



Small Grants Fund Update
Allocation Committee
January 27, 2026

Thank you, Councilor Ryan.

This year, we ran the second ever small grants funding round. As a reminder, small grants are for organizations with annual revenues between \$90,000-\$750,000. Just as in large grants, small grants applicants must apply for programs that fit into one of PCL's six program areas.

Small Grants Fund: Applicants

Program Area	# apps	3-year request (FY27-FY29)	Year 1 request (FY27)
After School	24	\$4,758,893	\$1,574,788
Mentoring	18	\$3,199,232	\$1,050,023
Hunger Relief	8	\$1,536,691	\$520,564
Early Childhood	3	\$480,000	\$160,000
Foster Care	1	\$240,000	\$80,000
Child Abuse Prev. and Interv.	1	\$147,510	\$49,170
Grand Total	55	\$10,362,326	\$3,434,545



We received 55 eligible applications requesting \$10,362,326 in funding. That's nearly \$7 requested for every dollar available, an even greater gap than the large grant round in which we had nearly \$4 requested for every dollar available.

This table outlines the number of applications and total 3-year amount requested across PCL's 6 program areas.

We received 24 applications in after school requesting \$4.8 million, 18 applications in mentoring requesting \$3.2 million, 8 applications in hunger relief requesting \$1.5 million, and 3 applications in early childhood requesting \$480,000. We received 1 application each in foster care and child abuse prevention. Those applications were for \$240,000 and \$147,510, respectively.

Small Grants Fund: Applicants

3-year request range	No. of apps	% of apps	\$ Total 3-year
Max \$240k	17	31%	\$4,080,000
\$225k-\$239k	6	11%	\$1,392,066
\$150k-\$224k	17	31%	\$3,217,745
\$100k-\$149k	9	16%	\$1,149,951
under \$100k	6	11%	\$522,564
Grand total	55	100%	\$10,362,326

This table outlines the size of 3-year grant requests by range, starting with maximum 3-year grant size. It shows the number of applications and total funding requested in each of the size ranges.

The maximum grant size is \$240,000 over 3 years, and the minimum grant is \$81,000 over 3 years.

Applications requesting 3 –year totals of \$225,000-\$240,00 make up 42% of the total applications, and 53% of total dollars requested. The majority of those requested the maximum 3-year grant.

Keep in mind that PCL limits funding requests based on organization size. Organizations were eligible for a small grant if their annual revenue in their last closed fiscal year was between \$90,000-\$750,000.

SGF Funding Process Timeline

Early February	Staff provide Allocation Committee with basic data and video links for all applicants (i.e. reference materials, not recommendations)
February 23	Community Council advises staff on funding recommendation.
March 3	Staff send funding recommendations to Allocation Committee and applicants. Opportunity to submit written testimony begins.
March 17	Written testimony due from applicants.
March 19	Staff sends applicants' written testimony to Allocation Committee.
April 7	Allocation Committee meets to decide grant awards.
April to mid-May	Staff presents grant awards to City Council for decision.
Mid-May-June	Grant negotiations begin
July 1, 2026	Grants begin

This slide outlines the timeline for the rest of the small grants funding process.

- PCL staff and Community Council members recently reviewed and scored all applications, which include a written component and a 5-minute video component.
- 3 staff scored the application's written component, and 9 of 12 Community Council members scored the video component of each application. An application's final score is the sum of the average written score (3 staff) and median video score (9 Community Council members).
- Staff will provide the Committee with access to all applicant videos. Staff are finalizing materials with video links and basic data on all applicants to send in early February.
- The Community Council meets on February 23 to consider, discuss, and vote on staff funding recommendations. Recommendations are crafted using factors including application score, program area and funding priorities, and program feasibility.
- The resulting recommendations will be sent to the Allocation Committee and applicants by March 3. Applicants will have 2 weeks to submit written testimony. The Allocation Committee will have 4 weeks to review the recommendations and over 2 weeks to review written testimony. Staff will meet individually with Allocation Committee members in late March and early April to prep you for small grant funding decisions at the Committee's April 7 meeting.

