

**City of Fort Lauderdale  
Community Services Board  
June 11, 2012 – 4:00 P.M.  
City Commission Chambers, City Hall  
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301**

<b>MEMBERS</b>		<b>PRESENT</b>	<b>ABSENT</b>
Donald Karney, Chair	P	9	0
Richard Whipple, Vice Chair	P	9	0
Benjamin Bean	P	4	0
Margaret Birch (arr. 4:04)	P	9	0
Earl Bosworth	P	9	0
Wendy Gonsler (arr. 4:07)	P	7	1
Helen Hinton	P	6	3
Bradley Katz (arr. 5:00)	P	3	0
Jasmin Shirley (arr. 4:02)	P	8	1
Kenneth Staab	P	8	1

**Staff Present**

Jonathan Brown, Manager, Housing and Community Development  
 Jeri Pryor, Federal Grants Administrator, Housing and Community Development  
 David Harvey, Housing and Community Development  
 J. Opplerlee, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

**Communications to City Commission**

None.

**I. Call to Order / Roll Call**

- **Quorum Requirement – As of 6/4/12 there are 10 appointed members to the Board, which means 6 constitutes a quorum**

Chair Karney called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. Roll was called and it was noted a quorum was present.

**II. Welcome and Board / Staff Introductions**

Ms. Pryor introduced the Staff members present, and the Board members introduced themselves.

**III. City Commission News**

None.

#### **IV. Approval of Minutes Summary – May 14, 2012**

**Motion** made by Vice Chair Whipple, seconded by Ms. Hinton, to approve the minutes of the May 14, 2012 meeting. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

#### **V. CDBG Discussion**

- **Review Agency Performance Indicators – FY 12/13**
- **Review Commission Approved Performance Indicators**
- **Determine Performance Indicators for Participation Agreements**

Mr. Brown recalled that at the May 14, 2012 meeting, the Board had requested that Staff compile a list of the performance indicators recommended by the public service agencies. The goal is to determine which of these indicators are accepted by the Board, which indicators should be amended or modified, and whether or not any indicators should be added to the list. Staff will then present them to the City Commission when Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) are discussed.

Ms. Shirley arrived at 4:02 p.m.

Ms. Birch arrived at 4:04 p.m.

Ms. Pryor provided two handouts, explaining that one includes City Commission-approved performance indicators and the other includes those indicators submitted by the agencies as part of their proposals. Mr. Brown advised that the Board may determine which indicators they prefer and which must be modified, or they may accept the agencies' indicators as presented.

Ms. Gonsler arrived at 4:07 p.m.

Vice Chair Whipple stated that the indicators provided by the Jack and Jill Child Care Center were of particular concern. He asked whether or not the Center provides Staff with, for example, a list of the days that students participating in the Center due to CDBG funds are in attendance, and whether or not these students are replaced by new students if they moved away.

Mr. Brown introduced David Harvey of Housing and Community Development, who monitors compliance with the CDBG program. Mr. Harvey explained that CDBG funds are used in a manner similar to scholarships, as they defray the costs associated with a child's participation in the program. Staff receives an attendance sheet with every payment request by the agency, and the Center is not reimbursed for days when those students are not present.

Vice Chair Whipple stated that this was important information the Board should have when they grade the agencies that make CDBG requests; however, he was not certain how this information should be incorporated into the performance indicators. He asked how the funds allocated to an individual child would be used if that child was absent.

Ms. Gonsher pointed out that when a scholarship is provided through the grant, the Center, in good faith, puts forth all the services needed by that student during his or her term. If the student is absent, this does not mean fewer services are provided overall. She cautioned that occasional absences should not affect the allocation given to the agency.

Ms. Gonsher continued that she had reviewed the information provided by the Jack and Jill Child Care Center, and noted that this was the only agency whose performance indicators she questioned. She felt many of the objectives listed were goals for the agency itself, while the Board would like to see the students' achievements. She suggested that one performance indicator could be, for example, that a certain percentage of students made pre-academic or developmental progress equivalent to or greater than what was expected of them during their time in the program.

Ms. Shirley added that in addition to the Center's care for a child, the child's parents must seek viable opportunities to increase their employment skills. In addition to providing scholarships, parents were required to attend classes at the Center. Ms. Gonsher said the parents' participation could be expected to affect the children's ability to learn in a preschool environment.

Mr. Bean observed that the evaluation method and reporting mechanism used by the Center ensures that a family support specialist will administer quarterly family assessments. These assessments are intended to indicate an increase in the overall score for a family. Lowered risk of abuse or neglect and maintenance of a stable income would also be assessed.

