

CHILDREN'S SERVICES COUNCIL OF PALM BEACH COUNTY
COUNCIL MEETING
January 28, 2016, 4:30 p.m.

MINUTES

1. Call to Order

Chair Langowski called the meeting to order at 4:32 p.m.

Present:

Thomas Bean
Vince Goodman
Kathleen Kroll
Greg Langowski
Thomas E. Lynch
Shelley Vana
Thomas P. Weber

Excused: Robert M. Avossa, Ed.D; Dennis Miles; Debra Robinson, M.D.

- A. Invocation – led by Vince Goodman
- B. Pledge of Allegiance – led by Vince Goodman
- C. Presentations

- 1. Early Learning Coalition Transition Update – Amy Blechman, Program Officer (CSC); Warren Eldridge, Chief Executive Officer, Early Learning Coalition of Palm Beach County

Amy Blechman, (CSC) Program Officer stated that the Council had asked Warren Eldridge, CEO of the Early Learning Coalition of Palm Beach County (ELC), to return and give an update regarding the transition in bringing all ELC services back in-house. Warren Eldridge acknowledged Christy Young, Chief Operating Officer (ELC) and stated that Ms. Young had taken the lead in making the transition happen.

Mr. Eldridge stated that they had conducted SRA surveys over the past few years to gauge the level of customer service to their clients. He stated that the findings had been that calls were not being answered, and calls were not being returned. Mr. Eldridge stated that Mr. Lynch had posed the question at the time “how would you know that you were improving?” He referred to the display on the TV screens and stated that it was a live feed to the ELC call center. He stated that items marked in green indicated that there was an available attendant ready to answer the call. He stated that the red indicators showed that those attendants were currently engaged in a call, and that the yellow indicators showed that an employee was otherwise engaged (for example, doing paperwork). He asked a Council member to make a sample call to the call center to demonstrate usage. Commissioner Vana called in and it showed a call being received live.

Mr. Eldridge stated that the technology in which they had invested had a feature entitled “whisper” which allowed for a manager to listen in on calls, and if staff needed direction the

manager was able to prompt the agent in their earpiece, unheard by the customer. He stated that they had 70% new staff in the call center.

Mr. Eldridge stated that they had received 72,560 calls, and were experiencing over 90% service level on most days. He stated that the service level was set at 2 minutes. He stated that on the first day of school they had received 1,700 calls. He stated that as a result of the calls they had enrolled more than 4,400 children, 47% of which had come from CSC funding. He stated that they had seen more than 24,000 families in person, in addition to those families still calling in.

Mr. Eldridge showed a video which gave a face to the numbers he had described. He stated that the video had been compiled by an ELC part-time customer service agent who had had no previous experience in school readiness.

Mr. Eldridge stated that comparing how the services and enrollment had previously taken place and calculating the cost savings of bringing it in-house they had estimated a savings of \$800,000 to \$1.4 million. He stated that they were currently at \$1,086,000 in savings over the previous year. He stated that they were saving money and were doing it in an effective manner. He stated that they now had direct control should a mistake or error be brought to light. He stated that they were now able to immediately address the error and make immediate decisions. He thanked the Council for its continued support. He stated that ELC now served a total of 34,000 children each year and was the envy of the State of Florida.

Commissioner Vana stated that she had experience with Palm Tran Connection and that she was impressed with the speed with which her call into the ELC call center had been handled.

2. Minutes

A. December 3, 2015 Council Meeting

A motion by Lynch/Bean to approve the Minutes of the December 3, 2015 Council meeting as presented was approved by unanimous vote.

3. Public Comment – Agenda Items – N/A

4. Council Committees:

A. Finance Committee

Tom Lynch stated that the Finance Committee had met prior to the Council meeting and had approved the unaudited December 31, 2015 financial statements. He stated that the Finance Committee approved the Great Ideas Initiative to use creative ideas to help develop programs not currently in existence. Tom Sheehan, General Counsel asked that the Great Ideas Initiative recommendation be removed from consideration for voting as part of the Finance Committee report, because it appeared on the Council agenda for voting.

An amended motion by Goodman/Vana to approve the December 31st financial statements (unaudited) was approved by unanimous vote.

B. Personnel Committee

Chair Langowski stated that the Personnel Committee had met prior to the Council meeting. He stated that they had considered the CEO performance reviews sent in by Council members and had conducted a performance evaluation for Dr. Williams-Taylor. He stated that the Personnel Committee recommended the Council approve a 5% merit increase for the CEO, in alignment with CSC staff, effective February 1, 2016.