Community Council Update: Recruitment. One Community Council member stepped off the council in the fall, and 5 more step off this spring when their terms end. Seven Community Council members will continue their current terms or renew for a second three-year term. This winter, PCL staff launched a recruitment process to appoint 6 new council members and identify two alternates. Recruitment ends March 2, and we hope to seat new council members this summer.



**Financial Update
Allocation Committee
January 27, 2026**

Financial update

Projected \$6.5 M additional resources over 3 years

\$2.8 M updated revenue projections FY26-FY28

- Higher assessed values of properties in local option compared to general fund, from Assessor's Office
- Compression effects lower than city economist projected previously in Dec. 2024

\$1.7 M new Parks Levy compression offset

- Levy had not been referred as of Dec. 2024, referred summer 2025 with continued commitment to offset compression on PCL; passed by voters Nov. 2025



- Several factors unique to PCL have led to an increase in resources available for grants by approx. \$6.5 million FY27-FY29 – or about \$2.17 million per year over the 3 years.
- Committee needs to decide how to allocate resources that were not expected when allocations were made in June 2024 for the large and small grants funding rounds, for grantee training, and the Community Childcare Initiative.
- This slide and the next will review the major sources of the projected resources. Then we'll present our recommendation and rationale.
- PCL receives revenue projections annually. In Dec 2024, we used projections provided by the city economist at that time to determine resources available for grants- \$70 M. One year later, this past December 2025, the economist's revised projections for FY26- FY28 show \$2.8M more in revenue. We asked the city economist what led to the changes. He explained that he was more conservative in his 2024 projections than current year trends, specifically:
 - Higher level of increased assessed values of properties included in the local option district as compared to general fund permanent levy, based on Assessor's Office current year data
 - Local option levies are compressed first, so they were less affected than the economist forecasted by the decreased value of downtown properties than general fund.
- Also in Dec. 2024, the Portland Parks levy was uncertain. Beginning in 2021, PCL has received funds from the Parks Levy to reimburse PCL for the additional property tax compression created by the 2020 Parks Levy. The Council ordinance referring the 2020 Parks Levy to voters included this provision.
- PCL did not include projected funds from this provision because as of December 2024, City Council had not referred the Levy to voters. The Council resolution in summer 2025 referring the new Levy to voters included the transfer of funds provision. Voter passed the new Levy in November 2025 at a higher assessment rate, which will further compress PCL. As such, the offset from Parks and Rec is projected to be approximately \$1.7 M.

Financial update

Projected \$6.5 M additional resources over 3 years

\$2 M miscellaneous

- \$664k grant underspending FY25
- \$162k actual revenue and additional interest FY25
- \$881k increased projected interest FY26- FY28
- \$310k dissolution Vibrant Communities service area

Other changes have resulted in projected resources of \$2 M from the following miscellaneous sources:

- *Grant underspending for FY25:* In forecasting revenue available for grants, PCL assumes some level of underspending by grantees because staffing vacancies and hiring frequently result in underspending. PCL projected 5% underspending on FY25 grant budgets in forecasting revenues available for grants based on the historical pre-pandemic average. Actual underspending in FY25 was approx. 7% of grant budgets, resulting in **\$664k** additional unspent funds, mainly from grants that ended June 30, 2025.
- *Actual Levy revenue in FY25:* Actual tax revenues for FY25 were higher than projected, and interest on fund balance was higher than assumed. Together, these equal **\$162k**.
- *Interest on fund balance:* PCL did not include interest on fund balance when projecting available resources for grants in advance of the large grant funding round because historically, interest on fund balance has been small and was treated as part of reserves. Using the rate set by the City Investment Officer and estimating annual fund balance, we are currently projecting an additional **\$880,821** in total interest accrued FY26-FY28. This is an estimate; actuals may vary based on interest rate and fund balance fluctuations.
- *City service area transition savings:* When PCL budgeted for FY26, our bureau was part of Vibrant Communities service area and we had budgeted \$310k in anticipation of contributing to internal management costs for the service area. When the Vibrant Communities service area was dissolved as of 7/1/25, the **\$310,000** that PCL anticipated contributing to Vibrant Communities management costs remained in PCL's account.

Any questions before we walk you through our recommendations?