Ms. Birch said she would have difficulty determining measurable objectives without numbers. She noted that in the case of "lowered incidences of abuse and neglect," this could mean a 50% lower or 75% lower risk; however, the results of quarterly family assessments do not track progress in this manner. She stated that she would like to see figures that tracked how students improved. Ms. Gonsher agreed, and pointed out that other agencies provided indicators that showed numbers related to success.

Mr. Brown advised that when the Board fine-tunes the indicators provided by the respective agencies, they would set the standard for future years: agencies applying in the future could be provided with samples of performance indicators

recommended by the Board and approved by the City Commission. He noted that no such format was provided to the agencies in the recent round of CDBG grants.

Vice Chair Whipple asked Mr. Harvey if he was aware of results from the quarterly family assessments that may not have been provided to the Board. Mr. Harvey said in the past, there had been no such assessments. Mr. Brown added that there had also never been performance indicators in the past, but only outcomes.

Mr. Bosworth said he was not comfortable with tying a specific figure to the performance indicators, such as a percentage of improvement. Ms. Birch said the Board was asked to consider an agency's expectations: if they request funds to accomplish a particular objective, they will have certain expectations.

Mr. Bean said he was in agreement with Mr. Bosworth, as he did not feel qualified to quantify the Center's reporting mechanisms. Because he was not familiar with the assessments used by the Center, he could not have an expectation of how many children would improve and how this improvement could be measured. Ms. Gonsler said it was not necessary to fully understand all the tools used by an agency, as the Board's expectation was that children would succeed.

She suggested that because the Board was having difficulty determining appropriate performance indicators for Jack and Jill Child Care Center, they might move on to other agencies to look at their indicators. She noted that Hope South Florida's indicators, by comparison, provided concrete goals and percentages. Ms. Shirley agreed that Hope South Florida listed measurable outcomes that could be documented and monitored for improvement. She felt in the case of Jack and Jill Child Care Center, some indicators, such as breaking the cycle of poverty, could be monitored, as the Center mandates that parents attend a ten-week course.

Ms. Hinton remarked that the Center is the only one of the five agencies receiving CDBG funds that does not use a percentage in its performance indicators. She also pointed out that there must be a baseline by which achievement can be measured.

Ms. Birch stated while all Board members may not be familiar with some of the assessment tools mentioned by CDBG applicants, the grant writers are familiar with them. She advised that the grant writers should be able to inform the Board what percentage of progress is expected.

Vice Chair Whipple noted that he was not certain it would be fair for the Board to set performance indicators for some agencies when other agencies have

provided their own indicators. Ms. Birch said the applicants were informed that measurable goals must be included in the applications. She noted that the lack of specific figures had made it very difficult for her to rate the application from Jack and Jill Children's Center.

It was decided that the Board would review the goals provided by each agency to determine whether or not their performance indicators were appropriate.

Mr. Bean noted that the indicators provided by Hope South Florida included monthly progress reports to the City, as well as measurable outcomes with specific percentages. Ms. Gonsler agreed, pointing out that this agency also clearly states the benefit its clients would receive. She suggested that while attendance may be a measurable statistic, it did not necessarily mean that the client would have successfully completed a program.

**Motion** made by Ms. Gonsler, seconded by Mr. Bosworth, to accept Hope South [Florida's] measurable outcomes as appropriate performance indicators.

Ms. Pryor advised that she would like to see consistency in the number of performance indicators to be provided by each agency. She pointed out that while Hope South Florida lists four indicators, Jack and Jill Children's Center only shows three, and other agencies may have more or fewer indicators. She asked if the Board intended to have a different number of performance indicators depending upon the agency. Ms. Gonsler and Mr. Bosworth asserted that this would be acceptable to the Board.

Mr. Brown emphasized that reporting on a monthly or quarterly basis would also be key to tracking performance: if the agencies only make their reports at the end of the year, there would be no performance indicators for the Board to review if the agency applies for CDBG funds again the following year.

In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

The Board moved on to the Broward Performing Arts Foundation. Mr. Bean observed that tracking would be more useful than quantifying results, as the measurable outcomes do not specify a number of students. He concluded that he would like to see a report of how many students were served by this program.

Ms. Shirley felt the Foundation's activities provide reasonable tools with which they can determine whether 75% of students met their objectives, as they would be using pre- and post-performance assessments. She added that with regard to the second objective, the Foundation could ask participating families to provide lists of the activities they undertook at home, since students were provided with books and study guides. Students' attendance is also listed as an indicator.

