

Program Application and Technical Assistance Committee

January 9, 2014 Meeting Minutes

10:00 am-2:00 pm

Overview of review process/debrief

- Lack of narrative made it difficult to do reviewer score
- Some of the projects I know better than others
- Used the sense of how good of the program more than the application
- The other piece was the question of does it go along with the BP? If not, why is it included
- Need narrative for a true application
 - In past, narrative was poor
 - If we hold with this format needs to have a stronger knowledge of programs need more people on committee that have more intensive knowledge of projects
- Possibly a smaller committee for renewals and larger for new applications
- CHIP did not review applications prior to printing yesterday as to not influence pulling APR
- It was emotionless which was positive
- Some of the thresholds might need to be adjusted (serving chronically homeless, mainstream benefits) 75% might be high
- Distribution of scores were all over the place
- All had a possible APR for 115 points, highest was 97
- Can see that providing TA to some providers has benefitted them through higher scores.
- Some projects did not know how their projects were awarded (restricted to serving chronically homeless). Of the beds that are chronic designated, how many are they filing?
- All we did was review the APR in a different format—needs to be clear that that's what we did
- If all of those were going to do is look at the APRs, rather than looking at application
- We need to be clear that we did not review applications for renewal.
- Data driven application rather than narrative
- Maybe we develop a tool that helps to better inform the narrative
- Not just a five minute presentation but a narrative as well.
- Helps us to understand what is really going on to highlight

- HMIS should not be scored using this
 - Need to have a tool to look at the HMIS
- Use the current reviewer areas for narrative, add in the “what is unique about your program?”—this is a different question than uniqueness in system.
- Set a limit---text box with 250 words
- Move it towards a community accountability process
- Vision of program about long term goals
- Cincinnati’s BP/ COC council has representative from workgroups
- Moving review to a community and technical process—needs to be inclusive of forward thinking—re-visioning where we are going

Review of rankings:

- HMIS ranking
 - Specific timeframes were in NOFA. Last APR had to be within that timeframe.
 - What APR was during that timeframe
 - Made phone calls to DV to pull their data into system since they do not use HMIS
 - Eric pulled all of the data
 - Went through
 - Housing measures
 - Rest is not PSH, it is transition
 - It looks like we have a real data problem
 - Need to make data committee get standards
 - Date is closed
 - Could be bad data
 - If Is bad data, date is now closed
 - We are stuck with scores on section 1 for the next 2 years
 - Is the \$400K already accounted for in the renewals

Michael and Christy left the room for discussion

Discussion of HMIS, determined it was a threshold project and therefore top rank. Cannot receive HUD funding without HIMS.

Amy makes a motion to put HMIS project application tier 1, project 1. Seconded Julie

HUD will not fund any projects without HMIS, therefore needs to be number 1

All in favor—4, opposed-none

Abstained: Christy and Michael

Assigned higher weight to HMIS data points (25% more) due to being subjective

Finalize next steps and responsible parties:

- Approval by ISC -1/11/13
 - Change the language to approval of rankings not voting on rankings at ISC and/or BPCouncil.
- I Mayoral signature –Completed application is needed (send the project SF424 and total amount). ISC will send to DMD to Julie . Need two weeks prior to 31st (17th)
- Notification of tier 2 projects-1/15/13-DMD as collaborative applicant (adam theis—julie fiddler to assist)
- Posting for public input 1/15/13—what are appeal process (R. Weiler—Julie check to see)
 - Appeal needs to be received in writing to DMD by January 20th
 - Have to document a material problem with data presented in raw data which was used to calculate ranking level
- Process to handle any challenges or questions to final ranking
 - Questions submitted to blueprint email address
- Assistance needed from committee for application submission
- If something comes up in next 2 week that is fundamental to getting it completed, send to ISC

Next steps:

- Next meeting and selection of chair—
 - Doodle calendar of February last week only with committee (Jim McIlhinney)

Data in application is proposed, Data in HMIS was proposed

- There were 26 applications for renewal.
- Rankings were established through the combination of two scores—1 which is the HMIS data that was pulled through APR reports as well as through a review of the data driven application by reviewers on the Program Application and Technical Assistance Committee. The HMIS portion of the application was weighted more heavily (25%).

- Scores were combined and then ranked high to low with 1 being the high score; 26 was the low score.
- The total amount that is eligible to be funded is \$4,184,187 (which is 95% of our ARD \$4,405,091).
- Per HUD's application process, rankings need to be divided into two tiers. The first tier for our application needed to equal or be less than \$4,184,187. A single project could not be split into two different tiers or is disqualified by HUD. There are 24 projects included in tier 1 (which totaled \$4,169,671). There are 2 projects that are included in tier 2 (which totals \$235,400)
- The HMIS project is a threshold project and therefore the top ranked project. Threshold means that HUD will not fund any projects without HMIS.
- As a special note (as advised by HUD), there would be a 2 point deduction if SSO appeared in tier 1, our SSO by scored in the tier 2 range.)
- Here are the rankings
- Need approval of the ISC of these rankings.
 - Accept or reject
 - Leslie, Jim, Patrick, Karin (can accept)

Parking lot issues:

- Moving review to a community and technical process
- More HMIS training
- Voting at Blueprint Council on rankings should be:
 - Approve rank
 - Decline rank
 - Abstain from rank
- Mainstream benefits scale too low; Chronic/family homelessness too high
- BP Council—what if elected member changes job roles? Industry change—no longer in homelessness work
- Appeals process