

CHILDREN'S SERVICES COUNCIL OF PALM BEACH COUNTY

June 22, 2017, 4:30 p.m.

MINUTES

1. Call to Order

Chair Weber called the meeting to order at 4:34 p.m.

Present:

Thomas Bean

Paulette Burdick

James Martz

Dennis Miles

Debra Robinson, M.D.

Thomas P. Weber

Excused: Robert M. Avossa, Ed.D; Vince Goodman; Greg Langowski; Tom Lynch.

A. Invocation – led by Chair Weber

B. Pledge of Allegiance – led by Chair Weber

C. Presentations

1. Healthy Beginnings Home Visitation Program Evaluation Report – Amy Lora, Evaluation Officer; Donna Wilkens, Managing Senior Associate, Metis Associates, Inc.; Michael Scuello, Senior Associate for Design and Analysis, Metis Associates, Inc.

The project is a unique opportunity to examine client outcomes longitudinally for three Home Visitation programs: i) Healthy Families Florida (an evidence-based program); ii) Nurse Family Partnership (an evidence based program); and iii) Prenatal Plus.

One objective was to conduct a rigorous outcome evaluation of the Prenatal Plus program in order to establish an evidence-base. All three programs were evaluated for individual performance with respect to the program's impact on client outcomes. While the programs might get additional outcomes, only birth outcomes were reviewed for this study. Three interlocking methods were used to address research questions:

- Primary data collection and qualitative analyses serving stakeholders and clients to get perceptions about the way programs were operated;
- Within-group dosage and exploratory analyses design – these were targeted to the participants of the three programs, in addition to comparative analyses which were not rigorous;
- Quasi-experimental well-matched comparison group design – a design which tries to ensure that the group used for comparison looks as similar as possible to the clients being treated, so that any differences realized over time could be attributed to the treatment.

Quasi-experimental design key findings for the Nurse Family Partnership program: of the seven outcomes reviewed by the study, **five out of seven had statistically significant differences** (weeks of gestation, full-term births, adequacy of prenatal care, number of prenatal care visits, and risk of depression) than their matched comparisons. **Two outcomes were termed “substantively important”** – if an outcome has a magnitude over a certain threshold it is termed substantively important (adequacy of prenatal care, number of prenatal care visits, and risk of depression).

The study examined outcomes of birth weight, weeks of gestation, and full-term births for the Healthy Families

<p><b>Florida</b> program and all <b>three had statistically significant differences</b>. Four other outcomes were also measured; in all, <b>five outcomes were deemed substantively important</b> (birth weight, weeks of gestation, full-term births, adequacy of prenatal care, and number of prenatal care visits).</p>	
<p>Quasi-experimental design key findings for the <b>Prenatal Plus</b> program: of the ten outcomes reviewed by the study, <b>seven out of ten had statistically significant differences</b> (birth weight, low birth weight, weeks of gestation, full-term births, infant risk, adequacy of prenatal care, and probable depression). <b>All seven</b> of the statistically significant differences were of large enough magnitude to be considered <b>substantively important</b>. In addition to the seven (statistically significant) outcomes being substantively important, one additional outcome, infant risk score, was found to be <b>substantively important</b> but not statistically significant.</p>	
<p>Outcomes from clients treated – <u>service dosage</u> was studied, and for several outcomes a higher level of service was associated with better outcomes (father involvement, tobacco usage, alcohol usage, birth weight, risk of postnatal depression, infant risk).  <u>Race and ethnicity</u> of clients over the four-year period of study did not impact findings, because the race and ethnicity between the comparison group and the clients were very similar.  <u>Marital status</u> – there was a gap in birth outcomes between clients that were married, and those not married. The Healthy Families Florida clients experienced a smaller gap between married and unmarried than matched comparisons.  <u>Subsequent pregnancies</u> – rates across all programs were too low to look at (in year four).</p>	
<p>Qualitative Data – How the implementation of the NFP program had performed in relation to state and national outcomes: there was a boon for Palm Beach County, several different outcomes were better than the national or statewide model. Being part of the Healthy Beginning system was attributed to giving the boost causing these superior local outcomes.          Program quality – across all three programs staff reported that the program quality was high and that the programs were culturally relevant.</p>	
<p>Across three programs, 15 statistically significant impacts were noted. In addition, while 3 other impacts were not statistically significant, they were of large enough size to be substantively important, and should be looked into in order to try to achieve statistical significance. Both staff and clients of the programs attest to the programs’ value and effectiveness. The overwhelming evidence is that continued investment in all three programs is warranted. The Prenatal Plus model (not currently established as evidence-based) should be submitted to a governing body for review, to start establishing an evidence base for that program.</p>	
<p>Can you explain the results regarding father involvement?           If we have visiting nurses, why wouldn’t we know whether the father is involved?           Are all the programs at capacity?</p>	<p>Father involvement was initially measured by the presence of the father’s name on the birth certificate. It later moved to looking at that metric in addition to vital statistics information. This metric is called a proxy measure because it is not direct measurement, there would not be direct measurement unless every client was approached and asked whether the father was involved in prenatal care.           We would know that, but it’s not collected within the HBDS system. It would have to be an item that is collected consistently across all cases that were being reviewed.          The proxy measure was usually that the father did not sign the birth certificate, so he either wasn’t there, or didn’t want to sign the birth certificate. The programs do whatever they can to engage and involve the fathers.           They have not been at capacity across the four years.</p>

