



The Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC)  
April 25, 2008 Meeting  
Ramada Inn and Conventional Center  
Eau Claire

**Members Present:** Sandra Butts (Chair), Nicole Bowman-Farell, Diane Fett, Sharon Fleischfresser, Jill Haglund, Linda Tuchman, Norma Vrieze

**Wisline Teleconference:** Julie Walsh, Theresa Walske (Guest)

**Guest:** Lori Wittemann

**State Staff:** Carol Noddings Eichinger, Jacqueline Moss

Chair Sandra B opened the meeting at 9:00 a.m. with round table introductions of attendees. The review of February 2008 minutes revealed an error on Page 4 (from 'Birth to 3' to 'Birth to 6'). Sandra B asked that the minutes be accepted after the correction and the Council members agreed. There were no general public present for comment.

**Public Speaking at Council Meetings-**

Jacqueline M outlined information researched on rules for any public member addressing the Council and time limits allotted for this (see handout "Other Councils Public Speaking Rules").

Carol E brought and discussed correspondences requested in the last meeting concerning parent Bridget Roleck's issues on vision-impaired Birth to 3 children. Ms. Roleck didn't need mediation and was pleased with contacts concerning her child and Birth to 3.

Linda T wondered if the Council should vote on adopting other councils' rules on public speaking time allotment; Jill H. suggested allotting time for public speaking at the beginning or end of Council meetings, that it should be at the Chair's discretion and should be 'stand-alone time'. Nicole B. commented that a disclaimer should be attached to the Council's website and all public notices of Council meetings that the Council is not a mediator.

**Directive:** This will be added to ICC website. They should be guidelines not rules, and they should be linked to select survey.

**Motion:** Jill H motioned that the ICC have a two-way address of-

- 1) 15 minutes designated at every meeting for public speaking;
- 2) Public speaker request Chair issue 5 minutes for their issue and that the Executive Steering Committee determines if appropriate for speaker to attend meeting.

This prompted more discussions/suggestions - one of which suggested a one- or two-sentenced description clarifying the Council's role. Carol E asked that ICC members tell staff what would be appropriate on the website. She suggested Sandy Blakeney be invited to a Council meeting to help develop the ICC website.

**Second:** Sharon F seconded the motion and its additions; the motion carried unanimously.

**Determinations-**

A discussion on how to start the process of criteria recommended by the ICC that will be transparent ensued. This year, all counties cleaned up data that was submitted for the annual

report and staff is waiting for the outcome from federal. Determinations will be issued sometime in June after staff receives charts with federal Determination for the state.

Theresa W outlined data for each Indicator and fielded questions along with Lori W and Carol E regarding county results. The question for the ICC to consider is: The proposed determination criteria are the same for all compliance indicators. **Should the criteria be different for Indicator 8? If yes, what are the alternative proposals for the criteria?**

Natural environments were discussed for child care programs. Nicole B suggested that parents are not always included in deciding if child care is actually a “natural environment” for that child and suggested closing the loophole that might “require” a parent to place a child in child care.

Indicator 5 and 6 are unique to counties – respect for cultural diversity in reaching out to families. The ICC should consider appropriate targets and determine if ‘uniformity’ should be the standard.

Though 11 counties had un-corrected required actions that had lasted over one year, at this time only two counties of those counties remained in that status and had corrective actions against them; one has been corrected and the other is being worked with to correct. This will clear our enforcement.

Indicators 8A-C:

These indicators prompted discussions on DPI’s perspective? Have schools and districts been informed? Jill H stated there is no common statement to make; should there be requirements or incentives? It would be best to meet well before 90 days of a child’s third birthday but what is the understanding? Should we work for intersection/dovetailing/uniformity? This is something to go to the LEAs with. Jill H has information on the DPI website.

Diane F pointed out that schools need to know that information is needed in order to meet federal requirements. There will be a discussion of a ‘new script’ to help counties prepare families if the finalized regs do require “identified notification” at a future meeting.

A discussion of new features in the reporting system to capture Indicators 1, 7, 8, and 9 – no flexibility with federal requirement, has to be 100 percent. 8A and B will remain the same. For 8C the recommendation is that counties be “rated” on their data for actually having a TPC this year, rather than the timeliness.

Indicator14: “validity of data” should be kept at plus or minus this year.

### **Workgroups-**

Sandra B asked how committees should be made up. She’d like to know what other states are doing with the fiscal and Medicaid portions of their committee make-up, and what other federal dollars are available.

ICC Meeting-Eau Claire

April 25, 2008

Page 3

Diane F and Norma V discussed new HMO and MA issues in their counties and how some families are opting out because of co-pays being increased on them. They said the enhanced rate

won't go to counties but to fee-for-services entities. They have e-mails from counties attesting the increased cost of co-pay and enhanced rates and counties not knowing what they don't know yet. Diane F and Norma V discussed BadgerCare (Standard and Plus) and the percentage of co-pays – they wanted something e-mailed to them about modifications to the contrary.

Nicole B discussed the tribes and tribal clinics, Medicaid, interagency and tribal government. GLITC is looking for federal dollars to tap into also. Sandra B wondered if it would be advantageous to poll former members to explore different avenues of funding. Linda T will review percent of dollars allotted in 1993 implementation statewide on up to present. Linda T will provide information giving background into ICC development.

Child find implications discussed-

1. Broad-based eligibility meeting strict criteria,
2. Uniqueness of each county's population served
3. Need to serve more children under the age of one

Model effective but system not funded.

Lori W discussed low-incidence communities and providers explaining what Birth to 3 does for families; evaluate and determine what the child needs; same process and thinking whatever the child's need. State level fully staffed is helpful where services are provided; frequency and intensity bring all pieces together. Would ICC members like to join Birth to 6? Referring to ICC group and look at funding. How intact are workgroups? Who's on the workgroups and willing to participate? The Council needs more people to fill vacant seats and to volunteer for workgroups.

There were further discussions concerning the make-up of former workgroups and the by-laws that dictate how people are selected to serve on the Council in specific capacities. Whoever is chosen to serve on ICC committees has to be endorsed by the administration of DPI and DHFS and cleared with the Governor's office.

Information about the next ICC meeting will be discussed in e-mails to members and a date and location will be decided then.

Chair Sandra B adjourned the meeting at 11:30 and Council members joined the Circles of Life luncheon.