A motion by Lynch/Vana to approve the Personnel Committee report was approved by unanimous vote.

5. **Consent Agenda**

1. Additions, Deletions, Substitutions

Chair Langowski stated that there had been a deletion and a substitution. He stated that Agenda Item 5B(3) (Reference #9) had been deleted for this month and that a discussion regarding that item was included in the CEO Report.

Chair Langowski stated that a substitution had been made for Agenda Item 5B(2) (Reference #8), and that it now included the amount of \$144,999 which had previously been blank. He stated that miscellaneous other verbiage in the agenda item had also been changed. Tom Lynch asked what verbiage had been changed. Tom Sheehan, General Counsel stated that the fiscal impact section had been simplified and other minor changes, none of which he considered substantive. John Bartosek, Chief Communications Officer stated that there had been a reference to the item that had been deleted from the agenda, hence that language had been pulled.

2. Items to be Pulled for Discussion – Agenda items 5A(1), 5A(2), 5A(4) and 5A(5) were pulled for discussion purposes.

3. Adoption of the revised Consent Agenda and Walk-in Warrants List

A motion by Bean/Vana to approve the revised Consent Agenda with the exception of agenda items 5A(1), 5A(2), 5A(4) and 5A(5), and approve the Walk-in Warrants list was approved by unanimous vote.

A. Program

1. Annual Comprehensive Program Performance Assessment (CPPA) Results

Debra Gotlib, Director of Program Performance stated that she had last given a CPPA update six months previously. She stated that CPPA was CSC's comprehensive program performance assessment which was performed on an ongoing basis throughout the year, in general it was conducted two to three times annually. She stated that results of the CPPA were reported mid-year and year-end. She stated that the results she would share were the contract results for year-end of fiscal year 2014-15.

Ms. Gotlib stated that the CPPA areas of review were:

- program implementation and program fidelity

- data submission and data quality
- program operations
- outcome achievement.

Ms. Gotlib described the scoring system as: 90% and above "in the green" (i.e. doing well); medium score of 75% to 89% (yellow); and a low score below 75% was categorized as red. She stated that programs scoring 90% and higher indicated that the program would continue, there were no interventions, no performance improvement, and no corrective action was necessary. She stated that if a program fell in the range of 75% to 89%, if they were in the higher end of this range they may be placed on a *performance improvement* plan, and if they were in the lower end of the range they would be placed on a *corrective action* plan, level one of the progressive intervention policy. She stated that if a program scored below 75% they would develop a plan to terminate the contract and ensure that the programs were wound down, with families receiving services adequately transitioned.

Ms. Gotlib stated that there were 51 programs reviewed, 30 had been evaluated using the scored CPPA (green, yellow, red), and 21 programs had been evaluated using the short form CPPA. She stated that the short form CPPA was a shorter form for programs that looked more at contract deliverables rather than evidence-based type programs that had process measures and outcomes. She stated that of the 30 programs that went through the scored CPPA, 26 had a score of 90% or higher. She stated that 3 programs had a score within the 75% to 89% range, as follows:

- Healthy Families with a score of 87% - were placed on a level one performance improvement plan. The areas of deficit were identified on a template and the program would determine what it would do to correct that deficiency. She stated that they were given a period of time (with a maximum of 6 months), and were given a mid-point by which time they would have to increase by a certain percentage, and achieve the full improvement by the final date.
- Community Voice with a score of 87% - were on a level one performance improvement plan. She stated that they had difficulty meeting some deliverables with late submission of documents. She stated that they had not met the targeted number of families (to serve), there were plenty of families to serve but they had incorrectly counted their data.
- Budding Readers with a score of 88% - no intervention/performance improvement plan would be initiated with this program because this program was scheduled to terminate.
- TOP (Teen Outreach Program) – this program was still pending data, data is being sought from the School District, and the score should be available in April.

Ms. Gotlib stated that there had been 19 programs which had met the contract deliverables with the short form. She stated that there had been two programs which had not met contract expectations:

- Head Start Match (Lutheran Services) – would be on a level two corrective action plan.
- Transportation consultant would be on a level one performance improvement plan.

