Unit 5: Show Me the Money – Securing and Distributing Funds
Kirsten Senturia, Sarena D. Seifer and Kristine Wong

CBPR partnerships must be as pro-active as possible in pursuing continued and new sources of funding well before current funding is due to end. Just as important as securing funding is making decisions about what funds are needed and how they will be distributed. This unit is intended to help you identify and secure funding for your CBPR partnership as well as make decisions about how those funds are distributed.

Learning Objectives

- Identify funding sources for CBPR
- Develop criteria to decide whether or not to respond to a given request for proposal
- Learn strategies for collaboratively developing a CBPR proposal
- Learn strategies for securing sustainable long-term funding
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Unit 5 Section 5.1: Developing a Fundraising Plan and Identifying Funding Sources

Since raising funds for CBPR partnerships is a challenging and competitive process, we begin this unit with some general fundraising strategies and tips to consider.

1. Utilize all of your connections

When it comes to networking, everyone is familiar with the phrase “It’s not what you know, but who you know.” This is especially true in the fundraising community. With so many projects to choose from, sometimes the only deciding factor can be a solid referral or recommendation and good word from a credible source.

To ensure that your partnership is not hindered by this common practice, when looking for resources (e.g. funding, in-kind support, people), it is important to educate yourself and be aware of all the different types of connections each partner may have to funding sources. Consider the question “who benefits from our success and how do we enlist them to help continue our efforts?” Ask partnership members to provide names of contacts they have with different organizations, associations, and sectors in the community. These may include the following: corporate/business sector, arts and culture sector, professional associations, civic organizations/associations, government (local, state, federal), foundations (local, state, national, corporate), other community initiatives, school boards/PTA, faith/personal/ethnic organizations, and key individuals.

Write down all these connections on a master list, and refer to it regularly. When writing a grant/responding to an RFP, meeting a funder at a conference or networking event, mentioning your work and relationship with the person in common may go a long ways towards your credibility than anything you may have achieved on paper. Before asking an individual or group for money, think about what you can give them in return.

2. Be proactive, not reactive

While many partnerships sit back and wait for the appropriate RFPs to come their way, they could be making more progress by proactively contacting program officers at foundations, government agencies, or even individual benefactors in the community. By contacting these individuals and giving them a general overview of your work (as well as sending them any written materials if requested), and letting them know that your partnership is always interested in CBPR funding sources, you may reap the benefits of this later, when the program officer is sending out a RFP, or a benefactor is ready to donate a good sum of money towards your program.

Involve funding agencies as partners. Invite representatives of current and prospective funding agencies to visit your community and see your work in action up-close (e.g., invite to be a speaker at a community forum, to serve on an advisory committee).

3. Consider non-traditional, creative ways to fund your partnership

As noted above, when operating in an environment where funding is scarce, it’s important to be creative and think “outside the box” to be successful. The list below includes a number of creative ways to obtain financial resources for your partnership (Community Toolbox):

• Share positioned and resources among organizations
• Become a line item in an existing budget
• Incorporate activities and services in organizations with a similar mission
• Apply for grants
• Using existing personnel resources
• Find free/low-cost personnel resources (e.g. volunteers, interns, shared positions)
• Solicit in-kind support
• Fundraisers
• Develop a fee-for-service structure
• Acquire tax revenues or public funding
• Secure endowments and giving arrangements
• Establish membership fees and dues
• Develop a business plan

4. Consider a wide range of funding sources

For example, did you know…

The Indian Health Service funds CBPR through its Native American Research Centers for Health: www.ihs.gov/MedicalPrograms/Research/narch.cfm

The US Department of Housing and Urban Development funds CBPR through its Community Outreach Partnership Centers Program: www.oup.org/programs/aboutCOPC.asp

The Administration for Children and Families funds CBPR through its Head Start-University Partnerships Program: www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/project/projectIndex.jsp?topicId=6

