

SUN Service System Coordinating Council
Partner Commitments, Grant Guidelines and Allocation Methodologies
FINAL DRAFT June 5, 2009

This document contains the following information:

General Commitments

- Commitments and Benefits of Mutually Responsible Coordinating Council Partners

Related to School-Based Services

- SUN Community School Grant Guidelines/Agreements
- Allocation Methodology for School-Based Services/ SUN Community Schools
- Implications of the Grant Guidelines

Related to School-Linked Services

- Allocation Methodology for School-Linked Services

Commitments and Benefits of Mutually Responsible Coordinating Council Sponsors

Adopted by the SUN Service System Sponsors on October 21, 2008

The SUN Service System collaboration is rooted in partners' mutual commitment to responsibility, values, strategies and funding for our community's children and families.

Commitments Required of Sponsors for Mutual Responsibility

- Invest in Portland/Multnomah County kids and families through active involvement and linkage to the SUNSS by:
 - Sharing decision making amongst all Sponsors
 - Contributing money to sustain and grow the SUNSS
- Align all child and family service systems from Sponsors and other partners (County and non-County)
- Represent the SUNSS in a manner consistent with all protocols and agreements
- Dedicate sufficient staff time to improve the SUNSS (system coordination, program and contract oversight, program delivery and supervision, etc.)
- Develop and build professional expertise among Sponsors and partners
- Communicate fully on all decisions and activities that directly affect the kids and families of the SUNSS, including financial implications of the system of care model; changes in funding, allocation and program design; and resource development
- Build the body of knowledge and best practices such as out-of-school-hours academic support, family success, anti-poverty service delivery, etc.
- Subscribe to a set of aligned performance measures and data collection processes
- Share data to better identify participants (i.e. clients) in common and measure evaluation outcomes
- Actively champion the SUNSS, cultivating new Sponsors/Funders
- Acknowledge relationship of Sponsor to the SUNSS by including the official SUNSS logo in all print and electronic publications, at all relevant presentations, and on other materials and signage

“(Sponsor Name) is a proud partner of the SUN Service System.”
(insert SUNSS logo)

Benefits for Mutually Responsible Sponsors

OUTREACH & ACCESS

- Broadens outreach to historically under-served communities
- Simplifies and speeds access for participants (i.e. clients)
- Serves people in their own neighborhoods, saving on urban infrastructure costs and aligning with the “15-minute community” concept for which the City of Portland advocates. The 15-minute community concept assumes that most community services are within a 15-minute walk or bike ride from home
- Makes better use of neighborhood-based public facilities

RESULTS & MISSION ATTAINMENT

- Each agency can claim the success of the whole SUNSS, increasing results of each agency
- Achieves better outcomes and serves more kids and families
- Focuses on prevention rather than remediation - addressing issues on less costly end of the service delivery continuum
- Frees up resources for partners and others to focus treatment on a smaller segment, for which third party reimbursements are possible
- Increases productivity of workers of each agency, since they can truly focus on what each does best
- Coordinates resource allocation resulting in cost efficiencies, unnecessary duplication or reductions and increased system capacity
- Helps partners achieve their individual core mission and goals including strengthening healthy communities, poverty reduction and academic success

PUBLIC OPINION

- Strengthens public goodwill
- Builds a sense of community so that the participants help to sustain and advocate for it
- Declares and demonstrates that all community’s kids and their families are the responsibility of all partners

SYSTEM INTEGRATION

- Links programs and services across agencies and jurisdictions
- Provides a multi-jurisdictional and intra-agency strategic approach to delivering services to those who have the greatest need
- Increases opportunities for attracting revenue diversity and long-term sustainability

SUN Community School Grant Guidelines/Agreements

Adopted by the SUN Service System Coordinating Council on March 20, 2009

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 areas 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).

Implications of Grant Guidelines and Recommendations

1. SUN Service System partners are committed to allocate resources based on poverty. This means that schools in the first two quartiles of the Poverty Index would be prioritized for grant applications.
2. Existing community schools in the first two quartiles will receive priority support from the partners (100% funding, assistance with sustainability, priority if cuts are made, etc.).
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. System partners are making a commitment to assist with sustainability for any grant-funded sites that are in accord with the Allocation Methodology (any that fall in the 1st or 2nd quartile of the Poverty Index. There is no commitment to assist grant-funded sites that fall in the 3rd or 4th quartile.
5. If lower-poverty (3rd and 4th quartile) school sites are chosen for SUN CS funding, the Council is recommending that funding should be at a level consistent with the SUN Service System Allocation Methodology (i.e. 75%).

