

SUN Service System Funders Meeting

December 7, 2007

3-5 p.m.

MEETING NOTES

Attendance

Funders/Council Members Present: Maxine Thompson, Krista Larson, Barbara Rommel, Karen Fischer Gray, Carole Smith, Dunya Minoo, Jerry Burns, Zeke Smith, Ken Noah, Bob McKean, Lorenzo Poe, Ted Wheeler, Lisa Pellegrino, Dan Saltzman, Joanne Fuller, Terry Kneisler, Tom Potter, Lisa Turpel

Also Attending: May Cha, Diana Hall, Peggy Samolinski, Hector Roche, Susan Stoltenberg, Liesl Wendt, Jean DeMaster

Materials Available Online

The following materials that were distributed during this meeting are available online at www.co.multnomah.or.us/suncc:

- [Core Services and Allocation Methodology Recommendations Report](#)
- [PowerPoint Presentation](#)
- [Potential Implications & Impact Discussion Paper](#)

Welcome & Intro

Multnomah County Chair Ted Wheeler welcomed everyone and expressed his thanks and appreciation for the work the Coordinating Council has been doing to arrive at the recommendations for Core Services and Allocation. The results went beyond his expectations.

He emphasized that everyone present was represented in the process either as a direct participant or had opportunities to provide input and feedback to a Council representative. The recommendations reflect consensus agreement of the Council and, as such, some recommendations may make people uncomfortable. The Council was able to reach consensus by having everyone give up a little bit of something.

Background and Process

Lorenzo Poe provided background information and an overview of the process for the Core Services and Allocation recommendations. This is covered on pages 3-4 of the [Core Services and Allocation Methodology Recommendations report](#).

Core Services and Allocation Recommendations

Joanne Fuller gave an overview of the Core Services recommendations, which included:

- Target Population
- Long-term system outcomes
- Partnership definitions
- Core services

Lisa Pellegrino gave an overview of the Allocation recommendations, which included:

- Overarching allocation principles
- Specific allocation methodology for school-based and school-linked services

Implications and Impact

Peggy Samolinski presented a discussion document that outlined some initial implications and impact associated with the Core Services and Allocation recommendations.

Discussion and Issues

The following questions, clarifications, and issues were brought up during this meeting:

- Why was the **target population** limited to school-age children (K-12) and their families?
There was a lot of discussion about this in the workgroup and at the Coordinating Council. The Council felt it was important to be focused and clear about the target population. The decision to recommend that the target population of the SUN Service System be children in grades K-12 and their families was because of the recognition that there are many existing groups focused on early childhood policy and services. However, the SUN Service System is the only place that brings together discussion and work focused on services for school-age children and their families. Therefore, there was consensus by the Council to target resources within the SUN Service System to that population with the long-term vision of expanding this to include early childhood services and programs. The early childhood system is considered a key stakeholder and efforts will be made immediately to begin engaging them as such in a coordinated manner.
- What is the **financial model** for these recommendations that describes the expected partner contribution? How will the system be funded? Is the expected financial contribution proportionate to the amount of resources received/cost of the resources? Will financial contributions follow the shift in resources or will it remain within the jurisdiction of the contributing partner (e.g. City of Portland contribution funds services within City of Portland)?
It was proposed that definition of a financial model be a next step that needs to occur as a result of the recommendations. Funders clarified that ultimately discussion and decision on a financial model would need to be the funders', though the Council could and should take on the model development work.
- Why was it decided to use **high school catchment areas** for allocation of school-based services instead of the percentage of actual need since the catchment areas vary greatly in size, producing inequitable distribution of resources?
This was mainly due to the compromise that had to occur when basing the recommendations on the two primary allocation principles: ensuring a geographic spread of services and allocating resources based primarily on poverty.
- Are the Allocation recommendations considered a **transition plan**? Ten years from now, will we be closer to equity around distribution of resources based on poverty?
Yes, the understanding is that as additional resources come into the system, it will be allocated based on poverty.
- The **data used in the Poverty Index** should reflect the most current data.
The Poverty Index will be updated with the 2007-8 data and analyzed to see if it changes any of the specific school sites mentioned in the Allocation recommendation.
- What are the implications/obligations implied in terms of supporting sites whose **21st CCLC grants** will be expiring? Do we want to encourage or discourage people from seeking these

types of grants due to its time limited nature and lack of resources to sustain it once the grant ends?

- What are the **parameters for how the existing dollars are spent** at SUN Community School sites if a decision is made to reduce funding for the site?
At a minimum, a 1 FTE site manager will be funded within the allocation. This is considered a minimum core component of the program in order to leverage additional resources. The assumption is that sites with reduced funding will raise or leverage additional resources beyond the funding they will be receiving.
- Funders considered making a decision at this meeting around the Allocation recommendation #4 about **whether to reduce funding or close sites**.
Due to the need for some partners to consult with others impacted by this before making a decision, this decision was postponed.
- There were a few large gaps identified for core service of School-Based Case Management, **Homework Assistance and Summer Programming**. Specific to Homework Assistance, the minimum level of service identified was a ratio of 1:8, and there is a gap in resources for this level of staffing. It was brought up that the City of Portland, Multnomah County, and the Port of Portland provide employees with the option of devoting up to four hours a month to doing volunteer work focused on children. This resource could be tapped into in order to fill this gap. The City of Portland would be able to commit to encouraging employees to volunteer to fill this gap.
- If we don't have the ideal minimum level of services, we should consider how to increase **coordination opportunities** in order to fill the gaps.
- All partners need to be **committed to increasing system resources** in order to ensure that those school sites in the first quartile of the Poverty Index get funded. Otherwise, the highest poverty schools are still going to be left without school-based SUN Service System resources.

Next Steps

- On the County's end, the recommendations will be incorporated into the upcoming RFP for those services in the SUN Service System procured through the Department of County Human Services.
- The Board of County Commissioners will be briefed on these recommendations
- The funders gave a final nod of approval for these recommendations and agreed that it would be useful to convene as needed to discuss system issues.
- The Coordinating Council will consider the discussion points raised by the funders at this session and create a plan and timeline for addressing them.