

## RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Date of Meeting: February 13, 2012

Members Present: Chair Nancy Joyce, Vice Chair Dean Wells, Secretary Dr. Colleen McKinney, Treasurer Dave Metzger, Jon Bell, Dave Leitenberger, Ivy Amos, Pam Siegenthaler, Carol Payton, Dr. Michelle Kowalski, Beth Price, Jim Kulig

Members Absent: Robert Konstam

Others Present: Randy Parker, Nikki Harless, Marsha Coleman, Elayna Rizer, Kevin Goshe, Lori Feeney, Kristina Schultz, Kevin Wharton, Carl Hunnell, Scott Basilone, Tim Harless, Edith Gilliland, Attorney R. Scot Harvey, Attorney Mark Landes, Attorney Cheri Hass

Others Absent: None

The regular monthly Board meeting was held on Monday, February 13, 2012, in the Board Conference Room at Richland County Children Services Board. Chair Joyce called the meeting to order at 4:37 p.m.

### A. OLD BUSINESS

On a motion by Siegenthaler, seconded by Metzger, the Board unanimously approved the following: the January Board minutes; the Special Board Meeting Minutes from January 19, 2012; The Special Board Meeting Minutes from January 26, 2012; and the Special Board Meeting Minutes from February 3, 2012. The Special Board Meeting Minutes for January 24, 2012, and February, 7, 2012, will be provided for approval at a later date.

### B. NEW BOARD BUSINESS

**Family Law Committee Follow-Up** – Chair Joyce noted that agency staff would be allotted 90 minutes to discuss the three remaining sections—Permanency, Resource Allocation, and Professional Courtesy. Due to the fact that there are several Board Committee meetings in March, this issue will be tabled and discussed at a later date.

**Committee Meetings – March 2012** – Executive Director Parker noted that we needed to have three committee meetings in March, and then approximately one committee meeting per month throughout the rest of 2012. The Board determined that the first Monday of each month would work. On March 5, 2012, the following meetings will be scheduled: Budget and Finance Committee meeting at 3:30 p.m.; Personnel Committee meeting at 4:30 p.m.; and Services and Programs Committee Meeting at 5:30 p.m. Schultz will ensure that the dates and times for the remainder of 2012 are emailed to Board members on Tuesday, February 14, 2012.

**Policy for Public Addressing Board** – Chair Joyce noted that the proposed policy for members of the public to address the Board at regular Board meetings will be discussed further with Attorney R. Scot Harvey.

### C. EXECUTIVE SESSION

At 4:47 p.m., Chair Joyce recommended going into Executive Session. On a motion by Bell, seconded by Amos, the Board voted unanimously to move into Executive Session to discuss matters of a legal

and confidential nature by a roll call vote. At that time each Board member responded as follows: Amos, “yes”; Bell, “yes”; Joyce, “yes”; Kowalski, (absent for roll call); Kulig, “yes”; Leitenberger, “yes”; Metzger, “yes”; McKinney, “yes”; Payton, “yes”; Price, “yes”; Siegenthaler, “yes” and Wells, “yes”.

The Board returned to open session at 8:37 p.m.

On a motion by Wells, seconded by McKinney, the Board unanimously voted to accept the changes made by Attorney R. Scot Harvey to the video surveillance system policy.

On a motion by McKinney, seconded by Siegenthaler, the Board unanimously voted to accept the policy for members of the public to address the Board at regular Board meetings.

#### **D. NEW AGENCY BUSINESS**

**2011 Grievance Report** – Coleman reported on the 2011 Grievance Report. There were 37 total grievances for 2011. Coleman report that for Grievance Outcomes/Resolutions, there were a total of 14 grievances in which the original case decision was upheld, and 10 grievances in which the disposition was changed. She reported that in 2011, only one grievance went to Step 3, which means that it was submitted to the Executive Director or his designee. Also, 31 grievances were avoided. Those situations involved 23 cases where the client wanted to talk about the problem, and 8 cases where the client was referred back to Step 1 of the grievance process.

**2011 PQI Report – 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter** – Siegenthaler questioned Alternative Response (AR) on page 5 of the report. She noted that there were only 24 AR cases in 2010, and 146 AR cases in 2011. Coleman explained that RCCS did not begin the AR grant/program until September 2010, and at that time there was only 1 AR worker. In September 2011, RCCS expanded the AR team to 4 workers, thus allowing for more cases to be randomized as an AR case.

Kulig asked if Coleman was tracking any AR trends. Coleman noted that the entities who were part of the AR grant were tracking the trends in their semi-annual report. She indicated that they were looking at both AR cases and traditional investigative cases that are part of the control group (IR cases).

Parker advised that cases will no longer be subject to the randomizer beginning in May 2012. At this time, we are working on establishing a plan for when that occurs, based on the data that we have been tracking and analyzing. He noted that the AR approach is less accusatory for families, and focuses on providing supportive services. At this time, we are not sure of the impact that AR cases will have on the court system because those cases have no formal disposition.

