



Board of Directors Meeting

January 10, 2013

Minutes – November 29, 2012

Item II.A.

PRESENT: Elise Minkoff, Chair; Brian Aungst, Jr.; Honorable Bob Dillinger; Maria Edmonds; Judge Raymond Gross; Honorable Bernie McCabe; Raymond Neri; Angela Rouson; Dr. James Sewell; Attorney Colleen Flynn

ABSENT: Dr. Michael A. Grego

PHONE PARTICIPATION: Commissioner Karen Seel

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mrs. Minkoff called the meeting to order at 9:03 AM.

II. CONSENT AGENDA

- A. Approve Minutes for October 11, 2012
- B. Accept Financial Report for October 2012

ACTION: Dr. Sewell moved to approve the Consent Agenda as presented; seconded by Mrs. Rouson. No discussion; motion carried.

III. ACTION

- A. Ratify the Recommendations of the Finance Committee

Mrs. Minkoff asked Mr. McCabe to lead the discussion. He said that, when the Finance Committee met, they were advised that, for next year, the insurance costs were not going to increase as was projected, which left some available dollars. The Finance Committee determined it was a good time to add 3% into the employee's paychecks (a total of 50 employees at a cost of \$102,936 annualized). There have been no cost of living adjustments for the past five years. In addition, it is recommended an average of three leave days be given for outstanding performance, and for the five DROP employees, an additional annual leave day since they are not required to contribute the 3% to FRS. The total cost would be \$149,779. The Finance Committee recommends to the Board that those proposals be approved.

Dr. Sewell asked if the annual leave bonus days were for other than outstanding employees.

Mr. McCabe said it would be based on performance.

Dr. Sewell: If you are just doing your job, which is Satisfactory do you receive a bonus for performance, i.e. a paid leave day?

Mrs. Lancaster: The leave days are considered a merit increase and only applied to a higher level of performance.

Dr. Sewell: Expressed concern that if you are just doing your job, which is satisfactory, you would receive a performance bonus.

Mr. McCabe: It is at the discretion of the Executive Director and performance based.

ACTION: Mr. McCabe moved to ratify the Recommendations of the Finance Committee; seconded by Judge Gross. No further discussion; motion carried.

Approval of the Salary Ranges

Mr. McCabe said the salary ranges were adjusted based upon them being antiquated. A study was done and the salary ranges were brought up-to-date. It does not result in any further expenditure of funds and there is no budget impact.

Mrs. Lancaster: The proposed action moves the ranges by 2.5% in keeping with the market.

ACTION: Dr. Sewell moved to approve the Increase of the Salary Ranges by 2.5%; seconded by Mr. Dillinger. No further discussion; motion carried.

B. JWB Personnel Policy

A revised memo regarding compliance with SB 88s.215.425F.S. (prohibits Special Districts from offering extra compensation, thus eliminating longevity payments) was distributed. Mrs. Lancaster stated that this item would be substituted as an action for the Board to take, which is a removal of that specific language from our Personnel Policies.

ACTION: Mr. Dillinger moved to approve the discontinuation of the Longevity Policy for employees; seconded by Dr. Sewell. No discussion; motion carried.

C. Quality Early Learning Initiative.

Mrs. Lancaster said this is a culmination of the work JWB staff began with the United Methodist Cooperative Ministries (UMCM), and Karen Sierra is presenting.

Karen Sierra, Senior Program Consultant, Program Development and Support Department: In June, a Letter of Interest was issued to the provider community regarding the Quality Learning Initiative; there were 12 respondents. The Review Team recommended, and the Board approved moving forward with negotiations with UMCM. In September, they presented both a written and verbal response to the Review Team, and the Team has been meeting with them on a regular basis. Both the Revered John Ekers, Board Chair and Pam Qualls, Executive Director were in the audience and available to answer any questions.

The Quality Early Learning Initiative will be serving up to 200 children, and are focusing on the five areas in the County most at risk. Children will be recruited from three of our programs: Healthy Families, Nurse Family Partnership and Total Family Strategies from Suncoast.

The Initiative is ready to start opening centers as of February 1st, initially serving 115 children at that time. The third center will be ready to open no later than August, serving a total of 60 more children.

Mr. Dillinger: Does this contract provide for before and after school care?

Ms. Sierra: This is for children 0 – 5 years of age, from 7:00 AM – 6:00 PM.

Mr. Dillinger: What kind of food is provided to these children?

Ms. Qualls: Federal Child Food Program, contracting with a caterer. The food will be prepared and brought in, according to the Child Care Program Guidelines and served to the children.

Mr. Dillinger: How many times a day?

Ms. Qualls: Three times a day, breakfast, lunch, and a snack in the late afternoon.

Mr. Dillinger: Inquired about an unsigned letter in his Board packet (attached to Minutes) and asked if someone could address the issues that were raised in the letter from providers.

Judi Bruckner said she had been asked by providers to represent them. They are concerned that this initiative could impact small business owners that already have pre-existing sites and could provide the same quality if the funding and the resources were available to them, and it would not be a situation where new sites would have to be opened. A Letter of Intent was presented and one agency is willing to be the oversight of these pre-existing sites.