Mr. Lynch asked when it was a provider who was providing services whether they would go from a short form to a long form for CPPA assessment. Ms. Gotlib stated that if it were a program, and they were operating a program that had fidelity measures and outcomes, it would be assessed using CPPA one. Mr. Lynch asked if a program was in the yellow whether it was always given a subjective timeframe in which to self-correct. Ms. Gotlib stated that it depended on the nature of the contract and the nature of the performance measure in question. She stated that if it was a performance measure that should be able to be fixed quickly they would be given a short timeframe to fix it, whereas if it was a target that may take 5 or 6 months to see a change, then that timeframe would be prescribed. Lisa Williams-Taylor, Ph.D., stated that 6 months was typically the longest timeframe that was given for correction.

Mr. Lynch asked whether there was a timeframe on how quickly they could seek termination, if it was determined that termination was necessary. He asked Tom Sheehan, General Counsel, whether CSC could terminate its contracts immediately. Mr. Sheehan stated that CSC contracts allowed for immediate termination although CSC had typically not followed this route. He stated that with CPPA they tried to allow for transition. He gave an example of a contract based upon the school year going through September 30, but that contract may be terminated by June because there was no point in the program getting ready for the next school year. He stated that if services were still needed they liked to hand those services off to another provider, and they liked to allow opportunity for staff from the defunded agency to apply for positions at the agency assuming the contract. He stated that it was all taken into consideration when determining when to terminate.

Mr. Lynch stated that he had not seen provision in CPPA for repeat offenders, when an agency was on corrective action, they fixed it, and a year later were in the same predicament. Debra Gotlib stated that if an agency appeared multiple times it would affect their CPPA score. She stated that CSC contracts gave CSC the flexibility to terminate for whatever reason CSC chose. She stated that should an agency remain repeatedly in the yellow, CSC could terminate the contract for poor performance. She stated that if an agency did not improve (even if it had not ventured into the red) then CSC would seek to terminate. Lisa Williams-Taylor, Ph.D., stated that a program could be operating with fidelity and at the same time could not be getting the required child outcomes in which case they would move forward to terminate. She stated that CPPA was a tool, and decisions could be made outside the parameters of the tool.

Mr. Lynch stated that the report had stated that 51 programs had been reviewed, and asked how many programs there were. Ms. Gotlib stated that this was the full number of programs. She stated that there were other contracts, but in terms of programs there were 51. Mr. Lynch clarified that all 51 programs were reviewed once or twice per year. Ms. Gotlib stated that they were always reviewed twice, and may be reviewed three times per year. She stated that if a program was on corrective action they would be reviewed at least three times. Mr. Lynch asked how many were assessed using the short form. Ms. Gotlib stated that 21 were reviewed using the short form. She stated that the CPPA was one tool they used for monitoring, and the program officers conducted monitoring separate and apart from CPPA for other performance such as making site visits and monitoring visits. She stated that CPPA reviewed performance, but the providers were also being monitored to ensure they were doing everything they needed to do under their contract. She stated that if a program was

failing in other areas they had the ability to put the agency on an improvement plan unrelated to CPPA.

Tom Sheehan stated that in addition to the power CSC had to terminate, the contracts were on a fiscal year basis, and CSC always had the ability not to renew a contract. He gave the example of the Budding Readers program which was not being renewed.

For informational purposes only; no action required.

2. Lutheran Services Florida Corrective Action Plan

Isandra Zayas, Program Officer stated that CSC had entered into a contract with Lutheran Services on June 1, 2014 for the provision of Head Start and Early Head Start services. She stated that it had been a 15 month contract and at the end of the 14/15 fiscal year the programs had been assessed using CPPA, short form. She stated that Lutheran Services had not satisfactorily met 3 out of 16 contractual requirements, and a simultaneous CSC preliminary audit cited a list of recommendations for the provider to apply and follow. Ms. Zayas stated that there was an ongoing body of work for Lutheran Services related to the integration of the Palm Beach County early learning system of care. She stated that a recent system integration status report also cited recommendations for Lutheran Services to follow.

Ms. Zayas stated that it was her responsibility as a Program Officer to inform the Council when a provider was placed on a corrective action plan. She stated that Lutheran Services had been placed on a correction action level two. She stated that the contractual deficiencies, together with the recommendations made up the corrective action plan, and Lutheran Services had received the plan. She stated that CSC would closely monitor Lutheran Services for the next six months, and was very confident that Lutheran Services would be able to meet all contractual requirements.

