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Introduction & Context

In the fall of 2010, three funders serving Washtenaw County (United Way of Washtenaw County, The Ann Arbor Area Community Funder, and the Office of Community and Economic Development) signed a Memorandum of Understanding to design and pilot a new grantmaking model called Coordinated Funding (CoFu). The Coordinated Funding model built upon earlier efficiencies within the Office of Community and Economic Development (OCED) where their Integrated Funding Model streamlined grantmaking from the City of Ann Arbor, Washtenaw County, and Washtenaw Urban County in 2008.

For the funding partners, Coordinated Funding was an opportunity to lead by example and maximize their impact in Washtenaw County. The goals for the model are to:

- Understand the full landscape of needs and distribute resources more strategically;
- Model the collaboration the participating funders espouse from funded agencies;
- Leverage each other’s funding and resources;
- Reduce or eliminate redundancies and streamline processes and procedures; and
- Better coordinate grant-making processes so funders can make better informed decisions together. ¹

A planning phase concluded in 2010, resulting in a model consisting of:

- Identification of six Priority Areas for funding (Aging, Early Childhood, Housing and Homelessness, Hunger Relief, Safety Net Health and Nutrition, and School-Aged Youth);
- Program operations funding tied to shared programmatic outcomes across the six Priority Areas;
- Identification and funding of a Planning and Coordinating Agency (P&CA) for each Priority Area to serve a leadership role in ensuring effective coordination and collaboration among nonprofits; and
- Capacity-building funding.

In early 2011 the Coordinated Funders issued an RFQ and an RFP for program operations funding to Washtenaw County health and services agencies and began the contracting process with the Planning and Coordinating Agencies. The RFP process for capacity building funding began in August 2011. Program operations funding was awarded in July 2011 as a two-year grant, and funding was extended an additional year in March 2013. The second funding cycle lasted from 2014-2016, and the third funding cycle is due to run from 2016-2018. Since its inception, CoFu has awarded $24.2 million in grants ($21.6 million in programmatic grants, $1 million in Capacity Building funding and $1.5 million to planning and coordinating) and has an additional $4.6 million committed for 2016-2018 programmatic funding, $135,000 for capacity-building funding and $265,000 for Sector Leader (formerly Planning and Coordinating Agency) funding.

Additional changes to the CoFu model since its inception include:

- The addition of two additional funding partners, RNR Funder2 and St. Joseph Mercy;
- Changes to the name, role, and lead organizations for Planning and Coordinating Agencies (now Sector Leaders);
- Shifts in Priority Areas (now called “Priority Areas”) where Nutrition is included as a part of Safety Net Health, and Early Childhood and School-Aged Youth are included under the Cradle to Career Initiative;
- Refinement of outcome areas; and
- Expansion of staffing roles for CoFu funders.

Since 2012, TCC Group (TCC) has worked with CoFu in an evaluative capacity in multiple ways. In 2013, TCC released an evaluation report covering findings emerging from the pilot phase. In 2015, TCC collected data related to the utility of CoFu funding outcomes and made recommendations. In 2016, TCC embarked on a logic model process with CoFu, developing an overarching logic model for CoFu and individual logic models for each Priority Area.

Also in 2016, TCC contracted with CoFu to conduct an outcomes evaluation of the initiative to date, with the goal of assessing the impact of CoFu on Washtenaw County. This report outlines the findings of the outcomes evaluation and provides recommendations to CoFu. The main evaluation questions guiding this engagement were:

1) To what extent is Coordinated Funding achieving the outcomes it desires?
   a. What changes have been seen among the funders?
   b. What changes have been seen among the nonprofit sector? To what extent are grant partners achieving the outcomes of interest? How does outcome achievement vary by Priority Area?
   c. What changes have been seen at the systemic level?

2) How well is CoFu operating? Is the current model able to achieve the goals of interest or should the model be adapted? What impact is the model itself having?

3) How, if at all, does CoFu need to adapt to ensure it is on track to achieve its goals?

---

2 RNR has twice served as the funder of evaluation work, including sponsoring this current evaluation.
4 CoFu has long articulated key community outcomes to guide its work, as described at https://coordinatedfunders.org/community-outcomes/ (retrieved 5/3/17). In addition to these community outcomes, they have articulated short- and long-term outcomes in their logic model. These outcomes are organized by those focused on CoFu funders, CoFu grantees (and the broader nonprofit sector) and the systems-level. Each set of outcomes is inter-related but has a unique perspective. This evaluation focused primarily on measuring the logic model outcomes, and secondarily on measuring the community outcomes.
CoFu currently has its goals organized into three main strands: those related to funders, those related to grant partners, and those related to the overall system or environment. To achieve all of these goals, CoFu uses the following strategies:

- Focusing funding on key outcomes across the five Priority Areas: Aging, Housing and Homelessness, Safety Net Health and Nutrition, School-Aged Youth, and Early Childhood;
- Funder coordination, including the sharing of issue and community information with each other, and with the broader nonprofit or philanthropic community (as relevant);
- Providing capacity-building funding and services for nonprofits; and
- Supporting Sector Leaders so they can play a coordinating role in each Priority Area, including leading thinking in each area, bringing in expertise, and helping funders understand the community context.

The explicit outcomes desired at the funder, grant partner, and system levels can be seen through the three strands of the logic model (Appendix G). Definitions corresponding to the logic models are also located in Appendix G.

Overall findings are organized by logic model layers (Funder, Grant Partner, and System) and across three categories: areas where evidence indicates activities are clearly working well, areas where there is mixed evidence of success, and areas where there is evidence that activities are not working as well. Logic model outcome boxes have been color-coded to illustrate progress: dark orange symbolizes outcomes that are completely or almost completely on track, a medium shade of orange is for outcomes that are somewhat on track, and light orange indicates outcomes that are not on track. Outcomes for which we were not able to conclusively assess the impact, or that were prevented from being addressed as a result of earlier outcomes not being attained, are in white. All outcomes have an alphanumeric code (which can be seen in the logic models). Throughout this report, findings have been tied back to specific boxes on the logic model using these codes.

Individual Priority Area and capacity-building findings can be found in Appendices A-F. Findings related to CoFu’s community-level impact are mainly embedded in the System section in addition to the Priority Area appendices.
Methodology and Limitations

TCC Group used a mixed-methods approach for this evaluation. This ensured we were able to collect different types of data to effectively triangulate information about what CoFu’s impact. Data sources included:

- **A grant partner survey.** A survey focused on perceptions of priority area achievement, CoFu as a model, and changes in the nonprofit sector was sent to all grant partners. It was completed by 52 grant partners, a response rate of 39 percent.

- **Focus groups and interviews.** TCC Group conducted a series of in-person and phone interviews in addition to focus groups. The groups interviewed included:
  - Grantees from each sector area, including capacity-building grantees
  - CoFu staff, representing director, management, and administrative levels
  - Non-CoFu affiliated funders
  - Sector Leaders

- **A review of grant report data.** TCC Group reviewed data from 2011 to 2016 to understand the outcomes grantees were reporting on having achieved, as well as what strategies they used, and the amount of funding received.

- **A review of externally available data.** TCC conducted research into the publicly-available data that could help inform progress towards community outcomes. Sources consulted included national databases such as the American Community Survey (ACS), Department of Housing and Urban Development’s (HUD) reports, Feeding America Survey, Kids Count, the Department of Health and Human Services Green Book, and local sources such as the Health Improvement Survey (HIP), Michigan Profile for Healthy Youth, Senior Exit Survey, MI School Data Washtenaw County’s 60+ Survey, Washtenaw County Cradle2Career and other county data, in addition to CoFu’s own data tracking sheets.

Limitations to the current methodology include:

- **A relatively low survey response rate.** Thirty-nine percent of organizations completed the survey, which may indicate that the data doesn’t precisely reflect the viewpoints of all grant partners.

- **Timing of focus groups.** TCC Group conducted its in-person focus groups the same week that grant reports were due. This led to some people being reluctant to participate, and some resentment that such a large time commitment was being asked of them during the same week that grant reports were due.

- **Lack of publicly-available data.** As noted in the next section, some community outcomes are more easily measured than others leading to a depth of understanding about what has changed that is not entirely consistent across the various Priority Areas.

- **Lack of data from program beneficiaries.** For multiple reasons discussed in the following section, the evaluation by design did not seek feedback from program beneficiaries.
Summary of Findings

Progress on Research Questions

Along with the guiding framework of multi-layer logic model, CoFu identified four key research questions. This section describes key findings and where to find additional information throughout the overall report.

1. As a result of Coordinated Funding, to what extent are people better off?

The evaluation drew upon two main resources to address this question - grant partner assessment of program quality and community-level data. An accurate answer for this question needs to be given at the Priority Area level, as the findings differ by Area. Table 1 highlights findings for each Priority Area regarding both program quality and community progress. Additional context can be found in the detailed report for each Priority Area. It should be noted that this chart does not intend to demonstrate a causal relationship between CoFu and any of the community-level data.

Table 1: Assessments of Program Quality and Community Progress by Priority Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Area</th>
<th>Program Quality Findings</th>
<th>Community Progress Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Housing and Homelessness | • 40% of survey respondents felt they increased their learning around how to better serve clients as a result of CoFu  
  • 80% of survey respondents felt they were better able to decrease the number of homeless people as a result of CoFu  
  • The Sector Leader is viewed as having good information on best practices | • Homeless count has decreased                    |
| Aging                | • 76% of survey respondents felt they were better able to increase or maintain independent living factors for vulnerable low-income adults over age 60 for as a result of CoFu  
  • Increased collaboration/sharing of best practices | • Increase in social support  
  • Steady poverty rate  
  • Some decreases in general life satisfaction |

TCC and CoFu discussed embedding this research question into the overall evaluation, but ultimately decided not to for several reasons, including: difficulty collecting data from program participants, the lack of ability to determine causation, the need for IRB approval, concerns about causing tensions in service delivery and the number of program recipients who would be able to speak to a longitudinal perspective.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Area</th>
<th>Program Quality Findings</th>
<th>Community Progress Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Early Childhood             | • 100% of survey respondents felt that, as a result of CoFu, they were better able to increase the developmental readiness of children with high needs so they can succeed in school at the time of entry  
• 100% of survey respondents felt like they were better able to serve clients as a result of CoFu  
• 66% of survey respondents felt CoFu increased service integration | • Increased participation in early childhood programming  
• Increased proportion of children meeting or exceeding socio-emotional expectations  
• Stagnant rate of childhood poverty |
| Safety Net Health and Nutrition | • Decreased perception of service integration as a result of CoFu  
• Increased collaboration and sharing of best practices | • Decreased percentage of uninsured  
• Increased percentage of low-income adults who reduced food intake due to cost  
• Stagnant percentage of people who have food security |
| School-Aged Youth            | • Increased engagement with best practices                                               | • Improved graduation rates (overall and low-income youth)  
• Slight increase in absenteeism  
• Slight increase in rates of abuse  
• Increased percentage of youth who report often feeling safe in school |

2. **To what extent could funded programs better measure the change occurring within participants’ lives?**

Evaluation findings indicate that funded programs vary in their ability to measure the change occurring within participants’ lives. Overall, grant partners were not always satisfied with the construction of programmatic outcomes and whether they were truly indicators of change. There are also specific challenges within certain sectors, such as whether it is realistic to measure progress/change versus maintenance of status (Aging) and lack of access to school department data (School-Aged Youth). Some Sector Leaders were better able to support grant partners in measuring change. Additional findings can be found in the individual Priority Area sections, as well as in the longer section covering progress on grant partner outcomes.
3. Are the community-level outcomes, strategies, and program outcomes currently identified the best indicators of population-level change for our respective Priority Areas?

Overall, grant partners and Sector Leaders have expressed some frustration regarding the community-level outcomes and program outcomes. Though there is some variation by Priority Area, the specific strategies are mainly on target, according to findings for each of the Areas. Grant partners were very eager to see needs assessment data for their Priority Areas, in order to better understand whether the current program and community outcomes were most relevant, but it is unclear if these needs assessments (which were tasked to Sector Leaders) have been completed. In the fall of 2015, TCC engaged in an assessment of the current program outcomes and their relevance/utility and the findings from that report are still relevant to address this question, as not all outcome revisions suggested in the program outcomes report occurred (and some occurred while data was being collected for this report).

4. As a result of coordinated funding, to what extent are recipient organizations of capacity-building interventions better off?

Overall, the capacity-building work funded by CoFu has been very successful for recipients. Recipients reported improvements in leadership (executive and board), in the discrete areas where they were funded to work, and in their ability to form a supportive network. Additional detail can be found in the System-Level Findings section and in Appendix F.

Progress on Funder Outcomes

CoFu is on track to achieving several of its stated outcomes. In the short-term, these include the funding partners having increased knowledge and awareness of how they are each supporting issue areas, and funders increasing their knowledge and awareness of community challenges. Outcomes achieved in the interim include CoFu being better equipped to identify and engage with other potential funding partners, CoFu funding partners being able to work together more effectively, as well as increased funder coordination on strategy, and funding for CoFu being maintained or increased. Long-term outcomes that are on track to being achieved persistence of the model regardless of specific players at the table, increased effectiveness of individual funder grantmaking, and work of individual funders being amplified.

Some funder outcomes were seen as somewhat on track. In the short-term, this included an outcome focused on increased ability to engage in rapid response to community challenges. In the interim-term, this included increased trust between funders and nonprofits. In the long-term, this included CoFu’s collaborative reputation being strengthened and recognized for operating effectively, and more equitable relationships between CoFu and grantees.
Progress on Grant Partner Outcomes

CoFu is on track to achieving a few stated grant partner outcomes. These include, in the interim, increasing nonprofit capacity in targeted areas, and in the long-term, increasing programmatic and organizational collaboration.

There are several outcomes that are seen as somewhat on track. In the short-term, these include: nonprofits having increased understanding of CoFu, its grants, its role in the system, and its benefits to nonprofits; nonprofits having an increased understanding of community trends and issues; and nonprofits having increased understanding of grantee-specific data. In the interim-term, these outcomes include nonprofits having increased understanding of performance and the strategic niche they are filling. In the long-term, these include nonprofits having an increased outcomes-orientation and increased functioning of grantees.

Several outcomes are seen to not be on track for success. In the interim-term, these include increased satisfaction with the grantmaking process and strengthened relationships with the CoFu funders. In the long-term, these include increased grantee advocacy for the CoFu model, increased effectiveness in monitoring and tracking, and increased understanding among nonprofits of their comparative effectiveness.

Progress on Systems Outcomes

One systems-level outcome was seen as on track in the interim term: participating nonprofits coalescing around priority outcomes.

Several others were seen as somewhat on track. In the short-term, these included: Sector Leaders being able to serve as leaders and drive and support nonprofit effectiveness, increased peer learning, increased collaboration on target outcomes and alignment of programs, increased ability to align programs with other similar efforts, and increased knowledge of gaps and duplicative work happening. In the long-term, these outcomes include increased efficacies of community programs.

For several outcomes that involved the broader nonprofit sector beyond CoFu’s grantees, there was not enough data to determine progress.
Findings on Funder Outcomes

Funder Outcomes: What is working well?

Participating funders are seeing improvements in their own organizational functioning (F1, F3, F13, F14). All participating funders have seen their own organizations improve as a direct result of participating in Coordinated Funding. Areas of improvement included:

- **Increased sector area knowledge.** All participating funders cited an increase in their understanding of the nonprofit sector — both generally and within specific sectors. CoFu was seen as opening up a space for conversation and peer learning that allowed for a deeper understanding of the nonprofit sector than funders had before, when they were operating with the perspective of only one organization.

- **Increased adaptive capacity.** Two organizations stated their adaptive capacity, including their ability to collect and learn from data, has improved at the organizational level because they understood, through CoFu, how funders can approach learning and data.

- **Improved grant systems.** One organization improved their grantmaking system from a paper system to an online system, resulting in efficiencies for this funder, and for potential and current grant partners.

- **A changed strategic perspective.** One organization noted how participating in CoFu led their organization to have an improved sense of “boldness and focus” as they became more clear about their strategic priorities and how they could pursue these priorities.

Funders perceive CoFu as helping them leverage and sustain funding (F6, F7, F12, F14). Having a commitment to CoFu was seen as helping the organizations involved sustain funding, even during transitions (e.g., staff transitions) that might have previously brought about a change in funding. This was especially true for the governmental agencies that can sometimes have less control over their funding. For these organizations in particular, having their name embedded in the CoFu model has allowed them to sustain funding during transitions and recessions, in a way that staff feel would not have been possible otherwise.

---

6 In this section, along with Findings on Grant Partner Outcomes and Findings on System Outcomes, we have tied specific findings to logic model boxes. For example a finding marked as F4 corresponds to logic model box F4 “CoFu collaborative better equipped to identify and engage other potential funding partners.”
CoFu is perceived to have a positive impact on elected officials (F4, F7). Multiple stakeholders felt that having CoFu in place has given elected officials a better understanding of issues in the health and human services sector and a stronger commitment to the maintenance of public funds for health and human services work. While elected officials may change over time, the way that CoFu can involve them in the process has allowed for opportunities for increased buy-in even during times of transition/turnover.

Funders are seen as having a high level of collaboration, across all levels of staff (F5). Across the board, staff from all funders felt there was a high level of collaboration. This was a shift from the earlier years of the model where staff were more separated by role and organization. Now, staff across organizations function well across roles, and there have been efforts to make roles more collaborative, so knowledge doesn’t sit with only one person. For example, when an in-person meeting takes place with a grant partner or potential grant partner, CoFu brings two staff people from different organizations. This has provided CoFu with the ability to weather some short-term transitions, a success they didn’t think would be possible even a year or two before.

CoFu is better able to introduce and integrate new funders and staff (F4, F5). Given that the model is still relatively consensus-based, there are some concerns about how easily the number of funders involved could increase. However, the recent addition of a new funding partner was seen to be relatively smooth, with other staff available to provide historical context as needed. This was seen as improvement from even two years ago when CoFu staff didn’t think they had the formal processes necessary to allow them to easily bring on a new funding partner.

Funder Outcomes: What has had mixed evidence of success?