Ms. Gonsher added that the reporting mechanism should be amended so the Foundation would share its results on a quarterly basis rather than at year's end for each of their three objectives. She felt a report of a measurable increase would be sufficient rather than requiring a percentage.

**Motion** made by Ms. Gonsher, seconded by Ms. Birch, to accept Broward Performing Arts Foundation's measurable outcomes, with quarterly reporting as the performance indicator for this agency.

Mr. Bean commented that he was not certain he was comfortable with quarterly reports by this agency, as he did not know what would be involved in putting them together and how much time the Foundation would have to spend in tracking progress as opposed to making progress. Ms. Pryor said the City receives monthly invoices that show how many participants were served. Requiring quarterly reports would simply involve the City's asking for the information.

In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

**Motion** made by Ms. Gonsher, seconded by Ms. Birch, to accept Luz del Mundo's measurable outcome, and that they provide quarterly information.

Ms. Shirley said she had some difficulty with the first outcome, which stated that 85% of participants in health care and prevention outreach would increase their knowledge about health. She felt it would be subjective to try and determine how participants had increased their knowledge, as the activities are limited to class participation, screenings, and keeping appointments.

Mr. Bean noted that the agency's evaluation method states its goal would be measured in documented proof, including medical records, medical baseline measurements at intake, and treatments, lab reports, and interviews. He felt the agency should provide a table or another summary document that would include these sources of information to demonstrate that 85% have increased their knowledge.

Ms. Shirley also noted that the agency should be more specific in citing whom they wished to work with: for example, they might reach out to diabetic patients receiving care in their medical centers, and could demonstrate proof that these patients attended classes, underwent assessments, and changed specific behaviors, such as taking medication regularly.

Mr. Bosworth recalled that the agency had planned to keep meticulous records in order to establish a baseline for patients. Ms. Shirley pointed out that there would be a difference in treating acute versus chronic illness, as chronic illness would require making behavioral changes and setting forth a care plan.

Mr. Bean suggested that Luz del Mundo could provide the City with a quarterly report demonstrating that 85% of participants had increased their knowledge. If the reports did not include sufficient information, it would be more difficult for the agency to qualify for CDBG funding the following year. He concluded that he was not certain the Board could address the issue of the agency's performance indicators by "creating something for them."

Mr. Staab asked if applicants are given the opportunity to explain the variables involved if they did not reach their benchmarks. Ms. Pryor said they would be given this chance, as the performance indicators are only projections, and circumstances may change during the year.

In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 7-2 (Ms. Hinton and Ms. Shirley dissenting).

With regard to Neighborhood Housing Services of South Florida, Ms. Gonsler observed that the agency's suggested performance indicators needed additional work: she was not satisfied with their first indicator, which dealt with class attendance. She noted, however, that the objective of having 50 lower- to moderate-income clients prepare a budget was a step in the right direction, although she felt it should be stated that the budget must be realistic or affordable. Another objective was having 35 clients develop action plans that included steps toward home ownership.

Mr. Katz arrived at 5:00 p.m.

Mr. Staab noted that while the agency's process began with 100 participants attending class, this figure was narrowed toward the end of the process as some participants moved toward home ownership. He pointed out that several variables could affect whether or not an individual would succeed at this goal, including variables that may be outside one's control.

Mr. Bosworth proposed adding verbiage specifying "successful completion" of the program, resulting in a client's certification. With respect to the budget and client action plan, he suggested the inclusion of the term "case-appropriate," as the Board would have no way to know each client's circumstances. The members discussed terms that could be applied to the development of individual budgets.

Ms. Birch said she did not understand the last goal, which referred to "clients who have increased their financial security." Vice Chair Whipple noted that only 10% of clients who begin this program will ultimately qualify for a loan; in addition to establishing a budget, they could work toward improving their credit, such as taking care of credit card debt.

Mr. Bean said he did not have any issues with accepting the measurable outcomes set forth by Neighborhood Housing Services of South Florida.

Ms. Gonsler said while only 10% of clients may qualify for a loan at the end of the process, it could be possible to track other varying points of success, such as understanding what changes would be necessary for clients to be able to buy a house in the future. She agreed that while the last stated goal was not entirely clear, the last measurable outcome could be quantified.

**Motion** made by Mr. Bosworth, seconded by Ms. Birch, to accept the measurable outcomes as reported in the program description chart for Neighborhood Housing Solutions, with the addition of the adjective “appropriate” or “case-appropriate” or “individualized” plan.

Ms. Gonsler proposed that the **motion** be amended to include reference to “reasonable [or] attainable budgets.”

The **motion** was restated as follows: to accept the objectives for Neighborhood Housing Solutions as the performance indicator, with the addition of the adjectives “realistic, practical, attainable, [or] individualized.”

