

4 R Kids Program and Service Committee Minutes
May 1, 2015
9:00 A.M.
Madison County Extension Office
117 N. John Wayne Drive
Winterset, Iowa 50273

Meeting convened at 9:00 A.M. and concluded at 11:30 A.M.

Attendance

Board members present Khristan Kaufman, Kendalyn Huff, Dena Owens, and Janice Jensen.
Others present Debra Schrader, Executive Director

Housekeeping (*information*)

Ground rules were reviewed.

Conflict of interest was discussed, there is no conflict of interest noted by committee members.

Janice volunteered to be the reporter for the board meeting May 21, 2015.

Debra Schrader will draft the minutes for the meeting.

Overview (*information*)

- This is the first year of a three year funding process and future funding and contractor performance will weigh heavily in the next two years.
- The committee reviewed the FY2016 request for proposals by utilizing Google spreadsheets for the RFP evaluation.
- All current contractors applied for funding and there was one new program.
- The committee reviewed the draft FY2016 allocations along with estimated carryover and drafted the FY2016 budget.
- It is to be noted the Board is in an unusual position, there is approximately 10% in F15 carryover which in turn allowed the committee to fill all funding requests.
- Grantees are to be cautioned as this is an unusual amount of carryover and future years funding may be vastly different.
- Due to the Board receiving model LOE status, the opportunity to utilize categorical funding in a flexible manner is allowed. Therefore, programs are allowed to be funded in a nontraditional manner - meaning categorical funds not allowed to fund programs will be allowed.
- Applicants are to be commended for their hard work and dedication to serving families.

Funding and Other Recommendations (*action requested*)

The following are recommendations for FY2016 pending, FY2015 carryover, state allocations, state program criteria, 4 R Kids Early Childhood Iowa Area board approval, Early Childhood Iowa approval, Department of Education approval and Department of Human Services approval. The recommendations and comments of the review are included on the following pages.

FY2016 Administration and Coordination Budgets

Agency	Program	Categorical fund Utilized	Notes	Funding
CIJDC	Board Admin	SR Admin EC Admin	Board expenses include marketing, board expenses, board member stipends, appreciation reception, audit costs, insurance deductible, copies, website, event sponsorship. This represents the same amount as FY15.	\$12,000 <i>EC and SR admin</i>
CIJDC	Fiscal Agent Services	SR Admin EC Admin	Fiscal agent and employer of record fees for FY2016; this is status quo and is the same cost as FY2015. There has been no change in the fiscal agent fees for 3 years.	\$10,000 <i>EC and SR admin</i>
CIJDC	ECI Director	SR Admin EC Admin SR Quality	A 2% raise was included on the director salary (approved at the April 16, 2015 Board meeting). Expenses include mileage, professional development, office expenses, and communication stipend.	\$77,385 (salary/benefits) \$12,600 (expenses)* <i>EC and SR Admin SR Quality</i>

The committee also recommends that once the FY15 books are closed and there are unallocated funds, an additional \$1,500 be allocated for professional development for the ECI Director.

Board Administrative Budget Line Items	
Fiscal Agent Fees	\$10,000.00
Board Insurance	\$1,600.00
Board Website	\$200.00
Annual Appreciation Reception	\$700.00
Marketing	\$1,000.00
4 Event Sponsorship (Toddlerfest, other, etc)	\$2,000.00
Copies	\$1,500.00
Board misc	\$1,000.00
Fiscal Audit Review (Agreed Upon Procedures)	\$2,000.00
Board Professional Development	\$500.00
Board Member Assistance/Stipends	\$500.00
Board insurance deductible	\$1,000.00
Total	\$22,000.00

Executive Director Budget Line Items	
Salary	\$62,155.00
FICA	\$4,662.00
IPERS	\$5,443.00
Health Benefits (no health, dental, optical or life insurance provided)	\$0.00
Workman's Compensation and Liability	\$2,523.00
Unemployment Insurance	\$2,602.00
Total	\$77,385.00
Executive Director Expenses Line Items	
Mileage (.39 per mile)	\$5,500.00
Professional Development	\$700.00
Communication Stipend (cell phone, long distance, internet, computers, software, printers)	\$3,840.00
Office expense (copies, paper, ink, office supplies, aircard, etc)	\$2,560.00
Total	\$12,600.00