Financial update

Recommendations for \$6.5 M over 3 years

Increase allocation to small grants fund by \$1M; total of \$2.5M for FY27-FY29, up to 12 grants

- High competition for funds
- Increase from planned 6-10 grants to up to 12 total to remain within staff capacity

Given what we just reviewed, staff has the following recommendations. We'll review them on 2 slides, and we ask that you hold your questions until after the next slide.

Increase allocation to small grants fund by \$1 million

The Committee had allocated \$1.5 million over 3 years, for 6- 10 grants, to the small grants funding round for FY27- FY29. Staff recommends increasing that allocation to \$2.5 million over 3 years and funding up to 12 grants.

Rationale:

- Competition for these grants is high as reviewed earlier: \$10.4 million requested for \$1.5 million available; nearly \$7 requested for every \$1 currently available. By increasing the small grants fund from \$1.5M to \$2.5M over 3 years, we can absorb a few more grants and meet more need.
- Small grants require more management than large grants, because the purpose is to help smaller organizations build capacity with programming and managing a city grant. We had planned for 6-10 small grants, and staff has capacity to go up to 12 (grant size is \$81k-\$240k over 3 years).
- We caution the Committee against allocating more resources to small grants than we recommend due to trying to stay within current staff capacity.

Financial update

Recommendations for \$6.5 M over 3 years

- **Increase funding to all current large grants by 8%; \$5.2M total for FY27-FY28 of current grants**
 - Lessen impact of 21% reductions made with 2024 projections
 - COLA for current grants, support for rising costs
 - Stable services for children/families amidst local, state, federal funding cuts
 - Honor community-centered funding processes
- **Remaining balance: \$300k in reserves**

Increase funding to all current large grants by 8% (\$5.2 million)

Staff recommends increasing current large grants by 8% at a cost of approx. \$5.2 million. Grantees would budget the increased funds in years 2 and 3 of their current 3-year grants.

Rationale:

- *Make up for funding reductions and rising costs:* In December 2024 PCL anticipated a 21% decline in revenue in advance of the large grant funding round based on the economist's projections. PCL reduced to continuing grants and awarded lower grant amounts than applicants requested. Providing an 8% increase lessens the impact of those reductions and allows a cost-of-living adjustment to address rising costs, and will help stabilize services for children and families as grantees manage federal, state and local funding cuts.
- *Stay withing PCL staff capacity:* We advise against revisiting the unfunded applications from spring 2025 large grants process. PCL awarded 94 of 168 applications -- over half -- and this resulted in a 20% increase in the number of grants PCL managed prior to 2025 but with the same staff capacity. Staff strategically determined a total number of large grants we could manage, knowing we had the small grants round coming up. Among the 76 unfunded applications, most scored below median, and PCL discontinued some for past performance.
- *Honoring community-centered process:* Amending contracts to increase current grants honors our past community-centered process that resulted in those grants. It keeps us on track with our current community-centered small grants process. There is no clear process by which staff or the Committee would reconsider the 76 unfunded applications, and staff do not have capacity to design a process to revisit them, much less take on more grants.

These 2 recommendations total approximately \$6.2 million of the \$6.5 million available. PCL staff recommends holding the remaining \$300k as reserves toward grant renewals in FY29.



Levy Performance FY25
Allocation Committee
January 27, 2026

Summary and Data

- Levy-wide performance highlights for FY25
- Performance trends FY22- FY25
- Performance Data Appendix available



These slides present a summary of Levy performance highlights for July 1, 2024- June 30, 2025.

- For this report, staff analyzed typical Levy performance data (used in city budget process, required by Act authorized by voters), and performance trends over the past 5 years of the Levy, which included the pandemic. Most trend data focuses on FY22 – FY25 since COVID safety and emergency protocols were in place during FY21 and they impacted how programs operated and whether/how children and families accessed services.
- FY25 was the final year of funding for grants that funded between FY21- FY25. Next year's report will cover the first year of performance for the grants made in the recent large grants funding round and that began July 1, 2025.
- We have included photos and quotes from grantees in this report, related to the data highlights.
- Thank you to PCL grantee partners for their work with annual reports. The data and narrative they report to PCL makes this performance summary possible. We're grateful for the work they do every day with children and families.
- Detailed data by program area is in the Data Appendix available on PCL website: www.portlandchildrenslevy.org

Overall Levy Goals

- Prepare children for school
- Support children's success inside and outside of school
- Eliminate racial and ethnic disparities in children's wellbeing and school success.