The Sociological Initiatives Foundation funds CBPR: www.grantsmanagement.com/sifguide.html

The Wellesley Institute funds CBPR in urban communities in Canada: www.wellesleyinstitute.com

Funding agencies that say “we don’t fund research” may fund community-based participatory approaches to community problem-solving, as Example 5.1.1 below illustrates:

Example 5.1.1: Funding Agencies that “Don’t Fund Research” may Fund CBPR

“…I participated in the Northwest Health Foundation’s 2nd annual conference on Community-Based Collaborative Research, “In Partnership with the Community: Collaborative Research to Improve Health…” One of the conference sessions featured presentations by two funding agencies with experience in funding community-based collaborative research projects. This article reports on the experience of the WK Kellogg Foundation; a future column will focus on the California Breast Cancer Research Program.

Terri Wright, program director at the WK Kellogg Foundation, began her presentation with the emphatic statement that “the Kellogg Foundation does not fund research.” She went on to explain that the Foundation is interested in solving community-identified concerns and that “the only
approach to understanding health issues is to engage community voices.” The Foundation’s mission is “to help people help themselves through the practical application of knowledge and resources to improve their quality of life and that of future generations.” For over ten years, the Foundation has been funding CBPR (CBPR) approaches to understanding and solving health issues. “CBPR allows us to operationalize our mission,” she noted. “We have a major commitment to engaged institutions and engagement implies equality, mutual responsibility, partnerships for the long haul and not just until the publication gets out.”

In response to the question, “What makes CBPR proposals competitive, what makes them stand out?” Ms. Wright highlighted a number of observations from her eight years at the Foundation: Authentic relationships in which community members are integral, equal partners – not superior or subordinate to institutional partners. Recognition that the health of communities requires community leadership and engagement, where communities are co-producers of knowledge. She mentioned the importance as a funder of not solely relying on what is written on paper, but actually going out and meeting with the partners to talk with them directly and frankly. “We have a sharp antenna for picking up when the community is being marginalized,” she noted. “We ask critical questions: Who defined the problem? Who conceptualized the problem? In what language is the problem defined? How did the community become engaged? Whose agenda is it? Who proposed the strategy?”

Ms. Wright illustrated her points with a story about a proposal she reviewed and subsequently funded after a year-long iterative process with the applicant. The initial proposal sought funding for a research project that would test an intervention designed to improve indoor air quality and decrease consequences of asthma in low-income housing. Although framed as fairly traditional community-placed research dominated by researchers, there were several “hooks” that caught the Foundation’s attention and imagination: The proposal involved an unusual collaboration between three universities, the US Department of Housing and Urban Development, a local foundation, a regional foundation, an energy company, the public housing tenants association and others. Further, the tenants association identified asthma as a problem and approached one of the universities for assistance with taking a systemic approach to solving the problem that included policy change aspirations. After a series of meetings and numerous phone calls between the Foundation and the partners involved, what ultimately was funded and implemented looked very different from what had initially been proposed. For example, rather than have university-based graduate research assistants going door-to-door to collect data from low-income housing residents, residents themselves were trained and hired for this role. Rather than have a study design in which half of the residents were
randomized to “no intervention,” the actual study design involved everyone receiving different intensities of an intervention. Rather than peer-reviewed publication as the sole end-point, public housing policy was changed, heating systems were retrofitted and other capital improvements were made, illegal toxic pesticides were identified for programmatic focus and indoor air quality was improved. In the initial proposal, “The universities were ‘right on’ with the problem but not the approach,” she noted. “The quality of the response is more robust when it’s a CBPR approach.” The partnership was transformative for all involved. The principal investigator, for example, remarked that “I will not go back to doing research the other way.”


http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/PM_100705.html#MessageFromExecDirector

6. Stay on top of CBPR funding opportunities

There are a number of ways to keep abreast of CBPR funding opportunities. We recommend the following resources:

Join the CBPR listserv co-sponsored by CCPH and the Wellesley Institute at https://mailman1.u.washington.edu/mailman/listinfo/cbpr

Scan federal funding announcements that are posted daily at www.grants.gov. On the site, you can also register to receive email notification of grant opportunities based on your identified interests.

