

SUN Service System Coordinating Council

May 4, 2007
8:30-10:30 a.m.

MEETING NOTES

Attendance

Members Present: Susan Stoltenberg, Lisa Turpel, Chuck Dimond, Bill Scott, Lorenzo T. Poe, Marina Rulevskaya, Barbara Kienle, Willie Poinsette, Jamila Lane, Nichole Maher, Lisa Pellegrino, Joanne Fuller

Also Attending: Hector Roche, May Cha, Diana Hall, Peggy Samolinski, Dunya Minoo, Mary Richardson, Mary Li, Judy Strand

Budget Update

Lorenzo Poe provided a brief budget update. He reiterated that the Chair's Executive Budget was only the first step in the budget process. There has been one public hearing, which included testimony around Touchstone and the health clinics (among other things). Chair Wheeler may ask the Coordinating Council to accelerate the work he proposed at the last meeting around redesigning the school-based case management services portion of the SUN Service System.

There were no questions or comments from the group.

DCHS Procurement Proposal

Peggy Samolinski reviewed the procurement process for the SUN Service System that she presented on at the last meeting. In response to the Council's request for a proposal for accomplishing the RFP planning work Peggy offered a proposal for the group's consideration. This proposal is outlined in two handouts that were distributed at the meeting and available on the website:

SUN Service System Procurement Planning Proposal
SUN Service System Procurement: Planning and Development Timeline May 4, 2007

In the proposal, DCHS asks for a steering body to provide oversight and guidance, pointing out that the Coordinating Council would be a natural group to act in this capacity. The formation of two workgroups initiated and sponsored by the Coordinating Council was also proposed to explore questions and issues around Core Services and Allocation Methodology and to develop recommendations (note; the Core Services group will take on the Siting discussion once the core services portion is completed). A kickoff meeting would occur to engage and invite community participation, inform stakeholders of the planning process, and answer questions. Both workgroups would report back to the Coordinating Council. Responses from members included the following.

- There was concern expressed about the need for the workgroups to do their work in the context of a broader vision. The School Age Services Task Force initially defined a vision for the broader service delivery system, and it was brought up that the vision needed a review by the Council before the workgroups begin meeting in order to allow for a clearer sense of the system that the Coordinating Council is building towards. It was emphasized that this background work needed to be done and shouldn't be delayed due to other timelines.

- It was asked whether the Coordinating Council would be expected to craft the framework for the workgroups and if the workgroups would be made up of some Coordinating Council members. The decision was that the Coordinating Council would act in a steering role for each of the proposed workgroups. The expectation is that Coordinating Council members lead and/or participate in the workgroups.
- One other comment focused around the recognition that the procurement work asked of the Council is one part of their overall work; that the work of the council is more broad and comprehensive than this immediate planning work.

Coordinating Council Work

Lorenzo Poe reiterated that there is a lot of critical work that needs to be done and is being fast tracked by the procurement needs and the opportunities the Chair presented to the group. He asked the group to consider all of this in the context of their other charges. Members reviewed a handout summarizing the Coordinating Council charge as defined by the School Age Services Task Force (available on website).

Responses from members included:

- Someone pointed out that there was little housing representation at the table and saw this as an issue especially as it pertained to their charge to identify and prioritize core services. However, Joanne Fuller and Mary Li both serve on a newly formed housing group and can bridge communication between the Coordinating Council and that group. Joanne Fuller is also charged with being the lead on housing issues for the County. She can see to it that housing representatives are at the table when they're needed.
- Members emphasized the importance of ratification by the BCC and other leaders of any recommendations that come out of the Coordinating Council. Members will need to go back to the groups they represent to advocate for the recommendations and get political buy-in.
- It was pointed out the issue of Core Services has multiple layers. There are the core services specific to the procurement, and then there are core services specific to the broader system. The procurement needs to set up a system that mobilizes all that is "core."
- The meaning of "joint ownership" is going to need to be addressed by the Coordinating Council. There are different points of view about what this means. It was suggested that this be discussed under #4: Sustainable Funding of the charge summary document and that it becomes a part of the Coordinating Council body of work.
- This is the County funding timeline, but there are other funding timelines as well (CHIF, PPS Superintendent search, State, etc.) that impact and/or may be impacted by the Council's work. If a truly integrated system is going to be created, the Coordinating Council will need to consider and integrate those timelines as well.
- A recommendation was made to surround the Coordinating Council timeline with key timeline points of other systems.

Members were in agreement with the DCHS procurement proposal.

Timeline

Members plotted their work on a timeline. The timeline is attached below and is also on the website.



Timeline

Additional responses were generated as the timeline was defined:

- It was clarified and agreed that work needs to happen around the vision before the workgroups are convened, but the group may also need to revisit the vision from time to time.
- It was recommended that critical points on the timeline when communication and commitment from stakeholders is needed be noted so that the same messages are carried from the Council to the respective jurisdictions.
- A recommendation was made to look across systems during the Evaluation work portion of the timeline.
- Another recommendation was made to include wording in the RFP that says the Coordinating Council will continue to provide guidance to the service system as key recommendations are made in the future and thus changes in either types or methods of service delivery may be recommended throughout the cycle of the procurement.

Workgroups

It was agreed that not all the work on the timeline could or should be done by the Coordinating Council; workgroups should be formed when appropriate. Members felt this would provide the opportunity to reach out to additional people, including direct service people. However, it would be critical for Council members to be represented on workgroups. There was clarification that alternate representatives of Council members were welcome to participate on workgroups but would not be the official representatives of the Coordinating Council on a workgroup "sanctioned/sponsored" by the Council. It was also pointed out that some work might be open to participation while other work may need specific people represented.

Members were asked to volunteer for the procurement workgroups. The following people expressed interest. Others were asked to continue to think about it for the next meeting.

Core Services

Lisa Turpel
Willie Poinsette
Krista Larson
Joanne Fuller
Chuck Dimond

Allocation Methodology

Lisa Pellegrino
Willie Poinsette
Krista Larson

Next Meeting

It was suggested that the Coordinating Council discuss if and how it can express interest in participating in the PPS superintendent search process.

A member recommended that everyone should consider whether they have staff resources that could be contributed to helping the County staff the Coordinating Council workgroups. This would encourage joint ownership and pave the path towards leadership being handed off from the County to another entity as recommended.

A suggestion was made to revisit the memorandum of understanding (MOU) that currently exists among the jurisdictions. The MOU was included in the School Age Services Task Force recommendations as a vehicle for written agreement for the Council..

Homework

- **Other Timelines:** Key points in other jurisdictions' timelines should be sent to Diana Hall for inclusion on the timeline (diana.c.hall@co.multnomah.or.us)
- **Vision Statement:** Members should review the vision for the SUN Service System set forth by the School Age Services Task Force (page 4 of the Task Force report)
- **Membership:** Members should consider who else needs to be represented on the workgroups and be ready to discuss this at the next meeting
- **Memorandum of Understanding:** Members should review the existing memorandum of understanding

Parking Lot

- Evaluation: What happens as part of the RFP vs. longer term?
- DCHS needs to help clarify what is needed for the RFP and not drive/forestall the larger conversation
- Letter to PPS re: superintendent search

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be on Friday, May 18, 8:30-10:30 a.m. at the Multnomah Building, **Room 112** (501 SE Hawthorne). Room 112 is the meeting room at the back of the Board Room on the 1st floor.