



# City of Columbia, Missouri

## Meeting Minutes - Final

### Human Services Commission

---

Tuesday, March 15, 2016  
7:00 PM

Regular

Department of Public  
Health and Human  
Services  
Conference Room 1  
1005 W. Worley

---

#### I. CALL TO ORDER

Ford called the meeting to order at 7:03 pm.

**Present:** 7 - Amy Camp, Tonia Compton, Stacy Ford, Mark Jones, Sharon Schattgen, Diane Suhler and Justin Thomas

**Excused:** 1 - Nathan First

#### II. APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA

Jones moved to approve the agenda. Camp seconded the motion and without opposition the motion passed.

#### III. APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016 MEETING MINUTES

Camp moved to approve the minutes. Thomas seconded the motion and without opposition the motion passed.

#### IV. OLD BUSINESS

##### A. City Social Services Funding Policy

Hollis stated a draft revised policy was sent to the commission prior to the meeting. Hollis recommended the policy exclude direct financial assistance such as utility and rent payments as well as childcare subsidies. Hollis stated rent and utility assistance were black holes and all of the social services funding could be spent on just one of these services. Hollis stated the City already provides utility assistance. Hollis stated it was hard for these types of programs to show performance measures. Hollis reminded the commission that the City already provides and subsidizes transit so services providing bus passes would be excluded. Suhler asked if the City offers free bus passes. Hollis stated that some council members have suggested this but at this time the City only offers half fare bus passes for low-income persons and students. Compton asked about discounted bus passes for college students. Hollis stated he did not think the City currently offers this but that the City does have transit contracts with some of the student housing providers. Suhler stated she believed this topic would be revisited in the future as she is on the City's transportation commission and they are considering transit costs and fares. Hollis reminded the commission that

funding for VAC's last proposal to provide bus passes was not recommended for funding based on the rationale that the social services funding was for the purchase of services the City cannot or did not want to provide and the City clearly provides transit services.

Hollis stated there were changes needed within the organization requirements based on the current Organization profile in the joint funding management system. Hollis stated additions to the organizational requirements included an advisory board roster, information about the top five compensated employees, licensure information and accreditation information. Hollis stated that if the provider organization capacity evaluation process is discontinued, he is recommending requiring the organization by laws in the Organization Profile as well as asking if the organization has a conflict of interest policy, whistleblower policy, business continuity plan, and records retention policy and schedule. Hollis asked if any further documents should be required. Suhler asked if the organization's sexual harassment policy should be required. Hollis stated this was not required because agencies certify they do not discriminate and sexual harassment is included in this. Hollis stated the language under section ten regarding monitoring was adjusted to mirror county language. Hollis stated the changes to the third bullet point under contract requirements were based on a change requested by the University. Hollis stated the specific dates would be removed from the policy as they are available on the funding website and in each RFP. Hollis stated he would remove the preliminary recommendations portion as well as the appeals portion and asked if there was any further discussion. Compton asked about the prohibition against religious discrimination as outlined on page seven. Compton asked if discrimination included a church run program refusing a homosexual program participant. Hollis stated that this situation would be covered by the non-discrimination certification and is also covered by the City's non-discrimination ordinance. Hollis stated that proposals have been denied in the past because of this issue. Ford asked about the change regarding the age definition for children and youth. Hollis stated this would be changed next year so it would not affect current contracts.

Hollis stated he will send the revised final policy in advance of the next meeting.

#### B. FY2017 Social Services Funding Allocation Process

Hollis stated there was discussion at the last meeting regarding dropping the applicant organization capacity evaluation process. There was no further discussion. There was a consensus to drop this component of the allocation process.

Hollis distributed a draft revised RFP process with revised key dates. Hollis stated the current RFP process is open from June 1st to December 31st, which he stated was a very lengthy period of time. Hollis stated he would like to push the RFP issuance back to July 1st. Hollis stated that the mid-contract reports and proposal were both due July 31st and it was challenging to have both deadlines at the same time. Hollis stated the proposal submission information session would change from July 1st to August 1st with participants attending after their letter of intent was submitted and approved. Hollis stated the proposal forms would be made available right after the information session. Hollis stated the proposal deadline would be August 31st. Hollis recommended the preliminary recommendation step be dropped as well as the appeal process. Hollis stated that there was only one appeal in the last 10 years and that he knew of no other funding processes that include preliminary recommendations or appeals. Hollis stated the commission and staff recommendations were essentially preliminary recommendations to council and that applicants could appeal to council via

