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How Did Washtenaw Coordinated Funders (CoFu) Get Its Start?

In 2010...

The Ann Arbor Area Community Foundation, the United Way of Washtenaw County, and the Washtenaw County Office of Community and Economic Development (comprising the City of Ann Arbor, Washtenaw County, and Washtenaw Urban County) decided to work together on a coordinated, equal and independent basis in order to maximize the impact of their human services funding in Washtenaw County in southeast Michigan (County Seat: Ann Arbor).

Maximizing funding impact meant: streamline grant distribution so as to eliminate gaps and redundancies in local area funding decisions; define and support shared, community-wide funding strategies; focus the attention of donors, funders, and nonprofit service providers on clearly articulated outcomes; continually, rigorously evaluate those outcomes; maintain transparency, accountability, inclusivity and equity in all procedures and decisions; and help community resources to go as far as possible, in particular by advocating to preserve public money going to local nonprofits. The Coordinated Funding (CoFu) model would benefit grantees by engaging them more in the grantmaking process. Rather than just apply and reapply for funding year after year, grantees would be asked by the CoFu partners to share their experiences and identify what was working in the process and what was not.

The original funders were joined in 2013 by the RNR Foundation and then in 2016 by St. Joseph Mercy Ann Arbor. The seven CoFu partners hope that their collaborative work will encourage other funders in the region and beyond to give generously in support of their work in the four Priority Areas: Aging, Cradle to Career (which includes Early Childhood and School-Aged Youth), Housing and Homelessness, and Safety Net Health and Nutrition.

In 2016...

...the seven organizations comprising the Washtenaw Coordinated Funders conducted a second evaluation of their collaborative grantmaking partnership. Grantees were asked their views on the CoFu model. Evaluators then assessed the impact of the Coordinated Funding model on the human services sector of Washtenaw County, Michigan in each Priority Area.

Advancement in each of these areas was assessed at the funder, grantee, and system levels by TCC Group of New York City. Here we present a summary of the evaluators’ findings and priority recommendations at each of those levels.

Snapshot of Washtenaw County

Location
Washtenaw County, part of the Southeast Michigan region, is 35 miles west of Detroit.

Population*
Total population: 344,791
74.5% White
12.7% Black or African American
7.9% Asian
4.0% Hispanic or Latino of any race
Population density: 488/square mile
(Ann Arbor: 4,243/square mile)
Total number of households: 125,327
5.9% consist of someone 65+ living alone
Life expectancies compared to whites
African Americans: 13 years less
Latinos: 20 years less

Income Distribution
County ranked 80/83 for income inequality and in the bottom 8% for upward income mobility

Median income
Per capita: $27,173
Household: $51,990
Family: $70,393

Below the poverty line
14% of overall population
8.6% of those under age 18
5.8% of those 65+

Education
Residents with high school diploma: 94.8%
Some college or associate’s degree: 25.9%
Bachelor’s degree: 53.3%
Graduate degree: 28%
Racial gap of 40+ points on standardized high school tests

*2010 U.S. Census
Who Are the Washtenaw Coordinated Funders?

The Coordinated Funding Memorandum of Understanding for 2016-18 was signed by the following seven funding partners:

**Ann Arbor Area Community Foundation (AAACF),** 301 North Main St., Ann Arbor; a tax-exempt public charity established in 1963 by local citizens as a permanent source of community capital. As a community foundation, AAACF is accountable to the needs of the citizens of Washtenaw County; they distribute proceeds from endowed funds as scholarships and as grants to local nonprofits.

**Washtenaw County Office of Community and Economic Development (OCED),** representing Washtenaw County, Washtenaw Urban County and the City of Ann Arbor, 415 West Michigan Avenue, Ypsilanti; informed by data and by community voices, OCED drives long-term system changes to increase equity and opportunity. OCED delivers services, invest resources, shape public policy, lead initiatives, and amplifies the impact of its community partners, so that the County’s citizens may fully participate in the community and the local economy.

**United Way of Washtenaw County (UWWC),** 2305 Platt Road, Ann Arbor; unites leaders from government, corporations, human service providers and the community to leverage funding for the network of programs that together make a meaningful, measurable difference in our community.

**RNR Foundation (RNR),** 627 Burroughs Street, Plymouth (home office in Colorado Springs, CO); a private family foundation that seeks new collaborative approaches to philanthropic investment for long-term change. RNR has supported all CoFu evaluations to date.

**Saint Joseph Mercy Ann Arbor (SJMMA),** 5301 McAuley Drive, Ypsilanti; St. Joseph Mercy invests profits back into improving healthcare services, acquiring new technologies, upgrading facilities, providing special services and programs to the community, and guaranteeing that care is available to all, regardless of ability to pay.

What Is Coordinated Funding and What Does It Do?

The Coordinated Funding model has three components—**Sector Leadership**, **Program Operations**, and **Capacity Building**—designed to streamline application and reporting procedures for grantees while preventing gaps and avoiding redundancies in services.

**Sector Leaders** (formerly called Planning and Coordinating Agencies) are agencies in each Priority Area that help CoFu funders and grantees understand what is needed to affect systems-level change in their area. This help may take the form of convenings of grantees and other organizations in a Priority Area; information on policy changes and advocacy opportunities; data analysis for a sector; and willingness to act as general “subject matter experts” in an area.

