

**CHILDREN'S SERVICES COUNCIL OF PALM BEACH COUNTY
COUNCIL MEETING
Thursday, October 27, 2011 - 5:00 p.m.
2300 High Ridge Road, Boynton Beach, Florida**

MINUTES

1. Call to Order

Chair Macon called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

Present:

Steven L. Abrams

Judge Ronald V. Alvarez

Frank A. Barbieri, Jr.

Perry Borman

Dari Bowman

Vincent Goodman

Greg Langowski

Rod Macon

Bill Malone

Excused: Willie A. Miller, Jr.,

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

2. Minutes

- A. September 22, 2011 Council Meeting

An omnibus motion by Goodman/Alvarez to approve the Minutes from the September 22, 2011 Council meeting and the Minutes from the September 22, 2011 TRIM Public Hearing was approved by unanimous vote.

- B. September 22, 2011 TRIM Public Hearing

An omnibus motion by Goodman/Alvarez to approve the Minutes from the September 22, 2011 Council meeting and the Minutes from the September 22, 2011 TRIM Public Hearing was approved by unanimous vote.

3. Individual Appearances – Agenda Items – none

4. Program Review Committee Report

Dari Bowman stated that the meeting had been very short, and recommended approval of the Consent agenda in its entirety, including Resolution #11-023 authorizing an expanded agreement to place Access Florida eligibility staff in CSC funded locations.

A motion by the Program Review Committee to approve the Program Review Committee Consent Agenda including Resolution #11-023 was approved by majority vote. Council member Borman abstained from voting.

5. Business/Consent Agenda

A. Consent Agenda Management

1. Additions, Deletions, Substitutions
2. Items to be Pulled for Discussion – There were no Agenda Items pulled for discussion purposes.
3. Adoption of the Consent Agenda, Revised Warrants List, and Financial Statements of August 31, 2011.

A motion by Goodman/Alvarez to approve the Consent Agenda, Revised Warrants List, and Financial Statements of August 31, 2011 was approved by unanimous vote.

B. CSC Funded Programs – Current – N/A

C. CSC Funding Allocations – Future – N/A

D. Planning & Development – N/A

E. Personnel – N/A

F. Financial

1. Warrants List - Approved by Consent

G. Administration

1. Resolution #11-022 Authorizing an Interlocal Agreement for CSC to go under the Jurisdiction of the Office of Inspector General

Tom Sheehan stated that CSC had received a letter from the Chair of the County Commission inviting CSC to voluntarily go under the authority of the Inspector General and the Ethics Commission. He stated that this agenda item related solely to the Inspector General. He stated that they had resolved all the contractual issues, and upon approval by the Council it would move to the Inspector General for signature, and would appear as a County Commission Agenda Item for approval. He stated that it would be effective January 1, 2012 with 9 months remaining of CSC's fiscal year, at the rate of 0.19% of the 2010 contracts, an amount of \$131,044 for the 9 months, with an annual rate of \$174,745.

Mr. Sheehan stated that it was almost a 3-year contract with two additional years, and could be terminated upon 90 days notice by either side. He stated that the cost in future years would be dependent on the percentage being charged by the Inspector General office, and that the Ordinance contemplated a percentage rate of 0.25% for the current year, although it had come in for less than that amount. He stated that the amount would also depend on the amount of the contracts for funded programs in 2012.

Vince Goodman stated that he was against the proposal because the Board was not appointed nor funded by the County Commission, and they didn't need any organization looking over their shoulders, telling them what to do. He stated that should someone make a complaint it may be the appropriate time to investigate membership.

Steven Abrams stated that some municipalities had brought suit to challenge the funding mechanism of the office of the Inspector General. Tom Sheehan stated that the Ordinance was very clear, the question being litigated was what was the referendum of the voters. Commissioner Abrams asked whether the Inspector General was able to specify a cap. Tom Sheehan stated that under the Ordinance the potential for a cap existed, and that the Inspector General had the ability to go higher than the currently proposed 0.19% - up to 0.25%. Mr. Abrams asked whether it was a flat fee or whether it was dependent on the contracts. Mr. Sheehan stated that on an annual basis it was a flat fee based on the prior year's contracts.

