SUN Service System Coordinating Council
August 17, 2007
8:30-10:30 a.m.

MEETING NOTES

Attendance

Members Present: Marina Rulevskaya, Joanne Fuller, Dunya Minoo (alt), Krista Larson, Lisa Turpel, Barbara Kienle, Nichole Maher, Lisa Pellegrino, Maxine Thompson (alt), Lolenzo Poe (Chair)

alt = alternate representative for Council member

Also Attending: Hector Roche, May Cha, Diana Hall, Peggy Samolinski

RFP Input Sessions

Peggy Samolinski shared a summary of the RFP Input Sessions held to date. There have been six sessions that were all well attended. Each input session included information about the RFP timeline and process, and the same questions were asked at each one to gather feedback. Below are some highlights and themes from the input sessions:

What are the strengths of the programs and System as they exist now?
- Serving more low-income and TOP populations than previously
- Collaboration and linkages happen because of system design/structure
- Improved relationship and connection with schools
- Collaborations are strong within the SUN Service System and help in leveraging dollars and seeking additional funding
- Combination of TOP programs with strong regional system allows diversity of program activities to meet specific community needs
- Flexibility in program delivery models to meet needs of different populations (TOP, SMY, ATOD) and school communities – and to provide services where they are needed and clients are comfortable (came up in ALL program sessions)
- The structure addresses the needs of "high risk" kids
- Many of the services are the only services in the County that provide the prevention/screening/early intervention end of the spectrum (ATOD, SMY, TS, SUN CS, SSSES)
- Using schools as service delivery sites for more services has worked well overall – leads to coordination of services, family comfort level in schools, links and referrals
- Case management as a service is a strength
- Get a lot for the amount invested

What are the challenges? How could we address those challenges?
- Not enough money; increased demand (more poverty)
- Name of system – associate SUN name only with community schools
- Need stronger linkages and integration with other systems: housing, health, DHS, juvenile justice
- Infrastructure of regional centers is under-funded, particularly if you expect a single physical location/site that is a multi-service center
- Countywide services have challenges managing the need/demand across the geography
- Families need connection to other services, which aren't always available

Are there other linkages, resources or funding that could be added or strengthened?
- DHS
- County: DCJ, Health, Mental Health, Gang Prevention System
- School Districts
- Many others depending on program/service

If you could do just one thing differently (or keep the same) what would it be?
- Keep culturally specific services
- Use current data for allocations
- Look at distribution of funding and regions to provide equity (possibly look at regional boundaries)
- Additional funding for anti-poverty services
- System should serve children of all ages and families

There are still two more input sessions:

Anti-Poverty Services
September 11, 2007
9-11 a.m.
NE Precinct, 449 NE Emerson St

Targeted Outreach Population (TOP) Allocation
September 20, 2007
3-5 p.m.
NAYA Family Center, 5135 NE Columbia Blvd

The Coordinating Council discussed the importance and value of gathering input from people using or seeking out services within the system. They reached an agreement to recommend that the Department of County Human Services (DCHS) also get some feedback from end users and find a way to integrate it into the system on an ongoing basis.

Workgroups Update and Discussion

Allocation Workgroup

Lisa Pellegrino gave an update on the work of the Allocation workgroup. This group has been working on developing an allocation formula for school-based services. They have also discussed allocation of anti-poverty services and received some general feedback from the anti-poverty providers group. There is some concern that they don't have the right people at the table for the school-linked services discussions, especially if the overall outcome is for other systems to adhere to the allocation formulas. It was stressed that the Allocation workgroup efforts will soon need to align with that of the Core Services workgroup in order for the Allocation workgroup to complete its charge. Lisa asked the Coordinating Council for guidance on how to best focus the workgroup efforts in addressing allocation for school-linked services given the tight timeline.

Although a broader conversation is needed, it was suggested that the Allocation Workgroup initially focus on the early childhood services attached to SUN and work in conjunction with the anti-poverty providers group to arrive at recommendations for allocation of anti-poverty services.

Core Services Workgroup

Joanne Fuller gave an update on the work of the Core Services workgroup. This group has identified broad service categories and will continue to refine, prioritize, and define these categories. Joanne asked the Coordinating Council to provide input into an issue the workgroup has been discussing around identification of the target population for the SUN Service System. Specifically, should the system include ages 0-5 as part of the target population?

Although the Coordinating Council made no decisions about this, the following points were discussed:

- Is there an early childhood system? There are varying views on this, and the question seems to be part of the reason why people are having a hard time deciding whether or not 0-5 should or shouldn't be part of the SUN Service System target population. Currently early childhood is not a system organized in the same way as the SUN Service System.
- The SUN Service System shouldn't ignore ages 0-5.
- One of the implications of including 0-5 might be that some funds need to shift from serving school-age to serving early childhood.
- Whatever the target population is, we shouldn't abandon the desire and need to connect and link more with other early childhood services.
- One proposal that was raised was to view SUN Service System *funding* as targeting school-age children, but *system ownership* would include early childhood services. In this way, it would be agreed upon that coordination, deep linkages, and collaboration needs to occur for services across early childhood and school-age in order to reach system outcomes.

The other issue that was brought up was that there is confusion in the community about the name of the system (SUN Service System) and perhaps the Coordinating Council should consider changing this. The Coordinating Council will discuss this at their next meeting.

Communication

A couple communication pieces were distributed for Council input. This included a letter providing an update of the Coordinating Council progress that will be sent to key leaders and groups. This letter will be accompanied by a flyer with some additional updates. The flyer will also be sent to a wider group of stakeholders as an update. The Council suggested some revisions which will be made before the communication pieces are sent.

The Coordinating Council will continue to discuss other communication strategies for building buy-in at their next meeting.

Next Meeting

Coordinating Council
Friday, September 21, 8:30-9:30 a.m.
Multnomah Building, **Room 112**
501 SE Hawthorne