**Capacity Building** grants are meant to increase a nonprofit’s effectiveness across areas of operations, leadership & governance, fundraising, and program/service delivery to the community. CoFu funders recognize that investments in capacity and infrastructure are necessary for nonprofits to fulfill their missions and compete successfully for the program operations funding CoFu funders themselves offer.

**Program Operations**, CoFu’s largest funding area, is for service delivery in all Priority Areas. Grantees report on progress toward outcomes annually. When applying, agencies select from among 20 research-based, best-practice program strategies linked to corresponding community outcomes.

Working together, the CoFu partners can better share information, work more closely with nonprofits to establish community goals, and increase cooperation in funding decisions. CoFu model goals are to:

- Understand the landscape of local charitable needs and distribute resources more strategically
- Model the collaboration funders espouse among local nonprofits
- Leverage each other’s funding and resources
- Reduce or eliminate redundancies and streamline processes and procedures
- Better coordinate grantmaking so funders can make better informed decisions together
- Attract additional investment in Washtenaw County health and human services organizations, as was done when St. Joseph Mercy was brought into the model
- Work together with nonprofits on a set of desired outcomes that represent the impact toward which we are working, creating the conditions in which all people in the County can achieve their human potential

A 2010 planning phase identified six Washtenaw County Priority Areas for funding: **Aging, Early Childhood, Housing and Homelessness, Hunger Relief, Safety Net Health and Nutrition, and School-Aged Youth**. Subsequently, Nutrition was included in Safety Net Health, and Early Childhood and School-Aged Youth came under the Cradle to Career Initiative.
Since its inception, CoFu has awarded $28.8 million in grants. In 2011 the Coordinated Funders issued a Request for Information (agency level assessment) and a Request for Proposals (programmatic and service level assessment) to Washtenaw County health and human services agencies. Two-year program operations grants were awarded in July 2011, and funding was extended an additional year in March 2013. The second funding cycle ran from 2014–2016, the third from 2016–2018, and the fourth from 2018–2020.

Selected Findings of Note: Coordinated Funding grantees are finding capacity-building support useful for their organizations and its application process simple. Those who received capacity-building funding felt that it helped improve the effectiveness of their work. Grantees are also finding that, as a result of Coordinated Funding, they are more familiar with other local nonprofits and are better able to coordinate services county-wide.

Grantees have generally coalesced around priority areas, reporting that they do indeed represent the areas of greatest need in Washtenaw County. Grantees are also clear on what the CoFu outcomes mean and how to direct their own services to meet them.

Coordinated Funding Logic Models (See Appendix B)

CoFu logic models trace how inputs, such as knowledge, organizational and individual relationships, and funding combine to create/support funding interventions and strategies and, subsequently, social and organizational outcomes in the short term (1–2 years), medium term (3–6 years) and long term (7–10 years). External forces, such as policy changes and the economic climate, affect all stages of the logic model. The ultimate impact of all three logic models is the same: “All Washtenaw County residents, regardless of race or socio-economic status, achieve their full human potential.”

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 results they truly desire, where new and expansive patterns of thinking are nurtured, where collective aspiration is freed, and where people are continually learning to see the whole together.

How Do Grantees Apply to CoFu for Funding?

Applicants submit proposals via an online grants management system. CoFu operates both discretionary and open, competitive grants programs. The level of rigor varies between grant programs and depends in part on the size of potential award amounts to grantees.

Who Are the CoFu Grantees for 2018–2020?

CoFu’s 2018–2020 cycle is funding 59 programs at 36 Washtenaw County agencies. For a complete list of grantees, see Appendix C.

Who Are the Sector Leaders and What Do They Do?

Sector Leaders are established local nonprofits that are well positioned to help CoFu funders and grantees system-level change in their sectors. Sector leaders may convene representatives of CoFu grantee organizations and other organizations in their sector; they may provide information on relevant policy change and advocacy opportunities; they may conduct needs assessments and other data analysis for their sector; and they may be turned to as general experts in matters having to do with their sector.

The CoFu Sector Leaders are...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTOR</th>
<th>LEADERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood &amp; School-Aged</td>
<td>Success by 6 Great Start Collaborative; Washtenaw Alliance for Children and Youth (WACY); and Washtenaw Futures, all housed at the Washtenaw Intermediate School District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Net Health &amp; Nutrition</td>
<td>Washtenaw Health Plan, a public-private partnership with Washtenaw County government, UMHS, SJMHS, and other local health care providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing &amp; Homelessness</td>
<td>Washtenaw Housing Alliance, a local nonprofit and government coalition dedicated to ending homelessness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aging</td>
<td>Area Agency on Aging 1-B, a southeast-Michigan subsidiary of a statewide nonprofit network designed to help older adults access government services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the findings of this report, the Coordinated Funders are embarking on a research and learning journey about systems change efforts that could align with the model.
About the Evaluators: TCC Group

TCC Group develops strategies and programs to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of foundations, nonprofits, corporate citizenship programs, and government agencies. Their staff are strategists, program developers, capacity builders, and evaluators. They have on-the-ground experience in education, arts and culture, community and economic development, human services, environmental conservation, and health care. They are critical thinkers, effective communicators, and skilled facilitators.

TCC Group specializes in evaluating funder collaboratives like CoFu. The funding partners felt that TCC had done an outstanding job with their 2011 process evaluation. The funders thus had a working relationship with TCC, which, in turn, had good familiarity with the CoFu funding model.

Other TCC clients include: the Carnegie Corporation of New York, the Ford Foundation, the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, the American Red Cross, International Planned Parenthood, and the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum.

