



**1600 East Century Avenue, Suite 2  
P.O. Box 2057  
Bismarck, ND 58502-2057  
Phone (701) 328-5345  
Fax (701) 328-5320  
E-Mail: [jhirsch@state.nd.us](mailto:jhirsch@state.nd.us)**

**MEETING MINUTES  
NORTH DAKOTA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL  
STATE COMMISSION ON NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE  
JUNE 4, 2003**

**Meeting Date, Time & Place:** June 4, 2003, 10:30 a.m., Job Service North Dakota, 1601 East Century Avenue, Bismarck, ND 58503.

**Members Present:** Al Lukes, Cathi Christopherson, Gloria Maragos, Jim Dahlen, Leo Cummings, Max Laird, Rosella Grant, Wayne Kutzer, John Pohlman, and Jim Hirsch.

**Members Absent:** Carol Olson, Dave Massey, Dr. David Gipp, Dr. Donna Thigpen, Lisa Ringstad, and Mike Zimmerman.

**Others Present:** Cheryll McDowall, Dan Marrs, Kaye Knudson, Melissa Kelley, Rosey Sand, Loretta Lord, and Jill Splonskowski.

**Opening Remarks & Introductions:** The Chair, Al Lukes provided a welcome to everyone. The Chair proceeded with asking members and guests to introduce themselves.

**Agenda:** Al Lukes moved for approval of the agenda as presented.

**Motion:** Jim Dahlen made a motion to approve the agenda. Cathi Christopherson seconded the motion. Motion carried.

**Approval of Minutes:** Al Lukes moves for approval of the April 16, 2003, minutes.

Max Laird commented that on the Motion on page 4 of the April 16, 2003, minutes that he would like to change the wording to “approve the draft policies revising the wording used for the peer review process”.

**Motion: Max Laird then moved for approval of the April 16, 2003, minutes. Rosella Grant seconded the motion. Motion carried.**

**Chair’s Report:**

Al Lukes briefly reviewed the Administrative and PDAT budgets. He stated that allocations have been made, the budget looks tight, it is small, but it looks well put together. Max Laird questioned how annual reviews are made on the budgets. Jim Hirsch explained that the performance review process would be analyzed. The PDAT budget is \$85,000 to date. Project staff went to Minneapolis for a conference, but other than that Jim Hirsch didn’t feel as though there were any other expenses thus far in this budget.

AL Lukes then commented on the attendance policy (either in person or by phone). He states:

- A) Two consecutive absences from Council and subgroup meetings shall result in a warning letter being sent out by the Council Chairperson.
- B) Three consecutive absences from Council and subgroup meetings shall be cause for a recommendation by the Council Executive Committee, to the Governor, for forfeiture of the appointment.

Cathi Christopherson then suggested that Jill Splonskowski send out an e-mail several weeks before the next meeting and also call members several days (2-3) before the meeting as to whether the member will be in attendance. Max Laird also suggested that e-mails should be either color-coded or identified somehow separately from the Youth and Workforce Development Council meetings.

**Council Business:**

Conflict of Interest Policy:

Jim Hirsch briefly explained that the Conflict of Interest Policy is a statement whereby members, employees, or appointees don’t or should not have an interest or concern in the issue at hand.

**Motion: Max Laird moved for adoption of the Conflict of Interest Policy. Wayne Kutzer seconded the motion. Motion carried.**

### Commission Expenses:

Jim Hirsch explained that the Member Expense and Reimbursement Policy states that expenses would be approved at the state rate. The per diem would need to be consistent with other states. This is simply a draft which reflects a per diem of \$62.50 per day.

**Motion: Wayne Kutzer moved for approval of the Member Expense Reimbursement draft. Cathi Christopherson seconded the motion.**

Before the motion carries, Max Laird identified some of the pressures he has received from the school system because of the need of substitute teachers in order for him to attend the meetings. Max feels that without sub-costs, more and more school professionals will not be allowed to attend the meetings under these conditions. Rosella Grant re-confirmed Max's thoughts. Jim Hirsch stated that he is checking with fiscal staff to see if the reimbursement policy could be adjusted somehow to better accommodate Commission members.

**Motion then carries.**

### Financial Management System:

Jim Hirsch explained that the fiscal manual has already been adopted by the Idaho training providers. The Commission staff took a portion of Idaho's policy in order to develop our own draft. Max Laird feels that the manual is well laid out, and it meets his criteria.

