

Early Learning Hub of Linn, Benton and Lincoln Counties Governing Board Funding Committee Meeting

MEETING COMMENCED	1:00pm, June 14, 2016 Newport Public Library, Newport
MEETING CALLED BY	Kristi May
WORK GROUP MEMBERS PRESENT	Bettina Schempf, Paul Smith, Rebecca Cohen, Jennifer Moore
VERSION	Final

Agenda topics

DISCUSSION ITEM	Welcome and Introduction to Collective Impact Funding
	We need to create a policy so that we can avoid the RFA process and handle funding challenges with a set plan of attack.
	How do we fund efficiently?
	The process we would like to see is to have the various work groups review the funding requests and decide who could provide the work needed to move our metrics. Then the work group could make a recommendation to the Governing Board about how the funding should be spent.
	We have a lot of funds to put out, and using collective impact is the most desirable method—and the one that the State wants us to use.
	We brought together the Funding & Resources Work Group and the Fiscal Oversight Committee and got their input to create a spreadsheet for reviewing funding requests. Allows us to determine what kind of funding--core, responsive, innovative—and then on to funding streams, etc.
	Do we want the work groups to make recommendations? The work groups are on the front-line in that particular sector and can help us to identify what work needs to be done and what groups can help us to make it happen. They become the work horses for us.
	Some of the solutions still won't be identified because they are not at the table. Do we have any other ways of identifying issues and agencies that aren't participating?
	Could we create a survey for each work group asking them what issues they are most concerned about?
	Part of the issue is accountability following the disbursement: reporting is time-consuming and some agencies don't have the capacity to do the reporting.
	We have to tie some outcome to the dollars. We would like to help the agencies get more efficient and knowledgeable, but we are limited by the requirements of the State as to how much leeway we can give the small agencies.
	What about "capacity grants"? Everyone gets at least a baseline to offset their operating costs, and then the "working dollars" are divided up according to another formula.
	Coordination Funds are the only ones that would allow us to spend them getting our partners up to speed and move our metrics: program participation, participation from different sectors, etc.
	In the Procurement Policy, the procurement of goods is strictly Linn-Benton Community College policy; however, the procurement of services is entirely up the Hub with the exception of the fact that some of these funds are reimbursable, and that cannot be changed. Back-up documentation is also required to have the same standard as the Federal and State policies. Can't be changed.
	Linn-Benton Community College has given us a lot of leeway because they have never dealt with an agency like us before.
	We have given funded agencies the option of reporting monthly or quarterly. Small agencies need their funding sooner, and monthly might be of big help to them.

Do we maybe have the Governing Board review the needs of our region again and reinvestigate what areas are “flaming red” and desperately need help?
We can’t do anything about the “back end” and what the state and feds are making us to for reporting, but we can review our “front end” and how to distribute and fund the small agencies in our area.
There is no hard-and-fast coordination number. Shared referrals are a goal, but there is no way to report it.
Sometimes there is a stated outcome, but more good work is being done and it is not measureable by the State.
We are looking at VistaLogic with our Family Connections project and it addresses the HIPPA and FERPA issues. 211 will also use it, and we will be able to link in to other agencies who also use 211.
We want to track admission to kindergarten, but the State is fighting how we get that data.
Does this group need to give more structure to having the work groups’ supply funding recommendations?

DISCUSSION ITEM	Metrics
You have to put out money in order to get money.	
We want to have quality assurance and quality improvement.	
Also the State’s insistence on “innovation” minimizes the work that has been going on for the last twenty years AND WORKS.	
Core funding are activities written into the Work Plan and the Strategic Plan	
Responsive funding is intended for needs that arise in the community, and can be used as needed. We set aside Coordination funds for this purpose	
Innovative funding is intended for projects that are new thinking and help us move the needle on the metrics	
Coordination Funds are contracted monthly allocations from the State for the everyday funding of the Hub.	
“Find them and fund them” should be our creed.	
Is there a potential for co-funding with another funder (such as United Way)?	
Review of current Procurement Policy:	
Exceptions to a competitive process, we will use a non-competitive process. (Move L to A) (Wordsmith A)	
If we are not able to serve the needs of the Hub, or find an adequate vendor, then we will go to a competitive RFA process.	
For Emergency funding, maybe elaborate a little bit that these funds are to be used at the discretion of the Hub Coordinator to help in the event of an emergency.	
Wordsmith V – remove last two sentences? Funds can’t be awarded at those meetings – leave that.	
Add Responsive Funding section.	

DISCUSSION ITEM	Next Meeting
Will be held remotely, and will send out emails to establish a date and time.	

NEXT MEETING	TBD
MEETING ADJOURNED	3:00pm