



# City of Madison

City of Madison  
Madison, WI 53703  
[www.cityofmadison.com](http://www.cityofmadison.com)

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

---

Thursday, May 26, 2011

8:00 AM

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

---

### CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

**Present:** 7 -

Anita Weier; Scott Peters; Lynn E. Edlefson; Nicole K. Anderson; Patricia A. Lasky; Diane B. Adams and Celsa G. Rodriguez

**Absent:** 1 -

Michael B. Jacob

**Staff Present:** Bill Clingan, Monica Host, Becky Schesny

Peters called the meeting to order at 8:07 am.

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

**MOTION** by Edlefson, seconded by Anderson to approve the April 28, 2011 minutes. Motion passed by voice vote.

### PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

### DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

None.

### DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. [22553](#) Community Resources Process Evaluation

Bill Clingan from the Community Development Division discussed the results of the evaluations of the 2 year process. Mary O'Donnell used Survey Monkey to create and distribute the evaluations. Committee members, service providers, staff members and Council members were all included in the survey. There are 3 categories of results: staff, Committee members and applicants.

A meeting is planned with applicants to discuss the responses and overall satisfaction level. The goal is to take away 5 or 6 things that can be used to improve the process.

The results seemed favorable. The Committee members ranked the process the highest, next were service providers then staff were the hardest in the evaluations. Most responses were neutral or above.

There were lots of comments from all groups. Repeated comments were noted once. Specific names listed in comments were deleted.

Adams asked Clingan how many made comments per group. Clingan explained that the service provided the least amount of comments and staff provided the most. He added that the numbers are more positive than the comments. Adams asked how many staff members responded. About 15 out of 20 had comments.

Adams suggested measuring the results and the cost effectiveness of the process. Do minimal changes if any at all for the next process.

Peters was surprised there weren't more service providers dissatisfied if they weren't funded at the level they had hoped. Important to use the same criteria for everyone and keep rankings in front of everyone to limit changing the ranking just based on what someone said at a meeting. Adams added that we all have our own filters that we use to make decisions.

About 130 programs applied for funding this last time.

Adams discussed funders creating numerous programs per center in order to spread the funding and reach more people.

Edlefson discussed the committee's movement away from priorities at times. Peters stated that priorities were high, but maybe funds should be divided by priorities so that the best ones for each priority can be funded.

Edlefson added that financial restraints per priority can cause problems. Different committees handled the funding allocations differently. Some ranked over all priority and funded down the ranking list until money was all allocated and others saved fund for each priority levels.

Adams is concerned with proliferation within agencies. Briarpatch did well then other agencies added similar programs. What is the mission, what do they do and where do they do it? Every school, district or alder district should have high quality support services.

Peters suggested looking into funding all over the city. Adams discussed asking agencies which aldermanic district each agency serves and added that neighborhoods don't necessarily meet up with the aldermanic districts. Lasky stated this is another layer of distribution. Perhaps less money available will help us better allocate.

Clingan offered that neighborhood indicators could also be used in the future. Adams

Clingan explained that the overall sense from the evaluations was that the process was long and time consuming. Staff recommendations for funding were used with all committees this time.

Once RFPs went out, to keep things fair, besides the blog for questions there was no real assistance given to specific agencies.

Edlefson discussed non-profits and some way agencies could strategically think about where they are going, what their goals are and their intentions. Agencies should not apply if they cannot or do not want to do the program.

The application training focused mainly on how to complete the application. Perhaps a discussion of service areas and descriptions would have been helpful and should be looked into for future funding processes.

Adams would like a one page summary from each committee regarding the funds available, the amount requested and how the money was allocated. Show which services were funded. A narrative regarding intention and what was actually done in the end would be helpful and provide clarity to the community.

Peters added that a one to two page narrative including ranking, votes and funds allocated could alleviate service provider questions.

Anderson suggested less room for subjectiveness. Make decisions more scientific. Reward agencies that get a lot of volunteers or have more Board of Director meetings. Scores could then be based on this info. Lasky cautioned about this practice. How do these things reflect a good program or agency? How many of them can be applied to all programs or agencies. Do we reward those agencies with better grant writers? Peters added that assessment system may be skewed based on higher quality having more money and better neighborhoods.

Adams reminded the group that for a total allocation of 6-7 million you cannot have more restrictions than its worth.

Rodriguez suggested adding new layers. Combine a map of distribution of services with community feedback to analyze goals versus what was actually accomplished. Feedback from community on service providers to rate the performance of agencies.

Clingan discussed the CSC meeting discussion regarding doing the process every year, or staggering it out so that one year one service area would be the focus and the next year it would be another service area. Also 4 year contracts were discussed. Or possibly 2 year contracts with the option to renew for 2 more years if services are being provided as required. Complications arise with 2 year contracts and 1 year budgets. Some areas will be stagnant for a while. Budget cuts or additions how do you sync it all up. Peters suggested default to priorities.

Edlefson asked about the goal of the staggering. To save time, less intensity? Host inquired about how agencies would be affected. It's a lot of work for agencies to go through the funding process. Edlefson added that both staff and agencies would have increased workload. Host discussed open process with large meetings. Perhaps the staggering would lead to less meetings.

Dane county has about 20% of their funds at play each year. City has more involvement with their process. Adams discussed the United Way combined application form years ago. This allowed everyone to know the same information. Also there were ways to see gaps in services. Kids, mom and families is who we serve. It should be seamless service.

Clingan discussed the 4 year contract. Adams is concerned that is a long time. Peters suggested allowing roll-over if the programs and agencies are successful then not to have to compete for funds. This may however weed out the start up of new programs. Peters would like to discuss the matter further and review the application again to see if there need to be any updates made.

Edlefson asked how many "new" startups are there? How many first time applicants? Host will look into that and provide the info at the next meeting. There was a move for family programming to the ECCEC. This was new this past year.

Adams discussed parent services presentations at upcoming meetings. Since it is so new to this group it would be important to have 10 min presentations on the agencies, how many are served, the philosophy etc. Getting better acquainted with these programs and agencies will help with future funding decisions. Host will look into having 3 come to the next meeting.

**Upcoming meeting topics**

Peters would like a paper application to review it. ECCEC could receive both a blank and completed application via email to review for the next meeting.

**Parent Groups:** Center for Families, Canopy and Rainbow Project will be invited to the next meeting to discuss parent programs.

Anderson would like a 4K update at the next meeting. She also discussed the Joint Finance Committee letter being sent to the CSC. It will be sent via email to this group and will be forwarded to the CSC group.

2.      [22204](#)      CSC Meeting Report

Discussed during the Community Resources Evaluation process.

3.      [19470](#)      ECCEC Subcommittee

Peters, Lasky and Edlefson will not be able to attend the June meeting. The group discussed cancelling the June meeting. The subcommittee for the July 28, 2011 meeting will consist of: Rodriguez, Adams and Anderson.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION** by Lasky, seconded by Edlefson to adjourn the meeting at 9:42 am.  
Motion passed by voice vote.