

Final Report on Transition Project to the Clay County Collaborative Board

Prepared by
Barbara Eiden-Molinaro
Success Services Inc.
October 6, 2005

The following recommendations were based on needs identified in interviews conducted between March 2 and April 5 with 11 Collaborative program staff, 19 members and alternates of the Clay County Joint Powers Collaborative Board, 11 members of the Children's Coordinating Council who are not on the Board, 2 Members of Collaborative Focus Groups who are not on the CCC or the Board, 3 staff members of Clay County Coordinator's Office and the Auditor's and Human Resource Departments. These recommendations were adopted by the Board on April 20, 2005. This is the final status report the implementation of these recommendations, as the transition project has ended with the contracting and orientation of Dawn Tommerdahl, the new Clay County Collaborative Coordinator. She will be overseeing the continued implementation of those recommendations which are on-going.

The recommendations addressed two primary concerns which were related to making a successful and smooth transition for the current staff and the programs; as well as concerns related to the Collaborative itself and the way partners relate to each other. The Collaboratives needs included:

1. Increased trust and improved morale
2. Improved communication
3. Streamlined and clearly understood decision-making structure
4. Refocusing the Collaborative by development and communication of a new more collaborative purpose and priorities consistent with that purpose
5. Addressing the Collaborative's financial needs proactively and with accountability

The following recommendations were designed to address the concerns and needs identified in the interviews. The recommendations regarding increasing LCTS income were referenced here but were addressed in a separate project. The status of implementation of these recommendations is noted in italics following each recommendation.

1. Recommendations to increase trust and improve morale

- 1.A. Authorize work groups to develop proposals for transition of the Truancy Intervention Program and Re-entry Services Program and report by June.

Restorative Justice was completing its transition at the start of this project, with the Clay County Sheriff's Office becoming the employing partner. At the time the Sheriff did not realize that this meant his office would actually need to become a Collaborative partner, but he graciously agreed to do so. Re-entry Services completed their transition in May, with Corrections becoming the employing partner. The staff of both these programs are now County employees. The Village Family Service Center became the employing partner of the Truancy Intervention Program staff beginning in August. All but one of the TIP staff that ended the school year with the program are now employed by The Village as TIP Family Advocates.

- 1.B. Focus all other work of the Collaborative, at the Focus Group, CCC and Board level on discussing, preparing for and implementing recommendations.

The Board decided to keep its commitment to the Focus Groups and CCC and consider funding requests for a final round of LCTS grants to partner programs. This was completed in May and since that time all the Collaborative activities focused exclusively on implementing the recommendations of the transition project.

- 1.C. Commit to identifying core values and holding each other accountable to behaviors and decisions consistent with them.

The following core values were identified in the planning process and adopted by the Board:

- *We care about children and families*
- *We believe in collaboration and partnership*
- *We believe in early prevention, identification and intervention*
- *We believe in strength-based, family-centered services*
- *We believe in partnering with and supporting families*
- *We believe in accessible services*
- *We value education and training*

As the new structure is set in place, and as partners join the Collaborative and the new groups form, it will be important to ensure that these core values are consistently expressed in word and deed.

- 1.D. Hold an annual meeting to celebrate Collaborative achievements and thank staff and Collaborative partners.

Since the Collaborative structure was not approved by the Board in July, invitations to organizations to become Collaborative partners could not go out as planned in August and the organizational meeting of the new Collaborative structure was not able to be held as anticipated in September.

2. Recommendations to improve communication

- 2.A. Approve draft letter to be sent to all Collaborative staff.

Termination letters were sent to all staff in April.

- 2.B. Commit to communicating directly and respectfully with all staff and collaborative partners.

The Board, in accepting these recommendations, agreed to treat each other and staff with respect, to communicate openly and directly. There has been some progress on these issues, and while many individuals have contributed positively during the transition, the culture of the Board has been difficult to change. For this reason it is good that in the new structure, the current Board will be split between Governance Board members and administrative group members. Current Board members will be a minority on both groups, so there is a good chance that a new culture will take place in each group. However, it has been said that the current culture is reflective not of the individuals involved, but of the culture of the larger community. My experience with individuals committed to the Collaborative makes me hopeful that a new more positive culture will become pervasive. However, some have already forgotten the degree to

which disrespect, mistrust and ill-will was preventing the Collaborative from functioning full and positively. Institutional amnesia could make it difficult for the Collaborative to honestly address barriers to respect and communication, and to consistently reflect its core values. Perhaps the biggest barrier in the current culture is the readiness some have to blame others for the Collaborative's problems, and the quickness with which some take offense and go on the offensive. Real barriers to collaboration and to providing effective services must be identified and dealt with directly, but for the Collaborative to be successful, partners must take responsibility for their own behaviors and feelings, and practice patience and discretion with other partners and Collaborative staff.