Tom Lynch stated that Lutheran Services had missed 19% and asked whether there was a short form evaluation in addition to a long form. Isandra Zayas stated that there were three different versions of CPPA – Version One was a very lengthy version which included process measures and outcome measures; Version Two usually included only process measures and not outcome measures, and Version Three was the short form version. Mr. Lynch suggested that when a program missed 19% of its plan it would be prudent to go from a short form to a long form to take a more in-depth look. Debra Gotlib stated that it was the nature of the contract which drove the type of CPPA used. She stated that Lutheran Services was not a program, and because of the services they delivered they did not have fidelity measures. She stated that they had a certain set of deliverables, and when they didn't meet them, they were put on a corrective action plan. She stated that it was not about gradations of one, two and three, it was the nature of the contract which drove the type of CPPA used.

Shelley Vana stated that Head Start and Early Head Start had been transitioned from Palm Beach County to Lutheran Services. She stated that it was a big deal if Lutheran Services was failing in its contract. Lisa Williams-Taylor, Ph.D., stated that it was coincidental that they had been conducting the CPPA and an internal audit on Lutheran Services at the same time and that it didn't typically happen that way. She stated that because of the added scrutiny they had been able to determine that things were not where they needed to be and that a

corrective action plan level two was immediately warranted. She stated that they had worked with Lutheran Services to determine how they would correct the issues. Ms. Vana asked why Lutheran Services would not submit the federal monitoring report.

Isandra Zayas invited Dr. Julian Serrano from Lutheran Services to the table. Dr. Serrano stated that they had failed to submit the federal review outcomes. Commissioner Vana asked whether the federal inspectors had come in and cited issues with things that needed to be changed. Dr. Serrano stated that this was not the case. He stated that when the federal report had been submitted to them there had been three or four findings which were wrongly stated in the document and were challenged. He stated that, as a result of a challenge to a fiscal item, they had redesigned the whole agency. Shelley Vana asked Dr. Williams-Taylor whether they would be looking at Lutheran Services, because the County had turned the programs over to CSC and Lutheran Services to ensure that it performed smoothly, and to have so many findings in such a short period of time did not bode well. She asked whether there was any communication with the County Administrator regarding the performance of Lutheran Services. Dr. Williams-Taylor stated that Jon VanArnam was aware, and asked whether Commissioner Vana would like CSC to present to the County. Commissioner Vana stated that she just wanted the County to be aware.

Chair Langowski asked Ms. Zayas when they would be coming back with a follow up report. Ms. Zayas stated that they would be presenting again in June. She stated that Lutheran Services had addressed many issues and had successfully resolved them. She stated that they were very confident that Lutheran Services would be able to meet its contractual agreements. Chair Langowski stated that he would not like to wait until June for an update and asked for an update to be scheduled for April. Ms. Vana stated that the children served by these programs were the county's most vulnerable children. She stated that by moving the contract to Lutheran Services from the County, she had an expectation that Lutheran Services' performance would exceed that of the County and they would do for the children what the County had been unable to do.

For informational purposes only; no action required.

3. Resolution #16-003 Authorizing Surveys and Focus Groups to Inform a Community Needs Assessment – Approved by Consent
4. Resolution #16-004 Authorizing Revised Usage of Under-Expended Funding (Great Ideas Initiative)

Kasha Owers, Director of Program Performance stated that an internal workgroup had been formed to identify opportunities for investment of under expenditures in great ideas in Palm Beach County. She stated that a six member cross-department workgroup developed a scope of work, looking from a Statute, by-laws and CSC fiscal guidelines perspective, regarding what could and would be considered, and not considered. She stated that the workgroup had looked at prioritizing the use of the under expenditures, and had developed a process for awarding the funding. She stated that they had engaged the CEO's Group and key stakeholders. She stated that the workgroup recommended that, in order for an organization to be eligible to apply they must be an IRS-determined non-profit doing business in Palm

Beach County for at least 2 consecutive years. She stated that they could be a CSC-funded agency, or a non-CSC funded agency. She stated that five categories of funding had been identified:

- Essential Services
- Supplies and Equipment
- Community Outreach and Engagement
- Capacity Building
- Capital Improvements (available to CSC-funded agencies only).

