



# City of Madison

City of Madison  
Madison, WI 53703  
www.cityofmadison.com

## Meeting Minutes - Approved EARLY CHILDHOOD CARE AND EDUCATION COMMITTEE

---

Thursday, March 13, 2014

8:00 AM

215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.  
Room 260 (Madison Municipal Building)

---

### CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

**Present:** 7 - Denise DeMarb; Linda E. Benzschawel; Scott Peters; Jennifer Templin;  
Diane B. Adams; Karalyn A. Kratowicz and Muriel Simms

**Absent:** 1 - Patricia A. Lasky

**Staff Present:** Jim O'Keefe, Monica Host, Varinia del Moral

Peters called the meeting to order at 8:03 am.

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Kratowicz added 2 edits to the minutes. On page 3, 4th paragraph under #4 insert "City" before staff for clarification. On page 4, 4th paragraph sentence should read "Child Care Unit needs something from the Committee" instead of form the committee.

There was a brief discussion on the WI Shares denial letter and how the system works. Adams asked for clarification on information listed in the minutes. DeMarb mention EOP applications and will continue further discussion on those later in the meeting.

**MOTION BY KRATOWICZ, SECONDED BY DITTRICH-TEMPLIN TO APPROVE THE FEBRUARY 13, 2014 MINUTES. Motion passed by voice vote.**

### PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

### DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

None.

### NEW BUSINESS

1. [33343](#) Update on CDD Funding Process - Jim O'Keefe

Jim O'Keefe the director of the Community Development Division discussed the funding process. One common theme is what can we do to bring pieces of the division together with common goals? Several departments were brought together and they will develop a core set of goals and objectives. DeMarb asked what agencies were joined. O'Keefe clarified that Community Services which allocates funding addressing social service needs, Child Care Unit, and CDBG which allocates federal and state funding for affordable housing, neighborhood centers, gardens, network of agencies for homeless persons, economic development and employment. The Madison Senior Center is also a part of the division and was part of several larger departments previously. Green Madison was also part of the CDD. There is room for improvement as we establish core sets of goals and values.

A second common theme is the mounting evidence surrounding education, employment, and public health as related to quality of life. DeMarb and others have asked how we can do a better job on policies and decision making to have the most impact on marginalized populations.

The current CDD funding process is being evaluated and will possibly be altered. An RFP went out earlier in March for up to \$120,000 for study focused on issues with an eye to produce tangible, actionable recommendations. With the results of the study we hope to be able to develop clear and focused goals and objectives and develop a funding process around the objectives.

The study will include recommendations and strategies on coordinating with other major funders including Dane County, United Way and others. One question is how can the City provide funds for services while strengthening non-profit organizations' leadership and ability to raise funds? Adams added that accredited child care centers are leaders. Host agreed, but they are not general non-profits included in the strategy. RFPs are due March 24th with 1 month for staff to review and decide on the procedures needed engage committees. Adams asked if they will get survey results from committee members. O'Keefe responded that yes they would. The original evaluation was driven by the Mayor and Common Council to review the process and the results.

DeMarb asked what are our goals as a City. Can we name them? We need our own goals and funding should be based on City goals for accountability. O'Keefe discussed having goals and objectives, but are they the right ones? Are they realistic? Are they measurable? We are looking for tangible answers from the study. Simms asked who reviews the study and who decides outcomes? O'Keefe explained that goals and objectives will involve staff, committees, community partners, Council, etc. Simms asked if new goals and objectives are developed who will review those. Will the public be involved? O'Keefe responded that would make sense and public input will be provided. Peters asked if the goals would be City goals or division goals? O'Keefe clarified it would be division goals, but they go beyond to have a better sense of what to accomplish. Host agreed that public comment on the study results will be included. During the funding cycle there is always a public hearing on

goals and objectives for committees, Council and public to weigh in.

DeMarb added that the process may affect goals and objectives of each committee. Committees can talk about goals and objectives then synthesize them with other CDD committees for combined goals and objectives. Peters stated that 2011 and 2012 they started early be more purposeful, cohesive and transparent in the process.