There is limited evidence that CoFu has had an impact on the philanthropic field beyond participating funders. (F10) The funders we spoke to, who were not affiliated with CoFu, could not articulate an overall improvement that the initiative has brought to the philanthropic field, and CoFu funders themselves similarly did not mention any impacts that were more comprehensive in nature, although the funders have shared their model in different venues.

There is some uneasiness around the lack of clarity about funding decisions (F9, F10). Grant partners and Sector Leaders did not have a good understanding of how funding decisions were made, including overall dollars allocated to each sector as well as the dollar amounts allocated to grant partners. This finding has gotten somewhat worse since the previous evaluation, where grant partners had more of an opportunity to interact with funders regarding funding allocations.

There are concerns about the ability of the model to allow for rapid response (F2, F8, F11). While the funders were able to adjust to state-level cuts to mental health funding and incorporate mental health services under Safety Net Health during the latest funding cycle, the two year funding cycle does not yet allow for the ability to redirect funds for rapid response. The funders are likely able to address rapid response issues through their own non-CoFu funding, but this does not seem to be explicitly embedded in the CoFu model itself. This was raised as a concern, especially in the Safety Net Health Priority Area, where grant partners expressed concerns about changes to ACA and how it could impact their funded programs.
**Funder Outcomes: What is not working well?**

Grant partners reported a decreased relationship with funding partners (F9, F15). Contrary to the 2011 evaluation, when grant partners felt that the CoFu process improved their relationship with funders, grant partners now feel much less connection and trust with funders. Grant partners see the Sector Leaders as the intermediary between funders and grant partners, but this relationship is not necessarily ideal since Sector Leaders are not seen as a confidential broker. Without a trusting relationship, grant partners are experiencing more anxiety about reporting and how to handle challenges in outcome attainment.

Funder communications were not viewed as transparent and forthcoming (F9, F15). There have been several instances where grant partners and Sector Leaders have articulated challenges with perceptions of funder transparency. For example, in the recent changes to Sector Leaders, including the incorporation of Nutrition under Safety Net Health and the transition of the Aging Sector Leader, changes were not communicated in a way that was helpful for Sector Leaders to share with grant partners. Given that funders have less direct communications with grant partners than in the past, there is not as much of a basis of trust to build upon in these types of communications when coming directly from the funder.
Figure 1: Funder Outcomes Logic Model Coded by Outcome Achievement

**Coordination Funding Logic Model Layer 1: Funder Outcomes**

- **Inputs**
  - Funding Collaborative
    - Field/sector knowledge and experience
    - Human capital
    - Existing relationships with community stakeholders
    - Cross-sector convening power
    - Financial commitment
    - Willingness to reflect and refine strategy
    - Strong governance from trustees
  - Sector Leader Organizations
    - Knowledge and understanding of community needs and functioning
    - Relationships
    - Leadership and convening skills
  - Grant Partners
    - Knowledge of and ability to deliver services

- **Interventions**
  - Funding across shared outcomes
    - Focus: Five priority areas (aging, housing and homelessness, safety net health and nutrition, school-aged youth, early childhood)
    - Strategy: One application for funding from all CoFu funders, grantees apply according to specific pre-determined outcomes
  - Funder coordination
    - Sharing of issue and community information with each other and nonprofit community
  - Capacity building funding
    - Targeted funds available for capacity building support
  - Coordination of Priority Areas
    - Sector Leaders provide a link between funders and grant partners sharing their perspective with each side
    - Sector Leaders lead the priority-level thinking in each area
    - Community-level needs assessment

- **Short-term Outcomes (1-2 years)**
  - F1 Funders have increased knowledge and awareness of how other CoFu funders are supporting issue areas
    - Gaps
    - Relationship
    - Approach
  - F2 Increased ability to engage in rapid response to community challenges
  - F3 Funders have increased knowledge and awareness of community challenges

- **Interim Outcomes (3-6 years)**
  - F4 CoFu collaborative better equipped to identify and engage other potential funding partners
  - F5 CoFu members able to work more effectively together
  - F6 Increased funder coordination on strategy
  - F7 Funding maintained or increased
  - F8 Increased risk tolerance among funders
  - F9 Increased trust between funders and nonprofits

- **Long-term Outcomes (7-10 years)**
  - F10 CoFu collaborative reputation strengthened and recognized for operating effectively
  - F11 Increased adaptive capacity of CoFu
  - F12 Persistence of CoFu model regardless of specific players at the table
  - F13 Increased effectiveness of individual funder grantmaking
  - F14 Work of individual funders amplified
  - F15 More equitable relationships between CoFu and grantees

**External Forces**
- e.g., policy changes, economic climate

Impact: All Washtenaw County residents, regardless of race or socio-economic status, achieve their full human potential.
Findings on Grant Partner Outcomes

Grant Partner Context

Aging

Though there has been some struggle to measure their progress towards the sector’s goals, grantees in this sector are confident in the strategies they have been using in their programming; Senior Social Integration, Senior Service Network Navigation and Senior Crisis Intervention. Grantee report data indicated there was a decline over time in the number of clients reached by the grantees but lack of contextual data makes it unclear if this was due to change in grantee efficiency or an issue with numbers reported. This sector desires additional support to track and evaluate program data in a uniform way in order to have a more accurate sense of how their strategies are benefiting clients. A significant challenge to Aging sector grantees success is the complexity of the needs that their clients face. They acknowledge that the absence of a county-wide department focusing on this sector is a barrier to agencies coordinating services. Despite this lack of centralized department, grantees have been successful in collaborating with each other share information, best practices and learn about opportunities to further improve programming.

Early Childhood

Grantees in this sector have consistently been able to exceed their projected numbers of clients served through their two-generation approach. This success may be due to increased political backing for Early Childhood issues as well as increased efficiency of the grantees, as they noted that under CoFu they have been able to serve more clients, learn how to better serve clients and improve their ability to achieve the sector outcome. Still they would like to see increased focus on reducing the number of children in special education and noted that this is a focus area missing from the current sector outcomes. Similar to other sectors, Early Childhood grantees have increased collaboration with other nonprofits around peer learning and best practices. This sense of collaboration extends beyond their sector, as Early Childhood grantees have also found value in connecting with nonprofits in other sectors to learn how they approach outcome measurement.

Housing and Homelessness

This sector has consistently worked on improving the number of people in the county that are in stable and positive housing and improving the number of people with increased income/access to benefits. Grantees in this sector struggle with setting accurate projection numbers, which impacts the ability to get an accurate sense of how they have been able to make progress against those projections. Despite grantees not reaching more clients than prior to CoFu, they are somewhat confident that they are able to better serve the clients they are reaching and confident that their ability to achieve the sector outcome has improved. There is also confidence in the measurability of the sector’s shared outcomes though they would like to have increased alignment between the required reporting and the Housing Management Information System (HMIS) that is federally mandated.
Safety Net Health and Nutrition

Grantees working to improve the health of residents in Washtenaw County have mostly exceeded their projected goals of clients served. Despite the success in reaching clients, there is a lack of uniformity in outcome measurement among grantees in this sector. This is likely attributed to varying organizational capacities and some confusion around the meaning of the outcomes. Grantees working specifically on food security don’t feel their services have enough visibility among community members and desire increased support to broaden their outreach efforts. Related to this, grantees recognized populations that have been left out of CoFu’s scope such as those dealing with mental health issues and substance abuse. Similar to other sectors, grantees in Safety Net Health and Nutrition have been able to increase collaboration to share learning and best practices, improve outcome achievement of clients and improve their own programs and services.

School-Aged Youth

Grantees in this sector consistently met their projected goals of amount of clients served, indicating some stability and strength in their services. They have been more strategic and deliberate about measuring outcomes and client feedback, though they sometimes struggle with accessing necessary data such as school records. In this sector, programming that focuses on positive youth-adult relationships and fostering literacy, school engagement and academic success are seen as the most helpful strategies towards outcome achievement. Similar to other sectors, grantees in this sector desired additional support to conduct evaluations and data tracking.

Grant Partner Outcomes: What is working well?

Capacity-building funding is useful and easy to access (G7, G12). Participants in capacity building work universally found strong value in the work and felt that they now had more tools to effectively do their work. The application and reporting process were also viewed as low-burden.

Grant partners are able to better coordinate services, especially across the county (G13, G14). Grant partners found value in the opportunity to get to know other organizations in the Priority Area meetings. This was especially helpful for the non-Ann Arbor grant partners, who were previously working in more isolated settings. Priority Area meetings have allowed for relationship building and the ability to strategize about specific clients.

“One positive impact is that it has given many agencies the opportunity to meet and learn from their peers, especially county-wide, at the many required meetings.”
- Grant Partner

---

7 Further findings on capacity building can be found in Appendix F.
Grant Partner Outcomes: What has had mixed evidence of success?

There is some pushback from grant partners around the desire for increased collaboration (G13). Some grant partners mentioned that the emphasis on more nonprofit collaboration from the funders signals that they may push untimely mergers or want nonprofits to reduce some of their service areas to prevent duplicity. A non-participating funder had heard a similar sentiment from mutual grant partners. This person reported hearing nonprofits pushing back on the requests for greater collaboration, stating, “When [the nonprofits] hear collaboration they think it's going to be a merger.” This finding was also present in our previous evaluation; with nonprofits feeling a pressure for collaboration that they didn’t feel was entirely fair or warranted. This many indicate that CoFu has not yet figured out a way to communicate with grant partners around its intentions and desires for greater nonprofit collaboration.

While there were some appropriate changes during the outcome refinement process, there is still a perception that outcomes are less meaningful (G1). Sector Leaders attempted to make outcomes more relevant and meaningful, but there is still a perception of frustration with the outcomes among grant partners (and Sector Leaders themselves, in some cases). A major challenge is lack of alignment with similar outcomes required by other common funders.

Program evaluation, outcome measurement, and reporting pose several challenges to grant partners (G2, G6, G9, G10, G11):

- Grant partners consider their work in this regard to be more output tracking than evaluation, and they do not feel they are learning from the data that they collect;
- Reporting requirements are not always aligned with what they are collecting at their organization;
- Data are not being collected in uniform ways across agencies in the same sector; and
- Demographic data are not aligned with the way their other funders collect data and that creates a lot of extra work.

CoFu Priority Areas have varying levels of ability to meaningfully engage with data collection (G3, G9, G10, G11). As Table 2 shows, TCC Group rated each Priority Area on five elements linked to data: 1) general sector capacity to collect outcome data; 2) capacity to collect outcomes of interest to CoFu; 3) buy-in to and satisfaction with CoFu’s chosen outcomes; 4) the presence of standardized outcomes that are not related to CoFu, and; 5) standardization of how data are collected. Overall, there is a trend toward relatively low capacity for collecting outcomes data. Sectors that are doing this better tend to have greater historical experience tracking outcomes in a standardized way (for example, the Nutrition sector organizations are accustomed to using assessment tools from Feeding America).

There is also a low level of satisfaction with the outcomes that CoFu is targeting for collection. While CoFu has updated the outcomes being tracked in several cases, this has sometimes led to its own pushback from grant partners who then have to figure out how to adapt their own data tools. Furthermore, sectors that have low capacity when it comes to data collection in general have a lower level of satisfaction with CoFu’s selected outcomes, because they don’t feel they have the capacity necessary to collect any data. Finally, it’s clear that some sectors – such as Aging and Early Childhood –
are struggling more than others with data collection and may need additional supports to get up to par with other areas.

Table 2: Ratings of Priority Areas on the Five Elements Linked to Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Capacity to Collect Outcome Data</th>
<th>Capacity to Collect CoFu’s Outcome Data</th>
<th>Buy-in and Satisfaction with CoFu’s Outcome Data</th>
<th>Presence of Non-CoFu Standardized Outcomes</th>
<th>Standardization of Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aging</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and Homelessness</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-Aged Youth</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Net Health and Nutrition</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium (High within Nutrition, low within Safety Net Health)</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While grant partners understand the purpose and structure of CoFu, many grant partners struggle to articulate the impact of CoFu and this has affected their views of the participating funders (G1, G5, G8, G14). Many grant partners do not feel that CoFu has led to increased achievement of outcomes, or any improvements broadly in the nonprofit sector. This has led to some grant partners having a more negative view of the participating funders, because they believe they are not giving the sectors enough support or resources to be truly effective under the model. These data are similar to data found in our previous evaluation, indicating that grant partners still do not feel the amount of money being provided through CoFu is appropriate for the expected goals. Some funding grant partners made the point that they felt CoFu was more of a public relations win for the funders without significantly changing anything for the nonprofit sector. For example, one person said, “I think CoFu is more about the funders, it serves their needs. They get awards for this and it’s all focused on them. I don’t think they’ve really successfully engaged us in that...the concept makes sense and it’s creative, but it feels like they’re just giving out a bit of money and then they receive an award for it. I don’t really feel a lot of buy in among our organizations.”
Grant Partner Outcomes: What is not working well?

The grant process is seen as overly cumbersome by many grant partners, a sentiment that was acknowledged by funders (G4). The grant process (e.g., the grant application and reporting) was not seen as right-sized by the majority of those with whom we spoke. The application itself was seen as extremely detailed, especially for grant partners that received small and/or multiple grants. The process was not seen as reducing administrative burden which disappointed grant partners who understood this to be one of the main goals for CoFu. This was especially significant for grant partners being funded for different outcomes—some of these grant partners are actually completing more applications and reports than they were before CoFu. While the grant report and application documents have been updated since our previous evaluation, grant partners still gave the process low ratings, indicating that more work could be done to adequately condense the grant process. In the previous evaluation, grant partners were more dissatisfied with the complexity of the RFQ process and the computer system, neither of which were viewed as problematic at the current time. For this round of data collection, the reporting process was viewed as the biggest challenge. Over 50 percent of survey respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement “CoFu data reporting requirements align with how my organization collects data.”

The six-month reporting process does not have a clear strategic purpose (G4). Grant partners submitted data twice a year – at six months and again at the end of the year. It’s not clear what purpose the six-month grant submission has as results do not seem to be audited or reviewed. This extra submission was a source of frustration for grant partners, especially for those with smaller grants.

The funding process was a source of confusion for grant partners (G4). When nonprofits are awarded a grant through CoFu, the check comes from one of the participating agencies. This has led to some confusion among grant partners who don’t feel clear on whether or not the funding they are receiving is from CoFu itself, or of the intersection between CoFu and the individual grant provider that may be authorizing the grant award. However, the amount of confusion seems much less when compared to data from our previous evaluation, indicating there has been some improvement around sector understanding of CoFu operations.

There was limited grantee report data on economic status and race/ethnicity of clients served over time to produce a comparative analysis (G3, G6, G10). While demographic data was available, there were several impediments to conducting an analysis such as demographic data being separated by organization rather than sector. Because several organizations in this sector also serve other sectors, there was no way to tell which demographic data belonged specifically to clients receiving sector-specific services. This discrepancy existed for the grantee data available from 2011 to 2013.
The Sector Leader role is seen as preventing meaningful relationships among the funders and grant partners (G5). The Sector Leader role has had several changes since the founding of CoFu. However, many grant partners feel the role has been purposefully constructed to prevent them from having meaningful access, connection, and relationships with the funding partners. The Sector Leader organizations are seen as middlemen in the process, responsible for enforcing the desires of the funders, but without leaving grant partners with a location or process for pushing back or airing their concerns. And several grant partners, across sectors, felt they had less access to funder staff now than they did before CoFu. This finding is similar to what our previous evaluation saw, showing that while the Sector Leader role itself has shifted slightly, there has not yet been a successful resolution of exactly what that role should look like to benefit the model. Sector Leaders themselves expressed concern that their role is more one of a go-between rather than a true advocate for the sector. Some Sector Leaders were uncomfortable with not being able to have candid and confidential conversations with grant partners because of the need to report back to funders. Sector Leaders would ideally like to be seen as partners by both the funders and the nonprofit organizations, but their role is not ideally positioned to make this happen.

"I also sometimes feel that we are a little caught in between the two groups [funders and grantees]. I will hear from community orgs that there isn’t any general funding and they really need that to keep them running. The reality of what the nonprofits need to keep running conflicts with what the funders think will achieve the outcomes."

—Sector Leader
Figure 2: Grant Partner Outcomes Logic Model Coded by Outcome Achievement

Coordinated Funding Logic Model Layer 2: Grant Partner Outcomes

Inputs
- Funding Collaborative
  - Field/sector knowledge and experience
  - Human capital
  - Existing relationships with community stakeholders
  - Cross-sector convening power
  - Financial commitment
  - Willingness to reflect and refine strategy
  - Strong governance from trustees

- Sector Leader Organizations
  - Knowledge and understanding of community needs and functioning
  - Relationships
  - Leadership and convening skills

- Grant Partners
  - Knowledge of and ability to deliver services

Interventions
- Funding across shared outcomes
  - Focus: Five priority areas (aging, housing and homelessness, safety net nutrition, school-aged youth, early childhood)
  - Strategy: One application for funding from all CoFu funders, grants made by nonprofits
  - Specific pre-determined outcomes

- Funder coordination
  - Sharing of issue and community information with each other and nonprofit community

- Coordination of Priority Areas
  - Sector Leaders provide a link between funders and grant partners sharing their perspective with each side
  - Sector Leaders lead the priority-level thinking in each area including data interpretation
  - Community-level needs assessment

- Capacity building funding
  - Targeted funds available for capacity building support

Short-term Outcomes (1-2 years)
- G1 Increased understanding of CoFu grants, role in system and benefits to nonprofits
- G2 Increased understanding of community trends and issues
- G3 Increased understanding of grantee specific data
- G4 Increased satisfaction with grant making process by nonprofits
- G5 Strengthened relationships with funders
- G6 Increased understanding of performance and strategic niche that individual organizations fill

Interim Outcomes (3-6 years)
- G7 Increased nonprofit capacity in targeted areas

Long-term Outcomes (7-10 years)
- G8 Increased grantee advocacy for CoFu model
- G9 Increased monitoring and tracking effectiveness of nonprofits
- G10 Increased sense of comparative effectiveness
- G11 Nonprofits have increased outcomes orientation
- G12 Increased functioning of organizations engaging in this work
- G13 Increased programmatic & organizational collaboration
- G14 Nonprofits are better positioned to attract more funders

External Forces
- e.g., policy changes, economic climate

Impact: All Washington County residents, regardless of race or socioeconomic status, achieve their full human potential.
Findings on Systems Outcomes

System Outcomes: Community-Level Context

In general, Washtenaw County has experienced a mix of improvements and slight declines in broader outcomes. As of 2016, Washtenaw County ranked 7th in the state for health outcomes, a slight drop from their rank as 4th in 2011. The health outcomes ranking is a composite measure that takes into account length of life and quality of life. In terms of health factors, a composite measure that takes into account health behaviors, clinical care, social and economic factors and physical environment, Washtenaw County is ranked 1st. Despite the county’s general high rankings in health outcomes and factors, individual rankings for the composite factors such as quality of life, health behaviors and physical environment has declined over time (Table 3). Between 2011 and 2016 poverty status has declined (Chart 1), and median household income has increased (Chart 2) suggesting that Washtenaw County residents are better off economically than they were five years ago.