TCC's Evaluation and Proposed Goals

In 2016, TCC contracted with CoFu to conduct an outcomes evaluation of the initiative to date. In early 2017, TCC and the CoFu partners distributed a survey to grantees, asking their views on the entire CoFu model, since the beginning in 2010. The main evaluation questions were:

1. To what extent is Coordinated Funding achieving the outcomes that the five funders desire? To what extent is it achieving outcomes desirable to the overall nonprofit sector? To what extent are grantees in each Priority Area achieving outcomes of interest to them? What changes have been seen at the systemic level?
2. How well is the CoFu model operating? What impact is it achieving?
3. How and why might CoFu need to adapt or be reconfigured? Do operations need to be modified to better position CoFu to achieve desired outcomes?

CoFu goals are organized into three strands: funders, grantees, and the overall system.

CoFu strategies:

- Focusing on key outcomes
- Funder coordination, including information sharing
- Capacity-building funding and services
- Supporting Sector Leaders

Funders, grantees, and the system were assessed across: areas where activities are working well, areas where there is mixed evidence, and areas where activities are not working as well. CoFu grantees were surveyed about the progress on outcomes since the start of the model started, but of course had the most recent funding cycle freshly in mind.

TCC Methodology and Limitations

TCC Group used a mixed-methods approach for this evaluation. Data sources included:

- A survey completed by 52 grantees (39%)
- Focus groups and interviews with grantees, CoFu staff, Non-CoFu funders, and Sector Leaders
- A review of grant report data
- A review of publicly-available external data that could show progress on community outcomes

Limitations to the methodology:

- Relatively low response rate (39%).
- Timing of focus groups. Same week that grant reports were due.
- Lack of publicly available data. Some outcomes more easily measured than others.
- Lack of data from program beneficiaries. Evaluators did not seek feedback from program beneficiaries.

Key Research Questions

As a result of Coordinated Funding, to what extent are people better off? To address this question the evaluators drew on grantee assessment of program quality and on community-level data.

To what extent could funded programs better measure changes within participants' lives? Grantees were not always satisfied that programmatic outcomes were truly indicators of change.

Are the community-level outcomes, strategies, and program outcomes currently identified the best indicators of population-level change? Grantees and Sector Leaders expressed frustration regarding the community-level outcomes and program outcomes.

As a result of coordinated funding, to what extent are recipient organizations of capacity-building interventions better off? Overall, capacity-building work funded by CoFu has been successful.
Outcomes by Stakeholder

Progress, Findings, Recommendations

This section reviews CoFu outcome progress by stakeholder. First the funders, then the grantees, and then the system level are discussed in terms of outcome progress, in terms of findings, and finally in terms of recommendations for the future. The reader sees in each case, compared to the original CoFu mission, what is now “on track,” what is “somewhat on track,” and what is “not working well.” Where appropriate, progress is broken out as “short-term,” “interim-term,” and “long-term.”

Outcomes by Stakeholder: Funders

**PROGRESS**

**FUNDER OUTCOMES ON TRACK**

- **Short-term:** CoFu better equipped to identify and engage with additional funding partners so as ultimately to secure even more coordinated investment in the County; CoFu funding partners able to work together more effectively; funding for CoFu maintained or increased.

- **Long-term:** Persistence of the model regardless of specific funders; increased effectiveness of individual funder grantmaking; work of each individual funder amplified.

**FUNDER OUTCOMES SOMEWHAT ON TRACK**

- **Short-term:** Increased rapid-response to community challenges.

- **Interim-term:** Increased trust between funders and nonprofits.

- **Long-term:** Collaborative reputation strengthened and recognized; more equitable relationships between CoFu and grantees.

**WHAT’S WORKING WELL**

Participating funders cited an increase in their understanding of the nonprofit sector. Certain funders reported: improved adaptive capacity and improved approaches to learning and data; conversion of grantmaking system from paper to online; and improved focus for clarifying and pursuing strategic priorities. CoFu membership was seen as helping individual funders leverage and sustain funding and was perceived to help elected officials better understand health and human services issues and help them maintain current commitments of public funds for this work. Finally, funders’ staff reported a high level of collaboration; knowledge didn’t sit with one person.

**WHAT HAS MIXED EVIDENCE OF SUCCESS**

To date there is limited evidence that CoFu has had an impact on the philanthropic field overall. Grantees and Sector Leaders lacked understanding of how funding decisions were made. Finally, there were concerns about the ability of the model to allow for rapid response to emergent community needs.

**WHAT’S NOT WORKING WELL**

Grantees reported diminished relationships with funders; funder communications were not seen as transparent. It was not ideal to have Sector Leaders function as intermediaries, due to confidentiality issues.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

The effectiveness of individual funder grantmaking and informal peer learning are on track; and individual funders’ work is being amplified. Funders will continue to make individual investments that complement work being supported through CoFu.

This TCC evaluation showed that CoFu’s collaborative reputation could be improved. CoFu will continue to commission evaluations with realistic targets and to share our findings in multiple formats. Adaptive capacity must be increased, in service of which CoFu will continue to periodically address refinements to strategies or outcomes and will consider responsive grants as a strategy in response to emergent community needs.

CoFu wishes to build more equitable relationships between the funders and grantees. This means improving funder transparency by sharing findings, continuing to assess weaknesses and opportunities of the model, and better communicating changes to grantmaking and how and why CoFu makes its choices. CoFu also wishes to facilitate direct grantee interaction with funders, instead of through the Sector Leaders.

