

Report of the Activities, Projects and Recommendations of the Planning and Evaluation Work Group

Prepared by Jane Patrick, Collaborative Coordinator
April 19, 2010

Planning

At their last meeting, the Planning and Evaluation Work Group reviewed the discussion of the CEO Group on March 1 and the ideas for expanding the **Back Pack Program** within Otter Tail County schools. In order to help move the project along, the Planning and Evaluation Work Group offered the following suggestions for consideration:

- Since several principals on the Truancy Work Group offered to assist with this project and they have included it on their work plan, this group should take the lead in developing programs for each community.
- To support the work of the Truancy Work Group, a sign-up sheet is going around today seeking input from our partners for agency staff and/or volunteers who would be willing to help in each community. This list of individuals will be shared with the principals in each community to help them get started coordinating their projects. In addition, P & E will develop a sample letter to give to each community to use for fundraising efforts and finding key community representatives to develop and/or support programs.
- The fund raising ideas provided at the last CEO Group meeting will also be shared with each community. Individual communities will need to decide the best funding options to pursue.
- Based on free and reduced lunch enrollment, the calculations in the Perham District and the letter of intent prepared by United Way for a recent grant proposal, Jane will identify proportionate amounts of funding desired and share this with each community.
- Collaborative funding – the group discussed whether or not the Collaborative should seek and pursue funding and/or fund raising efforts to partially or wholly support the program. The group agreed that ultimately individual communities would need to be responsible for sustainable funding efforts. However, the group is proposing two questions for the CEO Group's consideration:

Action requested:

- 1) Do the partners want the Collaborative to pursue funding from local foundations such as the Otto Bremer Foundation and West Central Initiative to pursue this as a Collaborative; *and/or*
- 2) If dollars are allocated again to the Collaborative from the Lutheran Community Foundation in FY11 do we want to designate these dollars as seed money for this program?

Evaluation

As proposed in the FY11 Work Plan presented at the last meeting, P & E will be facilitating SWOT analysis to help the partners identify and recognize the strengths in our collaboration; and ultimately what is needed from our work groups to keep the Collaborative alive. The group has agreed to invite Deb Hengel, a local facilitator, to come to their July meeting to figure the best way of proceeding with this initiative.

Action Requested: An error was made in the budget proposal for FY11 which was presented to the CEO Group last month for costs to hire a facilitator to conduct the SWOT analysis. Therefore, the P & E Work Group is requesting a modification to their budget request to include an additional \$800 that they did not use this fiscal year for the Biennial Planning process. Based on the increased cost that will be associated with the SWOT facilitation, the group is requesting an amount of \$2,000 instead of \$1,200.

As a result of their discussion in April, P & E also considered the fact that it may be very helpful for the CEO Group and Executive Council to first participate in SWOT analysis to ensure that they, as the leaders of our Collaborative, can identify, recognize and support the value of this collaboration.

Action Requested: If the P & E Work Group is able to arrange SWOT analysis for our CEO Group and Executive Council at the start of FY11, would the group be willing to participate?

Action Requested:

Finally, in order to effectively and efficiently do the job that the P & E Work Group believes the Collaborative has laid out for them, they are requesting feedback from the CEO and Executive Council on the work that they do. Specifically, the group is requesting that each partner at the table take a few minutes today to answer the following questions. Partners are asked to please leave their responses on the table as the leave today.

1) How important do you feel the role of the Planning and Evaluation Work Group is to the overall structure of the Collaborative? (Circle One)

- a. Very important b. Somewhat important c. Unsure d. Not important

Comment:

2) How useful do you believe the Biennial Planning Process is to the overall Collaborative and its work groups? (Circle One)

- a. Very useful b. Somewhat useful c. Unsure d. Not useful

Comment:

3) How useful do you believe the Collaborative's Biennial Planning Process to partner organizations? (Circle One)

- a. Very useful b. Somewhat useful c. Unsure d. Not useful

Comment:

4) Have you, either as an individual agency or as a Collaborative partner, found value in the "Opportunities for Collaboration" segment of the agenda in the past 12 months? (Circle One)

- a. Yes b. Unsure c. No

Comment:

5) In what ways do you believe the Planning and Evaluation Work Group helps the Collaborative maintain its structure and organization?

6) In what ways do you think the Planning and Evaluation Work Group could improve its function to better meet the needs of the Collaborative and/or its partners?