Data and Analysis: 2014 Funding Results

Introduction
This brief document presents analysis of the application pool in the 2014 Portland Children's Levy (PCL) funding process. Data selected for analysis in this document examine:
- The degree to which PCL achieved funding and allocation goals, including the goal of having 30% of funding be allocated to culturally specific services;
- How application score factored into funding results; and
- How past funding status as a PCL grantee, or not, factored into funding results

For data tables illustrating key findings, see the Appendices A & B of this document.

Key Findings by Topic

Applicant Pool and Funded Applicants
- Only 48.4% of all applications were funded and only 39.4% of funds requested were awarded.
- Early Childhood programs had the highest portion of dollars funded out of those requested, while After School programs had the lowest portion of dollars funded out of those requested.
- Across the Levy, applications for culturally specific programs comprised a higher portion of applications funded compared to their proportion in the general applicant pool. Applications for culturally specific programs received a higher portion of the total dollars they requested than applications for mainstream programs received for the total they requested.
- High scoring applications (those scoring 86 or higher) comprised 80% of applications funded.
- Applications from programs funded by PCL in FY13-14 were funded at higher rates than new programs (i.e. applications for services not funded by PCL in FY13-14).

Program Area Investment Goals and Goals for Program Area Strategies
- Allocation of Levy resources to program areas did not vary significantly from goals set at the beginning of the process.
- Slightly more was allocated to early childhood and child abuse prevention/intervention; and slightly less was allocated to foster care and after-school.
- In early childhood and foster care, investments did not substantially vary from the goals set for each strategy.
- In after-school, the fact that the City and County had agreed to put more resources into new SUN sites meant that fewer resources were needed from the Levy to fund these sites. This allowed resources to be shifted to other strategies in after-school, the bulk of which were used to fund more enrichment programming.
- The greatest portion of hunger relief investments were made in the alternative approaches strategy.

Investment in Culturally Specific Organizations/Programs
- 37% of total Levy allocations were made to culturally specific programs/organizations as compared to an average of 30% over the last levy period.
- The Levy set a goal of investing 30% of resources in each program area to culturally specific programs/organizations. It met this goal 4 of 6 program areas. Substantially more resources were invested in culturally specific programs/organizations in after-school and mentoring. No resources were invested in culturally specific programs/organizations for hunger relief.

Applications by Program Area

There were 122 total applications submitted from 62 applicant organizations. **Among all applications submitted, 48.4% were funded.** Across the 122 applicants, the total 3-year funding amount requested was $83,424,194. **Only 39.4% of total dollars requested were awarded** (a total of $32,881,078 awarded). Table 1 on the following page shows that among the 6 PCL program areas, After School had the most applications and the lowest portion of requested dollars funded. Early Childhood was the program area in which the highest portion of applications and dollars requested were funded.

Table 1. Total Applications and Funded Applications and Total Funding Awarded by Program Area

Program Area	Total Applications	Number Funded	Percent of Applications Funded	Total Funding Requested	Total Funding Awarded	Percent of Total Dollars Requested
After School	32	16	50.0%	$18,357,340	$6,005,000	32.7%
Child Abuse Prev. & Interv.	28	14	50.0%	$17,800,139	$6,482,272	36.4%
Early Childhood	21	14	66.7%	$20,168,020	$10,322,000	51.2%
Foster Care	14	8	57.1%	$9,737,521	$3,824,401	39.3%
Hunger Relief	12	2	16.7%	$7,911,887	$2,630,486	33.2%
Mentoring	15	5	33.3%	$9,449,287	$3,616,919	38.3%
Grand Total	**122**	**59**	**48.4%**	**$83,424,194**	**$32,881,078**	**39.4%**

Applications for Mainstream or Culturally Specific program services

Tables 2 and 3 illustrate funding results by whether the application was for culturally specific programs or for mainstream programs. Among all applications, **52.6% (20/38) of applications for culturally specific programs were funded, and 46.4% (39/84) of applications for mainstream programs were funded.** Of the 122, 15 applications (12%) were completely disqualified from funding consideration because they did not achieve minimum score requirements. Those 15 are included in the 63 un-funded applications.

Table 2. Number of Applications by Type and Funding Status

Applicant Type	Number of Applications	As Percent of Total Applications	As Percent of Funded Applications (n=59)	Number of Disqualified Applications (n=15)	As Percent of All Disqualified Applications
Culturally Specific Program	**38**	**31.1%**	**33.9%**	**3**	**20.0%**
Funded: Culturally Spec. Org.	*17*				
Funded: Mainstream Org.	*3*				
Mainstream Program	**84**	**68.9%**	**66.1%**	**12**	**80.0%**
Funded	39				
Grand Total	**122**	**--**	**--**	**--**	

A total of over $83.4 million was requested by the 122 applicants, but only $32.8 million was available. **Of the $27 million requested for culturally specific programs, 43.9% of that amount was awarded. Of the over $55 million requested for mainstream programs, 37.2% of that amount was awarded.**

Table 3. Amount of Funding Requested and Awarded by Applicant Type

Applicant Type	Sum of 3-year Request	Sum of 3-year Award	As Percent of Total Dollars Requested	As Percent of Total Dollars Awarded
Culturally Specific Program	$27,737,763	$12,175,228	33.2%	37.0%
Mainstream Program	$55,686,431	$20,705,850	66.8%	63.0%
Grand Total	$83,424,194	$32,881,078	--	--

Applicant Organizations

Among the 62 applicant organizations, 59.7% (n=37) were funded, and 25 were not funded. Among the 11 Culturally Specific Applicant Organizations, 63.6% (7 of 11) were awarded funding for one or more applications. Among the 51 Mainstream Applicant Organizations, 58.8% (30 of 51) were awarded funding for one or more applications.

