

**BOONE COUNTY CHILDREN'S SERVICES BOARD**  
**MEETING**  
**COMMISSION CHAMBERS – BOONE COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER**  
**801 E. WALNUT ST., COLUMBIA, MO.**

*Thursday, March 27, 2014 at 4:30 p.m.*

---

**MINUTES**

**Board Members Present:** Nancy McKerrow, Kathy Thornburg, Bruce Horwitz, Greg Grupe, Dewey Riehn

**Others Present:** Kelly Wallis, Director of Boone County Community Services

**Board Members Absent:** Les Wagner, Michele Kennett, Jennifer Walker and Suzie Forbis

**Guests:** Consultants from the Truman Institute, Jacqueline Schumacher and Christian Arment.

Greg Grupe, Vice Chair opened the meeting at 4:30 PM.

**1. Community Input Session #3**

Community input session #3 was opened by Jacqueline Schumacher. The BCCSB hosted a Community Input Session on March 27, 2014 and invited Boone County social services agencies to attend. The topic of this session was *Clinical & Mental Health Services* which centered on outpatient chemical and psychiatric treatment, counseling & related services for transitional living, crisis intervention inclusive of telephone hotlines, professional counseling & therapy, psychological evaluations and mental health screenings. Each agency was given five minutes to answer the following questions:

Question #1: *What are the top two issues you feel need to be addressed in your service population specifically for clinical and/or mental health services?*

Question #2: *Are there systemic obstacles to your success when working specifically with clinical and/or mental health services?*

Question #3: *Where is the gap in your clinical and/or mental health services?*

Questions #4: *What is a quantitative measure of your success when working with clinical and/or mental health services?*

Question #5: *Please describe collaborations you envision for addressing challenges in the clinical and/or mental health service area.*

## **2. Approval of Minutes of February 13<sup>th</sup> and 27<sup>th</sup> and March 13<sup>th</sup> BCCSB Meetings**

Call for review of the minutes from February 13<sup>th</sup> in the new format that Kelly has moved us towards. Everyone liked the new format of the minutes. First motion was made to be approved; a second motion was made. The whole board was in favor and approved the minutes. We now will consider approval of the February 27<sup>th</sup> minutes. First motion was made to be approved, a second motion was made. The board approved the minutes from February 27<sup>th</sup>. March 13<sup>th</sup> minutes for approval. First motion was made to be approved, a second motion was made. The board approved the minutes from March 13<sup>th</sup>.

## **3. Discuss and Approve Amendment to Bylaws**

The Board discussed the amendments made to the Bylaws. The Bylaws currently state the election of officers would take place in January. There was previous discussion at a board meeting regarding the timing of the election of officers. The Bylaws were sent to the Administrative Committee for amendment. The Administrative Committee proposed an amendment to the Bylaws which would call for election of officers in May. The Board was not in agreement with the amendments made.

Motion was made and a second motion was made to table and move the discussion to the next meeting. All whole board was in favor of tabling the amendments. A request was made for the Director to gather information regarding election of officers in St. Louis and St. Charles counties.

## **4. RFP Workgroup Report**

The RFP Workgroup is working toward making a recommendation to the Board regarding types of RFP's. The idea now is to have two main types of RFP's, one a purchase of service RFP and the other an RFP for innovative pilot projects. In addition we have three other funding categories. One is to pursue match funding opportunities, and we thought we would recommend later, more officially to the board that, that effort be imbedded if you will in both of those, purchase of services and innovative pilot projects. So there would not be a separate RFP but it would be part of those two major RFP's. The other two funding types are strategic opportunities and the emergency/contingency fund. The board would vote some percent of the dollars to hold back for those two opportunities. That would be another process/RFP to receive funding for a strategic opportunity. The committee will be more formally suggesting for a vote later at a different board meeting for those types of applications for funding.

