

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

March 6, 2009  
8:30 – 10:30 a.m.

### **Present**

---

Joanne Fuller, Krista Larson, Lisa Turpel, Willie Poinsette, Bill Scott, Maxine Thompson, Peggy Samolinski, Diana Hall, Lori Kenney

### **Grant Guidelines and Recommendations**

---

Group members reviewed the revised Grant Guidelines, noting that the “Values and General Agreements” previously listed at the bottom were removed, given that the “Commitments Required of Sponsors for Mutual Responsibility” adopted by Sponsors last fall address those values. Members had the following input on the draft guidelines:

- We have always been trying to balance the Allocation Methodology with two other values: providing universal access and recognition that a site needs to be ready to undertake the process of becoming a community school.
- The economic environment may be impacting certain locales more heavily. In this light, do we need to look at things differently? What could be shifted in the system to address changing situations?
- DHS may be receiving more TANF funds and may not have room for all the workers in existing offices. Perhaps those workers could be located at SUN Community Schools experiencing great increases in need.
- Consider how we can attach prosperity efforts to move people into jobs to families through SUN Community Schools.

Joanne offered her take on the implications of the Grant Recommendations:

#### **Talking Points on Implications of Grant Guidelines and Recommendations**

1. We are committed to allocate resources based on poverty. This means that schools in the first two quartiles of the Poverty Index should be prioritized for grant applications.
2. Existing community schools in the first two quartiles will receive priority support from the partners.
3. Additional providers can participate as lead agencies for SUN Community Schools if they are chosen by the school district and meet expertise and capacity criteria. [An initial set of criteria have been developed by the County.]
4. The Coordinating Council is not responsible for sustainable funding for any grant-funded sites that are not in accord with the Allocation Methodology.
5. The only recommendation the Coordinating Council chooses to make regarding funding for existing low-poverty SUN CS sites is that if they are chosen for funding, the funding be at a level consistent with the SUN Service System Allocation Methodology.

#### **Recommendations for SUN Community School Guidelines:**

*The following guidelines, agreed to by the SUN Service System Coordinating Council, apply to partners applying for grants to fund a SUN Community School. These guidelines are designed to balance our values of directing public money to support the highest poverty while also moving toward our vision of “Every School a SUN School.” Within that context, we leave room for thoughtful discretion with the highest integrity.*

- ❖ *Partners will act based on our mutual commitment to shared responsibility, values, strategies and funding for our community's children and families.*
- ❖ *The Allocation Methodology developed by the Coordinating Council, along with the poverty index, will guide allocation decisions – including which schools to include in grants.*
- ❖ *If partners are writing grants for SUN Community Schools, they must commit to fully using the SUN CS model and meeting the criteria in order to use the SUN name.*
- ❖ *For grants that meet the allocation criteria, all partners in 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:*

- *At the March 20<sup>th</sup> Coordinating Council meeting, finalize Grant Guideline recommendations and implication talking points.*

### **Agency Budget Shortfalls and other Funding Considerations**

---

Participants offered the following information about their agencies' funding situations:

#### County:

- Parent Child Development Services (PCDS) is now "out of target" (not in the budget for next year).
- The Chair's budget will be released April 23<sup>rd</sup>. The Chair and the Board could choose to restore some of the cuts.
- Budget projections due out in May will likely not be very good. Cuts at this time are 1.3 million to the SUN Service System services contracted through the County.
- The Chair has announced that salaries and COLA's are frozen. AFSCME (the union representing many DCHS staff) is voting on whether to freeze as well, which will free up some funding. The union will advocate buying back programs that keeps union jobs. PCDS has only 1 union FTE so that will probably not be favored.
- Touchstone: cutting three FTE and a manager, which could be purchased back by AFSCME.
- Total DCHS FTE cuts: 25
- Joanne said she would like to hear from Council if they have a recommendation for a cut other than PCDS.

#### Parks:

- Commissioners in charge of bureaus and bureau directors will make budget presentations next week.
- The Parks budget will be presented March 16 and reflects 29 FTE in cuts (including 1 SUN CS site manager).
- Several of the Parks cuts (ethnic outreach services, disabilities) are not palatable to the Council.
- Opportunity for the Coordinating Council to weigh in at the public budget hearing on May 20 or 21.
- There is a roughly 35K cut in the budget to City pass through for SUN CS as well as the cut to one Parks-run SUN CS. Coordinating Council can advocate for no SUN cuts, but if it's a necessity, recommend that Parks cut lower poverty sites.
- Want to talk with Coordinating Council regarding advocacy at the individual level too.
- Since Schools Family Housing was funded with one time monies, it is at risk for being cut.

#### PPS

- Hoping they will not have to cut any school days this year.
- Are preparing two budgets for next year; one at 5% reduction, one at 10% reduction. The latter will result in significant personnel cuts.

