

**Portland Children's Levy
Allocation Committee Meeting Minutes
October 2, 2017 2:00 p.m.
Location: Portland City Hall Council Chambers**

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

Attending: Mitch Hornecker, Deborah Kafoury (absent), Dan Saltzman (Chair), Serena Stoudamire-Wesley (absent), Julie S. Young

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

Approval of minutes from July 24, 2017 meeting

Young: So moved
Hornecker: Second
Vote: All in favor

Public Comment

None

Allocation of \$1.6 million

Meg McElroy: Today, we are looking for decisions of how to invest the final \$1.6 million of \$10.3 million brought to the attention of Committee last summer. At the July 24th meeting, staff introduced options for investment, but the Allocation Committee chose to delay decision-making on balance until state funding impacts on local services became clearer. We have 3 options of how to invest the \$1.6 million over the final 22 months of the current levy.

Option A: Invest \$1.6 million to Expand the Community Childcare Initiative to offset state budget cuts for Employment Related Day Care (ERDC)

This investment option addresses impacts of two state cuts: ERDC and focused childcare networks- childcare affordability and quality.

- Many early childhood and child abuse prevention and intervention programs were spared deep state cuts but some exceptions
- ERDC services were cut \$11 million statewide over the biennium.
- moderate cuts (approx. 10%- 12% reductions) to early learning hubs, the kindergarten partnership innovation funds administered by local hubs, and state's childcare quality improvement efforts such as Focused Childcare Networks that help family childcare providers enroll in and progress with meeting state childcare quality standards.

Invest up to \$1.28 million in childcare affordability

- Currently over 8,000 families in ERDC statewide will not lose benefits, but
- Natural attrition in program reducing caseload by 650 families over next 2 years;

- waitlist to begin this fall, and no families will be able to access ERDC unless after that attrition reduction, there is capacity later.
- Estimated 2,000 Oregon families on ERDC are in Multnomah County.
- PCL funds the Community Childcare Initiative (CCI) administered by Childcare Resource and Referral (CCR&R) of Multnomah County which provides additional financial help to Portland families receiving ERDC (working families with incomes at 185% of federal poverty level or less) to limit childcare costs to no more than 10% of their income.
- helps families at 186% - 200% of FPL, who don't qualify for ERDC but often struggle financially to afford childcare, pay no more than 15% of their income toward childcare.
- CCI helps families with children ages infant – age 12 (before/after care)
- CCI requires families to use childcare providers participating in the state's childcare quality improvement efforts, SPARK.
- As ERDC constricts over biennium, will limit families' access to Levy's CCI's services- greatly limiting working families access to affordable, high quality childcare.
- CCI currently funded to serve 100 children/year and last year exceeded goals, serving 134 children (81 families).
- Monthly median CCI benefit per family of \$300, (ERDC median monthly payment to CCI-enrolled families is \$600, median monthly cost of care is \$1,100.)
- Under this option: PCL could provide some of its remaining \$1.6. million over the next 2 years to help families who are cut-off from accessing ERDC due to state cuts
- **Cost implications:** PCL pays substantially more per family qualifying for CCI because ERDC would no longer be paying a portion of the childcare costs. CCI contribution per family could easily double or triple. Still, PCL could help CCI serve another *80-100 children annually* who cannot access ERDC due to state cuts.
- CCI staff rely heavily on ERDC screening and qualification done by the state to determine families benefits from CCI. If PCL choses to invest in CCI expansion to serve families on the ERDC waitlist, then PCL would need to support CCI to hire at least .5 FTE more in staffing to process applications from families and determine their eligibility for CCI benefits.