It was also agreed by the Board that the agency would be expected to report on these outcomes on a quarterly basis.

Ms. Shirley asked why a potential client would go through the necessary classes, testing, and certification, but would not develop a budget. Vice Chair Whipple advised that individuals who have never kept a budget before may be able to create a budget but may not fully comprehend what is necessary to follow it. Some participants are typically lost through attrition during the process.

In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 9-1 (Mr. Bean dissenting).

The Board moved on to the Susan B. Anthony Center. Ms. Shirley noted that while the measurable outcomes appear to decrease as clients are lost along the way, 100% of clients who have made it through the end of the 90-day program could be expected to remain sober while participating in the program, rather than the 80% goal stated by the agency. Ms. Gonsler said her understanding of this percentage was different: if 100 clients began the program and some were lost through attrition, 80 of the original 100 clients, or 80% of the starting group, may be expected to remain until the end of the program with 100% sobriety.

Ms. Pryor pointed out that in order to successfully complete the 90-day substance abuse treatment program, clients must have remained drug-free throughout its entirety. The goal is for 80% of the original group to successfully complete the program.



Ms. Hinton observed that the activities listed by the agency refer to a minimum of ten clients. Ms. Pryor suggested that the agency is projecting to serve at least ten clients during each 90-day program.

**Motion** made by Mr. Bean, seconded by Mr. Bosworth, to accept the measurable outcomes as the performance indicators [for the Susan B. Anthony Center], and [that they] be reported quarterly.

In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 7-3 (Ms. Hinton, Mr. Katz, and Ms. Shirley dissenting).

At this time Ms. Pryor recommended that the HOPWA 101 presentation on today's Agenda be rescheduled at a later time, as it did not appear there would be sufficient time to include this Item. She advised that handouts have been prepared for the HOPWA 101 Item and are available to the Board. She clarified, however, that the Board's discussion of the HOPWA RFP would take place at today's meeting.

The Board returned to the performance indicators for Jack and Jill Children's Center. Ms. Shirley commented that the grant writer for this agency had not done a thorough job in listing measurable outcomes on the application, and proposed that the Board ask that the Center provide them with a clearer list of these outcomes within a day's time.

She also recommended that the goal of assisting parents in finding and/or maintaining employment as a result of the child care program be incorporated into one of these measurable outcomes, such as the item dealing with the ten-week parenting program. The Board could then agree on the goals presented by the Center, but allow the writer a day's time to provide Staff with the actual measurable outcomes.

Mr. Brown confirmed that the Board may request this additional information; however, even if the agency can provide Staff with the amended measurable outcomes, there would be no opportunity to bring it back to the Board before it is presented to the City Commission with a recommendation. He emphasized that the Commission is seeking the Board's recommendation on the performance indicators.

Ms. Gonsler asked if Staff would feel comfortable "tweaking" proposed rewrites of the Center's performance indicators, as suggested by the Board, if the members are in agreement that the Center appears to be working from an approved concept. Mr. Brown said this could be done. Ms. Pryor added that this would provide a baseline to take to the agency and request further information.

Ms. Gonsler and Ms. Shirley recommended the following performance indicators, subject to the addition of further information:

- 80% of children served will make pre-academic or developmental progress equivalent to or greater than months in program, as measured by appropriate developmental assessment tools;
- 80% of parents attending the ten-week parenting classes will be able to state, orally or in writing, sound age-appropriate behavior management techniques;
- 100% of children served will have up-to-date immunization schedules;
- 90% of parents should be able to seek, secure, and/or retain employment as a result of the child care assistance provided.

Ms. Gonsler added that she did not feel quarterly reporting would be effective in the case of Jack and Jill Children's Center, and recommended that semi-annual reporting be requested instead.

**Motion** made by Ms. Gonsler, seconded by Vice Chair Whipple, to accept.

Ms. Pryor clarified that the Board had requested Staff communicate these enhanced performance indicators to Jack and Jill Children's Center.

Mr. Bean stated again that he was not comfortable rewriting the agency's performance indicators, as he had not felt the evaluation methods and reporting mechanisms proposed by the Center were in need of rewriting. He said he was more inclined to accept the indicators provided by the Center, such as student portfolio assessments and quarterly family assessments.

Mr. Bean continued that the proposed indicator stating 80% of children will make pre-academic or developmental progress was also a problem for him, as it would be difficult to measure how much progress was appropriate for the number of months in the program. Ms. Gonsler explained that a child in the program should reflect, through developmental assessment, at least six months' development. The 80% goal would allow for children who may not be able to achieve this development, such as children with developmental disabilities.