- 2.C. Commit to seeking the input of all stakeholders and keeping everyone involved up to informed of all changes that affect them.

Interviews with the 46 individuals in March and early April provided the basis for the recommendations. Those interviewed included Collaborative program staff, members and alternates of the Joint Powers Board, members of the Children's Coordinating Council, members of Collaborative Focus Groups and staff members of Clay County Coordinator's Office and the Auditor's and Human Resource Departments. The Board was presented with the recommendations on April 6 and adopted them on April 20. The changes were introduced and discussed at the Himmelman Workshop on May 9. Two meetings were scheduled in late May and early June to accommodate the schedules of Board members, to ensure they all had the opportunity to provide input into the proposed governance structure. A meeting was held with all the superintendents in early June to discuss the impact of the changes on the schools and gain their feedback. The changes were presented at meetings with the Community and Systems Change, Prevention/Early Intervention and Child and Family Well Being, and the Children's Mental Health Focus Groups; the CCC, the Children's Mental Health LAC, the TIP sub-committee; and the Restorative Justice-Re-entry Services Advisory Committee, and a smaller group representing those two programs. Sixty-four people attended the June 22 Planning Retreat, at which time the changes were presented and participants established the mission and vision statements and core values. E-mail was used as an on-going means of communication, and the website went on-line in late August. An e-mail announcement outlining the status of the changes and introducing the new coordinator was sent to everyone on the Collaborative e-mailing list. In addition I responded to numerous questions by phone and e-mail and in individual meetings throughout the transition.

- 2.D. Formalize membership for the Collaborative and each of its working groups on an annual basis.

The invitation to join the Collaborative could not be issued until the Board resolved questions regarding the partnership payments and governance structure. Since the new structure and partnership fees were finalized at the same time the contract for the coordinator was approved, the Coordinator is inviting potential partners, and those accepting the invitation will be asked to appoint members of the various Collaborative groups.

- 2.E. Identify partners' preferences and needs regarding communication and set policy and practices that addresses those around which consensus can be achieved.

E-mail addresses were obtained for all involved with the Collaborative, and e-mail became the exclusive communication tool until the website was developed in late August. Mail was abandoned as a form of communication and meeting packets were sent electronically after the loss of Collaborative support staff in May. The County

Coordinator's office assumed responsibility for posting meeting announcements, in order to comply with open meeting laws.

- 2.F. Develop website to open up communication and save coordination time.

The website went on-line at www.claycountycollaborative.org in late August, and was available to those interested in responding to the RFP for coordination. Meeting minutes and reports are now posted on the website. The calendar and partner contact information will be going on-line in the coming weeks. An e-mail sent to the entire mailing list directed people to the website as the primary means of information about the Collaborative.

- 2.G. Ensure that all members of all Collaborative groups have Internet and e-mail access and skills necessary to receive and share information.

Those members who were not previously using e-mail now have and use e-mail addresses. In a Collaborative of this size it is imperative that all those involved be willing to maintain an e-mail address and use e-mail and the website. It is efficient use of coordination time to help individuals set up e-mail accounts or problem-solve how to access e-mail, but it is not a good use of limited coordination time to send out paper mailings.

- 2.H. Distribute and post list of all members of all Collaborative groups on an annual basis.

A template has been developed for the website Partner page and will be posted by the Coordinator as soon as the partner organizations have been identified. Names and contact information for all Collaborative project staff and members of each committee and work group will be listed on the website description of each program and work group or committee.

- 2.I. Create group e-mailing lists for new Collaborative structure.

This also will have to be completed by the Coordinator when the groups are established. Contact information was provided the Coordinator for potential partner organizations.

3. Recommendations to streamline and clarify decision-making structure

- 3.A. Commit to creating a simple, manageable, easily understood and communicated structure and operational guidelines.