Commissioner Abrams asked whether there was a commitment on the IG's part as to how much time would be devoted to CSC business, i.e. not on a complaint basis. Mr. Sheehan stated that it was not spelled out in the contract, but during discussions it had been outlined that CSC would be furnished with records of time. Tana Ebbolle stated that discussions had brought forward that CSC would be very proactive in actively seeking a process audit and management review.

Judge Alvarez asked what legal obligation CSC had to pay the County. Mr. Sheehan stated that in the County ordinance CSC had the ability as a special district, to pay it. Bill Malone stated that unless there was a prohibition it could be treated as any other vendor. Mr. Sheehan stated that he was unaware of any prohibition.

Frank Barbieri stated that he thought the Council should wait until they saw how the IG's office operated. He stated that the newspaper had reported that the IG's office was currently meeting to create ethics rules to apply to the cities and towns, it was growing too fast and there was no proven record how it would operate. Perry Borman asked how long he would wait. Mr. Barbieri stated that he would wait until the rules were in place for the cities and towns, that he would imagine those rules would apply to the Council also. Mr. Sheehan referred to the newspaper article Mr. Goodman had circulated and stated that he thought the article was considerably old because it had the city attorney of West Palm Beach asking for permission to make public comments at the upcoming drafting committee meetings which had taken place in Fall and winter, 2010 and early spring 2011 prior to the adoption of the revised IG ordinance on June 1, 2011. He stated that the newspaper article was confusing because it also addressed ethics, and that it was a separate item addressed under the Ethics Commission. He stated that it was his opinion that it was appropriate to wait before going under the Ethics Commission because they

had a specific set code they had to work with. He stated that they were in the process of issuing a large number of advisory opinions.

Mr. Sheehan stated that the ordinance that had been adopted with regard to the Inspector General was the only set of rules that he was aware of, it was currently applicable to the County, and as of June 1st was applicable to the municipalities because of the referendum November 2010 where it was approved in every municipality and the county, averaging over 70%. He stated that they had indicated that those rules would be applicable to CSC as a Special District.

Steven Abrams stated that he understood the concerns and recognized the extra layer of bureaucracy, and stated that it was something that CSC needed to do as a public agency, and as a public agency that was subject to Referendum. He stated that it was a practical matter, that when the Health Care District had resisted there had been a threat by a legislator that he could go to the Legislature and impose it. He stated that it was a proactive step that CSC needed to take, that it ought to take, and this was the appropriate time to do so.

Frank Barbieri asked what the funding source was. Mr. Sheehan stated that \$166,000 had been included in the budget for the 2011/2012 fiscal year.

A motion by Alvarez/Abrams to approve Resolution #11-022 authorizing the Chief Executive Officer to execute, on behalf of the Council, the necessary interlocal agreement with the Office of the Inspector General with an effective date of January 1, 2012 through September 30, 2012 in an amount not to exceed \$131,044, with two additional fiscal years' renewal and a ninety-day termination provision was approved by a vote of 8:1. Council member Goodman opposed the motion.

Chair Macon introduced Joe Doucette, Chief of Administration, Office of the Inspector General; and Dennis Schindel, Audit Director, Office of the Inspector General and stated that he looked forward to working with them.

6. Business/Non Consent Items – N/A

7. Walk-In Items – N/A

8. Chief Executive Officer's Report

1. Strategy Update – Research & Evaluation

Grace Watson, Director of Research & Evaluation stated that the goal of the Research & Evaluation department was to assess the performance of CSC investments. She stated that they had produced approximately 40 evaluations and analytical reports over the past year. She stated that she wanted to describe the approach the Research & Evaluation department had taken in producing these reports.

