

**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING  
WEST VOLUSIA HOSPITAL AUTHORITY  
JULY 25, 2023 5:30 PM  
SANBORN CENTER  
815 S. ALABAMA AVENUE, DELAND, FL**

<b>AGENDA</b>
---------------

1. Call to Order / Pledge of Allegiance & Opening Observance
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Citizens Comments - Limited to 3 minutes per speaker
4. Approval of CAC Minutes for May 9, 2023 and May 23, 2023
5. CAC Input on Organizations not Included in Ranking
6. Improvements to Application Process for Next Year
7. Adjournment

If any person decides to appeal any decision made by the CAC with respect to any matter considered at this meeting or hearing he/she will need a record of the proceedings, and for such purpose he/she may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based (FS 286.0105). Individuals with disabilities needing assistance to participate in any of these proceedings should contact the WVHA Administrator at least three (3) working days in advance of the meeting date and time at (386) 626-4870.

**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING  
WEST VOLUSIA HOSPITAL AUTHORITY  
THE CHISHOLM CENTER  
520 S. CLARA AVENUE DELAND  
May 9, 2023 - 5:30 PM  
MINUTES**

**CAC Members/Attendance:**

Chair Taylor Hibel  
Lyda Kiser  
Christian Brown  
Jacquie Lewis  
Patrick Rogers  
Joanna Mercier  
Lorna Owens  
Maria Valdivia (arrived at 5:36 p.m.)  
Vice Chair Althea King (arrived at 5:37 p.m.)

**Absent:**

Ella Ran

**Others Present:**

WVHA Commissioner Voloria Manning  
WVHA Administrator Stacy Tebo

---

---

**Call to Order / Opening Observance**

Chair Hibel called the CAC Meeting to order at 5:31 p.m. and established that there was a quorum present. The meeting began with The Pledge of Allegiance and a moment of silence.

**Approval of Agenda**

Member Kiser moved to approve the agenda. Member Lewis seconded the motion. The motion passed by a 7-0-3 vote.

**Citizens Comments - None**

**April HealthCare Expenditures FY 2022-2023**

Ms. Tebo stated that the expenditures were up to date for the funded agencies that had applied for funding in the next fiscal year. She added that the expenditures represented half of the year.

**Former CAC Member Dr. Jenneffer Pulapaka – Review Process for Ranking**

Dr. Pulapaka explained her outline to the CAC and how she approached evaluating the programs.

**CAC Tentative Ranking and Discussion for Funding Applicants**

Ms. Tebo asked the members to email their final rankings to her by Friday, May 19<sup>th</sup>. She added that if they required additional space, they could add more rows to the Excel spreadsheet or attach documents containing their reasoning.

## Florida Department of Health (FDOH) Dental Services

Member Kiser said the application, like others submitted, provided outputs and not outcomes. She voiced confusion regarding the budget and said it would be helpful to know exactly what the funding was for. She added that multiple agencies had the same issues with their applications.

There was discussion that in previous years, the CAC did not ask agencies these questions. Ms. Tebo suggested that next year they might hold a mandatory pre-application meeting so that expectations were spelled out in advance of submissions.

There was consensus amongst the CAC members to support the funding of the dental program.

## The Neighborhood Center Outreach (TNC) - Access to Care

Member Kiser noted that TNC did not answer the questions, was not specific in their budget, unclear about the program, and questioned how they would increase service without an increase in staffing. Member Valdivia agreed with the concern raised regarding service increases and stated that it should have been explained in the application. Chair Hibel informed the others that there is a group of Stetson volunteers that help TNC.

Commissioner Manning said that at this meeting, the members should be sharing their ideas about ranking in addition to asking questions.

Member Valdivia, Member Kiser, and Vice Chair King advocated for partial funding at \$100,000. The other members said they were leaning towards full funding.

## The House Next Door (THND) Therapeutic Services

There was consensus that the members present were leaning towards full funding.