Table 3: County Health Ranking Data for Washtenaw County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Outcomes</th>
<th>2011 Rank</th>
<th>2016 Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of Life</td>
<td>5th</td>
<td>4th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Life</td>
<td>9th</td>
<td>12th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Health Factors (1st)     | 1st       | 1st       |
| Health behaviors (adult smoking, adult obesity, food environment index, physical inactivity, access to exercise opportunities, excessive drinking, alcohol-impaired driving deaths, sexually transmitted infections, teen births) |          | 3rd |
| Clinical Care (1st)      | 7th       | 1st       |
| Social and economic factors (high school graduation, some college, unemployment, children in poverty, income inequality, children in single-parent households, social associations, violent crime, injury deaths) | 3rd | 4th |
| Physical environment (59th) | 59th     | 61st      |

8 County Health Rankings (2016).
http://www.countyhealthrankings.org/app/michigan/2016/rankings/washtenaw/county/outcomes/overall/snapshot

9 Length of life is measured by premature death. Quality of life rank takes the following into consideration: number of days with poor mental health, number of days with poor physical health, low birthweight, overall poor or fair health.
Chart 1: Washtenaw County Poverty Status in Past 12 Months\textsuperscript{10}

![Bar chart showing the poverty status in Washtenaw County over the past 5 years, with percentages decreasing from 16.9% in 2011 to 14.6% in 2015.]

Chart 2: Washtenaw County Median Household Income\textsuperscript{11}

![Bar chart showing the median household income in Washtenaw County over the past 5 years, with income increasing from $59,055 in 2013 to $103,375 in 2015.]

Note: A family is defined as consisting of two or more people (one of whom is the householder) related by birth, marriage, or adoption. A household can be a person living alone or multiple unrelated individuals or families living together.\textsuperscript{12}

\textsuperscript{10} American Community Survey (ACS)
\textsuperscript{11} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{12} Ibid.
System Outcomes: What is working well?

Despite some concerns about the outcome process, grant partners have generally coalesced around priority outcomes (S6). Over half of survey respondents (55 percent) reported that the Priority Areas represent areas of greatest need in Washtenaw County. Grant partners are clear on what the outcomes mean and how to direct services to meet them.

System Outcomes: What has had mixed evidence of success?

There is some evidence of increased integration of services as a result of CoFu (S3, S4, S5, S8, S9, S10). Among survey respondents 38.5 percent felt that CoFu has resulted in more comprehensive/integrated services for community members. This aligns with the belief of some focus group participants that CoFu has allowed them to better coordinate services for clients being served by multiple agencies. However, this dynamic has not been consistent among Priority Areas. It is unclear if the integration improvements have been perceived by program beneficiaries.

Sector Leaders are very interested in the aspects of their role related to understanding and communicating the broader context, but are concerned about their ability to be effective in this space (S1) Given the changes in the federal and state funding arenas, Sector Leaders are aware that they will need to be able to serve as a resource for grant partners as they navigate the new reality. However, they struggle with their ability to offer meaningful assistance and are unclear if they will be able to offer support as grant partners seek to shift their strategies and work under CoFu.

The Priority Area meetings are not always particularly fruitful (S1, S2). Sector Leaders have recently perceived a desire for a greater emphasis on data rather than current trends, needs, and concerns in each Priority Area. While the data have potential for being fruitful, Sector Leaders are challenged by creating a cohesive meeting among grant partners who are working on very different outcomes and potentially with different populations. The data emphasis seems to be less unifying for the meetings, and is perceived as an accountability mechanism rather than a learning opportunity. Grant partners funded in multiple areas noted little consistency among the different Priority Area meetings, though they consistently found value in the opportunities to connect with other funded grantees. In particular, grant partners under Safety, Net Health and Nutrition have felt growing pains in the development of a meeting agenda that is useful for grant partners in both areas.

There is mixed data available on the improvements made towards the community-level outcomes prioritized by CoFu (S9). TCC group analyzed publicly available data such as local and state department records, surveys and reports to assess what changes had been made in each of these sectors. As Table 4 shows, there is variation among the sectors in terms of availability of comparative data over time with sectors such as Aging and Early Childhood lacking standardized data that could be directly compared. There was also a mix of improvements and declines occurring in the community. Though these data represent the Washtenaw County population more broadly, and not only those served by grant partners, they do indicate certain trends that have happened during the course of CoFu, which grant partners have likely contributed to in some way. Additional information related to the community-level outcomes can be found in the individual Priority Area appendices.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Community Level Outcome(s)</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>What Has Changed in the Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aging*</td>
<td>Increase or maintain the independent living factors of vulnerable, low income adults who are 60 years of age or older</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Slight decreases in life satisfaction between 2010 and 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Some improvements in sense of social support between 2010 and 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inc.</td>
<td>No change in the percentage of adults 65+ living below the poverty level between 2010 and 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>34% of older adults reported that they lack companionship(^{13}) in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inc.</td>
<td>52% of older adults reported living alone(^{14}) in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood*</td>
<td>Increase the developmental readiness of children with high needs so they can succeed in school at the time of school entry</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Improvements on participation in early childhood programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>5% decline in childhood poverty between 2011 and 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>17% increase in birth to three home visits between 2014 and 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>57% increase in children meeting/exceeding socio-emotional expectations at the time of kindergarten entry(^{15})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inc.</td>
<td>1% increase in children living in families receiving Food Assistance Program benefits between 2010 and 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>4% decrease in births with less than adequate prenatal care between 2009 and 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and Homelessness</td>
<td>Reduce the number of people who are experiencing homelessness</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>28% decline in point-in-time homeless count between 2010 and 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inc.</td>
<td>42% decline in number of available year round beds between 2010 and 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inc.</td>
<td>502 Housing Choice Vouchers were available to house families experiencing homelessness in 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{13}\) 60+ Senior Survey of Washtenaw County (2014)  
\(^{14}\) 60+ Senior Survey of Washtenaw County (2014)  
\(^{15}\) This data is based on a Kindergarten Entry Assessment piloted in Ypsilanti Township only.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Community Level Outcome(s)</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>What Has Changed in the Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety Net Health and Nutrition</td>
<td>Increase access to health services and resources for low income residents</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>14% increase in health insurance among low income residents between 2010 and 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inc.</td>
<td>53% of low income residents had dental insurance coverage in 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decrease food insecurity for low income residents</td>
<td>Inc.</td>
<td>29% decrease in number of residents receiving SNAP benefits between 2011 and 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inc.</td>
<td>1% decrease in percentage of low-income residents who are food secure between 2009 and 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-Aged Youth</td>
<td>Increase the high school graduation rate of economically disadvantaged youth</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>5% increase in county-wide graduation rates between 2011 and 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>8% increase in graduation rates among economically disadvantaged youth in county between 2011 and 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>6% increase in economically disadvantaged youth who often feel safe in school between 2010 and 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5% increase in economically disadvantaged youth who miss 10+ days of school between 2010 and 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>2% increase in students proficient in reading at a 3rd grade level between 2010 and 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase the physical and emotional safety of economically disadvantaged youth in their homes, schools and communities</td>
<td>Inc.</td>
<td>2% increase in rates of child abuse/neglect between 2011 and 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are limitations on availability of comparative data over time.*
System Outcomes: What is not working well?

There is a perception that Sector Leaders are asked to play a much larger role than they are resourced or positioned to provide (S1). The Sector Leader role is not operationally aligned with the intended pathway to change articulated in the logic model. Most Sector Leaders do not have sufficient data on their Priority Areas to perform their role fully. They do not have sufficient trust with grant partners or authority from the funders to lead autonomously. Grant partners perceive a level of frustration with the lack of current needs assessment data, indicating a lack of awareness that Sector Leaders all had needs assessments due to CoFu in early 2017. There is limited data available regarding the ability of Sector Leaders to serve as a resource to broader non-funded organizations, as non-funded organizations did not participate in data collection during this round of evaluation.

There is limited evidence regarding some of the longer-term system outcomes (S7, S8, S9, S11, S12). This evaluation intentionally did not solicit feedback from community members/clients and did not interact with social service organizations that were not funded by CoFu. However, it is unlikely that there has been significant progress in the achievement of long-term systems outcomes due to the mixed progress in the short-term outcomes.
Figure 3: System Outcomes Logic Model Coded by Outcome Achievement

Coordinated Funding Logic Model Layer 3: System Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Short-term Outcomes (1-2 years)</th>
<th>Interim Outcomes (3-6 years)</th>
<th>Long-term Outcomes (7-10 years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding Collaborative</td>
<td>Funding across shared outcomes</td>
<td>$1 Sector leaders are able to serve as leaders in their sectors and drive and support increased nonprofit effectiveness</td>
<td>$6 Participating nonprofits efforts coalesce around priority outcomes</td>
<td>$9 Integrated services/seamless experience for target audiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative</td>
<td>Focus: Five priority areas (aging, housing and homelessness, safety, net health and nutrition, school-aged youth, early childhood)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10 Increased efficiencies of community programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field/sector knowledge and experience</td>
<td>Strategy: One application for funding from all COPU funders, grantees apply according to specific pre-determined outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human capital</td>
<td>Capacity building funding</td>
<td>$2 Increased peer learning</td>
<td>$6 Participating nonprofits efforts coalesce around priority outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing relationships with community stakeholders</td>
<td>Targeted funds available for capacity building support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-sector convening power</td>
<td>Coordination of Priority Areas</td>
<td>$3 Increased collaboration on target outcomes/alignment of programs</td>
<td>$7 Broader social services community efforts coalesce around priority outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial commitment</td>
<td>Sector Leaders provide a link between funders and grant partners sharing their perspective with each side</td>
<td>$4 Increased ability to align programs with other similar efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to reflect and refine strategy</td>
<td>Sector Leaders lead the priority-level thinking in each area</td>
<td>$5 Increased knowledge of gaps and duplicative work happening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong governance from trustees</td>
<td>Community-level needs assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

External Forces

e.g. policy changes, economic climate

Grant Partners
- Knowledge of and ability to deliver services

Sector Leader Organizations
- Knowledge and understanding of community needs and functioning
- Relationships
- Leadership and convening skills

Human Capital
- Education and training
- Experience
- Leadership
Recommendations

In this section, we provide recommendations to the Coordinated Funders. Recommendations are divided into three main sections corresponding to the logic model strands: funder outcomes, grant partner outcomes, and system outcomes. While the majority of recommendations emerged from data specific to evaluations TCC Group has conducted on behalf of CoFu, some emerged from TCC’s own experience working with other funder collaboratives and results-based funders.

Recommendations to Improve Funder Outcomes

Long-term funder outcomes that are on-track:

- **Persistence of CoFu model regardless of specific players at the table**
  - Continue efforts to integrate funding entities into the program, beyond the buy-in of particular staff. The greater the extent that CoFu can work to get organizational buy-in from funders, the more likely the program is to be sustained beyond individual actors.

- **Increased effectiveness of individual funder grantmaking**
  - Continue taking time to reflect and engage in informal peer learning. Funders are already taking time to learn from each other in various ways, many of which are informal. Encouraging funding staff to continue doing this will allow for ongoing learning.

- **Work of individual funders amplified**
  - Continue making individual investments that are synergistic with CoFu’s work. Funders noted the synchronicity of some of their non-CoFu grants, leading to the possibility that CoFu’s work could be boosted by non-CoFu funds. When possible, funders should continue looking for place where their CoFu and non-CoFu work are complementary.

Long-term funder outcomes that could be improved:

- **CoFu’s collaborative reputation strengthened and recognized for operating efficiently**
  - Continue to commission evaluation work, especially year-over-year evaluations that can provide timely feedback. This ongoing feedback will allow the funders to continuously improve the operation of CoFu.
  - Publish evaluative reports (or the executive summaries of these reports). Consider sharing findings that may be of interest to others in the sector or region in other formats, such as conferences, webinars, or an in-person presentation.
  - Identify realistic targets for measuring the impact of CoFu in the future. Publicly accessible data are not readily available for each Priority Area, yet there is a strong desire among CoFu funders to be able to track the impact of CoFu on a broader, community level. Funders should identify concrete and measurable targets for their work in order to better set

---

16 Note: where relevant, many of these recommendations also address interim outcomes that could be improved (e.g. those marked as dark orange or medium orange on the logic models).
expectations and gauge progress. These targets should also be revisited at times of major change (e.g., ACA reform). A possible strategy to assist with this work could be using Results-based Accountability (RBA) as a model to ensure that grant work is tied to specific outcomes.¹⁷

- **Increased adaptive capacity for CoFu**
  - Build in a time period during each funding cycle to address whether the strategies or the chosen outcomes need any refinement. This will allow the funders to have a clear time to adapt the program when necessary. GrantCraft’s list of effective practices for funder collaboratives states, “[Funders should] constantly challenge the assumptions on which...goals are based; even though it may have taken months or even years to develop these...circumstances change rapidly, and so should your goals adapt to these changes.”¹⁸
  - Consider adding a pool of money that can be used for responsive grants. These grants would still be tied to the community outcomes, but would be used to respond to any community events or needs that may shift what different sector areas need.

- **More equitable relationships between CoFu and grantees**
  - Work to increase transparency in relationships. The Center for Effective Philanthropy has defined foundation transparency as being “clear, open, and honest about information that nonprofits care about, which is information about foundations’ processes and decisions that have implications for their work.”¹⁹ CoFu may want to work on improving their own transparency with grantees by more clearly communicating about changes to grantmaking (i.e., changes to the amount of funding available), sharing other relevant information, such as evaluative findings (i.e., findings from this evaluation), and more candid assessments with grant partners about the weaknesses of the model and how CoFu hopes to strengthen those areas.
  - Communicate at earlier points in time. Exponent Philanthropy stresses how funder collaboratives have an obligation to communicate more than funders in a regular one-on-one relationship. They write, “A collaboration must communicate how and why it makes its choices. It has a great obligation than usual.”²⁰ Building on this advice, CoFu should share their plans for the initiative in advance, even if just to say that changes are planned within a certain strategy. This will allow grant partners to feel they have access to more available information regarding future steps.
  - Broaden relationships with all programmatic grantees. A negative side effect of funder collaboratives can be a reduction in access that grant partners (or potential grant partners)

---

¹⁷ The Annie E. Casey Foundation has published a report about their experience using Results-based Accountability here: http://www.aecf.org/resources/a-road-to-results-results-based-accountability-in-the-annie-e-casey-founda/

¹⁸ More under point seven, here: http://www.grantcraft.org/blog/best-practices-of-collaboration

¹⁹ http://effectivephilanthropy.org/transparency-for-those-that-need-it-most-2/

have to funders. Because of this, it’s worthwhile for CoFu to consider ways to improve ways that more grantees can interact directly with funders. CoFu may want to consider expanding grantee access to funding staff, so grant partners are able to reach the funding staff directly instead of going through the Sector Leaders. Another way to do this might be having funders attend sector convenings a few times a year.

Recommendations to Improve Grant Partner Outcomes

Long-term grantee outcomes that could be improved:

- **Increased grantee advocacy for CoFu model**
  - Use the findings of this report to better articulate the value of CoFu. Funders may need to reframe the benefit of CoFu to grant partners (and other nonprofits in the community) based on a more realistic assessment of the grant partner experience and a more candid description of the benefits of CoFu for the participating funders. Communicating the value of collaboratives was a critical best practice identified by GrantCraft in a piece on effective funder collaboratives.
  - Improve functioning of CoFu for grant partners. Grant partners had several requests for the Coordinated Funders, including improving the transparency and depth of communication between the funders and grant partners, and changing the reporting system and requirements. CoFu should make changes wherever possible to improve grantee experience with, and buy-in to, the model.

- **Increased outcomes-orientation for grantees including improving efficacy of monitoring and tracking outcomes, grantee understanding of their comparative effectiveness, and overall outcomes orientation**
  - Consider having funding staff take a more direct role in making meaning from data. In the current logic model, Sector Leaders were seen as a key stakeholder that could hold data-oriented meetings with Priority Area grantees to allow them space to make meaning from data. Instead, CoFu may want to have the funding staff themselves organize meetings for each Priority Area focused on making meaning from the data. This may allow grant partners to engage with data in a way that feels more robust and applicable to learning.
  - Improve resources available to grant partners related to outcomes. Several organizations do not have evaluation-specific staff or systems and struggle with any level of data collection. CoFu may want to triage grant partners according to their skills in collecting outcomes data.

---

22 Note: where relevant, many of these recommendations also address interim outcomes that could be improved (e.g. those marked as red or yellow on the logic models).
23 For more information, see point nine, here: http://www.grantcraft.org/blog/best-practices-of-collaboration
24 GrantCraft includes “staffing up” as a key component of their list of good practices for funder collaboratives, emphasizing that having enough staff, and staff with the right skills, can be helpful in helping the collaborative be stronger. For more, see point three, “staffing up” here: http://www.grantcraft.org/blog/best-practices-of-collaboration
and offer training (possibly group workshops or funding for coaches or consultants) to allow grant partners who see data as a greater challenge to improve.

- Identify ways to aggregate outcomes into dashboards to track progress. Creating dashboards for each Priority Area may allow grantees to have a deeper understanding of how outcomes are shifting over time and how their own work, and their data collection efforts, contributes to this knowledge.  

