

VOCA Stakeholder Meeting Notes 3.27.23

Attendees:

- Cheryl Robb Welch – ED MOCADSV
- Zak Wilson – COO MOCADSV
- Jessica Seitz – ED MO Kids First
- Jamie Padgett – MAPA Statewide Victim Coordinator
- Ken Chapman – OWCI Assistant Deputy Director
- Leanne Reese – MOCASA Program Services Coordinator
- Connie Berhorst – DPS Program Manager
- Tiffany Johnston – VOCA Program Coordinator
- Tara Shahangian – VOCA Program Specialist
- Benjamin Johnson – VOCA Program Specialist
- Camryn Heimericks – OWCI Fiscal Intern

❖ Meeting started at 9:10 am

❖ General Q&A before getting into the topics

Tiffany: VOCA staff has been doing site visits. In addition, DSS is reviewing 10 agencies previously questioned on the VOCA services they are providing. DSS need to complete the review and will bring it for the next meeting discussion.

Jessica: Mentioned ARCHS was brought up in the legislative process. She wondered if they are just a pass through agency or if they do more and how they are used in VOCA.

Tiffany: Listed the agencies that ARCHS is funding under Neighborhood Healing Network.

Jessica: Requested a funding breakdown of each ARCHS subrecipient.

Tiffany: Stated will follow-up with the information.

Tiffany: Asked if there were questions on any other VOCA agencies.

Zak: Said that he thinks some agencies don't need their own contract including 1:6, Saweraa, and Employment Connections.

Tiffany: Stated 1:6 is not receiving funding and we could provide a write-up on Employment Connections.

Jessica and Zak: Requested a write-up on Employment Connections.

Tara: Saweraa is providing services and asked the group if they would like a write-up on the agency.

Zak: Stated he did not want a write-up.

Jessica: Some providers who have trouble spending were brought up, such as MO Highway asked if there is any reason why.

Tiffany: They have 2 contracts one for Human Trafficking and one for a School Violence Hotline, but they usually spend all their money by the end of the contract.

❖ Connie Berhorst comes in.

Zak: The biggest question is how we make sure they are actually crime victims they are serving and not just citizens.

Tiffany: They explain the distinction when they review them.

Zak: Wants to make sure they are VOCA eligible like with Employment Connection.

Jessica: Wants to know how some specific programs are VOCA eligible.

Tiffany: Asked them which providers they want a write-up on.

Zak and Jessica: Would like a write-up on Employment Connections and ARCHS. They also requested 5 funding providers ARCHS passes through.

1. Review of Current status of the VOCA fund and projections through FFY23-FFY24

Jessica: Without legislative action, what kind of deficit are we looking at to enact the 1-year?

Tiffany: We got FY23 award already which was \$24,764,263. Which was more than anticipated, but still short by approximately \$1.6M compared to FY22 award which was around \$26M. Also they are not renewing a few contracts so around \$3M can be put back into other providers.

Zak: Start with fund projections, \$24M ARPA, budget book language vs. bill language of last resort. Ken will ask Pat L. which language/authority is correct regarding ARPA and last resort language. Keep agencies who still have FY20 money to spend down due to liquidation deadline this year, push out as much ARPA as possible as fast as possible.

Connie: is there a supplanting issue by using ARPA first? If you spend ARPA now, keep it totally separate

Jessica: supplanting is not an issue, state is struggling overall to spend ARPA dollars, and legislature prefers for it to be spent earlier rather than later, wants to push out ARPA dollars to majority of agencies

Jamie: Do we need to adjust contracts to spend out of ARPA instead of award dollars?

Tiffany: if money is switched around, agencies will need new budgets, and FFDI's disclosed to them.

Jessica: Is it possible to start using ARPA funds instead of VOCA funds starting ASAP, like May 1st all invoices be submitted under ARPA funding?

Tiffany: It would require a new FFDI, and new budget because 100% ARPA funded programs have different reports.

Ken will talk to Pat about the authority and the switch over.

Zak: Asked Tiffany for the remaining balances for FY20 and FY21 funding.