<p>If funding is available, and the statistical outcomes are good, why are they not at capacity?</p>	<p>Metis Associates completed a study on client engagement in the HB system. Those findings have been shared and are currently informing the work to improve capacity across programs.</p>
<p>What is the ballpark figure of the number of clients served over the four years?</p>	<p>One thousand clients across all three programs.</p>
<p>Where does the program find the families?</p>	<p>Mostly referred through Healthy Mothers Healthy Babies (HMHB), via the prenatal risk screen. The screen is performed in OB-GYN offices, and HMHB also gives the screen. There is constant education to the OB-GYN of the importance of the screen. Based on the screen score, HMHB reaches out to the clients and explains the program and that they don’t have to pay, and from there it is client choice because participation is voluntary. HMHB will try 3 or 4 times to reach a family, including going to the home. Another way to be referred for services is through a doctor, the client may not score on the screen but the doctor may be aware of other extenuating circumstances, and will refer clients.</p>
<p>Therefore all women must have contacted a medical provider?</p>	<p>If a client hasn’t contacted a medical provider it is difficult for the Healthy Beginnings system to connect with potential clients. HMHB does make other outreach efforts, there is the Bridges program, they attend community events and fairs, and church organizations. There is a screening rate of 80 to 85% of all pregnant women, which is better than the State of Florida rate.</p>
<p>Is it 80% of all pregnant women, or 80% of women who visited a medical provider?</p>	<p>80% of all pregnant women. The statistics are calculated by how many babies were born the previous year, and they use that figure as an estimate for the current year, asking what percentage of that amount were offered a risk screen.</p>
<p>In the quasi-experimental well-matched group design, what are the variables you control for?</p>	<p>Race, sex, ethnicity, income, number of children in the household, (and others – there are at least 12 to 14 variables).</p>
<p>Is the term “substantively important” a new statistical term?</p>	<p>It is a term primarily being used by What Works Clearinghouse, governed by IES to determine what is, and what isn’t evidence-based for research. Similar terms are being used for the CDC, a governing body that will review the work undertaken in the Metis evaluation.</p>
<p>Is there any attempt being made to have alumni of the program act as an initial point of contact for the moms newly-introduced to the program? Are we building capacity in the community being served? Are we speaking the language of the mom, specifically and culturally, to recruit her into the program?</p>	<p>We have a ways to go. Healthy Families does that, there are program graduates that are family support workers. The programs will, on occasion, reach out to graduates and they will meet with clients, although there is not currently any formalized process.</p>
<p>Have we at least conquered the language difficulties?</p>	<p>Most of the time, yes. There are Creole-speaking, and Spanish-speaking nurses. Providers are contractually obligated to look for speakers of other languages when recruiting.</p>

<p>Are the nurses RNs? Do they have to be RNs?</p>	<p>Yes they are RNs. In some cases they had been able to get a waiver for the RN. Permission had to be sought in the case of the Nurse Family Partnership program (due to fidelity to the model), especially as it relates to language. Healthy Families does not require nurses.</p>
<p>As the nurses recognize those talents in the families they could encourage them to go to Palm Beach State College and get the contact information to become an RN.</p>	<p>The nurses work with the families – to see families working and pursuing education is one of the goals of the Nurse Family Partnership program.</p>
<p>You are aware that the County, School District and the Cities are actively working with Career Source to provide families with trainings to get good jobs?</p>	<p>Yes, we are aware of this and are also working with Career Source. To work with Healthy Families as a Family Support Worker you only need a High School Diploma, no degree or RN.</p>