- Improve grant partner ability to report on client demographics in a standardized way. There were limitations on the analysis of demographics served by grant partners because of the way their data was reported. CoFu should consider establishing a standardized form for demographic reporting, that prioritizes key demographics (such as economic status or race/ethnicity) and de-prioritizes demographics that pose a greater challenge (such as zip code). Furthermore, when possible, CoFu should collect demographics by program, and not just by organization, to better understand what demographics each Priority Area is reaching.

- Increased overall functioning of CoFu grantees
  - Continue investing in capacity-building activities. Capacity building has been a way that grant partners have been able to improve their overall organizational capacity, even when they are not directly tied to any specific community outcome. CoFu should continue investing in this work to allow more grant partners to improve.

- Increased grantee adaptive capacity
  - Continue to build space for grant partners to learn from each other. While each Priority Area currently has some type of convening or in-person meetings organized by Sector Leaders, the exact model, format, and goals of these meeting can be inconsistent. CoFu should consider articulating certain goals related to peer learning for these meetings. Activities could include having organizations share a struggle and allowing others to respond, group reading of new literature on good practices, an expert lecture, or another type of small group activities. These would both allow grantees to improve collaboration and their adaptive capacity.
  - Where relevant, offer group workshops focused on adaptive capacity. The Leadership DELI has been effective at allowing grantees to adopt leadership skills in a relatively low-stakes and low-burden environment. CoFu may want to consider a similarly structured program focused on adaptive capacity.

---


26 For more on how capacity-building efforts can enhance funder collaboratives see point five (Be prepared to fund key capacity gaps in collaboration), in this list of best practices of collaboration. Available here: http://www.grantcraft.org/blog/best-practices-of-collaboration
Recommendations to Improve System Outcomes

Long-term systems outcomes that could be improved:  

- **Integrated services and a seamless experience for target audiences, including increased efficiencies for community programs**
  - Consider technical assistance for all parties focused on client-centered design-thinking. Currently, most participating nonprofits are thinking about individual clients moving through their organizations, or services, and not about the overall experience participants are having in the nonprofit sector. This is especially complicated for CoFu because a family, or individual, may be accessing services from several Priority Areas, but be measured as a distinct individual within each program. CoFu may want to consider training for both funders and grantees on client-centered design-thinking. Design-thinking is human-centered and would envision the nonprofit sector from the lens of participants. These trainings could be the starting point for thinking about how services could be better integrated or lead to a seamless client experience.  

- **Increased ability to address and deliver on community needs among nonprofits and community leaders, including a better able to tackle systems change**
  - Provide training on systems-thinking to grantees (including both programmatic partners and Sector Leaders). In addition to training on adaptive capacity as mentioned above, CoFu may want to provide training on systems-thinking and approaches. These trainings could help build a shared vocabulary and create better buy-in to the systems-level goals of the model, as well as creating a clearer understanding of how each individual grant partner can contribute to systems-level work.  
  
  - Improve access to community outcome indicators. In some Priority Areas, such as Aging, Early Childhood and School-Aged Youth, there is not access to robust indicators that can be used to measure progress towards community outcomes. CoFu should consider establishing some metrics that would work for long-term tracking, and perhaps think about bringing on a local researcher to assist in this work.

---

27 Note: where relevant, many of these recommendations also address interim outcomes that could be improved (e.g. those marked as red or yellow on the logic models).  
28 A short case study on design-thinking applied within philanthropy can be seen here: [https://www.mcf.org/news/design-thinking-applied-minnesota-philanthropy](https://www.mcf.org/news/design-thinking-applied-minnesota-philanthropy)  
29 An overview of systems thinking as presented at the 2013 Family Philanthropy Conference is available here: [http://web.cof.org/2013family/presentations/COF_OpeningPlenary_DavidPeterStrohPresentationForDistribution.pdf](http://web.cof.org/2013family/presentations/COF_OpeningPlenary_DavidPeterStrohPresentationForDistribution.pdf)
In order to address these long-term outcomes for the systems work, we believe the following recommendations are also important:

- **Ensure that grantees have adequate management capacity to participate in Planning and Coordinating Agency meetings.** Grantees are often overwhelmed by the need to participate in multiple meetings when funded in multiple Community Impact Areas and they are not finding sufficient value in the meetings to make this a high priority.

- **Clarify Sector Leader roles.** CoFu may want to create something akin to a job description for Sector Leaders that includes all of their roles, and a feasible plan for performing the associated tasks. For example, if one of the roles of the Sector Leader is to have knowledge of community work happening within a certain Priority Area, they may write in time for going to community events into their workplan. This workplan should then be the basis for the funding Sector Leaders receive to allow for greater accountability. The practice of job descriptions focused on competencies and tasks is one mentioned by GrantCraft in their list of “Best Practices in Collaboration.”

- **Increase support and opportunities for Sector Leaders.** In order to ensure Sector Leaders are able to perform activities articulated in the logic model, Sector Leaders may need additional support or opportunities. These may include capacity building, an increased understanding of their role, or more frequency communications with CoFu staff.

- **Utilize needs assessments.** CoFu has already commissioned needs assessments for all Priority Areas. They should use the emerging data to engage in conversations with each sector, and possibly with new sectors, around what the needs are and how services can best meet those needs. These conversations may also contribute to advancing an outcome-orientation in grant partners as they gain a better understanding of how various outcomes are connected to the bigger picture outlined in the needs assessments.

---

30 For more, see point three, *Staffing Up*, here: http://www.grantcraft.org/blog/best-practices-of-collaboration
Benchmarking

CoFu expressed interest in having a set of benchmarks they could use to track their progress over time. Throughout the recommendations section, we have shared references to specific resources that support the given suggestions. In Table 5 below, we have shared some more explicit benchmarks from these resources for this work.

**Table 5: Recommendations and Potential Benchmarks Associated with Them**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Potential Benchmark</th>
<th>Other Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consider using Results-based Accountability to identify realistic targets for measuring the impact of CoFu in the future&lt;sup&gt;31&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Implement a results-based accountability system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build in time in each funding cycle to address whether the chosen strategies or outcomes need any refinement&lt;sup&gt;32&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Have a formal reflection period between grant cycles to discuss adapting strategies or outcomes</td>
<td>Consider opportunities for non-funders to weigh in with feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate with grant partners at earlier points in time&lt;sup&gt;33&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Share changes, or potential changes to CoFu at least six months before a new grant cycle or change is implemented</td>
<td>Consider talking to grant partners about what amount of time feels appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broaden relationships with all programmatic grantees&lt;sup&gt;34&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Consider having each funder attending Priority Area convenings at least once a year</td>
<td>Consider implementing a monthly “office hours” policy where grant partners can meet directly with funders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
<pre><code>                                                                        |                                                                                      |                                                                                               |
</code></pre>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Potential Benchmark</th>
<th>Other Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use evaluation findings to better articulate the value of CoFu(^{35})</td>
<td>Share evaluative feedback with stakeholders in an accessible way (e.g., executive summary, webinar)</td>
<td>Consider asking stakeholders what further questions or ideas the information raises for them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Share CoFu’s understanding of the benefit of the model for grantees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider having funding staff take a more direct role in making meaning from data(^{36})</td>
<td>Have meetings twice a year for funder staff to dive into data reports</td>
<td>Consider inviting Sector Leaders to these meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify ways to aggregate outcome into dashboards to track progress(^{37})</td>
<td>Creating a dashboard</td>
<td>CoFu may want to create two dashboards: one for external audiences and one for internal audiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue investing in capacity-building activities(^{38})</td>
<td>Amount of funding invested in capacity building is maintained or increased</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider technical assistance for all parties on client-centered design-thinking(^{39})</td>
<td>A training is offered on design-thinking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide training on systems-thinking to grantees(^{40})</td>
<td>A training is offered on systems-thinking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarify Sector Leader roles(^{41})</td>
<td>A clear job description type of document is created with Sector Leaders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix A: Aging Sector

Sector Context

CoFu’s Aging Priority Area seeks to improve the lives of Washtenaw County residents 60 years and older. Since Coordinated Funding began, nine organizations have been funded for their programmatic work in this sector. Census data from 2010, the year that Coordinated Funding began, showed adults 60 years or older comprised about 12 percent of the Washtenaw County population and that percentage has roughly stayed the same, increasing to 12.5 percent in 2015.\(^2\) The most pressing issues that affect the aging population in Washtenaw County are lack of social activity/connectedness, mental and physical health, difficulty with home care and housework, mobility, and financial hardship, based on self-reported survey data.\(^3\) Organizations funded in this Priority Area are working towards increasing the amount of older adults in Washtenaw County that are:

1) Living stably with basic needs met;
2) Accessing the social services they need; and,
3) Socially connected and do not feel isolated.

The current community-level outcome for this Priority Area is to increase or maintain the independent living factors of vulnerable, low-income adults who are 60 years of age or older.\(^4\)

Grantees have been devoting almost equal effort to both strategies: improving social support and critical needs of seniors. Outcomes over time were categorized as either focused on a critical need (access to health, stable homes, transportation, and legal or financial assistance) or caregiving and social support. The table below shows how many individual grantee organizations were utilizing strategies towards improving either the critical needs of seniors or their social support. Given that there were approximately six grantee organizations per cycle, this data shows that most organizations split their efforts between the two service areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Support/</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 of 6</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>4 of 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i.e., Health,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing, Mobility,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finances)</td>
<td>5 of 6</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>5 of 6</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>5 of 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

44 Low income residents are defined as individuals or households that are at or below 200% of the federal poverty limit (FPL).
There has been some progress towards this sector’s community-level outcome of increasing independent living factors of Washtenaw Seniors. Seniors perceive themselves as having a good quality of life, but there is mixed data on social support and integration. Recent 60+ Survey findings reveal the current trends in quality of life for Washtenaw County’s aging population. There was no comparative survey data available from years prior to CoFu, so we are unable to see how these data points may have changed over time. Over half of respondents to the most recent 60+ Survey (52 percent) reported a very good quality of life and an overwhelming majority were satisfied with their safety, independence and involvement in activities (Chart 1). Despite this, around one-third of respondents to this survey were experiencing issues of social isolation. Thirty four percent said they lacked companionship some or most of the time, while 26 percent said they feel isolated from others, 29 percent feel left out some of the time or often and 52 percent reported living alone. There was not clear explanation of the difference between feeling isolated and feeling left out. Public survey data from the Health Improvement Plan of Washtenaw County (HIP), which represents a larger sample of residents, shows a mix of declines and increases on key indicators of this sector’s community-level outcome (Charts 2 and 3). There was a slight decline between 2010 and 2015 in the area of life satisfaction, while there was an increase in social support for seniors ages 75 and over in the same time period. Additionally, the majority of seniors in 2015 indicated that they owned their own home (91 percent for those ages 65 to 74 and 82 percent for those 75 and older) which might indicate housing stability.

Chart 1: Quality of Life Indicators for Washtenaw County Seniors (from the 60+ Survey)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feeling</th>
<th>Percentage who Responded &quot;Agree&quot; or &quot;Strongly Agree&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I look forward to things</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to stay involved with things</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am healthy enough to have my independence</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel lucky compared to most people</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am healthy enough to get out and about</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I take life as it comes and make the best of things</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel safe where I live</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45 60+ Survey was completed by over 450 residents in Washtenaw County.
Chart 2: Life Satisfaction in Older Adults in Washtenaw County (from the HIP Survey)

Chart 3: Social/Emotional Support in Older Adults in Washtenaw County (from the HIP Survey)
Poverty rates among older adults in Washtenaw County have not changed over time (Chart 4). Data from the American Community Survey shows the estimates of percent of those 65 years or older living below poverty level have steadily hovered at around 6% between 2010 and 2015.

**Chart 4: Poverty Rate among Older Adults in Washtenaw County**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Poverty Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cost-per-client has slightly increased over the course of CoFu (Chart 5). There is no other grantee data to explain this slight increase, so this could simply be due to the cost of resources increasing over time.

**Chart 5: Average Cost-Per-Client in the Aging Sector**

- **2011-2012**: $103
- **2015-2016**: $118

---

46 Calculated by (Amount of funding) / (# of people served)
Six responses to the survey were from those in the Aging sector, representing 12 percent of all survey respondents and a response rate of 40 percent from the sector. Because of this, survey data may not be representative of all funded organizations in the sector.

**Funding Trends**

*Six grant partners were selected for funding in the Aging sector during all years of both CoFu funding cycles.* The amount of funding going to this sector has remained relatively consistent, with a slight increase in between the two funding cycles. During the first funding cycle of CoFu (2011 to 2013), the Aging sector received $347K per year in funding, which was 8 percent of CoFu’s total funding pool. Individual awards ranged from $9K to $218K, with an average grant size of about $58.5K. In the extension year, funding increased slightly to $359K. During the second funding cycle, the Aging sector received $442K per year, comprising 10 percent of the total funding pool. Individual award amounts ranged from $22.1K to $236K, with an average grant amount of about $74K.

*Though overall CoFu funding has remained consistent, organizations in this sector are experiencing cuts more broadly.* Qualitative data revealed this struggle as one grantee described, “The more we get out there and let the public know we’re available, [the] more funding gets cut and [we are] expected to do as much or more with limited resources.” They also noted that not all nonprofits are able to get County funding, which poses and additional challenge. Because of this, grantees noted that an increase in funding from CoFu (particularly to hire more staff) would increase their ability to work towards outcomes. Washtenaw County has no department explicitly devoted to aging issues. CoFu’s Aging sector has also recently experienced transitions in sector leadership. Blueprint for Aging, the previous Sector Leader, is no longer serving that role, and NEW has since been serving as the interim Sector Leader.
Outcome Achievement

Over the course of CoFu, the outcomes worked on in this sector have remained fairly similar (Table 2). In the earlier years of CoFu funding, outcomes focused on specific areas such as housing/home safety, financial issues, social support, mobility, and health. In the most recent funding cycle, those outcomes changed slightly to explicitly focus on vulnerable, low-income senior citizens, and the areas of focus broadened to critical needs, protective factors, and social integration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Outcomes in the Aging Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGING</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors move from crisis or vulnerable situations to situations assessed as stable, safe, or thriving in the area of <strong>housing and home safety</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors move from crisis or vulnerable situations to situations assessed as stable, safe, or thriving in the area of <strong>financial issues</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors move from crisis or vulnerable situations to situations assessed as stable, safe, or thriving in the area of <strong>care giving and social support</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors move from crisis or vulnerable situations to situations assessed as stable, safe, or thriving in the area of <strong>mobility and transportation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors move from crisis or vulnerable situations to situations assessed as stable, safe, or thriving in the area of <strong>health</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerable, low-income (at or below 200% FPL) older adults’ <strong>critical needs have been reduced</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerable, low-income (at or below 200% FPL) older adults’ <strong>risk factors have decreased and protective factors have increased</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerable, low-income (at or below 200% FPL) older adults’ <strong>social isolation has decreased and meaningful engagement has increased</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Aging sector grantees have shown varying abilities to achieve their projected goals (Chart 6). Grant application data on the projected number of clients to be served and the actual number served, reveal a trend of variability in this sector. Sometimes they are able to meet or surpass projections and other times they fall short of meeting the projections. In the first cycle from 2011 to 2013, grantees were able to pass their project number of clients served, but then declined in their ability to do so during the extension year. During the second funding cycle, grantees didn’t meet their target in the first year and then met it in the second year. Overall, the amount of clients reached by this sector was greater during the first two years of CoFu funding. There wasn’t qualitative data providing information on what might have caused this shift directly. It is unclear if this is a shift in efficiency of the organizations in the sector or if there was an issue with reporting numbers.

Chart 6: Projected Versus Actual Client Reach in the Aging Sector

Grantees are confident in the strategies being used for this sector (Chart 7). Grantees in the Aging sector utilize three key strategies in their work: 1) senior crisis intervention; 2) senior service network navigation; and, 3) senior social integration. Survey respondents from this sector rated them all positively in terms of helpfulness with social integration being the most helpful in achieving the community outcome. There was no qualitative data available to support grantees’ experiences with each of these strategies.
Grantees need more support in evaluation and data collection, particularly for senior crisis intervention services. They are still waiting for the development of a database that will better enable tracking and reporting data related to this strategy. When asked about the level of support received one grantee described it as, “None for SCIP piece. They’re supposed to help us develop a common database”. This strategy was also rated lowest in terms of helpfulness, which might indicate that grantees don’t find this strategy helpful because they are unable to properly measure their progress around it.

The complexity of the needs that vulnerable seniors have poses a challenge to grant partners working to serve them. CoFu grantees working in the Aging sector recognize that their clients face multiple issues such as mental illness, low income, and unstable housing, among others. However, grant partners do not feel fully capable of tackling all of these challenges and do not feel they are able to provide comprehensive services to their clients in order to get them everything that they need. Additionally, they cite the lack of a county-wide centralized department devoted to aging, such as an Area Agency on Aging, as a challenge towards coordinating their services and having the resources needed to best serve Washtenaw’s senior citizens.

When asked about resources that would improve their work, Aging sector grantees most frequently mentioned the need for a centralized area government agency to support the issues and the needs of the county’s aging population. Related to this, the absence of a Sector Leader and lack of communication around that topic makes Aging sector grantees feel neglected by CoFu leadership. Grantees felt that they did not have a true Sector Leader experience due to the transitioning out of Blueprint for Aging, whom they felt was helpful in this role. Qualitative data showed that grantees felt the lack of communication about the Sector Leader transition implied that “CoFu doesn’t care as much about the Aging sector.” The transition of the Sector Leader was not communicated effectively, grantees described it as, “It’s been this weird secret that Blueprint is not it anymore. There was an email that it was up in the air, but not clear. Who is the entity that decides this?”
Aging sector grantees struggle with tracking data in a uniform way. Each grantee in the Aging sector tracks data differently which leads to some difficulty in comparing outcomes. Additionally, grantees feel there is disconnect between how they track data and how CoFu requests the reporting of data. Partners aren’t confident that the data CoFu is requesting provide the most accurate depiction of their work due to how CoFu’s outcomes are worded. One person described the misalignment this way, “I think some of the way the [reporting outcomes are] worded, they’re asking about participants that are specific to the strategy. We don’t track the data in the same way [CoFu words it]. It doesn’t make sense to make changes to meet a funder’s need.” One grantee referred to their reporting for CoFu as “compliance” adding that the data they were asked to collect for CoFu “seems useless” for the organization’s own internal learning or tracking purposes. Grantees felt that having additional training for staff on evaluation, or funding for an additional staff member devoted to data collection activities, would greatly improve their ability collect the data required by CoFu, while also collecting their own data for learning.