public comment, as with all other contract recommendations. Hollis stated this would mean the preliminary funding work session would no longer be necessary. Ford asked if the council can change the funding recommendations. Hollis stated the council could but would either have to reduce allocations for one or more providers and/or allocate additional resources. Hollis said the one time council did so during his tenure it used discretionary funds to contract for a program that was not recommended by the commission. Jones reminded the commission that they were a recommending body only and the council makes the final decision. Hollis stated the site visits would still be based on the letters of intent and could be completed in August or in September. Hollis stated the downside of doing the site visits in August is that there is a possibility that an agency would submit a letter of intent but would not submit a full proposal or submit a proposal that was found to be unresponsive. Hollis stated that the site visits were challenging last year due to a lack of commissioner participation. Hollis stated that there must be a commitment to participate in the commission site visits; otherwise, this part of the process should be dropped. Hollis stated that the basic needs programs site visits may be easier as many of these visits can be done in the evening. Schattgen stated it did not make sense to do site visits before proposal submission deadline when considering the investment of time. Hollis stated there was also the potential that if the site visits were conducted during the proposal submission period, there could be unintended consequences such as inadvertently influencing what is being proposed. Schattgen asked if the proposals are read in the same time frame as the site visits. Hollis stated this is the current process. Hollis stated that under the current process, if an agency submits a proposal that is unresponsive, the site visit is canceled. Hollis asked if the commission members read the proposals before going on the site visits. Suhler stated that she completed the site visits before reading the proposals. Hollis stated he has received only positive feedback about the site visits from both commissioners and providers. Suhler asked if the site visits would be moved. Hollis stated the proposed changes move the site visits back along with the proposal reviews. Hollis stated that the potential changes to the commission calendar included cancelling the September meeting and moving the October and November meetings to the second Tuesdays of the month. Hollis stated that moving the meetings to earlier in the month would better facilitate the revised process. Hollis stated that adding a meeting in late June was also a possibility. Hollis stated that this new timing would reduce the time to review proposals by one week. Hollis asked if the commission thought that 4.5 weeks was enough time to review the proposals and conduct site visits. Suhler asked how many proposals could be anticipated. Hollis stated that his best guess was 12 proposals. Thomas asked if the October meeting would be changed from the 18th to the 11th. Hollis stated that was what was proposed in order to give the agencies two weeks to respond to proposal comments. Hollis reminded the commission that there were some agencies with multiple programs which would mean less site visits. Camp stated the new arrangement was manageable but was a lot to do within one month. Suhler stated that she didn't think the commission members needed more time, but perhaps the staff did need the extra time. Schattgen asked if the applicants received two weeks to prepare their responses to proposal issues. Hollis stated that this was the current process. Schattgen asked if some time from the two week agency response time can be taken to allow more work time for staff. Hollis stated that the October meeting could remain on the third Tuesday as a possible solution but that he thought he had enough time in the proposed process. Hollis stated the intent of the proposed changes was to give the commissioners the most time, not necessarily to give the staff more time. Hollis stated that all agencies have access to the process information and deadlines on the web site

at all times. Schattgen agreed that the agencies had sufficient notification. Ford asked the commission if they would like to keep the current process or adjust it. Compton stated she did not have a preference. Jones asked if the September, October, and November meeting dates would all need to be adjusted. Hollis stated that the revised draft calendar does reflect the changes for all three months. Hollis asked if the commission would like to plan on a June meeting where the finalized RFP can be reviewed. Ford asked what could be done if the commission takes four months off and an issue arises. Hollis stated that the Community Development Commission takes several months off. Jones agreed. Camp stated that extra meetings were not necessary, but did ask about the issue analysis. Hollis stated he, the county, and the United Way will be meeting with the University staff in April regarding re-starting this process. Hollis asked what the commission thought about the June and September meetings. Suhler stated that the September meeting could be canceled, but June should be scheduled and could be canceled in the future if necessary. Hollis asked if the commission would like to schedule a meeting on June 28th. Jones agreed that date was fine. Camp also agreed. Hollis stated he would suggest the commission permanently change meeting dates to the second Tuesday of each month beginning in 2017. Ford suggested the commission schedule a June 28th meeting, cancel the September meeting, and adjust the October and November meeting dates. Jones agreed. Hollis stated he would revise the calendar and forward to all commission members. Schattgen asked if the December meeting was reserved for the presentation to council. Hollis stated that was correct and reminded the commission that all members were asked to attend in support while he and the chair presented.

Hollis stated that there was a discussion at the last meeting regarding the citations criterion in the proposal ratings criteria. Hollis stated commissioner First had recommended expanding expectations for the criterion and changing the scale from 1 to 5. Hollis a draft revised rating document, reflective of the proposed changes, was sent to the commission prior to the meeting. Schattgen asked if anyone was tasked with checking references. Hollis stated he does this. Ford stated she did not feel this should be one of the criteria. Hollis stated there have been serious issues in the past with citations. Schattgen stated that literature-based citations could be very informative. Hollis stated agencies should be citing legitimate information. Ford asked if the agencies needed to cite journals. Hollis stated that agencies should be citing journals or other legitimate sources and not newspapers articles or editorials. Hollis stated this information was covered during the information session and Compton stated that good citations were necessary for agencies to gain legitimacy. Ford stated that good citations did not necessarily mean a better agency and stated she believed there should be no penalties for those program staff members who did not have the education or expertise to cite in a particular way. Hollis stated this was why further expectations were added to the criterion. Ford asked who checked the citations. Hollis stated he did but the commissions should as well. Compton and Schattgen stated they would check citations as well. Suhler asked if the citations were incorporated into the proposal as well as being listed. Hollis stated the citations must be listed parenthetically within the text. Jones reminded the commission that the reference list was one rating and the worst that would happen was that an agency would lose four points. Jones stated the proposals were viewed as a whole and not as singular elements. Camp stated agencies should include relevant material. Thomas asked where programs include best practice information. Hollis stated this was to be done in the program overview. Hollis reminded the commission that they do not force rank agencies. Hollis asked if the commission would like to modify the criteria as suggested or table