## Community Legal Services of Mid-Florida (CLSMF)

Member Kiser said the application was not clear, and the budget was not tied to the outcomes. Member Valdivia agreed the application was not clear.

There was discussion that CLSMF assists with providing potential card holders with other sources of coverage such as the VA and SSI. Six CAC members said they were inclined to recommend full funding.

Vice Chair King, Member Kiser, and Member Valdivia recommended funding at the current year level.

## Hispanic Health Initiative (HHI) – Taking Care of My Health

Member Kiser said she knows the organization provides a good service, but there were no measures or outcomes in the application. She said the budget amounts do not match the funding request. There was discussion regarding the definition of a full-time employee (FTE) that was not specified in the application.

There was discussion that the program was proactive in disease prevention.

Member Brown noted that at the recent health resource fair, he received more education from HHI than his own primary care provider. Member Valdivia agreed and noted they travel to all areas of West Volusia to educate residents.

Member Rogers said he was leaning toward reduced funding due to the budget issues in the application. The other members signaled they were inclined to recommend full funding.

### SMA Residential Treatment Services

There was agreement to recommend full funding.

### SMA Psychiatric/Homeless Services

There was agreement to recommend full funding.

### SMA Baker Act

There was a question regarding debt service on page eleven as SMA provided their agency budget not specific to the program. Jennifer Stephenson of SMA affirmed debt service was not part of the program budget and said they would do a better job next year of being program specific in their applications.

All members present agreed to recommend full funding as the program provided match funding through the Agency for Health Care Administration.

### Healthy Start Coalition of Flagler & Volusia (HSCFV) Outreach HSCFV Family Services Coordinator

Manuel Alamo answered questions regarding both programs and spoke about challenges in reaching all areas of the service area. He spoke about barriers to care, client transportation issues, and having a location for their staff to set up in the community. Member Valdivia noted that she was working with the agency to secure a place for them in the Pierson area.

There was agreement amongst the CAC to recommend full funding for both applications.

### Rising Against All Odds (RAAO) HIV/Aids/Outreach

Member Rogers spoke about RAAO's 2020 Form 990 and requested they provide an updated Form 990 from 2021.

Member Valdivia said she would like improved information on salaries next year.

Brenda Flowers said her application requested funding of \$167,682.52, but she had since considered increasing the request to \$205,000. She explained that RAAO intended to become an ESS partner with the Department of Children and Families (DCF), and DCF requires ESS partners to have equipment such as a fax machine and two computers for people coming in to apply for food stamps and Medicaid. She added that salary adjustments were needed.

Member Rogers said he was likely leaning towards full funding. The rest of the members said they wanted to recommend full funding.

### Creative Living, Inc.

Member Kiser expressed concern that the request is for WVHA to fund 90% of the total budget; that the budget is unclear; that page seven mentions job placement, but it is not mentioned anywhere else; that there is not a budget breakdown; and there is not information regarding what the funding is for.

William McIntyre was present to represent Creative Living. He stated he was not involved in the application preparation and only recently became involved. He explained there would be no program employees, and therapy would be accomplished through contracted services.

Member Valdivia questioned how they would measure success of the program.

Vice Chair King expressed confusion regarding how the application fits into the purpose of the WVHA. Member Brown, Member Kiser, and Vice Chair King said they did not support funding the application.

Member Owens and Member Rogers were undecided.

Chair Hibel, Member Mercier, Member Lewis, and Member Valdivia said they were leaning toward partial funding.

#### Foundations to Freedom

Member Kiser said she did not support funding.

Member Mercier said she supported partial funding.

Chair Hibel, Member Brown, Member Lewis, Vice Chair King, Member Valdivia, and Member Owens supported full funding.

Member Rogers was undecided.

#### **CAC Comments**

The CAC thanked everyone for attending.

#### **Adjournment**

There being no further business before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 7:29 p.m.