Grantees had mixed feelings about the process for developing Priority Areas and shared outcomes. Survey respondents were unsure about whether the process was transparent and involved enough community input on the outcomes. Respondents also did not feel confident that grant partners were well-positioned to take on work addressing the outcomes of interest, though it’s unclear if this is because they aren’t aware of work happening across the sector or if they have low-confidence in sector grant partners.

Chart 8: Perceptions of the Priority Areas and the Grantees Funded to Work on Them

- The process to select priority areas and shared outcomes was clear and transparent.
  - Strongly Agree: 33%
  - Agree: 33%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 17%
  - Disagree: 17%
  - Strongly Disagree: 17%
  - Don’t Know: 17%

- There was adequate community input on developing the program outcomes.
  - Strongly Agree: 17%
  - Agree: 17%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 17%
  - Disagree: 17%
  - Strongly Disagree: 33%

- Funded grantees were well positioned to take on the work.
  - Strongly Agree: 17%
  - Agree: 33%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 17%
  - Disagree: 17%
  - Strongly Disagree: 33%
  - Don’t Know: 17%
Grantees are better able to achieve their main outcomes as a result of CoFu, but do not believe the Aging outcomes are measurable or realistic. A majority of grantees that responded to the survey disagreed that the shared outcome was realistic and measurable (Chart 9). Despite this they were slightly more positive about their own organization’s ability to achieve the sector outcome as a result of coordinated funding. This confidence in their abilities might be due to the general positivity around collaboration and shared information among CoFu grantees.

**Chart 9: Perceptions on Data Reporting and Outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The shared outcome(s) for this sector are realistic.</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The shared outcome(s) for this sector are measurable.</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization has improved ability to achieve the following sector outcome as a result of Coordinated Funding: Increased or maintained independent living factors for vulnerable, low income adults who are 60+.</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a result of CoFu, grant partners are more connected to other organizations doing similar work. Through CoFu, grantees have become more familiar with other groups that offer similar services or serve the same populations they do. They are more aware of the services available to seniors, enabling them to make better referrals and seek collaboration with each other. When asked about a positive change in the sector as a result of CoFu, one grantee described it as, “Seeing and getting to know our cohort better—have to come to meetings but it is nice to know who is out there and get faces and names and make referral process better.” Survey data shows that Aging sector grantees have collaborated with each other and community leaders for a variety of purposes over the past year (Charts 10 and 11). When asked about their organization’s work in the past year most grantees have collaborated to share general information, peer learning, and best practices, and to help other nonprofits and community leaders improved their programs and services. Despite this spirit of collaboration, grantees are not collaborating with others to seek additional funding for their work or to jointly advocate for issues in the community related to aging.
Collaborated to share general information (e.g., information about our organization’s programs/services, what is going on in the community, etc.) with other nonprofit/community leaders in the community?
- Yes: 100%
- No: 0%

Collaborated with other nonprofit/community leaders to improve programming based on peer learning and/or best practices?
- Yes: 100%
- No: 0%

Collaborated to help other nonprofits/community leaders learn about opportunities to increase and/or improve their programs and services (e.g., opportunities for funding)?
- Yes: 80%
- No: 20%

Collaborated with other community leaders to seek funding to coordinate work to address the sector’s priority outcome?
- Yes: 80%
- No: 20%

Collaborated with other community leaders to jointly advocate to address a particular community problem?
- Yes: 80%
- No: 20%

Organizations in my sector...
- Strongly Agree: 100%
- Agree: 75%
- Unsure: 25%
- Disagree: 25%
- Strongly Disagree: 0%
Perceptions of the Coordinated Funding Model

About half of grantees feel the Coordinated Funding model has improved efficiencies. Survey data show grantees believe CoFu is a better process for grant funding than having funders operating separate processes (Chart 12). CoFu has enabled resources to reach areas in the county that may have been neglected in the past. As one grantee described it, “We participate in the process because the funding has helped spread resources and attention to other areas in the county.”

About half of grantees believe CoFu is a good use of resources (Chart 12). Grantees have mixed feelings on whether or not the CoFu model is a good use of their own resources. In particular, there is frustration with the amount of time involved in reporting on required data and attend sector area meetings and grantee convenings. One person said, “In one sense it’s counterproductive, we’re asking for funds to do programs and we have less time [to do the program work] [Funding] is covering staff time to do reporting and attend meetings.”

Chart 12: Perceptions of the CoFu Model and Its Impact on Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The coordinated funding model allows resources to be spent more efficiently</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The coordinated funding model has significantly increased the efficiency</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of distributing resources (e.g., funding, capacity building, peer learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opportunities) in our community in key areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The coordinated funding model is a good use of resources (e.g., funding,</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff time, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It’s unclear how grantees feel about the adequacy of the amount of funding. On one hand, survey data show that grantees unsure if the pool of funding available was too limited for them to impact their sector (Chart 13). However, qualitative data contradicts this, as grantees expressed value in the pooling of financial resources into a streamlined process. One grantee describes it this way, “Pooling financial resources from different agencies to streamline the application and evaluation process is a wonderful concept.”
Aging grantees are less positive about CoFu’s ability to reduce the amount of time they spend on grant writing and management (Chart 14). Most survey respondents disagreed with this quality of the model. Survey data showed 67 percent of grantees disagreeing that CoFu has reduced the amount of time spent on grant writing and grant management. They describe the current process as “cumbersome”, especially around providing demographic information for the recipients of services.

There are mixed feelings about whether services are more comprehensive as a result of CoFu. Half of survey respondents believed CoFu resulted in more integrated services for community members, while a third neither agreed nor disagreed, and 17 percent disagreed. Qualitative data was similarly mixed. Some grantees expressed sentiments such as, “We’re mobilizing services better, having more focus,” while others didn’t know if they could speak to the quality of services without doing a direct survey of the older adults receiving services.
Appendix B: Early Childhood Sector

Sector Context

CoFu seeks to impact in the Early Childhood sector by:

1) Improving the social and mental health of families, namely through
   a. Increasing the amount of children reaching developmental milestones; and
   b. Increasing parents’ knowledge of child development and parenting skills.

In particular, this sector aims to improve the lives of children that belong to low-income families and those that require special assistance.
The current community-level outcome for this sector is to increase the developmental readiness of children with high needs so they can succeed in school at the time of school entry.47

Grantees have been devoting almost equal effort to improving parent engagement and participation in early childhood programs (Table 1). For the purpose of seeing how strategies may have shifted over time, outcomes focused on by Early Childhood grantees were thematically coded as having an emphasis on either parent engagement or early childhood programming. Grantees have used strategies such as implementing the Nurturing Parenting Curriculum and partnering with licensed social workers and behavior analysts to carry out their services.

Table 1: Number and Percentage of Grantees Focusing on Each Strategy in the Early Childhood Sector48

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Access to Healthcare</td>
<td>3 of 5</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>3 of 5</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>3 of 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Engagement in child development</td>
<td>4 of 5</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>4 of 5</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>4 of 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daycare/Early Childhood Programs</td>
<td>3 of 5</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>3 of 5</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>3 of 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though external data on key indicators related to community-level outcomes is limited, available data indicate improved participation in early childhood programming. In terms of participation in early childhood programs, Michigan school data show that between 2011 and 2015 there have been some increases in participation in early childhood programs among economically disadvantaged children (Chart 1). Great Start Readiness Programs (GSRP) showed a particularly large increase in participation.

47 Children with high needs are defined as: children from birth through kindergarten entry who are from low-income families (200% below FPL) or otherwise in need of special assistance and support.
48 Child Access to Health care was not explicitly represented in the descriptions of actions taken in 2014-2016 grantee data.
over time, especially when compared to the 29 percent of children statewide who had participated in GSRP before entering kindergarten in 2015-2016. Additionally, there has been a general decline in poverty among children from birth to the age of 17 from 18 percent in 2011 to 13 percent in 2015, though the available data was not able to be segmented further to isolate the early childhood years. Additionally, county data reported that between 2014 and 2015 birth to three home visits increased from 17 percent to 34 percent.\(^49\) In more recent years, the percentage of children meeting/exceeding socio-emotional expectations at the time of kindergarten entry has increased based on data from the Kindergarten Entry Assessment. A comparison of data from 2014 and 2015 showed that in just one year the percentage of children meeting expectations increased by more than 50 percent (See Chart 2).

In this same time period there was also an increase in number of new preschool slots from 96 in 2014 to 2015.\(^50\) Additionally, between 2009 and 2012 the percentage of births with less than adequate prenatal care declined\(^51\) (See Chart 3). Though there is no direct evidence attributing this to CoFu grant partner work, this data shows overall progress towards this sector’s targeted community-level outcomes.

**Chart 1: Trends in Economically Disadvantaged Children’s Participation in Early Childhood Programs between 2011 and 2015\(^52\)**

---

49. Washtenaw County Cradle2Career  
50. Washtenaw County Cradle2Career  
52. 2011 data not available for Early on and GSRP/Head Start Blend; 2012 data not available for GSRP/Head Start Blend
Chart 2: Percentage of Children Meeting or Exceeding Socio-Emotional Expectations

This data is based on a Kindergarten Entry Assessment piloted in Ypsilanti Township only.

Chart 3: Percentage of Births with Less than Adequate Prenatal Care

---

53 This data is based on a Kindergarten Entry Assessment piloted in Ypsilanti Township only.
Despite several positive changes for this sector, there has been some struggle in addressing poverty issues for children. Publicly available data show the percentage of children aged 0 to 5 living in families that benefit from the Food Assistance Program stayed almost the same between 2010 and 2014 (Chart 4).

Chart 4: Children living in families receiving Food Assistance Program benefits

![Chart 4](chart4.png)

Cost-per-client has slightly increased in this sector over the course of CoFu (Chart 5). There was an inability to calculate an accurate number of clients served during 2015-2016 because of inconsistencies in the way data was reported. Because of this, we could not produce an accurate count of clients served during that year. The chart below instead uses the 2014-2015 data in its place to show the change over time.

Chart 5: Average Cost-Per-Client in the Early Childhood Sector\(^{54}\)

![Chart 5](chart5.png)

\[^{54}\text{Calculated by (Amount of funding)} / \text{(# of people served)}\]
Over the course of CoFu, six individual organizations in this sector have been funded, several of them through the entire duration of CoFu. Since CoFu started, there has been an increase in Washtenaw County’s focus on early childhood programming.

Three responses to the survey were from those in the Early Childhood sector, representing six percent of all survey respondents and a response rate of 21 percent from the sector. Because of this, survey data may not be representative of all funded organizations in the sector.

Funding Trends

During the first funding cycle, the Early Childhood sector received approximately $576K per year, which was 13 percent of the entire funding pool. Award amounts ranged from $7.7K to $337K with an average individual grant size of about $115K. For the extension year, the sector received $405K, though only three of the grantees from the first cycle received funding that year. Early Childhood sector funding went back up during the second cycle when it received $618K per year, or 14 percent of the entire CoFu pool. Award amounts ranged from $39.4K to $299.3K, with an average individual grant size of being about $124K.
Outcome Achievement

Over the course of CoFu, the sector outcomes have consistently focused on a two-generation approach, though the outcomes have shifted slightly (Table 2). In first funding cycle, there were outcomes focused on parent and child health insurance enrollment, access to medical/dental services (for both parents and children), parenting skills, home-visiting programs, and school readiness programs. In the second funding cycle the outcomes shifted to focus only on the home visiting services, parenting skills, and access to childcare and pre-school programs for children with high needs.

Table 2: Outcomes in the Early Childhood Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents develop measurably stronger parenting skills and capacities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents report that they are aware of how to access community-based support services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents have access to early literacy resources and prepare their children for school success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children attending licensed daycare and early education facilities through scholarship support has increased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of children enrolled in health insurance has increased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of parents enrolled in health insurance has increased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible children are attending Head Start and Great Start Readiness programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families and children are regularly accessing medical and dental providers for ongoing check-ups and well-baby/child visits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families are practicing safe behaviors, including safe sleep, abuse prevention, and correct car-seat use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents regularly access information and community-based support services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents are participating in home visiting programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children with high needs are participating in high-quality child care and preschool programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grantees are exceeding their projected number of served clients. Grantee report data showed that during both funding cycles they were able to achieve reach slightly above what their projected targets (Chart 6). However, there is a noticeable decline in the projected and actuals from the first grant cycle to the second. There is no qualitative or survey data to support what may have caused this drop in projections, though it may be possible that it is related to a shift in program outcomes as noted above.

**Chart 6: Projected Versus Actual Client Reach in the Early Childhood Sector**

While grantees believe outcomes are measureable, they are not finding a lot of meaning or relevance in the data reporting and outcomes. Grantees reported difficulty in using data to understand the extent to which they are progressing towards the shared outcomes. The current data tracking efforts were seen as compliance based. One person described it as, “Quite frankly it is just tracking outputs.” Despite this, grant partners did not believe they could report on more meaningful data, such as individual, client-level data, without significant support and capacity-building. Additionally, the shared outcomes do not seem realistic to organizations (Chart 7). Qualitative data support this tension between what can be measured and what would be relevant to measure, with grant partners saying they lack the funding and capacity to collect data that would provide a meaningful sense of program impact, such as conducting individual testing on children.

Grantees aren’t satisfied with the current outcomes and would like to increase the focus on reducing the number of children in special education. Grant partners mentioned this as an outcome worth adding to the current list of Early Childhood outcomes. As one grantee described it, “I think we should be tracking how many children in kindergarten are referred to special ed...” This suggests that Early Childhood organizations may already be collecting this data, but don’t see it fitting in with the current CoFu outcomes. The reasoning provided for focusing on this area is that a decrease in number of children being referred to special education in kindergarten can speak to the quality of pre-school
services in getting these children developmentally ready for grade school. Related to this, survey data showed that neither respondent agreed that the sector outcomes are realistic (Chart 7).

**Chart 7: Perceptions on Data Reporting and Outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The shared outcome(s) for this sector are measurable.</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The shared outcome(s) for this sector are realistic.</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization has improved ability to achieve the following sector outcome as a result of coordinated funding: Increased the developmental readiness of children with high needs so they can succeed in school at time of entry.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Early Childhood sector grantees are considering ways to partner with other CoFu grant partners in other sectors. Grantees mentioned that they receive value from being able to connect with others in the field, from outside of the Early Childhood sector, understand more about their work, and learn how they think about certain issues, such as outcome measurement. As one grantee stated, “It’s been nice to connect with other folks not only within the EC space but also all the other sectors. We are also learning how people are measuring their outcomes and thinking about ways to potentially partner in the future.”

In the years since CoFu started, the sector has seen a steady increase in children in Washtenaw County attending early childhood programs (Chart 8). This success might be attributable to a stronger collective focus among organizations in this sector as a result of CoFu. In focus groups, grantees also pointed out that “politically there’s been a greater emphasis on early childhood”, which could be another explanation for increased outcome achievement over the years.

---

55 Programs that were reported on by WISD were Early Childhood Special Education, Early On, Great Start Readiness Program (GSRP), GSRP/Head Start blended program.
Chart 8: Participation in Early Childhood Programs before Kindergarten in Washtenaw County, since the 2012-2013 School Year

The number of clients, quality of client services, and outcome achievement have all improved under CoFu. Survey data showed all survey respondents believe they have been able to serve more clients, and better serve clients, and achieve the outcomes of interest as a result of CoFu. During focus groups, grantees described the impact of CoFu. One said, “I’ve seen a more targeted, more focused approach from the community along the lines of community impact. All the funders are moving in the same direction.” Similarly, organizations agree that their ability to improve the sector outcome has increased as a result of CoFu. Some grantees did express a lack of clarity around whether these changes were directly the result of CoFu or not.
Over the past year, organizations in the Early Childhood sector have increased their sense of collaboration and increased the outcome achievement of the clients they serve. The emphasis on communication across the early childhood field has resulted in several types of collaboration for nonprofits in this sector (Charts 10 and 11). There is still room for continued collaboration, however, as survey respondents indicated that Early Childhood organizations are less willing to engage in forming alliances or merging with peer organizations.
Chart 10: Collaboration in the Early Childhood Sector in the Past Year

- Formed an alliance (formal or informal) with other nonprofits/community leaders in the community? 100%
- Collaborated with other nonprofit/community leaders to jointly advocate to address a particular community problem? 100%
- Collaborated to help other nonprofits/community leaders learn about opportunities to increase and/or improve their programs and services (e.g., opportunities for funding)? 100%
- Collaborated to share general information (e.g., information about our organization’s programs/services, what is going on in the community, etc.) with other nonprofit/community leaders in the community? 100%
- Increased outcome achievement of clients? 100%
- Collaborated with other nonprofit/community leaders to improve programming based on peer learning and/or best practices? 100%
- Collaborated to share general information (e.g., information about our organization’s programs/services, what is going on in the community, etc.) with other nonprofit/community leaders in the community? 100%
- Formed an alliance (formal or informal) with other nonprofits to provide joint programs/services? 100%

Yes  No
Chart 11: Collaboration in the Early Childhood Sector in the Past Year, continued

- Formed an alliance (formal or informal) with other nonprofits to develop and implement a parent/subsidiary relationship?
  - Yes: 100%

- Met with other nonprofits to formally discuss the possibility of merging?
  - Yes: 100%

- Formed an alliance (formal or informal) with other nonprofits to consolidate back-office functions (e.g., shared financial management systems, shared management of human resource management)?
  - Yes: 100%

- Formed an alliance (formal or informal) with another nonprofit for a joint venture (e.g., to develop a client tracking database, to jointly provide technical assistance to other nonprofits, to develop a shared earned income strategy, etc.)?
  - Yes: 33%
  - No: 67%

- Collaborated with other community leaders to seek funding to coordinate work to address the sector's priority outcome?
  - Yes: 67%
  - No: 33%
Perceptions of the Coordinated Funding Model

Grantees have a low level of awareness of CoFu’s funding process. Grantees were not confident that the amount of funding given out to organizations is based on the organizations’ programmatic work. As one grantee described it, “My sense is that the amount of funding does not match the programmatic goals, but is dependent on other [funding resources] being available.” Every sector respondent disagreed with or said they didn’t know about several aspects of the funding process including the level of community involvement in developing outcomes, the logic behind proposal scoring, and the distribution of funding (Chart 12). Additionally, no one agreed that the process to select Priority Areas and shared outcomes was clear and transparent.