**Motion: Max Laird moved for approval of the fiscal manual upon reviewing the draft. Rosella Grant seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.**

### **Grants Committee Reports:**

#### Peer Review Process:

Cheryll McDowall reported on the peer review process. Proposals were due on April 1, 2003. Two (2) existing projects applied for funding – Cooperstown & Youthworks. The variety of the projects was wonderful. Education, disaster, and human needs were some of the issues addressed in the applications. Almost all of the applications involved programming statewide. All proposals involved rural activities. Four (4) peer reviewers helped read and score the proposals. All eight (8) proposals were reviewed by the peer reviewers, and the Grants Committee met on June 2, 2003, to determine which proposals would be funded. It was determined that the top five (5) would be fully funded and \$5,000 would still be left over. Max Laird questioned whether there were ways to use up the extra \$5,000 rather than giving it back.

Melissa Kelley commented that not all funding dollars will be spent simply because of member retention. There is not going to be 100% funding on programs. For formula funds, if \$50,000 of program funds were left over, that money would be lost to the Commission. It's important to try to use up the funds if possible since they will not be allowed to be carried over from year to year.

Grants Committee Project Recommendations:

Max Laird reported on the Grants Committee Project. Max feels that there would be benefits if peer reviewers were separate from Commission members. It separates one group from leaning into the other. A clear division would benefit the peer review process. He also feels that the committee should have three (3) voting members, so that someone can make or break a vote.

Al Lukes suggested that three (3) members be appointed with one alternate designated. Max Laird then mentioned that he would like the staff to prepare a submission of planning grants in the future.

Max Laird went on to say that the Grants Committee's decision was to fully fund five (5) projects with two (2) projects possibly getting funded the extra \$5,000.

**Motion: Max Laird moved that The Learning Center (Cooperstown), Youthworks, Red River Basin Watershed Improvement Project, North Dakota Council on Abused Women's Services, and the State Board on Vocational & Technical Education be fully funded.**

Before the motion is seconded, Rosella Grant recommended that the funding cycle language needs to be identified in the award notice or award letter.

Max Laird also recommended a statement be put in the award notice stating that "You would need to reapply every year to be renewable after 3 years for additional funding, pending positive annual reviews".

Jim Hirsch points out that we should look into competitive funding in the future.

Melissa Kelley feels that we may want to pursue educational funding for the next grant year. Our guidelines state in the language that this is a one year program that may possibly be funded successfully in the future.

**Motion: Max Laird made a motion that we amend the previous Motion to reflect the projects will be funded, reflecting the issue of satisfactory annual reviews. Rosella Grant seconded the motion. Motion carried.**

Al Lukes stated that the motion will reflect that it is made by the Grants Review Committee, and not necessarily the commission.

A roll call was then taken and the results of the roll call are as follows:

Gloria Maragos – Aye  
Wayne Kutzer – Abstain  
Leo Cummings – Aye  
Jim Dahlen – Aye

Rosella Grant – Aye  
Cathi Christopherson – Aye  
Al Lukes - Aye  
Max Laird - Aye

**Motion: Rosella Grant made a motion that Jim Hirsch and his staff should identify and appropriate the additional \$5,000 in funding where they feel it is necessary. Max Laird seconded the motion. Motion carried.**

Max Laird then suggested that each of the five (5) projects are asked to visit with Jim Hirsch and his staff to get their input on who they feel should be funded the extra \$5,000.

**---LUNCH BREAK---**

### The Standards Project:

Cheryll McDowall reviewed the draft timeline with Commission members. She stated that by August 2003 the draft Request for Proposal should be completed for approval by the Commission at the September 10, 2003, meeting.

Jim Hirsch suggested that we try to conduct informational meetings throughout the region whenever possible.

### **Presentations:**

#### Administrative Standards:

Melissa Kelley gave her presentation on Administrative Standards 6-11. Standards 6-11 involve the creativity of the state.

#### ***Standard 6***

Standard 6 deals with engaging in a regular planning process. The first piece is to establish a mission statement. Planning and setting priorities involves input from other programs and volunteers. Standard 6.2 addresses the commission work and priorities.

#### ***Standard 7***

Standard 7 deals with the management of staff effectively. Since federal funds are used, job descriptions and job performance must be outlined. It also provides feedback to staff (annual evaluations). It helps develop staff and assure adequate staffing for each state commission. Standard 7.2 deals with facilitating commission governance. The Standard complies with state requirements for managing board activity, that it maintains a minimum number and required composition of commissioners. It provides support for commissioners, allowing those commissioners to fulfill required roles.