Invest \$320,000 in Focused Childcare Networks for supporting childcare quality

- Funding in this option CCI could be used to do 2 things:
 - 1) offset moderate funding cuts in state-funded Focused Childcare Networks also operated by Childcare Resource & Referral, and
 - 2) start a new focused network for Somali providers.
- State funding cuts to focused childcare networks would result in loss of 2 of 4 culturally specific networks next year in Portland.
- Currently, state via (Early Learning Multnomah) funds 1 Latino network, 2 Russian networks, and one African American network- combo state funding and United Way resources.
- networks are
 - 2-year cohort of 12 – 15 culturally specific in-home childcare providers that receive a culturally-specific network coordinator who provides coaching to enroll in state's childcare quality initiative, SPARK;
 - assists them to submit portfolios address childcare quality standards,
 - completing hours of training required for different quality ratings, and assuring they progress in the state's quality rating system.
- Last year, Networks served 52 culturally specific in-home providers.
 - 14 providers now have star ratings
 - nearly all providers have submitted their portfolios for review
 - have substantially increased training content and hours completed to participate in the rating process.

- CCR&R is interested in starting a Somali focused childcare network. Interest from Somali childcare providers for training and support, but don't have Somali staff to help with supporting unique requests, especially language capacity.
- CCR&R working with community partners and model in Seattle to develop network.
- Health Share and Oregon Community Foundation interested in funding options for proposed Somali network to address specific health objectives such as children's developmental screening, establishing a medical home, and navigating the US medical system.
- No state funds are available to support creation of a new network since cuts in funding to existing networks.
- cost to create and operate the new network for 2 years is \$160,000- \$80,000 each year.

To help funding reductions for existing 2 of 4 networks next year: \$160,000 total (\$80,000 per network, one year), Add Somali network: \$160k total (\$80,000 each year) = \$320,000

- Because CCI benefits for families can only be used with providers participating in SPARK, PCL support to networks assures more culturally specific providers are eligible to serve families enrolling in CCI.

Total funding: Up to \$1.6 million over two years, with \$320,000 designated toward focused childcare networks including creation of a new network for Somali childcare providers.

Young: I have a question about the cost of the 0.5 FTE for the CCI.

McElroy: It depends on who is hired. There is currently 1.5 FTE in the program. I could not tell you the amount off the top of my head. I could get you that figure.

Option B: Invest \$1.6 million to Expand center-based Early Head Start Services

- When the Committee invested additional revenues in the spring of 2015, it made substantial new early childhood investments in extended day Head Start— \$1.25 million annually to fund an additional 6 classrooms and 120 children per year. Head Start serves 3 to 5-year-olds.
- This proposal would expand center-based Early Head Start services—infants/toddlers.
- School year has started, opening new classrooms must be delayed until January.
- Center-based Early Head Start services offer families experiencing poverty a full-day, high quality childcare for their youngest children
- 2 largest providers of center-based EHS in Portland are Albina Early Head Start and Mt Hood Community College Early Head Start.
- Both agencies are current grantees in home-based Early Head Start and Head Start preschool.
- Approximately 300 slots of center-based Early Head Start in Multnomah County, which reaches a tiny fraction of the estimated several thousand infants and toddlers living in families experiencing poverty and likely eligible.

Two drawbacks to this option are:

- 1) it will increase the total percentage of Levy resources devoted to early childhood programming, and if the Levy is renewed, there will be pressure to maintain current investments, and therefore possibly preclude additional investments in other program areas; and
- 2) because program year for center-based services started with school year, and it would take time to get new classrooms up and running, the Committee should consider the impact of partial year funding for classroom-based services.

One classroom typically serves 8 children due to childcare licensing requirements and Early Head Start performance standards and the costs per year is typically \$160,000-\$180,000.

If interested in this option, the committee should consider funding both EHS providers for a similar number of additional classrooms for the 18-month period.

Total funding: \$1.6 million to support a total of up to 6 classrooms for one and a half years.

Saltzman: Do we know that the providers could use the investment in early head start?

McElroy: WE know they could each open at least one classroom. From my history with those providers, it seems likely that they could open 2 or 3 classrooms each.

Hornecker: Can you explain the difference between early head start and SPARK childcare?