Table 4. Applicant Organizations by Type and Funding Status

Type of Organizations and Funding Status	Number of Applicant Organizations	Percent of Applicant Organizations by Type	Percent of Funded Organizations by Type (n = 37)
Culturally Specific Organization	**11**	**17.7%**	**18.9%**
Funded	7		
Mainstream Organization	**51**	**82.3%**	**81.1%**
Funded	30		
Grand Total	**62**	--	--

Application Scores and Funding Status

Applications that scored 86 or higher comprised 80.4% of applications funded. During the funding process, the 15 disqualified applications were not considered for funding by the Allocation Committee. In addition, there were 4 applications for SUN community schools that were handled separately from the rest of the applicant pool. The remaining applicant pool included 103 applications considered for funding by the Allocation Committee. The distribution of scores for those applications ranged from the low 70's to just over 100 (for applications that received bonus points), with 85/86 being the scores that fell in the middle of the distribution. The table below breaks down the number and portion of applications on either side of the middle of the range, by program type (i.e. mainstream or culturally specific programming).

Table 5. Applications by Score, Funding Status, and Application Type

Program Type	Application Score of 85 or below	Application Score of 86 or above	Total Applications
Culturally Specific	**9**	**24**	**33**
Funded	1	18	19
Mainstream	**31**	**39**	**70**
Funded	10	27	37
Grand Total	**40**	**63**	**103**
% of Total Apps in Score Range	38.8%	61.2%	--
Funded	11	45	56
% of Funded Apps in Score Range	19.6%	80.4%	--

Applications from FY13-14 PCL Grantees and from New Programs

Among the 103 applications that were considered for funding, less than half were from FY13-14 PCL Grantees, yet **two-thirds of funded applications were FY13-14 PCL grantees.** Approximately one-third of all applications were for services not funded by PCL in FY13-14 but from agencies that had grants with PCL during FY13-14. Approximately one-fifth of all applications were for new services proposed by agencies that PCL did not fund in FY13-14.

In addition, applications for new programs (those not funded by PCL in FY13-14) were more likely to be funded if they scored in the higher range. For organizations that were not PCL funded in FY 13-14, 50% of their applications scoring 86 or higher were funded, while only 16.7% of their applications scoring 85 or lower were funded.

Table 6. Applications by Funding Status and FY13-14 PCL funding relationship

Type of Applicant	Total Applications	As % of Total	Funded	As % of Funded
PCL FY13-14 Grantees	45	43.7%	38	67.9%
New Services Proposed (PCL Grantee Organization FY13-14)	38	36.9%	12	21.4%
New Services Proposed by Organizations new to PCL	20	19.4%	6	10.7%
Grand Total	**103**	**--**	**56**	**--**

Table 7. Applications by Score Range, Funding Status, and FY13-14 PCL funding status

Application Score Range Status: PCL Grantee in 2014	Applications Grand Total	Applications Funded	% Funded in Score Range
Scored 85 or below	**40**	**11**	**27.5%**
PCL FY13-14 Grantee	12	8	66.7%
Not Grantee	28	3	10.7%
Scored 86 and above	**63**	**45**	**71.4%**
PCL FY13-14 Grantee	33	30	90.9%
Not Grantee	30	15	50.0%
Grand Total	**103**	**56**	**54.4%**

Appendix B: 2014 Funding Results Compared to Allocation Goals

Table 8. Program Area Allocations

Program Area	Goal	Actual	Variance	Allocated to Cult. Specific Org/Program	Variance from Goal for Cult. Specific
Early Childhood	31%	31.4%	0.4%	47%	17%
Child Abuse P&I	19%	19.7%	0.7%	26%	-4%
Foster Care	12%	11.6%	-0.4%	33%	3%
After-School	19%	18.3%	-0.7%	48%	18%
Mentoring	11%	11.0%	0.0%	39%	9%
Hunger	8%	8.0%	0.0%	0%	-30%

Table 9. Allocations to Strategies within Program Areas

Program Area	Strategy	Goal	Actual	Variance
Early Childhood	Intensive Home Visiting	50%	53%	3%
	Preschool/Head Start	35%	33%	2%
	EC Mental Health	15%	14%	-1%
Child Abuse Prevention & Intervention	Parenting	60%	67%	7%
	Therapeutic Intervention	40%	33%	-7%
Foster Care	Academic Support	40%	43%	3%
	Transition Support	30%	23%	-7%
	Permanency	30%	35%	5%
After-School	SUN	20%	12%	-8%
	Academic Support	60%	55%	-5%
	Enrichment	20%	33%	13%
Hunger Relief	Increase access/utilization of existing programs	N/A	26%	N/A
	Increase access to food during summer/OST	N/A	12%	N/A
	School-based food pantries	N/A	23%	N/A
	Alternative Approaches	N/A	39%	N/A

Note: PCL did not adopt specific strategies for mentoring program investments, and did not set goals for investment in particular hunger relief strategies.

Investing in our future
portland
children's
levy