#### ***Standard 8***

Standard 8 deals with implementing a system for training and technical assistance. Standard 8.1 states that the commission shall conduct a regular needs assessment of sub-grantees. Standard 8.2 develops a training plan using the results of the needs

assessment. Standard 8.3 implements the training and technical assistance plan. Standard 8.4 evaluates the training and technical assistance provided, and uses the results of the evaluation in the next round of planning.

### **Standard 9**

Standard 9 deals with generating broad-based support, meaning that commissions receive input and assistance from a variety of sources including:

- 1) Government Agencies and/or State Legislation
- 2) Private Sectors & Foundations
- 3) Community-Based Organizations and/or Organizations supporting Volunteerism

Outreach efforts to non-profits (for example) is a part of Standard 9.

### **Standard 10**

Standard 10 looks at promoting and initiating service within the state and how the commission collaborates with other organizations. The intent is that commissions are not isolated from their efforts.

### **Standard 11**

Standard 11 is about how commissions communicate information within the state. The commission Standard 11.1 asks that each state maintain a statewide calendar to notify the state of current events. Standard 11 has a set of second set of three components which are:

- Distribution of information to corporate funded programs
- Distribution of time crucial or sensitive information
- Distribution of information to others

Melissa Kelley also discussed the state's Administrative Standards review that the Commission will be subject to during 2004.

### **Learn & Serve Update:**

Rosey Sand discussed the Learn and Serve project update. The three (3) goals of the program are:

- 1) Foster a statewide support structure for Learn & Serve programs in schools;
- 2) Help local education agencies develop strong community relationships with the historical community in their area, and the State Historical Society;
- 3) Address the needs of at-risk youth through peer mentoring.

Specific requirements of the program are that there must be a 10% match the first year, a 20% match the second year, and a 30% match the third year. It must be a public school,

and it must provide service activities with a minimum of 40 hours of service over a school year. This grant will be notified if it will be funded by Fall 2003.

CNCS Project Update:

John Pohlman updated the Commission on the Lutheran Social Services Senior Companions Project. Most of the volunteers in the programs are located in the Western half (½) of the state of North Dakota. The State CNCS office has processed and approved the NE Human Service Center and the Dacotah Foundation Foster Grandparent Programs for funding. A VISTA grant for the Beyond Shelter, Inc. has been processed and approved also.

Foster Grandparent Program Update:

Kaye Knudson reported on the Dacotah Foundation's Foster Grandparent Program. The program offers opportunities for children as well as adults this summer by offering both a reading camp and an enrichment camp. She also reported that a recognition banquet was recently held with a good turnout. Foster Grandparents are now tying into schools, headstarts, daycare, etc... Volunteers for the Foster Grandparent Program must be at least 60 years of age and meet federal income guidelines.

RSVP Program Update:

Loretta Lord gave a presentation on the Mandan Golden Age Club's RSVP Program. RSVP is the only non-stipended program in the state of North Dakota. They have 1,015 volunteers in the Bismarck-Mandan area alone. They serve 145 agencies within their service area and donate approximately 180,000 volunteer hours per year. Statewide, the program also serves 22 counties whereby approximately 535,000 hours are served each year. Some agencies that the local RSVP program works with are the Bismarck Civic Center and the North Dakota Parks and Recreation Department. They lose about 100 volunteers per year, but gain about 105 back. The federal government pays 57¢ per hour (average) for their services for operating costs. The age limit to become a volunteer for this program is 55 years of age and there are no income requirements.

**New Business and Recommendations:**

None at this time.

**Motion: Rosella Grant made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Cathi Christopherson seconded the motion. Motion carried.**

**Meeting Adjourned**

The meeting was adjourned.

**Next Meeting:**

The next meeting of the State Commission on National and Community Service will be held on September 10, 2003, in Bismarck, North Dakota.

**Action Plans:**

- **Send a color-coded or identifiable e-mail and an initial mailing of the agenda and future meeting dates to all council members as well as follow-up with a phone call one week prior to the next council meeting to develop an attendance roster.**
- **Prepare a submission of planning grants in the future.**
- **Conduct information meetings throughout the region.**
- **Complete the draft Request for Proposal for approval by the commission at the September 10, 2003, meeting.**