Ms. Watson stated that one of the most important things to understand was the theory of change, and the logic behind the theory. She stated that the next quadrant outlined addressed monitoring for fidelity which was important because you didn't want to spend the time evaluating a program

which was not up and running. She stated that the approach was that the monitoring of the programs was conducted looking at it in terms of whether or not it was being implemented with fidelity, with adherence to the model, whether or not there was exposure to the programs in terms of the dosage and the quality of the program. She stated that the other aspect was looking at evaluation of programs, initiatives and systems. She stated that they looked at it in terms of evidence based programs and monitored for the outcomes. She stated that most efforts therefore, were looking at locally developed programs.

Ms. Watson stated that there were various types of reports, assessing the success of the programs, if the success was not being achieved, why it did not occur. She stated that there were certain programs where the models in terms of the outcomes and target population were similar, but the interventions were different. She stated the question was, which provided the best outcomes? She stated that they therefore tested those models.

Ms. Watson stated that in some instances they couldn't do full fledged evaluations so had conducted snapshots where they looked at point-in-time data. She stated that they had reported on 15 programs in terms of how they were achieving some key objectives, and how they were performing compared to the prior year.

Ms. Watson stated that another method of reporting was providing information on the implication of some of the county-wide indicators, and therefore providing contextual information on the dynamics of the families and the situations in which they resided.

Ms. Watson stated that the other body of work they wanted to highlight was around the CSC portfolio metrics. She stated that it was a framework that was based on the Pathways document. She stated that a committee had worked together to ensure that all the programs were aligned with the measurable conditions and the sentinel outcomes. She stated that for agencies with a variety of complex programs, it was often not based on any theory, just on the ability to produce specific outcomes. She stated that it allowed them to talk at a macro level, what their progress was in terms of achieving these outcomes.

Ms. Watson stated that during the past year they had only had partial information with data from 2009 and 2010. She stated that in the upcoming year they would have complete information which would allow them to do a full-fledged approach in terms of the metrics.

Ms. Watson stated that the portfolio metrics told them what was happening now, and the evaluation told them why. She stated that both of them together would tell CSC how it was doing towards driving towards achieving the Sentinel Outcomes.

Ms. Watson stated that utilization of the reports was important. Jeff Goodman, Team Lead stated that the reports were used in four major areas: i) to support planning, ii) for continuous quality improvement, iii) the outcome and achievement of funded programs, and iv) to identify county-wide trends.

Mr. Goodman stated that in supporting planning they covered issues critical to children and families in Palm Beach County. He stated that an example was prenatal father support. He stated that in

the past they had reported on the mother's marital status as an influence on birth outcomes, and the question had been raised whether it was really the marital status they were measuring, or whether they were measuring support by the father. He stated that many couples were unmarried but the support was there. He stated that in studies from the University of South Florida and the State of Florida they had examined birth outcomes when there was no father information on the birth certificate compared to when there was father information on the birth certificate. He stated that the results were astonishing.

Mr. Goodman stated that when a father's information was missing on the birth certificate:

- the mother was almost **twice as likely** to have a baby born **low birthweight**
- **one and a half times** more likely to have a **premature** baby
- the infant **mortality** was almost **three times higher**.

Mr. Goodman stated that if there had been prenatal fatherhood support for everyone they could potentially have prevented 54 infant deaths in a three year period. He stated that the importance of fatherhood support prenatally was shared with the planning department so that they could bring in programs that focused on fatherhood involvement, and that it was also shared with the outreach coordinator at CSC for him to share with the community, so that the community could also be informed of the importance of fatherhood support prenatally.

