Child Development Coordinating Council Minutes  
April 15, 2015

Attending

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voting Members Present:</th>
<th>Mary Groen, Erin Clancy, LauraBelle Sherman-Proehl, Betty Zan, and Carla Peterson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voting Members Absent:</td>
<td>Lance Roorda, Colleen Dunn, Julie Ingersoll, Marguerite Macek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Voting Members Present:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Voting Members Absent:</td>
<td>Jeanie Wade-Nagle, Cathy Wheatcraft, Tom Rendon, Tracey Mavis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff to Council:</td>
<td>Amy Stegeman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary:</td>
<td>Gloria Hamilton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Discussion Points

The meeting was called to order by Mary Groen and it was determined that a quorum was not present.

Approval of February 25, 2015 Minutes

Minutes were shared via email prior to the meeting and provided as a handout for the meeting. Mary Groen asked for any comments or edits to the February 25, 2015 minutes. No edits were recommended. The Council agreed by consensus to move the approval of the minutes forward for an electronic vote.

*Electronic voting results: The minutes were approved unanimously.

Program Updates: Amy Stegeman

Preschool:

Mary Groen shared that three applicants for the FY16 Shared Vision Preschool Grant submitted a Request for Reconsideration. Any submitted requests for reconsideration are forwarded to the Council per Chapter 64 in order to provide a response and supporting documentation. Mary Groen, as Chair to the Council, reviewed the requests, the related laws, and determined what documentation should be forwarded to Director Buck. She then worked with Amy to ensure this was submitted within the 20 day timeline allowed. Copies of the Director’s decisions were received indicating all three requests for reconsideration were denied. Therefore, there was no change in the proposed awards for FY16 Shared Visions Preschool Grants.

The Council had a brief discussion related to future considerations for grant proposals. Some topics included braiding/blending of funds, partnering across a community, one application for an organization even if having multiple sites for services, and connections to ECI.

Amy provided the following additional updates:

- Quarterly payments are being sent out as scheduled;
- Meeting with IT Department to discuss the year-end report; the application had some tweaks when moved to the Portal last year and there are some updates needed; and
- Unique ID numbers for each Shared Visions Preschool child have been created and will be uploaded into the TS GOLD system; grantees will not need to do this themselves anymore.

The Council had a brief discussion related to data collection at the state level, such as what is being collected and how it is being used. It was thought that it may be beneficial to see the data available to help us understand where kids are, what types of programs they are attending, how many at-risk children are receiving services as well as whether preschool is making a difference for children entering kindergarten.

- List of awarded grantees for FY 16 is available on the DE web-site
Parent Support:
Amy provided the following updates:
- Quarterly payments are being sent out as scheduled
- Mid-year reports were sent out. Received little feedback from grantees related to the accuracy of the data; Amy will be reviewing and addressing the collection of year-end data over the next few months

Parent Support Program Policy: Amy Stegeman
The Council discussed whether this policy was needed at this time. It was determined that the section of the policy related to data collection through REDCap was not needed. This requirement is already covered in current law and the assurances section of the application. The Council agreed by consensus to move the staff requirement forward for an electronic vote.
*Electronic voting results: The Policy Regarding Staff Requirements was approved unanimously.

Council Recommendation Regarding the Awards for FY16 Parent Support Grants: Amy Stegeman
The review and decision making process for parent support awards were reviewed. Amy provided an overview that included the following:
- Confidentially of information emphasized
- 14 applications submitted
- Proposing to award 6 of the 14
- Proposed awards/decisions are based on receiving funding similar to the FY15 appropriation; final award amounts will need to be based on FY16 state appropriation
- Currently, $815,261 of the state appropriation has been applied toward parent support grants.
- All but one of the nine previously funded grantees submitted an application.

The following information regarding the review process was shared:
- Reviewers used the scoring rubric provided to applicants to score applications
- Every application was reviewed by a minimum of 2 reviewers (all reviewers had completed a conflict of interest form and completed training).
- Additional process used to determine alignment between reviewer scores for consistency and to determine if additional reviews were necessary. Scores that were one point different on the scoring scale were considered aligned (For example, a score of 3 and a score of 4 were considered aligned while a score of 2 and a score of 4 was not aligned). Additional reviews may have occurred for the whole application or a particular section of an application based on results of the first review round.
- Final scores were determined based on an average of the 2 aligned review scores.
- Data was placed into a spreadsheet with no program identifying information visible and presented to a Department Team for implementation of a decision-making process to determine proposed awards.

As a reminder to the Council, the following information from the Funding Opportunity Details for the application was reviewed:

*Due to limited funding, grant awards will be targeted to those areas or communities where there is a high percentage of child poverty, a high number of unserved eligible families, and evidence of factors creating an increased need for quality education support programs serving parents of children with risk factors.
*The Department and CDCC are committed to ensuring there is statewide distribution of funds while providing funds to programs serving parents of children identified as most at-risk. The number of grants to be awarded will be determined based on quality of grant application, established need, and...*
available funding. Budget negotiation may be necessary to accommodate the obligation of all funds. All grant awards are contingent upon the 2015 legislative appropriation.