Allocation Methodology for School-Based Services/ SUN Community Schools

Adopted by the SUN Service System Sponsors on December 7, 2007

This section describes the ongoing methodology for allocation of resources for school-based services within the SUN Service System, particularly SUN Community Schools. This information is distilled from the Allocation Methodology recommendations adopted by SUN Service System Sponsors and partners in 2007.

GENERAL SYSTEM ALLOCATION PRINCIPLES

1. Allocate resources based primarily on poverty.
2. Assure a base level of service geographically spread across the county for both school-based and school-linked services.

SUN COMMUNITY SCHOOLS & OTHER SCHOOL-BASED SERVICES

1. Allocate a base level of resources in all high school catchments where the high school is in the top three quartiles for poverty using the Poverty Index (See attached 2008/2009 Poverty Index).
 - For SUN Community Schools (SUN CS): Allocate a base of 1 SUN CS site in each of the qualifying high school catchments.
2. Minimize SUN CS site changes between high poverty SUN CS sites within catchment areas.
3. Shift resources from sites with relatively lower poverty rankings. Funders, in consultation with affected partners including school districts and schools, shall decide whether to relocate or reduce funding for a site, and where to apply saved resources or relocate services.
4. If any schools in which the SUN CS program is operating are closed by the school district, or if new schools are opened by the school district, the SUN SS Coordinating Council will discuss the impact of these changes on the SUN Service System in consultation with funders and partners affected by the change, and make recommendations for relocation of SUN CS services if necessary.
5. Add new SUN CS sites with saved or new resources using the Poverty Index, with priority to schools in the top quartile of the Index. Decisions should be made using the most current poverty information available.
6. If schools ranked in the 3rd and 4th quartiles in excess of the 1 "base" site are funded, they should be funded at a reduced rate of 75% of the current SUN CS funding level.
7. The Council and funders who have contracted for provision of SUN CS services should review allocation of contracted resources three years after the initial funding in light of the most current Poverty Index rankings and consider adjustments in per site funding and location of services if necessary.

Allocation Methodology for School-Linked Services

Adopted by the SUN Service System Sponsors on December 7, 2007

This section describes the ongoing methodology for allocation of resources for school-linked services within the SUN Service System, particularly those funds that are managed by Multnomah County on behalf of the System partners. This information is distilled from the Allocation Methodology recommendations adopted by SUN Service System Sponsors in 2007 for use by the Department of County Human Services in its RFP process.

GENERAL SYSTEM ALLOCATION PRINCIPLES

1. Allocate resources based primarily on poverty.
2. Assure a base level of service geographically spread across the county for both school-based and school-linked services.

ANTI-POVERTY SERVICES

33% of total anti-poverty funding is allocated to Target Outreach Populations, which are countywide.

1. Allocate 100% of the funds remaining after 33% of the total anti-poverty funding is allocated to Target Outreach Populations to serve families in poverty with related children.
2. Use updated Census projection numbers to compute the percentage of families in poverty with related children for each region to determine allocations.

SOCIAL & SUPPORT SERVICES FOR EDUCATIONAL SUCCESS

1. For Regional SSSES, allocate funds based on the percentage of the target population living in a region.
 - Use the projection data developed in connection with the recommendation for allocation of anti-poverty funds, calculate the number of poor 6-18 year olds in the county, and in each region at a given point in time. Calculate the percentage of the entire population of poor 6-18 year olds that resides in each region.
 - Allocate funds for each region based on percentage of the total poor 6-18 year olds in that region.
2. If the funding level for a region falls below a reasonable "base amount" to provide services, employ a different allocation method. One option would be to contract with fewer providers to offer services over a larger geographic area.

OTHER AREAS

1. Maintain current methodology for other countywide services (Sexual Minority Youth Services; Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drug Services, etc.) based on program specifications.
2. Gather or procure better and more accurate data on the portion of the county population that each cultural group makes up, and on the total number of members of each cultural group in the county.

Note: At the time of the development of the allocation methodology for School-Linked Services, the Council Allocation workgroup used the existing formulas that related to services for Target Outreach Populations. This included a 33% allocation of resources to TOP services and an allocation methodology that determined the amount of the 33% to be allocated to each individual TOP population. These formulas were maintained at the time due to lack of more adequate data on TOP populations. As more data becomes available, the Council will review whether methodology changes are needed.