Mr. Goodman stated that another example of data uncovered being shared with the community/ programs was regarding perinatal periods of risk (PPOR). He stated that it identified the periods before or after the birth of the baby that contributed to infant mortality. He stated that they were able to identify areas in which to work with the mother, before or after she became pregnant. She stated that this information was used to drive the maternal health component of the Healthy Beginnings Delivery Plan. He stated that by doing this kind of analysis, if all factors were eliminated which contributed to infant mortality, there would be four periods in which they could work:

- **maternal health** – if they worked on the health of the mothers before they got pregnant they could have potentially eliminated 147 infant deaths over the three year period
- **maternal care** – if they worked on mothers during the time they were pregnant they could have eliminated contributing factors leading to infant mortality due to inadequate prenatal care they could potentially have eliminate 107 infant deaths
- **newborn care** – care within the first 28 days – they projected that if they could eliminate external factors there would have been 10 less infant deaths
- **infant health** – care up to the first year - they projected that if they could eliminate external factors there would have been 17 less infant deaths.

He stated that if they could eliminate all the mitigating factors they could potentially have eliminated 281 infant deaths over a 3 year period, about 2/3 of infant deaths during that period. He showed a chart attributing the cause of 90% of the deaths to the first two bulleted points outlined above – poor health of the mother before she got pregnant, or poor care of the mother while she was pregnant.

Mr. Goodman stated that these deductions were passed onto the planning department and the Healthy Beginnings Coalition for them to focus on services and work more efficiently in achieving

positive birth outcomes. He stated that he had presented to the Council in June how much infant mortality had been reduced in the past five years, and stated that this kind of information helped them drive down the infant mortality rate.

Mr. Goodman stated that another area in which they were working was continuous improvement and program refinement. He stated that the Primary Project operated in the schools and worked with children at-risk for social and emotional behavior problems. He stated that when the evaluation was performed on this program it highlighted that:

- 98% of the children in the program were already identified as at-risk prior to the program, they therefore knew from the start that they were targeting the right population
- After the program was implemented there was a statistically significant improvement in social emotional functioning at the school, and that those improvements could be attributed to the program.

Mr. Goodman stated that when the Primary Project evaluation outcome information was shared with the program division they also looked at the longitudinal study, to determine how sustainable these effects were.

Mr. Goodman stated that the Centering program focused on Hispanic pregnant women in Lantana. He stated that they had positive results in reducing premature births. He stated that this information was given to the program division, and the result of that was they were focusing on expanding the program into other areas, such as African American communities.

Mr. Goodman stated that there were desired outcomes for each program, and one hypothesis for early childcare programs was that children at-risk of not being ready for school, were more likely to be more successful than other children (i.e. those not at-risk) when provided with quality child care experiences. He stated that this hypothesis was proven in the Highlands statistics: Highland pre-K students performed significantly better than non-program participants in school readiness tests. He stated that 78% of Highland pre-K students scored "ready for school" compared to 33% of non-program participants.

Mr. Goodman stated that they also looked at county-wide trend data. He stated that when data was considered over time (5 to 10 years) they could see how well CSC's efforts had paid off, and how sustainable those results were over time. He stated that in June, 2011 they had presented results to the Council regarding improvement in 5 key birth indicators in Palm Beach County over a five year period. He stated that in comparison to other urban counties in the State of Florida they had been able show that Palm Beach County was the only county that had improved in all five indicators. He stated that by considering countywide trend data (in this case, birth outcomes) they could see that all the efforts were working and were being sustained.

Grace Watson stated that the examples given showed how critical it was to learn from the information provided and how they used the information to guide future efforts. She stated that some of the programs Mr. Goodman had described were evidence based programs, and some had been locally developed programs. She stated that the county wide trend data showed them exactly where they stood, and where they needed to do better (or continue to do well). She stated that

they wanted to continue that base of knowledge on the performance of the funded programs. She stated that the quality of the data was important in such analysis. She stated that they understood that it took time to reach these outcomes, and the trajectory was such that it was developmental and took time. She stated that they needed to develop milestones in order to measure themselves again and could thus measure progress.

Ms. Watson stated that they had been very fortunate to work with an advisory council, and they had taken guidance from the advisory council, with some very fruitful discussions. She stated that reports had been sent to the advisory council and they had been able to receive and implement feedback, using suggested methodologies. She stated that they wanted to foster the advisory council relationship even further to guide their work.

