

OFFICE HOURS REPORT COORDINATION & COLLABORATION

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. Siloing between organizations incentives competition and presents a barrier to collaboration. ^[1]
2. Health care services must address the many needs of the individual (childcare, pet care, etc.) ^[2]
3. Dispersing funds on a local level may be more effective than channeling funds through a single regional entity. ^[3]
4. The administrative burden is too high on small organizations. ^[4]
5. Small organizations do not have the capacity to independently invest in linguistic services. ^[5]
6. OHA can partner with trusted local organizations for community meetings. ^[6]

OVERVIEW

OPAL hosted a virtual Office Hours session hosted on October 3, 2023. Thirty-two grantees from around Oregon, who discussed coordination and collaboration in reports from RFGP 5250, were invited to attend (see accompanying Summary Report for full list of invitees). The session lasted one hour, and four organizations attended. The report summarizes the findings and feedback from grantee partners during that session. Please note that Portland-Metro area grantees were not included in this report, and will be part of separate, upcoming findings.

ATTENDEES

[Bridgeway Recovery](#) (Salem, OR)

[Crossroads Communities](#) (Lebanon, OR)

[Hearts with a Mission](#) (Medford, OR)

[Building Community Resilience](#) (Statewide)

BARRIERS AND CHALLENGES

1. [Siloing is one of the greatest challenges facing social services in Oregon](#). The structure of the system incentivizes inter-agency competition over grants and funding. Instead of creating separately funded areas of mental health, the system makes all providers compete for the same limited funding.
 - 1.1. Large organizations often dominate funding opportunities at the cost of the smaller organizations, whom they see as competitors. The larger organizations with more resources can be quick to go after funding opportunities, leaving very little for anybody else.
 - 1.2. Smaller organizations rarely receive any assistance from larger organizations in their region due to competition for funding and customers. As a result, they may never get off the ground.
 - 1.3. Measure 110 money entering the behavioral health system has required collaboration among providers, which organizations have viewed as a positive change overall.

- 1.4. Progress has been made, but the unfortunate truth is that large organizations also need the funding to continue to service their community and there is an infinite need and a finite resource.
2. [To effectively treat an individual, the system must also address their supplementary needs.](#)

Cooperation and collaboration are imperative because every person has many needs that must be met, including housing needs, job needs, food needs, healthcare needs, transportation needs, and childcare needs. As such, a core piece of solving Oregon's behavioral health issues is recognizing that collaboration is necessary to serve the holistic needs of the individual.

 - 2.1. Grantees provided examples of individuals choosing not to go to treatment due to no access to childcare or pet care. Additionally, when a provider must send an individual across the state for treatment, those organizations do not have any follow-up support in the person's hometown. These are examples of lacking a holistic treatment vision for an individual. Collaboration (and co-location) of services facilitates client care and lifts the burden from the individuals in need.
 - 2.2. Some work requires certificates and/or licensing by the state or county. Most organizations either (1) aren't authorized or (2) don't have the resources to provide all the services to meet a client's needs.
 - 2.3. **Crossroads Communities is piloting the "one-stop shop" model in the state.** Crossroads Communities has built an innovative community services center in Lebanon, designed to meet all needs in-house. The center co-locates healthcare services, social assistance, and workforce and educational development, with an entire first floor dedicated to childcare. To assist with transportation, the city has agreed to put a bus stop out in front of the community building.
 - 2.3.1. Crossroads Communities handles the property ownership, and partners with additional nonprofits to offer about a 60% market rate cost to have a unit within the building. Additionally, Crossroads Communities covers utilities, janitorial services, and security.
 - 2.3.2. Crossroads Communities has received more federal assistance (\$1.75 million) than state or local assistance for this development.
3. [Traditional state funding models which channel funds through a single regional entity cause inefficiencies and barriers.](#) Historically, state funds have been allocated to each county as an intermediary for distribution. The county would then either deliver the services themselves or subcontract it out after taking an administrative overhead.
 - 3.1. The outcome was a funding bottleneck, as one entity had control over dispersion of funds. Fewer funds went directly to the community, as a hefty portion was siphoned off. Small communities felt overlooked by the state for funding; nonprofits felt somewhat patronized by county organizations.
 - 3.2. Dispersion of Measure 110 funds changed this model by directly funding organizations without an intermediary. The new model regarded counties as applicants on the same playing field as small nonprofits and other historically 'underdog' groups.
 - 3.3. A hybrid of the two models, as participants noted, may be the best system, to meet administrative requirements while providing the highest direct impact.
4. [Administrative burden is too high on organizations.](#)