We talked about the timeline. We think that these two official RFP formats will be released in May. We worked on the purchase of service RFP, and we are thinking on the innovative RFP. We'll have the materials to bring to the full board in the not too far distant future. We discussed also having targeted RFP's. There was some discussion about funding an assessment center. If we decided that we wanted to do that we would develop a specific RFP.

a. **Discuss Targeted RFP for Family Assessment Center**

**Kelly:** That is something that I would like to discuss with the board and possibly consider as a voting item for this evening, since we have a quorum. I discussed this with Les Wagner, our board chair and he was in support of me presenting this to the board tonight. We've already heard quite a bit from the community about the lack of collaboration and the need for independent referral sources. We heard tonight from a couple different providers, but this has been consistent, there is a need to treat individuals from a systematic approach. There were several comments made that I think could be addressed through a family assessment center. It would not be a service provider, not an agency that provides services, but someone independent who could run a family assessment center and be our medium between the individuals and the providers. So not only would they be conducting assessments, but they would be making referrals. They would know all of the agencies and providers that are funded through the children's services fund as well as other agencies and providers who are providing services that the families might be directed to.

**Kelly:** I'm suggesting that we vote whether the board would like to seek a targeted RFP for a family assessment center.

I'm against voting on that tonight, without discussion. We're still in the process of getting input from the community. We have yet to digest that, and to even think more broadly of what our strategic plan is. These things really take some consideration.

**Kelly:** We can put it on the next agenda for discussion.

I don't think that concludes you Kelly from going ahead and starting to do some draft work based on what the sense of the committee is. I do think that all the meetings we've had are so informative and I agree that when we get the final report we can make more decisions. We have not seen the comments, we have only heard the comments, but they will be part of the report. Once we see the synthesis, if that particular item emerges as something that is very important, that would tell me this is something we really need to move forward with and fund. I don't think that hurts to have it in the back pocket in terms of what a tentative RFP might look like for that portion of the funding.

**Kelly:** I understand the approach on that and it is well respected. I do want to inform the board that our final deliverable from the consultants is in July. So if we will be waiting until our final deliverable from the consultants, we will be looking at an RFP going out after July.

My hope would be that if we agree with these two main types of RFP's, one for purchase of services and one for the more innovative pilot projects, if those go out

in May, I think its fine to wait a few months, for the other one, for the targeted. There would be a lot of work to do on those two and then we would know for sure if the other has emerged to something that is really important and we could do it at anytime. I agree, I think that's where are effort should focus, on those two, very basic RFP's. We have a pretty good feeling and I'm speaking from Les's chair, so I will speak his words that we're looking for innovation. We're looking for gaps. We're looking for things that we can fund that fill gaps and until we know where all the gaps are, certainly we can start funding some programs that maybe this first RFP process project is not as neat and tidy. It may be two different ways. Does that make sense to you?

**Kelly:** It does. I think that this is an excellent board, with excellent ideas and so I am going to respect the opinions. We will move forward at the pace the board is comfortable moving forward.

There was a motion moved to table this until the next board meeting. A second motion was moved to table until next board meeting. The board all voted to table the RFP discussion until the next board meeting.

**b. Discuss Targeted RFP for Crisis Intervention Services**

No specific discussion.

**5. Community Input Committee Report**

Nancy, Kelly and I met to discuss some community input information. Kelly was very interested in talking to members of the committee and Nancy and I were the ones who were able to attend about what we had in mind. We put a half day retreat on the calendar, because that was prior to her coming into her employment. We talked about several options with the retreat.

One thing that we talked about was we need to train ourselves in evaluating RFP's so that we are all doing it the same way. It's learning common language. You take two or three different RFP's and score them yourself, then see how each other scored them, dump them all together and walk through them. Talk through why you scored them that way. Then do one more as a group and see if we can tighten the criteria so we don't have any outliers that may go over some decisions. It seems that the scoring rubric would be built based on the two separate RFP's based off the specifics the RFP asked for.