PCL's goals come from the Act that was included in the City ordinance referring the reauthorization of the Levy to voters.

Main sections of this presentation/PCL performance data to gauge PCL progress with its goals:

- Access to Services: Number of Children Served and Demographics
- Amount/Types of Service Activities Provided
- Child/Family attendance/participation in program services
- Program, Child/Family Outcomes
- Demographics of staff/board in organizations receiving PCL grants

Service Access, Number Served: 2024-25


- 9,322 participants served across 5 program areas (combination of children and parents/caregivers)
- Exceeded goal for number participants to serve
- Returned to pre-pandemic trend of exceeding goal



These data are aggregated from 72 grants in 5 program areas- Early Childhood, Child Abuse Prevention & Intervention, Foster Care, After School, Mentoring

- All offering primarily relationship-based programming over time
- Includes Small Grants Fund (6 of 7 grants are in those 5 program areas) and Community Childcare Initiative (CCI), but we also highlight specific data on CCI program later in this report.
- Hunger relief is discussed separately in this report due the unique nature of services
- Programs set goals for the number of participants they plan to serve- children or parents/caregivers depending on the program model.
- Programs exceeded the number of participants they had planned to serve.
- Recovery from the pandemic over the 5-year levy period
- Slightly under goals in After School (94%). This program area has not reached the goal for number of children served in any of the last 4 years.

Service Access, Children Served: 2024-25




This graph helps illustrate the demographics of children served, including those who are disproportionately affected by inequities.

- Based on 9,984 children served. The number of children served is greater than total participants on the previous slide because where services are provided to caregivers as the program focus, programs also collect data on number and demographics of children served. This slide focuses only on children served directly or in family programs.
- Data from 72 grants in 5 program areas: after school, Early Childhood, Foster Care, Child Abuse Prevention/Intervention, and Mentoring, including small grants and CCI.
- 86% of children served are from families with incomes at 185% of the federal poverty level or less (Note for 2025: 185% of FPL = \$59,478 for family of 4 while Portland area median income was 2 times greater at \$124,100 for a family of 4.)
- 73% of children served identified as Black, Indigenous and People of Color
- 48% live or attend school in East Portland
- 31% speak a primary language at home other than English (over 50 languages reported by grantees)
- 8% had a disability according to data reported by PCL grantees, but many programs didn't collect information on the disability status of children/youth served or families didn't provide that information to programs at time of enrollment. PCL worked with grantee partners and Multnomah Education School District to report special education and Section 504 plan status of students participating in afterschool and mentoring programs. MESD data helps PCL better understand whether/how PCL programs reach children/youth with disabilities. Those data indicated 21% of children served in After School and Mentoring programs qualified for special education or a 504 plan.

Service Activities

- Goals for amount of services offered to children/families (e.g. home visits, after-school classes, mentoring sessions)
- Programs in 5 program areas met 83% of service activity goals
- Rate increasing with continued pandemic recovery



- Grant agreements have service activity goals for the amount of service a program will offer to children/families.
- Service activity goal example: offering twenty 1-hour group mentoring sessions during the year; providing an after-school class that is 12 sessions, each 1.5 hours long
- Service activity goals help PCL staff understand: Did the staff/program implement the activities as planned?
- In FY25 grantees met 83% of service activity goals.
- Factor most affecting unmet goals in FY25 and typically in past years was staffing turnover and vacancies.
- PCL did not aggregate progress on these activities before the pandemic because typically programs met most of their program activity goals. During the pandemic and as recovery occurred, PCL began aggregating these data to better understand the degree to which programs were able to implement activities as planned.
- Overall, programs have steadily improved in meeting service activity goals. FY21 data are not included because that year was still significantly affected by the pandemic and related safety protocols limiting the types of services that could be offered.
- Program areas ranged from the lowest at 79% in foster care to the highest at 85% of goals in child abuse prevention/intervention.

A glimpse into service activities

“Throughout the year, program staff have partnered with elders to host weekly play and art-making sessions for youth in the community. These gatherings offer children the chance to explore new materials and express themselves creatively through hands-on experiences. Activities are intentionally designed to be therapeutic...

