



City of Madison

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

Meeting Minutes - Approved EARLY CHILDHOOD CARE AND EDUCATION BOARD

Wednesday, September 24, 2008

8:00 AM

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

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Present: 6 -

Joanna R. Parker; Kathleen B. Raschke; Patricia A. Lasky; Tracy K. Kuczenski; Richard C. Schultz and Joanne E. Brown

Absent: 3 -

Lynn E. Edlefson; Bev A. Willer and Brenda K. Konkel

Excused: 1 -

Michael B. Jacob

Staff: Jolene Ibeling, Monica Host, Enis Ragland, Vari del Moral Smith, Becky Schesny, Bill Clingan

Brown called the meeting to order at 8:10 a.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion by Raschke. Seconded by Lasky to approve August 27 minutes. Motion passed by voice vote with Kuczenski abstaining.

Staff noted correction in July 23 regular meeting minutes. During the Bridge Lakepoint Waunona funding history discussion the center should have been referred to as Broadway Simpson Neighborhood Center.

Motion by Schultz. Seconded by Lasky to approve the amended July 23 meeting minutes. Motion passed by voice vote with Kuczenski abstaining.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Bill Clingan introduced himself to the group as the new Community Development Director. He oversees CDBG, OCS and Senior Center. He provided a brief summary of previous work experience.

Enis Ragland attended the Poverty Matters conference in Appleton. He commented that many in attendance expressed envy regarding Madison's unique support of quality early care and education and the valuable resource the program provides to the community was commended.

1. [11759](#) 2009 Budget Update - Enis Ragland

Ragland informed the group that the Mayor's Office requested more information regarding the role of Child Care Specialists. No new budget information has been released.

Brown announced that the Mayor did respond to the letter she submitted regarding the budget. The Mayor indicated in his letter he does recognize the value of services and programs to the community. Joanne will forward letter to Jolene to distribute to ECCEB members. Kuczenski thanked Brown for writing the letter.

2. [12080](#) Funding Process Review

OCS staff are requesting feedback from staff, committees and agencies involved in the 2009 funding process in an attempt to improve and streamline the next funding cycle/process. Staff distributed a list of questions regarding the funding process for the ECCEB, CSC and SCAC to review and discuss at their respective October meetings. Questions for consideration are grouped into four categories including priority setting, application, review of application and public hearings. The group should review and have input to share at the October ECCEB meeting.

3. [12052](#) Afterschool and Summer Programming are Keys to School Success

Staff highlighted a report from the Wisconsin Council on Children and Families. The report focuses on Community Learning Centers.

Staff informed the group that traditionally Madison school district programs are those that receive Community Learning Centers funding, however, recently Goodman Atwood was awarded a 5-year federal grant for their teen and elementary programs.

Staff distributed a referral list of accredited centers that includes accredited school-age programs. Staff distributed a second list that includes school-age programs that are not accredited but reviewed by child care specialists as part of the Community Resources Program.

4. [12053](#) Child Care Assistance Report

Child Care Assistance year-to-date (period 10, Sept 6, 2008) was distributed. Staff summarized and highlighted contents of the report.

Brown inquired about the effect of potential 5% cut on tuition assistance funds. The contingency plan would mean an increase in the number of waiting list families and an increase in the length of time families remain on the waitlist.

Funding Process Review discussion continued.

Board returned to discussion of the funding process review.

Summary of comments/themes are as follows:

- Need for clearer and more defined roles between Board and staff with respect to asking questions, level of influence the staff should have, and individual staff member's ties to the agency.

- Program performance could be a point of reference in decision making for group and staff would have this information. More information from staff needed. Program performance evaluation could take the form of a checklist or scoring sheet and/or annual performance review.

- Keep in mind that individual staff may be more critical of programs than others and more willing to state/share these criticisms, and that the level of staff interaction with agencies varies.

- The Board members need to have greater familiarity with agency programs. What is the best way to develop this capacity? Possibilities include holding Board meetings at agencies or neighborhood sites, brief presentations by agencies in the regular Board agenda, and site visits by Board members individually or in pairs. Programs that do not send representatives to the Board meetings may not have the capacity/ability to lose staff time to do so and this cannot be held against them.

- Desire/need for a needs assessment that could be used in the priority setting and funding decision-making processes. How do providers/programs fit into what City needs, what the City wants to accomplish and other networks/collaborations. A map of the City showing programs and agencies would be helpful.

- Staff are exploring/examining efficiencies in the funding process and contract monitoring including review of administrative cost to OCS to monitor contracts, two year vs. one-year contracts, efficiencies in the application process.

- Program priorities – do we need to re-evaluate? How do you decide between good agencies meeting priority needs?

- How do we meet emerging issues proactively?

- Accreditation/ program reviews are done each year for each agency. Lots of information is gathered and identify what information would be helpful to pass along to the Board. A one-page summary of a review, for example.

- Not all programs across CSC, ECCEB and SCAC have the same evaluation of programs. Consideration regarding whether or not an evaluation process needs to be consistent across respective funded programs.

- A standards document that can be used across all programs that provides elements feedback, current status, description same information should go to all groups.

- Standardized method of information sharing.

- In contrast, if the ECCEB is solely responsible for funding decisions why does the Community Services Commission need the same information?

- Commission needs to know how decisions were made.

- Community Services Commission exercised option of moving funding from one program area to another.

Ragland stated that staff group is addressing same questions/issues/challenges and will report back.

5. [12054](#)

ECCEB Subcommittee

The subcommittee will consist of Lasky, Parker and Raschke.

In October annual grants will be discussed.

Raschke requested that allocation of grants to for profit agencies be added as October agenda item for discussion.

MATC Associate Degree for Licensing classes will be transitioned to the Associate Degree program.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Lasky. Seconded by Parker to adjourn the meeting. Motion passed by voice vote.