**2. Minutes**

- A. May 25, 2017 CSC Annual Planning Session – A motion by Burdick/Miles to approve the Minutes of the May 25, 2017 CSC Annual Planning Session was approved by unanimous vote.
- B. May 25, 2017 Council Meeting – A motion by Martz/Burdick to approve the Minutes of the May 25, 2017 Council meeting was approved by unanimous vote.

**3. Public Comment – Agenda Items – N/A**

**4. Council Committees:**

- Finance Committee

<p>4/27 Finance Committee Minutes – Recommended for Approval</p>
<p>5/31 Financial Statements – Recommended for Approval</p>
<p>Proposed 2017/2018 CSC Annual Budget authorizing staff to provide to the Property Appraiser the tentative millage rate contained in the budget (with staff having the authority to adjust the millage rate to provide the same amount of budgeted tax revenue in the event the final figures from the Property Appraiser are different than these preliminary figures used to calculate the tax revenue). Budget numbers have not changed, except for a slight reduction in the millage rate to accommodate the most recent numbers provided by the Property Appraiser (from .6628 to .6605). – Recommended for Approval</p>
<p>Investment Policy and “currently available” investments selected by Committee – Recommended for Approval</p>

**A motion by Burdick/Robinson to approve the Finance Committee Report in full was approved by majority vote. Council member James Martz abstained.**

- Personnel Committee – No report

## 5. Consent Agenda

### 1. Additions, Deletions, Substitutions

A **substitution to Agenda Item 5B(2) (Reference #7)** was made: the first paragraph in the agenda item summary formerly read:

“For example, Palm Beach County children grades K through 2 show a 23% drop in reading proficiency over the typical summer.”

It now reads: “For example, 23% of all Palm Beach County children grades K through 2 showed a drop in reading proficiency over the past summer.”

The same changes were made in the Summer Learning Proclamation attached to this agenda item.

### 2. Items to be Pulled for Discussion – Agenda items 5A(1) (Reference #3) and 5B(2) (Reference #7) were pulled for discussion purposes.

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

**A motion by Burdick/Bean to approve the Consent Agenda with the exception of Agenda items 5A(1) (Reference #3) and 5B(2) (Reference #7), and approve the Walk-in Warrants list, was approved by unanimous vote.**

#### A. Program

### 1. Mid-Year Comprehensive Program Performance Assessment (CPPA) Results – For informational purposes only; no action required.

CPPA is the comprehensive program performance assessment which is completed on an ongoing basis throughout the year, two or three times per year.

- Version One of CPPA addresses programs that have outcomes
- Version Two addresses programs that may not be outcome-driven but have specific fidelity measures
- The CPPA Short Form is for programs that don't have a specified model but there are contract deliverables, and those programs are monitored for contract compliance (this version is not scored).

Scoring:

- Green = 90% or above – meeting expectations, no need for intervention or corrective action
- Yellow = 75% to 89% – improvement may be needed in one or more of the CPPA areas: a score from 85% to 89% may be placed on a Performance Improvement Plan; from 75% to 84% may be placed on a Corrective Action Plan.
- Red = Below 75% – Expectations as measured by CPPA are not being met. At mid-year program will be placed on Level III Corrective Action Plan; if “in the red” at the end of the contract year (when looking at outcomes) there would likely be an agenda item seeking approval from the Council to terminate the contract because it is not meeting expectations or achieving outcomes.

Regardless of whether the CPPA review is scored or not there is the same progressive intervention applied.

October 1, 2016 – March 31, 2017 – 58 programs were reviewed. 34 programs were reviewed using the scored CPPA, 22 programs were reviewed using the Short Form CPPA, and the remaining 2 programs were reviewed but not scored as they are newer programs in initial implementation.

Scored CPPA (34 programs) – 33 programs had a score of 90% or better, 1 program had a score between 75% to 89%.