Review the new funding opportunities in the CCPH Partnership Matters newsletter (CCPH members receive it directly by email every other Friday) at http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/guide.html#PartMatters

Scan the funding directory prepared for the 2004 Community-Based Collaborative Research Conference sponsored by the Northwest Health Foundation at http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/directory-062704f.pdf. The guide contains both federal and private funding sources listed with detailed information on each funding opportunity and previous projects that were funded, where available.
Unit 5 Section 5.2: Considering a Given Request for Proposals

Though funding agencies are beginning to increase their financial support for CBPR and other community-based research collaborations, these resources are still limited. It may be difficult for partners to identify funding opportunities that both encourage community collaboration and understand the nuances of CBPR. Partnerships may find themselves responding to funding opportunities just to get funds to support and sustain their activities, when the funding source or specific request for proposals (RFP) does not genuinely "get" CBPR. When considering funding opportunities, partnerships are advised to establish criteria that will determine whether the group will prepare a proposal in response to a given funding opportunity or RFP.

These criteria could consider the following:

- Does this RFP fit with the priorities and common agenda that the partnership has established?
- Does the funding agency appear supportive of collaborative approaches?
- Does the funding agency appear knowledgeable about partnerships and CBPR?
- When is the proposal due? Does it allow enough time to receive adequate feedback from the partners that will be involved?
- What is the time-frame for funding? Is this time appropriate for the CBPR activities being proposed?
- What ethical issues should be taken into consideration? (See Unit 1, Section 1.3 for further discussion of ethical issues)
- How will the proposals be reviewed? Are members of the review panel familiar with CBPR methodology and approaches?
- What is the history of this funding agency supporting CBPR in past awards?
- Do the specifics of the grant initiative support the CBPR principles established by the group, e.g. supports an ecological perspective or social determinants of health; allows for non-academic lead agencies and Principal Investigators or Co-Principal Investigators from the community?

Example 5.2.1: How Grant Deadlines can Crunch the Collaborative Process

While the School of Public Health and the Health Department agreed to adopt a community-based research approach for the center, there was not adequate time for the development of a true partnership in which all members could contribute to its initial design prior to the grant proposal deadline. Recognizing this lack of community involvement, a decision was made to select as potential partners community-based organizations that had some prior positive working relationship between either the School or the Health Department. Other criteria for the selection of community partners were the relevance of the organization's work to the proposed center, the success of their work, and the high regard in which they were held in the communities involved. In addition, it was proposed in the grant application that the first six months of the Detroit Community-Academic Urban Research Center (URC) would be spent establishing operating norms and setting priorities with the involvement of all partners in the process. Thus, six community-based organizations and an integrated health care system were invited and agreed to participate in the Detroit URC. It should be noted that these organizations were not involved
Following notification of the grant award, an initial planning team was established that was composed of several faculty and staff from the School of Public Health and the member of the Health Department who had been involved in submitting the grant. The team agreed that the first tasks in establishing the URC included the hiring of a Project Manager to handle the day-to-day operations of the Center and to have a separate meeting with the representatives of each of the partner organizations prior to the formation of the URC Board. The purpose of these meetings, which were held at each organization, was to begin to get to know and establish trust among the members of the organizations involved, explain the goals and objectives of the Center, discuss the principles of community-based research, outline expectations of being involved in the Center (e.g., being a member of the Board), and learn more about the organizations’ missions and activities.

