

Escambia Children’s Trust Board of Directors Special Meeting

January 3, 2023, at 11:00 AM

Open to the public at the Sunshine Health Welcome Room
2620 Creighton Road, Suite 401, Pensacola, FL 32504

MINUTES

Meeting Title:	Escambia Children’s Trust Board of Directors Special Meeting		
Date:	January 3, 2023	Time:	11:00 AM
Location:	2620 Creighton Road, Suite 401, Pensacola, FL 32504		
Chair:	Stephanie White	Scribe:	Alma Ellis
Participants:	<p>Board Members: Stephanie White, Tori Woods, Dr. Tim Smith, David Peaden, Dr. Rex Northup, Patty Hightower, Commissioner Lumon May, Ms. Melissa Sidoti</p> <p>Staff/advisors: Tammy Greer, Executive Director; Kimberly Krupa, Ph.D., Director of Programs and Performance; Meredith Bush, Esq., Legal Counsel; Ms. Alma Ellis, Board Liaison and Administrative Specialist</p>		
Not Present:	Pastor Lonnie Wesley, Judge Harris		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Approval of Agenda (Stephanie White, Chair) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Dr. Northup motioned to approve the agenda, Commissioner May seconded; no discussion, all in favor, agenda approved. ○ Public Comments Regarding Agenda Items <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ms. Stephanie White invited public comments regarding the agenda items. ○ Action Items <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>A. Alternating Times for Board Meetings</u> <p><i>Staff recommends the Board continue to meet on the second Tuesday of each month and to alternate meeting times so that every other regular meeting is held during the day, beginning at 9 AM.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ms. Hightower motioned to accept recommendation; Dr. Northup seconded. All were in favor, recommendation passed. ○ <u>B. Grants Review Process</u> <p><i>Staff recommends the Board revise the policy PART TWO: FUNDING OF COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS, 2.2 Competitive Funding to Community Organizations, Request for Proposal (RFP), as presented.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. Northup motioned to accept recommendation; Ms. Sidoti seconded. <p>Discussion: Line 45: Dr. Northup recommended <u>adding “to” to line 45 to now read: include, but not limited to, the following factors:</u> All were in general agreement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Line 52: Ms. Hightower asked if “etc.” on line 52 should be clarified. <u>It was suggested to replace “ect.” with “and similar considerations”</u> All were in general agreement. • Line 54/55/56/57: All were in general agreement on changes as shown on redline copy. 		

- **Line 60-69: Proposer Capacity:** Ms. Hightower asked if staff should review future proposals to confirm financial capacity prior to proposals coming before the Grants Committee. Ms. Greer advocated to also have back up from the Finance Committee for proposals that may have findings that could be relevant to the proposal. Proposer Capacity (Paragraph 1) to be re-worded as follows: *The capacity of proposers to render high quality services as outlined in the proposal will be evaluated by ECT staff, and in consultation with, relevant subject matter experts (as needed). The following documents will be submitted as part of the RFP process, unless already on file with ECT (i.e., via the proposer’s SAMIS agency profile).* All were in general agreement.
- **Line 70:** After the word summaries, insert wording from the RFP Q&A section of the ECT website (as read aloud by Dr. Krupa) which follows IRS requirements. All were in general agreement.
- **Line 71-87:** All were in general agreement on changes as shown on redline copy
- **Line 92/93:** Replace “Cone of Silence” with “Limitations on Communications”, remove “and Trust staff” and replace with “,The Grants Committee, and” and add the word “of” between exception and communication. Commissioner May voiced his desire to not have a Cone of Silence/Limitations on Communications. All others were in general agreement.
- **Line 106** Add “Grants Committee members will be identified prior to the issuance of solicitations.” before the word “Using”, and change “RFP” to “solicitation” in the next sentence. All were in general agreement.
- **Line 115:** strike “as observers”. All were in general agreement.
- **Line 124/125:** All were in general agreement on changes shown on redline copy
- **Line 127-135:** Strike “As part of the review process and following the Grants Committee meeting”, leave the word “may”, strike “at the Trust’s discretion”. All were in general agreement on these changes, along with the addition of the final sentence as shown on redline copy.
- **Line 159-168:** All were in general agreement on the changes shown on redline copy.
- **Vote:** There being no further discussion, vote was 7 to 1 to approve changes as noted above. Commissioner May voted against.