Ms. Owers stated that the process for awarding grants would involve posting the availability of funding to be posted on the CSC website (in spring, 2016) anticipating that awards would be made one-time each calendar year. She stated that regardless of the expenditure threshold, they did not anticipate any investments exceeding \$500,000. She stated that at an average of \$25,000 per grant, they would probably be looking at no more than 20 to 25 grants.

Ms. Owers stated that they recommended that an award should not exceed \$25,000, with a possible exception of capital improvements where there would be a match component required. She stated that if a project cost \$30,000, the first \$25,000 may be available as a grant from CSC, and the organization would need to show proof of match of the 50% delta (\$2,500 of the \$5,000 difference). She stated that they anticipated that the process would be competitive, and that an organization may not receive the full requested amount. She stated that the grant period would extend up to 12 months, therefore if funds were made available in July or August, the recipient would have a full 12 months in which to expend said funds. She stated that they anticipated requiring a project completion report which would be a full accounting of the project and what had been accomplished. She stated that the report should include all backup to the expenditures.

Shelley Vana asked why they would not just add more scholarships for camp or afterschool. Dr. Williams-Taylor stated that this would be CSC's first area of focus, however there were capacity limits to how many children could be absorbed in child care. She stated that with the Early Learning Coalition there were times when the child care centers could not absorb any more children (they did not have the capacity), therefore this initiative was another layer to push funds into the community if there were under expenditures. She stated that summer camps and scholarships were the first thing they would look at. Tom Lynch stated that the summer camps may be at full capacity. Commissioner Vana asked why the funding could not be used to increase capacity and serve more kids. Tom Lynch stated that funding in this manner could be used for someone who wanted to start a camp and eventually come into the program, and this was a way to be creative. Commissioner Vana asked for it to be put into the guidelines for the funding to be funneled to summer camp and after care as a first choice.

Tom Lynch stated that the Finance Committee had several recommendations: i) on the first bullet, remove Palm Beach County with the reasoning that if someone had a really good program in Miami or Tampa and they wanted to try to start it in Palm Beach County, it would be good for the county to help start it; ii) switch 3rd and 4th bullets, the 4th bullet says that the award would be made one time (probably June, July or August), but the grants and

competitive portion would be earlier than that, so that people would know they could proceed with a summer program.

Thomas Bean stated that he thought Mr. Lynch meant moving the 6th bullet above the 4th bullet which had to do with when the guidelines and applications would be available on the website. He stated that, related to the first bullet, an IRS-determined nonprofit was fairly standard, and he asked whether a State of Florida-acknowledged program would be approved? Kasha Owers stated that this had not been addressed, they had anchored their thinking on the IRS determination, but they could look into it. Mr. Bean stated that an entity could be IRS approved but not State of Florida certified. Mr. Lynch asked whether this would make it more restrictive. Mr. Bean stated that there had been an effort in the state to clean up non-profits which may not be on the up and up. Ms. Owers stated that an entity needed to be certified by the State of Florida in order to solicit funding, and they could therefore couple the two requirements together.

Mr. Bean asked why only 50% match would be required instead of 100%. Ms. Owers stated that a CSC funded organization may have very good ideas which exceeded well over the \$25,000, for example something that would cost \$50,000, and that half of the match, \$12,500, might be within an agency's reach, whereas the full \$25,000 match by an agency would present a hardship. She stated that the workgroup recommended that whatever amount was agreed upon, should it be 50%, could be made up of in-kind or cash. Dr. Williams-Taylor stated that it would give an opportunity to include those agencies who really needed that higher amount to implement their idea, and they had not wanted to limit an agency from implementing their idea the way it should be implemented (if made to pay the full match).

Mr. Bean responded to Commissioner Vana's query about why funds should be diverted and not funneled into camps and scholarships – he stated that it wasn't 'as opposed to', it was 'in excess of'. He stated that one of the benefits of this format was that a scholarship or summer camp attendance was funded through a CSC-funded organization, whereas this funding opportunity could be a feeder program. He gave an example that it could benefit some organizations that did not already do business with CSC, and could allow CSC the opportunity to take a further look at the organization and evaluate the opportunity to work with that agency and pursue working with them in a broader way. Mr. Lynch stated that if a proposal came in that exceeded the \$25,000, and the proposal was good, it could be looked at as a regular program. Dr. Williams-Taylor stated that it would give CSC the opportunity to see whether they were good programs or whether the program was meeting a need in the community which CSC hadn't typically funded before. She stated that they could then work toward making a recommendation to build future funding into the budget.