Chart 12: Perceptions of the Priority Areas and the Funding Process

Quantitative data indicate CoFu may have increased the level of service integration for clients and reduced time spent on grant management. As Chart 13 shows, survey respondents believe their work with clients is more integrated and comprehensive than it was previously, and that CoFu has reduced the amount of time spent on grant writing and grant management. However, there is limited qualitative data to support this finding.
Among Early Childhood grantees, there are varying levels of involvement with Sector Leader meetings and grantee convenings. Qualitative data show that some do not participate in Sector Leader meetings at all, while others actively attend. Those grantees who do participate in the Sector Leader meetings have found them to be quite valuable. For example, one grantee said, “Together we can discuss emerging trends and develop innovative ways to meet the needs arising from these trends. It also provides an opportunity to discuss and plan for changes in policy that impact our clients, as well as plan for advocacy efforts.” Sector Leaders were seen as a key avenue for expanding this learning and partnership, with grant partners wanting the Sector Leader to play a role in facilitating collaborations between organizations within the Early Childhood sector. For example one grantee said, “Part of what would make [partnership] easier for us to do, is if there was data collected and we can use the sector leaders help to figure out how to support other orgs as a capacity-builder.” The grantee convenings were also seen as valuable because they provide a space for organizations to learn from each other.
Survey data also show mixed perceptions of the Sector Leaders’ ability to play the role of a strong voice and resource in this sector (Chart 14). As referenced in the previous finding, qualitative data show that grantees would like the Sector Leaders to be more active in helping them figure out how they can support each other.

**Chart 14: Perceptions of Sector Leaders**

Grantees in this sector shared mixed feelings on their relationship with CoFu funders. Though some grantees described their relationship with funders as “good, they are open and responsive,” others pointed out that more recently there has been a lack of engagement from funders. As one grantee described it, “My sense is that we haven’t been very engaged with the funders.” They see the Sector Leaders as playing more of the direct role with them, while the CoFu funders have taken a more of a hands-off approach.

Despite mixed feelings about certain aspects of the coordinated funding model, Early Childhood organizations think this model can be replicated in other communities. They agree that it is more efficient than having several funders working in silos, providing resources to the nonprofit sector. For example, one grant partner said, “I do think that CoFu should be replicated in communities where the model is suitable...I think quality work can be done when community-wide values are established and funding supports the work on this level. It lends to make a greater impact when we all work together.”
Appendix C: Housing and Homelessness Sector

Sector Context

The Housing and Homelessness sector of CoFu works to improve the lives of those in Washtenaw County by:

1) Decreasing the number of people experiencing homelessness;
2) Increasing the stability of at risk populations to experience stable, permanent or positive housing; and,
3) Increasing the income and benefits of those at risk for homelessness.

Among those who have been the most at-risk for housing issues are unaccompanied youth, veterans, domestic violence survivors, the chronically homeless, and low-income individuals/families. Traditionally, there have been several agencies that coordinate with Washtenaw County departments to provide temporary and permanent solution services to those in need, leading to an established culture of collaboration and coordination in this sector, even prior to the existence of CoFu. Agencies that work in this sector have also received federal funding through HUD primarily for permanent supportive housing and rapid re-housing services.

The current community-level outcome for this sector is to reduce the number of people who are experiencing homelessness.

Grantees in this sector have been equally focused on their clients obtaining housing, maintaining housing, and improving their incomes and benefits. Outcomes that grantees worked on over time were coded by their main objective into those categories. Based on what they focused on in grantee report data, analysis was conducted to see how many organizations in each cohort chose to focus on these particular areas. In the Housing and Homelessness sector the outcomes were pretty evenly represented, with each being focused on by over half of the grantees.

Sources for this section:

Individuals living at or below 30% of the Area Median Income (AMI) are the target population for programs that align with this outcome.
Table 1: Number and Percentage of Grantees Focusing on Each Strategy in the Housing and Homelessness Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining Permanent/Positive Housing</td>
<td>9 of 15</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>9 of 15</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>9 of 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining Housing</td>
<td>9 of 15</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>9 of 15</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>9 of 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreasing Homelessness Time</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing Income/ Benefits</td>
<td>9 of 15</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>9 of 15</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>9 of 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of point-in-time counts of homeless individuals in Washtenaw County show achievement of this sector’s community outcome through an overall decline in homelessness. Department of Housing (HUD) data show that between 2010 and 2016, the number persons experiencing homelessness decreased (see Chart 1). This was not a steady decrease however, with jumps in point-in-time counts between 2012 and 2014. Additional Washtenaw County data show that in 2014 the average length of time people experienced homelessness was about 2.3 months. Washtenaw County’s portion of the statewide homeless population was approximately 4 percent in 2010, and it remained the same in 2016. Interestingly, though the homeless population has declined, the total number year-round beds has also declined (Chart 2). This count includes emergency housing, transitional housing, and supportive housing. It is inconclusive as to whether this decline is negative or positive as additional contextual information around the reason for the decline of beds was not available. There was limited data available to report on the number of Housing Choice Vouchers available to families in need.

58 Decreasing the duration of homelessness was an outcome created in the second funding cycle and thus data from 2011-13 was not available.
Cost-per-client in this sector has increased significantly since 2011 (Chart 3). Though there is limited data to explain this increase in cost-per-client, it is possible that people who haven’t already been housed are harder to reach, thus more expensive to serve. It is also important to note that in 2015-2016 there were less people requiring homelessness-related services, which could also factor into the cost-per-client being higher.
Nine responses to the survey were from those in the Housing and Homelessness sector, representing 17 percent of all survey respondents and a response rate of 41 percent from the sector. Because of this, survey data may not be representative of all funded organizations in the sector.

**Funding Trends**

**Housing and Homelessness has received the largest share of CoFu funding compared to other sector areas.** In the first funding cycle the sector received a total of $1.46 million per year and individual awards ranged from $13.5K to $207.5K, with an average of about $97K. During the first cycle (2011 to 2013) this sector received exactly one-third (33 percent) of the entire CoFu funding pool. For the extension funding year, the Housing and Homelessness sector received a total of $1.53 million. Finally, in the second funding cycle (2014 to 2016) this sector received $1.48 million per year, and individual awards ranged from $13.5K to $207.5K, with an average size of $134.2K. Collectively this accounted for 34 percent of the total funding pool, consistent with the previous funding cycle. Over the course of coordinated funding, 17 individual organizations have been funded, many of them during both cycles.

**Outcome Achievement**

A mapping of the outcomes grantees in this sector worked on over time, shows that the targeting services remain consistent. Though specific wording of the outcome may have changed slightly, the Housing and Homelessness sector has consistently work on improving the number of people in the county that are in stable and positive housing and improving the number of people with increased income/access to benefits (Table 2).

---

59 Calculated by (Amount of funding) / (# of people served)
### Table 2: Outcomes in the Housing and Homelessness Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased # of participants who have maintained housing for at least 6 months after receiving direct financial assistance for housing-related payments and/or housing stabilization services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased # of participants whose eviction was prevented after receiving direct financial assistance for housing-related payments and/or housing stabilization services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased # of participants who became engaged in a service relationship as a result of support from outreach and engagement programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased # of participants who exited and did not return to Emergency Shelter in a 12-month period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased # of participants who obtained a positive housing outcome at program exit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased # of participants who obtained permanent housing at program exit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased # of participants who maintained or increase their income within 12 months of program entry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased # of participants who maintained permanent housing for at least 6 months following exit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased # of participants who showed aggregate gains in self-sufficiency within 12 months of program entry, as measured by an increase in total score on the Self-Sufficiency Matrix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased # of participants placed into housing as a result of engagement efforts by outreach and engagement programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased # of participants who maintained permanent housing for at least 12 months following exit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average length of time homeless has decreased for participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased # of people who increase or maintain income and/or benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Housing and Homelessness sector grantees have varied in their ability to reach projected numbers of clients served. Grant report data show organizations in this sector, on average, met or exceeded their goal two of out the past five years, falling short of the goal in the other three years (though with a relatively small gap in two of those years). Qualitative data suggest organizations are struggling with setting an accurate projection number in terms of potential client reach. One grantee describes the tension between what the funder wants to see and the realistic goal of the organization. This person said, “It’s a game we all play in any grant we apply to…what’s the number that they want to see and that’s what we try to give them. Sometimes the goal is already set, there’s a standard in the community and we can at least go after that. We never set a goal of 100%, but it’s sometimes challenging to find that magic number.”

Chart 4: Projected Versus Actual Client Reach in the Housing and Homelessness Sector

The outcomes being collected are seen as measurable, though CoFu’s data reporting is not seen as sufficiently aligned with the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) already being used by grant partners (Chart 5). Eighty percent of grant partners agreed that outcomes they were collecting for CoFu were measureable. However, they were not seen as well-aligned with HMIS, an electronic database system that houses information about all of the individuals that access homeless services in Washtenaw County. This results in a reporting process that grant partners perceive as more compliance-oriented than learning-oriented.

Grantees also expressed frustration that the current CoFu reporting requirements takes up time that could be used to conduct deeper analysis into their pre-existing HMIS data. One grant partner explained this as follows, “It just feels more like compliance. HMIS is really the tracking tool for our housing data. If CoFu were to put more emphasis on the HMIS data, then that would be useful to us. But right now it
feels like time is just being taken away from our analysis to report for CoFu.” Despite this misalignment, most respondents to survey agreed that the shared outcomes are measureable.

Chart 5: Perceptions on Data Reporting and Outcomes

Most survey respondents felt they were better able to reduce the number of people who were homeless because of CoFu, though grantees were less likely to agree that CoFu has impacted client services in other ways. While grant partners do not believe they have been able to serve more clients under the CoFu model, they do have an improved ability to achieve sector outcomes. Survey responses revealed that a majority of respondents disagreed or were unsure if CoFu was allowing them to serve more clients that they were able to previously. And an equal percentage of survey respondents were in agreement and disagreement about whether the sector has increased learning on how to serve clients better. These data indicate some grant partners may not believe CoFu is having an overall impact on the quality or number of clients being served. In contrast a majority of respondents agreed that they have improved their ability to achieve the sector outcome (Chart 6). Through qualitative data grantees tied this to the timely and useful information being provided to them through the Sector Leader. As one grantee said, “If there’s an issue coming up in our community, our sector leader is able to pull information on best practices so that’s helpful.”
Grant partners have mixed perceptions about the clarity of communications during the funding process. Thirty-eight percent of survey respondents disagreed that the communication about the funding process was clear (Chart 7). This was echoed by qualitative data. One grantee commented about the lack of context they felt CoFu was using to make grant decisions. This person said, “If we get a drop in federal or state funding, then [CoFu] should be trying to balance the funding amount they give us. That’s more coordinated funding. There’s tons of data at the federal and state level that they can use to monitor the trends and make funding decisions. It will never be perfect, but there’s no transparency with us. So we don’t even know if they are looking at this kind of data in their decision-making.” Others felt communication around which outcomes organizations were most eligible to apply for could have been clearer. One grantee describes the confusion around this, “CoFu combines [outcomes] into one funding category, so we have both emergency shelter and rapid re-housing and we have to apply for both programs under one application. [But] for this year they wanted us to split them out into separate applications...we feel there’s been a lack of clarity on what they want us to apply for and how they want us to group or split them out.”
The Priority Areas selected by CoFu are seen as representing the areas where there is the greatest need and the organizations being selected are viewed as appropriate choices. A majority of survey respondents agreed that CoFu is focusing on the appropriate Priority Areas, given the needs in Washtenaw County. They also agreed that the grant partners funded under CoFu to work in this area were well positioned to take on the work of addressing those needs. Grant partners themselves suggested that though they could do the work, they would be able to do the work more effectively if they had additional support (e.g., training for staff, Sector Leaders’ providing them with information).

Grant partners feel CoFu’s model of centralized funding has led to some efficiency. CoFu was seen as streamlining the process of reaching out to multiple funders for support and of being able to complete only one grant report, instead of varying reports and applications for different funders.
Grant partners had some lack of clarity and disagreement with the current reporting process. As mentioned above, grantees appreciated only having one report, they did feel the report was overly burdensome for the level of funding being provided. There was also some tension around reporting on goal achievement. While grant partners understood the purpose of explaining numbers that fall short of what was projected, they were confused by having to report exceeding target numbers, especially because it doesn’t result in more funding in future years. One grantee said, “I never know what’s the benefit of us telling them that we’ve done more... because we still end up getting less funding each year. And there are a lot of people in the community that I’ve spoken to and they don’t understand the benefit of sharing that information because it doesn’t affect our level of funding in a positive way.”

The lack of transparency around the amount of sector-specific funding available is creating anxiety among potential grant partners. Grantees have an anxiety that the focus of CoFu will covertly shift between grant cycles, resulting in less funding be provided without any warning. One grantee described it this way, “They aren’t clear on where they are placing value within the sector, and it changes per cycle. We think that everything is the same but it turns out not to be the case and we end up with less money because of that lack of clarity.”

Housing and Homelessness agencies had a desire for reduced reporting requirements and additional support for staff. Grantees mentioned a desire to streamline the grant reporting requirements, and particularly the demographics being asked for clients, which is seen as very time consuming to compile and report. In addition, they requested training for staff related to improving their service delivery.

Sector Leader meetings and grantee convenings are seen as satisfactory, but with room for improvement. Survey data showed about half of grant partners felt their Sector Leader, Washtenaw Housing Alliance, is a strong voice and resource to the sector (Chart 9). Qualitative feedback shows that grantee convenings and Sector Leader meetings are seen as lacking a concrete focus and agenda. Grant partners requested a greater emphasis on concrete actions that can be taken to impact the sector on a systems level and increased assistance from the Sector Leader in helping understand and parse data.

**Chart 9: Perceptions of Sector Leaders**

The sector leader agencies provide a strong voice and resource to our sector.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Organizations in this sector perceive a lack of transparency and support from CoFu funders. Because grantees aren’t clear on how funding decision-making works in the CoFu model, there is a sense among agencies in this sector that the model is bureaucratic. Among survey respondents, about half were unsure or disagreed that there was clarity around the logic of proposal scoring (Chart 10). Grantees want more transparency around the about how funding and reporting decisions are made. As one person stated, “It kind of feels like everything they say is final, and there’s no flexibility. They say that we can approach them with problems we have, but it still feel very bureaucratic with the indicators, reporting etc. So that creates a fear of if our funding will be cut in future rounds, because they aren’t transparent.”

**Chart 10: Perceptions of Proposal Scoring**

The logic behind proposal scoring, was clear, consistent and well explained.

- Strongly Agree: 12.5%
- Agree: 25%
- Unsure: 12.5%
- Disagree: 38%
- Strongly Disagree: 12.5%
- Don’t Know: 0%
Appendix D: Safety Net Health and Nutrition Sector

Sector Context

CoFu’s Safety Net Health and Nutrition sector focuses on improving the lives of those in Washtenaw County by:

1) Increasing access to health services and resources residents; and
2) Decreasing the food insecurity for low-income residents.

The community-level outcomes for this sector are to increase access to health services and resources for low income residents and decrease food insecurity for low income residents. 60

In this sector, a majority of grantees funded work towards increasing healthcare access and coordination. For the purpose of analyzing how strategies may have shifted over time, outcomes focused on by Safety Net Health and Nutrition grantees were thematically coded in to the categories shown in the table below (Table 1). Looking at the number of organizations that worked on each category over time, it is evident that most of the organizations were focused on improving overall health access. It may be relevant to note that traditionally there have been fewer grantees working on Nutrition in general, which naturally skews the data.

### Table 1: Number and Percentage of Grantees Focusing on Each Strategy in the Safety Net Health and Nutrition Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare Insurance Enrollment</td>
<td>5 of 12</td>
<td>5 of 12</td>
<td>5 of 12</td>
<td>11 of 12</td>
<td>11 of 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination of Healthcare Services</td>
<td>11 of 12</td>
<td>11 of 12</td>
<td>11 of 12</td>
<td>5 of 12</td>
<td>5 of 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased Nutritional Risk</td>
<td>5 of 12</td>
<td>5 of 12</td>
<td>5 of 12</td>
<td>3 of 12</td>
<td>3 of 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This sector shows achievement in the community-level outcome of increasing health access through a decrease in uninsured residents. The rate of uninsured has dropped from nine percent in 2010 to four percent in 2015. 61 A comparison of Health Improvement Plan of Washtenaw County (HIP) survey data on insurance rates between 2010 and 2015, looking at those with an income of less than $35K, also supports that there are more low-income people in Washtenaw County that are insured (Chart 1). Data about dental care was only available for 2010 and showed that 53 percent of low income residents had dental insurance at the time.

60 Low income residents are defined as individuals or households that are at or below 200% of the federal poverty limit (FPL). Food insecurity is defined as the limited or uncertain availability of nutritionally adequate and safe foods, or limited or uncertain ability to acquire acceptable foods in socially acceptable ways.

61 1-year Estimates. Washtenaw County, American Community Survey (n.d.)
Despite a slight decline between 2010 and 2015, a majority of low-income residents report having a personal doctor or healthcare provider (Chart 2). Public data also show that since start of Affordable Care Act (ACA) health exchanges, there has been a steady increase in enrollment the Healthy Michigan Plan and other marketplace plans (Chart 3).
Data from a 2014 Feeding America survey show that in Washtenaw County the rate of food insecurity, a targeted community-level indicator, was 14 percent, slightly below the national rate of 15 percent. There was limited access to data about the rate of food insecurity over time among low-income residents specifically. However, the overall number of residents receiving SNAP benefits has declined over time (Chart 4) which has been attributed to improvements in the economy. Additionally, a comparison of HIP survey data over time showed that among low-income families there has been an increase in adults reducing food intake due to cost (Chart 5). Though a majority of low-income residents did not have to reduce food intake due to cost, this increase over time could indicate that there is room to reach more families in need through food assistance services. A comparison of available data over time shows the percentage of low-income residents that are food secure has slightly changed, only decreasing 1 percent overall (See Chart 6).