- Superintendent's budget will be out in mid-March.

Participants offered the following general comments/input:

- Council representatives should be talking with CHIF in the next month to address the implications of our Grant Recommendations to help guide the Board in decision making. A meeting will be set up in April. As a group, we should determine what it is we are advocating for.
- The Resource Group sees Council's message to CHIF as follows: Council is neutral between funding new high poverty sites versus existing low poverty sites. If new sites are funded, we recommend looking at the poverty index to determine priorities.
- New anti-poverty funds will become available from United Way as well as stimulus monies. We should expand our conversations around the Allocation Methodology and use that framework to guide our actions as new money comes into the system.
- Does the Allocation Methodology as it now stands just address Community Schools or the entire SUN Service System? Council should revisit how the Allocation Methodology should be applied across the whole system. We should distill the Allocation Methodology to use as an overall system philosophy.
- A consistent strategy is needed to talk with funders at their budget hearings about both advocating for no cuts to SUN and for using the Allocation Methodology.
- Lisa T. asked for a specific recommendation from Council regarding Parks' proposed cut of a site.
- Now is the moment to advocate for shifting funding to highest poverty sites. First, we will advocate for no cuts; if cuts are necessary, we advocate making cuts consistent with the Allocation Methodology.
- Leaders Roundtable will meet on March 31. Since we have no specific action for Sponsors, Bill will just give a SUN report and outline the principles Council is following.
- The MOU Leadership Team met last week and talked about opportunities to address budget cuts that will impact one another, in the spirit of understanding all our interdependencies and possible impact.
- Joanne is planning to attend the March 19<sup>th</sup> Leadership Team meeting to answer any SUN questions.
- Another group should be formed to develop a funding model for "Every School a SUN School."

*Actions Needed Now:*

- *Council staff will distill the Allocation Methodology for Council review on March 20<sup>th</sup>*
- *A small representative group (Joanne, Lisa T., schools, provider) will meet to determine Council's message to take to a meeting of the CHIF Allocation Committee and will then meet with CHIF*
- *Staff will set an agenda item for Council to make a recommendation that Parks not make any SUN cuts. If cuts are inevitable, Council recommends they follow the Allocation Methodology and proceed with their proposed site cut*

## Council Staffing

---

Bill Scott prefaced this discussion by reminding the group that Chair Wheeler had asked Council Sponsors for a joint commitment to providing staffing when the Council began. Leaders Roundtable is interested in making a financial commitment toward staffing in next year's budget, provided membership dues are sufficient. Leaders Roundtable views this as part of their long-term strategy and role, so this is a very appropriate use of funds. They would like to contribute on an ongoing basis. Bill reiterated their interest in continuing the discussion about a shared responsibility model whereby all contribute. Since all Sponsors currently already contribute dues to the Roundtable, it would work well to increase their individual contributions for the staffing piece. Leaders Roundtable might take on the role down the road of collecting those contributions. Members had the following input:

- The County welcomes utilizing a model that helps partners feel it is not just the County.
- Consider whether having the Roundtable administer the contract might make it easier for partners to support.

- We need to determine the specific ask of partners and timing of that ask.
- Each partner's share would be relatively small.
- With the current budget picture and timing, asking districts for contributions this year seems unwise.

#### Agreement and Next Steps:

- For next year, attempt to find adequate resources for staffing through the County, Leaders Roundtable, and the City.
- Joanne will talk with Chair Wheeler about approaching the City regarding a potential contribution for this year.
- Discuss whether the Roundtable might "own" the contract in future years and facilitate getting increased contributions from partners.

## Grant Applications

---

Group members shared information on grants that have been (or are in the process of being) written:

- Parks did not submit a CHIF grant application for Teen Services.
- Lisa Pellegrino reported they have received many applications:
  - 45 after school
  - 20 mentoring
  - 28 early childhood
  - 26 child abuse
  - Foster care applications are due next week

The following is what is currently known about schools and districts that are writing for the grants to create SUN Community Schools:

School	CHIF	21CCLC	Other
Marshall (21CCLC existing)	X	possibly	County program offer
Harold Oliver Primary (21CCLC existing)	X	No	County program offer
Glenfair (21CCLC existing)	X	No	
Jackson (CHIF existing)	X		
Sellwood (CHIF existing)	X		
Beverly Cleary (CHIF existing)	X		
Whitman (CHIF existing)	X		
PPS: Scott, Lee, Peninsula	X		
PPS: Scott, Peninsula, Humboldt		X	
David Douglas: 3 grants, each with multiple high poverty schools	X		
Reynolds High		possibly	
Gresham High		possibly	

## Next Meeting

---

None scheduled