Kasha Owers stated that current discussion did conflict with some of the workgroup discussions. She stated that the workgroup had specified that one thing they did not want organizations to apply for would be for drowning prevention, swim lessons, safety such as car seats, cribs, and summer camp slots. She stated that CSC already had the provision of those services through its traditional programs. She stated that this was proposed to be an opportunity for non-profit organizations, whether traditional or grassroots, even currently funded providers, to come in with a great idea to be funded for one-time purposes. She stated that it was not intended to be something that they would keep coming back to year after year

for recurring funding. She stated that if it were deemed to be worthy of a long-term investment, it would come through a different channel. She stated that it was an opportunity to explore great ideas and engage community partners which were not normally engaged by CSC. She stated that if there was a desire for the workgroup to rethink summer camp scholarships she would like that clarified, because the guidelines, currently in draft form, stipulated that summer camp scholarships would not be allowed for such an award.

Tom Lynch proposed an example such as a life safety program in the Glades could come to CSC for funding. Ms. Owers stated that the current draft guidelines prohibited such a usage of funding. Mr. Lynch asked why such a restriction would be included, because they wanted people to be creative. Ms. Owers stated that they were trying to protect the investment CSC already had because some of the allocated dollars were not used each year. She stated that they may need to provide the caveat that the funding was separate and apart as a great idea. Thomas Bean asked whether the guidelines that get posted would make it clear for organizations how they could participate in those areas that would not be funded such as drowning prevention. Ms. Owers stated that the guidelines did make it clear, and they gave the name of the agencies currently providing those services and contact information. She stated that they could eliminate these restrictions altogether and make it very broad-based and see what happened in the first year. Dr. Williams-Taylor stated that if CSC was already funding it, the idea was not to duplicate in those areas. She stated that they were talking about two different things, one was a specific program and the second was an area of interest. She stated that summer camps was a broad category, however if there was a unique program then it may qualify, even though it may be under the title of summer camps.

Judge Kathleen Kroll stated that it was her observation that all of the delinquent children did not have summer programs. She stated that in 2015 when the annual review was presented, the only area in which the Juvenile Court had been deficient was those kinds of kids. She stated that research showed that keeping kids in a summer program had proven outcomes. She asked how they could promote the funding opportunity to those people with the great ideas to come forward to use the funding. She stated that it was nice to fund drowning prevention, however the kids in her courtroom never even got to the water.

Kasha Owers stated that the issue with this initiative was the timing with the availability of the under expenditures. She stated that they were looking at making funds available to be awarded in the summer, usually around August, at the tail end of the summer. She stated that if it were a year-round submission process then someone may be presenting an idea which would not get funded until the following summer. She stated that the whole initiative was built around the use, timing, and availability of under expended dollars.

Judge Kroll asked how they would promote it when they were going to give the money for the following summer, such as a basketball program. She stated that many funded programs went unused in the Glades because they couldn't recruit the kids into them. Dr. Williams-Taylor stated that they could explore the marketing aspect with the County, because CSC camp funding was administered by the County. She stated that they could explore how to make those dollars available, and make sure those that need them are more aware of how to get them. Judge Kroll stated that many camps did not want to take the juvenile court kids. She asked how programs could be created (which were more expensive) for the kinds of deep-end

kids, whether because of abuse and neglect, or because of trauma and delinquency. She stated that they needed people who were trauma-informed, which was expensive. She championed some way for those people who were interested to be able to apply for funding and create those programs, because those are the kids they wanted to save, the deep-end kids.

Commissioner Vana stated that she was on the same page as Judge Kroll because she wanted the summer camp scholarship money to go to those kids who would not otherwise have a summer program or who were not engaged. She stated that there were many kids that did not participate in afterschool programs because they had to care for younger siblings. She stated that these were the kids who Judge Kroll got to see later on. She stated that if they were to do something like this she would want to see kids who would not otherwise be in a program, if there was underspent money, then it should be used to place a kid in something, one who would otherwise not be placed. Tom Weber stated that he was of the same mind, and that he saw it as excess funds after the other programs. He stated that he would clearly put summer camp and drowning prevention as priorities, and this discussion should only be for funds that could not be used in those areas.