This commitment was made by the Board. The original proposal for the new structure was simpler than that which was adopted. This is due to the number of work groups and committees that were established as a result of the planning process. While there is good justification for each work group and committee, there are more work groups/committees and more meetings than is optimal. Hopefully the new administrative level group will take charge of the Collaborative, review the number appointed to each work group and committee, and decide not to operate those for which there is insufficient interest at this time. In addition this group can hopefully influence the number of Governance Board and Executive Council meetings through their organization's Governance Board members. If this is not done there is a real danger that the Executive Council will replace the current board and the administrative level group will become as impotent as the CCC felt. If that happens the structure is

doomed, as the hope that has been resurrected regarding the viability of the Collaborative will die, and along with it, people's and organization's willingness to participate in the Collaborative.

3.B. Adopt new structure for the Collaborative that:

- Increases consumer representatives by identifying categories with seats on all levels of Collaborative governance;

The new organizational structure provides for parent/consumer representatives from the three Interagency Groups – the Interagency Early Intervention Committee (IEIC), the Children's Mental Health Local Advisory Committee (LAC), and the Community Transition Interagency Committee (CTIC); as well as the IIP Service Coordination and School-age Children with Disabilities System Work Groups. Each group is asked to appoint one member to the administrative level group and to the Governance Board, and to any of the work groups or committees they wish. Carolyn Strnad has volunteered to do an orientation for the parents serving on Collaborative groups, and assist in the orientation of the administrative level group and Governance Board so that those groups will be more parent-friendly. As we learned at the planning retreat, getting parents involved is not as difficult as ensuring that they have a good experience and are willing to remain at the table. The Collaborative has made a commitment to providing significant representation to parents, but much work has to be done to make that representation consistent and meaningful.

- Reduces board size;

This recommendation assumed the Governance Board would only meet once a year at the Annual Meeting, and that the Executive Committee of the Board would function on behalf of the Board throughout the year. This group was to have eight members, two representatives of the county-cities, education, non-profit and parents, who would meet with one representative of each sector from the administrative level group, who would provide communication between the two groups. However the structure that was adopted divided the cities and county, making each into their own sector, and provided for one, rather than two Governance Board representatives from each sector. This means the Executive Committee will have five voting members and five advisory members, which is smaller than the current Board. The Governance Board and the administrative level groups will be much larger, with one representative from each partner organization and each Interagency and System Work Group. While this may seem large, the administrative level group should work well once partners get to know and trust each other.

- Includes only representatives of partner governing boards and consumer representatives on the governing board;

This was adopted, and represents a change from the current Board, which is comprised of both the staff and governing members.

- Includes only executive and managerial level staff and consumer representatives on an administrative executive board;

This was also adopted. This will allow people with equal degrees of authority to sit at the table and make decisions on behalf of their organizations. This model does not permit superintendents and directors to send alternates, as the purpose is to encourage participation by people the top level of the organization, where policy and resource allocation can be focused on systems change and service integration. Those organizations which operate in multiple counties, where it is not feasible for the executive director to meet with multiple Collaboratives, may chose to appoint the highest ranking staff in Clay County to the administrative level group. This group should have the opportunity to select its own name after it begins to meet.

- Includes working groups related to Collaborative programs and projects, with membership that includes parents of children and youth who are in target population served by the working group;

This is part of the structure was adopted.

- Seeks to include previously existing statutorily-enabled groups such as IEIC, Children's Mental Health LAC, CTIC so that they might retain their autonomy but work within a new Collaborative framework to achieve mutual goals with increased efficiency and effectiveness;

The IEIC, LAC and CTIC were offered the opportunity to either become Collaborative work groups or Collaborative partners and each chose to become Collaborative partners. Meetings were held with the LAC and between the LAC and the Children's Mental Health Focus Group to determine the role of each group. The groups made a joint decision to have the LAC focus on supporting and empowering parents of children with mental health issues and those Rule 79 providers with whom they work, and advise the Children's Mental Health System Work Group, which will be the Collaborative's official voice for children's mental health issues.

- Endows all Collaborative partners with the same rights and responsibilities, except for those stipulated in Statute;

Some members of the current Board have had difficulty understanding the role of mandated partners in the Collaborative. For whatever reason, some continue to believe that the only partners that matter are mandated partners. This is not true. The statutes that established Collaboratives indicated that if certain partners refused to participate in the Collaborative, it could not exist, and the LCTS contracts required participation by certain partners. This is an acid test of the viability of a Collaborative. If a group could not get those partners to agree to participate it was thought that was an indication the group could not function effectively as a Collaborative. However, in all other respects mandated partners have the same rights and responsibilities of all other partners. Mandated partners simply qualify a Collaborative to be a collaborative and earn LCTS dollars, but all partners are equal in their responsibility to coordinate and integrate services and improve the systems in which they work.