---

[The three stakeholder tracks: Funders, Grantees, Systems-Level]
Outcomes by Stakeholder: Grantees

**PROGRESS**

**WHAT’S WORKING WELL**
Capacity-building funding is useful and easy to access. Participants found value in the work and felt they had more tools to do it. Application and reporting processes were seen as low-burden. Grantees can better coordinate services. They liked getting to know other organizations in Priority Area meetings, including relationship building and strategizing about specific clients.

**WHAT HAS MIXED EVIDENCE OF SUCCESS**
Some grantees pushed back about increased collaboration, fearing that funders wanted mergers or reductions in service areas. Another major challenge is that CoFu outcomes do not align with those required by other funders. Program evaluation, outcome measurement, and reporting all pose challenges to grantees. To learn from data, grantees must engage in evaluation as well as output tracking. Reporting requirements should align with what grantees are, in fact, collecting; though agencies currently are not collecting data in uniform ways and demographic data collection is not aligned from funder to funder.

**WHAT’S NOT WORKING WELL**
There is overall low capacity for collecting outcome data and low satisfaction with outcomes. Many grantees struggle to articulate CoFu’s impact. They feel CoFu is more of a public relations tool for funders. The grant process is seen as cumbersome and extremely detailed by many grantees. The semi-annual reporting process does not have a clear purpose; results are not believed to be audited or reviewed. Finally, Sector Leader organizations are seen as middlemen, enforcing the desires of the funders, but grantees have no process for pushing back. Sector Leaders themselves expressed concern that they were go-betweens rather than advocates.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**
By encouraging grantees to share positive experiences with the CoFu model, CoFu can better articulate its value, more realistically assess the grantee experience and more candidly describe CoFu funder benefits. Grantees have indeed requested improved communication with funders, and have requested changes to reporting requirements. Funders might improve outcome and data collection resources for grantees, so they can take a direct role in making meaning from data and engage with data in a more robust and applicable way. CoFu might aggregate outcomes into dashboards for each Priority Area, so grantees understand better how outcomes shift and how their work and data collection contribute to knowledge, and CoFu can help grantees report on client demographics in a standardized way. It was suggested that CoFu continue investing in capacity-building activities, continue to build space for grantees to learn from each other, and offer adaptive capacity workshops.

Outcomes by Stakeholder: Systems-Level

**PROGRESS**

**SYSTEMS-LEVEL OUTCOME ON TRACK**
Participating agencies are coalescing around priority outcomes.

**SYSTEMS-LEVEL OUTCOMES SOMEWHAT ON TRACK**
Sector Leaders drive and support nonprofit effectiveness. There is increased peer learning; increased collaboration on outcomes and alignment of programs; increased ability to align programs with similar efforts; increased understanding of gaps and duplicative work, and increased efficacy of some community programs.

**SYSTEMS-LEVEL OUTCOMES NOT ON TRACK**
**Interim-term:** Increased satisfaction with the grantmaking process and strengthened relationships with the CoFu funders.

**Long-term:** Grantees can better coordinate services. Application and reporting are not aligned from funder to funder. CoFu should establish metrics for long-term tracking of grantee and community outcomes, which change over time, and commit to engaging a local researcher for additional support. This could improve access to indicators measuring progress on community outcomes. Grantees need adequate management capacity in order to participate in meetings led by Sector Leaders. Currently they are not finding sufficient value in the meetings to make them a high priority. The funding partners may also wish to clarify Sector Leader roles and increase support and opportunities for Sector Leaders, who themselves may need capacity building, increased understanding of their roles, and more frequent communications with CoFu staff. Finally, CoFu should use the data from needs assessments to engage all sectors around what services can best meet needs.

**OUTCOMES BY STAKEHOLDER**
Trends, Outcomes, and Perceptions of CoFu

NOTE: Revisions to CoFu program-level strategies and outcomes are considered prior to each grant cycle by all stakeholders together. Stakeholders consider whether a funder strategy is still a “gold standard” for its associated community-level outcome (e.g. increased high school graduation rates for economically disadvantaged youth). If so, best practices that support those strategies are reviewed and additional ones may be considered. If a different set of strategies is required, these will be considered, along with associated best practices.

Our Community Outcome: Increase/maintain the independent living factors of vulnerable, low-income adults 60+

Adults 60+ comprise 12 percent of the Washtenaw County population. Most pressing issues: lack of social activity/connectedness, mental and physical health, difficulty with home care and housework, mobility, financial hardship. Grantee goals are for seniors to: live stably with basic needs met; access social services; connect socially and not feel isolated.

Grantees are confident in programming strategies: Senior Social Integration, Senior Service Network Navigation, Senior Crisis Intervention. The number of clients reached declined, perhaps due to grantee efficiency or reporting issues. A significant challenge is the complexity of client needs. The absence of a county-wide aging department is a perceived barrier to service coordination.

Aging: General Trends
- Grantees have devoted equal effort to improving social support and seniors’ critical needs.
- There has been some progress toward the community-level outcome of increasing seniors’ independent living factors.
- Poverty rates among older adults in Washtenaw County have not changed over time.
- Cost-per-client has slightly increased over the course of CoFu.

Aging: Funding Trends
- The amount of funding going to this sector has remained relatively consistent.
- Though CoFu funding has remained consistent, some organizations in the sector are experiencing significant challenges securing federal or state funding.