Parents and staff have shared that children not only look forward to these sessions each week, but many have shown growth in emotional regulation, increased ability to be redirected, and stronger, more trusting relationships with elders and neighbors.”


- *Bridge Meadows*



This slide shows an example of service activities from Bridge Meadows' Intergenerational Interventions programs, in PCL's child abuse prevention & intervention program area. Bridge Meadows reported about the success of these activities between children and elders and shared this photo. (Quote edited for brevity.)

Program Participation/Attendance

- Goals for amount of service participants complete/attend
- 68% of participants in 5 program areas met participation goals
- Rate increasing, but hasn't reached pre-pandemic rate of 75%



- Grant agreements include participation goals for children/youth/families
- Participation goal examples: completing 6 months of enrollment in the program and attending at least 12 group sessions in that time; or attending at least 42 hours out of the 60 hours offered
- Participation goals help PCL staff understand how much of the service offered youth/families actually attended.
- FY25 children/youth/caregiver served met 68% of participation/attendance goals.
- Rate is increasing toward pre-pandemic rates; typically, 75%- 80% of participants met program participation goals.
- Mentoring and after school programs continued to have lower rates of participation in FY25 compared to other program areas. The rate in those program areas was 45% and 67% respectively, but in other program areas it ranged from 72% to 86%. Mentoring and after school program areas have had the lowest participation rates compared to other PCL program areas for the past 4 years.
- Staffing vacancies had impact on missed participation goals. With mentoring, 2 of 7 grants in that program area skewed the overall results. When removed from the calculations, 69% of youth in the remaining 5 mentoring grants met participation goals. Similarly, 3 grants in after school skewed the overall results and when removed, 74% of youth in the program area met participation goals.
- In Mentoring, the programs focus on serving middle school and high school youth, who have many competing demands for their time, and they can choose whether or not to attend. Participation rates are generally higher in programs serving younger children and youth because families help children attend/participate.

Focusing on child/youth participation

“PT&E has worked hard over the last year to increase our overall attendance by staying consistent with expectations and following up with youth and parents when attendance expectations are not met and/or when trends emerge that may impact attendance in the future. For the 2024-2025 school year, we exceeded our goal of at least 70% of youth attending 81 sessions or more, reaching 72.7%. Compared to the previous year, we have increased our attendance average by over 30%, which we are extremely proud of.”


- *Portland Tennis & Education*



- This slide shows an example of how Portland Tennis & Education, an after school program, focused on children's participation in services and helped increase the rate of children attending their services.
- I'll note that PT&E previously received a small grant from us, and they successfully applied for a large grant that started July 1, 2025.






Outcome Goals

- Outcomes vary by program model in 5 program areas, intensity of services offered, and population served.
- Results are reported only for participants that met participation goals and completed outcome measurement tools.
- Continued pre-pandemic rate, 75% -80%, of outcome goals met








- Grantees have outcome goals in their grant agreements.
- Service Activity Goals + Participation Goals= Outcomes (what is offered to children/families, how much they attend/participate, produces outcomes such as changes in knowledge, attitudes, behavior)
- Outcome goal examples: 90% of youth will demonstrate positive school engagement; 85% of parents will demonstrate/increase positive parenting practices
- Most programs were able to collect data to track and report on most outcome goals, compared to previous years with pandemic-related service disruptions.
- Across all grantees, 202 outcome goals tracked- met 82% of those goals.
- FY25 rate similar to PCL past rates, pre-pandemic; typically grantees met 75%-80% of outcome goals.
- Following slides report outcomes tracked and reported across groups of programs that offer similar services and measure similar outcomes for those services. Results are only reported on clients who reached program attendance/participation goals and who completed outcome measurement tools.

