

Clay County Joint Powers Collaborative Board Minutes

3:30 PM, July 20, 2005
Room 4, Family Services Center

In Attendance: Ben Brunsvold (Clay County), Lisa Erickson (Moorhead ISD #152), Shelley Ford (Corrections), Shelley Guida (The Village Family Service Center), Lori Keblar (DGF ISD #2164), Lanette Krinsky (Parent Representative), Carol Ladwig (Moorhead ISD #152), Kathy McKay (Public Health), Larry Nybladh (Moorhead ISD #152), Joe Pederson (Lakes and Prairie Community Action), Rhonda Porter (Clay County Social Services), Brad Saville (CCC Representative), Carolyn Strnad (Parent Representative); and Barbara Eiden-Molinaro (Transition Project Manager)

1. Ben Brunsvold called the meeting to order.
2. **Motion:** To approve the proposed Agenda. (S. Guida/C. Ladwig/Carried)
3. **Motion:** To approve the minutes of the May 25 Board meeting. (C. Ladwig/K. McKay/Carried)
4. Joe Pederson gave the report of the Finance Committee. Questions were asked regarding the Committee's recommendations and discussion included:
 - Joe explained that the recommendation to reimburse for eight percent administrative costs reflect an average cost. Grants may be reimbursed at between five and ten percent, but actual costs typically run around eight percent. He pointed out that the recommendation was subject to annual review and the percentage could go down.
 - There was concern about the effect of requiring projects to use LCTS funds to leverage other funds, and not be the sole source of any project income. It was feared that this would be a problem for the Truancy Intervention Program, since while the TIP work group is discussing Child Welfare-Targeted Case Management, nothing is finalized that would allow it to earn this third party reimbursement. Joe pointed out that the intent of the recommendation was to recognize that with the decrease in LCTC funding, and those funds must be stretched as far as possible. The recommendation was amended to take effect for FY07.
 - The role of the contracted coordinator regarding grants was discussed. Joe explained that securing funding is the responsibility of Collaborative project work groups. It was suggested that in light of declining LCTS funds the Collaborative needed to pursue grants for a variety of purposes, and so it might be wise to look for a coordinator with grant writing skills. There was general agreement that the coordinator should play a role in identifying and sharing information about grant opportunities. The question focused on whether or not grant seeking should be an expectation and included in the RFP. This would require additional hours/dollars be added to the contract, as grant writing is very time intensive. It was determined that grant writing services will be contracted separately, and will not be included in the coordinators' contract.
 - Joe shared the factors that went in to the recommendation that the Finance Committee be authorized to look at options for fiscal hosting services. The cost of the service, the timeliness of bills paying, and the on-going issues with getting up-to-date and accurate financial reporting were all factors that were considered in making the recommendation. Rhonda explained that many of the recent problems with bill payment and financial statements were a result of the changes brought by the transition and that the particularly the process for bill paying had become cumbersome, which is why bills have not been paid in a timely manner. It was pointed out that the same level of reporting will

not be needed when there are fewer dollars and less line items and transactions, and that the County will need to continue to receive LCTS funds and do LCTS reporting, as required under the LCTS contract.

Motion: to approve the following recommendations:

- A. To ratify the Finance Committee's acceptance of a proposal from Monique Maack to develop a Collaborative logo and website for \$1620.
- B. To ratify the Finance Committee's approval of expenses related to the June 22 Planning Retreat as planned by the CCC.
- C. Payment of parent/consumer representatives serving on all Collaborative meetings be determined at the stipend rate set by Clay County
- D. To move the \$20,000 for the Family Support Model Work Group from the grant category to a line item to be included in the FY06 budget.
- E. To authorize the Finance Committee to develop a proposal for a ten month FY06 budget from September 1, 2005-June 30, 2006, and at that time the Collaborative move to a State fiscal year calendar of July 1-June 30, following the schedule outlined in the Financial and Planning Calendar.
- F. The Collaborative establish a reserve fund set at a minimum of twenty percent of anticipated income.
- G. LCTS funds be used only to leverage non-Collaborative funds beginning in FY07, so that no Collaborative projected is fully funded by LCTS income;
- H. All third party reimbursement for Collaborative funded projects be considered Collaborative funds.
- I. The rate for reimbursement of administrative costs to partners be set at eight percent for FY06, and that this rate be reviewed annually.
- J. To request the Personnel Committee not to include grant writing responsibilities in the Coordinator's Scope of Work.
- K. To authorize the Finance Committee to develop recommendations regarding outsourcing those fiscal host responsibilities which do not have to involve the County.

(J. Pederson/K. McKay/Carried)

5. Joe reported on the Executive Committee meeting. The following issues were raised by the Committee and resolution was reached in discussion with the Board:
 - The Collaborative's permanent address will continue to be 715 11th Street North.
 - The Collaborative's web address will be www.claycountycollaborative.org
 - The draft logos for use on the website and printed material were reviewed. Barbara will communicate the feedback to Monique Maack.

Motion: The TIP program coordinator be paid to remain under contract for the month of August to assist in the transition of the program to one directed by the work group with staff employed by partner organization(s), at a total cost, including the search and background checks, of no more than \$3850.