Aging: Outcome Achievement
- Outcomes have remained similar: housing/home safety, finances, social support, mobility, health. In the most recent cycle, the funders zeroed in on vulnerable, low-income seniors.
- Grantees have shown varying abilities to achieve goals.
- Grantees are confident in their strategies: 1) senior crisis intervention; 2) senior service network navigation; and 3) senior social integration.
- Grantees need support and training in evaluation and data collection. Each grantee tracks data differently. Grantees don’t think CoFu data requests give the best picture of their work.
- With no County-wide aging department, grantees feel unable to tackle certain challenges, and they feel underserved by CoFu leadership.
Grantees had mixed feelings about shared outcomes involving enough community input. Most grantees thought shared outcomes were unrealistic and not measurable; they were more positive about their own ability to achieve outcomes. Grantees do achieve outcomes better under CoFu.

CoFu has helped grantees be more connected and be more aware of services for seniors, but grantees are not collaborating on additional funding or to advocate around aging issues.

While grantees believe outcomes are measurable, they are not finding meaning or relevance in the data by helping more children reach developmental milestones and increasing parents’ child development knowledge and parenting skills. Grantees exceeded numbers of clients served through a two-generation approach that involves parents and children in programming. Increased political backing and efficiency may have helped. Grantees’ capacities have increased. These grantees have increased collaboration with other nonprofits around peer learning, best practices, and outcome measurement.

Data indicate improved participation in early childhood programming among disadvantaged children. There has been a general decline in poverty among children 17 and under. The percentage of children meeting/exceeding socio-emotional expectations at the time of kindergarten entry has increased. The percentage of children aged 5 and under in families benefiting from the Food Assistance Program stayed almost the same from 2010 to 2014. Cost-per-client has increased slightly. Since CoFu started, there has been an increase in Washtenaw County’s focus on early childhood programming.

Early Childhood: General Trends

CoFu seeks to improve the social and mental health of families and children by engaging parents, increasing access to services, and improving parent engagement and participation in early childhood programs.

Our Community Outcome: Increase children’s developmental readiness to succeed in school. Grantees have devoted equal effort to improving parent engagement and participation in early childhood programs.

Early Childhood: Outcome Achievement

First cycle outcomes focused on parent and child health insurance enrollment, access to medical/dental services (parents and children), parenting skills, home-visit programs, and school readiness. Second cycle outcomes shifted to just home-visit services, parenting, and access to childcare and pre-school programs for high-needs children.

Grantees exceeded projections of clients served, but there is a decline in projected and actual numbers from the first grant cycle to the second, perhaps due to the shift in program outcomes.

While grantees believe outcomes are measurable, they are not finding meaning or relevance in the data reporting and outcomes. Current data tracking efforts are seen as compliance-based. Partners require significant support and capacity-building. Shared outcomes do not seem realistic to grantees, who say they lack the funding and capacity to collect meaningful data on program impact.

Grantees aren’t satisfied with current outcomes and would like to increase the focus on reducing the number of children in special education. A decrease in the number of children being referred to special education in high-needs children.

Kindergarten can speak to the quality of pre-school services. Early Childhood sector grantees are considering how to partner with CoFu grantees in other sectors. “It’s been nice to connect with other folks within the EC space and in other sectors. The funders are learning how people measure their outcomes and are thinking about ways to partner in the future.”

Under CoFu, the sector has seen a steady increase in Washtenaw County children attending early childhood programs. This may be attributable to a stronger focus among organizations as a result of CoFu and to a greater public policy emphasis on early childhood. The number of clients, quality of client services, and outcome achievement have all improved under CoFu. Organizations in this sector have increased their sense of collaboration and outcome achievement of the clients they serve. There is still room for collaboration, however. Grantees say that Early Childhood organizations are less willing to engage in alliances or mergers with peer organizations.

This sector works to: decrease the number of people experiencing homelessness in Washtenaw County; increase stable, permanent, or positive housing for at-risk populations; and increase income and benefits of those at risk for homelessness. Among those most at-risk for housing issues are unaccompanied youth, veterans, domestic violence survivors, the chronically homeless and families with low incomes. Traditionally, agencies have coordinated with County departments for temporary and permanent solutions for those in need. Agencies in this sector have also received federal funding through HUD.

This sector has increased numbers in stable and positive housing with increased income/access to benefits. They struggle with projections, affecting their ability to measure progress. They are not reaching more clients but feel they are better serving the ones they have and that their ability to measure and achieve outcomes has improved. They would like increased alignment with federally mandated reporting.

Grantees have focused equally on clients obtaining and maintaining housing and improving incomes and benefits. Over half of all grantees are focusing on each of these outcomes.

Point-in-time counts of homeless individuals in Washtenaw County show advancement toward this sector’s goal of reducing the number of people who are experiencing homelessness.

Cost-per-client in this sector has increased significantly. Those not already housed may be harder to reach and more expensive to serve. In 2015-2016, fewer people requiring homelessness-related services may have meant a greater cost per person.

Housing and Homelessness: Funding Trends

Housing and Homelessness has received the largest share of CoFu funding compared to other sector areas. First cycle: 33 percent of the CoFu funding pool. Second funding cycle: 34 percent.
Housing and Homelessness: Outcome Achievement

The Housing and Homelessness sector has consistently worked on improving the number of people in stable and positive housing and the number of people with increased income/access to benefits. Grantees have varied in reaching projected numbers of clients served. Organizations are struggling with determining potential client reach. “Sometimes there’s a standard in the community and we can go after that. We never set a goal of 100%, but it’s sometimes challenging to find that magic number.”