Tom Lynch stated that it was the first 5% of under expenditures which meant that there was the other 95% that could be used for programs. He asked how CSC could advertise to people that CSC needed these programs and encourage them to start one. He stated that someone may already be operating a great program and asked how they could be encouraged to expand it and do more, because CSC had the money to do it. He stated that they would be saving a lot of money later by not incarcerating those children. Dr. Williams-Taylor stated that part of it was getting the word out in general that it was available because it was a very different way of funding than CSC's norm. She stated that she constantly received funding requests for new programs and different ideas, so it was a great place to direct them for funding.

Tom Lynch stated that they should say that here was one way to start a program with \$25,000, but if there was another much bigger program in mind which needed more funding you could go through the regular funding process. He stated that they would advertise that they were looking for programs that help kids which CSC hadn't done before. He stated that CSC had been reactive, when someone brought a program they agreed with it, instead of trying to start or encourage programs.

Tom Sheehan, General Counsel stated that CSC had the ability, if a specific program was required, to release an RFP for that program. He stated that the funding amount would be whatever was deemed appropriate for starting up the program, not \$25,000. Mr. Lynch stated that he had heard for years that there was a shortage of available slots/programs for kids who needed a summer program and afterschool. Mr. Sheehan stated that there were waiting lists. Mr. Lynch asked what had been done to create a camp to take the kids off the waiting list. Mr. Sheehan stated that up to this point CSC had not been operating any camps, but had been putting money into the scholarships (slots) to utilize the existing camps, whereby the children who did not have the money to go to camp then had a way to afford to attend. He stated that if they wanted to create additional camps or additional types of camps he would suggest the RFP process would be the way to go, and they could spell out exactly what they were looking for. Mr. Lynch stated that if a certain entity did a great job of operating a camp, why wouldn't

they go to that person and encourage them to expand to a second camp, because there would already be a proven track record. He stated that RFP respondents may not operate a quality camp. He asked if it could be approached in this manner. Mr. Sheehan stated that it could certainly be limited to those who already had existing camps, and CSC typically required respondents to provide information about their experience, and the review team performed due diligence and research. Commissioner Vana stated that she did not want to see a waiting list any longer. Mr. Sheehan stated that this would take a different approach, because CSC was following its traditional methods of funding. He stated that CSC could put more money into scholarships for summer camps from under expenditures.

Lisa Williams-Taylor stated that CSC typically provided (her estimation) \$500,000 per year to the County for summer camp scholarships. She stated that in 2015 they had heard there were over 300 children on the waiting list so they had brought it back to the Council and had increased the funded amount to \$1.2 million. She stated that this increase had been performed using under expenditures, and a policy was created at that time to allow staff to move forward using under expenditures, eliminating the wait of bringing it back to the Council for approval. Judge Kroll stated that it was her understanding that dependent children had top priority when accessing those dollars, although she was unsure whether this was true. It was clarified that dependent children were children who were victims of abuse, abandonment, and neglect. Judge Kroll stated that she could not get a dollar for a DJJ (Department of Juvenile Justice) kid. Commissioner Vana stated that this area needed to be looked at. Judge Kroll asked what the best practices were for DJJ kids. She stated that the Sheriff's office had funded a program for the court which had run at Lakes, and the kids from 8th to 9th grade were very susceptible in the summer. She stated that if you couldn't hold onto those kids in the summer it was a lost cause. She stated that she needed help, help to know what those programs were, and funding to go to those kids. Dr. Williams-Taylor stated that they could definitely look at that, and stated that CSC funded scholarships. She stated that it was also a task of looking at summer camps and what types of camps were available. Judge Kroll stated that she understood why camps may not take those kids, those kids had problems because of a lifetime of trauma and sexual abuse. She asked that they look for some specific camps, and allocate some of the funding making it a priority for these types of kids. She stated that they should be creative, but be creative in serving that group as priority. Commissioner Vana stated that if there were any type of under expenditures available, it could also be used to address the waiting list. She asked for an update after the summer, outlining how many kids had been on the waiting list, how many kids were served, whether a new program was added, and how many DJJ kids had been served.

Chair Langowski asked whether they should wait to vote until changes had been made, or vote with the aforementioned verbal changes. Tom Sheehan stated that they could do it verbally with the changes, and include that the Finance Committee recommended approval of the usage of underexpenditures.

A motion by Lynch/Goodman to approve Resolution #16-004 authorizing revisions to the usage of under-expended funding to include the Great Ideas Initiative as follows:

- **Bullet #1 remove 'in Palm Beach County'**
- **Move bullet #6 to become bullet #2**

- **Bullet #4 would then follow**
- **Bullet #3 would then follow**

utilizing the remaining 5% under expenditures for the purposes outlined was approved by unanimous vote.