Outcome Goals

Program area	Results for some common outcomes
 Early Childhood	94% of children met expected developmental milestones. <i>11 of 15 programs, 324/346 children</i>
 Early Childhood	97% of children not on track with developmental milestone(s) referred for additional support. <i>11 of 15 programs, 37/38 children</i>
 Early Childhood	93% of parents/caregivers met parenting goals. <i>7 of 15 programs, 214/229 parents/caregivers</i>
 Child Abuse Prev. & Interv.	91% of parents/caregivers met parenting practice goals. <i>7/14 programs, 212/232 parents/caregivers</i>
 Child Abuse Prev. & Interv.	79% of parents/caregivers report increased safety, stability. <i>10/14 programs, 298/379 parents/caregivers</i>

- Data in each program area where similar types of programs track & report similar types of outcomes.
- Table shows number of grantees in program area that track/report that outcome, out of the total number of grantees in that program area.
- Of those that track/report the outcome, the table shows the number of children/youth/caregivers assessed for the outcome, and the number and percent that met the outcome.
- Results similar to past years- for outcomes reported, children/families experienced positive results similar to past PCL outcome data reported.

Outcome Goals

Program area	Results for some common outcomes
 Foster Care	90% of youth met academic goals. <i>4/10 programs, 125/139 youth</i>
 Foster Care	94% of youth met positive youth development goals. <i>4/10 programs, 102/108 youth</i>
 After School	87% of children & youth met youth development outcomes. <i>11 of 19 programs, 1,343/1,541 children and youth</i>
 Mentoring	98% of youth met school engagement outcomes. <i>4 of 7 programs, 275/280 children and youth</i>
 Small Grants	97% of youth met academic goals. <i>2 of 6 programs, 58/60 youth</i>

- Data in each program area where similar types of programs track & report similar types of outcomes.
- Results similar to past years- for outcomes reported, children/families having positive results similar to past PCL outcome data reported.

Success beyond the outcomes

“Without Albina Head Start and Early Head Start, I would not have been able to go to college and graduate. For the last few years, I have been on the Parent Policy Council, which is a great way to contribute to giving back to the community.”

- parent of child attending Albina Early Head Start

“My normal school science class is boring, but AKA Science after school is fun! I liked learning and building with my friends, and we helped each other. The teacher is great too. I feel more open about myself and can say what's on my mind. And I love it! This class is fun, relaxing, and awesome.”

- Ron Russell MS SUN student in AKA Science after school



In addition to the specific outcomes that programs measure for their PCL grant, they also often share other successes and quotes from client surveys. This slide features quotes from Albina Early Head Start in the Early Childhood program area, and from Impact NW's AKA Science in the After School program area.

As shown in the quotes, often times the outcome data collected and reported by programs does not capture all the ways that a program may positively impact children and families.

Outcomes for School-Aged Youth

Outcome	% met outcome 2024-25	% met outcome 2023-24	% met outcome 2022-23	% met outcome 2018-19
Youth attend 90% of school days	65%	63%	62%	82%
Youth have no behavior referrals for suspension or expulsion	89%	90%	91%	90%
9th – 11th grade students earn 6 credits	78%	83%	76%	78%
High school seniors graduate	69%	78%	76%	79%



- PCL works with grantee partners, Multnomah Education Service District (MESD) and local school districts to look at school-related outcome data on participants in PCL after school and mentoring programs. Aggregate data on participants in PCL after school and mentoring programs is provided by MESD and released by school districts to PCL.
- Only students who meet program participation goals are included in these data.
- Table on slide compares rates from the last full school year before the pandemic on the far column, to the past 3 school years, focusing on students served in PCL-funded after-school and mentoring programs, including some small grants.
- In general, school-related outcomes improved over the past 3 years (full in-person school years).
- For youth behavior in school and credit attainment, outcomes rates in FY25 are similar to pre-pandemic results shown in the last column.
- School attendance among children/youth in PCL-funded programs is improving, but remains below pre-pandemic rates. Similarly, Oregon Dept. of Education data show school attendance among all students in Portland is 68% of students attending 90% of days and is up from last year at 61%.
- Graduation rates dipped for PCL program participants. Oregon Dept. Of Education (ODE) has not yet released FY25 graduation rates for the state or local districts. For context, the graduation rate for Portland area schools in FY24 was 75%, and it was 69% for “underserved races/ethnicities” and 63% for students in poverty. Typically, graduation rates for participants in PCL-funded programs have exceeded graduation rates for comparison populations. Until we have FY25 graduation rates for local districts and comparison populations, it’s difficult to interpret the change in PCL’s data for FY25. It’s worth noting that during spring FY25, PCL granted funds to several new mentoring programs serving high school students. Those programs may help contribute to improving graduation rates for FY26.