Eighty percent of grantees agreed that outcomes collected for CoFu were measurable. But they were not seen as well-aligned with HMIS, an electronic database housing information about all who access homeless services in the County. Grantees expressed frustration that CoFu reporting requirements take up time that could be used to conduct deeper analysis of their existing HMIS data. “If CoFu were to put more emphasis on the HMIS data, that would be useful to us.”

Respondents felt they were better able to reduce the number of people who were homeless because of CoFu; they were less likely to agree CoFu has impacted client services in other ways. Some grantees may not believe CoFu is having an overall impact on the quality of service or number of clients being served. A majority of respondents agreed that they have improved their ability to achieve the sector outcome.

Safety Net Health and Nutrition: Outcome Achievement

Grantees have exceeded goals for clients served, but outcome measurement is uneven, due perhaps to varying organizational capacities and confusion around outcome meanings. Food security grantees need increased support for outreach. Grantees increased collaboration to share learning and best practices.

Most grantees supported increases in healthcare access and coordination. Outcomes for Safety Net Health and Nutrition grantees were thematically coded into categories: Healthcare Insurance Enrollment; Coordination of Healthcare Services; and Decreased Nutritional Risk.

Safety Net Health and Nutrition: Funding Trends

Prior to the current round of funding, Safety Net Health and Nutrition did not include those working on food issues. Hunger relief was its own sector, run primarily by the organization Food Gatherers. Organizations believed that the streamlining of CoFu sectors and outcomes made less funding available for food security, though this was, in fact, not the case. They worry about decreased visibility.

Safety Net Health grantees felt more positive about the communication around the funding process than grantees focused on hunger relief. This may have been caused by grantees’ lack of clarity on why hunger relief was recently placed in the Safety Net Health sector.

Safety Net Health and Nutrition: Outcome Achievement

Outcomes in this sector have remained consistent. Food security organizations have focused on access to healthy foods and decreasing nutritional risk. Safety Net Health organizations have focused on increasing access to health insurance and services.

Organizations in the Safety Net Health and Nutrition sectors have exceeded their projected goals for the most part. Safety Net Health grantees are learning from and sharing best practices.

Grantees shared that they all have varying capacities to measure outcomes, leading to a disjointed process across agencies. “In the meetings it didn’t feel like it was very clear what those outcomes are.”

There is frustration around tracking of the shared outcomes; grantees don’t find the required data to be useful for measuring the effectiveness of their programs. This varies somewhat by area.

There is mixed feedback about visibility and integration of services. Qualitative data show that nonprofits would like more CoFu funding for outreach. Grantees reveal mixed feelings about integration of services. Duplication of services and lack of integration remain challenges, though some grantees saw greater interconnection with CoFu. One grantee said, “We are doing a better job of connecting people to meaningful support long term.”

Safety Net Health and Nutrition organizations say several issues and populations are being left out of the CoFu model. Survey respondents commented on community members not being reached by CoFu’s sector areas and services. They would like to see CoFu expand 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. Grantees reported sharing information and best practices to improve their own services and help other organizations. As one grantee described it, “It helped to have our staff listen to what other groups were doing.”
Our Community Outcome: Increase the high school graduation rates of economically disadvantaged youth and increase the physical and emotional safety of economically disadvantaged youth.

This sector focuses on improving the lives of youth in Washtenaw County by: increasing the graduation rate; and increasing the physical and emotional well-being of economically disadvantaged youth.

This sector engages young people’s self-efficacy, agency, and leadership, and it increases engagement with school through out-of-school programming, educational support, and two-generation family engagement.

Grantees in this sector primarily focused on increasing participation in school and improving the safety of students at school and home.

Grantees met goals for clients served. They have been more strategic and deliberate about measuring outcomes and client feedback, though they struggle with accessing data. Most helpful strategies: programming focused on positive youth-adult relationships; fostering literacy, school engagement and academic success. More support is needed for evaluation and data tracking.

Statewide data show some graduation rates have improved, especially among economically disadvantaged youth but absenteeism has not. Between one-quarter and one-third of students still encounter bullying.

Grantees met goals for clients served. They have been more strategic and deliberate about measuring outcomes and client feedback, though they struggle with accessing data. Most helpful strategies: programming focused on positive youth-adult relationships; fostering literacy, school engagement and academic success. More support is needed for evaluation and data tracking.

Statewide data show some graduation rates have improved, especially among economically disadvantaged youth but absenteeism has not. Between one-quarter and one-third of students still encounter bullying.

School-Aged Youth: Funding Trends

School-Aged Youth grantees perceive uneven importance being assigned to different sectors by CoFu funders. Currently, this sector is receiving one of the smaller portions of the CoFu funding pool. Grantees did feel the funding process was clear. Perhaps further transparency about funding decisions could alleviate tensions among sectors.

School-Aged Youth: Outcome Achievement

This sector’s outcomes focus on the physical and mental safety of youth, on academic achievement and improvement, and on healthy relationships with adults.

Grantees in this sector have consistently met their projected goals of amount of clients served.

Grantees 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.

Grantees also experience hurdles accessing school records. CoFu could provide support for an external person to work with organizations solely around data collection, organization, and reporting. Organizations also reported that nonprofits in their sector have increased focused on measuring outcomes and client feedback.

Programming that facilitates positive youth-adult relationships is the most helpful strategy to achieving sector area change.