The meetings held with the community-based organizations all involved the director of the organization and usually several staff members. In all instances, the persons from the School and Health Department who had some prior working relationship with the organization attended the meeting. Following introductions and a brief presentation about the Detroit Community-Academic Urban Research Center, the meeting was devoted to addressing questions from the community-based organizations. It was clear from the tone, formality, and questions asked at these meetings that there was considerable skepticism about the intentions of the University of Michigan coming into Detroit. (The University is located in Ann Arbor, a 1-hour drive from Detroit.) Specific concerns were raised regarding how the efforts of the Center would benefit the community, what the advantages to the participating organization would be, and how data were going to be used and shared with the community. In several instances, the organizations questioned why they should be involved in a "health" project given that their focus was on community and economic development rather than health or health services. The members of the initial planning team tried to listen, describe their history working with community-based organizations and conducting CBPR, and explain their definition of public health and the role of social and economic factors in health and quality of life.

It was not clear after these meetings whether all of the community-based organizations were going to choose to be involved in the Detroit URC. They all subsequently did decide to participate; however, for some of them the reasons for doing so differed from what the initial planning team (naively) had in mind. For example, as one community partner shared with the Board several years into the project: "We saw ourselves as gatekeepers. If the University was coming here, we wanted to be sure we
watched over what they were doing."


Reprinted by permission from Lippincott Williams and Wilkins http://lww.com
Unit 5 Section 5.3: Collaboratively Writing Proposals

After deciding to respond to an RFP, here are some questions to consider when assembling the research team and writing the proposal.

Assembling the research team

Which faculty, community member, or other partner representatives should be involved in the writing process? Grantwriting can be a very technical process. It is important that those involved have the skills and experience in developing grants to effectively communicate how the partnership will address the proposed issues. However, those partners who may have little or no experience in writing grants should also be included from the process. When skills such as grantwriting are shared through this type of collaborative work, the process has the effect of not only building capacity within the group, but strengthening the group as well.

Do new partners/faculty need to be invited to be a part of the existing project team? Depending on the subject of the proposal, it may be necessary to invite additional partners with expertise in specific subject matters to strengthen the proposal. However, before bringing on an additional partner, the existing partnership should collectively decide whether the particular partner is an appropriate match. For more information on identifying and selecting partners, see Unit 3, Section 3.1.

What is the role of the team and individual members in this project? Team members should be clear about the roles and responsibilities of the group. Is this just the proposal writing team or will this also be the final steering committee/advisory group that will help guide the project? What knowledge and contribution can each team member bring to the table and are they willing? Who will serve as the project’s Principal Investigator?

Exercise 5.3.1: Assembling the Research Team

In a large group or in small groups, use the following questions to consider how the research team should be assembled:

- What kind of influence will community members have on the direction and activities of the study?
- How will community members be involved in all phases of the research?
- Who will make decisions?
- What will the structure for that decision making look like?
- How will the study be staffed?
- How will the study design be developed collaboratively by community partners and researchers?
- How will the study team facilitate a collaborative community relationship and sustain equitable involvement throughout the study?
- What training or capacity building opportunities will be incorporated into the budget for community partners? What training or capacity building opportunities will be incorporated for the researchers?
- What will the benefits of participation be to the community partners, from the researchers’ point of view?
- What is the plan for sustaining the partnership in the community after completion of the project?

Determining and clarifying the roles, responsibilities and expectations in proposal writing

During the grant writing process it is imperative that all the partners involved understand what their roles and responsibilities will be in the project. For the community, if there are individuals at the table, we need to consider the capacity of the individual to carry out these roles. If there are organizations around the table, both the individual and organizational capacities need to be considered. The ability to carry out certain types of work is very different with an organizational affiliation. It is also important to know what the partners expect from the
project. This can include anything from how partners will communicate with each other and disseminate information to specific health outcomes or certain changes within the partnering community. The realities of each expectation should be discussed as well. Clarifying this early on in the process can help build trust, especially when what is expected is received.