The above information was used to develop the criteria for decision-making as described below:

1. Documentation of Need
   a. As represented in the application section
      i. high percent of child poverty
      ii. high level of unmet needs/unserved eligible families
      iii. factors creating increased need for quality education support programs serving parents of children with risk factors

2. Statewide Distribution
   a. Ensure families with children who are at-risk in all areas of the state may have the opportunity for programming

3. Application Quality
   a. Represents the quality of comprehensive services and overall programming

Steps followed to make Proposed Award Determinations:

Level 1:
   • Total Score of Documentation of Need is 90% or higher
   • Application Quality (total score) at or above 94% (median quality = 89%)
   • $640,763 awarded

Level 2:
   • Total Quality of Grant Application at or above 90%
   • Highest Documentation of Need Score
   • Awarded one more application at $129,178 for a total of $769,941

Level 3:
   • Total Quality of Grant Application at or above 90%
   • Total Score of Documentation of Need is 90% or higher
   • Statewide Distribution - At least 1 program within each quadrant of the state - happened naturally through level one and two with the exception of one quadrant within the state
   • Anticipated Available Funds – Need to Allow for Adequate Funding
      o 2 applications remained after the above criteria were implemented
      o only one could be adequately funded with remaining amount of anticipated funding
      o Awarded one application at $64,300 for a total of $834,241 (above the anticipated appropriation)

*All Grant offers will be contingent on the final state appropriation and meeting program requirements.

The Council was reminded of the deadline to notify FY16 Shared Visions Parent Support applicants of their award status by April 29, 2015. After a short discussion, the Council made a recommendation related to the third level of the decision-making process to suggest using the following:

Level 3:
   • Statewide Distribution – At least 1 program within each quadrant of the state (happened naturally through level one and two with the exception of one quadrant within the state)
   • Score of Documentation of Need is 90% or higher
• Total Quality of Grant Application at or above 90%
• Highest Total Quality of Grant Application
• Awarded one application at $163,415.32 for a total of $933,356.32 (above the anticipated appropriation)

It was the Council’s determination that this would best represent funding being offered to the applicants with the highest need and highest application quality. This maintained a proposal for 6 of the 14 applicants being awarded grants. Since the overall dollar amount requested by the six applicants was much higher than the anticipated appropriation, the Council recommended the following:
• use the remaining amount not allocated to preschool grantees for the parent support grants
• determine if requested budgets could be decreased for individual applicants
• offer a reduced award amount for each of the awarded applicants by applying an equal decreased percentage (approximately 90% of what was requested by the applicant)

Amy will take the recommendations back to DE administration prior to making final grant award announcements.

The Council agreed by consensus to hold an electronic vote to approve the decision-making process for the FY16 Shared Visions Parent Support Grants as amended above and contingent upon the state appropriation.
*Electronic voting results: The decision-making process was unanimously approved.

At this time, the Grantee names were disclosed to Council members with the modified decision-making steps reflected in the results. The Council agreed by consensus to hold an electronic vote to recommend the DE award FY16 Parent Support Grants and notify applicants of their award status.
*Electronic voting results: The recommendation to award FY16 Parent Support grants and notify applicants was unanimously approved.

Meeting Dates and Agenda Items for FY16
There was a short discussion related to Iowa Code 256A, the duties of the Council, appointees designated for Council representation, and future agenda items. Some of the conversation items included:
• the need to send letters to those listed in law to verify designees and ensure adequate representation for the Council in FY16
• a possible need to develop by-laws and address items such as attendance to meetings and length of membership on the Council
• how some of the duties of the Council as stated in law are outdated and no longer needed because it is addressed by other groups now (ECI); can this be addressed or should we consider recommending a change to the law
• the desire to request data for review by the Council
• the need to update the program evaluation for Shared Visions Preschool Programs
• the need to elect a new Co-Chair to begin in September of 2015; Mary Groen will be the Chair through the July 2015 meeting and Erin Clancy will become the Chair in September 2015.
• the Council decided to keep the July 2015 conference call on the calendar
• meeting dates for FY16 were proposed using the third Wednesday of the month (see below) and it was agreed upon by the Council to move these to an electronic vote for approval
*Electronic voting results: The proposed meeting dates for FY16 were unanimously approved.
• another future topic mentioned was to consider having Julie Ingersol present on the Professional Development CCDF 2016 State Plan

In summary, the Council identified goals for the next year to include program evaluation, data collection, by-laws, and collaboration plans with other early childhood boards and councils.

CDCC Member Updates:
Erin: CCDBG is under reauthorization and seeking input for development of the state plan. There are several new parts such as pre-service orientation, increased number of professional development hours, consideration of the recalibration of Quality Rating System (QRS) and tiered accreditation. A draft can be sent on for comment. A work group for professional development is making a recommendation to ECI for registry.

Betsy: UNI is bringing back a post-BA endorsement program that will be entirely online. One would need initial teacher licensure and it would take a year plus two summers to complete the endorsement. The program starts in May and applications are due now.

LauraBelle: no updates

Carla: Iowa State got approval for online bachelor’s degree in early care and education. This is not a teacher licensure program.

Mary: IGDIs remains voluntary and is not required for preschools. There are trainings being offered if districts are interested. The school accreditation process is undergoing changes and the preschool monitoring for SWVPP will be part of this system. It will be going to a tiered accreditation system and it is being piloted with a desk audit and then site visits being made based on initial results and levels of need. Another recent change is that childcare programs in school buildings will need to be licensed by DHS and will not have the option to follow DE standards.

Public Comment: None - The Council recommended moving this to the beginning of the agenda in the future.

Adjourn
The Council members present agreed to adjourn the meeting. No motion was made due to the lack of a quorum.

Future Meeting Agenda Items
See agenda items above.

Future Meeting Dates
The next Council meeting dates are:
- September 16, 2015
- November 18, 2015
- February 17, 2016
- April 20, 2016
- July 20, 2016 – Optional Conference Call