban karto si ay dhalinyarta ugu xidho noocayda shaqooyinka daryeelka dadka waaweyn? (Dooro mid kaliya)
   □ Laba ah la taliyayal waaweyn/ Lagu laammaneeyo hage qof weyn ah/lagaga dayanayo ilmaha
   □ U qoondayn la taliye weyn/ lagaga dayanayo kook dhalinyaro ah
   □ U baahan la taliye weyn iyo ilme si uu ula kulmo si toddobaadle ah
   □ Hubinta xidhiidhka la taliyahu waxa uu ku dhammaadaa in kabadan dhawr sanno
   □ Diirada saaraya taageerada la talinta ee hirgalinta qoonta iyo guusha dugsiiga
   □ Diirada saaraya taageerada la talinta ee dalinyarta ka gudbaysa dugsiiga sare llaa shaqada, xirfad ama waxbarasho sare
   □ Diirada saaraya adeegyada la talinta ee dhalinyarta kujiira daryeelka xanaanaynta
9. maxaad u malaynaysaa inuu yahay waxa ugu muhiimsan ee Levy ay qaban karto si ay u siiso cunto caafimaad leh, nafaqo leh carruurta gaajoonyaysa? ((Dooro mid kaliya)

☐ Makhsinada cuntada ama saxaradaha cuntada laga heli karo kaniisadaha ama goobaha bulshada
☐ Makhsinada cuntada ama saxaradaha cuntada laga heli karo dugsiyada
☐ Cuntooyinka la diyaariyay waxa la siiyay jaarka ama goobaha bulshada
☐ Cuntooyinka la diyaariyay waxa la geeyay guryaha

☐ Quudinta iyo barnaamijyada waxbarashada cuntada
☐ Bulshada iyo/ ama beeraha dugsiga waxbarashada beerista
☐ Balaadhi galaan gala barnaamijka fiican ee dugsiga

10. Aragtidaada, waa maxay saddexda muuqaal ee ugu fiican ee adeegyada tayada sareeya ee carruurta iyo qoysaska?

□

□

□

□

□

□