Mr. McCabe: If there was an agency willing to provide oversight and provide their services why did they not express interest when the proposal went out?

Ms. Bruckner: A Letter of Intent was done, but not accepted, and JWB went forward with the UMCM. We believe we could have better defined those things had we submitted an actual proposal.

Mrs. Lancaster: We have been having open discussions for almost two years, testing the marketplace, having discussions among providers, and seeking interest through the initial RFP that was put out. The initial response to the RFP was that we should step back and wait, and in five years providers might be ready to step up and provide the level of care that we were expressing a need for. We are talking about a shift in JWB's investments from subsidized care to quality early learning, with the higher level standards because the 500 children we serve are those most at risk. We have found that only about half of the children from subsidized child care come to school ready to learn; this Board has said that is unacceptable for the population we serve.

What we are sensing from providers is their concern about needing to adapt in the future, and they want help getting there. We asked for capacity to serve 200 children quickly; we looked at a number of providers through their Letters of Interest, which outlined what they were prepared to do; they didn't meet the numbers we were talking about. The goal is large rapid impact versus a gradual growing impact. UMCM was the only entity that was ready to move very quickly.

We are talking with St. Petersburg College about creating a model learning lab for providers to enhance providers' skills, but right now we have an opportunity to move to a larger scale. We are changing the conversation to early learning versus childcare, and if we don't as a community try to change the conversation, nothing will ever change for providers or for the children.

The way the state operates is to pay a subsidy rate between 50-60% of the market through ELCs. The school system's effort is the Lew Williams Project on the Gibbs campus (approximately 90 children) and potentially a larger number in North Clearwater. We have a commitment to that, along with St. Petersburg College and this is a means to impact a relatively small number of children more quickly. This is our recommendation to you as a Board as a way to move the agenda.

Mr. Dillinger: One sentence in this letter indicates that "now your program is allowing people who don't work or go to school to have this entitlement for free while many qualified working families have been on the waiting list for years."

Mrs. Lancaster: It is not the job of JWB to deal with the Early Learning Coalitions' (ELC) role of providing subsidized childcare. While we provide the match for ELC to draw down the dollars for the subsidized childcare, ours is a different project from that. There are 2,000 children on the waiting list for the ELC, but they have also lowered the age range to 0 – 5. This focuses on taking the children out of our three early identification programs at birth, and putting them into an environment that enhances their learning, and has nothing to do with the people on the waiting list for the ELC; it is a program different and apart from the Welfare to Work Program that the ELC provides.

Ms. Sierra added that all three programs that the children will be referred from work with the families on self-sufficiency, as well.

Mrs. Lancaster: These are high-risk families whose children are identified early as JWB children. We recognize them at birth and we are trying to give them and their families a chance. We are still funding quite a few slots in our safety net which are managed through the ELC. We are working on advancing the standards; we believe if you do that and it works the conversation in the community can change. We desire the highest quality learning environment and support a fair reimbursement rate for providers who provide it.

Judge Gross: We recently received a zip code breakdown of the areas where the children are least prepared. Were these locations selected to try and be an overlay for those who are selected or what were the factors? What were the criteria that were used to choose those specific locations for these programs?

Mrs. Lancaster: We anticipate services being provided in all five of the highest risk communities however, with respect to the distribution these were the areas where the greatest number existed. This is also where UMCM could provide capacity moving very quickly

Ms. Sierra: We are looking in the Tarpon and High Point area for the next two locations.

ACTION: Mr. McCabe moved to finalize and execute the contract with United Methodist Cooperative Ministries; seconded by Dr. Sewell. No discussion; motion carried.

Mrs. Minkoff recognized Ms. Bruckner as a childcare advocate, having served with her on various Boards, and thanked her for her comments.

Mrs. Lancaster said staff will continue to try to advance the work to enhance the skill set in the provider community to enable a broader group of providers to offer the service.

D. Recommendation for New Data System

Ms. Marcionette brought a recommendation to the Board from the RFP team regarding the selection of a new client tracking database. Back in 1998, when SAMIS was first developed, JWB thought differently about how social services should be delivered and how outcomes should be measured. Earlier this year, the Board decided to no longer be part of the SAMIS collaborative, so JWB contracted with the collaborative on a month-to-month basis until another arrangement was decided upon. The collaborative has made the decision to no longer contract with JWB on a month-to-month basis, which leaves us in the position of having to move forward immediately.

As a result, JWB looked at three different systems which had the capacity to meet our need: CHEDAS, Social Solutions and Mosaic. Ms. Marcionette outlined these different systems, indicating JWB staff recommends the purchase of the Mosaic Grants Evaluation Management System. There is a rapid development cycle, which does not use a lot of staff resources, provides training on demand through video, email, help desk and telephone calls, plus flexible contracting. The fiscal module it is ready to go, and is close to what is currently being used, and the bulk of the client data tracking should be in place by the end of June 2013.