<p>Short Form CPPA (22 programs) – all 22 programs met contract expectations relating to the program/services. The one program scoring in the yellow (Technical Assistance – Early Learning Coalition) had been on progressive intervention at the end of FY 15/16 and had improved considerably, scoring at 88%, so no formal intervention was required; they are on track to meet all of their deliverables.</p>	
<p>What does the Technical Assistance – Early Learning Coalition program do?</p>	<p>It provides support to child care facilities, assistance and guidance around the tools to use at that level, in the child care setting. It’s to help child care providers serve the children better in their child care setting.</p>
<p>It says “no intervention needed”, however it says the program has been on “progressive intervention”?</p>	<p>The progressive intervention policy has three levels of intervention.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Level One – An improvement plan, to formalize it in writing. The program outlines how it intends to fix the problem, it has deadlines and check-in points with targets.</li> <li>○ Level Two – Corrective action – it is formalized in writing.</li> <li>○ Level Three – this is very serious and you are in danger of losing your contract.</li> </ul> <p>It may have been interpreted that “progressive” means ongoing for this program, and this is not the case.</p>
<p>How do these results compare to the mid-year results for the previous two years?</p>	<p>Results are better. The longer CPPA has been a tool of measurement, the programs are performing better. In the previous year there were approximately 3 or 4 programs on some sort of progressive intervention. In the past several years the programs better understand CPPA and what CSC is looking at. Over time the program is able to track its own data, it’s not always CSC doing the measuring because they are able to track and measure themselves, and they often approach CSC and ask for guidance in areas where they see they are off target.</p>
<p>For the intervention plans, is it always assessed over a 6-month period? Can they re-up?</p> <p>How long could we potentially be funding a program heading in the wrong direction?</p>	<p>Yes, typically a six-month period. It’s possible that it could be applied for a second six-month period, but if the issue in question has not been improved by then, the program would not be meeting expectations.</p> <p>If there was no change it would be recommended for defunding. If a program was on a level one intervention and there’s only one area needing improving, a determination may be made on a case-by-case basis. When a program is on an improvement plan, they usually fix it and keep improving.</p>
<p>Give an example of a program with no outcome measures that you would use the CPPA Version Two for.</p>	<p>Technical Assistance is a program, but outcomes are not measured. We would look at whether the program was being implemented, whether the service was being provided to the child care providers as prescribed. Another is the Children’s Forum – Quality Program Assessment. We are supporting providers, so that they support the children. It is often used for those programs that do not have a direct impact on child outcomes</p>
<p>If the child outcomes are not as hoped, the providers are punished and the Technical Assistance receives no backlash.</p>	<p>The Technical Assistance program is part of the Strong Minds network. When looking at child-level outcomes, we would be looking at the children served by Strong Minds. The Technical Assistance program is one of the supports to the Strong Minds network. The evaluation of Strong Minds (next year) will look at the child-level outcomes.</p> <p>Supports to the Strong Minds system (for child care providers) are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Technical Assistance for the Early Learning Coalition (child care</li> </ul>

	<p>providers)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Program Assessments conducted by the Children’s Forum</li> <li>○ Professional Development – provided by Palm Beach State College.</li> </ul> <p>These are supports to help providers achieve quality. One thing to be evaluated in the Strong Minds evaluation is whether these are the right supports, and whether they are supporting providers. Refinements will be made in supports offered, and system partners are held accountable for their efforts in helping child care centers and family child care homes make their progress.</p> <p>As a part of the Strong Minds system we are looking at providers to make sure they are increasing their quality; on the CSC end we are doing due diligence to ensure CSC is doing its part to help them increase the quality.</p>
<p>CPPA is so process-oriented. Is there a chart with all this criteria on one page?</p> <p>If you had a program that had outcome measures showing the children were benefitting, however, all their paperwork was not in order, they didn’t turn things in on time, could the CPPA be dismissed?</p> <p>One program in particular had produced good outcome measures but had been terminated because of paperwork. I want assurances that we are focused on the children.</p>	<p>CPPA is process-oriented. Other than the outcomes, it is quantitative. Programs are monitored, program officers do observations such as home visits, therefore qualitative assessment is also taking place. One other thing being considered is whether there is a way to do some more qualitative assessment.</p> <p>We’ve had programs reaching their outcomes and not meeting all their fidelity measures: the programs have continued on. Getting outcomes is the most critical thing. Most of the time, the program was being operated correctly for the most part which is part of the reason why they have continued on.</p> <p>A program would never be terminated without the approval of the Board, the conversation takes place at the Council meeting. It’s hard for a program to be “in the red” without affecting child outcomes because of the weighting. The weighting is very heavy in child outcomes. We will pull out some criteria around the weighting which explains it, and it will be brought back to the Council.</p>

