

Clay County Joint Powers Collaborative
Executive Committee
2:15 PM August 31, 2005
Room 7, Family Service Center

Present: Ben Brunsvold (Clay County – Chair), Shelley Ford (Corrections), Lanette Krinsky (Parent representative), Carol Ladwig (Moorhead ISD #152), Dr. Larry Nybladh (Moorhead ISD #152), Joe Pederson (Lakes and Prairie Community Action), Rhonda Porter (Social Services); and Guest Shelley Guida (The Village Family Service Center) and Barbara Eiden-Molinaro (Transition Project Manager)

1. The meeting transitioned from the joint meeting of the Personnel and Executive Committees. Shelley Guida provided an update on the status of the Truancy Intervention Project. There were nearly 40 applicants for seven positions, in what was a strong pool of candidates. In addition to Alex Ishaug remaining as coordinator, three of the former staff applied and accepted positions with The Village to continue with the program. Of the new staff, not one was making \$12/hour previously, so were more than pleased with the pay scale which had been adopted as a compromise between the non-profit and county scales. Since not all the staff are electing to take benefits, the combined salary/benefit pool should cover the staffing costs. All but the person hired most recently will start work on Tuesday, September 6, and that person will get time off her current position to be oriented with the rest of the staff that morning. The person hired for Barnesville-Hawley-Ulen-Hitterdal will cover D-G-F until the needs are determined. Staff will be paid on a monthly basis, rather than on a daily rate, as in the past. They will work throughout the school year, with families on days schools are not in session. Alex will run the program on a day to day basis and report to Shelley, as well as to the TIP Work Group. Alex will receive supervisory training through The Village.
2. The proposed agenda was reviewed. **Motion:** To approve the agenda. (J. Pederson/R. Porter/Carried)
3. The minutes of the August 8 meeting were reviewed. Dr. Nybladh asked that his comments about the structure be put in context, so #5 was amended to read: "...In response to the question of whether or not the governance level was needed, Dr. Nybladh reviewed the various levels and..." **Motion:** To approve the minutes from the August 8 meeting (S. Ford/J. Pederson/Carried)
4. Shelley Ford asked the group to approve the contract with NDSU for evaluation of the Re-entry Services Program. She explained the County Board had already approved the contract. **Motion:** To approve the extension of the contract with NDSU to evaluate the Re-entry Services Program in compliance with the grant agreement. (J. Pederson/L. Krinsky/Carried)
5. The Collaborative records were discussed. The new coordinator will have to go through the files in the Collaborative office prior to the lease expiration on September 30 and determine what is to be stored and what they need to move to their office. Joe and Rhonda agreed to meet with the Coordinator to assist with this process.
6. Ben Brunsvold indicated that he will be providing an official letter of recommendation for Cynthia Sillers. Board members will be asked to direct any requests for references to Ben. **Motion:** To approve the proposed agreement with Cynthia Sillers, with the letter of reference to be developed by Ben, with the assistance of Shelley Ford and Rhonda Porter. (L. Krinsky/S. Ford/Carried) Dr. Nybladh thanked Ben, Rhonda and Shelley for their work on this.
7. Rhonda Porter agreed to receive and go through the Collaborative mail, including the grant reports that are due September 15. She will assure that payments are made on the grants.
8. Ben Brunsvold opened the discussion of the governance structure. Carol Ladwig indicated she had sent out an e-mail to make people think about the structure and provide an opportunity for discussion. She will share the feedback she gets at the September 21 Board meeting. Ben suggested that we are so far down the road with the proposed structure that it would be difficult to change it, and pointed out that the proposed structure is really an extension of a philosophy which was previously endorsed by the

Board. Joe expressed the concern that non-profits have about his agency being one of two non-profits on the current Board and indicated he believes it is important to bring together the management level people on a regular basis and have them meet with the governance board at least once a year. In response to the question of how governance board members are supposed to be informed about the Collaborative, Joe responded that it was the CEO's responsibility to inform their board about the Collaborative. Joe said he would like to see the work groups doing the work of the Collaborative, with oversight by the executives.

Carol raised the question of the correlation between Partnership Payments and representation, indicating that Moorhead Schools and the County are asked to pay \$250 while the other partners will be assessed \$100. Barbara indicated that the Partnership Fees were to cover meeting expenses, not to determine the levels of representation on the Governance Board, and suggested that the Board reconsider the levels passed last month. She suggested that the Board might choose to assess all partners \$100, including each department of the County, since each are individual partners.

The group discussed the role of cities, and how they might see the work of the Collaborative as germane to their work. Barbara Eiden-Molinario expressed concern about the proposed option that the cities be represented on the Collaborative governance levels and the non-profits not be so represented. She indicated that the non-profits who have been involved with the Collaborative have a singular focus on serving at-risk kids, whereas cities do not.

Ben pointed out that the current Board mixes administrative and governance functions, which is difficult. Barbara explained that her goal was to disband the current Board, which has had difficulties and did not have the trust of those involved in carrying out the work of the Collaborative in programs and groups. She indicated that the proposed model would split the current board, with some members serving on the Administrative Level and others on the Governance Board, and perhaps the Executive Committee of the Governance Board. In both cases, if non-profits are allowed membership as proposed, there would be enough new members to ensure a change of culture on both levels. Joe indicated that he saw a real appeal in starting afresh, with the Collaborative re-inventing itself.

The question of signatory responsibility was raised, and it was suggested that this could be given the Board chair.

Dr. Nybladh pointed out there is a difference in the role that boards play in the education and non-profit sectors, and this makes it more difficult for people to envision the role of the Governance Board. Barbara indicated that the Governance Board as proposed would operate more like a non-profit board. It was suggested that Board training might be necessary so everyone has the same expectations for their role.

Carol raised the issue of the appropriate number of meetings of the Governance Board, perhaps with an orientation at the beginning of the year, and one mid-year meeting to learn more about the Collaborative and then the annual meeting. It was pointed out that no matter how many times a year the Governance Board meets, the CEOs are responsible for communicating with their Board about the Collaborative throughout the year. It was suggested that perhaps the Governance Board could meet in January and June, at least initially.

The group discussed how the decision about the structure would be made. Barbara reflected that it was a mistake not to have put the Executive Committee's recommendation to adopt the proposed structure out as a motion at the last Board meeting. It was determined that a motion to adopt the new structure be put on the agenda for discussion at the next board meeting. Ben pointed out that the Collaborative has had considerable achievements, but what had been was no longer working, so something had to be done, and so the Collaborative will continue to evolve.

9. The meeting adjourned by consensus.