

Funders Group Meeting Summary

January 12, 2010

3 – 5pm

Funders Group Members Present:		Funders Group members absent:
Jason Johnson Emily Leslie Sara Levin Jackie MacLean David Okimoto	Bill Rumpf Arthur Sullivan Tom Tierney David Wertheimer	

Funders Group Representatives/Staff Present:		
Joseph Adriano Bill Block Gretchen Bruce Lisa Cipollone-Wolters	Laird Heia Cheryl Markham Katie Miller Linda Peterson	Sola Plumacher Kate Speltz Debbi Thiele Kristin Winkle

Welcome and Updates

Jackie MacLean, Chairperson of the CEH Funders Group opened the meeting, reviewed the agenda and asked for updates.

Bill Block announced that the CEH Governing Board meeting is scheduled for January 27, 2010. Updated workplans are needed and also be prepared to report out at the Governing Board meeting.

On the workplans please include answers to these additional questions:

1. What accomplishment are you proudest of and why?
2. What is the largest barrier you are facing to get the work done?
3. What can the Governing Board do to assist?

The IAC recommended a systems change symposium with the Governing Board as sponsors to take place this summer. Systems change could include issues such as Youth, Jails, WDC.

Discussion:

What is the desired outcome? Can this group take on the challenges that are raised? Do we have the resources?

The purpose is to look at systems improvement mentioned in the 10 Year Plan that haven't happened yet.

Membership

There was a discussion about whether Building Changes should be offered a seat at the Funders Group table. Originally Building Changes was seen as part of the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation work and not necessary to include separately. However, now that BC is "unbundled" from Gates they are interested in participating and it is believed they have approximately \$1 million to contribute to the funding pool.

Discussion:

David Wertheimer agrees it's a good idea. In 2009 BC became the administrator of the largest segment of Gates Funding as its own entity.

The biggest concern funders had was the lack of priority and funding cycle alignment and there was considerable discussion about working with them to line up their funding deadlines and priorities with the Combined NOFA. Funders acknowledged it will be a challenge for them and we wouldn't expect it to happen overnight.

Jackie will discuss the importance of the alignment and expectations of the funders group with Alice Shobe at BC. Despite the concerns funders agreed that it would be good to have them as a participant at the table.

Funding Expirations Data Presentation

Cheryl Markham, on behalf of the Funding Expiration sub-group, reviewed the data tables that were developed. To begin, she walked through the funding source and projects pages and explained the definitions for each column.

Fund Source Page Discussion:

- Determine if cuts to Mental Health need to be included.
- Add a “total annual amount” to the fund source table.
- WFF is not included but should be.
- Add Rapid Re-housing Stimulus Funds.
- Applicable prevention and employment dollars should be included (and are currently included).

Overall Discussion:

We are unlikely to get new money but can probably maintain existing programs through current award end dates. We need to evaluate current programs to be sure we continue those that are functioning well.

This work ties in with the mid-course status of the 10 Year plan and should tie in with the overall strategies of the 10 Year Plan.

Having the data gathered in this way allows us to sort the data and then evaluate priorities and strategies in relation to the data.

The next step is to determine priorities. DSHS, Workforce Development and the Funders Group/IAC each developed priority analysis documents. All can be looked at for reference.

At the March FG meeting we should start the process of identifying priorities. This provides good timing with the spring funding decisions.

The Funding Expiration Sub Team will provide a complete version of this table by the February 8, 2010 Funders Group meeting. Also include a variety of slices in which to review the data, such as project type, fund source and expiration starting with those expiring first; and renewal year.

Send out the list of projects and categories to the IAC for their feedback.