- Ensure that each level of governance has clear and appropriate decision-making powers that are distinct from and respected by the others;

The structure was designed to allow the superintendents and directors to run the Collaborative, just as they run their own organizations, and the Governance Board to govern. County boards, school boards, and non-profit boards each have distinct roles within their organization. This could lead to confusion among Governance Board members, and so one model must prevail. It is clearly most appropriate for Collaborative governing bodies to operate more like non-profit boards than school boards or County boards or city councils.

The Executive Committee is a committee of the Governance Board. The representatives of the administrative level group are to act in an advisory capacity, representing the administrative group's recommendations. This group must avoid re-creating the operation of the current Board, with its mix of governance and executives, or the new structure will fail.

- Builds in a rigorous evaluation component to measure outcomes of both the Collaborative and each of its programs.

This is the role of the Planning and Evaluation Committee, on which most members of the former CCC have agreed to serve.

3.C. Authorize creation of a Planning and Evaluation Work Group.

The CCC was asked to work on the planning retreat, since their work was concluded when the last round of grants were reviewed. They worked together well and were extremely effective in planning and hosting the planning retreat, and then in developing the recommendations based on the retreat. Most of the members of CCC have indicated they will be asking to be appointed to represent their organizations on what they recommended be named the Planning and Evaluation Committee (PEC), so there is a solid and talented base for this key group. Other partners may certainly assign staff to this group.

3.D Invite the Children's Mental Health Focus Group and the Children's Mental Health LAC to discuss how they could merge their operations to create one unified but diverse voice for children's mental health issues.

Children's Mental Health Work Group is awaiting authorization with new structure and members can be appointed once the partners have been finalized

3.E. Adopt annual planning and budgeting cycle to provide structure, accountability, discipline, and predictability.

On July 25 the Board adopted a fiscal and planning calendar that included changing the fiscal year to July 1-June 30. A ten month FY06 budget was approved by the Board on August 17, effective Sept. 1, 2005-June 30, 2006. The planning calendar will begin in March and allow ample time for communication between work groups, the administrative group and the Executive Committee of the Board, prior the Board approving the budget and work plans in June for the year beginning July 1, 2006. Since only the TIP Work Group was organized and met to develop the FY06, no project or Collaborative work plans were developed for FY06. In the future work plans should be approved with the budget, as the budget should be based on the work plan.

3.F. Update Joint Powers Agreement and operating guidelines.

This could not be done until the new structure was adopted, which occurred simultaneously with the contracting of a new coordinator. Given the timing it was more appropriate for the new coordinator than for me to work with the group that is updating the Agreement. I did, however, provide the group with extensive written recommendations. One of the primary recommendations was not to include the operating guidelines in the Agreement. The advantages of not doing so include less frequent need to revisions in the Agreement, which have to be approved by the boards of each of the partner organizations; and waiting would let the administrative group, which will operate the Collaborative, to participate in the decision-making. The current Board needs to remember the distrust that its past actions have engendered and avoid appearing to be making only cosmetic changes.

4. Refocus the Collaborative by development and communication of a new more collaborative purpose and priorities consistent with that purpose.

- 4.A. Contract with Arthur Himmelman to come to Moorhead the afternoon of May 9 to discuss issues related to effective collaboration, at a cost of \$500, or later at a higher cost.

Arthur Himmelman presented a workshop on collaboration on May 9, with forty participants from 17 partner organization, parents and Collaborative staff in attendance. One of the primary messages from the workshop became a paradigm shift for many involved with the Collaborative – a change from problem-stating to problem-solving. This concept became the basis for the problem-solving work groups developed to address needs identified during the planning retreat.

- 4.B. Issue an invitation to Amalia Mendoza, Children's Mental Health Division, Minnesota Department of Human Services, to come to Moorhead the end of May or beginning of June to discuss State expectations of Collaboratives, at no cost to the Collaborative

Amalia Mendoza, Kathy Jefferson and Amy Ortega, all DHS staff working with family service and children's mental health collaboratives, each presented at the June 22 planning retreat.

- 4.C. Hold planning session to identify the Collaborative's mission and vision and priorities and the Collaborative structure that will achieve them.

A planning retreat was held on June 22 with over sixty participants from 24 partner organizations, plus parents and staff of all Collaborative projects. Due to time constraints the CCC developed the mission statement based on the ideas generated during the planning retreat. The vision statement and core values developed by the planning retreat participants, and the mission statement were all adopted by the Board.