Success beyond the outcomes

“One youth we’ve had the privilege of supporting began services with us while on probation. He was getting into trouble and struggled to understand the consequences of his actions, even as it began to cost him opportunities to participate in activities he loved, such as sports. The connection between his choices and those lost opportunities wasn’t yet clear to him. We’ve worked closely with this young person to build trust, offer support, and guide him through social-emotional skill building. As the relationship deepened, we began to see a meaningful shift in his attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors. His school performance improved, his grades rose, and his behavior in the classroom and at home stabilized. Most notably, he began demonstrating consistent positive behavior and a growing ability to take accountability for his actions. He is now beginning to understand how his choices impact others and directly shape his ability to engage in the things he loves.”

-Pathfinders of Oregon, Mentoring Inside Out



This slide helps offer context for the types of barriers and challenges that students are navigating when it comes to school success. This quote comes from Pathfinders, Mentoring Inside Out program and shows the type of sustained relationship and connection that led to positive outcomes. (Quote edited for brevity).

Hunger Relief Programs

- Served 13,686 children, 98% of FY25 goals
- Distributed over 3 million pounds of food, equivalent to an estimated 2.5 million meals
- Distributed food at 63 community locations, including home delivery and weekend backpacks
- Provided 287 classes & workshops for cooking, gardening, and nutrition/wellness

Next few slides focus on PCL's 12 hunger relief grants, which collectively served 13,686 individual children and over 10,000 adults. Among children served:

- 62% identify as BIPOC, and data for 19% of children served were not provided by clients at intake.
- 60% live or attend school in East Portland and data for 16% of children served were not provided by clients at intake.

Hunger relief served nearly 4,000 more children than PCL's other 5 program areas combined, yet had higher rates of missing demographic data. Hunger relief programs try to minimize barriers to food access, including not collecting data that might prevent families from feeling safe or comfortable accessing food. Hunger relief programs had 10% more missing data on race/ethnicity and 6% more missing data on zip code of children served, compared to PCL's other 5 program areas. Still, the data suggest programs reached children disproportionately impacted by food insecurity and poverty.

- Programs distributed over 3 million pounds of food, or the equivalent of over 2.5 million meals, at 63 locations, through on-site pantries, weekend backpacks, events, or delivery. Distribution locations include schools, parks, community-based organizations, and affordable housing communities. Food was also distributed through home delivery and weekend backpacks/food bags sent home with students.
- Classes and workshop goals were met, providing over 280 classes with over 4,000 children/youth and parents/caregivers focused on cooking, gardening, nutrition, and wellness


Hunger Relief Programs

“Our program collaborated with Growing Gardens to host a children’s cooking class. We created stations to grind maize, make tortillas, and quesadillas. It was a wonderful enrichment opportunity for children where they learned about our cultural traditions, foods, and celebrated foods we eat at home. We provided a short evaluation, and all 17 children indicated they would like to attend a class like this again.”

- *Familias en Acción*

Clase de Maíz

1. Circula la emoción que sientes después de tomar la clase



2. ¿me puedes decir una cosa que aprendiste de la clase?

ce me encanta
cocinar

3. ¿Qué más te gustó de la clase?

LAS QUESADILLAS ME GUSTAN
LOS MEJORES QUESADILLAS

4. ¿Te gustaría tomar la clase otra vez? (circula)

a. Si
b. No

This slide highlights Familias en Accion's cooking/nutrition class for children/youth (quote edited for brevity). It also shows an example of how the program gathers feedback from youth participants. Here is a translation of the questions and some of the answers:

1. Circle how you felt after taking the class.
2. Can you tell me one thing you learned from the class? “that I love to cook”
3. What did you like most about the class? “the quesadillas were the best quesadillas”
4. Would you like to take another class? “Yes”

Grantee Organization Demographics

Many of PCL's 50 grantee organizations reported race/ethnicity of all clients served by the organization, their direct service and management staff, and board of directors for FY25

- 58% of organizations served majority BIPOC clients
- 61% had majority BIPOC direct service staff
- 55% had majority BIPOC management staff
- 48% had majority BIPOC boards of directors



