

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

Thursday, June 26, 2014 at 4:30 p.m.

MINUTES

Board Members Present: Les Wagner, Greg Grupe, Dewey Riehn, Nancy McKerrow, Bruce Horwitz, Jennifer Walker, Michele Kennett, and Harry Williams.

Others Present: Kelly Wallis- Director of Boone County Community Services, Joanne Nelson- Program Manager Community Services, and CJ Dykhouse- Boone County Counselor.

Board Members Absent: Kathy Thornburg

Guests: Jacqueline Schumacher and Christian Arment, Institute of Public Policy in the Truman School of Public Affairs

1. Open Meeting

Les Wagner, Chair, opened the meeting at 4:30.

2. Approval of Minutes

May 22, 2014 Minutes – Les called for the approval of these minutes. Bruce made the motion and Dewey seconded, the motion carried.

3. Discuss and Finalize Memorandum of Understanding

Michele (committee chairperson) led the discussion about the importance of a MOU between the Boone County Commission and the Boone County Children's Services Board regarding the logistics of personnel and a variety of other things are covered in terms of our relationship between the two. Michele asks the Board if it is really necessary to review the policy again; at which point Kelly shares that this policy had been reviewed previously and small suggestions had been made and the current draft reflects those small suggestions. Michele asks the Board for any questions or comments. Les comments that he feels this policy captures the basics of the formality of the relationship between the Board and the county. Michele, via the MOU committee, moves to adopt the current MOU draft. Greg seconds, the motion carries.

4. Discuss and Finalize Individual Scoring Evaluation Tool

Kelly explained that previous suggestions from Board members had been incorporated in the updated Evaluation Spreadsheet. Joanne, Program Manager, explains that the form has been designed to formulate totals captured throughout the spreadsheet; however if Board members choose to print out and write their opinion/scores, that will also suffice.

There is a discussion at length regarding whether or not Board member's individual evaluation score sheets will be public record. CJ explains that as long as the individual score sheet are handled judiciously, they will not be considered public record. It is further explained, by CJ, that the group consensus forms will be a public record and have the subcommittee member's names on the form.

Greg suggests that in the interest of scoring proposals, it might be beneficial for the Board to collectively review a prescreened high scoring proposal and a low scoring proposal. This would allow the Board to see how the scoring evaluations work in a real setting.

Nancy motions to accept the evaluation form; Dewey seconded; the motion carries.

5. Discuss Letter from Truman School regarding Potential Conflict of Interest

The Board received a letter from the Truman School Consultants regarding a potential conflict of interest. Jacqueline, consultant, explains to the Board that the Truman School has received inquiries from agencies asking for their help in applying for the BCCSB funding proposals. CJ suggests an extensive Conflict of Interest Policy document to be used between the Board and the consultants from the University of Missouri, Truman School. Les explains to the Board that the consultants play no part in the creation of evaluation forms and that the consultants may be able to offer a voice to the community in regards to the fund. There is confusion amongst the Board as to whether or not our Board consultants will personally help other outside agencies applying for the grant. Jacqueline offers that the Truman School can align themselves with the BCCSB if a long term business relationship can be met.

Further conversation segued into the problems from a similar board in St. Louis, MO. Michele suggests developing a robust disclosure policy with the Truman School that the Board can defend in the instance there are questions regarding a relationship between the consultants and the BCCSB. Kelly also offers, after further conversation with CJ, that the BCCSB amend the contract with the consultants so that there is a contractual obligation between the two regarding conflict of interest.

Harry motions that a Conflict of Interest Policy be developed. Greg seconds; motion carries.

6. Discuss Potential Board Member Conflicts of Interest

CJ suggests developing a framework in which Board members can navigate through in order to avoid potential conflicts of interest.

- A) Statutory eligibility to serve on this Board - Under 210.861. Subset 3 “No member of the board shall serve on the governing body, or have any financial interest, or be employed by an agency which is a recipient of the fund generated.
- B) Undefined terms – AGENCY. We worked on a set of by-laws and Article 7 of those by-laws we’ve articulated what our collective vision was on ethics and conflicts of interest. This is a document that is intentionally difficult to amend because we wanted it to be more like a constitution. This requires a continuous obligation to disclose conflicts of interest.
- C) Missouri Ethics Commission and their interpretations of ethics requirements and Chapter 105 of the Revised Statutes of Missouri speak to personal relationships that may pose a conflict of interest.

CJ continues to explain how important it will be for this community to understand the definition of agency and how the University of Missouri falls under that. We do not want to rule out this entire organization but we need to articulate the rationale and articulate the intentions of the relationship (with the Truman School) and do this publicly so that the intention is known to everyone.

A Conflict of Interest Policy Committee is formed with: Michele as the chair, Nancy, Dewey, and Bruce.

7. Discuss Contingency Fund Applications

Kelly clarifies for the Board that this is not meant to discuss the Rainbow House application, but specifically on how to handle such Contingency Fund Applications as they arrive. A committee is asked to be formed to handle such applications. Kelly and Joanne have developed an evaluation tool that can be used by the committee to analyze contingency fund applications and once the committee comes to an agreement, their recommendation would be made to the board.

Committee: Jennifer – Chair, Greg, and Bruce.

8. Discuss Evaluation Process

Kelly explains that it will be hard get an evaluation process set in stone until the Board knows how many proposals have been submitted. The general idea is that there will be individual evaluations, subcommittees and then a group consensus. As of now, there will be eight board members available so outside evaluator’s maybe needed (possibly from the Department of Social Services, the Department of Mental Health, Heart of Missouri United Way.) Recommendations for outside evaluators and their contact information are encouraged to be brought to the next Board meeting. The Board decides to wait until all proposals are received before further developing the evaluation process.

9. **Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned by Les.

NEXT MEETING: July 10, 2014