I could see having an argument for the retreat at the time that you're talking about. I could also make a case for having a retreat to digest the information and gathering to start thinking in terms of a strategic plan before we start looking at specific proposals. We have only had some very basic discussions, that's why I didn't want to talk about a specific proposal about an assessment center. We haven't even begun to think about some of the basic decisions that the board has to come to. About what direction we are going in. What are strategies are. We haven't even really discussed how we are going to

evaluate proposals, once they come in. So I could see a proposal for the retreat for that basic discussion and having it soon. Having that first, before we start getting into specific proposals. I think two half days, one for the purpose of learning from this point what we have heard and from Jacqueline and Christian and to finalize the RFP. More importantly to finalize the rubric for scoring the RFP. The second half day would be on what you all talked about. We could do a half day on Friday, and then weeks later on a Saturday have our other. There needs to be two different time frames, one before the RFP, then one after.

**Jacqueline:** Basically when the community input sessions are over, after April 10<sup>th</sup>, you will have all of the feedback back ready to go. On July 10<sup>th</sup> the final report includes also the key informant interviews, the key informant surveys, things that are really far down on the radar. As of now, you have your inventory done and the synopsis of the local reports was just sent recently to Kelly. So at the end of April, you will have all of the deliverables excluding interviews and surveys. I'm happy to share that with you. I am happy to share any interim documents with you. The feedback briefings are broken down by sessions. So you will have different breakouts for each session night. All their worksheets will be in the appendix. If you have a specific question, you can refer back to the three and a half to four page write up about what was said.

**Jacqueline:** Everything is broken down by bullet points. I've taken all of their responses and broken it down into four different categories. It's either: Access, structure, lack of services, mental health or transportation. All of their comments are split out in these four categories.

**Greg:** Suggested that prior to the open forum meeting, it might be good for Les to write an editorial for the Sunday's paper inviting people to come in.

So I see the first big retreat being the opportunity for you to present that kind of stuff and some discussion, so we can start thinking more strategically about where we are.

## 6. **Personnel Committee Report**

### a. **Interviews**

We've conducted three interviews for the Program Manager position. We have one interview left to conduct tomorrow.

### b. **Special Meeting for Board to meet Program Manager Candidates**

**Kelly:** I would like to address tonight setting a special meeting for the board to meet the Program Manager candidates. There was interest in the board providing input on the candidates. If it's possible, I would like to get that scheduled before our next meeting that is in two weeks from now. We can do that through a doodle, since several people are missing. Does anyone want to

suggest a certain day of the week or timing? Maybe next Thursday? I will put out a couple of dates for suggestion.

7. **Public Comment:** My name is Terry Plain. I serve as a claims program manager with Missouri Foundation for health. I also serve as a regional program officer for the Central region. So I see Boone County often. I definitely applaud the residents of Boone County for seeing children as a priority and developing the fund. I do not envy you in terms of trying to develop this type of infrastructure. Representing the foundation, I would like to think that hopefully we can serve as a resource and there are many wonderful potential opportunities that I have see as the residents have come and spoken. I just applaud you and think there are some great opportunities as you move forward.

**Other Comments:**

**Jacqueline:** Just moving forward, we want to make sure we're thinking about the public survey and interviews. So in this committee input sub group, just kind of have that on your radar. We don't want to have Christian and I where we have idle hands and have nothing to do.

Could you send an e-mail to the entire board with specifics that you would like. Like if you would like names, etc. That helps us if it comes to us by e-mail.

**Jacqueline:** It would be developing the survey tool if we still think it's necessary and the board identifying the six key informants to interview. I will put that all in the e-mail.

The first two sessions were extremely well attended. We're seeing a lot of groups here multiple times and we are seeing brand new groups each time. We may not have as great of a need for the survey and perhaps you can switch those hours towards possibly more key informant interviews. What are your thoughts?

**Jacqueline:** I think that's a possibility.

My opinion is that I think that you get better quality from key informants.

Meeting was motioned to be adjourned. Second motion was made. Meeting adjourned.

**NEXT MEETING: April 10, 2014**