McElroy: Center-based early head start has 8 children, a set curriculum; staffing with lead teacher and 2 other trained adults; detailed health and safety standards. There are over 1,000 performance standards for early head start. They are regularly visited by federal head start compliance officials.

The State SPARK program requirements are not as stringent as early head start. There are a variety of differences in setting, materials, staffing, etc.

Young: Is there a difference in the requirement for parents to be working between the two?

McElroy: Both have substantial requirements for work or school for the parents.

Option C: Invest in Both Options A and B

- You could decide to invest some of balance into CCI and focused childcare networks as well as into center-based Early Head Start services.
- CCI benefits families with young children and school age children in before/after school care, while center-based Early Head Start is specifically for the youngest children (thus an increase in early childhood allocations).

If the Committee pursues this option, you might consider apportioning as follows:

- Invest up to \$780,000 to expand CCI to assist low-income working families with affording high-quality childcare.
- Invest up to \$320,000 in Focused Childcare Networks to assure all 4 existing networks continue operations through 6/30/2019, and start a new Somali network.
- Invest up to \$500,000 in 2 additional center-based Early Head Start classrooms annually with each of the 2 current EHS providers opening one additional classroom for families in their geographic regions (Albina in N/NE Portland, and MHCC in East Portland).

Saltzman: The focused networks are culturally specific?

McElroy: Yes. They are Latino, African-American and Russian. There is support for adding a Somali network.

Public Comment – none

Young: I appreciate the information provided by staff. It is a complex question. I stand in support of investing in both options A and B. That is option C.

Hornecker: Great presentation. I am in favor of option A. Option A gives broader reach of ages. It is about a 2 to 1 bang for the buck in terms of children and families served. I love keeping families working who want to keep working. Our funds can help keep people out of the pool of the unemployed and dependent on safety nets.

Saltzman: I support option C. All of these investments are crucial. I wonder what you meant by the idea that funding the head start classrooms creates an expectation of future funding. Do you mean that similar to all of our investments there is the hope for continued funding?

McElroy: Yes.

Young: I move that we adopt option C as presented by the staff.

Saltzman: I second the motion.

Vote of Option C

In Favor: Young, Saltzman

Opposed: Hornecker

The motion passes.

Adopted Resolution

- **Invest up to \$780,000 to expand Childcare Initiative through Childcare Resource and Referral** to assist low-income working families with affording high quality childcare.
- **Invest up to \$320,000 in Focused Childcare Networks** to assure all 4 existing networks continue operations through 6/30/2019, and start a new Somali network.
- **Invest up to \$500,000 in 2 additional center-based Early Head Start classrooms** annually with each of the 2 current EHS providers opening one additional classroom for families in their geographic regions (Albina in N/NE Portland, and MHCC in East Portland).

System Partner Grant Recommendation

McElroy: In the Spring of 2015 Committee decided how to allocate additional revenues allocated \$200,000 toward supporting system partners and improving the systems that affect children

Committee has invested \$125,000 of that toward:

- \$100,000 over 2.5 years in partnership with other private funders to develop
 - more culturally and linguistically diverse master trainers (trainers who train cadres of other trainers) who can provide culturally and linguistically specific trainings to childcare providers serving communities of color, English language learners and rural areas; and
 - identify and develop culturally responsive training curricula improvements in partnership with trainers and the communities they serve.
- \$25,000 over one year in partnership with other private funders toward non-profit cohort (including some PCL grantees) and funder cohort (including PCL staff) participation in Center for Equity and Inclusion's multi-year process at advancing equity and inclusion policies and practices at program, organization, and systems level.

The Committee has a balance of \$75,000 to spend in the next 2 years.

Staff recommends investing the balance—up to \$75,000-- in planning and piloting of a training curriculum based on the locally developed Community Education Worker model.