- Community Engagement in advance of the 2019-20 funding round prioritized funding organizations with staff who reflect the cultural identity/backgrounds of families they serve, and that organizations are managed/led by people who reflect their clients' cultural identity/background.
- PCL asked organizations' demographic data during the 2019-20 application process, and as part of grantees' annual reporting.
- In FY25, 33 of 50 organizations reported race/ethnicity of clients served, of staff and of board members.
- Data from 17 organizations are excluded:
 - 3 organizations are school districts/community colleges, and numerous factors influence the people they serve, the staff they hire/retain, and people who serve on their boards.
 - 1 organization serves clients statewide and the number of clients it served is nearly double the number served by all other organizations included in this analysis.
 - 5 organizations submitted no data; 2 are culturally specific.
 - 8 organizations were not asked to submit data due to grants ending in June 2025; 3 are culturally specific.

Among organizations reporting, data suggest the majority of PCL's grantee organizations have majority Black, Indigenous, and People of Color clients, direct service staff, and management staff.

NAYA, Foster Care support program



"I think it is very important to note that one of the common things we hear from youth is that it feels good to see representation everywhere in the building from the moment they walk through the door. I have personally heard the youth say, *I feel secure when I am in the building because I feel like I have a place here because I see people like me.*"

-- NAYA, foster care support

This slide highlights why the demographic data reported in the previous slide is important. The photo shows youth in NAYA's Foster Care support program helping each other set-up a teepee at the Delta Park Pow-wow. (Quote edited for brevity).

Community Childcare Initiative

Served 185 children, reaching 93% of goal

- 63% identify as Black, Indigenous, and People of Color;
27% white, 10% not reported; 35% lived in East Portland
- 51% were school-age served before/after school and summer childcare, 35% ages 3-5, and 14% infants/toddlers

67 providers participating, 40 centers, 27 family childcare sites

CCI aligned with state childcare policies: served children/families on state waitlist for ERDC; covered total costs of care between state reimbursement for childcare cost and provider's actual fees; ensured families' costs for quality care are *fully covered*



Community Childcare Initiative is a “special initiative” of the Levy; addresses program areas of Early Childhood and After School

- Provides subsidy to ensure working families earning low incomes and with children 6 weeks to 12 years old can afford/access high-quality childcare
- Compliments state's Employment Related Day Care subsidy (ERDC) 4 different ways: by helping families choose high-quality care, serving children/families on the waitlist for ERDC, covering copays for families receiving ERDC, and covering the gap between childcare providers' fees and the state subsidy reimbursement rate.
- The program reached 93% of its goal to serve 200 families due to staff turnover and an unexpected family leave for a staff member.
- CCI serves families earning up to 250% of the federal poverty rate (approx. \$80,000 for a family of 4). Of the 185 children served, 71% (n=132) were from families with incomes of 200% of FPL or less (\$64k for a family of 4).
- Covering that gap helps childcare providers cover true business costs of care, which is important to ensure stable, high-quality early childhood workforce, both in childcare centers and small business childcare providers. In FY25, 67 childcare providers participated in CCI.
- Majority of children served are of color and majority of children served are school age and infant/toddlers.

Additional context about families participating in CCI:

- Monthly median income of families in CCI: \$3,844
- Monthly median cost of childcare for families in CCI, before subsidy: \$2,620
- Monthly median ERDC subsidy: \$1,176, monthly median CCI subsidy: \$883

Impact of CCI on participants

“Thank You all so much! I honestly don’t know where my kids would go after school, if it wasn’t for the help you guys have given us! I’m able to continue working and they’re able to have a fun, positive and supportive environment to thrive in!”

-parent/guardian participant receiving childcare support from CCI

“Thank you! Our families greatly appreciate this program, and we look forward to the continued partnership.”

-childcare program partner participating in CCI



In spring 2024, PCL staff worked with CCI to implement family and providers surveys to understand the impacts of CCI. Those results were reported in PCL’s FY24 data report to the Allocation Committee last year, and the full report is available on PCL’s website.

This slide features 2 quotes from participants in CCI from FY25 that reinforce the positive results from CCI survey results published last year. The first quote helps illustrate how CCI impacts the families whose children receive childcare subsidies. The second quote highlights the experience of childcare providers participating in the program.