2. Resolution #17-014 Authorizing an Increased Allocation for the Continuous Improvement Initiative – Approved by Consent
3. Late Penalty Assessment – Palm Beach State College Professional Development Systems and SEEK Scholarship Programs – For informational purposes only; no action required.

B. Business

1. Warrants List – Approved by Consent
2. Proclamation Declaring July 13, 2017 as National Summer Learning Day and July 2017 as Summer Learning Month (Revised)

A question had been raised because it had stated “Palm Beach County children grades K through 2 showed a 23% drop in reading proficiency over the summer” and it should have said “23% of Palm Beach County children grades K through 2 showed a drop in reading proficiency...” It was not a 23% drop, it was 23% of the children.

**A motion by Burdick/Bean to approve the revised Proclamation to raise awareness and recognize July 13, 2017 as National Summer Learning Day, and July 2017 as Summer Learning Month was approved by unanimous vote.**

**6. Non Consent Agenda**

**A. Business**

**1. Resolution #17-013 Authorizing Changes to the Council's Bylaws**

Exhibit "A" - Page One: There was a 1990 amendment to the Statute – as a pre-existing CSC we had the option of opting-in to that amendment. One of the provisions was the appointment process for gubernatorial appointees; they were changing it in the 1990 amendment by having the County Commission nominate people to the Governor, and the Governor would only appoint Council members from those nominees. Currently, anyone who wants to apply can apply to the Governor, and the Governor appoints from there. The Council had undertaken a discussion and decided not to do anything, and evidence of this decision should be contained within the Bylaws.
Exhibit "A" – Page One: the acronym DCF for Department of Children and Families was added.
Exhibit "A" – Page One: "Special Meetings" was replaced by "Emergency Meetings"
Exhibit "A" – Page Two: Provision for the Secretary were made consistent as with the Chair and Vice-Chair.
Exhibit "A" – Page Two: Schedules <i>adopted</i> by the Council (not "arranged").
Exhibit "A" – Page Three: The process of how the meeting works if a quorum is not present: if five (or less) Council members attend, the meeting would take place but no voting would occur; the Council is then polled to come up with an alternate date. At times it is determined in advance that a quorum will not be present. In these cases the CEO can cancel the meeting, poll the Council members, and set a new meeting date/time.
Exhibit "A" – Page Four: Reference to special meetings has been replaced by "Emergency meetings", and in all cases, even if it cannot be published in the newspaper in time, it is noticed on the CSC website.
Exhibit "A" – Page Five: Article V - Board Attendance – the Statute permits the DCF Administrator to designate an appointee due the multiple Boards in multiple counties on which the DCF Administrator sits. This is the only Council position that allows a designee.
Exhibit "A" – Page Five: Article VI - Conflict of Interest – this has been modified to make language consistent.
Exhibit "A" – Page Seven: Finance – CSC practices had earlier been changed regarding budget and millage rate to whatever was required by law. The Judge is prohibited by law to vote on the millage, but he is not prohibited from voting on the budget. General Counsel advice to the Judge is to abstain on both budget and millage because they are intrinsically tied together. Millage rate and final budget shall be established by the Council pursuant to applicable Florida law – this refers to the two TRIM hearings in September.
Exhibit "A" – Page Seven and Eight: Article VIII Chief Executive Officer – this has been modified to read more clearly and to express the original intent, ensuring there is a comprehensive plan for the needs of the children; employment, development, and evaluation of staff for CSC pursuant to the employment policies; and implementing policies and procedures to be carried out by staff to further the work of the Council. #4 specifies that CSC will establish policies and procedures relating to the evaluation of funding requests, monitoring of programs funded by the Council and other similar matters, subject to the approval of the Council. In #10 – Recommending to the Council contracts, etc. unless approval of such contracts has been delegated to the Chief Executive Officer/designee. In the current procurement policies the CEO has been delegated the authority to approve contracts of \$50,000 or less, or to have a designees (currently the CFO or Director of Operations).
Exhibit "A" – Page Eight – Item #11 – recognizing the title of Chief Executive Officer (not administrative officer).
Exhibit "A" – Page Eight – Article X Amendments – the revision was to add the current day's date, June 22, 2017.