Mr. Staab asked if it would be worth Staff's time, and the Board's time, for Staff to work with Jack and Jill Children's Center on the proposed performance indicators. Mr. Brown said when agencies apply for CDBG funding, they understand that the Board will make the final recommendation on performance indicators to be issued, and that this may mean their original performance indicators may be modified or changed altogether. He assured the Board that Staff would make the Center aware of the recommendations that will be presented to the City Commission.

In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 8-2 (Mr. Bean and Mr. Bosworth dissenting).

#### **IV. HOPWA Discussion**

- **HOPWA 101 Presentation**

It was noted that the Board had agreed to postpone this presentation until the next scheduled meeting.

- **RFP Status**
  - **Possible Speaker from City of Fort Lauderdale Procurement Office**

Mr. Brown commented that he was pleased to see representatives of several agencies present, as they will have a clear understanding of what the Board will be looking for once they hear the discussion of the RFP.

Ms. Pryor reported that the date by which the HOPWA RFP must be on the street is still “a moving target,” and was unlikely to occur in June. There have been multiple drafts of the RFP thus far; it is hoped that the RFP will go on the street in July. It must be out for a 30-day period. She estimated that if the RFP goes out the second week of July, for example, it will not be due until the second week of August, which meant the reports would be presented to the Board members for review by the third or fourth week of that month. The RFP would then be awarded by the City Commission in September.

She asked that the Board members review their calendars to determine if they would be available the third or fourth week in August, so a review meeting might be tentatively scheduled during that time. Mr. Brown said this date or dates could be determined at the Board’s July meeting. If members cannot make the July meeting, they would still have the opportunity to provide Staff with their availability for August.

Ms. Gonsher requested clarification of the basis for the RFP’s rewrites, asking whether these were generated by the agencies, the City Commission, or Staff. Mr. Brown said they were requested by Staff in order to ensure that the RFP be written in a way to avoid concerns from the agencies. The goal is for all parties to clearly understand the RFP and to be able to submit a responsive proposal. There are also Staff members from different City Departments who had concerns and questions about the previous RFP.

Ms. Gonsher asked if the RFP’s content comes from Housing and Community Development, and is then reviewed by Procurement. Mr. Brown confirmed this, noting that some of the procurement rules, methods of scoring, and other

aspects have changed; in addition, some HOPWA programs are seeking multiple providers, which necessitated changes to scoring so more than one provider may be sought. The City clearly defines its expectations in the RFP.

Ms. Pryor continued that once the City Commission awards the RFP, Staff has roughly two weeks to have contracts signed, executed, and in place before October 1, 2012. Once the RFP is on the street, the logistics of when the Board will meet to review the proposals must be determined. It will not be possible to change these dates once they are set due to the timeline of the process.

Vice Chair Whipple expressed concern with the delay on behalf of the providers, and asked if additional delays would be expected in July. Mr. Brown said Staff was cautiously optimistic that the dates could be settled upon at the July meeting. Ms. Pryor added that HUD's annual action plan, including the CDBG recommendations, is due on August 15; however, as it is not possible to meet this deadline for HOPWA funding, the annual action plan will advise HUD in writing of the process that is underway, and will inform them that an amended action plan showing funding allocations will be submitted in October.

Pablo Calvo, representing the Broward Regional Health Planning Council, stated that his provider agency shared some Board members' concerns regarding the compressed time frame. He asked if provisions were in place to deal with any additional delays, such as disputes when the RFP is issued or returned, and whether a process was available to ensure continuation of services beyond September 30, 2012.

Mr. Brown replied that the intent in writing the RFP is to avoid any such disputes. If it is not possible to set dates at the July meeting, he would discuss a backup plan with the City Manager prior to that meeting.

Ms. Gonsler said she was concerned with the August/September time frame, as members may have vacation plans for that time. She pointed out that while the Board has been enthusiastic regarding their involvement in the process, they would be affected by the shortened time frame as well. She asked if the process required a quorum of the Board in relation to its involvement with Procurement. Mr. Brown said he understood that the Board would serve as the RFP committee: even if only three members were present, for example, they would still serve in this capacity, despite the lack of quorum. Ms. Pryor added that it would be necessary for an odd number of members to be present, as votes would be required.

## **VII. Good of the Order**

None.

**VIII. Items for the Next Agenda**

It was noted that the HOPWA 101 presentation would be made at the July meeting.

**IX. Communications to the City Commission**

None.

**X. Adjournment**

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 5:59 p.m.

[Minutes prepared by K. McGuire, Prototype, Inc.]