Taylor Hibel, CAC Chair

**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING  
WEST VOLUSIA HOSPITAL AUTHORITY  
THE CENTER AT DELTONA  
ACTIVITY ROOM 1  
1640 Dr. Martin Luther King  
Blvd. DELTONA, FL  
May 23, 2023 - 5:30 PM  
MINUTES**

**CAC Members/Attendance:**

Chair Taylor Hibel (arrived at 5:36 p.m.)  
Vice Chair Althea King  
Jacquie Lewis  
Joanna Mercier  
Lyda Kiser  
Patrick Rogers  
Christian Brown  
Lorna Owens (arrived at 5:38 p.m.)  
Maria Valdivia (arrived at 5:48 p.m.)

**Absent:**

Ella Ran (unexcused)

**Others Present:**

WVHA Commissioner Jennifer Coen  
WVHA Commissioner Donna Pepin  
Administrator Stacy Tebo

---

---

**Call to Order / Pledge of Allegiance & Opening Observance**

Vice Chair King called the CAC Meeting to order at 5:34 p.m. and established that there was a quorum present. The meeting began with The Pledge of Allegiance and a moment of silence.

**Approval of Agenda**

Member Lewis moved to approve the agenda. Member Kiser seconded the motion. The motion passed by a 6-0-4 vote.

**Citizen Comments**

There were none.

**Approval of CAC Minutes for May 2, 2023**

Member Lewis moved to approve the minutes. Member Kiser seconded the motion. The motion passed by a 6-0-4 vote.

**May Healthcare Expenditures 2022-2023**

Ms. Tebo stated that she included this for the CAC's information, and the expenditures were up to date for the current fiscal year.

**CAC Final Ranking and Discussion for Funding Applicants**

### **Florida Department of Health Dental Services**

All members present agreed to choose full funding for the application.

### **The Neighborhood Center Outreach-Access to Care**

All members present except Members Kiser and King agreed to choose full funding for the application. Members Kiser and King chose funding at \$100,000 and stated they were not clear what the extra 25% was for. They agreed that outcome measurements are essential. Vice Chair King noted that the agency had been told in previous years that they needed to specify their outcome measurements.

### **The House Next Door Therapeutic Services**

All members present agreed to choose full funding for the application.

### **Community Legal Services of Mid-Florida**

The following members chose to fully fund the application: Member Owens, Member Lewis, Member Brown, Chair Hibel, Member Valdivia, Member Rogers, and Member Mercier.

Member Kiser chose to fund at the current fiscal year level of \$105,794 because they did not tie their budget to program goals or outcomes. Vice Chair King chose funding at \$100,000 and said they were another agency previously told to specify how services and funding are connected.

### **Hispanic Health Initiative – Taking Care of My Health**

All members except Member Rogers agreed to choose full funding for the application. Member Rogers chose to partially fund the application at \$65,000. There was discussion that their application response needed improvements, and they should articulate specific outcome measurements and records of expenditures.

### **SMA Residential Treatment Services**

All members present agreed to choose full funding for the application.

### **SMA Psychiatric/Homeless Services**

All members present agreed to choose full funding for the application.

### **SMA Baker Act**

All members present agreed to choose full funding for the application.

### **Healthy Start Coalition of Flagler & Volusia (HSCFV) Outreach**

All members present agreed to choose full funding for the application.

### **HSCFV Family Services Coordinator**

All members present agreed to choose full funding for the application.

### **Rising Against All Odds HIV/Aids/Outreach**

All members present agreed to choose full funding for the application except Member Rogers who recommended partial funding of \$100,000.

## **Creative Living, Inc.**

There was discussion regarding a need for autistic services, but several members voiced concern regarding the completeness and clarity of the application and if it met the legislative purpose of the WVHA. Vice Chair King stated the application did not meet the criteria of what the CAC and WVHA are charged to do. Ms. Tebo said she did not view the application as complete; that the WVHA reimbursement rate was not stated; that the Medicaid reimbursement rate was not provided as requested; that required documentation was missing; and that all agencies except Creative Living were present at the Q & A meeting.