Development of Training Certification for Community Education Workers

- Community Education Worker (CEW) model grew out of a community planning, collective impact process convened in 2012-13 through Social Venture Partners Portland and All Hands Raised
- focus is to address racial disparities in early learning service access and outcomes associated with kindergarten readiness.
- modeled after Community Health Workers, internationally recognized approach to promoting health education. Community members in traditionally underserved and marginalized communities develop their capacity to improve health within their own communities and to change health systems to better serve their needs.
- CEW project in Multnomah County first funded in 2014 as a community-driven pilot project supported by Social Venture Partners Portland and by state funding through Early Learning Multnomah (ELM)/United Way (local state-funded early learning hub).
- It is a collaboration between Latino Network, NAYA, Urban League and IRCO and is coordinated by the Multnomah County Health Department's Community Capacitation Center, a local leader in community health worker training, development, and support.
- During 2016-17 seven CEWs (many part time) who identify as people of color and/or immigrants and refugees from the following communities served members of their own communities: Latino/Spanish-speaking, Native American, African American, Somali, and Zomi (and other cultural groups from Myanmar).
- Collectively, they provided 173 families/269 children with home visits, parent/child groups, developmental screenings, family advocacy in public systems, and resource referral/connection.
- CEWs specialize in helping families navigate their local public school as they enter kindergarten, mitigating the institutional challenges often experiences by families marginalized in public systems.
- Families served by the CEWs all identify as families of color, experience poverty (185% of the federal poverty level or less), and over 45% of families spoke a primary language other than English in the home).
- Evaluation of the CEW project shows positive outcomes for children and families associated with school and kindergarten readiness (e.g. increases in: confidence to help children be school-ready, engagement with school and health care systems, personal empowerment/advocacy and social supports).
- 7 current CEWs have each completed 90 hours of community health working training coordinated by the Community Capacitation Center earning them a CHW certificate.
- They have also completed 100 hours of training focused on topics in early childhood and development. Training topics examples: social determinants of health, developmental screening, community organizing, to home visiting skills.
- No recognized certificate currently exists to document their professional development achievement with the additional training, or to assist them in getting credit in other professional development systems such as the Oregon Registry: Pathways for Professional Recognition in Childhood Care & Education.
- Certificate development for CEWs would allow current early learning professionals (including those funded by PCL), such as home visitors, preschool teachers, and childcare providers, to pursue specialized training focused on topics related to reducing racial disparities, elevating family voice, and advancing system change all specifically in early learning.
- Development of CEW certificate would be collaborative effort and partnership between current CEW agency partners.
- Funding would go toward planning and development of certificate requirements and standards, and toward piloting a training for early childhood professional interested in obtaining the certificate.

- CEW certificate pilot would focus on the most essential knowledge and competency areas from the current CEW model for early learning professionals who want to utilize features of or the entire CEW model in their early childhood work; training would be 60 hours.
- Funding would be granted to Latino Network as the lead partner with subcontracts to each of the existing CEW partner agencies: IRCO, NAYA, Urban League, and the Community Capacitation Center of Multnomah County Health Department.
- First year of the project would focus on:
 - planning meetings of workgroup from CEW partners to establish the pilot training content and delivery methods based on training already developed and first used under the current CEW project.
 - training and development of the existing CEWs to help facilitate and leading training modules, furthering their professional development.
- Second year of the training would include
 - Solidifying certificate training curriculum modules
 - piloting of the training modules that would comprise the certificate
 - evaluation of training/ including creation of recommendations for how modules for certificate could become institutionalized into existing, recognized professional development systems such as the Oregon Registry for childcare works and/or OHS's registry for traditional health workers.
- Because the CEW model has grown out of communities of color, poised to provide a highly culturally responsive early learning and kindergarten readiness service model for children and families of color.
- As the Levy moves forward, funding this effort may also inform Levy funding priorities for culturally responsive early learning approaches
- Could also create a professional development pathway that is low-cost/free to workforce that faces numerous barriers accessing college courses or having their previous international coursework recognized, and builds cultural community leadership around early childhood and family voice in public education.

Young: What would be the role of Levy staff with this project?

McElroy: I see it as like other grant agreements. I do not see it as much of a burden on staff to monitor. There will be progress reporting and possible staff attendance at meetings.