Siegenthaler questioned three sections on page 8 of the report, under Major Unusual Incidents/Incidents Involving Clients, and the reasons for those incidents. She specifically inquired as to “Other”, in which there were a total of 68 in 2011, compared to 29 in 2010; “Left home without permission but returned”, in which there were a total of 23 in 2011, compared to 6 in 2010; and “Child abuse/neglect”, in which there were a total of 15 in 2011, all of which occurred in the fourth quarter, compared to 1 in 2010. Feeney explained that in the fourth quarter of 2011, RCCS began tracking incidents on all open ongoing cases in the agency. In 2010, and for the first three quarters of 2011, RCCS only tracked incidents on substitute care cases.

Kulig questioned the Mental Health Liaison Interventionist (MHLI) on page 9 of the report. There were 323 referrals made in 2011, compared to 177 referrals made in 2010. Coleman explained the services provided by the MHLI, and the benefits of those services to families working with RCCS.

**2012 PQI Plan** – Parker explained that the PQI Plan is something that is approved by the Board on an annual basis. The purpose of the PQI Plan is to develop, maintain and improve services consistent with our

mission and vision statements, as well as the mandates of the Council on Accreditation (COA). Coleman noted that the only change made from the 2011 PQI Plan to the 2012 PQI Plan was the removal of child and family development and support services (mainly provided through Help Me Grow). The agency will now be accredited in four areas—foster care, kinship, adoption, and child protective services.

On a motion by Kulig, seconded by Kowalski, the Board unanimously voted to approve the 2012 PQI Plan as it was prepared and presented.

**Monthly Statistics** - Parker asked whether Board members had any questions regarding the information they were provided. Price questioned whether the percentages for the final case dispositions were in the Monthly Statistics. Wharton explained that the case disposition percentages for November 2011 were as follows: 45% of the intake investigations were substantiated or indicated, and 55% of the intake investigations were unsubstantiated. Wharton noted that his report on those statistics would always be two months behind due to the forty-five day investigation period for new intake reports accepted by the agency.

Kulig asked RCCS Program Supervisors about tracking trends within their respective program areas. Wharton explained that neglect cases are always the highest number of cases within the Differential Response Division. He noted that FINS cases have increased since 2010, as well as cases with underlying drug issues and economic issues.

Siegenthaler asked about the role that other community agencies play in assisting families. Wharton noted that Catholic Charities and the Salvation Army both assisted where they were able. Wharton further explained that we often receive self-referrals from people because other agencies are unable to assist due to funding issues. Parker explained that there has been dialogue about putting funds with 2-1-1 to allow them to assist with rent, utility assistance, etc. Parker explained that the concern was that because there is such a great need for assistance, those funds would be used up very quickly. T. Harless noted that he has had dialogue with other providers regarding the same.

N. Harless explained that the nice part about FINS cases was that we still complete a Safety Assessment on those families. This allows us to assess them and refer them for ongoing services if necessary. If a case is transferred for ongoing services, we are also required to complete a Family Assessment.

**Communications Report** - Hunnell noted that the Rally for the Kids was on February 11, 2012. Hunnell explained that all children who participated received a free t-shirt, tennis racket, and food. Hunnell noted that we are considering, at the recommendation of Ron Schaub, moving from 2 sessions to 1 next year. Eighteen agency employees and administrators were present at the event. A photo gallery and story about the event has been posted on the agency's web site. Kowalski and Parker discussed different options moving forward, including a week-long tennis camp over the summer dedicated to children working with RCCS. Parker also noted that the Citizens for Children Services committee needed a Treasurer, which was previously held by Joe Palmer. Kowalski will now be the Treasurer for that committee. There is approximately \$24,000.00 in the account. Ideally, there should be \$40,000.00 in the account by the time the agency needs to run a levy campaign.

**Adoption Subsidy Report** – No discussion was warranted.

**Financial Update** - Goshe presented the fiscal summaries for January 2012, which included revenue of \$238,694. Expenditures for the month were \$639,515. The reserve balance is \$5,626,686, which is 57.2% of the annual 2012 budget.

Price specifically questioned where attorneys' fees were located on the document. Goshe noted that it was on page 4, in the green line labeled Purchased Services. Parker explained that Goshe has back-up for the bills if any Board members wanted to look at anything specific.

**Personnel Actions** – Rizor reported that seven new social work staff were hired in the month of January. Five of those seven filled the five new positions that were approved by the Board as part of the 2012 budget. Two of the seven filled positions that were vacant. Rizor also noted that there was one promotion in January.

**Employee Training** – Rizor noted that agency staff attended 3 trainings in the month of January.

## **E. BILLS**

**Payment of Agency Bills-** Joyce noted to Board members how we pay the bills. Goshe explained that foster and adopt bills are usually paid the day after the Board meeting; utilities are typically paid as they come in to avoid any delay in services; and certain bills, such as payroll and health insurance are paid after the Board meeting. Siegenthaler specifically questioned why CORSA doesn't pay for Attorney Harvey. Parker and Joyce explained that Attorney Harvey is not a CORSA attorney. Siegenthaler asked if Attorney Hass was always paid through CORSA, and Parker indicated that she may be paid out of separate funds if it is not related to a case through CORSA.

On a motion by Metzger, seconded by Amos, the Board unanimously approved the payment of the Agency bills.

## **F. ADJOURNMENT**

On a motion by Wells, seconded by Metzger, the Board moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:22 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted:

\_\_\_\_\_ Nancy Joyce, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_ Kristi Schultz, Recording Secretary