The Coordinated Funders wish to amplify the value of our community investments and extend our collective reach to help all those in Washtenaw County to achieve their full potential. Grant funds awarded through the RFPs for CoFu’s 2018 Program Operations Grant Cycle will prioritize those in or at risk of being in crisis.

• Prevention Services & Programs: 35%–45% dollar allocation
• Treat immediate family/individual crises: 55%–65%

Our Priority Populations (NOTE: “dollar allocations” are a range for each population, not the relative proportion of the entire CoFu grant investment.)

• Individuals/families in ZIP codes of 48197 & 48198: 70–75% dollar allocation
• Individuals/families in census tracts with low ratings on Washtenaw Opportunity Index: 25–50%
• Individuals/families with annual incomes ≤ 200% of the Federal Poverty Level: 75–85%
• Families with newborns enrolled in Medicaid and/or with children enrolled in MiChild: 20–35%
• Homebound Seniors: 20–35%
• Individuals/families experiencing chronic homelessness: 15–30%
Comprehensive Capacity Building

In addition to grants supporting local health and human service programming across the social safety net and grants to Sector Leaders to support practitioner convening and systems change, CoFu also make grants to build capacity of the health and human services sector in Washtenaw County.

Thirty-one percent of survey respondents received capacity building funding. Twelve percent responded to the survey.

Grantees had positive perceptions of the capacity-building work. Positive changes as the result of due to building included: a strengthened board and executive committee, more organizational viability, and more effective leadership and management.

The capacity-building application and reporting process is not perceived as burdensome.

Grantees would like more latitude in selecting consultants. Capacity-building funding goes directly to the NEW Center, which chooses consultants for the grantee.

Even non-grantees have benefited from capacity-building learnings. Some grantees who were not funded acknowledged that CoFu was helpful in providing sector-wide trainings.

Findings on Leadership DELI (Develop, Elevate, Launch, Innovate)

A program of NEW: Solutions for Nonprofits, Ann Arbor/Detroit, in collaboration with ZingTrain, a program of Zingerman’s Community of Businesses, Ann Arbor

CoFu grantees attend trainings held as part of Leadership DELI, a business leadership development program facilitated by Nonprofit Enterprise at Work (NEW), a southeast Michigan organization focused on training nonprofit leaders, and ZingTrain, a program that trains both nonprofit and for-profit leaders in the unique business approach developed by Zingerman’s Community of Businesses (including the original Zingerman’s Delicatessen) in Ann Arbor. Workshops attended by CoFu grantees have included: “Leading with Zing!”, “Leaders as Coaches,” “The Art of Giving Great Service,” “Diversity, Inclusion and Equity,” “Bottom Line Training,” and “Creating a Vision of Greatness.”

Participants felt the Leadership DELI workshops were a good use of their time. There is’ however, limited data on organizational changes made as a result of participation in the Leadership DELI.

APPENDIX A: CoFu THEORY OF CHANGE

The CoFu Theory of Change grows out of the CoFu mission: “To amplify the value of our community investments and extend our collective reach.” This mission addresses a problem, articulated thus: “All Washtenaw County people do not have the opportunity to achieve their full potential.”

The Theory of Change then lists a number of “Stances” (e.g., “We engage with willing partners,” “Human capital is critical to furthering our impact,” etc.) that are presumed to be taken by all stakeholders—funders, nonprofits, citizens of the County, and so on, who constitute the Theory’s “Scope.” The stakeholders employ Strategies, such as nurturing partnerships and learning from data, that lead finally to desired Community Outcomes, broadly stated as, “All Washtenaw County people regardless of race or economic status achieve their full potential.”

APPENDIX B: LOGIC MODELS

CoFu logic models trace how inputs, such as knowledge, organizational and individual relationships, and funding combine to create/support funding interventions and strategies and, subsequently, social and organizational outcomes in the short term (1-2 years), medium term (3-6 years) and long term (7-10 years). External forces, such as policy changes and the economic climate, affect all stages of the logic model.

The ultimate impact of all three logic models is the same: “All Washtenaw County residents, regardless of race or socio-economic status, achieve their full human potential.”

APPENDIX C: PROGRAM OPERATIONS GRANTEES 2018–2020

CoFu’s 2018–2020 Program Operations Cycle is funding 59 programs at 36 Washtenaw County agencies. Appendix C lists each of the agencies and programs.
**APPENDIX A: CoFu THEORY OF CHANGE**

**MISSION:**
To amplify the value of our community investments and extend our collective reach

**THE PROBLEM**
All Washtenaw County people do not have the opportunity to achieve their full potential.
Racial & economic inequities persist in our communities
People of color are 2 times more likely to live in poverty
15% of people live in poverty
39% of people struggle to afford basic needs
Racial gap of more than 30%–40% points in student test scores
Our County is in the bottom 8% for upward income mobility

**SCOPE**
Sector leaders: Executive of Support Funders: Nonprofits: Social Service Providers: Washtenaw County people: Community stakeholders: Community members

**COMMUNITY OUTCOMES**
All Washtenaw County people regardless of race or economic status achieve their full potential.
At-risk aging population is increasingly less vulnerable
High-needs children are developmentally ready for academic achievement
Economically disadvantaged youth graduate from high school with more physical & emotional safety in their homes, schools & communities
Homelessness in rare, brief, & non-recurrent in our County
The County is a healthier community with healthier people
All have improved health through access to nutritious food

**STANCES**
Our priority populations are at the center of our work.
We engage with all partners.
Collaboration is a process, not a map.
Our network is our map.