To assure that everyone stay on the same page in terms of activities, outcomes, and resource sharing, it may be valuable to develop a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA). This document can be used to help with accountability and setting up timelines, deadlines and systems of reporting. By incorporating language necessary to clarify what is expected, this also helps in building capacity for the community-based organizations involved. It assures that both the project outcomes and organizational responsibilities are met, which in turn makes sure that the project will positively impact the community. An MOA ensures that each partner will be held accountable to fulfill their end of the bargain, and that the work is done both fairly and collaboratively. Thus, the MOA sets up both a support and accountability mechanism at the same time; no one goes off and does their own thing without regard for the other partners.

**Determining and clarifying the roles, responsibilities and expectations in proposal writing**

When preparing the grant proposal’s budget, consider items to include that may be unique or especially important in CBPR proposals. These may include:

- Communications – for example, cell phones, walkie-talkies, high speed internet access, newsletters
- Staff – for example, community organizers, outreach workers, community health workers, student research assistants, work-study students
- Safety items – for example, security guards, mace
- Photo cameras or voice recorders
- Food
- Child care
- Mileage and parking fees
- Participant incentives
- Community partner stipends or honoraria
- Tuition, continuing education credits
- Training
- Conference travel and registration fees
- Translation and interpretation services
- Promotion and marketing materials
- Dissemination – for example, community forums, public service announcements, paid advertisements

### Exercise 5.3.2: Your Partnership’s “Household” Finances

Financial management of a CBPR partnership or project can be compared to managing household finances. Consider the various roles in an actual or proposed CBPR project, and how partners adopt certain family-like behaviors and personas when money matters are on the table. Spend 15
minutes answering these questions in groups of 4-6 people, and 15 minutes discussing the answers and issues as a large group.

- Who is "earning" the income? To whom does the "company" write the paychecks?
- Who gives out the "allowance?"
- Who is responsible for making sure the "house is maintained?"
- Who is responsible for assigning "chores?" Who is responsible for doing the chores?"
- How are major purchase decisions made?
- How are major purchase decisions made?

Given the different costs, benefits and reward structures that exist across the organizations involved in a CBPR partnership, the partnership should strive to achieve an equitable distribution of these costs, benefits and resources among the partners. There are a number of strategies that partnerships can use to accomplish this, for example:

- Submit grant proposals in which non-institutional partners are the primary recipient of the funds and have major responsibility for the conduct of the project.
- Ensure that all partners receive financial compensation as part of core grant funding that adequately reflects their time involvement in the project.
- Adequately compensate community participants (who often volunteer their time and effort in partnership activities) through stipends, continuing education credits, in-kind benefits or other compensation (e.g., paying for parking or daycare) in order to make participation possible.
- Assist community partners in applying for grants and other resources for their programs.
- Challenge assumptions and the status quo regarding the allocation of funding for indirect costs. The high indirect cost rates of many institutions are often cause for concern in CBPR partnerships. Ask questions about the allocation of funding for indirect costs. For example, where do these funds go? Have there been instances in which a portion of these funds are made accessible to the principal investigator's (PI's) school/department or directly to the PI? These policies and precedents vary from institution to institution and it may be possible to direct a portion of funding for indirect costs back to the project or partnership.

**Reviewing the proposal**

Adequate time should be given for all partners involved to review the proposal and provide feedback to the grant writing team on suggestions, concerns, and questions that may need to be addressed and incorporated. All partners should consider the following items when reviewing a proposal:

*Does the proposed project:*

- Complement or contribute to the overall mission, goals, values, etc. of the partnership?
- Provide services and build capacities that have a positive impact in the community?
- Address other key CBPR principles established by the partnership?
- Involve scientifically sound research (basic or applied) that contributes to science and enhanced knowledge and understanding of a given community issue or problem?
- Apply methods that are flexible with research that involves community (i.e., research design, data collection, etc.)?

Overall, partners should think about whether the proposed project addresses community problems while creating new knowledge: Community Wisdom + Academic Research = New Knowledge
Developing strong proposals

When developing proposals, the following tips and strategies may be helpful (Seifer SD):

What drives reviewers crazy?

