

Question #1

- Current proposed solutions are more party driven, but should be issue driven. Need government to work together to break gridlock to reduce human suffering so that nonprofits can be more performance driven towards providing quality services vs. speculating on future funding and budget status.
- Properly functioning budget
 - o Impacts civic engagement/institutions
 - o Smart growth development- with lack of redevelopment agency funding
 - o Housing/shelter budget/funding instability
 - Child subsidies get cut first
 - o Need for fair local funding and support, values focused on equity/equality
- Government should be more preventive than reactionary. Forward thinking long term planning don't mortgage the future i.e. local \$ to keep kids out of jail by catching them before gangs, prevent health, environment issues, CA could continue to be seen as the innovator
- State budgets are passed on time. State funding for future years must be given to organizations much sooner in the budget year.
- Generate more local/ reg funding \$, less volatility in funding results in more stability of services provided
 - o Don't have to chg. Delivery based on funding streams
- Ability to be proactive vs. reactive in service delivery, more investment based services. Reduce stigma/ discrimination for service recipients. Less negative public views of social service \$ users
 - o Welfare, immigration etc.
- Quality vs. quantity may not be reflected in the system of accountability proposed. When isolated agencies are accountable and rewarded for performance on a narrow set of outcomes, accountability may result in less collaboration, not more.
- Nonprofits serve the community need functioning government. Government funding cuts negatively impact seniors, children and vulnerable population. Important programs that help community are subsidized by government. Cost of community solutions increase when prevention programs are cut and more expensive. Recidivism goes up for all programs and system is overused and abused → increased expenses. Government need to invest in prevention programs
- Less onerous reporting. Less funding available; tax regs will affect non-gov donations? Budget impasse/delay creates fatigue which affects funding. Balance current "party-line" stands towards mutual goals, i.e. what's good for the district? Increased oversight of accountability (City of Bell, Enron) checks, balance. Better/easier access to gov. funding.
- Consistency / stability in funding streams. Streamlining services/depts. Minimize needs for some services once broader goals are achieved. Increased collaboration leads to cross sector delivery of service without duplication of services. Increased efficiency and cost savings. Increased transparency.

- Government grants limited and complicated. Staff “strong get stronger”. Process at city level more streamlined complications rise as you go bigger. Innovation stifled- works better at local. Hard to keep up with process ex. Arts: inevitable that will die if we don’t pay attention.
- Collaboration
- Education . Planning for budgets two years out can help. Localize and streamline fees. Clarify state’s role. Relook at CA state constitution.
- \$ for social services. \$ for basic needs. Need for ↑ quality service for ↑ efficiency. Understanding what the community needs and wants rather than funding what programs apply.
 - o Esp. specific services for arising needs (veterans).
- Everyone is stronger when state is stronger. RFPs should reflect what communities want (strategic planning). Can we lift local best practices to the state level? Improved storytelling is needed: RESULTS. Outcomes between government and nonprofits need to better align. Look at efficiencies in service delivery. Need for realignment → authority and \$ at local level. Data driven decisions at state and local level. Where do the community needs and Nonprofit needs diverge. Stronger government is a better partner to nonprofits on capacity building. Who sets the standards? State vs. local.
- Need overarching policy. Stop tinkering → poking small holes – fix it stop short sighted decisions. Do that through building community bonds bottom up.
- Opens up lines of communications. Empower politicians to make right decisions. Give voice to the community. Would reduce the distraction and enable us to better do our job. Would provide stability, security, consistency for budgeting and planning. More information. Ultimately improves quality of services for the community. Could open up funding to new programs. Would free up more \$ for nonprofits. Create better solutions.

Question #2

- Find common ground across nonprofits statewide reforms connect with lobbying organizations to effect change that is collaborative, not divisive.
- Partner with foundations local government and nonprofits serving the same or similar population
- Promote positive change in the budget that works with nonprofit leaders to make informed decision that will impact services and funding for nonprofits
- Involvement and education of people about the environment or other issues the local level- take successful models and replicate it state-wide. Better collaboration between government agencies, private and nonprofit for test/pilot projects to provide services, etc to our community – support a better way
 - o Pay for in-home help or home remodel to keep people out of nursing homes – now only pay for in facility care
- Grassroots advocacy around certain subjects (i.e. workforce investment/development, children’s health, education)
- Become active participant in policy forums. Promote advocacy on all levels, social justice government → service recipient. Initiate/collaborate in concepts/pilot programs with positive outcomes. Lobby/join with similar/larger organizations to make policy changes. Publicize return on investment outcomes
 - o Invest in programs with best ROI
 - o Performance based
- Moving to a people centered model of service provision is important but building collaborations to shift to such models (one stops, community schools, etc.) will require not just service funding but also investment in infrastructure and training to manage integration and change and give staff support and tools they need to succeed while working differently. The devil is in the details in integration and implementation.
- Work for more with CA Forward. Have nonprofit intermediaries facilitate more forums like today’s program. Raise consciousness of nonprofits “move government closer to people”. Reframe nonprofits from government contractors to influencers, nonprofits are solution providers- not just askers for \$. Help to demonstrate nonprofits work do make a difference to the entire community (more than individual agency’s work.)
- Concerted lobbying nonprofit agenda. Finding middle ground, mergers for mission – and strategy – focused initiatives among like – minded organizations. Outreach, awareness of non partisan focus of California forward. Funding stipulation for collaborative grant seeking and program delivery.
- Create opportunities to collaborate, so many doing similar things ex. Agree on “basics” of a need then map/split up to meet –identify needs that not even recognized (instead of all doing same thing) Creates growth despite limited resources. Power of networks.
- Advocacy

- Single nonprofits, small business owners, consultants can join consortium.
- Need to understand reforms more thoroughly
- Engage and connect to what it means to pay taxes; what they are voting for → how it impacts their families and communities. Education! About redistricting; proposition. CAFWD involve/partnership with ethnic groups, religious groups, etc. in different languages. Frame the issue as involving the “majority of minority”.
- Regulation and \$. Equal distribution. Referendums/earmarks. Constant borrowing, growing deficient. Base funding on spikes. Lack of trust in gov.
 - o Use of special elections
 - o Lack of information
- Transparency
- Tax policy
- Abuse of initiative process