The following members chose not to fund the application: Member Owens, Member Kiser, Vice Chair King, Member Rogers, and Member Mercier.

Member Brown chose to fully fund the application.

Chair Hibel chose to partially fund the application at \$50,000. Member Lewis chose to partially fund the application at \$65,000. Member Valdivia chose to partially fund the application at \$60,000.

## **Foundations to Freedom**

The following members chose to fully fund the application: Member Owens, Member Lewis, Member Brown, Chair Hibel, and Member Valdivia.

Member Kiser chose not to fund the request because the application was not compliant, lack of specific programming in their budget, high indirect costs, and concerns regarding staff qualifications.

Member Owens left the meeting.

There was discussion regarding the number of people that might be served by the program.

Vice Chair King chose to partially fund the application at \$150,000. Member Rogers chose to partially fund the application at \$100,000 due to the limited numbers of clients served and uncertainty if it met the mission of the WVHA. Member Mercier chose to partially fund the application at \$125,000 due to lack of formal staff qualifications.

Barb Girtman affirmed the services are Medicaid reimbursable and therefore meets the mission of the WVHA; that staff are currently going through the certification process; that the west side doesn't have this type of service; that addiction counseling is a critical need in Volusia County; and that they addressed the issue raised at the previous CAC meeting regarding storage of client medications.

Kelly Haynes, COO of Foundations to Freedom, noted the specific number of employees currently certified and said that by the time the application might be funded, all employees would be certified.

## **Application Process for Next Year**

Ms. Tebo said she would like to extend the process next year so that the CAC has more time to review applications, and they wouldn't have to meet three times in a single month; that there needs to be a hard deadline for submittal of all required documentation so that there are not items such as insurance certificates coming in after the CAC has received the applications; that members had mentioned throughout application review that agencies needed to specify outcomes in their submittals; that meetings be more structured with time limits amongst organizations to ensure fairness; that a mandatory pre-application meeting be instituted, so the agencies understand ahead of time what is required and expected; that the CAC come up with a rubric to address scoring the applications in a more objective manner; and that she would like to schedule an additional meeting in a few months to

discuss the suggestions.

Member Kiser noted that agency budgets should be tied to deliverables specific to WVHA funding, and outcomes for the project funded by WVHA should not be the same as the oversight agency requires. She clarified the rubric would include how much weight goes to different components of the application.

Member Lewis stressed that the agencies specify that they would be utilizing funding to address needs itemized in the latest community health needs assessment. She added that agencies should ask themselves if their goals align with the purpose of the WVHA before applying. She stated that improving the process is meant to protect the WVHA and the people served in the community.

There was discussion regarding one person being designated as a compliance officer that would review and ensure all required documentation is obtained, and that the documentation would not necessarily have to be reviewed by all members.

Member Rogers suggested the following changes to the application: reduction of specified required documents, one set of supporting documents per agency, a pdf of the agencies' latest 990, only including salaries of the top three to five officials in each agency, separating cash completely from in-kind in the budget, inclusion of site visit reports, and bullet points on the application rather than a lengthy narrative.

Member Mercier said if a currently funded agency is applying, they could include a report of what they did in a prior year. Chair Hibel noted that each agency submits an annual report to the Board and speaks at scheduled WVHA meetings throughout the year.

Member Brown said he would like to see a paperless application in the future.

There was discussion that an improved process would provide more credibility for the WVHA.

Ms. Tebo said they would need time to present the CAC's recommendations to the WVHA Board of Commissioners and Attorney Small.

Member Kiser left the meeting.

Member Rogers moved to recommend to the Board that they authorize an additional CAC meeting. Member Mercier seconded the motion. The motion passed 7-0-3.

### **CAC Comments**

The members offered their closing comments and thanked the agencies for their submissions.

### **Adjournment**

There being no further business before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 6:46 p.m.