Order as revised by motion:

- Organizations eligible to apply must be an IRS-determined nonprofit organization doing business for two consecutive years.
- Great Ideas Initiative Guidelines and Application will be made available on CSC website in the spring.
- Awards will be made one time each calendar year in the summer.
- Grant period is maximum of twelve months. Maximum award is \$25,000 (grants for Capital Improvements in excess of this amount may be considered and will require a match component). A Project Completion Report (with supporting documentation) and any submission of unused funds will be required at the close-out of the grant.
- An organization does not need to be currently funded by CSC to apply (with the exception of Capital Improvements).
- Award process will be competitive. Applicants are not guaranteed funding. If awarded funding, may not be at requested amount.
- Depending upon availability of funding, may award 20-25 organizations in the first year.

Vince Goodman asked whether there was currently a waiting list for summer camp slots. Dr. Williams-Taylor stated the summer camp opportunities had just been released on the website so the list was just starting to be compiled.

5. Proclamation Declaring January, 2016 as National Mentoring Month

Lisa Williams-Taylor, Ph.D. introduced Gary Graham, Mentoring Initiative Director from the United Way of Palm Beach County. Dr. Williams-Taylor stated that Mr. Graham was responsible for leading mentoring efforts in Palm Beach County for 28 different agencies reaching approximately 2,500 children annually. She stated that Mr. Graham had oversight of the Mentor Center of Palm Beach County, a local affiliate of the National Mentoring Partnership. She stated that the Mentor Center was the only organization of its kind in the State of Florida.

Gary Graham stated that January was National Mentoring Month and as such, there was an annual National Mentoring Summit in Washington D.C. He stated that he had planned to attend the Summit but his flight had been canceled due to weather. He stated that they took time out in January to recognize the wonderful mentors and mentees, and to recognize the wonderful things that the programs had accomplished.

A motion by Lynch/Vana to approve the Proclamation declaring January, 2016 as National Mentoring Month was approved by unanimous vote.

B. Business

1. Warrants List – Approved by Consent
2. Resolution #16-001 Authorizing Website for Parenting Public Awareness/Education Campaign – Approved by Consent

6. Non Consent Agenda

- A. Business – N/A
- B. For Informational Purposes Only – N/A

7. Walk-In Items – N/A

8. Chief Executive Officer's Report

1. Barriers to Accessing Prenatal Care

Lisa Williams-Taylor, Ph.D. stated that the CEO Report contained a follow up to the Planning Session, the issues being experienced in Palm Beach County and within CSC's system were very similar to those happening nationally, and they were actively working on how to decrease those barriers.

2. Growing Up Strong Show

Dr. Williams-Taylor stated that the three most recent Growing Up Strong shows had featured mentoring, quality after school, and the Strong Minds network. She thanked Council members Tom Weber and Thomas Bean for participating and being part of those shows. She stated that she would be reaching out to other Council members over the next year to be interviewed for the shows.

3. Parenting Campaign Update

Dr. Williams-Taylor stated that the agenda item regarding the creation of mobile apps in support of the universal parenting campaign had been deleted from the agenda for the current meeting, and that it would be brought to the February meeting, as negotiations were currently ongoing.

4. Angel Tree

Dr. Williams-Taylor stated that the CEO Report contained pictures from CSC's Angel Tree gift distribution.

5. Employee Achievements

Dr. Williams-Taylor stated that the CEO Report contained notification of various staff certifications and credentials. She stated that three members of staff had received advanced

degrees: two staff had received their Ph.D., and one had received her MBA. She congratulated staff.

9. Legal Reports

1. CSC Annual Meeting and Election of Officers February 25, 2016 Council Meeting

Tom Sheehan, General Counsel stated that February's meeting was the annual meeting and would include the election of officers. He stated that there would also be a Prevention Partnerships for Children, Inc. (PPC) meeting, and election of PPC officers.

2. Certificate of Compliance

Mr. Sheehan stated that Certificates of Compliance had been received from all Council members.

10. Individual Appearances – Non-Agenda Items – N/A


11. Council Comments – N/A

12. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:40 p.m.



Vincent Goodman, Secretary



Lisa Williams-Taylor, Ph.D., Chief Executive Officer