Note from Jeriane: The Senate reiterated in the hearing process for the SFY23 budget that this funding should only be used after the VOCA funds are expended.

2. Review FFY23 - 24 contract allocation methodology to develop recommendations if there is a FFY24 VOCA fund deficit or increase

Zak: If we do not have authority for ARPA funding they are still \$5M short, what are recommendations? Zak prefers targeted cuts to folks that consistently de-obligate funds, and Jamie agreed.

Ken: texted Bobby and asked about the ARPA funding, Bobby said they most likely have authority.

Group decided to hold off on this conversation until firm confirmation that they have authority to spend ARPA.

Note from Jeriane: DSS has the authority, but we must spend ARPA last.

3. Identification of percentage range of VOCA fund for each identified category

Zak: We established the 5 categories last meeting, now they need to establish the percentages. Recommendations: DV 51%, SA 10%, CA 25%, US 4%, System Based 10% based on updated representation spreadsheet.

Note from Jeriane: This totals 100% and we need to retain admin, so the calculation needs to occur after the removal of administration fees.

Zak and Jessica: Agreed the range from the recommendation percentage can fluctuate roughly up or down 2.5% - 3%.

Tiffany: Bulk of underserved is in Systems based.

Jamie: MAPA spends about 60% of funds on underserved.

Zak: Contracts might vary because unsure if some agencies like Healing Action Network spends more out of underserved or different categories.

Note from Jeriane: This is not the Neighborhood Healing Action Network through ARCHS, this is a separate agency in St. Louis and they provide non-VOCA funding to MOCATE. They received \$263,120 and 100% is underserved.

Jessica: Would like more information on the types of groups that are included in underserved (i.e. rural, survivors of homicide, witnessing crimes, etc.) for some dual agencies.

Tiffany: Will provide the SAR for contracts beginning April 1, 2022. These are only estimates, not actuals as the contract is still active.

Ken: Suggested looking at #'s with that 1.5% fluctuation on either size. Said DSS can start working on those values. Zak agreed with idea and would like to see that.

Note from Jeriane: We can provide the previous contract finalized SAR, and the new estimates. There are differences between estimates and actuals.

4. Review application process with procurement requirements and category specific responses

Jessica: Believes regions should be changed. Some agencies are having a hard time with the regional allocations. Stated there should be a budget within the proposal process.

Connie and Jamie: Agreed with Jessica .

Notes from Jeriane: If there are no longer regions, how will the group decide if the funding meets the crimes? This previously came up during session and the House stated that St. Louis was not receiving adequate funding at that time.

Need to hear from procurement, my understanding is if they put an itemized amount in the proposal that then they have to stick with those amounts, or there would have to be regular contract changes. That is why we focused on services in the bid process, and the line-by-line funding outside of the contract.

Tiffany: Mentioned having sample NFO from other states. Asked if group wanted to see it.

Zak and Jessica: Want to review it to see what categories other states use.

- NFO 1a. How does serving victims of crime advance your agencies strategic plan (add)
- Section D: How do you collect data/use it or quality assurance improvement? Include state plan with NFO that states categories, definitions and priorities.

- Zak: are there geographic priorities? Remove regions, add budget requirement to proposal.
- Section A - Attachment B: History and Experience
 - 1a: # 1-2 pages max
 - Zak: Thinks some of the questions in this section are repetitive. Maybe an Abstract of the project.

Notes from Jeriane: To Zak – what are your proposed language changes?

- Section 3:
 - Zak mentioned this section is where agencies who have good grant writers will excel compared to other agencies. This section is important and they need the numbers but doesn't think it should be as significant of a weight.

Notes from Jeriane: To Zak – What is the number you would like to use?

- Leanne: If organization is a DV shelter, should they say they are a certain type of agency like a CAC? Thinks they should identify with a few sentences what the program is and what categories they serve? (Zak agrees).

Notes from Jeriane: What is the exact language that needs to be included?

- Jessica: Wants to add in Section A, a question that asks how they specifically help victims of crime, basically a reasoning for why they applied for VOCA.