the discussion. Thomas stated he did not necessarily want to modify the criterion. Camp asked if the criteria matched the application. Hollis stated yes they do follow the content of the proposal. Hollis stated that technically a program can write a proposal without including citations. Schattgen stated that citing evidence and information is more important than the formatting of citations. Schattgen asked where the programs reference best practices as evidenced by literature. Hollis stated this is the program overview. Thomas stated this was covered in the program description. Hollis stated the performance measures touch on this subject as well. Hollis stated commissioner First did not like the current ratings criteria legend and Hollis asked if anyone used the legend. Schattgen stated she would use the legend, but agreed the language could be better. Hollis stated he could ask First if he was willing to draft revised language and asked if the commission would like him to do this. Thomas stated he was not opposed to someone volunteering to draft revised language. Ford stated the ratings were more important than the legend language. Compton asked about a norming process. Hollis stated this was what the language was attempting to do from an inter-rater perspective. Hollis stated he does monitor for intra-rater reliability. Suhler stated new commissioners may rate differently but used discussion and teamwork as a norming process. Hollis stated that some commissioners start ratings at five and go down from there while others start at three. Hollis stated that the ratings are not used to force rank proposals for allocation purposes. Hollis stated the long-term solution was a true rubric but that building one would be a challenging process. Hollis stated he has discussed building a joint rubric with the county and United Way. Hollis asked if there was consensus regarding the proposed changes to the citations ratings criterion. Ford asked if the five point scale was included in the changes. Hollis stated it was. With the exception of Ford, there was consensus to modify the citations criterion. Hollis stated he would contact First about drafting revised legend language and these changes could be finalized at the next meeting. Suhler stated she struggled with the unit cost portion of the proposal. Hollis this was an ongoing issue and that he and the county have discussed developing a taxonomy of services which could include a fixed cost. Hollis stated the St. Louis County Children's Services board has a taxonomy which includes prices for services. Hollis stated he has the start of a taxonomy. Hollis stated that in the past proposal form there was a formula to calculate the unit cost, but this did not work very well for programs with multiple services. Hollis stated the current process has the agency enter the rate and asks for a citation of a public rate. Hollis stated there were still providers who did not know their unit cost.

## V. NEW BUSINESS

None.

## VI. STAFF REPORT

Hollis stated the Collective Impact team was restarting the issue analysis process with a goal of building an on-line indicators platform which would be maintained throughout the year. Hollis stated the United Way was still pursuing being able to evaluate and build capacity through grant funding. Hollis stated he was working with Social Solutions to change from five proposal forms to one. Hollis stated they may not be able to do this because it may result in too many fields in one form. Hollis stated the next best solution was to go from five forms to two forms. Hollis stated he is also working to build an interim form which would be used to resolve issues while maintaining the original forms. Hollis stated he would be

discussing these options with Social Solutions on Friday. Hollis stated there was an issue with CASA funding. Hollis stated their final FY2015 report initially indicated they had not delivered all of their FY2015 deliverables. Upon further investigation, Hollis said he discovered that they were improperly categorizing consumers by funder rather than actual residence. Hollis stated he determined that they had in fact provided the contracted deliverables. Hollis stated that a revised final FY2015 report was submitted by CASA and the final payment was approved. Hollis stated there was also an issue with Adult Day Connection. Hollis stated they did not expend all FY2015 funds. Hollis stated he was working with the organization to adjust their sliding fee scale to allow for full subsidy for uninsured persons under 200% of poverty level, which is the intent of the funding. Hollis said he has granted a extension on the Fy2015 deliverables and will be monitoring this situation. Hollis stated the City Manager has indicated that all departments should prepare for 3% budget cuts for the FY2017. Hollis stated that if the manager's proposed budget includes cuts to social services funding, the commission may want to again submit comments during the budget hearings. Hollis stated there was a 2% cut in 2009. Hollis stated the 3% cut would result in the lowest level of funding since 2008 and the poverty rate has increased significantly since that time.

## VII. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION REPRESENTATIVE REPORT

Jones stated CDBG funding went from \$831,000 to \$839,000 and the HOME program received \$415,000. Jones stated there were no projects voted on since the last meeting. Jones stated the housing trust efforts were moving forward although there was not a consultant's report available yet. Jones stated the trust was based on a model from Vermont. Hollis stated there is a serious and growing affordable housing issue in Columbia.

## VIII. PUBLIC COMMENT

No comments.

## IX. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

No comments.

## X. FUTURE MEETING TOPICS

Hollis stated he would finalize the policy and ratings criteria legend language at the April meeting. Hollis stated indicators should be available in May.

## XI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:04 pm.

Members of the public may attend any open meeting. For requests for accommodations related to disability, please call 573-874-7214. In order to assist staff in making the appropriate arrangements for your accommodation, please make your request as far in advance of the posted meeting date as possible.