



St. Louis Office for Developmental Disability Resources
Minutes of the Program Committee
February 17, 2022

Board Members Present:

William (Bill) Siedhoff

Nina North-Murphy

Cynthia Mueller, Committee Chairperson

Board Members Absent: Sherry Wibbenmeyer

Staff Members Present:

Shaelene Plank, Executive Director

Samantha Montgomery, Director of Service Coordination

Nate (Nathaniel) Head, Sr. Agency Relations Representative

Rachel Shapiro, Executive Assistant

Ebony Young, Agency Relations Representative

Guests Present: None

The meeting was called to order by Cynthia Mueller at 4:03 pm.

1. FY23 Funding Cycle Update – Nate Head

a. The committee went through the funding recommendations. 60 renewed programs have no changes; 5 have changes; 16 were recommended for reductions.

i. Of the five changes, 3 of them had no programmatic changes:

1. Pathways to Independence – Combining young adult and adult socialization. There will be a decrease in the budget by \$6,000 but will be the same program, data, and target population. There will be one line item on the budget instead of two.
2. St. Louis ARC Launch program is separating its Family Navigation into a different component.
3. Recreation Council – In the portal, we are combining multiple vouchers into one voucher. Tracking will be the same as before but will be one line item in the budget. Recommending a 20% reduction due to low usage. They can ask for an increase if anything changes.

ii. Two programmatic changes

1. Lifebridge afterschool program – The service does not fit in the childcare service category. More socialization. Will change service category and types. Target population shifting from younger children to transition age. The Lifebridge afterschool transportation award line item will change – people use the transportation service as part of the program, so we will eliminate the afterschool transportation line item in the budget and roll it into one line item. We support doing that. We do not support their request for an increase to their units (based on past usage). They asked because they think utilization will go up.
2. Paraquad’s Continuing Education program – Looking to expand their course catalog to include a healthy relationships class (ages 16-21). Will revise the current target population from adults not enrolled in high school to this new demographic. PLB is also on board with that expansion.

iii. Reductions – In 2021 \$1 million was left on the table (even without POS billing and adding new programs). Many agencies are optimistic in their projections to get as much funding as possible, but agencies are experiencing participation and staffing issues. We must make changes, so we don’t leave so much on the table every year. In March the committee will have the opportunity to review

applications. We looked at agencies who reported underutilizing their award. 16 programs came up. Nate highlighted some of these cases:

1. Still watching Canterbury Enterprises (may have more individuals come back to work). Recommending \$30,000 less. Looked at pre-COVID utilization as well. Reported that they may not return to normal levels. We have the capacity to restore some of these funds if things pick up.
 2. ESMW supported employment – they agreed to this reduction. Utilization down (COVID and staff shortages).
 3. ESMW Project Search high school program – have not been able to get into the host business at the VA hospital. Schools were not doing out-of-school work experiences. Looks like may be able to operate the program at the VA in 2023. When it is operating it is a great program (they hit their numbers and achieve great outcomes). We will return to the amount prior to the increase added for another training program that did not happen.
 4. Heartland industries – similar to Canterbury.
 5. MERS/Goodwill – ISLA services suffering due to staffing and participation; Sheltered workshop has been consistently under their target to serve 55 (even pre-COVID).
 6. Paraquad Continuing Ed – only doing virtual programming; as a result, participation is down. They are not going to provide in-person until the fall. They will probably not hit their target of 49.
 7. Preferred Family Healthcare ISLA service – low usage over past 3 fiscal years. Right-sizing their award. Not getting the referrals they received in the past. Client base remains the same. Staff shortages as well.
 8. St. Louis ARC supported employment – had high hopes but struggle to get participants. Discussion about hiring the right people for the city – people who can connect with the residents and want to work in the city.
 9. Judevine in-home support – Right-sizing the service. Only support 2 (not the targeted 15).
- b. 4 projects' renewal status is under review.
- i. Best Buddies – have tried to get into the schools for two years. Made some connections with non-public schools. Teachers could not commit to the program.
 - ii. Preferred family healthcare youth employment training – struggled to re-launch in the schools. Still working on how to adjust the program to provide it in the remote world.
 - iii. Center for Head Injury Services – Adaptive equipment. It is one of our priorities to bring on another AE provider. Will review against new adaptive equipment requests received.
 - iv. Paraquad supported employment – not supporting anyone. Do not anticipate serving anyone. Not recommending continuing that.
- c. New Projects: Received 7 requests so far and anticipate receiving another one or two.
- i. They include 2 AE programs, 1 employment training program, 1, family navigation project, and 1 self-determination in action project. All currently receive funding from other county boards. We have not finished our review of these.
 - ii. Discussion about family navigation vs. service coordination. Since we have 2-1-1 and service coordination, does it make sense to fund it? Need to continue reviewing it. Family Navigation – caseloads are higher. Nate and Ebony will research more.
- d. Conversation about what agencies are basing projections on. Have discussed within the Alliance what the future may look like. What will services look like? Trying to sit down with agencies (may have Sara lead

groups with agencies) and find out what we can do to support them. We will be having some conversations about that with our partner agencies and may come back with recommendations.

2. New FY22 Projects Update – Nate Head – they are up and running. Bringing in new families who had not been connected to supports. The portfolio is diversifying, the UCP project was slated to serve 10 and they are already at 6. Will be there before the fiscal year is over. Searching for a permanent location (goal is to have a clinic in the city).
3. DMH / State Budget Implications for TCM
 - a. Privatization of case management. Sam and Shaelene met with Sheila Wunning at DMH about our desire to expand TCM. She thinks the State will put out an RFI (request for interest) of current providers of TCM. Will have to see what it looks like when it comes out. We could take some county cases but have to be specific about the zip codes (not too far west). Waiting to see what goes through with the state budget and what the RFI looks like when it comes out. They know we are interested. CARF surveyor met with Angela Logan (DMH) and Angela told her they are happy with our services and hope we will expand our services.
4. Reviewing applications – AR will provide new requests and asked the committee if they had any specific applications they needed to see. The usual summary will suffice.

Call for a motion to adjourn – Cynthia Mueller - **Adjourned 5:06 pm.**

DocuSigned by:

Cynthia Mueller

6805DD5D6AFB475...

Cynthia Mueller, Secretary

3/14/2022

Date Approved