• When applicants don’t follow the instructions
• When there are inconsistencies between what’s described in the proposal narrative and what’s included in the budget
• When acronyms are used and not explained
• When numbers in the budget don’t add up
• When there are multiple spelling mistakes
• When tiny type is used and there is hardly any white space
• When the data sources cited are old
• When the argument for the study’s significance and relevance in a particular community are based on national data
• When a community is described only in terms of its needs and not also its strengths and assets
• When no sound rationale is provided for the composition of the partnership
• When letters of support don’t actually say anything (e.g., they all simply repeat the same language, they are not consistent with commitments described in the proposal narrative and/or budget)
• When there is not a clear link between community-defined priorities and the proposed focus and approach
• When the study design is so specific and detailed that there is no room for a participatory process
• When no attention is paid to barriers to community participation (e.g., childcare, transportation, interpretation services)
• When attention is paid to the research methods but not the methods of building/sustaining community partnerships and community participation
• When a community board is to be established, but no detail is provided about board member recruitment, composition, role, staff support, etc.
• When there is no evidence of community capacity building (e.g., creating jobs, developing leaders, sustaining programs)
• When it is not easy to discern how funding is being divided among partners (e.g., show what % is going to the community vs. the university)
• When it is not clear who was involved in developing the proposal and how it was developed
• When most or all of the funding is retained by the applicant organization

Ways to strengthen your proposal:

• Be creative! (e.g., use stories, quotes and photos to help make your case)
• Ask trusted colleagues not involved in the proposal to review drafts and be brutally honest
• Debrief on any and all comments received by reviewers
• Volunteer to be a proposal reviewer – reviewing proposals will make you a better grant writer

Understand the review criteria and peer review process followed by the funding agency you are applying to. For example, for the National Institutes of Health: http://cms.csr.nih.gov/AboutCSR/
Unit 5 Section 5.4: Securing Sustainable Long-Term Funding

As your partnership seeks long-term funding, you may find it tempting to become “funding-driven” rather than “program-driven”, due to the relative lack of CBPR funding sources available. Being funding-driven means that the overall goal to fundraising is to bring in money to fund any project or intervention – even if it means designing a new project or altering an existing project – to fit the requirements of funding opportunities that arise. In contrast, being program-driven means that your partnership only applies for grants that fit with your previously decided upon program priorities. While some may think that applying and receiving funds outside a partnership’s priority areas is a worthy short-term solution that keeps a partnership together during lean times, it is hardly a long-term solution. In the long run, focusing on fulfilling new grant objectives and adding in new partners to meet that area of expertise can distract the partnership and take away valuable time and energy from making progress on its identified focus or priorities.

Instead, it is wise for partnerships to develop a sustainable long-term funding plan – well in advance of the end date of current funding. Planning should start at least a year in advance of the date that funds are projected to run out. However, when determining when the right time is to create such a plan, note that it is never too early to begin planning, as federal government agencies have been known to reduce grantees’ funding due to budget cuts. (See related discussion of this topic in Unit 7, Unpacking Sustainability in CBPR Partnerships)

Creating a sustainable long-term funding plan

There are a number of steps involved in creating a sustainable long-term funding plan.

1. Assess your current situation

Before you determine how much money you need to raise in the future, it is helpful to have a clear context of your partnership’s current funding situation. Figure 5.4.1 provides a way to examine your situation through several different perspectives. When listing funding sources, don’t forget to include in-kind support (i.e., goods or services that are given, rather than money).

Figure 5.4.1: Current Funding Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Sources</th>
<th>Cash Totals</th>
<th>In-Kind Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time Remaining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewal Option?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services/Supports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Kind/Volunteer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exercise 5.4.2: Assessing Your Current Funding

Complete Figure 5.4.1: Current Funding Matrix and answer these questions:

• Which funders are the major supporters of the partnership, each activity/project?
• Who should be funding this effort, but isn’t?
• What funders may be able to increase their level of support for a particular activity/project?
• Which activities/projects may be ending/reduced in the next few years?
• What surprises you about the matrix?
• What have been some funding successes?
• Is there a way to reallocate some of our existing funds?
• What is good about this funding structure?
• What challenges does this funding structure present?
• Are we meeting our fundraising goals, or not?
• What is working, and what isn’t working?
• Are we getting enough return for the effort we’re putting in?
• What changes can we make to improve this situation?
• What are 3 changes our partnership can implement within the next few months that can positively impact our chances to sustain our funding?