---

Sources:
Washtenaw County, DHHS Green Book and CMS Data for Open Enrollment, Marketplace Enrollment. Healthy Michigan Plan and Marketplace Data from this chart does not represent only low income residents.
Food Insecurity in Washtenaw County. Feeding America. (2014).
http://map.feedingamerica.org/county/2014/overall/michigan/county/washtenaw
Chart 4: Number of Residents Receiving SNAP from 2011-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>37,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>35,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>32,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>29,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>27,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>26,682</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 5: Percentage of Adults in Low-Income Families who Reduced Food Intake Due to Cost (from the HIP Survey)

- 2010: 13%
- 2015: 20%

---

64 Washtenaw County, DHHS Green Book
Cost-per-client has decreased slightly over time for the Safety Net Health sector (Chart 7). There is no explanation for this slight decrease based on other grantee data, but this might indicate that organizations are improving their efficiency in service delivery. This data does not include organizations working on food insecurity as the available data was too limited to perform that comparative analysis.

Chart 7: Average Cost-Per-Client in the Safety Net Health Sector

$64  $59
2011-2012  2015-2016

65 Calculated by (Amount of funding) / (# of people served)
Thirteen responses to the survey were from those in the Safety Net Health and Nutrition sector, representing 25 percent of all survey respondents and a response rate of 42 percent from the sector. Because of this, survey data may not be representative of all funded organizations in the sector.

**Funding Trends**

Prior to the current round of funding (2016-2018), Safety Net Health and Nutrition did not include those working on food issues. Hunger relief was its own sector and was run primarily by the organization Food Gatherers. They were the only organization in that sector funded during the first cycle and two other grantees were added during the second cycle. Funding remained relatively consistent over the five years of the hunger relief sector’s existence. The hunger relief sector received $286.2K per year during the first funding cycle, $284K in the extension year, and then $334.8K per year during the second funding cycle.

For the Safety Net Health and Nutrition sector (excluding hunger relief), the size of individual grants ranged from $4.6K to $276.8K, with an average of $23.9K during the first cycle. During that cycle, the sector received $965.4K per year, which comprised 22 percent of the entire funding pool. Funding during the extension year was very similar, at $977.2K. During the second cycle, individual grants ranged from $16.2K to $222.6K, with the average award size being $66.3K. The sector saw a drop in their CoFu funding in this cycle, receiving $663.4K per year, or 15 percent of the total CoFu pool.

This sector receives the second largest amount of funding from the CoFu pool, though organizations focused on food insecurity feel they are receiving less funding. Organizations focused on food security noted that the streamlining of sectors and outcomes made less funding available for food security work. They worry that as this model continues, there will be less visibility for issues related to hunger relief. Qualitative data support this with comments such as, “There are pros and cons to the streamlining. I love being part of the safety net health group, but it also creates silos. Previously many of the agencies could apply individually to the funders. And now its streamlined but there’s less funding available to us for food security. So it’s kind of weakened the visibility of that need.”
Safety Net Health and hunger relief grantees differed in their opinions on the clarity of communications about the funding process. Survey data show that Safety Net Health grantees felt more positive about the communication around the funding process than grantees that were focused on hunger relief (Chart 8). This difference of opinion may have been caused by grantees’ lack of clarity on why hunger relief was consolidated with the Safety Net Health sector in recent years.

Chart 8: Perceptions of the Funding Process (Communications)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hunger Relief</th>
<th>Safety Net Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communications were clear</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outcome Achievement

Outcomes that grantees have worked on in this sector have remained consistent over the course of CoFu (Table 2). Organizations with a food security lens have focused on access to healthy foods and decreasing nutritional risk, while Safety Net Health organizations have focused on increasing access to health insurance and services.
# Table 2: Outcomes in the Safety Net Health and Nutrition Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAFETY NET HEALTH AND NUTRITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased # of patients/clients enrolled or re-enrolled in <strong>public health insurance programs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased # of patients/clients establishing ongoing care with a <strong>primary care provider</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased # of patients/clients receiving <strong>subsidized medical/dental services</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased # of patients/clients completing <strong>specialty care treatment plans</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased # of patients/clients completing <strong>dental treatment plans</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased # of patients/clients <strong>linked to mental health or substance abuse services</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased # of women <strong>receiving pre-natal, inter-pregnancy, and post-natal care</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased # of patients/clients <strong>regularly accessing and consuming healthy foods</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased # of patients/clients <strong>demonstrating a decreased nutritional risk</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased # of patients/clients <strong>demonstrating improvement in health knowledge and behavior</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased # of patients/clients <strong>effectively managing chronic illness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased # of patients/clients receiving <strong>cancer screenings</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased # of patients/clients receiving <strong>immunizations, age-appropriate screenings and Body Mass Index status</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased # of patients/clients receiving <strong>preventative healthcare services</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased # of people <strong>receiving care coordination between primary care providers and other care categories</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased access to primary care and adult dental care services for the uninsured and for those newly insured under the Affordable Care Act (ACA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased total number of patients served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased # of low income (at or below 200% FPL) residents whose nutritional risk has decreased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased average daily consumption of fruits and vegetables (FV) (excluding potatoes) in a cross-sectional sample of clients accessing fruits and vegetables at the targeted 40 programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Organizations in the Safety Net Health and Nutrition sectors have exceeded their projected goals for the most part. Though more recent data was limited for the Nutrition sector, the earlier data shows that for two of the three years in the first funding cycle, grantees exceed the projected number of clients served (Chart 9). Organizations working on Safety Net Health issues were successful in surpassing their projections for every funding year (Chart 10). Survey data indicate that Safety Net Health grantees are learning from and sharing best practices with each other, which could be one reason for their success with exceeding projections (Chart 13).

**Chart 9: Projected Versus Actual Client Reach in the Nutrition Sector**

*Indicates that at least one outcome was in a format that did not allow for the calculation of clients served.*
Nonprofits in Safety Net Health are not uniformly measuring their outcomes. Grantees shared that they all have varying capacities to measure outcomes, leading to a disjointed process across agencies. Grant partners also expressed a lack of clarity on the meaning of the outcomes, which likely contributes to this variation of outcome measurement across organizations. As one grantee described, “I don’t feel like there’s been a ton of good information available on what the outcomes are. I’ve seen them but I think in the meetings it didn’t feel like it was very clear what those outcomes are. It’s a little obscure. They’re bringing people in to ask us what we think they should be looking at when the grants have already been awarded and they should be telling us directly what to report on.”

There is frustration around tracking of the shared outcomes, as nonprofits don’t find the required data to be useful for learning about the effectiveness of their programs; however, this varies by area. For example, requirements such as collecting individual-level information is not the best fit for those working on Nutrition as they serve network member organizations, where it is not feasible to have data on all the people that benefit from their services. One grantee said, “We might use some of the data to track numbers for an annual report, but our data for CoFu is like a square peg in a round hole.” Survey data support this sentiment as almost half of respondents disagreed that the reporting requirements align with how their organization collects data (Chart 11), though this varied greatly by area with 68 percent of hunger relief grant partners believe the outcomes did align with how they collect data and only 15 percent of Safety Net Health grant partners saying the same.
There is mixed feedback in this sector about visibility and integration of services. Qualitative data show that nonprofits would like more funding from CoFu to be able to increase their outreach efforts. There are still many people in the community that could benefit from their services if they were aware that they exist. For example, one grantee said, “CoFu could maybe provide more funding for the visibility of the organizations in the Safety net. There are so many people who struggle with food insecurity and don’t even know that these services are available. The funders could be helping with outreach in the broader community.”

When asked about integration of services on the survey, grantees reveal mixed feelings (Chart 12), with very few agreeing that services are more integrated and comprehensive as a result of the CoFu model. Currently, grantees recognize the duplication of services as still being a challenge to programmatic work in the sector. One grantee describes how the lack of integration can end up posing more harm than help to their intended clients, “We’ll have [clients] who use multiple services, and then...we might become the barrier to them using other services. So I don’t know if there’s enough integration among the various services that are offered. And there even seems to be some duplication of services.” Somewhat contradictory to this point, other grantees did recognize an improvement in connecting with each other as a result of CoFu. These organizations felt these stronger connections will help improve their ability to connect clients to the most relevant services in the future. One grantee describes this way, “I do think we are providing better services, we are doing a better job of connecting people to meaningful support in the long-term.”
Safety Net Health and Nutrition organizations recognize that several issues and populations are being left out of the CoFu model. Survey respondents commented on members of the community who are not being reached by CoFu’s sector areas and services, in particular, they would like to see CoFu expand its focus to include those dealing with mental health issues and substance abuse.

Grantees in this sector have increased collaborations with their peers and community leaders over the past year (Charts 14 and 15). Grantees reported sharing information and best practices and benefiting from bringing in this information to improve their own services as well as to help other organizations with program improvement. As one grantee described it, “It really helped for us to have our staff members listen to what other groups are doing sometimes helps us learn about some best practices. Usually best practices has a much more formal tone to it, that it’s been researched based. But the types of best practices that we learn from each other are less formal, more along the lines of what we’ve learned works best for our organizations.”
Chart 13: Safety Net Health Grantee Learning and Collaboration

Organizations in my sector are sharing best practices with other organizations in the sector.

Organizations in my sector have learned best practices from other organizations in the sector.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

63% Agree, 37% Disagree
75% Agree, 25% Disagree
Chart 14: Collaboration in the Safety Net Health Sector in the Past Year

- **Collaborated to share general information (e.g., information about our organization’s programs/services, what is going on in the community, etc.) with other nonprofit/community leaders in the community?**
  - Yes: 100%
  - No: 0%

- **Collaborated with other nonprofit/community leaders to improve programming based on peer learning and/or best practices?**
  - Yes: 100%
  - No: 0%

- **Increased outcome achievement of clients?**
  - Yes: 67%
  - No: 33%

- **Collaborated to help other nonprofits/community leaders learn about opportunities to increase and/or improve their programs and services (e.g., opportunities for funding)?**
  - Yes: 67%
  - No: 33%

- **Collaborated with other community leaders to seek funding to coordinate work to address the sector's priority outcome?**
  - Yes: 67%
  - No: 33%
Chart 15: Collaboration in the Hunger Relief Sector in the Past Year

Collaborated to share general information (e.g., information about our organization’s programs/services, what is going on in the community, etc.) with other nonprofit/community leaders in the community?

Collaborated with other nonprofit/community leaders to improve programming based on peer learning and/or best practices?

Increased outcome achievement of clients?

Collaborated to help other nonprofits/community leaders learn about opportunities to increase and/or improve their programs and services (e.g., opportunities for funding)?

Collaborated with other community leaders to seek funding to coordinate work to address the sector’s priority outcome?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yes | No
Perceptions of the Coordinated Funding Model

There are mixed feelings on the value of Sector Leaders’ role in the model. Some have useful engagement with Sector Leaders, while others lack clarity on the purpose of these meetings. For example, one grantee described their experiences this way, “I honestly haven’t really figured out the purpose of the sector meetings, so to me that says what the sector leaders are supposed to be doing is not clear.” In contrast, another grantee commented on the benefits of the Sector Leader’s meetings, “I will say that I have appreciated the meetings, even though it takes a big effort from us to come…I’ve learned some things that I wouldn’t have known on my own.” At this time, it is unclear if there’s an underlying cause leading to these differences in perception. Survey data support these mixed feelings about the Sector Leaders (Chart 16).

Chart 16: Perceptions of Sector Leaders

Grantees have mixed feelings on the quality of CoFu funding available to them, with a notable difference by area. There was a noticeable drop in funding given to this sector between the two cycles which was brought up as an area of tension in focus groups. As one grant partner explained, “We used to get more money from the United Way than we get now through CoFu. It wasn’t a huge amount but it was more.” The difference in perception around the adequacy of funding by area is clear – while 83 percent of hunger relief grant partners agree or strongly agree the amount of money provided is too limited to make significant change, only 22 percent of Safety Net Health grant partners say the same (Chart 17).
Lack of confidence in CoFu’s decision-making is putting a strain on the nonprofits' relationships with funders. Most respondents to the survey from the Safety Net Health sector did not agree that their relationship with funders had improved (Chart 18). As one grantee describes it, “I feel like the decision makers in CoFu who get to decide what and who they are going to fund, that they don’t necessarily know what’s really going on. The focus is always going to be where the major portion of the population is, but if you’re claiming to serve all of Washtenaw County you have to actually do that.”
Nonprofits in this sector also had mixed feelings about CoFu’s Priority Areas and outcomes. When asked if they felt the focus represented the greatest areas of need in Washtenaw County, some agreed while others were unsure (Chart 19). These responses might reflect the change in pressing health issues in the community and could indicate that nonprofits would like CoFu to be more reactive to current shifts in the sector. Survey data also indicate that there is room to improve on the level of community involvement the development of program outcomes.

**Chart 19: Perceptions of the Priority Areas and Outcomes**

- **There was adequate community input on developing the program outcomes.**
  - Strongly Agree: 15%
  - Agree: 53%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 23%
  - Disagree: 8%
  - Strongly Disagree: 8%

- **The priority areas represent areas of greatest need in Washtenaw County.**
  - Strongly Agree: 15%
  - Agree: 31%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 46%
  - Disagree: 8%

- **The process to select priority areas and shared outcomes was clear and transparent.**
  - Strongly Agree: 31%
  - Agree: 39%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 23%
  - Disagree: 8%
Appendix E: School-Aged Youth Sector

Sector Context

The School-Aged Youth sector focuses on improving the lives of youth in Washtenaw County by:

1) Increasing the graduation rate; and
2) Increasing the physical and emotional well-being of economically disadvantaged youth.

Through targeting students’ skills with 21st century learning, this sector hopes to prepare youth for their future particularly by engaging characteristics such as their sense of self-efficacy, agency, and leadership, to name a few. Additionally, this sector aims to increase youth’s engagement with school through providing out-of-school programming, educational support, and two-generational family engagement programs.

The community-level outcomes for this sector are to increase the high school graduation rate of economically disadvantaged youth and to increase the physical and emotional safety of economically disadvantaged youth in their homes, schools and communities.67

Grantees in this sector primarily focused efforts on increasing participation in school and improving the safety of students at school and home. For the purpose of analyzing how strategies may have shifted over time, outcomes that School-Aged Youth grantees focused on were thematically coded in to the categories shown in the table below (Table 1).

Table 1: Number and Percentage of Grantees Focusing on Each Strategy in the School-Aged Youth Sector68

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improving Attendance and Graduation Rates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 of 13</td>
<td>12 of 13</td>
<td>12 of 13</td>
<td>5 of 9</td>
<td>5 of 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ensuring Youth Safety/Support at Home and School</strong></td>
<td>6 of 13</td>
<td>6 of 13</td>
<td>6 of 13</td>
<td>4 of 9</td>
<td>4 of 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improving 21st Century Learning Skills</strong></td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>2 of 9</td>
<td>2 of 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

66 21st century learning is represented by knowledge in four main categories; 1) **Fundamental Subjects** - English/language arts, World languages, Arts, Mathematics, Economics, Science, Geography, History, Government and Civics, 2) **Learning and Innovation Skills** – Creativity and Innovation, Critical Thinking and Problem Solving, Communication and Collaboration, 3) **Information, Media and Technology Skills** – Information Literacy, Media Literacy, ICT Literacy, 4) **Life and Career Skills** – Flexibility and Adaptability, Initiative and Self Direction, Social and cross-cultural skills, Productivity and Accountability, Leadership and Responsibility

67 Economically disadvantaged youth are defined as those who qualify for free or reduced lunch program, or youth from families with incomes below 185% of the federal poverty limit (FPL), particularly children living in low equity/opportunity neighborhoods.

68 21st Century Skills was not a focus of this sector in the during the first funding cycle of CoFu.
Statewide data show some achievement towards community-level outcomes; graduation rates have improved, especially among economically disadvantaged youth but absenteeism has not. Michigan school data show that graduation rates overall, and among economically disadvantaged youth in particular, are higher than the statewide rates (See Chart 1). Additionally, the average dropout rate among school systems in Washtenaw County last year was about 5.5 percent, with Ypsilanti Community Schools having the highest rate at 17 percent. The county’s average dropout rate was lower than statewide rate of 9 percent. Additionally, the percentage of students proficient in Grade 3 level reading improved from 69 percent in 2010 to 71 percent in 2013. Despite this success there has been an overall increase in absenteeism among economically disadvantaged youth (See Chart 2).