6. Barbara Eiden-Molinaro presented the TIP Work Group report. The TIP sub-committee that had worked with the program previously and the new Work Group are in agreement that it is important for as many of the current staff as possible remain on with the program, and that this requires maintaining them at their current pay rates. This means that the Collaborative will not realize the intended cost savings, but it will preserve the effectiveness of the program. New staff could start at the new wage scale, which over time would reduce costs. The Board discussed the difference between county and school wages as compared to non-profits, and the need to have salaries that attract and retain staff that will continue to make the program successful. However, it was also noted that any employing partners will need to hire staff under their own policies, though the TIP Work Group will want to have input into the staff selection.

Motion: In order to provide program continuity the employing partner should be informed that it is the preference of the Collaborative that staff who are offered re-employment be hired at their current rate. (L. Nybladh/L. Erickson/Carried)

Barbara also reported that the Work Group took the recommendations from superintendents' meeting, as communicated to them by D-G-F Superintendent Bernie Lipp, and wishes to expand the focus of the program. Discussion included the question as to whether or not approving this recommendation required a budget increase, and it was concluded that it would not have to.

Motion: The scope of the Truancy Intervention Program should include prevention and earlier intervention services at the elementary level, and the creation of stronger partnerships with parents. (L. Nybladh/L. Erickson/Carried)

7. Ben reported on Collaborative staffing. He indicated that negotiations are continuing with Cynthia Sillers regarding the completion of her employment and that the Executive Committee will act on the arrangements prior to the next Board meeting. Ben reminded that group that the decision to award 30 grants in April and May, with grant reporting deadlines of Sept. 15, has been an added complication.
8. Barbara Eiden-Molinaro reported on the Transition Project, presenting an updated timeline showing progress to date on each task. The group discussed the timeline for hiring a coordinator in light of the fact that the work groups would not be able to start meeting as early as hoped, and determined that it was advantageous to have the Coordinator meet with the work groups from the beginning and be oriented with them. This will mean that the transition will extend longer and there will be more overlap between the Coordinator and Barbara than initially anticipated. The goal will continue to be to have someone contracted on or as soon after September 1 as possible. The Personnel Committee will be working with Barbara to develop a draft Scope of Work and RFP for the Coordinator, which will be brought to the Board for approval at the August meeting.
9. The governance structure was discussed. Barbara held two informal meetings with Board members, as well as meeting with all the superintendents, to go over the structure in detail, answer questions and get feedback prior to its public unveiling at the June 22 Planning Retreat. Some changes were made in the structure and the materials used to present it as a result of the input of Board members. Barbara had been asked to prepare a list of organizations and individuals who have been actively involved with the Collaborative so that the Board would have a better understanding of who would serve on which level and the number of partners involved. The list included: 8 city-county partners, 7 education partners, 13 non-profits and 4 Inter-agency groups, who have been asked to appoint parent/consumer representatives to the different levels of Collaborative governance. Of these 33 potential partners, all of whom had staff on one of the Focus Groups, the CCC or the Board, four have not participated in any of the transition project activities, nor have they contacted Barbara to express interest, so would not necessarily need to be considered invited to become Collaborative partners. All the rest of the partners are aware of the change in governance structure and many those who are not currently on the Board have already determined who they will have on the administrative level group, which is the group that most closely corresponds to the current Board. A wide ranging discussion ensued.
 - It was clarified that current board members who serve on their organizations boards will serve on the governance level group, and that superintendents, county and city department heads and non-profit directors will serve on the administrative level, which will have primary responsibility for the operation of the Collaborative.
 - The issue of mandated partners was addressed. This structure recognizes mandated partners as those are required by statute and without whom the Collaborative would not exist, but expands membership to include all the schools, cities and the non-profits who have been, in effect, Collaborative partners without full representation. Since the goal of

Collaboratives is systems change and service integration, it is essential all are represented at the administrative level, which is where those that are in the best position to change their organizations are directly involved.

- It was clarified that each partner organization is represented at both the administrative and governance level, and only partners would have the opportunity to appoint representatives to the Collaborative work groups.
- The question was raised if the governance level was effectively a rubberstamp. If the work groups, administrative level and the Executive Committee of the Governance Board fulfill their obligations under the just adopted planning and fiscal calendar, and if the administrative level representatives keep their board informed throughout the year, the annual meeting should, in fact, pass the annual budget and work plan./
- It was asked whether or not there would be standing committees, which are not included the structure, and would be up to the members once they begin meeting. The concern was raised that they would add to the complexity and number of meetings.

Joe, who had taken over as chair when Ben had to leave, concluded the discussion by saying that obviously additional discussion was needed, but that the intent was that all schools and non-profits (as well as the County and interested cities) needed to be at the table, and that this is the principle on which we would move forward. The discussion will be resumed next month. This will mean a delay in creating the work groups, as each of those the Board identifies as a potential partner will be given the opportunity to decide if they are going to be Collaborative partners, and if so, will be asked to appoint a member of their board to the Governance Board, their superintendent or director to the administrative level group, and representatives to the work groups.

10. Members of standing committees were asked to complete and turn in meeting availability forms so that committee meetings can be scheduled. Rhonda asked to be excused from duty on the Formal Agreement Committee, since she chairs the Finance Committee and serves on the Executive Committee. Brad Saville was asked to consider replacing her.
11. The written report from Jane Patrick on the Local Collaborative Time Study Project was shared, but time did not permit discussion of this project.
12. The meeting was adjourned by consensus at 5:20 PM. The next Board meeting will be held at the regularly scheduled time of 3:30 PM Wednesday, August 17. Room 4 is not available so Room 2 has been reserved. Materials will be sent out prior to the end of the preceding week.