2. Decide where to place your priorities, given your particular situation

Carefully review the answers you wrote down in response to Exercise 5.4.2. Both the matrix and discussion questions will also help you identify new funders (or types of funders) to target, and enable you to identify other areas that your partnership has not yet tapped for funding, by noting where your current financial supporters are concentrated. Lastly, the matrix may also show you where you can reallocate existing resources for greater impact. These answers will help show you where you may want to place your fundraising energy.

Consider how much time and energy your partnership may have available to raise funds. Will the partnership be able to pull off a proposal to a federal funding agency, which can take anywhere from to 6 months to up to a year (for grants that require pilot data) to complete? Do you have the time to incorporate pre-grant planning activities/data collection into your programming? If not, then applying for foundation funding may be more appropriate for you.

3. Research active RFPs and forthcoming funding announcements, and create a plan with a timeline

By identifying active RFPs and funding opportunities that you know will be announced in the coming year, your partnership will be able to put together a plan that allows you to ample time to respond, without sacrificing and compromising the work you have already been funded to do.

The plan you create should have a list of tasks associated with each funding opportunity, along with the estimated time it will take to complete each task. When estimating timeframes, think conservatively to be on the safe side, as unexpected setbacks can arise (for instance, you may be waiting longer than expected to hear back from a potential consultant on the grant or a key staff member may resign suddenly).

4. Maintain your plan with regular check-ins

To ensure that you will implement the plan, take time once a month to review the plan as part of the agenda of regular partnership meetings. This is important, as situations, conditions, and priorities can change. Discuss with partners whether or not it still makes sense to follow the plan as written. If not, make changes or substitutions
based on what is realistic for the partnership’s work plan at the time.

5. Make contingency plans and take constructive steps even when your funding is not secure

What happens if the current funding is about to end and the partnership hasn’t been successful in securing additional funding to continue?

• Find an organization willing to give resources to continue the effort for a few months, to give the partnership time to search for resources or to bridge the gap until the new funding starts?

• Ensure that there is good documentation on the effort (e.g., activities, findings, budget), so that it will be easier to restart the activity once new resources are in place.

• Apply for awards to keep the effort visible and demonstrate its worthiness.

• Engage those who are affected by the discontinuation. Get testimonials from community members – ask them to speak to policymakers, potential funders and/or the media.

Example 5.4.3: Maximing Resources and Distributing Them Equitably

Since the end of our original funding under the Community-Based Public Health initiative in 1996, we have not received funds to support our work. However, the partnerships and projects that evolved from the initial funding are receiving financial resources. The partnership decides how resources are divided through a “consensus plus” process. We still struggle with issues of fairness such as the health department and universities’ indirect cost requirements, but in so far as possible, we treat the community, academic, and practice partners equitably, reflecting the input that each will provide to the project through steering committee participation and coordination of intervention programs and other activities. We maximize the amount of funding directed to the community itself that can be used to enhance the capacity of community such as employment, office space, and the use of contracted services such as catering. The following organizations and core projects currently receive financial resources through this partnership: the Prevention Research Center Community Board, Fathers and Sons, REACH 2010, Youth Violence Prevention Center, Ruth Mott Health Careers, and Friendly Access. The University of Michigan is no longer the only lead agency. The Health Department is the fiduciary of REACH 2010 and the Greater Flint Health Coalition is the fiduciary of Friendly Access.

Excerpted from Flint PRC proposal
Unit 5 Citations


Unit 5 Recommended Resources