Judge Alvarez asked who sat on the advisory council. Ms. Watson stated that Chair Macon was on the advisory council, in addition there were other nationwide participants hailing from such places as: University of Michigan; Chapin Hall Center for Children at the University of Chicago; University of Denver; and from the Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence, Institute of Behavioral Science, University of Colorado at Boulder. Tana Ebbole stated that the individuals were nationally and internationally known, and their participation spoke highly of the work of the Research and Evaluation department and the work of CSC. She stated that there was a comparable group of (equally prestigious) advisors on the "Think Tank" who also came to CSC twice per year to help work through the latest research, where CSC was going, what made sense, and what pitfalls to consider.

2. Common Eligibility Project

Beverly Auerbach stated that the One-E-App common eligibility tool for Palm Beach County had come to fruition. She stated that common eligibility was a web-based software solution that screened and qualified people for various health and human service programs. She stated that the committee had undertaken a rigorous process with interviews, need assessment, information gathering, rating of proposals, reference checks, webinars, demonstrations, etc. She stated that they had collaborated with Miami-Dade and Broward counties throughout the process as they were also seeking a common eligibility tool for their counties.

Ms. Auerbach stated that the One-E-App tool from Social Interest Solutions in California was selected because it met every identified requirement. She stated that in April, 2011 the funding had been secured, and the United Way had assumed responsibility as the temporary fiscal agent. She stated that a contract was in place, and customization of the tool for Palm Beach County was underway. She stated that it would be implemented in phases, (as funding permitted) and that they would go slowly to ensure it was working correctly. She stated that the tool interfaced with Access Florida, and they had been working closely with the Department of Children and Families to facilitate such a collaboration. She stated that the tool also performed other screenings and was able to produce paper referrals for other programs. She stated that this would be an invaluable tool to families in Palm Beach County, it would help families to no end from having to go from agency to agency to make applications, it eliminated all the duplication. She thanked the Council for funding the Common Eligibility project, and thanked Council Member Perry Borman for championing the project and attending the meetings.

Judge Alvarez asked how the Common Eligibility Project could increase revenue coming back into the community. Ms. Auerbach stated that millions of dollars was given back to the Federal Government every year, for example, in food stamps. She stated that there were many people who qualified for food stamps, but were unaware that they qualified. She stated that they hoped to increase the usage which would bring revenue into the community.

3. Community Food Alliance

Nate Nichols, Executive Resident stated that as of October 26, 2011 the United Way had been awarded \$140,000 by the Jim Moran Foundation to work in the community food arena. He stated that the funding would be provided for 3 years. He stated that one component was a \$75,000 allocation for (food distribution) truck maintenance and for gas. He stated that there would be an allocation of \$35,000 in the first year to help with gleaning. He stated that the third area receiving an allocation was Education, in the amount of \$30,000. He stated that the Flipany program (**F**lorida **I**ntroduces **P**hysical **A**ctivity and **N**utrition to **Y**outh) was an evidence based program, and that it taught families how to prepare nutritious foods.

Judge Alvarez commented on a presentation at the October 26, 2011 Board meeting of the Community Foundation, and asked Mr. Nichols to expand. Mr. Nichols stated that the local community had tried to engage with an entity entitled 'Feeding South Florida', this organization was a supplier of food from the federal level. He stated that the local community felt that Palm Beach County did not receive its fair share of foodstuffs from Feeding South Florida, and have tried to work with this entity to increase the amount of food. He stated that as a community of funders (outside of Feeding South Florida), a letter had been submitted to the National Feeding America entity outlining the local desire to operate independently. He stated that Palm Beach County was one of the richest agriculture communities in the country, however, there were families that still went hungry. He stated that Feeding South Florida was a feeding bank that covered Miami-Dade, Broward, and Munroe counties, which were all very large communities. He stated that the local coalition contended that Feeding South Florida may not have the capacity, infrastructure, and all the necessary supports to focus adequate attention on Palm Beach County. Tana Ebbole stated that the Board of County Commissioners were onboard in a major team effort headed by John Van Arnam, and they had crafted the letter (to operate independently of Feeding South Florida), which had been subtle and diplomatic, albeit pointed. Perry Borman stated that he had been with the Community Food Alliance before joining DCF four years previously, and the situation had been long standing.

