

Planning and Investment

June 15, 2015

CHIP

Attendance: Kay Wiles, Patrick Monahan, Tyler Stumm, Jeremy Turner, Eric Wilka, Michael Butler, Alan Witchey, Betsy Whaley, Terri Bailey, Gabie Benson, Samantha Spergel

Agenda

Jeremy Turner welcomed attendees to the meeting.

Alan Witchey was introduced as the new Executive Director of CHIP.

Jeremy provided background of the previous meeting, which was a joint meeting between PATA and Planning and Investment. He also reminded attendees that goal of today's meeting is to discuss process, not to discuss particular programs.

HMIS Rubric

Eric Wilka reminded attendees what goes in to the HMIS rubric score.

Ranking Projects and Reallocating Money

Jeremy asked if there are any factors to consider in the ranking other than the community ranking, especially if a project is important to the community and consistently ranks in the bottom.

Alan said there are communities that look at sub-populations rather than projects.

Michael clarified Eric's previous remarks. He said Eric was saying we need to measure across similar project groups. And by doing that you can eventually whittle down to the top-performers of each category.

Jeremy suggested looking at how the Balance of State reallocates money. He also asked if they can reduce projects outside of totally defunding projects. He also reminded people that the funding matrix was created to address drops in funding to programs. The matrix has a list of resources to fund programs.

Concern about the process

Phil said he would like to see more clarification on high and low-performing projects and why they were ranked that way.

Betsy was concerned about the timing of the discussion. She said it could come across as unfair and there could be backlash.

Michael said we have to address some of these issues for this year because it goes in to our application for this year. Eventually we will develop in to a permanent process.

Phil said we should take the money that is already volunteered this year. He suggested that we could be creating more problems by creating a process this year.

Jeremy said although a program may score well on our community's ranking, it may not be in line with HUD's priorities.

Michael reminded the attendees that HUD is not looking at individual projects. They are looking at our Continuum as a whole. He added that it is a gamble to keep the low performers in this year. It may jeopardize our future funding.

Phil said he likes the idea of working with low-performers and helping those low-performers improve.

Samantha said that if our continuum does not meet threshold, we will receive one year of funding, but no new projects will be funded.

Finding \$58,000/Ramification of Reallocation

Betsy said we could fund all the renewals and then reallocation starts at the bottom. Another option would be to take the lowest renewal projects and reduce their funding by an amount that equals \$58,000.

Jeremy suggested finding the projects that were giving money back with regularity and that it would be easy to find \$58,000 that way. Those projects are already giving money up so it would not be detrimental to them.

Betsy was concerned about those programs being unable to reapply at the market rate because of their budget.

Phil said a formerly homeless person could lose their house because of our decision.

Kay said that could happen regardless of what we do due to community rankings. There are going to be people in low-performing projects. She suggested asking new projects to reduce their funding by \$58,000.

Gabie wondered if we are not taking major chunks out of our reallocation it may not send a big enough message to HUD.

Kay said we need to respond to a lower-performing project because it is a low-performing project.

Betsy suggested de-funding the lowest performing project.

Keeping Score

Jeremy asked what if the lowest performing project is a major grant. What do we do with that?

Eric reminded the attendees that the Indianapolis community took a huge scoring hit on our written policy so we need to address that.

Paul provided the lowest scoring and highest scoring projects from the HMIS rubric.

Alan reminded people that the lower scoring projects were youth-based projects and is a reason why it's important to compare across different populations.

Accountability and Review Committees

Patrick suggested doing a mid-year performance review.

Members suggested giving low performers a year to turn it around while reminding them that if they do not, they may not receive funding.

Michael added that he would rather cut \$200,000 for this year than lose out on \$4.8 million dollars in funding.

Alan suggested creating an accountability piece for low performers.

Patrick suggested creating a review committee to determine future funding.

Phil suggested having a committee of people who do not have projects, but know about the processes.

Kay suggested creating a peer review committee.

Betsy voiced support behind that committee.

Alan said it helps to have knowledgeable group who are familiar with non-profits

Kay said she would learn a lot from that.

Patrick said he is familiar with scientific reviews. If you invited a representative from every provider so they all have a chance to review and have a leader. Each agency has someone on their staff to be a peer reviewer.

Eric read off Indianapolis' scores: 48.5/69 (Strategic Planning); 15.5/28 (CoC Coordination)

Jeremy asked what organizations did not allocate funding.

Submitting application:

Michael said the city submits the application

Betsy asked if we could provide assistance to the city for writing our performance. It would be helpful if city works with people.

Samantha said she didn't see a problem with it.

Jeremy voiced his support in favor of a peer review committee, and in having another committee to review applications and allocation.

How much is available?

Tyler said Midtown did not provide as much as we could.

Betsy said what the city sent did not reflect what they did not spend down.

Michael asked what our annual renewal demand amount (ARD) is for this year. Based on calculations, our ARD is greater than current grant request amounts. But that is based on budget sheets, Michael thought were actual budget sheets. Michael will get clarity on that.

Eric said regardless we still need to come up with a plan for reallocation.

Michael clarified that we may not have to defund anyone this year, but we still need to talk about performance.

Michael said he will request actual budget amounts, recapture amounts, and projects that have voluntarily reduced.

Patrick said he is familiar with scientific reviews. Jeremy asked what we are going to do to make sure the \$58K is available.

Patrick suggested appointing a sub-committee to decide it.

Alan asked if there are populations we want to protect.

Kay said that our lowest performing project has been our lowest project for a while.

Patrick said if this project did not give anything back, then it would be a good place to start.

CRP

Jeremy said the presentation at the CRP is the time to explain why their project ranked low. The problem is that if you remove projects that serve felons and sex offenders then you are removing the only programs that serve these persons.

HMIS

Michael said HMIS is subject to review. Each continuum has to have HMIS and it can be funded by the CoC grant, but does not have to be. CHIP would be unable to sustain the HMIS without the CoC grant.

Meet Again?/Mayoral Review

Patrick said it's hard to have a hard and fast ruling today due to some complexities such as the NOFA not being released yet.

Eric said whatever time frame is we have to shave off two weeks because it goes to Mayor's office for review.

Jeremy said the Mayor gives final approval or special consideration for our budget.

Patrick said Jeremy wanted us to make a procedural decision because of information Michael will be receiving. He then asked if that would be reason enough to meet again.

Jeremy responded that we really wanted to have the rankings for today's meeting. He added that the continuum and BPC are not places to discuss single projects and how to help people.

Kay said if we put decisions in place, more dominoes are going to fall and we just don't know where dominos are going to fall.

Michael said he will send another doodle link once we get that information back and once Demetrius has our numbers and what amount of funding agencies have potentially given up compared to last year's funding numbers and what our actual funding amount is we can request.

Eric said projects are placed in Tier 1 and Tier 2.

Terri asked if reallocation process will be in Tier 1 or Tier 2.

Eric said there's an appeals process if a project is defunded.

Recap

Jeremy said he will talk to Mary about her interest in peer committee. He asked members to bring information about how peer reviews operate.

Michael reminded members to keep their decision-making at a rational level not an emotional level so we have a process that is not swayed by our feelings for certain projects.

Commented [MB1]: Huh? Swayed, maybe?

Betsy said this process challenges us as a community. We may need to look at funding low-scoring projects such as youth projects through different methods.

Terri said those same conversations we are having about youth programs we are having about transitional housing.

Jeremy said we will look at investment strategy portion and those are our next steps. I want us to start making progress.

Michael reminded everyone that the CoC Technical Assistance session is on June 24th. At that committee we will be working on continuum wide performance standards.

Adjourn: 4:48 p.m.