Notes from Jeriane: What is the exact language that needs to be included?

- Connie: Suggested adding something such as "What's the problem, why is it a problem, and including statistics relating to the Nation."

Notes from Jeriane: To Connie, this was in the notes, but we cannot determine what it means. Will clarify in the meeting on April 10th.

- Remove #1B, # 2

Notes from Jeriane: Will review this section on the 10th when procurement is available.

- Section B: Zak wants this wordsmith.

Notes from Jeriane: What is the exact language that needs to be included?

- Ken: How specific with the type of crime? 5 Category limit only?
- Zak: If they develop strong definition of Underserved, then yes. (Collective agreed they need a definition of Underserved)

Notes from Jeriane: When are we going to include the underserved providers in this conversation?

- Tiffany: Asked if they wanted an appendix of definitions included?
- Zak: Agrees but also wants to include a 3-year state plan.
- Tiffany: So a like state plan posted with it?
- Zak & Jessica: Yes, so people can refer to it and see where they fit in.

Notes from Jeriane: If there is an appendix, the group needs to decide what is included. In regards to the state plan, we can include a link to the plan in the RFP. However, we will take comments from all agencies on the plan. We should consider a public comment/public hearing for transparency.

- Section C:

- Zak does not like the word “EVERY” in services based on category applying for – wants customized
- Zak: Curious if they can use different prompts for different applicants based of the type of service(s) they provide. (Example: If applying for category DV, answer box 1a—skip box 1b).
- Connie thinks they should be able to, but Ken unsure
- Jessica: wants maybe more specific questions because some agencies will over dump information because they do not want to leave anything out.
- Jamie: mentioned it also results in not enough info and some were docked points for not including things like facility size.

Notes from Jeriane: We can design the proposal.

- Section D:

- Zak: Not great section because hard to compare DV to CA.
- Jessica: Mentioned having to report that data to the feds, so maybe changing wording to “How do you collect & quality assure data?”

Notes from Jeriane: We can design the proposal.

- Section E: moving services into section c (condense)
 - Connie: # 2 change to description rather than a summary, request specific questions, Section D: why do you collect the data, how do you use it? Look at the data when you are monitoring (program)

Notes from Jeriane: Need to draft the language.

- Section F: wordsmith (ROI) question
 - Jessica: where do you fit in your community? How do you help out? Provide pre-bid clarification
 - Zak: If you pick N/A, please explain how you cannot get the services

Notes from Jeriane: Need to draft the language.

- Volunteer Section:
 - Jessica: No issue, possibly condense into section C- services
 - Zak: clean up question about Volunteers doing specifically VOCA project work, & wants the unduplicated # of volunteers.

Notes from Jeriane: Need to draft the language.

- Personnel Section:
 - Zak: good to have a list of personnel on a project, clear up language, talk about education and experience. Key personnel form- ask Wade about possibly combining it with budget and list of paid VOCA staff

Notes from Jeriane: Need to draft the language.

- Training Plan:
 - Zak: weighted too high but essential, wordsmith question 1 and 2

Notes from Jeriane: Need to draft the language.

- Sustainability plan:
 - Connie: sent out funding form- will send to group, create a review form with expectations, and make sure it matches questions

- Zak: use template for 25% other funding requirement, ask question if you were cut by XX % what would the contractor provider do?
- Jessica: wants to include question about what other funding sources are used as part of the scoring. Use funding sources chart.

Notes from Jeriane: Need to draft the language.

- Post Review Questions & Thoughts:
 - Connie: thinks questions should be very clear on forms & NFO.

Notes from Jeriane: We need to know what the proposed language is.

- Zak: Agrees and thinks applicants should know the questions beforehand as well. (Collective agrees).

DSS To Do List

1. Update project descriptions to include ARCHS, employment connection, and questioned C/A agencies, make sure it includes how they identify victims/non victims
2. Update spreadsheet for category percentages based on SAR categories reported
3. Report out expenditure levels by grant year, and remaining to date
4. Send out other state NFO samples to group (done)
5. Follow up on underserved survey clarification