**STRAATEGIES**
Build an adaptive service infrastructure for systems change
Empower discipline in pursuit of results
Nurture partnerships that build our expertise & sharpen our understanding
Signpost data for learning

**WE VALUE:**
Collaboration | Equity | Transparency | Outcomes | People | Adaptive Capacity

---

**APPENDIX B: LOGIC MODELS**

Impact: Human Suffering in Washtenaw County is alleviated.
Definitions

- **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.

### APPENDIX B: LOGIC MODELS

Outcomes Report, September 2018

#### APPENDIX C: PROGRAM OPERATIONS GRANTEES 2018–2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Name</th>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Funding Award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Social Services of Washtenaw County</td>
<td>Senior Services Program (SSP)</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Social Services of Washtenaw County</td>
<td>Resource Advocacy Program (RAP)</td>
<td>$9,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Social Services of Washtenaw County</td>
<td>Senior Care Information Program (SCIP)</td>
<td>$18,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Social Services of Washtenaw County</td>
<td>Senior Care Information &amp; Senior Service Network Navigation</td>
<td>$107,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Social Services of Washtenaw County</td>
<td>Senior Social Supplementation</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Advocacy Program</td>
<td>Legal Services for Older Adults</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packard Health, Inc.</td>
<td>Senior Services for Healthy Living</td>
<td>$9,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Meals on Wheels</td>
<td>Resource Advocacy Program for Active Seniors</td>
<td>$99,584</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Funding**: $865,871

---

FY18-20 Program Operations Investments

- $26,674
- PSH Miller Manor $38,867
- Treatment for Opioid Addiction $66,375
- SafeHouse Center Shelter Program $93,972
- Future Leaders $13,600
- Packard Health/SAWC Integrated Health Services at the Delonis Center $75,000
- Rapid Re-Housing for Adults $90,000
- Housing Access for Washtenaw County (HAWC) $105,000
- Family Shelter Health Assessment and Referral Program (FSHARP) $29,495
- Alternatives for Youth Program $33,750
- The Collaborative – Ypsilanti YMCA Early Childhood Development Center Family Support Program $19,000
- Check and Connect $148,882
- Senior Crisis Intervention & Senior Service Network Navigation $101,080
- Emergency Shelter Program for Youth $97,000
- SOS and IHN Rapid Re-Housing $108,362
- Youth Development Program $39,646
- Nurturing Families Washtenaw $22,500
- School Comes First! (SCF) @ Hikone, GBC & Bryant Community Centers $106,440
- Permanent Housing Supports $96,394
- School Comes First! (SCF) @ Mitchell Elementary $33,525
- Education Advocacy & Support $73,646
- Home Vegetable Garden Program $17,754
- Legal Services for Older Adults $35,000
- Home-delivered meals for persons under 60 $65,992
- Emergency Shelter for Homeless Children and Families $107,250
- Food Gatherers' Food Security Network Permanent Supportive Housing Services $14,798
- Here for YOUth $247,428
- PSH Family Services Team $100,000
- Home Services Program (HSP) $97,500
- Resource Advocacy Program for At Risk Seniors $30,453
- Ypsilanti Youth Drop-In Center $32,000
- Washtenaw ISD Early Head Start $90,000
- Resource Advocacy Program (RAP) $86,250
- Behavioral Health Services of CSSW and Packard Health – Ypsilanti Washtenaw Child Advocacy Center $35,000
- Benefits Advocacy and Referral Coordination $20,000
- Cyber Safety and Bullying/Cyberbullying Prevention Program (CSP) $14,625
- Residential and Shelter Diversion Programs $100,000
- SOS Family Shelter $47,954
- Senior Crisis Intervention Program (SCIP) $36,100
- Building Foundations $165,000
- 30 Agencies
- 59 Programs
- 1,201,843
- Total School-Aged Youth Graduation Investments: $411,243
- Washtenaw Coordinated Funding
- SAY: Graduation
- Safety Net Health
- Nutrition
- Housing & Homelessness
- Early Childhood
- Aging
- Student Advocacy Center of Michigan
- Peace Neighborhood Center
- Community Action Network
- Read 2 Succeed and Summer Education Program @ Brick Elementary School $15,000
- Ozone House
- Ozone House
- Mentor2Youth
- Avalon Housing, Inc
- Unified-HIV Health and Beyond
- Shelter Association of Washtenaw County
- Home of New Vision
- Faith in Action
- Corner Health Center
- Corner Health Center
- Catholic Social Services of Washtenaw County
- Aid In Milan
- Ypsilanti Meals on Wheels
- Ann Arbor Meals on Wheels at Michigan Medicine
- Washtenaw County Community Mental Health
- Washtenaw County Community Mental Health
- Washtenaw Coordinated Funders | coordinatedfunders.org

---

Total Rehabilitation: $90,896

- Total School-Aged Youth Safety Investments: $317,459
- Total Housing & Homelessness Investments: $1,344,788
- Total Early Childhood Investments: $676,163
- Total Nutrition Investments: $405,806
- Total Aging Investments: $493,811
- Total Safety Net Health Investments: $680,872
- Total School-Aged Youth Safety Investments: $91,877
- Total School-Aged Youth Graduation Investments: $411,243

---

Total Program Operations Investments: $4,250,144

All amounts listed are annual investment amounts. Annual funding is committed for two years, July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2020. Contingent spot availability funding.