Chart 1: Four-Year High School Graduation Rates for Michigan and Washtenaw County Youth between 2011 and 2015
There are mixed results in terms of youth safety. Still there is room for improvement on the issue of youth safety. Data from 2011 to 2015 show that the rate of abuse in residents from birth to age 17 is lower in Washtenaw County than in the state overall (Chart 3). However, there has been a slight increase in that rate for Washtenaw County between 2011 and 2015, going from 9 percent to 11 percent. In 2015, only 13 percent of high school students reported being picked on or bullied by another student, while 14 percent reported witnessing an act of bullying (Chart 4). However, between one-quarter and one-third said they sometimes encounter bullying. There was no comparative data available for these items from earlier years. Some public data on economically disadvantaged youth show that there has been an increase in feeling safe at school (See Chart 5). Data from a 2015 Senior Exit Survey indicated that around half of high school seniors felt that they often experienced a school environment that was safe and that they had at least one adult they could count on for support (Chart 4), while a little less than half felt their school environment was safe from intimidation and harassment. Though many feel positively, there is still room for growth in improving high school students’ physical and emotional safety. This data was not reported in terms of economic status, so there is currently no ability to report on school safety among lower-income students specifically.
Chart 3: Rates of Abuse in Michigan and Washtenaw County between 2011 and 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Washtenaw County</th>
<th>Statewide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 4: High School Safety Experience of Washtenaw County Youth Overall

- I experience a school environment safe from physical violence.
  - 95%
- There is at least one adult at my school that I could count on to help and support me if I needed assistance.
  - I am picked on or bullied by another student.
    - Often: 13%
    - Sometimes: 24%
    - Rarely: 22%
    - Never: 42%
  - I witness acts of bullying.
    - Often: 14%
    - Sometimes: 32%
    - Rarely: 32%
    - Never: 23%
  - I experience a school environment safe from physical violence.
    - Often: 55%
    - Sometimes: 35%
    - Rarely: 7%
    - Never: 3%
Comparative cost-per-client data was not able to be calculated for this sector because of the limitations of the grantee report data around number of clients served. Ten responses to the survey were from those in the School-Aged Youth sector, representing 19 percent of all survey respondents and a response rate of 48 percent from the sector. Because of this, survey data may not be representative of all funded organizations in the sector.
Funding Trends

Overall funding for this sector increased slightly between the first and second cycles, with a noticeable spike during the extension year of the first funding cycle. During the first cycle, this sector received $664.8K per year, comprising 15 percent of pool. Individual awards ranged from $9.6K to $113.3K, with an average grant size of $47.5K. The sector received a considerable increase of funding in the extension year with a total of $838.2K but then funding decreased to $766K per year in the second round. During this round of funding, individual awards ranged from $7.5K to $96.8K, with an average grant size of $76.6K, comprising 18 percent of the funding pool.

School-Aged Youth grantees perceive uneven importance being placed on the different sectors by CoFu funders. They identified a tension among the sector groups because certain sectors, such as Housing and Homelessness, get a significant share of the funding. Currently, this sector is receiving one of the smaller portions of the CoFu funding pool. Despite this, grantees felt the funding process was clear and that the RFI process was appropriate given the amount of funding they received. This might indicate that further transparency about the reason behind funding decisions could help to alleviate possible tensions among the sectors. As one grantee describes, “[It has] been a point of contention—different groups are just as important but housing and homelessness gets the lion’s share of funding because there is a county/city wide initiative to bring homelessness down to zero.

Outcome Achievement

This sector’s outcomes have consistently focused on the physical and mental safety of youth, academic achievement and improvement, and healthy relationships with adults (Table 2). The main change to the outcomes over time has been the addition of improvement on 21st century learning skills and the Youth Matrix score, both added in the second cycle of funding.
### Table 2: Outcomes in the School-Aged Youth Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased # of youth enrolled in school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased # of youth attending school in accordance with policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased # of youth making educational gains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased # of youth reporting no use of alcohol/drugs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased # of youth accessing mental and physical health services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased # of youth living in emotionally safe home environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased # of youth living a legal lifestyle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased # of youth living in stable housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased # of youth accessing physical, dental, and vision care regularly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth can identify at least one adult who can provide practical and emotional support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased # of youth engaging in safe, consensual sexual activity (if sexually active)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased # of youth showing academic improvement of at least one grade level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased # of days youth attended school (average)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth report feeling safe at school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth report feeling safe at home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased # of youth who show gains in social competency skills and behaviors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased # of youth who report at least one adult outside of family, as a result of program participation, who provides practical and emotional support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased average number of days programming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased # of participants that demonstrate a Youth Matrix score of 24 points or higher or improve by at least 4 points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased # of youth who have improved their 21st Century Learning Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grantees in this sector have consistently met their projected goals of amount of clients served. Though numbers served have declined over the course of CoFu funding, this sector seems to be able to meet their targets (Chart 6). Grantee data did not indicate possible causes for this decline in clients served.

**Chart 6: Projected Versus Actual Client Reach in the School-Aged Youth Sector**

While grant partners have a high level of frustration with collecting data for grant reports, there has been a growing emphasis on client outcomes. Reporting for CoFu is seen as taking away time from service delivery. Nonprofits expressed frustration with the reporting they are required to do for their programs. Many organizations have small staff and limited capacity so the reporting takes away from their ability to do programmatic work. Several grantees in the focus groups complained that the reporting and data collection takes up too much time and ultimately money. Here are several grantees describing this frustration:

- “Both myself and CoFu underestimate time it takes [for reporting], and when they cut our grants by $8K, and our cost of living raises, and health care costs increase, it’s a challenge.”
- “I think they should ask the cost of time we spent on data and fund it. So that it’s not taking money away. Does the funding justify 5 hours for data collection or 30 hours?”

Additionally, grant partners are experiencing hurdles with accessing school records and don’t have enough control over the information that they need to report back to CoFu. Some suggested that this struggle could be alleviated with CoFu providing support for an external person to work with organizations solely around data collection, organization, and reporting. Additionally, they think it would be helpful for CoFu to conduct some sort of community needs assessment to establish baseline data. One grantee explained, “I’m not sure they have baseline data. There needs to be an established
timeframe. They should hold off RFPs until there is a community needs assessment done for this.” Despite these feelings, organizations also reported that nonprofits in their sector have increased focused on measuring outcomes and client feedback and many agreed that organizations in their sector are more deliberated with measuring qualities of their programs (Chart 7).

Chart 7: Perceptions of Outcome Measurement in the School-Aged Youth Sector

Programming that facilitates positive youth-adult relationships is the most helpful strategy to achieving sector area change. When asked to rate the five sector strategies used in terms of helpfulness to achieve outcomes, the programming facilitating this type of relationship received the highest rating (Chart 8). Intervention programming around literacy and academic success was the second most helpful strategy. On-site school programming was rated as the least helpful. There was limited qualitative data to provide insight on why certain strategies were more helpful than others.
Grantees feel the shared outcomes may encourage focusing on youth who are easier to serve. Organizations do not think the shared outcomes are supportive of those who work with hard to reach youth or youth who are dealing with multiple social service needs beyond what their organization can offer. They worry that the current outcomes incentivize organizations to work with youth who will are easier to impact, thus increasing positive data points to report out. Grant partners see this dynamic as putting more emphasis on the reporting to CoFu rather than actually serving clients who are most in need. One grantee described it this way, “One measure is attendance rate...we work with out of school youth and it’s complicated. It incentivizes working with easier kids.”

CoFu is seen as lacking expertise in this sector. Qualitative data suggested that grantees perceive the CoFu funders as lacking experience in their sector. This lack of expertise is seen by grant partners as impacting the outcomes process leading to the changes in community outcomes. Grantees would like to have more time and opportunity to give input on the outcomes based on their experiences serving clients. One grantee explained, “Where is the institutional knowledge? I have heard that there wasn’t enough time [for grant partners] to give input on outcomes and plans...I’m not sure that people in CoFu have worked in the field and they have to recognize that.” In contrast, survey data indicated that the relationship with Sector Leaders is more positive, as most respondents agreed that the Sector Leader (Washtenaw Intermediate School District) provides a strong voice and resource to the School-Aged Youth sector.
Grantees feel CoFu is a good use of resources. All survey respondents agreed that the CoFu model allows resources to be spent and distributed more efficiently and that it is a good use of time for their staff (Chart 9).

Chart 9: Perceptions of the CoFu Model and Its Impact on Resources

![Chart 9](image)

Relationships among organizations in this sector continue to be collaborative. Grantees recognize that a lot of communication and collaboration is happening in the sector, including learning and sharing best practices. However, grant partners do not attribute this to CoFu but rather to pre-existing norms of collaboration that have always been present in the sector. While grantees believe their organizational capacity is improving, they don’t feel they are yet seeing any overall changes in the sector. As one grantee describes, “We have brought people together who thought about how can we work together to do something. I don’t know if there are any changes right now.” Survey data also support the conclusion that organizations are learning best practices from each other (Chart 10).

Chart 10: School-Aged Youth Grantee Learning and Collaboration

![Chart 10](image)
Appendix F: Capacity Building

Findings on Comprehensive Capacity Building

Over the course of the capacity-building program, grant partners funding under capacity building have chosen to work on the areas detailed in Table 1.

Table 1: Breakdown of Capacity-Building Focus Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity-Building Area</th>
<th>Number of Grant Partners Focusing Here</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Culture and Leadership</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Development</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing and Communication</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Model</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only around one-third (31 percent) of survey respondents who applied for capacity-building funding (not the Leadership DELI) actually received the funding. There were two organizations that did not apply for funding in this area but received it anyway. In total there were six respondents to the section of the survey around capacity building, representing 12 percent of survey respondents.

Grant partners had positive perceptions of the capacity-building work. Almost all respondents agreed that their organization developed leadership skills as a result of this process, and most agreed that they developed new organizational practices and experienced clear capacity gains (Chart 1). Additionally, half of the organizations who responded to the survey developed supportive networks to continue their capacity-building learning. Grant partners described positive organizational changes as the result of capacity building including: a strengthened board, a strengthened executive committee, more organizational viability, and more effective leadership and management.

---

69 Capacity-building plans were only available for 2014-15 grantees.
The capacity-building application and reporting process is not at all perceived as burdensome. Grantees were uniformly appreciative of the ease of the process and had no concerns with the level of detail in the application or reporting processes.

Grantees would like more latitude in selecting consultants. While earlier iterations of the capacity-building work allowed grantees to select their own consultants, capacity-building funding now goes directly to the NEW Center and NEW chooses consultants for the grantee. Sometimes the fit has not been ideal, and a few grantees felt that they had to be very forceful in either pushing back against a specific consultant or pushing back against the direction the consultant wanted to go. One grantee said, “We found it to be challenging to work with NEW and that very often we had to make our schedule fit to their staffing needs.”

Even non-grantees have benefitted from capacity-building learnings. Even some grantees who were not funded acknowledged that CoFu was helpful in providing sector-wide trainings on areas that were identified as capacity-building needs in grant applications. Grantees also expressed their appreciation for this support.
Findings on Leadership DELI

The Leadership DELI, also facilitated by Nonprofit Enterprise at Work (NEW), focused on providing leadership training to staff members at nonprofits. This training series was designed to cater to grassroots organizations and aims to increase participants’ knowledge and skills. Workshop topics included:

- Leading with Zing!
- How to Improve (LEAN)
- Leaders as Coaches
- The Art of Giving Great Service
- Diversity, Inclusion and Equity
- Bottom Line Training
- Creating a Vision of Greatness

Leadership DELI participants felt the workshops were a good use of their time. Twenty-six survey respondents participated in the Leadership DELI, representing half of all survey respondents. A majority of participants agreed that the workshop content was appropriate to their needs and that participating in DELI was a good use of their time (Chart 2). Additionally, participants agreed that they left each session with tangible action steps for improving leadership skills at their organization. Focus group participants who participated in Leadership DELI were also very satisfied with their experiences, though many felt that a more deliberate peer learning strategy between sessions would make the experience even more impactful (which is admittedly challenging because different staff attend different sessions). As one grantee described it, "I really like it. I don't love meetings or trainings but this one is everything they say it is. I walk away with things we are excited about. Things that have changed who I am as a manager."
There was limited data on organizational changes made as a result of participation in the Leadership DELI. A little over a third of organizations have been able to change their work, structures or culture as a result of what they learned during the DELI program.
Appendix G: Coordinated Funding Logic Models

Figure 1: Funder Outcomes Logic Model

Coordinated Funding Logic Model Layer 1: Funder Outcomes

**Inputs**
- Funding Collaborative
  - Field/sector knowledge and experience
  - Human capital
  - Existing relationships with community stakeholders
  - Cross-sector convening power
  - Financial commitment
  - Willingness to reflect and refine strategy
  - Strong governance from trustees
- Sector Leader Organizations
  - Knowledge and understanding of community needs and functioning
  - Relationships
  - Leadership and convening skills
- Grant Partners
  - Knowledge of and ability to deliver services

**Interventions**
- Funding across shared outcomes
  - Focus: Five priority areas (aging, housing and homelessness, safety net health and nutrition, school-aged youth, early childhood)
  - Strategy: One application for funding from all CoFu funders, grantees apply according to specific predetermined outcomes
- Funder coordination
  - Sharing of issue and community information with each other and nonprofit community
- Capacity building funding
  - Targeted funds available for capacity building support
- Coordination of Priority Areas
  - Sector Leaders provide a link between funders and grant partners sharing their perspective with each side
  - Sector Leaders lead the priority-level thinking in each area
  - Community-level needs assessment

**Short-term Outcomes (1-2 years)**
- F1 Funders have increased knowledge and awareness of how other CoFu funders are supporting issue areas
- F2 Increased ability to engage in rapid response to community challenges
- F3 Funders have increased knowledge and awareness of community challenges

**Interim Outcomes (3-6 years)**
- F4 CoFu collaborative better equipped to identify and engage other potential funding partners
- F5 CoFu members able to work more effectively together
- F6 Increased funder coordination on strategy
- F7 Funding maintained or increased
- F8 Increased risk tolerance among funders
- F9 Increased trust between funders and nonprofits

**Long-term Outcomes (7-10 years)**
- F10 CoFu collaborative reputation strengthened and recognized for operating effectively
- F11 Increased adaptive capacity of CoFu
- F12 Persistence of CoFu model regardless of specific players at the table
- F13 Increased effectiveness of individual funder grantmaking
- F14 Work of individual funders amplified
- F15 More equitable relationships between CoFu and grantees

*Impact:* All Washtenaw County residents, regardless of race or socio-economic status, achieve their full human potential.

**External Forces**
- e.g., policy changes, economic climate
Figure 2: Grant Partner Outcomes Logic Model

Coordinated Funding Logic Model Layer 2: Grant Partner Outcomes

**Inputs**
- Funding Collaborative
  - Field/sector knowledge and experience
  - Human capital
  - Existing relationships with community stakeholders
  - Cross-sector convening power
  - Financial commitment
  - Willingness to reflect and refine strategy
  - Strong governance from trustees
- Sector Leader Organizations
  - Knowledge and understanding of community needs and functioning
  - Relationships
  - Leadership and convening skills
- Grant Partners
  - Knowledge of and ability to deliver services

**Interventions**
- Funding across shared outcomes
  - Focus: Five priority areas (aging, housing and homelessness, safety, health and nutrition, school-aged youth, early childhood)
  - Strategy: One application for funding from all CoFu funders, grantees apply according to specific pre-determined outcomes
- Funder coordination
  - Sharing of issue and community information with each other and nonprofit community
- Coordination of Priority Areas
  - Sector Leaders provide a link between funders and grant partners sharing their perspective with each side
  - Sector Leaders lead the priority-level thinking in each area including data interpretation
  - Community-level needs assessment
- Capacity building funding
  - Targeted funds available for capacity building support

**Short-term Outcomes (1-2 years)**
- G1 Increased understanding of CoFu goals and outcomes
- G2 Increased understanding of community needs and issues
- G3 Increased understanding of grantee specific data

**Interim Outcomes (3-6 years)**
- G4 Increased satisfaction with grant making process by funders
- G5 Strengthened relationships with funders
- G6 Increased understanding of performance and strategic niche that individual organizations are filling
- G7 Increased nonprofit capacity in targeted areas

**Long-term Outcomes (7-10 years)**
- G8 Increased grantee advocacy for CoFu model
- G9 Increased monitoring and tracking effectiveness of nonprofits
- G10 Increased sense of comparative effectiveness
- G11 Nonprofits have increased outcomes orientation
- G12 Increased functioning of organizations engaging in this work
- Increased Grantee Adaptive Capacity
  - G13 Increased programmatic & organizational collaboration
- G14 Nonprofits are better positioned to attract more funders

**External Forces**
- a.g policy changes, economic climate
Figure 3: System Outcomes Logic Model

**Coordinated Funding Logic Model Layer 3: System Outcomes**

**Inputs**
- Collaborative funding
  - Field/sector knowledge and experience
  - Human capital
  - Existing relationships with community stakeholders
  - Cross-sector convening power
  - Financial commitment
  - Willingness to reflect and refine strategy
  - Strong governance from trustees

- Sector Leader Organizations
  - Knowledge and understanding of community needs and functioning
  - Relationships
  - Leadership and convening skills

- Grant Partners
  - Knowledge of and ability to deliver services

**Interventions**
- Funding across shared outcomes
  - Focus: Five priority areas (aging, housing and homelessness, safety, health and nutrition, school-aged youth, early childhood)
  - Strategy: One application for funding from all CoFu funders, grantees apply according to specific pre-determined outcomes

- Capacity building funding
  - Targeted funds available for capacity building support

- Coordination of Priority Areas
  - Sector Leaders provide a link between funders and grant partners sharing their perspective with each side
  - Sector Leaders lead the priority-level thinking in each area
  - Community-level needs assessment

- Funder coordination
  - Sharing of issue and community information with other funders and nonprofit community

**Short-term Outcomes (1-2 years)**
- S1 Sector leaders are able to serve as leaders in their sectors and drive and support increased nonprofit effectiveness
- S2 Increased peer learning
- S3 Increased collaboration on target outcomes/alignment of programs
- S4 Increased ability to align programs with other similar efforts
- S5 Increased knowledge of gaps and duplicative work happening

**Interim Outcomes (3-6 years)**
- S6 Participating nonprofits efforts coalesce around priority outcomes
- S7 Broader social services community efforts coalesce around priority outcomes
- S8 Increased complementarity of human services work

**Long-term Outcomes (7-10 years)**
- S9 Integrated services/seamless experience for target audiences
- S10 Increased efficiencies of community programs
- S11 Increased ability to address and deliver on community needs among nonprofits and community leaders
- S12 Better able to tackle systems change

**External Forces**
- e.g. policy changes, economic climate
Definitions Corresponding to the Logic Models

- **Adaptive Capacity**: the ability to monitor, assess, respond to, and stimulate internal and external changes. It also involves being proactive and generative by playing an advocacy role and trying to shape the environment as well.

- **Advocacy**: a wide range of expressions, actions and activities that seek to influence outcomes directly affecting the lives of the people served by the organization.

- **Learning Organization**: organizations where people continually expand their capacity to create the results they truly desire, where new and expansive patterns of thinking are nurtured, where collective aspiration is set free, and where people are continually learning to see the whole together.