



St. Louis Office for Developmental Disability Resources
Minutes of the Program Committee
February 5, 2021

Board Members Present:

William (Bill) Siedhoff
Cynthia Mueller, Committee Chairperson

Board Members Absent:

Nina North-Murphy
Sherry Wibbenmeyer

Staff Members Present:

Shaelene Plank, Executive Director
Nate (Nathaniel) Head, Senior Agency Relations Representative

Rachel Shapiro, Executive Assistant
Ebony Young, Agency Relations Representative

Guests Present:

Mark Keeley, St. Louis ARC
Alison LaMont, Delta Gamma Center
Heather Lytle, F.A.C.T.

Rachel Riney, Best Buddies
Erin Sueleman, Down Syndrome Association
Rachel Svejkosky, F.A.C.T.

The meeting was called to order by Cynthia Mueller at 4:01pm.

1. Updates from new agencies – The committee heard presentations from our four newest agencies, Best Buddies, Delta Gamma Center, FACT, and Down Syndrome Association, about their programs.
2. St. Louis ARC request (Mark Keeley)
 - a. Although he already put it in writing, Mark again thanked DD Resources and the Easter Region Alliance for how they responded to the pandemic. Also, the fact that all SB40s were aligned before this happened allowed for a collective and rapid response. All agencies are equally grateful for the response.
 - b. St. Louis ARC's Parents Learning Together program – It is for parents with cognitive disabilities, teaching them to raise children in healthy safe environments. This has been done virtually since March. Curriculum presented in 6 areas: medical & health care, child safety, positive discipline, child growth and development, family planning and STDs, and developing natural supports. FY20 we served 43 parents and 95 children. This year 39 parents and 86 kids. Since the program's inception, St. Louis ARC has always had to raise additional funds to cover it; however, the gap between what they have to raise and what DD Resources gives has grown larger over the years. He respectfully requested the committee review their rates and consider a rate increase (individual and group rates). They are seeking \$85,406 to narrow this gap. Does not affect their need to continue raising funds because costs will continue to increase.
 - c. St. Louis ARC originally approached us at the end of June. They thought they could raise the money but had to forego their largest fundraising opportunities. We asked them to track their actual expenses and said we would look at it again. DDR did not know what our financial picture would be. Family Forward is a program that was discontinued, which freed up \$20,000. Also, there is \$66,000+ not being utilized by agencies for programs that cannot operate during the pandemic this year only.
 - d. The committee will consider reallocating the unused \$20,000 Family Forward allocation to the Parents Learning Together program on an ongoing basis, AND also help fill the gap this year only with the \$66,000+ from other agencies.
 - e. Parents Learning Together is a critical program. Concerned we only have \$20K ongoing and the needs will remain. The committee agreed that they could provide the funding (\$20,000 + \$66,000) for this fiscal year, of which \$20,000 would be ongoing, but would need additional information to recommend granting the additional \$66,000 in following years. Decided to move on to next agenda items to better

inform decision. Mark acknowledged that they will always be fundraising for their services; however, they cannot continue to sustain how much they will be raising. If they can lessen that gap going forward, they would appreciate that assistance. Sees the need for the next couple of fiscal years. Committee will revisit this request at the end of the meeting.

3. Mid-year funding report (Nate Head)

- a. According to fiscal, we are projecting approximately \$400,000 of program budget could go unspent in FY21 due to agencies not utilizing allocated funds. Proposing to reallocate to one-time individual assistance program – to support individuals and their families maintain healthy, safe environments, prevent crises, and maintain services. Nate proposed \$100,000 to be allocated to eligible agencies with the contingency of continued need in these areas.
- b. Options to do this:
 - i. All-inclusive option – provide aid in areas of housing, health and transportation. We attached some output reporting requirement. Asking agencies to track individuals they have helped in those areas. Each agency would have access to these funds and determine the eligibility of the individual. Expectation is that individuals would have already exhausted their opportunities in the community. This would be a last resort.
 - ii. Technology-focused – opportunity for individuals to access programs and services virtually. Agency will have ability to determine need based on individual's financial need. Also supposed to have exhausted all other community financial resources. Output reporting requirements – agencies track and report to us individuals who access tablets, phones, data plans, etc. See success with this with Rec Council. Can help people continue to receive services.
 - iii. Independent Living Assistance Fund – ILAP. ISLA providers would be able to access this fund immediately. Help people access community immediately. DDRB and PLB have already been offering this service. Our ISLA providers have been asking if we could provide this as well.
 - iv. Combine options 2 and 3 – still figuring out how to manage.
- c. The committee asked how much input was from provider agencies in determining the needs? Partner review meetings have been completed and we gained information from those about what individuals need. They need technology, data, and living / health needs. All options are legitimate. Oversight is the concern. Will people exhaust all other options? Providers are under pressure. Want to be good stewards of the money we receive. Maybe we can work something out with what Recreation Council is already doing with providing tablets. Their goals are connected to leisure and socialization programs, but perhaps we can expand this model and offer it to other agencies in other areas.
- d. Mark Keeley shared his opinion about what his agency has been seeing regarding needs: Transportation to employment (Uber gift cards for people in employment program). Food is also a need – but they may be able to get it through other resources. Technology and transportation are large needs.
- e. Recommended to add technology to option 1. Need more accountability regarding the eligibility requirement. Need parameters to give agencies guidance as to how the money can be applied. The committee requested that the Agency Relations department expand option 1 and bring it back to them – include eligibility criteria and oversight. They will have it ready for program committee to look at and bring to full board to look at before the next Board meeting (on February 11, 2021).

4. FY22 Funding Cycle

- a. FY21 budget was \$5.7 million. Looking like we might be at \$5.8 million in FY22. Not looking at major changes to funding across all the agencies. A few modifications. Finance team is looking at COLAs.
- b. Need to discuss a few adjustments as we get closer: School respite programs decreased, transportation decreased, some organizations have been successful in receiving grant money and no longer need as

much from us, social enterprise should be gradually reduced over period of 3 years, and some programs are phasing out. Board needs to know we will have some available funds as we look at all the requests.

5. Return to St. Louis ARC request

- a. **Bill moved to provide funds for this fiscal year as Mark requested and will ask the Board to approve the ongoing reallocation of the \$20,000. St. Louis ARC will be requesting additional units (\$87,000) for FY22, which will be looked at through normal funding cycle. Cindy seconded the motion. All in favor. Motion approved.**

6. Adaptive equipment RFP (Nate Head)

- a. We have an adaptive equipment program with Center for Head injury services. Past few years, we noticed the number of individuals being served is decreasing and administrative costs are remaining the same or increasing.
- b. We are moving forward with an RFP to bring in additional adaptive equipment and technology providers to expand that service (more individuals in the City can benefit from that program). Working on this through the Alliance.
- c. Looking at rolling it out for FY22
- d. We have a relationship with Maryville University (OT grad students) and are working with Easterseals and the Alliance in identifying individuals who could benefit from the assistive technology and reduce staffing needs. We were also approached by Wash U to do this service with us and meet that need. Wash U would be able to provide services to all ages.
- e. Program Committee would like to see the RFP when we put it out.

7. Other

- a. How does the committee want to review service profiles when we get our funding requests this year? Last year we read all of those with new programs and changes. This time we do not have new programs. Will bring those with major changes for full review, as well as those we specifically want to bring to your attention.

Bill moved to close the meeting. Cindy seconded by proxy and the meeting was closed at 5:32pm.

DocuSigned by:

Cynthia Mueller

8B05DB66B6AFB475...

Cynthia Mueller, Secretary

2/16/2021

Date Approved