4. Employee Service Awards

Tana Ebbole directed Council members' attention to the CEO Report, and congratulated staff on achieving various years of service with CSC.

5. Return on Taxpayer Investment (ROTI) – Investment for Results

Tana Ebbole stated that she would be setting up individual meetings with each Council member to brief them on ROTI (return on taxpayer investment) which they may rename "Investment for Results" to avoid confusion.

Ms. Ebbole stated that they were in the process of creating a matrix to be able to identify where a program stood relative to: i) the program being implemented successfully and effectively, ii) the alignment of the program relative to CSC achieving its sentinel outcomes; and iii) the program's cost reasonableness. She stated that in this manner they could focus on the programs bringing them closest to achieving CSC's outcomes, and what gave CSC the optimal power to achieve child outcomes. She stated that they did not want to invest in programs that were operating poorly, either due to alignment or due to performance.

Ms. Ebbole stated that this work became even more important in decision making because, based on the 11/12 budget and the upcoming 12/13 budget, unless something changed with regard to property values or unless taxes were increased, CSC would be in the position of needing to cut approximately \$2 million in program funding. She stated that this would be a tool to strategically identify where to make the cuts and maximize effectiveness.

6. Children's Services Council's Parent Information Hotline

Tana Ebbole referred to the Parent Information Hotline flyer, and encouraged attendees to spread the word.

9. Legal Reports

Tom Sheehan, Legal Counsel stated that the annual Certificate of Compliance would be sent out to Council members prior to the December 8, 2011 Council meeting. He asked Council members to complete and submit the Certificate of Compliance prior to the January 26, 2012 Council meeting. He stated that the existing Certificate of Compliance (for calendar year 2011) would also be sent to Council members to refresh their memory of other organizations of which they may be Board members.

Mr. Sheehan stated that in addition to the implied powers CSC has, for example, hiring a consultant to do audits or contract review, this is an interlocal agreement entered into under the authority of Chapter 163, which gives us the authority to enter into/expend funds on the subject of this agreement.

Mr. Sheehan stated that there will be no Council meeting in November due to the Thanksgiving Holiday, and that the December Council meeting would be held Thursday, December 8, 2011.

10. Council Committees

1. Personnel Committee

Chair Macon stated that the Personnel Committee had met earlier that day. He stated that due to economic circumstances, over the past several years there had been no salary increases for staff. He stated that for the previous two years they had given staff the time off between Christmas and New Year's, the equivalent of four days' leave, as compensation. He stated that the Personnel Committee recommended closing CSC again in 2011 between Christmas and New Year's. He stated that this was historically a slow time of the year.

A motion by Malone/Alvarez to approve the Personnel Committee's recommendation to close CSC for the period between Christmas and New Year was approved by unanimous vote.

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

12. Council Members' Comments

Chair Macon stated that it was the last meeting in which they would have the privilege of sitting with (interim) Superintendent Bill Malone, and the Council would miss his time, talent, and dedication to CSC. He thanked Mr. Malone and stated that the Council would sincerely miss his contributions.

Bill Malone stated that at the time of assuming the position of Superintendent he was unaware that he would have the privilege of serving as a Council member. He stated that the School District and Children's Services Council were partners in so many ways, he immediately felt comfortable, and the work was so intertwined, it almost seemed as if the two organizations should merge. He stated that he had enjoyed the opportunity of serving on the Council.

Judge Alvarez stated that the Judiciary had met with elected officials on Monday, October 24, 2011. He stated that he had had the opportunity to plug CSC and early childhood programs. He stated that he had pointed out that they the State was being reactionary instead of concentrating on things as they were starting out, in early childhood.

13. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

Dari Bowman, Secretary

Gaetana D. Ebbole, Chief Executive Officer