Workplan Report – Coordinated Entry for Families – Proposed Program Design

Debbi Knowles provided an update on the proposed program design for coordinated entry for families. The key components of the proposed centralized system include:

- Defined point(s) of entry into the system, using regional hubs linked to the places at-risk and homeless families seeking help regularly go for assistance.
- Development and use of standardized, strengths-based, culturally appropriate screening and assessment protocols and tools by designated staff specifically trained in the intake process.
- Consistent coordination among providers and systems for services and referrals.
- Common HMIS system for streamlines service delivery, tracking and evaluation.
- Streamline systems to identify real-time availability of housing and services, and assist families in securing the appropriate services and housing matched to specific family needs as quickly as possible.
- Ability to divert families from homelessness.
- Coordination with other initiatives such as prevention efforts, rapid re-housing, tailored programs/services and linkages to economic opportunities.

Progress:

Currently the team is piloting a common screening tool and coordinated referral process within the family homeless system to select households for several newly funded rapid re-housing programs and a separate high need project. Similarly, a coordinated screening and referral system is being implemented for select homeless prevention programs in Seattle and King County.

Timeline:

- Third/Fourth Quarter 2009: Developed and implemented a common screening tool and referral process for several selected programs. Convened Coordinated Entry and Assessment Work Group and developed the proposed system design.
- First Quarter 2010: Resolve pending elements; refine screening and triage tools; and develop governance structure. On-going engagement with funders and providers on proposed system.
- Second Quarter 2010: Review and finalize budget, staffing, and evaluation. Identify resources. Conduct selection process for sites/staff. Continue stakeholder meetings on system implementation.
- Third Quarter 2010: Develop program policies and procedures. Develop memoranda of understanding with funders and providers; begin cataloguing housing and services for inclusion in the system.

- Fourth Quarter 2010: Contracting with sites/staff. Complete cataloging of programs. Finalize MOU's with funders and providers.
- First Quarter 2011: Roll out phase.

Discussion:

We have researched all best practices nationwide. This plan is somewhat of a hybrid of Cook and Hennepin County.

PeoplePoint, AssetBuilding/Benefits Portal Link (DSHS) could be considered for ways to connect.

Hearth Act

Kate Speltz, DCHS, discussed the pending new regulations to the HEARTH Act. New regulations were intended to be distributed in November but as yet, have not been received. Kate and Eileen Denham, City of Seattle, will be pulling together local focus groups to ask for input on the responses received to the draft regulations and in May 2010, the final HUD regulations will be released. These new regulations will go into effect in 2011.

Background: HUD's Homeless Assistance Grants are distributed in two ways. HUD allocates a share for the Emergency Shelter Grants (ESG) program which is distributed by formula to cities, counties and states. Funding that is not allocated for the ESG formula is made available through a nationwide continuum of Care (CoC) competition. The competition gives priority to renewals of existing projects. Funds that are left over are used to fund new projects.

The HEARTH Act increases funding for several activities:

- Funding for ESG would more than double from 8 percent to 20 percent of the program
- Funding for programs serving rural areas would rise.
- For the first time, communities would be eligible to receive 3-6 percent of their program funding for planning, monitoring and oversight. Seattle and King County staff has filled this role and haven't used funding for administrative costs thus far.

Within the new regulations, there is a new standard for High Performing Communities which will allow the recipient additional dollars and flexibility in how to use those dollars. However, this is a very high standard and Kate feels it will take King County a few years to reach that level.

HMIS

David Okimoto, UWKC, reported that the Sponsoring Partners/HMIS meeting is scheduled for February 1, 2010. The Sponsoring Partners want the agencies to drive the agenda and will be requesting questions with the invitation.

Transitions

How do we facilitate the transitions with the new elected leadership within the county?

Recommendations include providing cross government gatherings and discussions/presentations to city councils.

Bill Block offered to present an update on the 10 Year Plan to city councils.

Develop region specific, detailed one pagers about the issues affecting different regions within the county to encourage ownership in these areas when presenting around the county.

As the 10 Year plan is halfway through, it presents a good opportunity to "re-brand" it – which again, provides an opportunity for renewed ownership with new leadership.

Dave Wertheimer encouraged Bill to talk with Mark Courtney with "Partners for Our Children" (UW) to review the work they are doing in the area of homeless youth prevention. David will make the connection.

Submitted by Laird Heia, CEH Staff