**A motion by Burdick/Robinson to approve Resolution #17-013 authorizing adoption of the revision of Bylaws as set forth in Exhibit “A” to the Resolution was approved by unanimous vote.**

2. Ratifying Items from the CSC Annual Planning Session

There were two items still outstanding from the Planning Session, Mission and Vision, and CSC’s Equity Statement. Based on feedback from the Planning Session the statements have been revised. Although the general consensus was to keep it streamlined, there had been discussion that they didn’t want to lose the promoting public policies piece, so it was added into the Mission statement. Feedback had been received regarding the difference between equity and equality and therefore this differentiation had been added to the Equity Statement.

**A motion by Bean/Burdick to approve the Mission, Vision, and Equity Statement as presented with revisions was approved by unanimous vote.**

B. For Informational Purposes Only – N/A

**7. Walk-In Items**

1. Memorandum in Response to Questions from a Council Member

Questions had been received from a Council member regarding June’s Council packet and information, therefore a Memorandum had been prepared to address those questions.

- i) Copies of the CPPA Guidelines were provided
- ii) Assistance to smaller agencies – this was addressed in the Memorandum
- iii) Summer Proclamation (declaring July 13, 2017 as National Summer Learning Day and July 2017 as Summer Learning Month) – A question had been raised regarding a 23% drop in reading proficiency. It was determined that the wording was incorrect and it was revised to 23% of all Palm Beach County children grades K through 2 showed a drop.
- iv) There was a request to walk through the newly-revised Bylaws, which had taken place.

<p>How do Council members wish to handle questions that are raised prior to the Council meeting? Is a Memorandum addressing the questions the preferred practice?</p>	<p>Staff recommends addressing questions by pulling the agenda item and addressing questions during the meeting, which was how it was performed with the Summer Learning Proclamation and the Bylaws at the current meeting.</p> <p>An alternative method would be to give a handout on the items in question.</p> <p>Council members receive an email one day prior to the Council meeting with the walk-in Warrants list, any questions raised could be responded to at the same time of sending the email.</p> <p>If there is not enough time to address questions before the Council meeting it could be noted that the questions are pending, and the response could be presented as part of the CEO Report the following month.</p>
---	---

If it is sent by email the day prior, would we still get a hard copy at the table on the day of the Council meeting? (Yes).

It doesn’t need to automatically be pulled, sometimes it’s just a matter of clarification. We should get it by

email, even if it's just before the meeting, and we should also get a written copy. It should be emailed so that there is an electronic record. It should also be attached to the Agenda for the public record. Whatever materials are at Council member places at the Council meeting, these materials are included in the final packet on the CSC website and therefore available to the public.

## 8. Chief Executive Officer's Report

1. Great Ideas Initiative – Under expenditures have been identified, and the second round of the Great Ideas Initiative will begin in July. Organizations must be non-CSC funded organizations in good standing with the IRS, and with an operating budget of \$1 million or less. An amount of \$750,000 is available, and individual awards can be up to \$25,000, with consideration for indirect costs, based upon the size of the organization's budget.
2. Great Ideas Initiative Success Story – The Women's Foundation of Florida had received \$25,000 from CSC to support a Girls Leadership Institute/STEAM Academy for middle and high school girls. They held the Academy May 20 at Palm Beach State College. Additional girls from Belle Glade will be invited to another academy. CSC Great Ideas Initiative funding allowed for the Women's Foundation to double the number of attendees over the previous year, serving 300 girls, plus support a parent track.
3. Community Planning and Partnership – Focus Group in Riviera Beach – The National League of Cities and the Center for the Study of Social Policy had sought parental feedback from local communities.
4. Zip Code Report – CSC first produced a Zip Code Report in April, 2010. A new report is in development and copies will be distributed to Council members when it becomes available.
5. Timing for Program and System Evaluation – In response to a question raised at May's Planning Session, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention's (OJJDP) article titled: "Evaluability Assessment: Examining the Readiness of a Program for Evaluation" was provided in the CEO Report. It shows that CSC's practices are in direct alignment with the recommendations in the article, and also in alignment with those of the American Evaluation Association.
6. Upcoming Community Events – Please let staff know if Council members would like to attend community events, staff would love to have you along.
7. CSC Auditor Earns MBA Degree – Flo Roth, Agency Compliance Auditor received her MBA degree.
8. Florida Chamber Event in Orlando – CEO Lisa Williams-Taylor, Ph.D. attended the Florida Chamber event "Learners to Earners" Summit in Orlando. One half day was devoted to the importance of Early Childhood and why it was so important to the business community and future workforce. Chamber materials were provided to the Council.
9. Ready by 21 to Hold Annual Conference in West Palm Beach – Because of Palm Beach County's Birth to 22 work, the national organization Ready by 21 will hold its annual conference in West Palm Beach in April, 2018. This is a huge accomplishment for Palm Beach County as a community.