Mr. Aungst: On page 27, the price breakdown: is the purchase cost for Mosaic cost certain or flexible?

Ms. Marcionette: The range is a cost certain; there are different prices for different types of development.

Mr. Aungst: That is a purchase cost one-time, first year cost, and a term of use license fee or renewed every year?

Ms. Marcionette: The license is renewed every year and the Board will be able to review the agreement.

Mr. Aungst: Will the interface with the old data versus the new data have continuity?

Ms. Marcionette: Yes, Mosaic has gone into a number of national systems and they are able to easily import that data.

Mr. Aungst: How about CHEDAS; is there information the County will have that we will be able to interface with the two systems?

Ms. Marcionette: Yes, through our partnership with the County the two systems will be able to interface.

Mr. Neri: Is there a possibility to add other sources of information?

Ms. Marcionette: Yes, through our data warehouse we can add information from the Child Welfare System, Eckerd, Juvenile Justice System, and the entire public school database.

Mr. Neri: I think once before I mentioned tie-in to the Sheriff's database to implement a questionnaire as to why those people are there. We look at children who can't learn because they aren't fed and we are housing them at an extraordinary cost. It would be interesting to compare the data.

Ms. Marcionette: We want to launch longitudinal research this year with our newer programs such as Nurse Family Partnership, where we start with the children prenatally. There are a number of studies that found what we are doing in the early stages of life has an essential and quantifiable impact. That is really what drew us to this system.

Mr. Dillinger: We have this Roadmap to Success coming from the Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ). Are we getting access to the DJJ database?

Ms. Marcionette: Our agreement is still awaiting their consideration.

Mr. Dillinger: I will bring up the issue at the Roadmap to Success meeting.

Mrs. Minkoff: It was indicated that we are lighter in the IT department than previously. Do you need to bring outside people in to implement Mosaic?

Ms. Marcionette: Only if we kept SAMIS.

ACTION: Mr. Dillinger moved to accept the recommendation of the new Mosaic Data System; seconded by Mr. Neri, motion carried.

Subsequent Discussion:

Mrs. Flynn: Are you approving staff to obtain the contracts to bring back to the Board, based on Mr. Aungst's question, or are you giving them permission to go ahead and execute the contracts in the amount set forth in the Memo?

Mrs. Lancaster: We would ask the Board's approval of my authority to execute the contract. We have the money in the budget, and, if agreeable with the Board, future renewals would come back before the Board for approval.

Mrs. Minkoff: We would like to see the contract.

Mrs. Lancaster: As soon as it is finalized we will get it out to the Board Members.

Mr. Aungst said he does not have a problem with Mrs. Lancaster's request for authority as long as Mrs. Flynn reviews it and says that it is within what we have approved as an Agreement in Principal at the Board meeting.

Mrs. Flynn: Whenever it involves; for these maintenance agreements and IP licenses, the IP attorney at the firm makes sure they are not doing anything to run afoul of IP law.

IV. DISCUSSION

A. Joint School Board/BCC/JWB Meeting Agenda

Mrs. Lancaster said, for some time Board Members have discussed the concept of a Joint Meeting with the Pinellas County School Board and the Board of County Commissioners. After the initial discussion among the Board Members, she spoke to the County Administrator, and to the previous school superintendent, and we are working towards establishing an Agenda. The County Administrator does not want to proffer the idea to the Board of County Commissioners unless there is an Action Agenda. Before you is a draft agenda of items that may offer grounds for a discussion. Please augment or remove any items, and it will be presented to both the School Superintendent and the County Administrator for their consideration.

Mr. Neri asked if it would it be possible to invite the sheriff to this meeting.

Mrs. Lancaster said she would proffer the idea to the others. The original idea proposed by Commissioner Seel was a Joint Meeting among the three bodies. On behalf of the Board, Mrs. Minkoff could extend an invitation to the Sheriff if the School Superintendent and County Administrator are willing.

Mrs. Lancaster asked that any additions or edits be sent to her via email.

V. PRESENTATIONS

A. Child Welfare

Judith Warren had a family medical emergency and was unavailable to present. She will be invited back in January.

VI. INFORMATION ITEMS

Mrs. Lancaster distributed a spread sheet and gave a brief explanation on the child care dollars that are now being spent.

Mrs. Minkoff asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Aungst asked if this was an amalgamation of different parts of the budget that have been identified specifically for these purposes and not a line item with sub parts in the actual overall budget.

Mrs. Lancaster said this is an amalgamate of the current dollars being spent for specific types of childcare, the number being served, and providers of services.

VII. OPEN AGENDA

Mrs. Minkoff reminded the Board that she and Gay will be presenting to the Pinellas County Board of County Commissioners on December 11th at 9:00 AM if Board Members want to attend.

Debra Prewitt distributed the Florida Legislative Leadership and 2013 Session Report as an information item. This report shows where various representatives have been assigned.

VIII. ADJOURN

Dr. Sewell moved for adjournment at 9:55 AM; seconded by Mrs. Rouson; no discussion; motion carried.

Minutes Submitted by:

Dr. James Sewell
Board Secretary
01/10/13