Saltzman: Where will these trainings be offered? Would it be at a community college?

Sadie Feibel from **Latino Network** addressed the Committee. The trainings would be delivered at the Multnomah County Health Department Community Capacitation Center along with experienced community education workers from the nonprofits currently delivering the services.

Public Comment – there was a question about who could participate in the CEW program.

I am **Arika Bridgeman-Bunyoli** from the **Community Capacitation Center** which is part of **Multnomah County Health Department**. I coordinate the Community Education Worker program. A training cohort is typically limited to about 25 participants. We plan to pilot the program in English, but hope to offer in Spanish in the future. We could open up the participation, but have a limit of about 25.

McElroy: The amount requested is up to \$75,000.

Hornecker: I move to adopt the staff recommendation.

Young: Second

Vote: All in Favor.

The Allocation Committee agrees to fund the Community Health Worker program for \$75,000.

Community Engagement in Anticipation of Possible Levy Renewal in 2018

Saltzman: I want to clarify what we are discussing here. This conversation is about how we will plan for funding allocations if the Levy is renewed. It is not about what the Levy will be.

Pellegrino: We are raising this topic to begin a discussion. We got feedback from the last funding process that everyone wanted more time for all parts of the process. We are trying to start that process as early as possible. We assume that there would be a competitive funding round if the Levy is renewed. We want to be prepared for that eventuality. It takes time to create and execute community engagement. It has nothing to do with the Levy renewal process.

Review Planning/Community Engagement Process used in 2013

- The process was conducted entirely by staff due to revenue declines. There was not funding to engage outside help.
- Focused on getting input on funding and service priorities in the service areas prescribed by the ballot language
- Input was also gathered on proposed overall goals for Levy, and then on strategies that were developed after getting input on funding/service priorities. We modelled our process on that used by Oakland, who have a similar levy. Oakland uses an outside consultant to run their process.
- Methods used by staff:
 - Survey (translated into 4 other languages), 500 respondents; mostly multiple choice
 - Stakeholder and Community Group Meetings: 39 groups consulted; attended by over 300 people
 - 3 Public Meetings: primarily providers attend these; approximately 100 people total.
- Staff also compiled a local data report on children using education, health, and other population level data to describe characteristics and outcomes for children locally.
- Research on best practices was also compiled by staff and used to develop strategies to achieve program area goals.

Themes from 2013 Input Process – Across all program areas

- Focus on intensive, longer duration, relationship based services that focus on family/child goals
- Focus on populations most at risk for negative outcomes, especially children of color who experience disparities in outcomes
- Focus on high poverty areas of the city – outer East and North Portland
- Fund culturally specific and culturally responsive services that intentionally integrate culture into service design and delivery
- Increase professional development available for grantee organizations.

Themes from Feedback Gathered after Conclusion of 2014 funding process

- Extend the timeline for all phases of the process (input, application review, decision making)
- Public testimony before funding decisions is not a satisfactory format for hearing from applicants because of the volume is so high and there isn't time for questions and/or meaningful discussion

- Dissatisfaction with decision making process by both applicants and Committee members

Open Discussion on Planning/Community Engagement as we approach Levy renewal in 2018

- Consider hiring an outside consultant to assist with design and implementation of planning and community engagement process; Advantages include
 - Increased capacity to do more extensive outreach and use more intensive methods of engagement
 - Different expertise than staff
 - Capacity to hire groups/individuals with greater connection to diverse communities, and wider group of people (parents, youth)
 - 3rd party facilitating collection of input/ideas so community does not have to talk staff directly – greater anonymity for people might lead to more honest feedback
 - We are not as financially constrained as in the past, so could afford a process with an outside consultant.
- Consider what topics you want to include in the planning/community engagement process:
 - Levy governance and structure
 - Funding process – e.g. 2-step, interviews etc. May be different options to explore
 - Investment/funding priorities and community needs/preferences

We wanted to offer the Committee the chance to enter into this conversation.

