

Continuum of Care
Program Application & Technical Assistance Committee Meeting MINUTES
March 10, 2014
CHIP Boardroom
11:00-1:00 PM

- Committee sign-in / contact info updates (Kelly Frank)
 - Please check your contact info and update if needed
- Welcome and Introductions (Christy Shepard)
 - Attendees
 - Mary Jones
 - Eric Wilka
 - Adam Hutton
 - Michael Butler
 - Julie Fidler
 - Erika Aquila
 - Christy Shepard
 - Amy Nelson
 - Mary Gardiner
 - Janna Bruce
- Committee Chair update (Kelly Frank)
 - Committee chair = Amy Nelson
- Update on Blueprint Council (Christy Shepard)
 - Seated – 6 appointed and 13 elected for total of 19 BP Council Members
 - Chair – Phil Smith
 - Vice Chair – Mary Jones
 - Orientation held last month
 - First meeting just held - focusing on roles and responsibilities of the BP Council, governance charter amendments, CoC annual calendar of activities
 - Past meeting info will be posted on Indycoc.org
- Priority community performance metrics (Kathy Pedrotti Hays)
 - See attached PowerPoint
 - Info has been shared with each committee
 - Goal is to set priority performance measures to guide the work and the development of the implementation plans
 - Rapid rehousing – check definition on this – you do not have to be “homeless” to be rapidly rehoused
 - Grants manager can share HUD definitions as needed

- Input can be sent to Laura Littlepage or Michael Butler – please send via email by 3/14
- Service provider survey (Kathy Pedrotti Hays)
 - Committees wanted to better understand what services exist, scope of services, who is doing what, funding streams supporting the work, current or desired partners, etc. = so it was suggested we survey providers offering services to the homeless
 - Survey was drafted and edited by CoC committees
 - Provider survey was distributed electronically last week to 70 providers – one survey will be completed per organization – we identified a lead contact at each organization who received the survey to complete
 - Survey was to be completed by today 3/10 – we will do follow-up this week to encourage completion
 - Results will be shared in upcoming committee meetings
- Committee priority discussion items (Amy Nelson)
 - Audit renewal process
 - See attached notes from prior meeting including comments on ranking process
 - See attached scoring rubric based on APR data that we used in 2013
 - Committee likes this tool and likes that they do not see it while they are doing their ranking – but would like more time to review it before the committee meets to finalize ranking
 - Want more narrative info to assist with the ranking – renewal application was hard data without any narrative
 - We cannot do new applications without reallocation
 - Cannot separate committee to focus on new versus renewal – because one impacts the other – new impacts renewal amount – need to be a part of the larger picture and discussion
 - Recommend best practice of CHIP not looking at applications while completing the data portion of the ranking
 - Keep HUD thresholds – but we could change how the points are distributed (ex: chronically homeless) (do we have different thresholds for different types of programs?)
 - 2012 community result – aggregate based on program type in HMIS
 - Expectation that you would increase over time – to better our standing with HUD

- Need to educate the providers – how the funding is awarded and for what
- Must add a narrative component – helps an agency stay connected to funding priorities / 3 outstanding things you have done – what you want to advance in the future / what is unique about your program?
- Narrative via online application with text box with word limitation
- Add a community process – community accountability
- Ranking process needs to be done by April BP Council meeting anticipating NOFA to drop in July
- Want to set an annual calendar that is not dependent on when NOFA drops
- Components of a Recommended Ranking Process
 - Recommendations
 - Timeline on new and renewal
 - Process to loop in Investment Strategy & Performance Auditing Committee – on struggling projects not meeting outcomes
 - New applications
 - Renewal applications
 - Components of process
 - Data
 - Narrative
 - Committee ranking
 - Community ranking
 - Renewals
 - Start with what worked well – use data ranking process based on APR and HMIS data used in 2013 / not seen by committee members until after ranking is done
 - Subjective to available funding
 - Do we decide that some groups are not even eligible for renewal – so they do not even submit?
 - Programs that are struggling and not meeting outcome expectations – they are given a probation window with TA support and then funding can be pulled if not improving (need a plan to share this message – who

communicates the message – would be the Investment Strategy and Performance Auditing Committee). Our committee should send a formal request to this committee to initiate such follow-up and communication.

- Applicable to both new and renewal
 - Set annual calendar = call for new and renewal applications in April
 - Add a narrative component (for new and for renewal – less for renewals)
 - How does this fit into BP?
 - Program uniqueness
 - Who do they serve
 - Measure involvement in CoC
 - Additional questions could be sent to applicant once NOFA drops
- New
 - Need to look at renewal projects and determine if we want to reallocate to allow for new projects
 - Call for new projects at same time with a very similar process
 - Eventually we rank new and renewal at same time – this helps us determine if a new project is worth funding over a renewal project that is not meeting outcomes
 - Hold a meeting to inform on new projects – priorities, expectations, process to apply
 - We don't know HUD eligibility requirements until NOFA drops – but if there is a project of value that does not fit – we can then leverage the CoC infrastructure to find ways to resource the project
 - Could have additional questions that go to applicants once the NOFA drops
 - New projects are more about establishing interest and eligibility at this time
- Build out community process review
 - Example from Dallas

- Timeline for creation of implementation plan
 - Meeting with CoC leadership to finalize a 2014 Calendar of Activities
- Next meeting
 - Schedule a meeting for next week to finalize ranking process to go to BP Council in early April and to full CoC in late April
 - Next meeting set for March 19, 2014 from 3 to 5 pm at CHIP
 - Meeting prep
 - Send Cincinnati samples via email – committee members come back with recommendations based on that model – what do we want to change or improve?
 - Scoring rubric based on APR/HMIS data
 - Ranker training and qualifications
 - Narrative application suggestions (determines baseline eligibility – would be reviewed by the Program Application and TA committee)
 - Collect samples for Threshold application from Cincinnati
 - Look at the process being used for the rest of the state – email to Kathy to see what we can use to inform our process development
 - Annual calendar of activities/process