Taylor Hibel, CAC Chair

### **2024 WVHA Application Process Suggestions**

1. Release the application in January to extend CAC review time & hold a mandatory applicant meeting to ensure applicants are aware of requirements, stressing that there is a hard deadline for submittal of ALL documents with the application. Affirm that incomplete applications will not be accepted or scored.
2. At the meeting, we should stress that agencies should ask themselves if their goals align with the purpose of the WVHA before applying.
3. Include a checklist to ensure a complete packet is submitted.
4. Create a rubric that includes how much weight goes to different components of the application for scoring and explain it at the mandatory applicant meeting.
5. Designate one person as a compliance officer that would review and ensure all required documentation is obtained, so that the documentation would not necessarily have to be reviewed by all members.
6. Require one set of financials per agency to save paper/cost/time.
7. Reduce/specify required support documents.
8. Transition to a paperless application.
9. Include question requiring agencies to specify that they would be utilizing WVHA funding to address needs itemized in the latest community health needs assessment.
10. Include a question on their most recent site visit results for returning agencies. If they were not in compliance, specify what was done to rectify issues.
11. For returning agencies, require documentation on final outcome measurements for previous year funded.
12. Use bullet points on the application rather than a lengthy narrative.
13. Require balance sheet and profit and loss statement for previous year and PDF of 990.
14. Specify salary for top 3-5 employees only, and not everyone in the program.
15. Agency budgets should be tied to deliverables specific to WVHA funding. Identify in the budget what the funds from WVHA would be supporting. Agencies should not include their overall budget for other programs.

16. Budget: have separate columns for cash and in-kind income and expense.
17. Include a grid for number predicted and number actually served in previous year, current year-to-date and application year, such as:

<b>Grant Year</b>	<b>WVHA number proposed served</b>	<b>Actual WVHA numbers served</b>
<b>Previous Grant Application year</b>		
<b>Current Grant year Oct. thru _____</b>		
<b>2023 – 3024</b>		

18. Require outcomes instead of outputs. Outcomes for the project funded by WVHA should not be the same as the oversight agency requires. They must be specific to the WVHA funding.
19. Audit results (Supply each agency with blank audit form so they are informed on what the auditor will be looking for on the day of audit.)
20. Structure CAC meetings with time limits amongst organizations to ensure fairness.
21. Timed event – 10 minutes for a presentation, 10 minutes for questions, and no generalized statements from CAC members about the organization or their work.
22. Since all CAC members do not have the opportunity to do site visits, those who do could provide feedback.
23. All agency deficiencies experienced in recent years should be shared with other CAC members to assist in decision making.
24. Develop a marketing strategy to reach the population we serve.

The following rubric will be used to score each of the eight areas:

1. Demonstration of need for funding as it pertains to the current Volusia County Community Health Needs Assessment
2. Description of project including intended goals and outcomes
3. Description of the work
4. Budget aligned to goals/outcomes
5. Identification of target population
6. Monitoring method to assess agency goals
7. Detail, completeness, and clarity of the budget
8. Alignment of goals within grant application to the mission and goals of the WVHA