- **Public Comment**

- One member of the public offered comments regarding the process.

- **C. Advance Funds**

- **Recommendation:** *Staff recommends the Board revise the policy PART TWO: FUNDING OF COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS, 2.3 Required Contract Clauses for Direct Community Services, as presented.*
- Ms. Sidoti motioned to approve Advance Funding changes; Dr. Northup seconded.
- **Discussion:** Commissioner May stated the process of advancing payments to organizations is not in good stewardship of taxpayer dollars. Some discussion took place as to how many organizations may request advance funds. Board members voiced

concerns with funding organizations that do not already have operating funds in place.

- **Voting:** With no further discussion and zero in favor, this recommendation did not pass.
- **D. Construction/Renovations Funding**
 - **Recommendation:** Staff recommends the Board revise the policy PART TWO: FUNDING OF COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS, 2.3 Required Contract Clauses for Direct Community Services, as presented.
 - Ms. Sidoti motioned to discuss, Commissioner May seconded.
 - **Discussion:** Ms. Sidoti voiced concern with agencies asking for money for renovation or construction of buildings they purchase or that may have been gifted to them. She also voiced concern with spending Trust money on renovations/construction to organizations that may or may not be in existence a year from now or three years from now. Ms. Hightower voiced her agreement with Ms. Sidoti. Commissioner May stated that taxpayer dollars should remain with the public. Ms. White stated the need to determine what “renovations” includes. Ms. Greer questioned whether the Board was ruling out construction/renovations all together or if they simply cannot be included in a services RFP. Ms. Krupa shared that there are several proposers in this RFP that are asking for renovation expenses. Commissioner May asked Ms. Bush the bid process when using public funds. Ms. Bush explained that there are very strict restrictions on this. Ms. Greer suggested seeing if the Board would consider putting a capital grant in the strategic plan to cover things of this nature. Ms. Hightower pointed out the need for services in the community, not buildings.
 - **Voting:** Ms. Hightower motioned for the Trust **not** to fund any construction and/or renovation, Commissioner May seconded. Vote was 7 to not fund and one (Dr. Smith) to fund.
 - *Staff was directed to reach out to all proposers that included construction or renovation costs in their proposal and ask them if they can still do their program without the construction. If they can, staff is to request they re-submit their proposal without those items.*
- **E. Level II Screening Requirement**
 - Public Comment: One member of the public offered comments regarding background screening of individuals who are working with children.
 - **Recommendation:** Staff recommends the Board revise the policy PART TWO: FUNDING OF COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS, 1.0 Policies pertaining to Funding of Community Organizations, 1.4 Funding Eligibility, as presented.
 - Dr. Northup motioned to discuss, Dr. Smith seconded.
 - **Discussion:** Ms. Greer stated this was brought forward was because when the policy was initially written, it stated the staff of the providers (anyone who has contact with children) must undergo a Level II background screening. Ms. Greer said the previous policy was not clear enough because some of the agencies (unless they were working with the School District or The Head Start or certain agencies) don’t have access to the clearinghouse so they are not able to go into the clearinghouse and do the traditional Level II screening. This is to clarify and be more aligned with the statute.

- *Dr. Northup suggested adding wording regarding time frames on how often screenings need to be renewed. Ms. Krupa stated the Trust has language regarding time frames in one of the RFP Q&A answers and this information can be added. All were in general agreement.*
- **Line 25** *Remove “a Level 2 or comparable”.* All were in general agreement.
- **Line 32** Add “during the funded project period and” after the word inspection. All were in general agreement.
- **Voting:** With no further discussion and all in favor, this passes with amendments and changes as noted in red line copy.

There being no further business, this meeting adjourned at 2:01pm.

Minutes Approved

Stephanie White, Board Chair (signature)

Date: