

3 – Communities of Opportunity - Governance Group Minutes

Friday, July 20, 2018 1:30 pm – 4:00 pm

Location: Seattle Foundation, Board Room

Members Present: Sili Savusa, Tony To, Marguerite Ro, Lydia Assesfa-Dawson, Michael Brown, Marty Jackson, Jenn Ramirez Robson, **On Phone:** Nate Smith, Alison Mendiola, Gordon McHenry Jr

COO Staff: Andrea Akita, Cristiana Gonzalez, Kai Domingo, Alice Ito, Amanda Kay, Kirsten Wysen, Kim Tippens, Alena Sorensen, Blishda Lacet, Aaron Robertson, Cheryl Markham, Jan Capps, Diana Parades **On Phone:** Sharon Bogan

Consent Agenda: Governance Group (GG) approved the July 20th, 2018 consent agenda which included meeting minutes from June 15th, 2018.

Learning Community Request for Applications (RFA)

Kalayaan and Jan presented information for the proposed Learning Community RFA.

The Learning Community is an opportunity to:

- Strengthen and support communities in King County to reach and sustain the aims of COO.
- Work with Community to shape the types of learning activity and capacity building offerings.
- Test components and models for building capacity and shared learning
- Support organizations and community-based partnerships in the County working towards more equitable outcomes.
- Build stronger regional relationships with other partnerships, initiatives and communities conducting similar work;
- Provide leadership in building capacity, knowledge, and solidarity for reaching collective goals

COO conducted conversations with community based/culturally based organizations and COO partners, including 9 local, community-based groups that provide capacity building in a very different way. Needs identified by these groups informed the writing of the RFA. The overarching idea was to work with consultants in a collaborative way, as opposed to the normative government approach.

During the discussion, the Governance Group voiced concern that managing the relationships may be challenging, given the number of consultants. They recommended that staff define these relationships and consider who the consultants would be accountable to, and how can they will have ability and agency to operate. A suggestion was made that an organizational chart would be helpful. There was also a request for seeing how these components fit within the overall budget.

Points were raised that we are learning and prototyping models, and we we need to take a little risk. Everyone agreed to not hold the process up, but that Marty, Nate, Lydia and staff would work to with staff to review the RFA prior to its release.

Backbone / Implementation Funding ([Slide deck](#) link), Presented by Andrea

Both Sili Savusa of the White Center CDA and Tony To of HomeSight recused themselves from the discussion.

At the end of the calendar year, the lead organizations and their implementation partners in the Rainier Valley, White Center and Seatac/Tukwila will complete the activities and deliverables in the current phase of COO backbone and implementation work.

As staff prepares for the next phase of implementation work, we seek feedback and direction from the Governance Group on the proposed process for 2019-2020 backbone and implementation funding for these partnerships.

For our discussion, please consider the following questions:

- What additional information will be helpful for you to make decisions on the proposed funding process?
- What criteria should be considered for determining the amount of funding available for each of the three original place-based partnerships?
- Would you like to participate on group to review proposals and make recommendations to the Governance Group?

Discussion:

- Governance Group would like to hear more about what has occurred in each placed based partnerships over time. The importance of quantitative and qualitative information was stressed and the ability to use personal stories to highlight accomplishments are useful. GG is interested in understanding the partnerships' goals, their successes and their challenges.
- What does equity in funding look like for all nine Place Based Sites, plus the Institutional Systems and Policy Change grants? There needs to be a sense of the vision for each strategy and their relationship to one another as we look at the entirety of the BSK Levy (2022).
- There are advantages to setting the funding amounts. Criteria needs to be able to measure the health of the partnerships. There was recognition that, healthy doesn't necessarily mean everyone is getting along, but collaboration is happening.
- The partnership is operating within an environment where they are trying to change conditions; the backbone or "glue" funding resources is important. In the COO model that has been built, we are collectively trying to do this in a different way and over time, which takes time to build trust and relationships, especially since we are dealing with communities that are historically under resourced.
- The evaluation process will help get a handle on a baseline and measures for outcomes, but this doesn't define all of the outcomes that we have for COO. We need markers to evaluate what has been accomplished, and what work is still ongoing. It would not be fair to evaluate the current work based on the new criteria that is being developed. We need to careful that we are not imposing unrealistic expectations and outcomes to work that has been done over past funding cycles.

There was not adequate time for a full discussion at the meeting. So, the Governance Group will continue the conversation at the next meeting.

Adjourn 4:18 pm