- 4.1. Grantees advised that many organizations do not even bother applying for grants, because reporting requirements are too demanding. An organization with one volunteer administrator cannot handle 40-50+ hours of administrative work to submit grant forms.
- 4.2. Crossroads Communities has created a program in which they share administrative services with smaller organizations. They work with volunteer-based nonprofits to co-employ workers and share their salaries.
- 4.3. Encouragingly, grantees mentioned that more recent grant applications have been more succinct, and the reporting requirements have followed. They hope this trend will continue, especially for smaller community-based organizations.
- 4.4. Grantees wonder if the high administrative burden placed on the providers has also impacted OHA's resources. Community members were told they would receive their funding within 40 days of submitting an application and receiving an invoice. However, they have been waiting up to 90 days.
5. [Small organizations do not have the capacity to independently invest in linguistic services.](#) Collaboration can allow organizations share linguistic and translation services to make it available for clients, in a way that is feasible for providers.
 - 5.1. Crossroads Communities has developed a model to share translation services with other local organizations. By devoting a portion of operation expenses to equity and inclusion, local organizations can make translation services available immediately within their small, predominately white community.
 - 5.2. Grantees believe that it may be helpful to provide a stipend to communities for linguistic services instead of having OHA employ language specialists.
6. [Distrust of government requires OHA to work with community leaders.](#) While grantees believe in-person meetings would be very useful, they would be curious to know OHA's message and goal prior to coming into their community and before facilitating local meetings.
 - 6.1. Historically, the state has leaned on county health providers to set these meetings up. However, grantees recommend going directly to the organizations. The higher you go up the ladder, the more likely people will not be willing to trust you.
 - 6.2. Grantees are all very confident that other organizations in their area would attend if it were hosted and promoted by the community leaders.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. [Adopt funding models which break down organizational silos, incentivize collaboration and discourage competition.](#)
 - 1.1. Provide separate funding opportunities based on an organization's size to avoid competition. Use the Oregon Community Foundation as a model for this bifurcated system.
 - 1.2. Use Measure 110 funding as a guide for requiring collaboration among organizations.

2. [Promote collaboration between behavioral health groups with services that meet other needs, including housing, employment, food, healthcare, transportation, and childcare needs.](#)
 - 2.1. Streamline the process for organizations to open supplemental services for individuals and co-locate behavioral health services with other social services, childcare, pet care, etc.
 - 2.2. Provide capital funds for local “one-stop” community resource centers to house multiple service organizations, following the lessons learned from the Crossroads Communities center in Lebanon.
 - 2.2.1. Observe the pilot model from Crossroads Communities in Lebanon to learn how these central locations meet the needs of their community.
3. [Allocate funds locally, or through a hybrid delivery system, instead of through an intermediary.](#)
 - 3.1. OHA should consider funding community-based administrations and allow them to distribute the funds, with a rough guideline for how the funds are to be used (specific enough to use for the right purpose but general enough to let them identify their own community needs).
 - 3.2. OHA should work to get the funding as close to the people who can use the services or are providing the services.
4. [Lower the administrative burdens and reporting requirements for small organizations with fewer resources.](#)
 - 4.1. Implement a two-tiered application and reporting system. For instance, the system could:
 - 4.1.1. Require more relaxed grant application and reporting requirements on organizations that receive less funding and have fewer resources.
 - 4.1.2. Require comparatively more rigorous application and reporting requirements for larger organizations.
 - 4.2. Consider incentivizing models to share administrative services and payrolls between smaller and larger organizations.
5. [Support organizations in providing local linguistic services.](#)
 - 5.1. Encourage collaboration between local organizations to share their linguistic and translation services.
 - 5.2. Consider providing a stipend to communities to provide linguistic services, instead of having OHA employ language specialists.
6. [OHA should establish partnerships with trusted local organizations for all community engagement related to direct funding projects.](#)
 - 6.1. Demonstrate transparency with organizations about OHA's goals prior to the community meetings.
 - 6.2. Grantees highly recommend partnering with community organizations to host local meetings. They are well-connected within their community and have longstanding relationships with local

groups. Multiple attendees offered to host the meeting in partnership with OHA in order to increase local attendance.