## 9. Legal Reports

### 1. Review of Sunshine Law and Public Records Law

The Sunshine Law provides right of access to government proceedings, including Council meetings. A knowing violation of the Sunshine Law is a misdemeanor of the second degree, punishable by 60 days in prison and a \$500 fine. Unintentional violation carries a civil penalty of up to \$500. Correction of a Sunshine Law violation can be both cumbersome and time-consuming.

There are three basic requirements to meet Sunshine Law regulations: i) the meeting must be open to the public; ii) there must be reasonable notice of the meeting; and iii) Minutes of the meeting must be taken, and available for public inspection.

The Law applies to the Board meetings of the Council, its committee meetings, and any other meetings in its decision-making process.

The Law applies any time two or more Council members discuss a matter in which foreseeable action may be taken by the Council; or two or more committee members discuss a matter in which foreseeable action may be taken by the committee, whether at a formal meeting or elsewhere. Be mindful of the Sunshine Law in the course of your daily business.

The Law covers conversations, email, instant messaging, Facebook, Twitter, and all other methods of electronic communication. It does allow one-way communication, therefore a Council member can send an email to the CEO upon which she can send out to all Council members, without showing everybody's name.

Communications with staff are ordinarily not covered by the Sunshine Law, but staff is not permitted to be used as a conduit to communicate information between Board members.

Public Records Chapter 119 defines public records very broadly, as almost anything in a physical form, received pursuant to law ordinance, or in connection with a transaction of official business by an agency. Documents, tapes, photographs, films, recordings, data processing, are all covered.

A person who is denied the right to inspect and/or copy public records may bring a civil action against the agency. If they are successful they are entitled to attorney's fees. They may be denied attorney's fees if the court finds that the record-seeking was for an improper purpose.

Additionally, a public officer who knowingly violates its provisions is subject to suspension, removal, or impeachment, and is guilty of a misdemeanor in the first degree. There is a requirement that before you sue for public records, you have to provide the records custodian 5 days' notice. This applies only if we have a notice of how to get hold of the records custodian. CSC has this information available at the front desk and on its website.

Absent statutory exemption, public records are available for viewing and copying by the public, and there is no draft exception. The location of a record does not determine whether or not it is public; if you receive an email regarding CSC on your personal computer, it is still a public record. Documents can be retained by a third party and still be public records. Email messages, text messages, instant messages, etc., are all public records and thus subject to the statutory requirement of being maintained pursuant to the schedule. CSC captures all types of messaging it uses, so if it is not on a CSC device, Council members (if using social media) have a responsibility to ensure that those records are preserved.

### 2. Next Council Meeting August 3, 2017 – There is no Council meeting in July, and the Council meeting for August is held early in the month, on August 3<sup>rd</sup>.

3. September Council Meetings and TRIM Public Hearings – September Council meetings and TRIM Public Hearings are set for September 14<sup>th</sup> and September 28<sup>th</sup>; the Council meeting will begin at 4:30 p.m., and the TRIM Hearing will begin at 5:01 p.m. on each date.
  
4. Annual Financial Disclosure Forms Due July 1<sup>st</sup>


All Council members should have received their annual Financial Disclosure forms which are due by July 1<sup>st</sup>. If Council members already file a Financial Disclosure form for their job, they do not need to file an additional one for CSC, the one form counts for all offices held.


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

**11. Council Comments – None**

**12. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:57 p.m.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Vincent Goodman, Secretary

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