ORGANIZATION / AGENCY \_\_\_\_\_

CAC MEMBER NAME \_\_\_\_\_

TOTAL SCORE \_\_\_\_\_

	1 Point - Needs Improvement	2 Points - Average	3 Points - Very Good	4 Points - Exceptional	Score
Section 1: Demonstration of Need as it Pertains to Current CHNA	Description of need is hard to understand, verbose, or uses jargon. • It is not clear what the specific need is, and no data or information is included to support justifying need.	Description depicting the need is somewhat clear and minimally explains why funding is needed. • There is some data or information to support need.	Description depicts the need for the project well and language clearly describes current status. • Data or additional information supports narrative and shows clear need.	Description is very clear, concise, and easy to understand. • Information and data are attached, and clearly supports need. Additional data or information complete a big picture explanation for need.	
Section 2: Description of Project Including Intended Goals and Outcomes	The description of the project is vague or unclear. • The goals of the grant are not addressed or clearly stated. • The goals do not align with the need stated. No outcomes are described.	The description of the project is somewhat clear and includes details. • The goals of the grant are addressed but not clearly stated. • Goals and desired outcomes are minimally described and are somewhat aligned with the need described.	The description of the project is very clear with detailed descriptions of the work to be completed. • The goals of the grant are clearly stated. • Outcomes of moderate impact and value are described. • There lacks some specificity in what is measurable in outcomes.	The description of the project is exceptionally clear and provides detailed information • The goals of the grant are clearly stated. • Significant outcomes are described. • The specific outcomes of each goal are stated clearly and are directly aligned to the described need. • All goals and outcomes are measurable both qualitatively and quantitatively.	
Section 3: Description of the Work	The description of the overall work is hard to understand. • Alignment between goals, outcomes, and the description of work is vague.	Description of the work to be completed is addressed but vague at times. • There is alignment between goals and the description of work. A more clear and concise description of overall work to be completed is needed.	The description of the overall work to be completed is clearly stated. • Work or project described is sound and overall is aligned to grant's goals. • Describes a feasible timeframe for achieving goals.	The description of work is clear and concise. • The work is strongly aligned to the grant's goals. • Describes a feasible timeframe for achieving goals.	

Section 4: Alignment of Budget to Description of Work and Goals/Outcomes	Little to no alignment between the proposed budget to support achievement of goals and outcomes found in the description of work.	Somewhat of an alignment between the proposed budget to support achievement of goals and outcomes found in the description of work.	A significant alignment between the proposed budget to support achievement of goals and outcomes found in the description of work.	A clear and strong alignment between the proposed budget to support achievement of goals and outcomes found in the description of work.	
Section 5: Identification of Target Population	Target population is marginally identified, and agency has no previous experience serving this population.	Target population is somewhat identified, and agency has little previous experience serving this population.	Target population is somewhat identified, and agency has demonstrated some experience serving this population.	Target population is clearly identified, and agency has demonstrated experience in serving this population.	
Section 6: Monitoring Method to Assess Agency Goals	Very limited or no monitoring to ensure a clear focus on goals. • Limited or weak plan for evaluating impact of the work in achieving annual grant goals.  • No data collection plan in place to measure impact of grants actions.	Somewhat of a monitoring plan to ensure a clear focus on goals. • Somewhat of a plan created for evaluating impact of the work in achieving annual grant goals. • Some data collection	A significant monitoring plan created to ensure a clear focus on goals. • Clear and strong plan created and executed for evaluating impact of the work in achieving annual goals. • Significant and strong data collection processes are in place to measure impact of grant's actions.	Exceptionally designed monitoring plan to ensure a clear focus on goals. • Comprehensive systemic plan created and executed for evaluating impact of the work in achieving annual grant goals. • Exceptional data collection processes are in place to measure impact of grant's actions.	
Section 7: Detail, Completeness and Clarity of the Budget	The program budget is incomplete and is unclear how it supports the work outlined.	Somewhat vague budget information. Appears to somewhat support the work outlined.	Adequate budget information. Appears to support the work outlined.	A comprehensive and clear Budget is detailed, complete and clearly supports the work outlined. Revenue/expense seems reasonable.	
Section 8: Alignment Between WVHA's Mission and Grant Goals	Lack of alignment between the WVHA's mission and the goals of the work described in the grant application.	Somewhat of an alignment between the WVHA's mission and the goals of the work described in the grant application.	Significant evidence of an alignment between the WVHA's mission and the goals of the work described in the grant application.	Clear and strong alignment between the WVHA's mission and the goals of the work described in the grant application.	

Things to consider:

Past issues with compliance in the application process or with the organization as a whole

What progress has been made since the last application period?

Finance evaluation (Red flags from a finance perspective.)

Healthcare evaluation (Red flags from a healthcare/mental health perspective.)

Community evaluation (Red flags from a community perspective.)

Site visit evaluation