- 4.D. Include reminders of the Collaborative mission/vision on all Collaborative communications and meeting agendas.

The heading of all agendas and reports have included the vision statement developed during the planning retreat: "Successful partnerships building successful families." The Mission Statement can also be used on Collaborative publications: "Our mission is to work in partnership and collaboration to empower and provide opportunities for children and families."

- 4.E. Develop orientation materials and create a process for orienting all those involved in Collaborative groups to the Collaborative.

Orientation materials were developed for the Planning Retreat that reflected the situation as of mid-June. Decisions made resulting from the Planning Retreat and regarding the organizational structure are reflected on the current website. This will save printing costs when the new groups are convened and oriented.

5. Recommendations to address the Collaborative's financial needs proactively and with accountability

- 5.A. Rescind instructions to CCC to spend or allocate \$300,000 by August 31, 2005.

The Board decided not to immediately adopt this recommendation, due to the commitment already made to the Focus Groups, the CCC and the applicant programs. Once final round of LCTS grants was approved totaling \$227,922 in LCTS funding.

- 5.B. Place an immediate moratorium on spending Collaborative funds for anything that is not a Collaborative project or for the administration and proper functioning of the Collaborative.

Other than the last round of LCTS grants, all other funding was focused on the transition project, Collaborative programs, and administrative expenses.

- 5.C. Commit to providing funding only to collaborative projects and activities developed by work groups which provide on-going direct oversight.

The Board adopted this policy on May 25. With the exception of the last round of LCTS grants, approved in the previous meeting, the Collaborative will no longer provide funding to partner programs. The Board initially agreed to limit funding to the four on-going collaborative projects – IIIP Service Coordination, Re-entry Services, Restorative Justice and Truancy Intervention Programs. The Board later moved the Family Support Model grant from the final round of grants to the FY06 budget, making it the fifth Collaborative project.

- 5.D. Adopt recommendations, policies and practices designed to maximize LCTS income.

Jane Patrick, LCTS Coordinator has already trained all LCTS participants on current practices designed to maximize LCTS income. The schools, Public Health and Corrections will all need to be involved in determining practices that will allow the Collaborative to continue to earn LCTS reimbursement in light of federal changes. These changes were due to take effect October 1, but have not yet been officially announced. Additional training of LCTS participants will be held when situation with IV-E is finalized. Since the Minnesota Dept. of Human Services is giving County Social Services responsibility for implementation of the changes, Rhonda Porter and Jane Patrick are taking the leadership on this issue.

- 5.E. Adopt policy regarding payment of administrative costs to employing partners.

On July 20 the Board adopted the Finance Committee's recommendation to set 8 percent as the amount employing partners can charge the Collaborative for their administrative costs.

- 5.F. Adopt a policy regarding expectations regarding maximization of third party reimbursements for Collaborative projects.

On July 20 the Board, upon the recommendation of the Finance Committee, determined that as of July 1, 2007 projects can only use LCTS funds to leverage other funding.

- 5.G. Adopt a policy regarding grant funding that includes:
- circumstances under which the Collaborative will seek grants; and
 - the Coordinator's and fiscal host responsibilities related to grants.

The administrative level group is in a better position than the current board to determine the extent to which the Collaborative - the 'table' around which members meet - should compete with the 'chairs' – the individual partner organizations, for scarce grant dollars. When this group is established they should discuss this issue. It may be that they want the Collaborative to only seek grants which clearly require a significant degree of collaboration, or they may wish to pre-approve any grant proposals submitted by the Collaborative on behalf of any work group. They may also ask the Collaborative to serve as a clearinghouse for information about grants. This can simply involve the Coordinator sharing information she receives from various sources with partners. It could also include partners telling the Coordinator about grants they intend to seek so that that information can be shared with others who express interest. The Coordinator could also convene and facilitate meetings about grants of interest to a number of partners to determine the potential for cooperation or coordination. The Coordinator can also be asked to research grant opportunities for the Collaborative. The hours in the RFP included the potential for all these options, but, specifically did not include grant writing. If the Collaborative wishes to seek grant funding, either a partner will have to volunteer staffing or a grant writer will have to be contracted. This will provide discipline and save the Coordinator from writing ill conceived and/or time consuming grant proposals. Arrangements for financial management of grants must be made with the fiscal host prior to the submission of grants.

