

Planning and Investment

Reallocation, ct'd

6/30/15

CHIP

3737 N. Meridian

Attendance: Tyler Stumm, Betsy Whaley, Kay Wiles, Brian Paul, Lara Chandler, Eric Wilka, Jeremy Turner, Alan Witchey, Terri Bailey, Michael Butler, Paul Harris, Gabie Benson, Karin Thornburg, Courtney Purnell

Final Rankings and their Influence

Jeremy opened the meeting and asked if the final rankings were available.

Michael asked if the final rankings were going to influence us. Michael said the process should be shaped by parameters instead of the ranking.

Jeremy said we need to review the ranking at some point.

How much is available?

Michael said the voluntary reduction is \$376,559.50. The Annual Renewal Demand is \$4,925,221.

Karin said she thought Partners in Housing voluntarily gave money back from every program and therefore there was more money available.

Michael said there is enough money to fund new projects with the current voluntary reduction and there is actually \$69,000 left over. He will review the chart and make corrections before the next meeting.

Jeremy asked how we want to reallocate for the future.

Karin said she thought we addressed that with the tier system.

Michael said the tier system would be required by HUD once they release the NOFA.

How do we reallocate?

Kay said we could reallocate around APR outcomes and organization's staff participation and CoC process.

Karin suggested community ranking.

Michael said reallocation has to be consistent with the plan in the continuum. We will need to have conversations with low-performing projects that do not fit in to community model.

Kay said we could have quarterly reporting on APR outcomes. If people are not meeting expectations, then we offer to meet with them and provide TA.

Jeremy asked who would be in charge of this committee.

Brian Paul said it sounds like PATA.

Members discussed the committee's make-up. Most said they didn't want it made up of all service providers.

Betsy said this group needs to clarify the difference between peer review and performance management. Betsy said peer reviews are about creating consistency and performance management is about outcomes.

Gabie agreed and said it was not fair to discuss outcomes with peers.

Michael added that the performance management will look at HUD standards. Technical Assistance Committee will help us with goals and creating consistency.

Jeremy said APR will just be a part of the ranking. He also reminded members that if a program had a low APR ranking, then it would be able to make for a low APR during the presentation portion of the Community Ranking Process.

Jeremy also added that he didn't feel that Indianapolis did not need to put that programs voluntarily reduced their funding request to HUD.

Betsy disagreed. She said that programs reducing their funding is showing that the Continuum is operating as it should.

Michael said we are also adding 4 new projects that are consistent with HUD standards. It demonstrates shifting and better utilization of funds.

Karin also reminded members that the CoC has only been around for two years.

Betsy said we also need to create our own community standards that do not necessarily align with HUD standards. She added that any ranking in the bottom 49 percent could have something important get defunded.

Role of Grantee

Kay asked what Continuum of Care's responsibility and grantee's responsibility. If we are not performing on our SSVF, the United Way (grantee) comes to us.

Courtney said with CDBG grants, the city monitors and are trying to set up quarterly benchmarks. But for the Continuum of Care, this is a partnership between the city and the organizations. She added that the Continuum needs to align with HUD's goals. The Balance of State had to do the same.

Future NOFA

Jeremy said there will be renewals for next year's Continuum of Care and it's not certain if we will have the needed funds.

Michael said we will have a refined process for NOFA 2015. We will start defining the process for 2016 and should have this process defined by December 2015.

CRP Rankings

(Michael presented the final rankings from the Community Ranking Process)

Michael said he has further questions in to Demetrius about the rankings and the process. Michael added that the rankings will not be released until his questions are answered.

Discussion about rankings:

Terri asked if this is how last year's ranking looked.

Michael said the rankings were different.

Brian said he would like to see the formula.

Kay did not think the rankings were accurate.

Betsy said she was concerned about Rapid Rehousing being ranked at the bottom.

Jeremy asked if we put projects in tier 2 that don't align with HUD and then don't fund the bottom scorers.

Betsy asked if there were certain projects that could be funded with other monies outside of HUD because not everyone qualifies for PSH as an option.

Recruitment

Jeremy said there needs to be a push to increase the size of the Continuum.

The \$68,000 question

Kay asked what are we going to do with the remaining \$68,000.

Jeremy said we need to approach new projects to see if there is a possibility to increase the amount of people served. New projects are the only ones that can accept additional funding.

Terri said we can give the money to new projects or we return the funding to programs who voluntarily reduced their ask.

Introductions

Members introduced themselves.

Courtney said she will be overseeing the CoC, HOPWA, and ESG grants.

PATA vs. Planning and Investment

Jeremy asked which committees will oversee what new implementations. He said the performance management is Planning and Investment and the Peer Review is PATA.

Peer Reviews, Performance Management

Michael said we will get Technical Assistance.

Betsy said she did not see any need for Technical Assistance for the peer review other than to review best practices from other Continuums.

Karin said she thinks peer reviews need to be mandatory.

Jeremy said that sort of implementation would need to be voted on.

Courtney said she liked the idea of the CoC creating a recommendation. The City is more of a partner.

Betsy said the standards around training should not be burdensome. But there should not be standards around documentation and training.

Top Concern?

There was discussion around creating a top concern for the community.

Jeremy said we could ask the Continuum to set priorities during election.

Betsy thinks the decision should be data-informed.

Michael said this committee reviews data and then could present for the community to vote on.

There was discussion about asking other members what their top priority should be and then reviewing and comparing answers.

Next Meeting

- The next meeting will review the 2015 release.
- Data Quarterly reviews
- Setting process for performance alignments for Indianapolis
- Review the Final CRP rankings
- Money left on table

Next meeting will be in two weeks.

Meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.