Agency and Info	Benchmarks	Funding Requested	Notes/Comments	Funding Recommendation
<p>Dallas County Public Health Nursing Services</p> <p>(Short term home visitation)</p> <p>Model – Maternal Child Health</p> <p>(Serves prenatal or recent birth)</p>	<p>105 families 380 home visits 1.66 FTE</p>	<p>\$82,660</p>	<p>Application strengths: Good identification of the importance of stories. The Iowa Family Support Credential.</p> <p>Application areas of improvement: Need to work on referrals and collaboration with other family support programs.</p> <p>Other recommendations and/or comments: It is important that a short term family support program feed into other family centered programs.</p> <p>Contract language: 1. Contract language is to be added that the program shall be a feeder/referral source for ECI funded family support programs. This will be tracked monthly and reported quarterly. 2. Contract language is to be added that the program will work collaboratively with the ECI local coordinated intake system, additionally when the program receives a referral from the ECI local coordinated intake system, the program is to make contact with the family within 5 working days.</p>	<p>\$82,660</p> <p><i>SR family support</i></p>
<p>Lutheran Services in Iowa</p> <p>Intensive home visitation</p> <p>Model – Healthy Families America</p>	<p>36 families 780 home visits 2.27FTE</p>	<p>\$114,003</p>	<p>Application strengths: Evidenced based model. Appreciate the connection with ACES. Outstanding collaboration intent with Partners in Family Development and coordinated intake.</p> <p>Application areas of improvement: Low visit rate. Staffing appears to be a challenge.</p> <p>Other recommendations and/or comments: Concern the program cannot meet benchmarks, may need to revisit the targets. Committee will continue to monitor program for compliance.</p> <p>Contract language: Contract language is to be added that the program will work collaboratively with the ECI local coordinated intake system, additionally when the program receives a referral from the ECI local coordinated intake system, the program is to make contact with the family within 5 working days.</p>	<p>\$114,003</p> <p><i>SR family support</i></p>
<p>Partners in Family Development Inc</p> <p>Long Term Home visitation</p> <p>Model - Parents as Teachers</p>	<p>125 families 1,000 home visits 12 groups 3.875 FTE</p>	<p>\$292,478</p>	<p>Application strengths: Well showcases customization of the plan (i.e. evenings, weekends) in meeting needs of families. Parent Cafe is great strategy. Stellar work with marketing engagement and collaboration.</p> <p>Application areas of improvement: Proposal could be strengthened in the budget regarding the cost of the program as the benchmark marks have not changed from the previous year but the overall budget increased more than \$32,000. More information/explanation regarding the 135 referrals received versus those that accepted would have been helpful.</p> <p>Other recommendations and/or comments: It is highly encouraged to pursue additional funding to support the program.</p> <p>Contract language: Contract language is to be added that the program will work collaboratively with the ECI local coordinated intake system, additionally when the program receives a referral from the ECI local coordinated intake system, the program is to make contact with the family within 5 working days.</p>	<p>\$292,478</p> <p><i>SR family support</i></p>

Agency	Benchmarks	Funding Requested	Notes/Comments	Funding Recommendation
Southwestern Community College Long Home visitation Model – Parents as Teachers	25 families 340 home visits 12 groups 1.0 FTE	\$72,804	Application strengths: Iowa Family Support Credential. Use of collaboration to connect families is extraordinary. Family Cabinet is a great strategy. Sustainability plan was very well written. Application areas of improvement: None. Other recommendations and/or comments: Did not met the RFP technical review. Children screened for children with developmental delays was noted as 0, is that true? What is the plan to eliminate the waiting list? Contract language: Contract language is to be added that the program will work collaboratively with the ECI local coordinated intake system, additionally when the program receives a referral from the ECI local coordinated intake system, the program is to make contact with the family within 5 working days.	\$72,804 <i>SR family support</i>
Warren County Health Services Child care nurse consultant	100 visits 3 trainings 35 providers .4 FTE	\$37,126	Application strengths: Long standing CCNC staff along with staff qualifications. RFP clearly articulated best practices that were tied into the CCNC service. Application areas of improvement: Is there a significance of capturing the early learning providers served? Other recommendations and/or comments: None	\$37,126 <i>SR quality</i> <i>SR other</i>
New Opportunities Inc Child care nurse consultant	85 visits 4 trainings 40 providers .5 fTE	\$36,060	Application strengths: Gap filling for child care providers is good. Application areas of improvement: Lacked information regarding sustainability. Other recommendations and/or comments: Did not met the RFP technical review. Appeared the RFP followed the standards of state CCNC standards but did not provide information on operations.	\$36,060 <i>SR family support</i> <i>SR other</i> <i>Early Childhood</i>
Orchard Place/ Child Care Resource and Referral Incentives for attending child care providers	13 providers	\$4,751	Application strengths: High qualified trained staff. Collaboration with other agencies was exemplary. Application areas of improvement: Better explanation on how to improve recruitment efforts as well as how to engage providers. Other recommendations and/or comments: What lessons were learned in the past years to recruit providers?	\$4,751 <i>Early Childhood</i>
Dallas County Agricultural Extension District Quality Improvement Project for early learning environments	60 trainings 165 face to face contacts 500 parent contacts 1.25 fTE & 15 child care providers	\$94,654 & \$26,250	Application strengths: Engaging clients and learning of their interests. Cooperative case management. Significance based on qualified staff and the high return of investment of quality education. Updated the process used for providers to qualify for mini grants. Application areas of improvement: None. Other recommendations and/or comments: Goals were lofty but reasonable due to track record. Other funding was secured to support child care mini grants.	\$94,654 & \$26,250 Total contract amount \$121,204 <i>SR preschool</i> <i>SR other</i> <i>Early Childhood</i>