- 5.H. Develop income projections based on the most likely scenarios, including loss of IV-E funding.

Income projections showing the projected loss of 71 percent of Medical Assistance LCTS income and 100 percent of IV-E LCTS were prepared and reviewed by the Finance Committee prior to Planning Retreat, where the information was shared. The FY06 budget was developed based on these assumptions.

- 5.I. Provide 60 day notice of intent to close the Collaborative office.

Notice was given the office was closed at the end of September.

- 5.J. Develop and implement plan for disposing of or storing Collaborative property.

Cynthia Sillers assumed responsibility for this in consultation with County staff.

- 5.K. Identify and make arrangements to meet needs for storage of Collaborative records.

Cynthia Sillers left the Collaborative records in clearly labeled boxes in the office. When the new coordinator was contracted, she met with Rhonda Porter and Shelley Ford to determine what was necessary to keep, what should be kept easily accessible to the Coordinator, and what should be stored. Although the option exists to rent accessible storage space in the Family Service Center, at this time the records not taken by the

Coordinator are being maintained at Social Services in a secure, unused office. This is only one example of that many ways which Shelley Ford and Rhonda Porter, to name only two, gave generously of their time to the Collaborative during the transition.

- 5.L. Adopt new financial reporting procedures to provide accurate and concise information about all the available Collaborative funds and develop and provide each level and working group standard financial reports for their area of responsibility.

The Board agreed that only a one page financial report prepared by the Coordinator would be necessary. Each committee and work group with a budget will get financial reports whenever they meet. The Finance Committee will continue to work with the fiscal host to establish a mutually agreed upon starting balance. The Coordinator will work with the fiscal host to ensure that the income reported to her and the expenses authorized by her match the records of the fiscal host. If this becomes an on-going difficulty, some members of the administrative level group may need to assist the Coordinator in working with the fiscal host. However, given the number of groups already identified, it is not suggested that a Finance Committee be formed. The budgets are to be developed by the work groups based on guidelines from the administrative group, and are to be reviewed by the administrative group and recommended for adoption to the Executive Council of the Board, and then go to the Board for final approval at the Annual Meeting in June.

- 5.M. Negotiate a new agreement with the County to establish costs of purchased services.

This will be addressed by the current Board's Finance Committee when the fiscal host is finalized. However, \$2500 is all that was allocated for this purpose in the FY06 budget.

- 5.N. Determine appropriate level for reserve fund.

On July 20 the Board accepted the Finance Committee recommendation to set the reserve at twenty percent of anticipated income.

- 5.O. Adopt a 2005-06 budget that will spend down LCTS income as required.

The Board adopted the FY06 budget as recommended by the Finance Committee on August 17.

6. Coordination Recommendations

- 6.A. Review Coordinator's and Administrative Assistant's job descriptions and update them to reflect emerging needs as appropriate.

The Administrative Assistant resigned in May, but this issue was addressed in on-going discussions with Cynthia Sillers, outgoing Coordinator and Ben Brunsvold, Board chair. There were no real difficulties, but my proposal did not assume that I would be functioning without support services and doing much of the work of a coordinator after mid-May.

- 6.B. Review IRS Twenty Questions and identify additional changes necessary to contract for coordination.

These were shared with the Personnel Committee and with the Coordinator.

6.C. Develop separate RFPs for Collaborative Coordinator and LCTS Coordinator.

The Board accept Jane Patrick's proposal to continue to provide LCTS coordination services through June 30, so no search was undertaken. However, Jane provided a scope of work (an independent contractor's version of a job description) which will be available when a search is necessary for an LCTS Coordinator. A Request for Proposals was developed for the Coordination contract and accepted by the Board in August. It contained both scope of work and performance standards against which the Coordination contract can be evaluated.

6.D. Conduct search for and orient Collaborative Coordinator and LCTS Coordinator.

This was completed with the authorization on September 20 to contract with Dawn Tommerdahl as Collaborative Coordinator and with Jane Patrick on August 17 as LCTS Coordinator. The final orientation meeting with Dawn is scheduled for October 11. After that time I will remain available as a resource and support to Dawn, should she request assistance. I am extremely pleased with the selection of Dawn as Collaborative Coordinator and that Jane will continue with the LCTS program. I have the utmost of confidence in both of them. It is much easier to leave what has been a very challenging and satisfying project in such capable hands. Hopefully the Collaborative partners will provide them the support necessary to fully implement the recommendations which are require on-going work.