Saltzman: Oakland used an outside firm?

Pellegrino: They put out an RFP (request for proposal) who worked with a variety of groups to gather information. Their consultants do a broader variety of work.

Young: What process was used prior to 2013-14.

Pellegrino: We hired some outside consultants to facilitate public meetings. They did not help with design. Outreach was more limited than what we envision.

Young: You raise many valid points. The question is how we can best reach the communities who need the services. We want to be better informed on how we are doing with that. Hiring outside consultants with expertise seems like a good way to get better information. It is not clear whether the consultant would design the process.

Pellegrino: We have thought that the Allocation Committee would steer development of the process to some extent: what are you interested in investigating and how would we go about doing the investigation. We can help drive that process as well as get feedback from a consultant about process design. We imagine it would be an iterative process. Before we begin gathering the information, it would be good to get community input on what you are thinking of doing.

We want to get a sense of your priorities before we begin. Chair Kafoury did give us input that she is interested in a robust community engagement process.

Saltzman: What would you see as first steps in this process?

Pellegrino: We would need to go through a City Purchasing process to hire a consultant. We would gather intelligence from groups who have hired consultants for similar processes. We are working on gathering that information now. We can get written information from the Committee before we meet again.

If you want to hire someone, we should begin sooner than later. Over the next 6 months, we should be making decisions about how we want to move forward.

Hornecker: It would help me to understand whether there were big misses in our last process. Knowing how and why we made mistakes would help me to decide whether a consultant could be helpful. We are talking about community engagement. I am not sure what the problem we are trying to fix is. It is not clear whether we did well or not last time we sought to engage the community. I would like more understanding on how we did.

Pellegrino: We are recommending a deep dive prior to the beginning of the next levy. We are concerned that if staff conducts the feedback process, we will not get the most honest feedback. You do not know what you are missing unless you run a more robust process. We did get feedback that our process did not give enough time for decision-making. We did not speak to groups of parents; there were no focus groups done; there was no engagement of folks closer to the ground and involved in grassroots efforts in different communities. We did not have time and capacity to do those things. I am not sure I would know what we missed. I cannot say for sure we would get a different result. My hope is that we would.

Hornecker: I hear you saying, because we did it, we don't know if it would be better if someone else did it. What do we know about the way we did it. Is there any evidence that having a staff-run process was inadequate or problematic? I do not know why folks outside of current grantees would have any reason to be less than honest. Are there folks out there who could let us know how they would help us explore those questions? We might invite folks who do this work to submit proposals around how we should proceed. We do not have the expertise to design a process.

Pellegrino: We can give you a framework for a process. We wanted to hear from you before we began to design the process.

Saltzman: I thought our processes were robust in the past. There will always be folks who are not happy with the process. We are not discussing the governance structure; that decision is made by the voters.

Pellegrino: Funding process is decided by the Committee. I wanted to hear whether you want more input around the process. We can give the process some shape and share that with you in the future.

McElroy: We are talking to other City departments, the County, Oakland Children's Levy staff about how they do community input processes. We are already engaging folks who have done this type of work.

Hornecker: There is limited flexibility about how we run these meetings because of public meeting law. So, I do not favor asking the community about that issue. We have made a big push east and have done well in seeking to target funding to historically underserved communities. I am in favor of asking the community about how we are doing and how we can do better in serving those communities. I would like for us to hear about needs and gaps.

Young: As an Allocation Committee, we are involved in the funding process. I would guess in the community, there would be questions about the administration of the fund. Our role is relatively small, although important. We are having limited interaction with the grantees. I could see a consultant being helpful in engaging the grantees around the administration of the Levy.

Pellegrino: We will bring some shape to the process and bring it back to you. WE will also explore what budgets would be for this type of process. We have heard one entity spending about \$100,000 for a year-long process. Most governments use some kind of public input process before granting out funds.

Saltzman: Thank you Lisa. That concludes our business for today. We do not have our next meeting scheduled yet.

Adjourned 3:35 pm