

## **SUN Service System Coordinating Council Resource Workgroup Meeting Notes**

January 23, 2009  
9:00 – 10:30 a.m.

### **Present**

---

Joanne Fuller, Krista Larson, Barbara Kienle, Lisa Turpel, Willie Poinsette, Peggy Samolinski, Diana Hall, Lori Kenney

### **Grant Policy Recommendations and Agreements**

---

As Lorenzo was out of town, Diana set forth our goals: 1) to review the draft policy recommendations developed at the last meeting, 2) to discuss budget considerations and identify preliminary ideas for how to address them.

The group discussed grant policy recommendations and decided to make a general agreement to share plans for grant applications and placement of sites but this should not be policy because of fair trade restrictions. This agreement is in alignment with the partner commitments that the Sponsors adopted last fall. The following general agreements and grant policy recommendations were identified in this session:

#### *Draft General Agreements:*

- *In the spirit of partnership, we (particularly providers/contractors) will inform one another and the Coordinating Council about proposed grants and discuss and coordinate as best we can our plans for grant applications and placement of sites.*
- *As much as possible, our policy and action around grants will be tied to our shared collaborative/community goals.*

#### *Draft Grant Policy Recommendations:*

- ❖ *We see value in pursuing grants/resources that last from 3-5 years.*
- ❖ *The Allocation Methodology developed by the Coordinating Council, along with the poverty index, will determine allocation decisions – including which schools to include in grants as well which to cut if we have to reduce the System.*
- ❖ *If partners are writing grants for SUN Community Schools, they must commit to fully using the SUN CS model in order to use the SUN name.*
- ❖ *For grants that meet the allocation criteria, the System will assist in addressing sustainability issues upon expiration, as budget considerations allow.*
- ❖ *The System will attempt to provide gradual phasing out of expiring grants, rather than an abrupt cut (allowing the school community time/opportunity to raise the funds themselves).*

#### *Next Steps:*

- *Discuss these recommendations with the full Resource Group on Feb. 13th*

### **Anticipated Budget Shortfalls**

---

Members discussed the anticipated cuts and shortfalls on a working document and how to address them:

- Joanne said the County anticipates 12% cuts for all departments; however the Chair will not necessarily settle on equal cuts across the board and may choose to add back to departments. She does not foresee cuts from the County to community school sites. At the State level, there are a number of cuts proposed that will have a significant impact on the community. Currently, the areas expected to take the biggest cuts are as follows: drug and alcohol services for adults will lose nearly all their funding; long term care for senior services; mental health.
- While the City may be making some mid-year cuts, Lisa said she did not anticipate any additional Parks cuts that would impact SUN CS. Lisa said it was a good idea to advocate for Parks sites.
- We will lose five full sites plus some partial losses, if we do not receive any additional funding.
- Would we cut a school at the lower end of the poverty list to fund Whitman?
- The Mayor's interest in supporting 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> graders/middle school could help MLC.
- The education portion of the American Recovery Act may offer some assistance; however, much of that is for infrastructure. A total of 13 million is earmarked for Title 1.
- There is a significant amount of funding available through CHIF for full service programming. This is a perfect fit for our community schools model. The amount is large enough to fund 16 sites at the current ~\$95,000/site level.
- Marshall could apply for either CHIF or 21CCLC. Another option is if some funds could be freed up at the district level for programming at other SUN Community Schools; there might be enough funding for Marshall.
- CHIF has increased overhead to 15% (from 5%)
- The top amount SUN CS could apply for is \$515,000
- Peggy has set a meeting for next Wednesday to discuss grant applications with partners and to determine how we should move forward with grant applications.
- We need to find out from Lisa P. whether the County could apply for the funding, and pass it directly on to the provider.
- Members said they believe an agency needs the school's endorsement to apply for a grant for a school. Our hope is that agencies will talk to the schools about intent to apply and the districts will discuss that with Council.
- Currently, a school like Rosa Parks doesn't use the SUN branding as it doesn't use the full model, and it contracts with a non-SUN provider as the lead agency. The reason to closely monitor use of the SUN branding is to avoid expectations that SUN would be responsible to pick that school up once funding ran out. Group members were interested in pursuing how we could change this policy to accommodate "SUN affiliates" so schools could take on the best parts of the model without assuming the County has liability to sustain them. One possibility is to develop clear expectations for affiliates along with a financial commitment to the County for a portion of overhead.
- Encourage Centennial and Reynolds to apply for grants to cover Harold Oliver and Glenfair.

#### *Actions Needed Now:*

- *Be prepared to talk broadly about the magnitude of the potential loss (number of sites) with funders and elected officials.*
- *Talk with CHIF to advocate for alignment with SUN including participation on the Council and consideration of existing effective practices within their funding decision process. Council members to do outreach to Allocation Committee members individually.*

#### **Next Meetings**

---

**Friday, February 13, 2009**  
**8:30-10:00 a.m.**  
**Multnomah Building**  
**Room 625**