O'Keefe explained that this is no easy undertaking and will be disruptive to normal funding cycles. We shouldn't do a 2 year funding cycle with current goals and objectives if the system needs to be changed. CDD recommended 2014 contracts be extended to 2015 while modifying the process and restart in summer of 2015. The exceptions would be employment programs. Mayor has an employment initiative of \$1 million for RFP for employment. Federally funded programs require competitive process and will also be done in the 2014. Neighborhood centers will be part of the process as well.

Adams cautioned that with a diversion such as new goals for service that we be sure not to neglect everyday work that still needs to be addressed. O'Keefe agreed and the 2013-14 contracts will be extended for 1 year.

Peters asked why not do a regular process this year and in 2016 make the updates. O'Keefe stated it seems odd to use a system that needs attention and updates. In 2015 we can use improvements and move forward.

DeMarb stated the evaluation of funding process is important. She used the EOP binder as an example. There is \$100,000 in funds available, but over \$1 million requested. It takes time for staff to review and make funding recommendations. Where and how could staff better use their time? It would be beneficial to realign the process.

Adams asked about doing a side by side comparison. Have the study people participate and watch a full funding process vs. doing it retrospectively. DeMarb responded that it was about evaluating the process and developing goals. Adams added that development and developers is one driver, but human services is the other driver. DeMarb mentioned she is proud of the work being done and wants to understand that the time spent is spent well.

O'Keefe added that this discussion had begun before he started with the CDD. Reasons the process will be evaluated include:

- long arduous process where often fund same programs or agencies as in the past. Does not allow for new ideas or approaches.
- There is too much need and not enough funding available. It is important to come out with realistic goals and objectives.
- Lots of duplication, lack of coordination with agencies that serve the same people. Try to bring these groups together.

O'Keefe would like to see tangible recommendations come from the study vs. an educational report.

DeMarb discussed non-profits not coordinating efforts instead of competing for same funding. O'Keefe mentioned the Jointer study listing redundancy in programming and not looking out for non-profits.

Host added that the Community Resources funding process has become more complicated over the years. Remember non-profits are here to make connection with residents. Host is for delaying the 2 year process now to allow for the review the current process and develop a system to best fund goals and objectives.

DeMarb discussed EOP application process. Peters added this is the 2nd cycle that allows for new and innovative programs to be funded and there is a more nimble process. O'Keefe stated this is a new approach for new and emerging opportunities to address old problems. This allows us to accommodate grassroots organizations or new organizations that have not received City funding. In the first round of funding there were \$200,000 in funds available and over \$2 million requested by applicants. There will be another round for \$100,000 this fall.

Adams asked who oversees the contract. Host explained the CDD does. DeMarb added that 1the Council wanted extra funding to support other agencies.

O'Keefe stated the EOP areas are much larger and broader terms than other funding cycles. There is value in funding other groups and opportunities. There was an ordinance that supported EOP including making the Conference Committee a standing committee that makes recommendations to Council. The Conference Committee consists of 3 members from CSC and 3 members from CDBG.

2. [33037](#) To adjust the Child Care Assistance income guidelines to keep them in line with the poverty guidelines published by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and adopted by the State and to reflect inflationary increases.

Peters discussed the income guidelines. Varinia del Moral reminded the group that they were presented last month to include the updated federal poverty guidelines. We update these every year. Families that make more may stay qualified for WI Shares longer and those on the City program may get more subsidies yearly.

**MOTION BY DITTRICH-TEMPLIN, SECONDED BY DEMARB, TO RETURN TO LEAD WITH RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL. Motion passed by voice vote..**

3. [33059](#) CSC Committee Report

**No Report.**

4. [31496](#) ECCEC Subcommittee

Benzschawel and Dittrich-Templin will not be attending the April ECCEC meeting. The subcommittee for the April 10th meeting will consist of Peters, DeMarb and Simms.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION BY SIMMS, SECONDED BY KRATOWICZ TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:21 AM. Motion passed by voice vote.**